

## Durham E-Theses

---

*A study of role conflict in a changing society with special reference to some twentieth century problems*

Clifford Hedley Jobson

### How to cite:

---

Jobson, Clifford Hedley (1982) A study of role conflict in a changing society with special reference to some twentieth century problems. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7894/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.


THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN  
A STUDY OF ROLE CONFLICT IN A CHANGING SOCIETY WITH SPECIAL  
REFERENCE TO SOME TWENTIETH CENTURY PROBLEMS

CLIFFORD HEDLEY JOBSON

Submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in the University of Durham

November 1982

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



22. MAY 1984

## ABSTRACT

### THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN. A STUDY OF ROLE CONFLICT IN A CHANGING SOCIETY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SOME TWENTIETH CENTURY PROBLEMS

This thesis arises out of a very practical and personal need to identify, examine and possibly resolve any role conflict that might be experienced by the military chaplain in the performance of his religious and military duties. It endeavours to trace the dilemma against a background of certain military and political activities and in the light of some theological comment to arrive at some form of modus vivendi whereby those who legitimately take up arms in the defence of their country are not without the ministry and help of those who, in ordination, have taken up the profession of Jesus Christ. The history of the military chaplain is traced from the early days of his acceptance by society to the time when he begins to feel rejected and serious doubts are being raised as to his ability to serve both God and Caesar.

In an attempt to discover if there is any support or even understanding for his peculiar and specialised ministry the relationship between Church and State is examined and analysed. The role of the chaplain in both war and peace is studied with particular reference to the nuclear deterrent debate, Northern Ireland and its problems and of course the two great world wars of the twentieth century. Questions are asked of many chaplains in an attempt to discover if the conflict is in any sense destructive of their ministry or indeed creative. In the end the role of the military chaplain is seen to be but a microcosmic reflection of the paradoxical role that is continually being experienced by all Christians in their attempts to establish the Kingdom of God in a world which is far from perfect.

DECLARATION

No material contained in the thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation found should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

## CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	1 - 6
The Military Chaplain . . . . .	1 - 29
Origins - The Early History - A Brief Outline . . . . .	1
The Royal Army Chaplains' Department . . . . .	7
The Chaplain of Today . . . . .	20
The Military Chaplain and Role Conflict . . . . .	30 - 87
Role Conflict relating to Religious beliefs and practices . . . . .	38
Role Conflict with regard to the Military Organisation . . . . .	46
Conflict between the Chaplain and Civilian Clergymen . . . . .	61
Specialised Clergy v. Parochial Clergy . . . . .	75
Church and State . . . . .	88 - 122
The First World War . . . . .	123 - 164
The Age of the Nuclear Deterrent . . . . .	165 - 207
The Chaplains' Role in the World of the Nuclear Deterrent . . . . .	208 - 244
The Military Chaplain and Northern Ireland . . . . .	245 - 274
Background History . . . . .	245
Life in Northern Ireland Today . . . . .	247
Some Conflict Problems for Chaplains . . . . .	258
Conclusion . . . . .	275 - 283
Annexures A (1) Specialised Clergy & Parochial Ministry	284
A (2) Reasons for joining Specialised Ministry	286
B Clergy & Commanders ratings for task options	288
C Ratings of Qualities by Clergy & Commanders	289
D Ratings of Qualities by Chaplains . . . . .	290
E Clergy, Chaplains & Commanders ratings . . . . .	292
F Difficulties about Specialised Ministry . . . . .	294
G Difficulties about Specialised Ministry . . . . .	296
H Analysis of clergy returning to parochial work	297
I - A questionnaire by G.C. Zahn . . . . .	298
J - The Military Chaplain in N. Ireland . . . . .	304
Abbreviations . . . . .	306
Bibliography . . . . .	307

INTRODUCTION.

From a book of memoirs Brigadier the Lord Lovat wrote of an incident that happened during the preparation for the Normandy Landings.

"..... On Sunday Rene de Naurois, his decorations a splash of colour on a white surplice, said Mass for three hundred men kneeling on the grass. At the Interdenominational Church Parade a favourite hymn, that has since become our own, was sung with feeling:

Eternal Father, strong to save ....

O hear us when we cry to thee

For those in peril on the sea.

It goes well with male voices, but the new padre preached a rotten sermon about death and destruction which caused surprise. There are few atheists to be found before a battle, or later in the shell holes. Tension was building up, and charity perhaps a trifle thin upon the ground. There were a number of complaints; the cleric was suspended and told to return from whence he came. Poor fellow! A spark can cause the prairie fire! It was mistaken zeal from a man, lacking in combat experience, who did not know his Congregation, and doubly unfortunate in that it conflicted with my own "God speed" before departure. The incident was forgotten but the dismissal was badly taken. On the last day in camp the unfortunate man took his own life. A sad business, with barely time for regrets, for troops were belting



up amidst the dust and shouting as embarkation transport came grinding into Southampton to take us away. Max, a most humane officer and the soundest of administrators, cleared up the pitiful remains. The padre was put down as a 'battle casualty'". (1)

Such is the paradox, the dilemma, the conflict of many military chaplains but the resolution of their problem is seldom, if ever, so unhappy as the poor man who took part in the Normandy Landings of World War II. Alan Wilkinson writes:

"I believe that the paradox of the military chaplain should be seen as a particular expression of the whole paradoxical business of being a Christian who has to try to live in history with the aid of an eschatological Gospel and with the problem of a delayed parousia". (2)

The aim of this thesis is to show that though conflict does exist it is in no way the monopoly of the military chaplain but rather something which is shared by the whole of Christendom as it endeavours to live out its life in the world but not of the world. The military chaplain, with his peculiar and specialised ministry, may indeed be a focal point for the conflict that exists between peace and war, but in no way should he be made to accept the blame for a nation's efforts to defend itself in this nuclear age.

Many areas of conflict have been identified and many scholars have been active over the Post World War II years to examine and analyse such conflict situations. Alan Wilkinson is but following in the

footsteps of men like Waldo Burchard, Gordon C. Zahn, and Clarence Abercrombie all of whose works will be considered in due course.

There is nothing new about Wilkinson's attempt to discern eight types of paradox and tension existing in the role of the military chaplain.

What is surprising is the fact that he is surprised at his findings and yet it appears he has done nothing to bring himself up-to-date with all the efforts, on the part of chaplains attached to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, to explore the conflict problem in some detail, particularly where the nuclear debate is concerned. The West German Army Chaplains' Department has undertaken a lot of theological and political research into the whole area of War and Peace. (3)

Every year chaplains from all the NATO Countries meet and discuss the problems related to our particular ministries so there is much open debate and considerable scholarship.

Throughout this thesis the broad areas of concern identified by Wilkinson will be examined. Efforts will be made to bring the whole debate into the 1980s and away from the somewhat stereotyped, old fashioned view of life in the Forces represented by the two major World Wars and what can be remembered by those who participated in them, either as chaplains or interested onlookers. Attitudes have undoubtedly changed over the years. There is now an altogether different perspective to examine particularly where world peace is concerned and whether or not nuclear weapons contribute to the peace programme or indeed prepare for an inevitable holocaust. The debate will continue to rage in Church and in State and it is at this level that any conclusions ought to be made if indeed any can be made. The military chaplain is but a tool in the hands of both Church and State. He is closely identified with the Armed Forces of one because he is the ordained representative of the other. He is what he is because he operates with

the permission and the blessing of the Church that ordained him and gives him the authority to minister in the peculiar way that he does. The basic relationship is spelled out by an American military document which states:

"An ecclesiastical endorsement is a statement of official approval from a specific religious group and is a basic requirement for appointment as a chaplain. The endorsement is submitted by the applicant's religious group directly to the office of the chief of chaplains. Withdrawal of such an endorsement is a basis for action to end commissioned status as a chaplain. The Army obviously sees each chaplain as an official representative of a particular religious group. This obligates all chaplains to maintain active, continuing membership in their respective groups; to maintain continuing relationship with their group leadership; and, to the observance of group requirements as promulgated by endorsing agencies". (4)

It is clear from this statement, albeit American, that the army authority has some form of quasi-contractual relationship with certain religious denominations and what is true of American Forces is equally true of any other National Defence Force employing chaplains. While the Army pays the salaries and maintains staff control over individual chaplains, the primary relationship is with the Church and its various denominations.

Throughout this thesis the burden of responsibility for theological

and political decisions can be seen to be specifically with the endorsing agencies of the various Churches. Chaplains can and do make contributions to the main arguments but in the last analysis they are but representatives of the Church that endorses their ministry to the soldier, sailor or airman.

1. LORD LOVAT - March Past p.302
2. ALAN WILKINSON - Article in Theology July 1981 p. 249  
"The Paradox of the Military Chaplain"
3. Streit um den Frieden - Arguments - a production  
on behalf of the Evangelical Church for the  
Bundeswehr.
4. United States Army Field Manual 16-5, sec 2-8

MILITARY CHAPLAIN

Origins - The Early History - A Brief Outline

Long before the word Chaplain had ever been invented, there were holy men, of sorts, whose word and advice was always sought before any dangerous enterprise was undertaken. The Old Testament bears witness to the work of the true and false prophets, and no doubt before that, there would be men willing to stake their reputation on being able to read the signs of the time, in order to fulfil a two-fold function of advising leaders on a course of action and reassuring followers that the gods would be favourably disposed towards them. Times may have changed but human nature still requires reassurance and good advice. In Britain, priests of the Church have always had a most important part to play in the history of soldiering and warfare, from the very earliest of times. Records during the Roman occupation are scarce but after that there are constant references to the relationship of priest and soldier. As early as 429, a certain Bishop, Germanus, leads the army in a battle in Wales against Saxons and Picts, and is instrumental, in no small way, for victory in what is called the Hallelujah Battle. The historian Bede, too, makes reference to a leading role played by clergy in certain other battles in Wales, Chester, York, Scotland and elsewhere. It was after fighting a fierce battle in Culdrethone Ireland, that Columba, though victorious, was forced to leave and with a few Lieutenants arrived in Iona to set up the standard of Christianity in England again. He was often met by military chaplains of a different sort called Druids but "with the cry that 'Christ is my Druid' he beat them at their own game".

(1) *After* the coming of Christianity to England and the church was regarded as the depository of all knowledge it followed that many *of the clergy therefore were*



also leading statesmen of the realm and on occasions were forced to raise and lead armies into battle. Relations between Church and Monarch continually varied from the hostile to the friendly. The relationship that existed between William and Lanfranc was one of the happiest between King and Archbishop and the result was a strong Church which became one of the instruments for William's total subjection of the English people.

In order to maintain law and order William imposed upon the people of England a military organisation requiring a Standing Army which was quite a new departure. He enforced certain rights and dues including the supply of armed men for the King's service in proportion to the amount of land they held.

"From none of these conditions was the Church exempt. The same homage was exacted from a Bishop as from a Baron and many of the Bishops were great territorial magnates. The Bishop of Durham's castle was the greatest fortress in the North of England ..... When a Bishop travelled he always had with him a goodly posse of Knights and men-at-arms". (2)

As well as being landlords and statesmen, many clergy were the only people capable of any sort of meagre scholarship and so they were often left to control the purse strings, paying both Naval and Military, as well as the civil and domestic expenses. They could even be said to be the forerunners of the Royal Army Pay Corps.

"It is probably true to say that up to 1300 no war was embarked upon, no army raised in England, which had not on its strength and

amongst its leaders, many of the foremost ecclesiastics of the land. When we come to the period of Edward I we come to the end of the fighting clerics and the appearance on the pay roll of the Army Chaplain". (3)

Initially there were two categories of Capellans: the magnificent being paid the princely sum of one shilling a day and the Vulgaris who only received half as much. By 1346, in the Army that fought at Crecy, three grades of Chaplains are mentioned.

"The first class - in the retinue of the King - of whom there seem to have been twenty four. The second class was attached by the Barons, and the third appeared in the retinue of the Welsh". (4)

By the time of Henry V one particular Chaplain, by the name of Thomas Eltham, wrote an account of the battle of Agincourt 1415 and mentioned, in passing, that by then the King employed a total of 32 Chaplains. The establishment of Chaplains becomes more fixed as history develops until in Standing Orders of 1621 there is definite mention of regimental Chaplains.

"Responsibility for religious observance of the men in the ranks is laid firmly on the Colonel of the Regiment and his Officers. There is nothing voluntary about it. A Lieutenant is enjoined, 'In the field and upon service to see prayers read at the head of his company, every night; and on Sundays he will compel all soldiers not on guard to go to

the Colonel's tent and to hear prayers and sermon.

He (the Lieutenant) is to be religious, valiant and wise'. And the Colonel of the Regiment is 'to have a well-governed and religious preacher in his Regiment so that by his life and doctrine the soldiers may be drawn to goodness. He is to cause so many of his Regiment as are to relieve the watch morning and evening to be drawn in parade before the head of the quarters where divine duties are to be performed by the preacher'. And with regard to the latter, 'The Preacher, be he priest or minister, whether Lutheran or Reformed or Roman Catholic, his office is well enough known and there is much respect to be paid him; and the laws of war provide severe punishment to those who offer an offence or injury to his person or charges. His duty is to have 'Care of Souls' and it is well if he meddle with no other business, but makes that his only care". (5)

The Civil War began in August 1642 and this period, because of the nature of the conflict is particularly significant in the development of the role of the military chaplain.

"How far it was religious and how far a political or class struggle it is hard to say. Roughly speaking, on one side were ranged the King and Anglicanism (represented by episcopacy and the Prayer Book), but also autocracy and despotism; whereas on the other side stood Parliament and Puritanism (whether Presbyterian or Independent)". (6)

Both sides had their adventurers and idealists as well as their priests and pastors. When the war, which was inevitable, eventually began, the Parliamentary Army was very liberally supplied with Chaplains.

"In September 1642, many clergymen reported for duty at the HQ of the Earl of Sussex at Northampton and were posted to a Regiment .... Cromwell's Chaplains were the first war correspondents. It was their duty to write up the movements and the battles of the armies to which they were attached". (7)

By 1648 the Army Council had the right of appointing Chaplains to Regiments. Previously the appointment of such men was always in the hands of the Commanding Officer who might be tempted to sell the appointment to the highest bidder or keep it for some close friend or relative.

In 1649 Cromwell took an Expeditionary Force to Ireland and with it went a number of Chaplains, though too few in number to be of any great impact. Instead, officers petitioned to have a greater issue of Bibles. The number of Chaplains serving with Regiments seems to fluctuate with the fortunes of war and harvest - many of them retiring from active service for a season and then returning to the colours, having performed their duties to their parishes, families and farms.

The fortunes of the Army fluctuated after Oliver Cromwell died in 1658. A new King came to the throne and one of the most urgent tasks of the new Parliament was to disband the Army because it was both a financial drain and an extravagance as well as a possible threat. By 1661 some 35,000 men were dismissed and so came to an end the Standing Army as it had been known and the Militia were reconstituted as a sort of volunteer reserve.

The fortunes of Church, State and Army had been seen to be dependent upon each other, to a greater or lesser extent, and this interdependence was to be seen in evidence again and again in later history. Since the Restoration in 1660, up to 1796, a Chaplain formed part of the establishment of every Regiment, as a field officer. Parliament, in their articles of War 1662-63 had prescribed the duty of every Chaplain. He was to read the prayers of the Church of England every day and to preach as often as he thought fit. Every soldier or officer absent from prayers was to lose a day's pay. (8)

By 1666 The Articles were more specific and if chaplains did not comply with them they were threatened with severe disciplinary action. The selection of Regimental Chaplains was once again the *perquisite* of the Colonel. He sold it and the priest who bought it received the pay. He did not often do the work as this was handed down to some deputy who received a nominal stipend in return.

The War of Spanish Succession (1702-13) saw the fortunes of Marlborough realised. He was both a brilliant strategist and an excellent leader of men. Knowing the psychological value of corporate and religious acts of worship he welded together into an Army what might have been little more than a rabble.

"He was a strict disciplinarian and insisted also on the regular conduct of public worship. Before battle Marlborough would take the sacrament and then ride out on his white horse". (9)

He had a Chaplain General on his staff and a Chaplain. With each Regiment absenteeism was fairly high on the part of officers, particularly

amongst Chaplains. On 2nd July 1704 there were only seven chaplains present out of an establishment of twenty-one. Unfortunately the decline in standards that was to affect the quality of ministry amongst Church of England clergy in the 18th Century was clearly to be seen in the less devoted attitude of the military chaplain. The problem of absenteeism amongst the clergy was a continuing problem in the period of the Napoleonic Wars. In 1793 only one Chaplain accompanied the Army to France and in 1795 not even one Chaplain offered to accompany Sir Ralph Abercromby as he prepared to go to the West Indies.

"It was therefore decided to abolish regimental Chaplains and by Royal Warrant of 23 September 1796 the Army Chaplains' Department came into being". (10)

#### The Royal Army Chaplains' Department.

Chaplains had existed for hundreds of years before but invariably they had been regarded as the perquisites of Bishops, Colonels and men of high esteem. In 1796 their position was to some extent regularised in order to abolish absenteeism which was rife and in order to provide proper recompense for services rendered both at home and abroad.

"Among the many qualifications laid down for the appointment of Chaplains are - zeal in his profession and good sense; gentle manners; a distinctive and impressive manner of reading Divine Service; a firm constitution of body as well as mind". (11)

By 1827 Presbyterians were recognised as a separate Branch of the Army Chaplains' Department. In 1836 the Roman Catholic position was regularised and Chaplains of this persuasion were given similar status though

they did not come under the Chaplain General for any reason and still do not. By 1860 uniform was prescribed and became compulsory. In 1862 another column was added to army returns of religious denomination and the phrase "other protestant" first appears, to be followed in 1881 by a Royal Warrant granting capitulation grants to Wesleyans on the same terms as Church of England, Presbyterians and Roman Catholics. By 1889 Jews were recognised in the Army as a separate denomination and the first Jewish Chaplain was appointed in 1892. The Department continued along these lines until the outbreak of the Great War in 1914.

With the British Expeditionary Force there went 65 Chaplains under a Principal Chaplain. It was a most haphazard arrangement there being no establishment for Chaplains in any division or hospitals or base areas.

"No provision had been laid down for their attachment, rations, accommodation or any other essential need". (12)

Chaplains made the best of a bad job, provided a service to the best of their ability and often at the expense of some tolerant well disposed Colonel, who, strictly against regulations, found them bed and board and supported them in their sacramental ministrations.

At the outbreak of War the full establishment of the Department was 117 : - 89 (C of E) 17 (RC) 11 (Presbyterians) and 40 temporary. Despite the shortage of numbers and the appalling lack of administration or even concern, Chaplains continued to be "about their master's business".. The Reverend O S Watkins, who later became Deputy Chaplain General wrote an interesting account of his own experiences in the Retreat from Mons.

The following is a short extract showing how Chaplains both identified and involved themselves with their men:

"We could hold no services but none the less the chaplains were busy. To them no service was too menial, no task ever came amiss. They washed the swollen, filthy feet of the footsore infantry; on bended knees they swabbed up the bloodstained floor of a dressing station; they helped the doctors with the wounded, lent a hand to carry a stretcher, rode ahead to choose bivouac or billets, and then guided the unit to its place of rest. These were the things which brought us close to our men and they opened their hearts to us so that we could minister to their spiritual needs. But most precious and most sacred was the service rendered to the dying, and when the end came, the last sad office to the dead .....

Never before had men been so tested as these were during the fortnight of the retreat from Mons .....

it was a triumph of mind and spirit over physical weakness, and it impressed our comrades of the fighting services far more than our preaching has ever done or is likely to do". (13)

When it became obvious that the war was going to last longer than a winter and that the opposing armies had begun to dig in for a long campaign the Adjutant General felt that the time had come to organise the Chaplains in France and to increase their numbers. As a result of this shake-up Chaplains found themselves posted to formations where the greatest good

could be accomplished by their presence. They were centrally situated, posted to field ambulance units, put under the supervision of more experienced and senior Chaplains and by and large some effort was made to coordinate and rationalise services offered. "At this stage inter-denominational difficulties were unknown and united church services were common". (14)

By July 1915 the War Office, under pressure from the Archbishop of Canterbury decided that in the BEF (British Expeditionary Force) in France a Bishop should be appointed as Deputy Chaplain General to take charge of all the C of E Chaplains in the field. The Principal Chaplain took charge of the remainder. For many Chaplains hard at work tending the sick and the wounded and the dying it was the "thin end of the wedge" and they found themselves responsible to men of authority who, whether they wanted to or not, began to build little ecclesiastical empires for themselves amidst the squalor of Flanders Fields. Relations were only "moderately happy" we are told by Reverend P Middleton Brunwell in his book The Army Chaplain, but at the end of the war it is significant that there was a desire to revert to a unified department.

"At first General Officers were unwilling to allow the Chaplains to remain in the trenches or even to visit the front line, and many of the Chaplains were severely reprimanded for doing so. The reasons were: firstly, that they would be in the way; and secondly, that if they got wounded, stretcher bearers, whose essential task was to carry wounded soldiers, would have to be diverted to the padres. Moreover, for the padre to be carried away dead or wounded would have a bad

morale effect on the troops. Commanding Officers maintained that there was quite enough danger for the padre at the dressing station and he would be able to see all the wounded passing through and have full scope to carry out his spiritual duties. As the war went on, however, it was found that the men much appreciated the presence of the padre in the front line, and Army Commanders issued orders that Chaplains were to be allowed to go anywhere they like with their troops. Later still it was left to Assistant Chaplains General (ACsG) to give detailed instructions in this matter to suit each particular operation or situation". (15)

By 1917 the Chaplains' Department in France was as well organised as any other branch of the service.

Brigadier Sir John Smyth in his book In this Sign Conquer tells of a conversation that took place between Reverend T B Hardy VC DSO MC the most decorated of all wartime Chaplains and ~~of~~ Reverend Studdart Kennedy. It took place, Studdart Kennedy wrote, in the ACG's office at Etaples.

"Hardy asked me to tell him the best way of working. I said, 'Live with the men, go everywhere they go. Make up your mind you will share all their risks, and more, if you can do any good. The line is the key to the whole business. Work in the very front and

they will listen to you; but if you stay behind, you are wasting your time. Men will forgive you anything but lack of courage and devotion". (16)

It is that sort of advice and that sort of spirit which has made the Chaplains Department what it is today. Three words typify the role of the modern Chaplain - integration, involvement and identification and they have their origin in the mud and the filth and the trenches of the Great War of 1914-18.

It was not easy in the early years of the war and many Chaplains found it very difficult to work out a reasonable *modus vivendi*. The Church was divided in its opinions as to the morality of the war and consequently Chaplains found themselves to some extent unsupported. The Gospel they preached seemed to be irrelevant to the needs of suffering soldiers and this too tended to separate Chaplains from those they desperately wanted to serve. In Alan Wilkinson's book The Church of England and the First World War this conflict, both in practical, ~~times~~ theological and moral terms, is discussed at great length and some of this detail will be examined at a later stage. In passing it is sufficient to say that from the travail of conflict was born a Chaplains' Department that was soon to be honoured for its service its sacrifice and its dedication to duty.

On Armistice Day 1918 the total number of Chaplains in the Department, exclusive of overseas Chaplains and those engaged locally in foreign stations, was 3,475. These were made up as follows:-

G. of E.	1985	United Board	251
R.C.	649	Jewish	16
Presbyterian	302	Welsh Calvinist	10
Wesleyan	256	Salvation Army	5

of this number 172 gave their lives in the service of King and Country and are remembered in the Royal Garrison Church of All Saints Aldershot.

An Army Order (No. 92) published on 22 Feb 1919 read as follows:-

"Army Chaplains' Department. His Majesty the King, in view of the splendid work which has been performed by the Army Chaplains' Department during the present war, has been graciously pleased to approve of the Department being in future designated - "The Royal Army Chaplains' Department".

The period between the wars 1920-1939 saw more organisation, starting with a unified Department in 1920 and continuing along closely integrated and ecumenical lines until the present day.

"Unfortunately the Roman Catholics felt themselves precluded from participating in the scheme, and they continued to be administered independently by the Permanent Under Secretary of State in the War Office and by 'A' Branch in commands and in divisions". (17)

Suitable methods of selection were adopted satisfactory to various denominations and to the unified Department as a whole. Initially the establishment for each denomination was one Chaplain for 1,100 men of that denomination, though this fluctuated from time to time owing to all sorts of economic and ecclesiastical pressures, both internal and external. Chaplains served as Regulars for a variety of terms depending upon the types of commission received, and also as Territorials. In addition to these two uniformed Chaplaincy services the RACHD could not possibly exist without the work done in all depots by Officiating Chaplains. In

peace-time conditions, numbers of soldiers serving in many units do not justify having a regular Chaplain on the strength of the unit so his job is done by local clergymen and ministers, being paid on the basis of capitation as laid down in the Royal Pay Warrant. In the event of an outbreak of war an additional class of Chaplain is necessary immediately, and emergency commissions were consequently given to those clergymen who volunteered for service in 1939.

There is a carefully worked out chain of command with all Chaplains being administered at the War Office (later the Ministry of Defence) by the Chaplain General and a Deputy Chaplain General. The whole Chaplaincy service is under the direct control of the Permanent Under Secretary of State who takes a great and personal interest in all its affairs.

When the 1939-46 war started there were 169 Chaplains in the Department, of whom 121 were C of E and the remainder drawn from all the other denominations. In addition there were about 100 Territorials plus a few in the Reserve Forces. At the peak period of the war these numbers had risen to 3052.

"The history of the Department during the war years cannot be recounted, as can that of an Army unit or formation, which operated as such and left a detailed war history behind. The wartime Chaplains worked on their own in comparatively small groups. It is therefore from the accounts of individual chaplains that any sort of picture must be built up - and also from some of the opinions of the Generals on the Chaplains with whom they worked". (18)

There is neither time nor space to go into any details. Suffice it to say that Chaplains served and suffered and died in every theatre of war. They were integrated, involved and identified with the men and women of the Armed Forces they were privileged and called by God to serve. In his memoirs Field Marshal Montgomery highlights the importance of spiritual values and thereby he gives priority of place to those whose job it is to instill in men and women something of the spiritual nature of their existence.

"I do not believe that today a commander can inspire great armies, or single units, or even individual men, and lead them to achieve great victories, unless he has a proper sense of religious truth; he must be prepared to acknowledge it and to lead his troops in the light of that truth .... he must be sure that the spiritual purpose which inspires them is right and true. All leadership is based on the spiritual quality, the power to inspire others to follow; this spiritual quality may be for good or evil. In many cases in the past this quality has been devoted towards personal ends and was partly or wholly evil; whenever this was so, in the end it failed. Leadership which is evil, while it may temporarily succeed, always carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction". (19)

Like many great leaders before and after him Montgomery saw the Chaplain as the link man to spiritual power. He was never the welfare officer, the purveyor of material goodies that took the edge off boredom, but always the man of God bringing to men the presence and the power of God

through word and sacraments.

It was a former Chaplain General who when serving during the war conceived the idea of a battle school for Chaplains. Many young chaplains had never experienced battle conditions before and so they trained along with combatant troops to get the feel of things so that in the event of active service they would be more efficient and less dependent upon soldiers for their safety.

"Whatever memories Second Army Chaplains may have of the Church Stowe Battle School, one thing is beyond dispute: they were given an introduction to battle conditions which, in the view of those who underwent similar training in assault courses organised on a divisional level, was second to none. Church Stowe must surely have been unique in the history of the Army". (20)

Airborne Chaplains did the same course as any other soldier of the Parachute Regiment and this too made for identification, involvement and integration. The common danger they all shared proved to be a great unifying bond which brought them together in worship. The Reverend J McLuskey MC DD writes:

"We did not worship together in France just because we were afraid. Worship had meaning and reality for us because we lived together. We shared the same hopes and the same fears. One of the reasons for neglected churches today is surely to be found here. The people who live around the parish church only happen to live together. In their 'togetherness'

there is no community. If they are so little 'one' throughout the week, is it strange that they fail to be 'one' on Sunday? There was another reason why our worship seemed natural and meaningful. We worshipped where we lived; in the clearing where we slept; round the camp-fire which was home - worship was part of our daily life". (21)

Chaplains of all denominations gave their lives during the Second World War and a memorial to them is the lovely Chapel in the Royal Army Chaplains' Department Centre, Bagshot Park.

"It had long been the great desire of the Department to have a permanent home and Headquarters ..... Chaplains had no base and nothing corresponding to "The Church" behind them; they belonged nowhere". (22)

Without a depot or somewhere similar there was nowhere to gather new recruits and train them in the ways of the Army. A couple of places at Chester and Tidworth were used but both were inadequate. Eventually on 23 April 1947 the Depot of the Department moved to its present home in Bagshot Park.

The post War scene is but a continuation, a deepening and widening process of that which had evolved during the two world wars. Chaplains still have to travel far and wide in the service of 'peace-time' troops. There is no let-up in training to meet new conditions. The Chaplain

has to prove to himself and those he serves that he can look after himself in all circumstances. To be a burden is to be a nuisance and very few of those have done much to promote the Kingdom of God.

The role of the RACHD Centre is to train Chaplains to cope with life in the Army and also to be a sort of spiritual power house for some 11,500 students of all ranks who attend residential courses throughout the year.

"The Bagshot Park Centre is essentially a house of prayer, a home of Christian Fellowship, a centre of service and a living force which sets itself at all times to maintain and strengthen the dignity, the honour and the traditions of the Department". (23)

Since the last great war Chaplains have served soldiers with great distinction in Korea, Cyprus, Malaya, Aden, Palestine, Borneo, East Africa, Egypt, Belize and Northern Ireland, not forgetting, of course, BAOR which has taken a big slice of the man-power for all the years since 1946. When, in 1964, the Archbishop of Canterbury visited BAOR he spoke to the clergy and assured them of :

"his constant awareness of the role of the Armed Forces in defence of peace, and of pride in those of his clergy who were ministering to servicemen and their families engaged in this great enterprise". (24)

In a postscript to the history of the Army Chaplain the Chaplain General to the Forces wrote:

"The situation today is that once again in our history we are passing through a period of tremendous change and re-orientation in almost every aspect of our domestic, national and international existence. The Armed Services of the Crown are in no sense excluded from this upheaval. With the unprecedented advance of science and technology, particularly over the past two decades, and with the ever-escalating horror of thermo-nuclear missiles, the whole concept of large-scale warfare has changed and is changing. Despite the considerable moral tensions to which the present situation gives rise, the main purpose and task of our Defence Services is to help prevent nuclear war and maintain the greater peace .....

There are, however, three paradoxes. The first is that in order to prevent war the Defence Services have to be highly competent and trained to wage war. Secondly, there has been forged a weapon which we believe will never be used, but we shall never know what might have happened if the weapon had never existed. And thirdly, as far as the Defence Services are concerned, the more we succeed in this task the less we are needed". (25)

Against a background of ideological turbulence and economic stringency the Church has decided, rightly or wrongly, to concentrate on liturgical

reform and ecumenical endeavour. The Chaplains too are caught up with new movements and consequently their ministry and mission in the 60's and 70's has tended to concentrate on the making and sustaining of Christians under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. There is constant searching of one's conscience, constant tension and constant appraisal of situations, acceptable in the past perhaps, but now under the close scrutiny of those who question the existence of the Army itself.

As long as our nation however puts its trust in those it employs for its defence then the Military Chaplain will find his role in serving them to the best of his ability.

"The history of the Department has been a very long one and there have been many changes, but in the end the aim is now as it was for our brethren in the beginning, seeing we have this ministry we faint not, for we preach not ourselves but Jesus Christ our Lord, and ourselves as servants for his sake". (26)

#### The Chaplain of Today.

It ought now to be spelt out exactly what a military Chaplain is and what is expected of him both by Church and State for it is to both of these organisations that he belongs. Although he is a member of the Armed Forces it is important to realise that of all the regiments and corps the Chaplains are the only people who are administered directly by the Deputy Under Secretary of State on behalf of the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Defence. By Royal Warrant dated 23 Sep 1796 the Army Chaplains' Department came into being. Before that Chaplains had been the responsibility of Regimental Colonels and sometimes when

there was pressure in the form of active service overseas, many Chaplains found that they were not available. This led to many embarrassing situations when whole armies would take to the field and not one Chaplain would be in attendance. Clearly this state of affairs could not be allowed to persist and so a Royal Warrant was issued. It laid down special conditions of service for Chaplains and abolished the office of "Regimental Chaplains" making quite sure that there could be no nepotism and no exchange or transfer of commissions. Having drawn up a scale of pay for all sorts and conditions of Chaplains the Warrant ends with some words about who is to be in charge of the newly formed Department.

"We do hereby subject all Regular Chaplains, desiring to be continued in our Service, to the orders of the Person who we shall hereafter appoint to be Chaplain-General of our Army, and who is to govern himself by such Instructions as we shall from time to time think fit to give him through Our Secretary at War.

Given at Our Court of St. James's, etc." (27)

Chaplains are, therefore, appointed by The Secretary of State for Defence, on the nomination of the accredited representatives of the various denominations and on the recommendation of the Chaplain General or his opposite heads of service for the Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy. Clergymen of the Church of England are recommended for appointments to the Chaplain General by their Bishops. Other Chaplains are recommended by their respective Church authorities. A quinquennial review of denominations of all service personnel is carried out to determine the proportion of Chaplains relative to their particular denomination.

"A Chaplain holds the Queen's Commission as a Chaplain. He thus becomes a member of an ordered community which, to a large extent, has always depended on every member knowing his rank and keeping to it. This, however, is hardly the case with the Chaplain. He 'ministers' to every soldier of every rank. Yet within the life of the Army - Unit or Garrison - the Chaplain is given an easily recognised place. He wears uniform like everyone else, but he is very much encouraged to go about some of his duties, especially when he is visiting families, in civilian dress .....

Whatever his age or experience or length of service the impact he makes on his community, upon the individual lives of men and their families, depends not on rank but on the Chaplain himself". (28)

In general the duties of a Chaplain are similar to those of any civilian clergyman and may be listed as follows :-

- a. The conduct of Divine Worship and the Administration of the Sacraments according to the traditions of his own denomination.
- b. The supervision of his Garrison or Unit Church with all its organisations and activities e.g. Sunday School, Women's Guilds, Youth Fellowships, etc.
- c. Giving religious instruction to children in Garrison Schools.
- d. The systematic visitation of families, patients in Hospital and soldiers undergoing detention.
- e. Carrying out the programme of Character Training for all ranks which should involve more than a 60% coverage of all army personnel.

- f. Taking an interest in the general welfare of his unit, including their social and sporting activities.
- g. Accompanying troops on exercise and training in order :-
  - (1) To master a minimum of military skills to survive in the field.
  - (2) To share as fully as possible the life of the men he seeks to serve. (29)

As far as Queen's Regulations are concerned then here again the following extracts serve to show the place of the Chaplain within the military society.

"The reverent observance of religion in the Armed Forces is to be regarded as of the highest importance and it is the duty of all concerned to make proper provision for the spiritual and moral needs of all personnel". (J5.262)

"Commanding Officers have the primary responsibility for encouraging religious observance by those under their command, but it is important that all who exercise authority should set a good example in order to lead others to an intelligent acceptance of Christian principles in the life of the Armed Forces". (J5.263)

"Sympathetic consideration is to be given to the needs of minorities who do not profess the Christian Faith". (J5.264)

"A clergyman is granted a commission as a Chaplain to provide religious ministrations to service personnel

and their families and to care for their spiritual and moral welfare. When a commissioned Chaplain cannot be made available, civilian clergy of the appropriate denomination may be appointed as Officiating Chaplain." (J5.261)

"Commissioned Chaplains are posted .... on the instructions of the Chaplain General and are under his direction in all matters relating to their professional duties".

"Chaplains have the right of access to their superior in the Chaplaincy Services either through Chaplaincy Administration Channels, or on personal matters, direct."

"In spiritual and ecclesiastical matters Chaplains are under the discipline of their appropriate Church authorities". "Chaplains are subject to the normal discipline of the service to which they belong".

(J5.274)

"Commanding Officers are to ensure that Chaplains and Officiating Chaplains are at all times treated with the respect due to their calling and given every facility for the efficient performance of their duty. Chaplains should be addressed both officially and otherwise by their ecclesiastical title or official appointment and not by their relative or military title". (J5.275) (30)

Professionalism and its requirement has entered into the ranks of all modern soldiers, not least the Chaplain. Particularly in the modern

army and under modern fighting conditions it is essential to learn the basic rules of the professional fighting soldier. Only by so doing can the Chaplain efficiently fulfil any of the functions demanded and expected of him during a combat role. If this is to be achieved to any degree of satisfaction, it must be achieved by training with the soldier as he trains. The Chaplain is consequently expected to be physically fit for route marching and cross country movement. He must know how to survive on basic rations, with a minimum of clothing and in open country in all weathers. He must be able to use a compass, read a map and move at night over variable terrain at variable distances and speeds. A Chaplain is expected to behave in a soldierly manner and be trusted at all times to perform his duties with minimum fuss and maximum efficiency and courtesy.

The RACHD Handbook for Chaplains states that:

"He must avoid being a passenger or a liability. A basic knowledge of the following subjects must be learnt: map reading, use of radio equipment, first aid, ability to drive a  $\frac{3}{4}$  ton truck across country and detect simple faults, fieldcraft (which includes the use of camouflage and nuclear, biological and chemical protective equipment)". (31)

On active operations a Chaplain must be physically fit and medically ready to move having had all the necessary inoculations and vaccinations. He must make arrangements for his family because the normal overseas tour, unaccompanied, is anything up to 12 months. He must ensure that he is in possession of all the equipment and baggage he needs, not only for himself but also for the performance of his duties as a Chaplain.

"This phase of a Chaplain's life is probably one of the most rewarding. He will experience discomfort, loneliness, fear and a sense of having been uprooted and without either a married quarter or a Garrison Church to which he can retreat. Such experiences help the Chaplain to identify himself with his men and rapidly bridges the gulf which may separate men from their Priests and Ministers". (32)

Different climates and situations mean that a Chaplain must be flexible in his planning and methods so that he can always be ready to minister to his men, whatever the military situation demands. He must be prepared to use every means at his disposal for reaching the men he serves and in some locations this means a variety of travel methods from helicopter to the animal and human foot. Church is literally "where two or three are gathered together" and Church furniture can be anything from ammunition boxes to tail boards of trucks and whatever nature has provided. In these circumstances the paraphernalia of ecclesiastical ceremonies is a luxury one can do without. Never is the Chaplain allowed to carry weapons and the general provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention apply in all circumstances. What Spiro Agnew said of the American clergy could indeed be said of the Military Chaplain.

"Maybe the religious leaders ought to realise that their total function is not only to enlighten their congregations, but to live with their parishioners and serve them and be aware of the values that are inherent in the community - instead of entering that community convinced of the need to instil a new set of values". (33)

Perhaps more than his civilian counterpart the military Chaplain is aware that the society in which he lives is a society full of values of the sort that resemble those of a closed order of religious men and women. It is a society within a society - a society which is disciplined and controlled and yet it is a society which exists only because Parliament wills it and decrees it by passing the Army Act each year. Without this action the army would cease to exist and along with it the Military Chaplain.

The Military Chaplain.

1. J R H Moorman A History of the Church of England p.11
2. J Smyth In this Sign Conquer p.3
3. P Middleton Brunwell, The Army Chaplain p.10
4. Ibid p.11
5. Smyth p.14
6. Moorman p.237
7. Smyth p.17
8. Ibid p.24
9. Ibid p.26
10. Ibid p.27
11. Middleton Brunwell p.14
12. Ibid p.16
13. Smyth p.161
14. Ibid p.163
15. Ibid p.165
16. Op cit p.175
17. Middleton Brunwell p.17
18. Smyth p.221
19. Ibid p.231
20. Ibid p.247
21. Ibid p.250
22. Ibid p.315
23. Ibid p.317
24. Ibid p.335
25. Ibid p.341
26. Ibid p.344

27. Royal Warrant dated 23rd September 1796
28. RACHD Handbook para 0131
29. Ibid para 0132
30. Queens Regulations
31. Op cit para 1004
32. Ibid para 1012
33. C. Abercombe The Military Chaplain p.31

THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN AND ROLE CONFLICT

In a complex modern society there are many institutions, organisations, clubs and brotherhoods all existing, it seems, to satisfy and cater for the needs and wants of mankind. This means, in effect, that any individual throughout his lifetime can play out many social roles and according to taste, environment, heredity or other pressures he will devise some system of priorities for the social roles in which he participates. There could be said to be a scale of role obligations, the relative positions of which are determined by the strength of the claims made upon the individual. All sorts of attractions and all sorts of claims are continually being made so that the individual could be torn in opposite directions or in more than two ways at once. Roles need not necessarily be in harmony and often are not. The individual, so we are told, needs to harmonise any conflict or tension within himself in order to bring about some sort of consistency of personality. Divergent roles can play havoc with a man's equilibrium and so some means of resolving conflict and tension must be sought and practised. Jesus Christ discovered this on many occasions, the best known perhaps in the Garden of Gethsemane - "Father if it be possible, let this cup (of suffering) be taken away from me .... but nevertheless not my will, but thy will be done". The temptation narratives are all about role tension and conflict and so the Christian too must inevitably have to face up to problems of being "in the world but not of the world".

Role conflict is the conflict that exists when a choice has to be made between two separate and sometimes divergent roles. For example, there may well be conflict between the roles of a man who is a father of young children and also a member of a rugby XV. Other role conflicts are more serious because the roles involved are more crucial or the situation more

complicated. How does a father for example react to a dangerous war-time mission that demands volunteers? How does a Christian react when he is faced with a crisis of conscience? How does a Chaplain react when faced with the conflict of deciding between God and Caesar?


The profession of a military chaplain is one which deliberately sets out to make role conflict a way of life and the relevant question for us is not whether it exists, but how useful or destructive it might be for us, as individuals, for the church and for the army in which we serve. It is possible for role conflict to inspire the chaplain to greater creativity in his ministry for I believe conflict to be the crucible in which a man's ministry is tried and tested. Without a death there can be no resurrection and without conflict and its resolution there can be no real formation of the character and personality. Regardless of his military uniform, his identification and involvement with soldiers, his postings and his life style, a chaplain still remains very much within the institutional environment of his church. (This is obviously more true for some than for others). While many of his goals may be military ones designed to make the military machine tick over more smoothly, they are still nevertheless religious goals because the military society is not necessarily outside the religious one but can be part of it, integrated, if not exactly absorbed by it, though in history one can cite quite a few armies whose specific *raison d'etre* was religious. Chaplains owe their primary allegiance to their particular religious denominational needs within the church. Recently in 1979 the Archbishop of Canterbury summoned all of his Chaplains from the three Services for a "Charge". The Moderator of the Church of Scotland and the President of the Methodist Conference visit their troops every year and are welcomed by them into their churches, garrisons and homes.

The relationship of the civilian church to the Army Church is one which blows hot and cold and seems largely to be dependent upon the status of the Armed Forces within the nation at any particular time.

The Chaplain however is a professional "Churchman" whose ministry happens to take place in a largely secular society. Just as the parish priest can live and work in a secular society so too can the military chaplain. It is not true to say that he has left the Church and entered the military. In a very real sense he can actually take the Church into the military and indeed a large part of the world in which he lives is dictated by ecclesiastical pressures rather than military ones. The military environment is merely the vehicle in which and through which the Chaplain operates as a man of God amongst men and women who happen to wear a military uniform. It can therefore be argued that Chaplains to the Forces can exercise greater ministries than they already do if only both the institutions of Church and Army recognised that Chaplains can belong fully to both with responsibilities to both which are not mutually exclusive.

Understanding the institutional duality of the Chaplains' role together with what the army and the church expects from the Chaplain is no easy task. Two sociologists, Getzels and Guba have worked out a model of social behaviour which might be helpful. Their model is based on a socio-psychological theory of social behaviour which conceives of any organisation or sub-division of an organisation as a social system. In other words a "social system" in Getzels and Guba's terms is conceptual rather than descriptive and should not be confused with "society" or "state". The Army is a "social system" or any sub-division of the army can be called a "social system" like a regiment or a Field Force or a Division. The model is therefore applicable regardless of the level or the size of whatever "social system" we care to choose.


## Institutional Dimensions



## Personal Dimensions

Recognising the influence of these 2 dimensions we can better understand the behaviour of the individual as he tries to meet the requirements of both dimensions. As the Chaplain begins to meet the needs of the Army he is said to adjust whereas when he is completely integrated he is fulfilling the role expectations of both dimensions - the army and the personal. If there is a clash and role conflict ensues this can be a most unhappy situation and not easily resolved unless either one dimension or the other is ignored. (1)

The model given to us by Getzels and Guba is inadequate in many respects but at least it gives us a starting point. For the Chaplain there are at least 3 dimensions, sometimes more and all these need to be *reconciled* in order to produce that sort of integrated personality which seems to be so desirable.



Obviously this somewhat complicated model can be further enlarged by breaking down each section into a number of divisions: home, family, children, wife, in-laws, sport, holidays and so on. The individual dimension is always the *most important* and of course none of the expectations are ever always the same because there are different Commanding Officers, different Senior Chaplains, different ecclesiastical rules and different traditions - all of which are in a state of tremendous flux.

*The way in which these conflicting roles are harmonised can indicate* how efficiently clergymen are operating within the military environment. Sometimes the various roles might not relate to each other and then disharmony occurs and problems arise.

The Chaplain according to Gordon C. Zahn "holds a place in the military hierarchy because he is a clergyman;" and within the ecclesiastical hierarchy he has been assigned this specialised ministry in the military organisation. "His service to the military is ecclesiastical; the fulfillment of his personal religious calling as a clergyman is military". This can be emphasised by the fact that although he is both Officer and Clergyman, He may encounter some difficulty in being recognised as either within the two separate contexts for example his fellow Officers may 'look down' upon him as being less of an Officer than they - and

this is often balanced by a tendency on the part of many of his fellow clergymen to regard him as somehow less of a priest than his civilian counterparts. (2)

It can be seen that we have now arrived at the other part of the problem namely, Role Tension. This, very briefly, is the strain imposed upon an individual who has to choose between two dimensions of the same role. Zahn maintained that Royal Air Force (RAF) Chaplains during the 1939-45 war experienced tension at two levels, ~~namely~~ the military and the ecclesiastical or religious level. I believe there is another area of tension for the military Chaplain and that is within the relationship he has with other clergymen. This tension is not peculiar to the military Chaplain, but can also be experienced by all other Chaplains who are not part of the traditional, historical and parochial *structure* ~~of~~ the Church of England.

It is interesting to note, in passing, that the same alienation is not experienced by chaplains serving as ministers of the Church of Scotland. This may be due to all sorts of factors but on the surface there seems to be a closer affinity between Church and State in Scotland and certainly the role of the military Chaplain is regarded as being an essential part of the Church's ministry to its men and women in uniform. The military Chaplain, as far as the Church of Scotland is concerned, is much more integrated and involved in the Assembly and Church government whereas the Church of England synod has only the Chaplain General and his opposite chiefs of Chaplains for Royal Air Force and Royal Navy ~~as~~ part of the governing and legislative processes. The Church of Scotland is often approached by the Chaplain-General for a man to fill a vacancy as Chaplain of a particular Scottish Regiment and the Church in response will

recruit a man suitable for the particular needs of the regiment in question.

The Church of Scotland too produces a magazine for its clergy and people in uniform. Going by the name of The Scottish Forces Magazine it endeavours to bridge the gap between civilians and Forces and acts as a Newsletter keeping both sides of the Church well and truly informed.

Generally speaking as far as the Church of England is concerned any fraternization that takes place does so on an ad hoc basis with little or no involvement or indeed interest shown by the civilian Church.

This lack of contact can, in itself, lead to a feeling of not being wanted, loved, or even understood. The Chaplain is immediately in a role conflict situation. Assuming that there must be a drive towards a consistent and integrated personality and that this striving is part of the human scene affecting all members, there must also be something in the nature of a resolving technique which allows individuals to come to terms with role conflict. There must be some factor or factors which resolve, for individuals, the problems that arise from divergent roles. Waldo E. Burchard in The American Sociological Review of October 1954 suggests that most solutions can be reduced to three:

1. abandonment of one of the conflicting roles.
2. rationalisation, which may assume many different forms, or
3. compartmentalisation of role behaviours. (3)

It may be that these techniques are in themselves not sufficient to overcome the problems of role conflict, in which case, it has been suggested that individuals invent new patterns of behaviour which in

some cases have been diagnosed as being neurotic, aberrant, psychotic or just eccentric. Gordon C. Zahn argues that it is in the military Chaplain that one finds extremely severe conflict in roles assigned to him by both Church and the Military Command. Chaplains not only share the dilemma of the Christian in war-time, they also function as Officers in both environments of Church and Forces. As Officers they are supposed to be responsible for the achievement of victory; but also they are expected to ensure that the means would have to be acceptable as well on moral grounds. Hence it is argued that in the person of the military Chaplain there are at least three if not four areas of possible conflict and we shall deal with them in turn. I shall endeavour to use the findings of Gordon C. Zahn, Waldo Burchard and Clarence Abercrombie III and compare them with the results of an identical questionnaire submitted to Chaplains of H.M. Forces in 1978-1980.

There are some five major items in Christian philosophy from which role conflict for the military clergyman derives. These may be summed up as follows: the doctrine of love, of universal brotherhood, of peace and of non-resistance to evil and of course the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill". It is argued by Zahn and his disciples that all these doctrines are manifestly incompatible with the aims of a nation at war. Therefore it is impossible he says for the Christian in military service to put them into practice. Moreover the age old problem of the relationship between Church and State is still at issue here - whether the state or the Church shall demand the first loyalty of its followers.

Certain hypothetical situations were tested by the questionnaires referred to above and in the main they could be summarised as follows:-

- (1) that the position of the Chaplain leads to a conflict in roles

for the incumbent of that Office but that this was in no way extraordinary to the military Chaplain.

- (2) that the Chaplain seeks to reconcile this conflict either through rationalization or through compartmentalization of role behaviours.
- (3) that rationalization of conflict roles tends to strengthen the Chaplain's role as a military officer at the expense of his role as a minister of the Gospel.
- (4) that the Chaplain serves as an interpreter of the values of the military organisation, helps to resolve dilemmas to do with values on behalf of the soldiers, and helps to promote the smooth operation of the military machine.

Although it must be admitted that all four *hypothetical situations actually exist* in reality it is maintained that this is nothing new for the Christian whether he is in uniform or out of it. There is a Theology of Conflict examples of which are numerous in the Bible.

Role Conflict relating to religious beliefs and practices.

A Chaplain of the Forces has a three~~fold~~ role incorporating the three facets of Ordination: - prophet, priest and pastor. He sees his ministry as both caring for and sustaining the faithful members of Christ's Body and also proclaiming the Gospel in a missionary environment to those who are outside the realm of God's Kingdom. The British Chaplain as opposed to the American Chaplain has a very definite role in evangelism and this he carries out, by word and deed, but largely by being identified and involved with all those he serves. One Chaplain General's interim report stated quite categorically that the aim of every Chaplain to the Forces was to "make and sustain Christians".

Religion in the Army is not ~~a matter of compulsion~~, though soldiers are encouraged to attend some form of worship if it is "sponsored" by their particular unit or sub unit. The Army of today is largely a five day week organisation and so many soldiers are in fact away from the unit or garrison at the times for normal Christian Sunday worship. "Character Training" however, is carried out in almost every unit and this is part of the Army's training directive (No. 15), and covers a multitude of religious, socio-religious and practical issues which are designed to give guidance and instruction to the soldiers along very traditional and Christian principles. Our "Way of Life" has its roots in the Judaistic Christian concept of divinity and morality and therefore it is essential that those who are prepared to "lay down their lives" know for what it is that they might be dying. The guidance given to soldiers is not compulsory, though it forms part of their workaday training programme. From experience it seems to be welcomed by all, both Officers and other ranks, for what it is - a simple basic, down-to-earth attempt to make relevant the Christian Gospel to men and women in particular circumstances. Ignorance about the foundations of our society and about the Christian Faith is appalling! Many soldiers, especially recruits, have no idea about the significance of the main Christian festivals like Easter and Whitsuntide.

In a very real sense, the Chaplain is not only a Pastor and a Priest to the faithful but also a Prophet and a Missionary to those who "have ears to hear".

Asked by Zahn what ~~were~~ considered to be the three most important tasks of the military Chaplain the overwhelming majority stressed what might be described as 'religious' or 'pastoral' functions - 85% in fact. Eventually after second and third choices were added and allowing for some overlapping the results again gave a clear indication of what Chaplains saw as their

duty:- general pastoral duties - 68.5%; specified religious duties 67.1%; welfare and general friendliness 63%; and Christian witness and example 46.6%. (4) An interesting correlation was carried out by Abercrombie in his Book "The Military Chaplain" He endeavoured to compare the reaction of Chaplains and civilian clergy with Commanding Officers' reactions to certain questions about "Task Options". An interesting feature was that for the first four options the Chaplain and the civilian clergyman were almost identical, with the Commanding Officer only slightly out of harmony. It was clearly seen that all three groups of interested parties placed the following task options in roughly the same order:

The Chaplain visits with and ministers to the sick and wounded.

The Chaplain administers the Sacraments and conducts worship.

The Chaplain counsels troops on personal problems.

The Chaplain helps men <sup>to</sup> gain spiritual strength that will enable them to perform their duties more effectively. (5)

Zahn tried to discover the same role for Chaplains by asking a similar question, but limited the answer to one of five options thus creating unnecessary dilemma and confusion. Many Chaplains refused to give any answers at all due to a "real inability to decide and not as a sign of superficiality or an unwillingness to co-operate". One Chaplain replied: "I cannot answer this because each of the first three items in turn could take priority according to the changing circumstances of every day. He would not always be among the wounded and dying .... he would not

always be conducting services ..... he might well try to maintain the morale of the men (even if it were only distributing a few cigarettes like "Woodbine Willie") but bolstering up the fighting spirit of the men is of no particular importance in his ministry". (6)

Indeed, as though to prove the point against himself, Zahn states that 42 out of 63 Chaplains thought that bolstering up the fighting spirit was of the least importance. Zahn seems to be asking an unfair question in that it demands a clear cut specific answer to problems that are far from being clear cut or specific. Perhaps with some theological training he might have been able to see the impossible nature of his question. On the whole he tends to divide a Chaplain's role into specific areas, with no overlapping, so that he fails to see that a human being is in fact an integrated personality and incapable of being divided into watertight compartments. He sees as something specially significant "that such widely different activities such as proclaiming the Gospel and stimulating recreational activity can be seen as part of the Chaplain's job - and both leading to the same effect". (7)

When questioning the reasons for becoming a military Chaplain, Zahn discovers that 34 out of a possible 73 were motivated, to some extent, by the military dimension. Specifically religious motivation was not apparently stressed by Chaplains in explaining their choice of career. Waldo Burchard in his dissertation says that "patriotic motives are of greater influence than other specific motives inducing a clergyman to become a military Chaplain". (8) Both Zahn and Burchard find it odd that at this stage in one's ministry, having already chosen to be ordained, for some spiritual reason I assume, there then must be another spiritual reason for wanting to become involved in a military environment. Clergymen, whether in uniform or not, are primarily clergymen and would

hope to remain so even if they find themselves working in a prison, a hospital, a school or the Army. It must be admitted however, that Zahn, in a footnote, does say that 28 out of 37 chose "religious service" as opposed to "patriotic service" as the reason for serving in the Forces. This finding is supported by all of the Chaplains in the Army at the moment. Not one of them would be prepared to say that patriotism, per se, was the motivating factor, for joining the Army. "Patriotism" in some circles has almost become a "dirty word" and this political theorists say, tells us something about the present political state of our nation. Patriotism however is not like religion. If the psychological and social need for patriotism disappears then perhaps religion assumes an even greater significance. Despite their Lutheran training about the pride of place of the State in their thinking and philosophy of life both Bonhoeffer and Niemöller could suffer the indignities and terror of Nazi concentration camps for their love of God.

Having already been imprisoned, Bonhoeffer writes to the Judge Advocate, Dr. Roeder, between interrogations, trying to make his case clearer so that the Nazi authorities might understand him better.

" ..... it is hard for me to see how earlier conflicts with the Gestapo have arisen from a purely Church attitude ..... would I have found my fiancée in an old officers family? ..... would I have offered myself as an Army Chaplain immediately after the outbreak of war? If anyone wants to learn something of my conception of the duty of Christian obedience towards the authorities, he should read my exposition of Romans 13

in my book "The Cost of Discipleship". The appeal to subjection to the will and the demands of authority for the sake of Christian conscience has probably seldom been expressed more strongly than there". (9)

Obviously puzzled by attitudes of clergymen towards the state Zahn asks some rather hypothetical but nevertheless pertinent questions about Chaplains serving with Hitler's Forces during the last major world war. He asks three questions - one to do with the Sacrament of Holy Communion being celebrated on our altar draped with a swastika; another about whether or not it was a scandal (in the theological sense) to have served with Hitler at all; and the third dealt with the conscience of the Chaplain having discovered that the Nazi regime was immoral or that wars were unjust. Most Chaplains were not perturbed by the Flag, indeed some hinted that it showed subservience of the State to Christ and therefore it ought to remain - no matter what sort of flag it was! There was no obvious operational conflict and from this Zahn deduces that

"The military Chaplain tends to identify the national cause with his own religious commitment .....  
The crudities of the past, whether it be the blessing of cannon or the 'Gott Mit Uns' on the belt buckle, may no longer be with us. But the failure to see anything seriously wrong in placing a national flag on an altar suggests the persistence of the old attitudes in more subtle forms". (10)

The Jews of course have always regarded themselves as being a "Holy Nation" and many scholars would agree that much of Christian Theology has

developed along very similar lines. (The relationship between Church and State in the New Testament is dealt with elsewhere). It can be argued that there is no real difference today and that service to the State can still be regarded as honourable and, unless the State is evil, support for it is according to God's will. To limit the working of God to individual people is to curtail his omnipotence considerably and even to some extent his omniscience. 60 out of 71 Chaplains said that they never actually thought about the Justice or otherwise of the War. They tended to leave that side of things to Church leaders and Politicians. Their main concern was in looking after the men under their pastoral care. Abercrombie was similarly puzzled. He thought that as Chaplains were slightly more patriotic than their civilian counterparts, probably they felt that their role would be of some significant benefit to the Army they served. He further reasoned that as a consequence American Chaplains would not be so keen to serve in armies that might be enemies of the United States. He therefore asks the question: Would they be prepared to serve Christians in another Army?

91% said they would be prepared to serve in the  
British Army;

83% in the Swedish Army; 63% in the Soviet Army and  
61% in the Army of North Vietnam.

*He concludes* that along with the Chaplain General of the United States Army - "Chaplains always serve people, never armies!" (11)

One former Chaplain in Chief to the Royal Air Force wrote that men's motives for joining the Chaplaincy service are

"Compounded of a desire for wider experience

in a specialised field, freedom from the financial worries of maintaining buildings and organisations, a desire to minister in the main to young people and a sense of being in the front line in both the religious and literal sense"

Another Chaplain, a Roman Catholic, writes that the appeal of service life lay in

"the idea of a wider life, a life of travel, a life away from needlework parties, women's guilds etc., - a life of adventure".

Motives then are obviously mixed but in the main they agree with the published report Specialised Ministries (1971) which clearly stated that most Chaplains did their work as Chaplains because it needed doing.

(12)

The military Chaplain is also largely free from the whole area of complex rivalries and defences which are sometimes associated with denominationalism in civilian life. Indeed religious life in the Forces is largely free from all denominationalism with perhaps the exception of the Roman Catholics who still maintain their own traditions and administration under the Ordinary to the Forces, assisted by three principal Chaplains acting as Vicars General. Many of the postings in the Army are completely free from all denominational strings. Indeed the ecumenical status of the Forces would appear to be years ahead of anything in the civilian Church. One RAF Chaplain wrote an academic dissertation for Bristol University on The Theological significance of the FMUB (Presbyterian, Methodist, United Board) Church of the Royal Air Force and its contribut-

ion to the Re-union of the Churches. The point he makes is quite clear and could be repeated by all the Churches within the services: "Before joining the RAF many accepted disunity of the Churches as a matter of course, but out of the experience within the PMUB fellowship, they have been drawn from isolation to co-operation". (13) One GE Chaplain however, said that religious beliefs of the serviceman must be respected and not glossed over in a wave of emotional ecumenism. It was important to

"get across to the serviceman that he is not a unique animal, totally separated from the Christianity he knew outside. There is no point in building up a false situation in the service that would be completely different from outside .... I try to make my Anglicans better Anglicans and to establish fluid relationships with others as well". (14)

Despite the gloomy picture painted by Zahn there seems to be very little evidence to indicate, at this stage, that role conflict or tension, if it exists, is anything like the problem it is supposed to be.

#### Role Conflict with regard to the Military Organisation

There must of necessity be considerable areas where the role of the military Chaplain is not so clearly defined as to be *subsumed* easily under specific headings. This particular section will endeavour to show something of the relationship that exists between the Chaplain and those amongst whom he has chosen to minister.

At the outset there are those who would maintain that the presence of a Chaplain tends to legitimate the role of the Forces, particularly in

wartime. Zahn for example sees the Chaplain as "the pastor in uniform" and so he "constitutes an affirmation, rightly or wrongly, that there is no basic incompatibility between the values represented by the religious community and the war being waged by the secular ruler". The Chaplain may indeed insist that his presence with fighting men in no way indicates the Church's approval of war. He may well emphasise his pastoral and priestly role or that he is there simply to provide religious services as a specialist, like other specialists. Zahn however would still maintain that no matter how far removed might be the *role of a specialist in religion* he is still nevertheless bolstering up the fighting element of the unit to which he is attached. His whole research rationale is based upon just this sort of conflict situation.

The Christian, he maintains, is in a constant state of conflict because the requirement of 'this world' seems to contradict or openly repudiate the moral standards of the 'other world' to which he is presumably committed.

"Thus, even without directly urging the men in arms to greater and more dedicated participation in the war effort, the Christian clergyman, by assuming military rank and wearing the military uniform, cannot help but 'preach a sermon' in this vein, by his mere physical presence on the scene". (15)

Burchard suggested that if the only reason a Chaplain was attached to the Forces was to administer the sacraments and "utter generalities about sin" there would be no reason why a pacifist could not perform the same duties. There are many like Zahn and Burchard who argue that "Chaplains are Officers" in the full sense of the word. This however is denied by a great number of Chaplains who insist that, since they do not exercise

command over troops they are not really officers, but only hold their rank for purposes of pay. Burchard argues that

"The exercise of Command over troops, however, is not the distinguishing characteristic of Officers. It is the distinctive function of the line officer. Staff officers, including Chaplains, are governed by the same rules and regulations as the line officers; they are accorded the same privileges they are expected to maintain the same relationships with enlisted men  
 ..... in spite of all their efforts to play it down, the very fact that they have rank stands in the way of free and easy intercourse with enlisted men". (16)

Zahn pursues still further this question of rank and uniform and asks if Chaplains think they are helped or hindered by it. Most Chaplains would probably agree that uniform helped them to identify and integrate and so become more efficient as Chaplains. "Rank can be of great use in your work, but it must never be abused" said one Chaplain and another followed suit, saying: "many servicemen, he felt, have a jaundiced view of clergymen, almost seeing them as pacifists. If they see one in uniform, however, they will regard him as one of them! As for rank it is not a barrier if borne well! The average airman and officer prefer the Chaplain to have rank, knowing the higher the rank, the more helpful he can be". This respondent concluded, "the majority of the people who moan about it are those who make rank and uniform a barrier - the greatest barrier is the dog collar we wear". (17)

"The Chaplain is both military officer and clergyman" states Zahn and then he asks "which do you think is most likely to come to mind?" (18)

All Chaplains interviewed said that 'clergyman' came to mind first. Of

the officers and other ranks attitude towards them they thought that 38.9% would say 'clergyman'; 22.2% would favour 'clergymen' but 11.1% would think that the "officer" role would predominate. The important feature in all of these answers is of course that the Chaplain regards himself as a clergyman. If ever he fails to come up with that conclusion he might as well hang up his dog collar for ever!

When asked by Zahn what Chaplains considered to be the two or three personal characteristics most essential to a man's success as a Chaplain, he discovered in their replies that they fell into roughly three major categories; personal characteristics like sociability, flexibility in attitude, intellectual ability and manliness, and then the second category stressed the spiritual characteristics of the Chaplains' work and the last dealt with the military aspects. Of the three groups the first claimed 115 mentions; the second 50 and the third only 16, and of these, all were connected with identification and an ability to move around the world at short notice. (19) Zahn then followed this question with one about those personal characteristics which are the most likely to interfere with a man's success as a Chaplain and discovers that 35.5% of the Chaplains questioned claimed that being 'too puritanical' was the most serious failing. 30.6% thought that a deficiency of a manly approach, like not having 'guts' and courage, was a shortcoming; and lastly only 12.9% claimed that 'too much spirituality' might be a problem. In a very similar question personality problems lead the field when it comes to a Chaplain's failure rating amongst his men. Trying too hard to be 'one of the boys', insincerity, timidity, shyness and introversion all counted high on the list, followed by too much emphasis on some military aspect and finally excessive religious zeal. (20)

Throughout his work Zahn keeps on returning to the business of legitimacy, trying at all levels to find ways and means of involving Chaplains with the morality or immorality of war and suggesting that their presence gives approval to whatever the politicians and the generals decide. He would agree with Burchard when he says that the Chaplain is

"also a military officer, and it is part of his duty to uphold the values of the military system, to promote discipline, to defend the status quo and to apologise for war as a means to the achievement of the good life". (21)

Abercrombie too seems interested in this particular feature of Chaplaincy work. At the outset he claims interest in the relationship of Christianity to the Army Chaplain. Does the Chaplain legitimate the goals and missions of the military, or does he proclaim a prophetic message that cuts vertically across the demands of the military environment - sometimes supporting, sometimes attacking but always transcending? (22)

Following his investigation, Abercrombie discovers some people in American Society keen to challenge the constitutional rights and privileges offered to military Chaplains. So far the courts have rejected all such challenges in America.

"Through the years the constitutional permissibility of the chaplaincy has been a question of recurring interest in terms of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Chaplains are not specifically mentioned in the Constitution, but since they hold Commissions from the Government and are paid out of public funds they are invariably questioned in terms of the restriction concerning "an establishment of religion". However, conversely, they also are defended as necessary in terms of the "free exercise" clause of the same

amendment. A common constitutional argument in support of the chaplaincy says in effect that "free exercise" of religion is the primary concern which the "no establishment" prohibition is meant to insure. Therefore if one must choose limited forms of religious "establishment" (such as government support of the chaplaincy) in order to insure "free exercise" the basic purpose of the First Amendment in respect of religion - freedom of religion - has been served by compensatory, substitutionary or neutralizing action". (23)

As from 1973 the requirement for all cadets and midshipmen to attend Church because, "future career officers needed to know about Chapel programmes in order to fulfil their function of providing for the welfare of their men" - no longer has the support of the courts and its rejection may well have weakened the constitutional status of Chaplains as a whole. The defence of the status quo is enunciated by Abercrombie and runs as follows:

"The Commander of a military unit has the final responsibility for the welfare of the men in his unit. Such welfare obviously consists of food, shelter, and the other things that are necessary to support physical life. In another sense, however, human-beings have developed welfare needs that go beyond the physical necessities of life. One such "need" may be religion. Thus the Commander also has a responsibility for the religious life of the men in his unit. Since the Commander himself obviously lacks the training to understand, personally, the religious needs of his men, the Chaplain is appointed as a staff specialist to assist ..... thus the army is not paying (unconstitutionally) for a man to perform religious activities. It is instead, purchasing the services of a specialist who (by

performing religious activities) aids unit Commanders in fulfilling their responsibilities in securing the welfare of their men". (24)

This attitude can lead to some confusion because it is obvious that the military need not be at all interested in a Chaplain's faith or religion as long as he performs his assigned functions to the best of his ability and to the satisfaction of his superior officers. On the other hand the Church who sponsors him might expect more from him than mere religious duties performed at the request of some Commanding Officer. Herein perhaps lies the conflict that both Zahn and Burchard see as being so traumatic. Abercrombie sees it as being no more than that which any Christian could normally expect to find in any walk of life. Religion can be something that builds up the foundations of life or, on the other hand, shakes them and it is this duality of the very nature of religion that can lead to tension in many cases and conflict in others.

In another of his questions Zahn suggests that "with prayer half the battle is won" and that religion in the Forces is supposed to assure the support of God. (25). Chaplains are then asked to comment on how widespread such an attitude is among officers and whether or not they, as Chaplains, agreed with them. 27 Chaplains thought that there might be just a tendency, on the part of officers, to think that prayer actually made some difference to the outcome of battles. As far as the Chaplains themselves were concerned however there seemed to be general disagreement with the statement. The "God of Battle" notion was firmly rejected, with one (R.C.) Chaplain saying, "God's on your side if you are winning - and not on your side if you are losing". Another commented that "prayers cannot deflect bullets or bombs". Prayer was obviously not amongst the latest weapons in general use!

Following a lecture on "The Role Conflict of the Military Chaplain", given at the Royal Army Chaplains' Department Centre one young Chaplain was moved to write a theological justification of this "conflicting role" by an exegetical examination of Exodus. 17 v. 8-16. Moses and his two aides were seen to be acting in the role of religious leaders and advisors while a volunteer army, comprising a representative number of Israelites, waged war against the Amalekites. Many points of similarity were drawn out of the narrative and it is possible to compare this incident with the modern chaplain and his role in support of his men in battle :-

1. He is identified with his men.
2. He is seen to care for them and pray for them.
3. The battle is defensive and not an act of aggression.
4. He is a non combatant but nevertheless involved.
5. There is a need to prepare for a warlike situation in order to defend what is important.
6. To be reminded of God, even in the midst of battle, is to be reminded of certain standards essential to right and moral behaviour. (The Geneva Convention is a constant reminder to the modern soldier of certain standards that must be maintained, even in the heat of battle).

Getting nearer to the heart of his thesis Zahn then asks if a Chaplain's duty, as a military officer, is ever in conflict with his duty as a Christian clergyman. (26) 61.4% came out with an emphatic 'No' while the remainder could see the possibility of conflict but only on an operational level, never on the moral plain. However, Zahn is still not satisfied and continues to push the point despite the overwhelming evidence that the vast majority of Chaplains do not consider themselves to be 'military officers'. Apparently an airman had once told

his Chaplain that he could no longer come to Church because he considered himself to be 'outside the pale' since his work was, he thought, incompatible with what he considered Christian behaviour to be. Perhaps Zahn had forgotten momentarily that all are sinners and if sin is going to prevent anyone attending Church then none would ever make it into the Kingdom of Heaven. Most Chaplains however, still insist that there is no real moral conflict but Zahn sees this as an "unawareness of the possibility of conflict" and therefore criticises Chaplains for their ostrich-like attitude to life.

The next question concerns the resolution of conflict once the Chaplain is prepared to allow its theoretical possibility (27). Here again there was almost an unanimous decision in favour of the "religious" dimension - only 4 out of 58 were prepared to admit the possibility of a "military" solution to the problem of conflict. Most Chaplains it would seem have to have hypothetical questions and problems raised in order to exercise their minds about possible answers. To say that they never think about them is significant, only in the sense that problems of conflict so seldom occur and therefore to think about them and ponder over them would be neurotic and perhaps a waste of valuable time.

The next issue to be raised was in connection with stories heard about killing enemy prisoners. Under what circumstances, asks Zahn, are such orders justified? (28) Clearly of course such action would be a violation of the terms of the Geneva Convention and could therefore never be countenanced under any circumstances - expedient or otherwise! 4 Chaplains did not answer saying that they were 'not qualified'; all the remainder, 69 of them, disapproved with expressions of disbelief and horror that such action would or even could be contemplated. Zahn then assumes in his hypothetical way that a Commanding Officer has given such

an order and asks what the Chaplain's reaction would be. 46 would complain and take it to a higher authority, but ~~some would~~, some would accept it, "if it were a case of military necessity"; "if it meant saving lives in the long run"; and *considered that such actions might be justified by the argument that in a total war everyone is involved.* Abercrombie puts two very similar questions to his Chaplains and in answer to the Chaplain versus Army conflict situation he discovers that 60.2% had never experienced it. Those who had experience of such a conflict excused it as follows:

"In no case did a Chaplain think that the situation had arisen because of an intrinsic conflict of Christian teachings with military necessities. Chaplains seemed rather to feel that the problem had occurred because of a Commander's improper perception of military missions and necessities: if the Commanders had not had a distorted view of their function, no conflict would have resulted". (29)

As most Chaplains had no experience of such actual conflict situations, Abercrombie, like Zahn, presents hypothetical cases in order to discover Chaplains' reactions. What for example would the Chaplain have done if he had heard orders to kill enemy prisoners? 71% would make a strong protest, *and* tell soldiers not to follow orders, 7% even favoured the use of violence to stop the killing! Abercrombie found that

"none of the Chaplains thought that a killing-of-prisoners situation constituted a conflict of military necessity with Christian ethical demands. Instead, and inarguably, they felt that orders to kill prisoners were outright illegal and were prohibited by military law as well as by the Christian ethic". (30)

When Abercrombie then substituted as the crucial issue in question, the supply of a brothel "for the purposes of raising morale", Chaplains again showed an almost universal desire to protest but without anything like the vehemence shown previously. Some could realise what the men were feeling like and could sympathise and some could even ask if perchance there might be a clerical discount offered in this hypothetical brothel. Abercrombie concludes that "Chaplains are no more anxious to "legitimate" the military than civilian clergyman think they should be".

(31)

Most Chaplains do not encounter situations in which God and Caesar come into direct conflict; furthermore, if they did, they would tend to believe that Caesar has mistaken his own best interests and consequently was in need of some friendly helpful advice and criticism. If a Chaplain thinks that the army is doing something wrong he will protest in the best way he knows to prevent it happening. The result is, more often than not, in favour of the Chaplain who not only gets what he wants, but is also praised for "bucking the system" and for showing the moral courage he is expected to have.

On questions to do with taking hostages, executing civilians as reprisal measures, torture and the like, once again the vast majority of Chaplains were emphatic about their disapproval of such actions and would do all in their power to prevent them and protest about them. On issues to do with conscientious objectors, 80% of Chaplains said that they would help them find a satisfactory end to their problems by indepth counselling in order to determine their sincerity. Then they would support them *during the process of their return to civilian life under military rules and regulations.*

75.8% of Chaplains thought that the nature of war today was such that it was no longer possible to maintain the old distinction between

"combatant" and "non-combatant". One CE Chaplain wrote that "there is no such thing as a non-participant in war; anything justified against military personnel can be justified against any participation in a nation at war". (32) The Christian whatever his viewpoint about war might be, is involved in a way that once was not envisaged or even thought possible. Even pacifists in the last war were kept alive by the Navy, protected by the Air Force and eventually allowed to live in peace by the combined efforts of all three services. His involvement in the war effort is perhaps a negative one but nevertheless by virtue of the fact that he is dependent upon others for his life he is involved. One Chaplain comments that: "All one can do is exercise a ministry, uphold the finer things and remind men of higher values even if they are temporarily submerged". War is a dirty business, but opting out seems virtually impossible these days. The whole nation, including mothers and grandmothers could be involved in some sort of war effort, and no one escapes the unpleasant consequences. This in no way excuses the brutality of war or the suffering that results, for all would agree that war was evil.

90% of Chaplains questioned by Zahn preferred the "Pauline" to the "Pacifist" resolution to the problem of total war. In other words, service to the Forces could easily be justified in terms of obedience to legitimate authority. Having examined rather superficially some Roman Catholic debates about the morality of total war, Zahn is forced to the conclusion that

"however clear the theological principle might be - whether enunciated by Council, Pope or professional theologians - the application of the principle to a specific act (or policy) of war is neither clear nor automatic". (33)

This naturally gives way to conflict, particularly if Chaplains are made to think, or are prepared to think, about the deeper underlying moral issues connected with war. Conflict is built into the system and the Chaplain, with the help of his ecclesiastical superiors and political leaders must somehow work out a solution which is acceptable to himself and then is capable of being accepted by those amongst whom he is sent to minister. At this stage Burchard would describe the Chaplains' behaviour as compartmentalisation - a device allowing the Chaplain to focus all his attention on a particular aspect of his job which he describes as "normal" while pushing to one side that other aspect which causes discomfort. Zahn then interprets Burchard by saying that the Chaplain

"might be inclined to leave all 'military decisions' to the Commanding Officers and their superiors and to ignore, if not indeed deny, any obligation to furnish moral guidance to his parishioners when such decisions seem to test or violate the bounds of traditional morality". (34)

In answer to the question about conflict being resolved by Chaplains in favour of their military allegiance the majority emphatically denied it and yet Zahn, in coming to his conclusion, could still write:

"Not only did the results of the inquiry support the basic assumption that tension is present in the Chaplain's role, but they also served to confirm the expectation that where such tension is present and recognised, it is most likely to be resolved in favour of the military dimension of the role". (35)

He admits the fact that his conclusion is contrary to the response he obtained, but nevertheless he is quite prepared to support it in an odd sort of way. The general tendency he says is to restrict protest, on the part of Chaplains, to military channels or even turn the whole matter over to Chaplains' Branch superiors. This he describes as a "military resolution to a moral dilemma". He then claims as further evidence *in support of his conclusions*, an unwillingness on the part of Chaplains to "counsel disobedience to an immoral command" and he suggests that this reluctance testifies to the priority that would be given to military needs and structures. Zahn considers this question of disobeying immoral commands perhaps the most important of all his questions. 61.8% of the RAF Chaplains could never envisage a situation where they would be obliged on moral grounds to advise men to disobey an order. The remainder gave a qualified 'yes'. It is important, they said, to recognise the fact that on occasions immoral orders are given and if they are recognised as such then it is not only the right, but the duty to disobey. The War trials held at Nuremberg after the last war proved this point over and over again. To be ordered to do something immoral is no defence in law. Abercrombie's findings would indeed substantiate this particular point of view. Chaplains ought to be more than a little concerned about the morality of military actions and by and large they are.

Burchard on the other hand is quite convinced that Chaplains have sold their souls to the Quartermaster's Stores. It appears he says that

"the Chaplain regards himself as operating in a moral context while he is conducting religious services or performing other tasks which are associated in his mind with the work of a clergyman, and which are not covered by military regulations, but not while dealing with

Commanding Officers, fellow Officers, channels of communication, and in other non-religious situations which are covered by the regulations. In religious situations he is guided by religious values, in other situations by other values". (36)

With regard to questions of discipline, Burchard sees the Chaplain as someone who remains outside the sphere of influence until a decision is taken and then he steps in to congratulate or commiserate. This conclusion of Burchard is in no way substantiated by the majority of Chaplains questioned by Zahn, Abercrombie or myself. Both Zahn and Burchard seem incapable of accepting the evidence of their own statistical analysis. Both ~~problems~~ are heavily oriented towards the pacifist attitude and whether or not they are aware of it, they have allowed this bias to ~~reduce their~~ <sup>value of their academic</sup> conclusions, and so spoil any scholarly achievement which might have been useful. Abercrombie accepts the fact that he thought that "the Chaplaincy was used in a rather straightforward way to legitimate the goals and missions of the United States Army". During the course of his research however, he became convinced otherwise.

"The maintenance of this independence from the demands of the military environment has required persistent dedication, courage, and even sacrifice on the part of the Chaplains themselves. In the light of this quiet, steadfast heroism, it may be improper for one outside the ministry to ask for more, to say that the Chaplain must stand ever prepared to belabour a human, erring army with prophetic criticism. Nevertheless I think the time has come for the words of prophecy to be said. I am also

convinced that the Chaplain will find the strength to say them". (37)

Conflict between the Chaplain and Civilian Clergymen.

This section could easily have been a mere extension of that which will deal with the conflict experienced by specialised clergy in relation to their parochial counterparts. The military chaplain is only a member of that specialised group of clergy and yet by reason of the nature of his "parish" he is perhaps closer to the parochial system than any other of the specialised clergy. His parish has a geographical connotation but his parishioners wear uniform and are under one system of discipline. In all other respects he is the parish priest ministering to the needs of his people.

Zahn, Burchard and Abercrombie however all have very positive views that any similarities between civilian clergymen and military chaplains are only superficial. If exposed to criticism, the military chaplain would be seen to be yet another cog in the military machine, an officer as opposed to a clergyman, and a militarist as opposed to a pacifist. At the parochial level, certainly, the military chaplain is discriminated against in much the same way as any of the other specialised ministers. (38) At a different level, because of the nature of his work in the Forces, there seems to be considerable evidence that the chaplain finds himself in a lonely corner facing an opponent who seems to be actively pacifist; who does not understand him, and who seems to think the worst of him.

The question of uniform and rank has been dealt with elsewhere but it is true to say that in identifying with the serviceman the chaplain seems to have cut himself off from his brother clergymen in civilian life though

only 1 in 37 Chaplains said that uniform actually hindered his work. The Chaplain's pay is from a different source and though in the past it has been considerably higher than the pay received in civilian parishes it is nevertheless true to say that there are more necessary "outgoings" which in the end even up the disparity. In June 1978 a priest joining the army would have got considerably less than his counterpart when taking a parish. In 1980 the *scale of pay* for soldiers rose considerably to offset *the effects of* inflation and to bring the army in line with its "civilian counterparts" according to the military salary structure. It is still true to say however that some civilian clergymen experience a drop in salary on joining the army. For the majority however, in real terms there is little difference in net remuneration. Along with the financial aspect there goes a social aspect which may possibly give rise to suspicion and even criticism. By virtue of the fact that the chaplain is simply regarded as one other member of a unit who is employed for his professional ability and who is not only identified by uniform with the rest but he also lives with them sharing their way of life at all levels, he is consequently an integrated member of that society. Along with the hardships of separation and the turbulence of continued moving all over the world there is often a greater emphasis placed on conviviality and the social round. If the chaplain does not want to be isolated he must integrate and this obviously involves joining in with whatever social life there happens to be. Many people would argue that this is no more and no less than that experienced by any other specialised minister doing his duty and enjoying it.

As far as the actual work is concerned Zahn said that all the chaplains he interviewed were unanimous in their insistence upon the similarity between their work and that of the civilian pastor. (39) When asked

about specific differences between the two jobs this brought forth 29 advantages and 106 disadvantages. Among the advantages listed by chaplains was the nature and composition of their congregations - young, fit, predominantly male and intelligent. Disadvantages, however, predominate; most of them arising from the tremendous mobility of men so that literally a church could be emptied overnight. Some chaplains can well remember "taking over" a Church, surrounded by two thousand soldiers, where there was literally no congregation at all. Such a challenge is seldom open to civilian counterparts. Among other disadvantages were; frustration at work with the system, loneliness, family insecurity and separation from what can best be described as the church fellowship. Other personal problems to do with alcohol, sex and matrimony are what many chaplains would probably describe as "neutral" in that, on balance, they provided opportunities,

However, every chaplain is very much aware of the great privilege he has of working within a military environment which relieves him entirely of all the financial worries of running a church which seem to bedevil, most of the time, the ministry and energy of his civilian counterparts. Everything from pews to pulpits to postage stamps is provided so that all his effort is then directed towards fulfilling his ordination vows. Although the chaplains themselves would never admit it and would rather emphasise their similarity with their civilian brothers Zahn still thinks that *they* are different.

"The chaplain, it becomes more and more clear, is not

'just' a clergyman like every other clergyman after all.

When the specific question is raised, he abandons the level of the easy cliché and frankly recognises that there are distinct differences as well as general similarities between his work and that of the civilian pastor - and, moreover, he is prepared to state these differences (as we have seen) in terms of advantages and disadvantages". (40)

An engineer will still be an engineer regardless of the firm for which he works. The clergyman is exactly the same, whether in or out of uniform, though some would be prepared to admit that, if anything does tend to separate the military chaplain from his civilian counterpart, it would be uniform and the sense of identification <sup>which</sup> it achieves.

Oddly enough, it is not Zahn or Burchard who deal in depth with Chaplain versus clergyman relationships but Abercrombie. The other two only briefly touch on the subject and then in what seems to be, a very superficial way, based upon preconceived ideas as to the, supposedly, great influence that the military environment exerts over the Chaplain. Both of them conclude that in any conflict/tension situation, problems are always resolved in favour of the military which is *contrary to the opinions of the chaplains themselves.*

Abercrombie however addresses himself to three closely related questions:

1. In the context of American Society, what roles and values are really viewed differently by civilian clergymen and military commanders?

2. With respect to roles and values that are viewed quite differently, where along a military officer - civilian clergyman, continuum are chaplains generally located?
3. Are there any factors of military or religious background that will enable us to predict where along the continuum a particular chaplain will be found? (41)

Although Abercrombie is obviously dealing with the American situation the similarity between that and what is experienced in Britain is obviously so great that there must be some close identification enabling us ~~to reach~~ some legitimate conclusions.

Abercrombie first puts to clergymen and then to commanders eleven task options. He tries to discover what it is that civilian clergymen think chaplains ought to do and then what commanders think. (42) The results obtained were somewhat to be expected, in that commanders thought that military functions were more important than purely religious ones and similarly the clergymen's response could have been forecast. However, on the whole, the task evaluation of clergymen and commanders was extremely similar, except for two areas: - the prophetic role of the chaplain and the expectation that he will boost morale by helping to cope with suffering and hardship, and by assisting in making those personal adjustments which are required in order to meet a combat situation. Clergymen think that the prophetic role of evangelism and conversion comes seventh in the order of priority for chaplains whilst commanders are not really interested in this aspect of soldiering at all. Reconciliation is rated fifth by clergymen and next to last by commanders. Abercrombie concludes this particular section by saying that: "Commanding Officers are willing to use religion to legitimate military service - in-

directly and probably unconsciously ..... Since the American cause is held to be just, the chaplain is expected to give men the courage they need to carry on the battle for the right." As one colonel said, "To me it boils down to the chaplain helping sustain courage - personal and unit". Abercrombie then quotes Luther: Whether Soldiers too can be saved, (selected writings).

"If the heart is bold and courageous, the fist is more powerful, a man and even his horse are more energetic, everything turns out better, and every happening and deed contributes to the victory which God then gives". (43)

On the question of discovering a conscientious objector there is great similarity of thought though the balance is still weighted, as one might be expected to with clergymen only slightly more concerned to help the objector gain his release. Commanders feel that the road for the objector must be kept open but <sup>for obvious reasons it must not be</sup> made too smooth.

In reply to the question: "Do situations arise in which chaplains feel morally bound to oppose military activities?" 90% of Commanders thought not; while 90% of clergymen disagreed. The implication seems to be quite clear; civilian clergymen expect chaplains to be in a role of conflict situation with the army whereas commanders see no problem.

The contrast between the views of commanders and clergymen *extends* to certain attitudes as well as the evaluation of some personal qualities and beliefs. Commanders were slightly more in favour of their country: "Right or wrong"; but only 4 out of 14 qualities to do with forgiveness, patriotism, killing and loving ones enemies were rated

67

differently by clergymen. (44) An interesting feature of these questions showed that Southern Baptists were more nationalistic and patriotic whereas Lutherans and Catholics were more opposed to certain possible aspects of national policy, like retaliatory bombing. (45) When asked if chaplains saw their military role as a legitimating function for the army; over 90% held that the chaplain does not legitimate and almost 99% claimed that he should not. It would seem that most chaplains want nothing to do with it and certainly this attitude would be upheld by all of the British chaplains interviewed. Following another series of questions dealing with attitudes towards nationalism, honour, suffering and retaliatory bombing of civilians, there was considerable agreement. It would seem however that chaplains are not only more patriotic, they also are prepared, in some small measure, to allow for certain actions, like moderate retaliation, if the need arises. (46) Despite some differences, military chaplains react in a very similar way to civilian clergymen, not only in thought but deed.

The big differences seem to be between chaplains and commanders. When asked to elaborate on these differences 60.2% made no mention of them and so one concludes that they cannot be all that significant. 21.3% admitted that some incidents had arisen but Abercrombie emphasises that: "In no case did a chaplain think that the situation had arisen because of an intrinsic conflict of Christian teachings with military necessities". (47) Problems arose because some commander had failed to evaluate the true nature of his mission and its necessity. Chaplains tend to believe as has been pointed out elsewhere that when there is conflict between God and Caesar it is Caesar who has made the mistake and it is therefore Caesar who needs help and if necessary some not unfriendly criticism.

It might be of interest to try and discover how these attitudes of chaplains

are formed. What might be the psychology behind them and what is the underlying cause for any change that might take place? Abercrombie says that as far as people are concerned; in order to survive in a new environment they are compelled to change their behaviour patterns so that new patterns will be congruous with <sup>the</sup> old. Chaplains are the product of some civilian church congregation. They go to Theological College and/or University and then they are ordained.

After a minimum of two years service in a parish they could then be in a position to join one of the armed services as a military chaplain. By this time attitudes have already undergone considerable change. In trying to measure and analyse such change, particularly when the young clergyman becomes a chaplain, Abercrombie suggests that differences between the attitudes of chaplains and civilian clergymen will be greatest where differences between the attitudes of military commanders and civilian clergymen are greatest. In his book The Human Group George Homans says that

"the more frequently persons interact with one another, the more alike in some respects their activities and their sentiments tend to become". (48)

Thus young immature chaplains with little active service are more akin to their civilian counterparts and conversely chaplains with long service have perhaps changed their attitudes towards the military quite considerably. Presumably, it is argued, that in the Forces there could be pressures and influences which were immediate and attractive, particularly when chaplains were virtually cut off from any of the external influences of other civilian clergymen. To be isolated both physically and geographically from the civilian church and its environment means that the military presence becomes overwhelming and supreme

and with it all come the subtle pressures which invariably end in a change of attitude. The chaplain consequently, it is thought, becomes more "military". Only by keeping in constant touch with the civilian environment, both ecclesiastical and social, can the chaplain hope to retain some of those original attitudes he once possessed. Another problem arises when those who find themselves very secure in their environment can then afford to "let their hair down" every now and again and deviate from what is considered to be "normal" behaviour. At the other end of the scale, (often measured in terms of rank and seniority), those who are "new to the army game", can still afford to "throw over the traces" with the feeling that as yet they have nothing to lose. These problems tend to complicate the issue and no easy conclusions can be reached for no two chaplains are alike and no two react in the same way to external stimuli.

In some research carried out by Clifford E. Keyes, another American, it was discovered that whilst the army retains only 18% of its junior officers almost 52% of its chaplains elect to remain on for extended duty after their initial tour. (49) The same is true for the British Army, in that over the last 5 years only 15% can be regarded as "wasted chaplains". The majority of these leave because the Chaplains' Department, for one reason or another, want to dispense with their services. On the other hand a small percentage of wastage could imply a high standard of selection procedures in choosing men who already have, to some extent, shown that they are capable of accepting change and therefore more flexible. Perhaps the main factor for keeping Chaplains in the Services lies in the fact that "far from being in conflict with the military life style, many religious values are actually emphasised in the army". (50) The Chaplain does not see the soldier's life as characterised by blood, lust, cruelty and idolatrous state worship or even regimental worship. Instead, he

emphasises the soldierly qualities of unselfishness, courage, dedication, discipline and a loyalty to something outside himself that indeed transcends self.

In his book The Soldier and the State, Samuel Huntington shows that a very good case can be made out for there being a strong link between military and religious values. Liberalism he maintained has dominated the American Post War scene but there were now signs that this is beginning to change in favour of a "more sympathetically conservative environment for military institutions". It is said that what happens in America yesterday can happen in Europe today or tomorrow. We have yet to experience this wind of change blowing through our corridors of power. Many scholars would maintain that liberal solutions to military problems "constituted the gravest threat to American military security". The same problems are facing the military security of the United Kingdom, encouraged and exacerbated by the liberalism of the Post War decades. Huntington sees the revival of interest in popular religion as a sign that future military programmes will be safe and secure. In The Professional Soldier, Morris Janowitz suggests that similar values emphasised by both the army and the church tend to attract the same sort of people for both careers.

"Military Officers frequently made reference to linkage between their profession and the ministry. One Army Colonel when asked about the gratification of military life, said: "It is not too different from priesthood or ministry in serving a cause". A retired Naval Captain wrote to his son: "The Naval profession is much like the ministry, you dedicate your life to a purpose. You wear

the garb of an organised profession. Your life is governed by rules laid down by the organisation. You renounce the pursuit of wealth. In a large measure you surrender your citizenship; renounce politics; and work for the highest good of the organisation. In the final analysis your aims and objects are quite as moral as any minister's because you are not seeking your own good, but the ultimate good of your country. You train men to be good and useful citizens, like the minister, what you say must conform to the rules of the organisation".

(51)

In both America and in Europe many sons of clergy frequently take up a military career and conversely, many Officers who resign have found, in Ordination, an expression of their desire to do service in the name of a great and noble cause. (At the present time the British Army has over 30 bona fide ordination candidates and 17 are actually undergoing theological training). It might be argued by people like Burchard that this harmony of life and thought between the religious and the military is wishful thinking on the part of chaplains and could be said to be a rationalisation of the conflict that really exists. Many scholars would not agree with this, maintaining that much of Christianity and the development of theology is due in part to thinking that service to our country was indeed service to God. At one time, before the liberalism of recent times, the two were thought to be congruent and not at all set in opposite camps as seen by Zahn and Burchard.

The last hypothesis supported in the main by Abercrombie seems to fit the picture for most chaplains in that

"many chaplains will tend to see military values as similar or identical to the values they had developed as Christians and clergymen before becoming Chaplains. For these Chaplains the military will not constitute a new and different moral environment requiring behaviour (thereby attitudinal) adaptation; therefore their attitudes will not be changed". (52)

Abercrombie then asks questions dealing with tasks, opinions and options. He comes to the conclusion that there seems to be a noticeable difference in attitude and that this difference is at greatest variance over those issues in which clergymen and commander attitudes are also very different. Thus it appears he concludes that "differences between clergymen and chaplains are not simply random but instead are related to the demands of the military environment". (53) With more military experience he thinks that these attitudes might increasingly change until they begin to resemble very closely those of the military officer, as opposed to the civilian clergyman. Following the old pattern of questions Abercrombie asks about patriotism, honour, suffering and retaliatory bombing. He imposes variable conditions such as years of service, rank, combat time and school background. He then discovers that experience of military matters makes no appreciable differences at all to <sup>the</sup> original attitudes of chaplains. Next he thinks that length of service and seniority might have some bearing on the subject: militariness perhaps depending on rank, medals, campaigns, importance and future expectations. Although there is some slight variation, his findings again are not really significant. He writes that: "I have made a reasonably thorough attempt to use military background factors to explain the variation of 'militari-

ness' among chaplains. That attempt has quite convincingly failed". (54)

All sorts of influences are then examined to find out the reasons for the failure - school, college, home, poor, rich, southern, white-collar, etc. etc. No new answers are found and so he is forced to conclude that "for the clergyman who becomes a chaplain, the military simply does not constitute a new and different religious environment requiring behavioural (thereby attitudinal) adaptations". *The attitudes of Chaplains* seemingly transcend the influences and the demands of military environments. The Chaplain can and does maintain that his Christian attitudes are in fact the best attitudes for the soldier and officer. Indeed for the whole of society Christian attitudes are held by him to be transcendental and thus relevant to any situation or environment. Whatever it is he believes in, he is prepared to believe in it, even if he is the only one in step. Here it must be taken into consideration, of course, the possibility that some Chaplains, during their initial tour of duty discover that socially or theologically or even psychologically they are square pegs in round holes.

*Probably his accounts* for the small number who leave of their own accord.

The Chaplain then, by and large, remains virtually the same as far as his attitudes and behaviour is concerned. The military environment does not make him more military than he originally was. Indeed, as Abercrombie so rightly points out, the military environment has in fact acted as a shield to protect him from influences at work in the world outside the Forces. Some scholars would say that there seems to be a new concept of the Kingdom of God. Theology, particularly since Karl Barth, has undergone a change and along with it political, military, social and economic forces at work have all produced a vastly different society from that which at one time was mirrored in the army. Not only has the pacifist fringe been enlarged but all sorts of "ordinary" people are beginning to ask all sorts of different

questions to do with "What sort of Society do we want?" Archbishop Donald Coggan was not alone in his quest to discover what makes the present society tick. Today even patriotism and flag waving can be construed as divisive. Law and Order are held by many politicians to be no longer sacred but simply debating points for those who on their relentless march towards social justice and egalitarianism are prepared to ignore both law and order.

Some students of social philosophy and history would maintain that there has come into being a new way of life with new values and new concepts about what is right and what is wrong. Religion too has changed dramatically over the past 20 years. Conservatives would argue that the only remaining bastion of the old standards is found in the Forces and seemingly they have not, as yet, changed. However ~~the~~ pressure to adopt Trade Unionism *may dictate* that change *is on the way.*

Faced with all this change in society, while the Forces remain somewhat isolated and therefore free from external influences, Abercrombie next looks at the age group of these civilian clergy who have undergone change. He discovers that, by and large, it is the young ones who have moved out of step with old traditions and old customs. The younger clergy are the ones who are out of sympathy with the military machine and all that it stands for. *Some scholars would argue that this indicates a* movement of religious values away from nationalism to something else. It *might well* account for the fact that not many younger clergymen are seeking to join the Forces. *as well as* for a feeling of alienation experienced by many military chaplains. This *has also* been experienced by the Police and this again is symptomatic for it seems to have a bearing upon the attitudes of society as it exists

at present. This divergence of attitudes, may only be temporary because sooner or later society at large, from which is recruited the armed forces and the police, is going to force a change on those who wear the uniform of soldiers or police. New Chaplains for example will have new ideas and new attitudes so that in time, with wastage and influence, the Chaplains' Department too will no doubt catch up with the church outside. In the meantime it would be helpful if the lines of communication between civilian clergymen, especially young ones, and Chaplains are kept open and that dialogue could take place regularly, at all levels of our religious societies. Unfortunately it seems that army chaplains tend to be isolated from those civilian clergy who could be the very best source of dialogue about any *Change of attitude*. The Chaplains Department must learn to rely more and more upon local contacts, upon Territorial Army Chaplains and those colleagues who minister to cadets and smaller units as officiating chaplains. It is remarkable that the young clergymen who are recruited these days are by and large 'a chip off the old block' in that their attitudes on joining are in fact very similar to the attitudes of those who are old enough to retire. Can one therefore argue that only certain types of clergymen become military chaplains or indeed any sort of specialised chaplain?

#### Specialised Clergy v. Parochial Clergy.

In the report of a working party of the Ministry Committee of the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry on priests in specialised work, published under the title Specialised Ministries (1971) we read that "though the parish ministry may pass through considerable changes ..... there is no doubt that such a ministry ..... will remain the basic pattern for the foreseeable future". (55) Having said that, in no uncertain way, the report then goes

*the encouragement of*  
 on to make a case for specialised ministries. *This seems to point to*

Some difficulty experienced by these particular ministers in relation to those who regard the parochial ministry as "divinely inspired." Although specialised ministries are a necessity in the church, the bulk of the clergy, especially in the parishes are loathe to accept them as being no more than a luxury to be tolerated. Tensions between both sections of the clergy will be dealt with later in the chapter along with suspicions and doubts voiced by some Bishops.

*The argument in favour of specialised ministries is a threefold one.*  
 The Church must minister to people where they are. Society today is vastly different from that of even ten years ago. The vast majority of the population lives in urban, industrial areas with little or no contact with the Church. People are more mobile, more prosperous, having more leisure and with it there is a great desire to experiment with different patterns of living. The Church must be able to speak to these people if it is to have any voice in the world or any respect in the minds of those who are part of the change. There is a different sense of community today and no longer is the old parish necessarily the centre of community life. Work, leisure, entertainment, and sport are all areas of modern human endeavour. Their widespread location has influenced the old geographical understanding of Church life in England. The frontiers of the Gospel are being pushed out of the home into the factory, the school, the shop, the garrison and the sports complex and though many of the tasks of evangelism can be carried out by trained laity there is still a need for clergymen to show that they too are involved and integrated otherwise there will be no feeling of identification or commitment. The clergymen who work

in these new areas need to be specially trained and familiar with their environment if they are <sup>not</sup> they will be out of tune and out of sympathy with those to whom they minister. The report stresses the need for teachers, administrators, psychologists, theologians, social workers and youth workers although, of course, all these people need not be ordained in order to function properly in the hospital, school or factory. The report quotes an earlier report on Patterns of Ministry at Uppsala in 1968: - "in the complex and pluralistic society of today, no single pattern of ministry can ensure that the Church's witness is made at every point, and that every social group receives adequate pastoral care". (56) The need for a specialised ministry is therefore clearly defined. The work of such a Minister would be divided into pastoral, prophetic and evangelistic, including of course the administration of the Sacraments. The role of the old parish priest is thereby extended into particular communities having an identity of their own, a corpus of their own and often a life style of their own.

"The Specialised Priest is called to be a pastor in a special environment, in circumstances which are in many ways different from the parish priest. His ministry must have a specialised orientation. He must be trained and equipped to speak with particular groups of people and to understand the special problems that arise out of their particular circumstances". (57)

He will meet people in their everyday working lives who, literally, have no contact with the parochial clergy at all. He needs, therefore, to have a special insight into their motivation, into their work and into their leisure and this he will find difficult to obtain unless he <sup>is</sup> identified <sub>^</sub>

and involved with them. His ministry will be that of a peripheral ministry in the highways and byways of Society. Perhaps an even more vital aspect of his ministry will be concerned with the structures, institutions and influences which mould the lives of those amongst whom he ministers. He will be playing the all important role of a prophet in trying to discover what God is saying, in and through a variety of secular situations. The hospital chaplain should not just be concerned with his patients but also with the whole field of medicine and its ethical ramifications. The prison chaplain should be interested in prison conditions, in the bigger issues of crime and punishment, as well as his prison inmates. The service chaplain should be concerned not only about the moral issues of warfare but whether or not his soldiers are behaving, as good members of the society they are called upon to defend. As a result, the specialised minister will be more clearly involved in everything that surrounds him in the contemporary situation. He will have to justify his role in a secular society which does not take him for granted and therefore he will need to examine his role and clarify it to his own satisfaction. To say that the specialised minister is simply a parish priest writ large enshrines a misleading half truth. "It underestimates all the particular orientations required in such a ministry and completely ignores the prophetic functions" already stressed as being so important. Some specialised ministries need a professionalism and skill which is not possible for the parish priest to acquire unless he gives up his parish and undergoes specialised training. Despite the fact that many people regard specialised ministries as more in touch with the contemporary scene there are still a vast number who would like to see the minister/priest only concerned with his rather narrow religious field. If he tries to play a significant part in the life of society, *whether* in the school, hospital, army or factory there will be some who will oppose him. The temptation to do what is expected

of him, to be an orthodox chaplain who fits into a defined niche, will be considerable.

Despite many preconceived notions about the nature of the ordained ministry it must be obvious that the church is and must be committed to a multiplicity of forms of ministry. The 1968 Lambeth Conference stressed that if the Church is to be continually renewed for mission there must be a greater diversity in the roles of the ordained ministry. If the theological gifts of the New Testament are to be regarded as important for the building up of the Body of Christ then it follows that a ministry which is confined to one pattern, namely that of the parochial organisation, is not sufficient and does not give adequate expression to the Pauline concept expressed in Ephesians 4. The early church certainly recognised that ministry was a diffuse thing which became corporate in as much as it had relevance to the Body of Christ. "In a highly specialised world, with highly specialised needs, we can no longer regard the parish priest as omni-competent".

The report then goes on to deal with the relationship <sup>between</sup> the specialised minister and the parochial clergy. He is regarded by some as *merely an extension,*

*or as an appendage to something more important or even as second class compared with the mainstream of the church's ministry.* It can be argued however that the very opposite of this can sometimes be just as strongly felt by those of the specialised ministry. They have skills and expertise in addition to those of the parochial clergy and so they are "special." (58) <sup>an analogy</sup> There is <sup>an</sup> in the field of medicine, where discontent is just as great, *between specialists and general practitioners on the ground that the mere fact of having specialised makes some superior to others.* It can be pointed out however that Christian Ministers

of all sorts are in fact seeking to minister to the whole man and therefore the analogy with medicine is misconceived. Specialised clergy *may* have special skills but <sup>his</sup> in no way makes them superior for their skills are not necessarily higher or better. It is far safer to say that all patterns of ministry are complementary and that ministry, in general as well as in the particular, is a ministry of equal partners.

In a questionnaire submitted to clergymen about the reasons <sup>why</sup> they entered their specialised fields the overwhelming evidence showed that their reasons were positive and in no way were they related to some kind of disillusionment with parochial life. (59) The vast majority of specialised ministers thought that their parochial experience was 'very important'!

*Many* regarded their specialist field as a job that needed doing, or because they already had skills which were pertinent or a personality more suited. A substantial minority indicated some degree of criticism of the parochial system. This of course might be countered by saying that they obviously could not cope with the pressures of parish life and so decided to leave. This is the sort of comment often made by the parochial clergy and seemingly without much foundation. Most clergy both parochial and otherwise were critical of the parochial system because it impeded them doing the job for which they were ordained, ministering to people and not raising money for church fabric.

*The report, while* setting out to be unbiased, *consistently* tries to find excuses for clergy who leave parishes in favour of some specialisation. The facts are that most clergy leave because of a variety of good, legitimate, well thought out, positive reasons. Some however are said to leave because their congregations are dwindling and they seek tailor-made congregations in school, or prison, or hospital. Some were

thought to be unsure about the function of their ministry and left the parochial sphere to look for something more clearly defined and disciplined. Whatever the reasons it must be accepted that tension does exist between the parochial and specialised clergy. The report states quite categorically that these "tensions cut quite deeply". Relations were described by many as "not good". The administrative structure of the Church did not encourage a multiplicity of forms of ministry and those outside *in fact* feeling, cut off. The attitudes of the Parish clergy were summarised along with one or two comments from Bishops. In listing these attitudes it is only fair to say that all the evidence was provided by specialised clergy and therefore it may well be biased according to some scholars. Some parish priests thought that all the work of any importance could be based on a parish, indeed must be based on a parish. Some Bishops agreed, making the following comments:

"We feel that as far as it is practicable, the pastoral care of institutions in a parish should be the responsibility of the parish church".

"A great deal of the ministerial work of the so called specialist character is, in fact, part and parcel of the care of the parish priest and is best to be regarded as such".

"I believe those specialised ministries that are of teaching, or industrial chaplaincy or of hospital chaplaincy to be of limited usefulness though important".

"We consider specialists should be kept to a reasonable minimum, far too many of them can harass incumbents and multiply forms and meetings without necessarily helping the mission of the church". (60)

Coupled with these comments, at a time when the church is very short of man-power, it must be asked if clergymen can be spared for specialised ministries? "Another good man lost to the parish" is the frequent response.

At a time when the pressure is on the parochial system some parish priests feel that specialised ministers are doing more harm to the cause by opting out. It might be argued that jealousy on the part of the parish priest could not be ruled out as a possible cause of friction. The morale of many parish priests was said to be low, whereas that of the specialised clergy was high.

Having<sup>to</sup> raise money, in the parishes, for a particular charity did not always endear the specialist minister to his parochial brother. There seemed to be a great deal of ignorance on the part of the parochial clergy about specialised ministries. One schoolmaster priest wrote in the Prison Chaplain's Newsletter of May 1969 that the specialised priest "experiences a growing sense of estrangement from his parochial brethren. He is met with little understanding or interest, and he looks in vain for support from them." There is often *only* a tenuous relationship with the Diocese with the specialised clergy receiving little or no encouragement from the Bishop. When trying to get back into parochial life the specialised minister finds great apathy and even resentment amongst the parish priests and many feel that they are being discriminated against. Another factor, *is the disparity between the stipends of the parochial clergy and the specialised ministries. Here it could be argued that the parochial clergy seem to have the advantage over their brethren.*

Episcopal interest in, or supervision of, specialised ministries seems most inadequate. The report makes a recommendation: "If the specialised minister is to have and be seen to have an important

part in the life of the church it is vital that he should be fully involved in the parish, the diocese, and the central structures of the church at every level possible, and in relationship with a Bishop". (61)

As far as Bishops are concerned it is further stated that "there should be specialised Bishops in the same way as there is a Bishop to the Forces".

(62) It could be argued however that specialised Bishops might well divorce themselves and the clergy they lead even more so from the main stream of church practice. The more the specialised ministries can integrate within the diocese and the parish the better for all concerned. As far as the Bishop to the Forces is concerned the military chaplain and his congregation are not looking for and certainly do not get a specialised Bishop. He merely exercises his episcopal functions wherever the Forces happen to be stationed overseas. Experience has shown that it is far better to turn to the local diocese whenever soldiers are in the United Kingdom. Some Bishops to the Forces have had no experience of the Forces prior to their consecration and many, it seems, are ignorant of the problems and the needs of military chaplains. They tend to bring to their so called specialised office no more, no less, than any other Bishop. When it comes to voting in the General Synod of the Church of England many specialised clergy are not entitled unless they possess a license under seal and very few of them are so privileged. Some are not even put on to a diocesan mailing list despite letters to Bishops offering help and giving it without remuneration on numerous occasions. There is indeed a very sad lack of interest shown by the parochial clergy to any of the specialists. Problems of loneliness, morale and lack of spiritual life are bound to appear. By and large they are overcome by involvement in and integration with the communities they serve. Having done without the support or indeed the interest of the parochial clergy for such a long time

it is hardly surprising that the specialist often tends to cut himself off from them and consequently looks inwards for friendship and companionship, finding it, not in the ranks of the ordained, but rather with the laity. Three army chaplains have just returned to service with the Forces again after a very short time out in a civilian parish. All of them complained about being "out in the cold" as far as their brother clergy were concerned. However, none of them were unhappy with their relationship with church congregations. All of them expressed a sadness amounting to an uneasy conscience at having to leave their congregations but a yearning to re-establish the friendship and the fellowship of their brother priests and ministers in uniform.

1. Getzels and Guba, "Role, Role Conflict and Empirical Study" quoted by M.C. Branham in Air University Review, July/August 1978, Vol 29 No. 5 pp 49-53.
2. G.C. Zahn - Chaplains in the Royal Air Force p.26.
3. W. Burchard "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains" in the American Sociological Review October 1954 pp 528-535.
4. Zahn p 103-104, Question 13.
5. Op cit p 91 (See Annex E)
6. Zahn p 106-107, Question 19.
7. Ibid. p 109.
8. Ibid.p 88 - Zahn quotes Burthard The Role of the Military Chaplain p. 203.
9. D. Bonhoefer Letters and Papers from Prison p.60.
10. Zahn. p.124.
11. Abercrombie - The Military Chaplain p.92.
12. Op cit p.29 and p 110 (See Annex A and A (ii)).
13. Op cit p.28 quoted by Zahn p.93.
14. Ibid. p.95.
15. Ibid. p.226.
16. Ibid. p.228 Zahn quotes Burchard The Role of the Military Chaplain p. 156-157.
17. Zahn. p.100.
18. Ibid. p.61. Question 23.
19. Ibid. p.55. Question 10.
20. Ibid. p.56. Questions 11 and 12.
21. Ibid. p.226. Zahn quotes Burchard The Role of the Military Chaplain .
22. Abercrombie. p.16.
23. R. Appelquist. Church, State and Chaplaincy p.33.
24. Abercrombie. p.17.
25. Zahn. p.76. Questions 16 and 17.

26. Ibid. p.119. Question 26.
27. Ibid. p.120. Question 27.
28. Ibid. p.139. Question 33.
29. Abercrombie. p.96.
30. Ibid. p.97.
31. Ibid. p.99.
32. Zahn. p.214.
33. Ibid. p.257.
34. Ibid. p.266.
35. Ibid. p.240.
36. Abercrombie. p.106. - quoting Burchard Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains p.531.
37. Abercrombie. p.148.
38. See Specialised Ministries ((ACCM) 1971)
39. Zahn. p.85.
40. Ibid. p.100.
41. Abercrombie. p.18.
42. Ibid. p.71. (See Annex B)
43. Ibid. p.74.
44. Ibid. p.81 (See Annex C)
45. Ibid. p.84 (Note 48)
46. Ibid. p.96 (Annex D compare with Annex C & E)
47. Ibid. p.96.
48. Ibid. p.103. Abercrombie quotes Homans.
49. Ibid. p.108. Abercrombie quotes Key's Student research project p.86. "An evaluation of certain Factors Affecting the Retention Rate of Career Chaplains in the United States Army".
50. Ibid. p.108.
51. Ibid. p.114.
52. Ibid. p.109.

53. Ibid. p.110.
54. Ibid. p.123.
55. Op cit. p.15.
56. Ibid. p.17.
57. Ibid. p.21.
58. Ibid. p.22.
59. Ibid. p.29. (See Annex A(i) and A(ii))
60. Ibid. p.35.
61. Ibid. p.42.
62. Ibid. p.42.

CHURCH AND STATE

There have been many attempts to separate Church from State and any attempt to do so, as far as the Christian church is concerned, must start with some examination of the Old Testament. It has been said by some scholars that all our modern theories for the co-existence side by side of Church and State find their origins within the creation and development of the Jewish nation.

"The greater part of the Old Testament deals with a people which was at the same time a State and a Church: an organised political community, with political institutions, such as a Monarchy and civil and military administration: and a religious community, with holy places, sacrificial rites and a sacred calendar. No representative Israelite between Saul and Zedekiah would have thought of denying either aspect of the national life". (1)

Having said that however it is still possible for one aspect of national life to criticise another. The prophets could easily complain bitterly about the conduct of Kings and indeed Kings have been known to try and silence prophecy. Over the years there evolved a special sort of modus vivendi of checks and balances operated by those who were speaking on behalf of God and on behalf of the nation, though to all intents and purposes, both State and Church were still indivisible.

Throughout the New Testament however we find a very different state

of affairs. Israel by this time had undergone many changes and though the relationship between Church and the body Politic remained virtually the same as it had done for generations, under Roman occupation there was a very definite separation - the State being identified with Roman government and all that that entailed. Judaism, despite the puppet government of Herod and his family, was no longer an independent, autonomous State. Such privileges as it had under Herod were granted by the Roman Emperor and any authority it enjoyed was severely limited and curtailed. That the Sanhedrin for example had some powers is not questioned but the extent of those powers was carefully monitored and checked. With these somewhat important qualifications to be borne in mind it can be said that the Jewish State, as such, had by now no real sovereign powers. The Jews regarded themselves as an occupied nation, as a persecuted people, oppressed and under authority. It was very much the classic situation of a "them" and "us" confrontation. Under these circumstances it is very natural that once again the Jews should look forward to a time when God's rule and His Kingdom would be established upon earth. It was essentially apocalyptic in nature and varied in character from a rather philosophical concept of God's sovereignty to a more practical manifestation in the time of the Maccabees who wanted something of a more tangible nature.

Against this background of hopes and fears, of occupation and oppression, of freedom fighters and thoughts of a new era, the Christian Church had its birth. "The Kingdom of God" and all that those words conjured up was very much at the forefront of people's expectations.

"To some, this time lay on the edge of history, it could be hoped for and prayed for, but not otherwise affected by human agency. To others, the time lay within history, and its coming lay (under God) within the power of their own right hand, and at the sword's point. The question of Acts 1.6 is thus one that no doubt sprang to the lips of many christians. 'Lord, is this the time when you mean to restore the Kingdom to Israel?'" (2)

The Christian Church of the New Testament is basically a religious community living out its role in a secular state but feeling obliged to proclaim the gospel of Christ to all around it. "The Kingdom of God" is the recurring theme and seemingly it can be proclaimed to anyone of any nationality. Throughout Acts and the Epistles both Luke and Paul see themselves as being in no way in direct conflict with the State. In many ways the Roman authorities are regarded in a most favourable light (cf. Acts 13.12; 16.38; 17.19). At no time does Paul, a Roman citizen himself, complain about the treatment he receives at their hands. Any trouble seems to be caused by the Jews and their hatred of Christians. If any incitement occurs it is instigated by the Jews. As far as the Christians are concerned there seems to be little or no quarrel between Rome and themselves. We are reminded in Acts 3.13 that at the trial of Jesus it was Pilate who was determined to release him. According to C.K. Barrett Christians sought and enjoyed the protection of Rome, seeing the Roman authorities as "God's servants". (3) The main task however is to examine in some detail the relationship between the Christian and the State in which he lived. If such a relationship existed, how did it effect the attitude of the Church towards the State?

How far was the original attitude retained as the march of history progresses and does the geographical spread of the Church throughout Europe have an effect on Church State relationships? The proper attitude a Christian ought to adopt towards the State is a recurring theme in Church history and one which, of late, still provokes lively discussion. Answers given to the questions which are posed can range from Augustine's two Kingdoms thesis, through the mediaeval insistence on the absolute supremacy of the Church in both spiritual and temporal affairs, to modern assertions of the State to lay claim upon the loyalties of each individual before all other associations to which he may happen to belong.

The diversity of the conflict goes back to the Bible itself and in particular to the New Testament where the answer to a distinctively Christian assessment of the State appears to move in two different directions. One answer suggests that Christians do have a role to play as citizens, neither to withdraw completely from the State nor seek to transform it into something new. If 'the Lord your God is one', as the Old Testament scriptures so strongly affirm, then he is sovereign in and over all spheres of life including the State, and demands obedience of the people of God, there as elsewhere. Many hold this to be the burden of Paul's argument in Romans 13, 1-7 as well as being the main substance of the argument in 1 Peter 2, 13-17.

A second line of argument, expressed most clearly in the Johannine literature is strongly a-political. The leaders of the State will never understand Christianity because it is unworldly (John 17, 14-18; 18, 33-38) and since politics clearly belong to the things of the world they should be shunned by Christians (1 John 1, 15-17). This has led

some to urge that Christians should withdraw from social and political involvement, having as little to do with the State as possible. Others, on fire with eschatological hope, have attempted through the State to anticipate the millenium by creating a new social order here on earth.

The duality whereby the New Testament describes the State both as the 'servant of God' and the 'servant of satan' raises for many christians profound problems of a conflict nature. Where does the apparent contradiction lie? How should Christians react to both legitimate calls? Does the Christian serve God or Caesar or both?

(1) Mark 12, 13-17.

In the context in which this famous passage is found some scholars are of the opinion that it is there for a special purpose: to show Jesus as being the Son of God and that whatever is God's should be paid to him. In this way it is hoped that the people will be able to identify the true nature of Jesus and then render to him what is due to God. The question was obviously designed to trap Jesus for it dealt with a "head tax" collected by the Romans from those of the Jewish nation who lived in Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea. According to B.H. Branscombe "The assessment began in AD 6 when Archelaus the son of Herod the Great, was deposed and Roman procurators took over the administration of his territory". (4) As a consequence a revolt broke out following intense resentment. "Its leaders declared, according to Josephus, that 'this taxation was nothing but a direct introduction of slavery, and urged the nation to assert its liberty'. Christ was therefore firmly pinned on the horns of a dilemma - either he lost the support of his friends and the crowds by saying the tax was lawful

or he became a revolutionary by forbidding to pay the tax". (5)

A.E.J. Rawlinson in his commentary on St. Mark says "The Lord's answer is an evasion of the dilemma ..... He expresses no opinion as to the theoretical rightfulness or wrongfulness of Caesar's rule .... Coins were regarded as being the private property of the sovereign whose image they bore. Since Caesar's coins were in actual circulation, Our Lord argues, the Jews in paying tribute were only giving to Caesar that which was his own. There was no conflict between that and their duty to God". (6) C.K. Barrett maintains that the coin in a way represents services rendered by Caesar in the shape of safety and good order. So far then as Caesar renders service he might well expect to be paid. The coin bears the image of Caesar and therefore it is clearly his. Man, on the other hand bears the image of God and needs to show his complete dependence upon God. Barrett goes to some length to point out the importance of the conjunction 'and' *as linking* the two sides of the story rather than declaring them to be mutually exclusive as some scholars would have us believe. "What some of his contemporaries regarded as alternatives, he joined together". (7)

Jesus saw no real reason to oppose the State or its claims upon the individual. If men and women are beyond reproach in all they do and say then there might not be a need for law or sanctions or anyone to uphold them. However, human nature, being what it is, "needs the support of specific commandments backed by specific sanctions. To say this is not to criticize the Sermon on the Mount; it is to criticize society, or, more properly, the human nature which is the raw stuff of society". (8) There is a great difference between living in the real world with all its tensions and problems and preaching about an ideal world with no tensions or problems.

H.G. Wood quotes Lord Acton as saying of this particular passage

"Those words ..... gave to the civil power under the protection of conscience, a sacredness it had never enjoyed and bounds it had never acknowledged: and they were the repudiation of absolutism and the inauguration of freedom". (9)

Be that as it may it is fairly safe to say that in the Gospel narratives the State enjoys a certain place in the structure of life which is a necessity in the present historical context. On the other hand by comparison with God's Kingdom and his rule upon earth, earthly Kingdoms pale into insignificance. The context in which we ought to read this passage is one of eschatology. "Caesar's claims are but little in comparison with God's". (10)

(11) Romans 13, 1-7

For Paul too, "the whole structure of human life, as known and experienced in this world, is a temporary arrangement". G.K. Barrett brings in, by analogy, 1 Corinthians 7, 29f together with 2 Thessalonians 2, 6-7; maintaining that though they do not refer explicitly to any relationship of Christians with the State nevertheless they are correct in thinking in eschatological terms that the end is near. This impending event colours all thought and action and though the State is part of the order that will eventually pass away it is still necessary for the time being, in order that the man of sin, a forerunner of the end, will not appear before all things are ready. The restraining force ( $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu$ ) as the Empire, is personalized as ( $\delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omega\nu$ ) its chief representative being the Emperor. If this play on words is acceptable then Barrett claims that two conclusions follow:

- (a) the Empire has a positive role in God's purpose
- (b) this role is a temporary role - it will come to an end when the Emperor is taken out of the way, so that he holds up the appearance of the man of sin no longer. (11)

Underpinning society or civilization there are various pillars or foundations *which* together make up the stability and the strength of the modern state. Remove the foundations, for whatever the purpose and the whole structure begins to collapse - as a house built upon sand during monsoon rains. This really is the thesis of Sir Frederick Catherwood, the Christian industrialist, in his new book First things First. Catherwood claims or reasserts the fundamental necessity of having foundations for any sort of society to succeed, and the foundations or pillars he emphasizes are *found in* the Ten Commandments of Moses. Without something like these then Society begins to display all the symptoms of disintegration and destruction. Wars, earthquakes, famines, pestilence and the break up of family life will herald the coming of what St Paul calls the son of perdition. After him there can only be one glorious climax to the whole of creation - the coming of the Son of Man himself in power and great glory after the fashion of all apocalyptic writing and then the end of all things will be at hand. The Emperor and the Empire, the State in other words, operates as the brakes upon Society in its headlong rush to self destruction. "The Emperor is God's servant, whether he recognizes the fact or not and his service is defined in terms of the swift eschatological movement of history towards its close". (12)

Romans 13, 1-7 is part of Paul's description of the Christian life which begins really at Chapter 12.1 where the Christian's response is described

as (Ἀδελφείων) - service to God and considered to be most reasonable. In Romans 13 Paul considers that obedience to the State is all part of a Christian's <sup>Service</sup> (Ἀδελφείων). He reinforces this view by holding that the 'higher powers' or 'governing authorities' <sup>(ἐξουσίαι ὑπερεχούσων)</sup> derive their authority (ἐξουσία) from God since 'there is no authority except from God' and therefore they are a divine instrument, and should not be resisted.

Many scholars mention Gullmann's well known view stated in The State and the New Testament that the "authorities" to whom Paul refers are not in fact authorities of the State but rather ecclesiastical or divine angelical powers and principalities that stand in the shadows and use the State. Gullmann insists that this passage should be related to 1 Cor 2. 8; 6.3. The fact that the parallel word (κόσμοις) used by St Paul as meaning "worldly government" in no way weakens the other worldly view.

However O.K. Barrett is quite adamant when he says that such "powers" were defeated by the victory of the Cross (Col 2. 15). In no way are they lurking in the shadows as God's servants indeed the opposite may be nearer the truth. The task of the State is to encourage the good and punish the evil. Rulers exercise their God-given authority for the purpose of upholding good conduct and so they act as the servants of God (δούλως). Since they are in fact appointed by God they must be seen to be his servants and entitled to recognition, respect, obedience and even pay in the form of taxes. Sometimes it is necessary for the government as servant of God to execute the wrath of God upon the wrong doer and for this reason of course he bears the sword, presumably not just for punishment but also for deterrence. It is the task of the Christian to be a subject, loyal by conviction rather than through fear, to pay his tribute to Rome as well as his ordinary taxes, and to extend to his rulers all that is due by way of respect and honour in addition to

the taxes he owes. Emil Brunner in his commentary on this passage says that "It does not concern the acknowledgment of an abstract idea of the State, but the actual State and its real action". (13) It is highly significant that this passage was written by Paul during the reign of the most corrupt Emperor that Rome had ever known - Nero, who regarded himself as a God. Paul was not thinking so much about the actual figure of the Roman Emperor as of the members of the Senate and all the civil servants, who regardless of the Emperor always tried to serve the State per se faithfully. It is fairly safe to assume that since Paul himself appealed to the Roman high court for justice he obviously had confidence in its impartiality (Acts 25. 10f). Later, in his letter to the Philippians, written whilst in a Roman prison, he is still confident that his appeal will bring about a release (Phil 1. 19-26; 2. 24). Nowhere do we hear Paul complaining about the State or how the State deals with him. Alan Richardson reminds us that "Paul cannot be quoted as representing the attitude of the Church towards the political authority of Rome after the persecution of Nero. There is, however, clear evidence in the New Testament that the Church's attitude remained unchanged". (14) Christians are even encouraged by Paul (1 Tim 2. 1-3) to say prayers on behalf of the State that all men should lead a "tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and honesty" and this is described as "good and acceptable in the sight of God". The State is clearly seen by Paul to be an instrument for law and order and peace ordained by God himself. It is part of the natural order of things. "He who resists authority" - that is, the duly constituted political government - "withstands the ordinance of God". Richardson says that this attitude of Paul "represents the wisdom of the ancient world, where thoughtful men realised that the forces of violence lay so near to the surface of civilized life that an eruption

might suddenly create havoc unless the authority of government was upheld by a law-abiding majority". (15) We are reminded by Plato that Socrates drank poison rather than escape from an unjust sentence passed upon him by duly constituted and legitimate authority.

Are we to gather from all of this that Paul in particular and perhaps the Bible in general regard people as being naturally selfish and therefore needing threats and coercion to keep them from destroying themselves and everyone around them?

Luther claims that the State is rather like a Dutch dyke erected against sin and the harmful tides waiting to destroy the world. "Without strong government human life would be - as Thomas Hobbes and the biblical realists agree - 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short!' Weak government is a contradiction in terms, since a nominal government without the will to govern is not a government at all!" (16) *The changing pattern of the twentieth century does nothing to modify this rather pessimistic view of mankind.*

It would follow that many people would seem to be prepared to support the strong arm of the law, regardless of its political connections, rather than live in fear and be surrounded by anarchy and crime. At a recent lecture given by Professor Zabalovski of the Russian Orthodox Church it was stated that this was in fact the attitude of the Church in Russia. (17) "Rulers are not a terror to those who keep the laws but to law-breakers". HF

*This is the case* what price freedom? It might be that too much freedom ends up destroying freedom. The world has seen the tyranny of Nazi Germany, the ideology of Communism and the frightening power of rampant

Islam when individuals are stripped of all their rights, even to criticise or vote against the rulers and their policies. The world has seen, in the last century, more fanaticism of both extremes than anything Paul saw in even the worst days of Nero. . . . By and large, government in his day was carried out by administrators who believed in the old civic virtues and in the Stoic concept of the natural law and of the place of the individual within that law. "Christian civilization, whatever its imperfections, baptized the virtues of Greek and Roman political wisdom into the service of Christ, or at least aimed at doing so". This wisdom Paul saw in Romans 12 and 13 as being part of God's plan for the world and so it had to be obeyed. (18)

Many people have argued that Paul's views about the State and its close identity with the ordinance of God can lead the world into all sorts of trouble. Luther could argue for the State and its rulers against the political power of the Papacy. Elsewhere Luther's ideas could bring about a subservient attitude to the State as in Bismark's Prussia and indeed in Germany as in the days of Hitler's rise to power. The <sup>Reformed</sup> Church in South Africa too seems to have its problems being closely related to the machinery of government. Somehow there must be a nice balance when both God and Caesar can receive their rightful allegiance. In criticising the Lutheran church of Nazi Germany for failing to oppose the excesses of totalitarianism one must never forget the efforts of Pastor Niemöller <sup>and</sup> Bonhoeffer to restore the balance. Albert Einstein's testimony speaks for itself:

"Only the Churches stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never

had any special interest in the Church before, but now I feel a great affection and admiration because the Church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for truth and moral freedom. I am forced to confess that what I once despised I now praise unreservedly". (19)

Dietrich Bonhoeffer too, perhaps one of the greatest modern Christian heroes, is someone who believed it to be his Christian duty to take part in a conspiracy aimed at the violent overthrow of the German government at a time when that government was at war with most of Europe. In 1943 he wrote:

"The great masquerade of evil has played havoc with all our ethical concepts. For evil to appear disguised as light, charity, historical necessity, or social justice is quite bewildering to anyone brought up on our traditional ethical concepts, while for the Christian who bases his life on the Bible it merely confirms the fundamental wickedness of evil".

He asks the question, "who stands fast?" against all the pressures and temptations of the evil that surrounds mankind. Perhaps the reasonable man, or the fanatic, or the man of conscience or duty - all these men are capable of standing fast but Bonhoeffer comes to a different conclusion:

"Only the man whose final standard is not his reason, his principles, his conscience, his freedom, or his virtue, but who is ready to sacrifice all this when he

is called to obedient and responsible action  
 in faith and in exclusive allegiance to God -  
 the responsible man, who tries to make his  
 whole life an answer to the question and call  
 of God". (20)

The  
 theologian George Kaufman, quoted by John Macquarrie in his book  
The Concept of Peace, goes so far as to claim that non-resistance  
 is one of the basic attributes of God.

"The Christian Gospel is no  
 announcement that God enters into community with  
 men and overcomes their rebellion through compelling  
 obedience against their will. Quite the contrary.  
 It is through suffering the cross which men inflict  
 on him that he wins over their hearts inspite of  
 themselves". (21)

In the words of Bonhoeffer:

"God lets himself be pushed out of the world on to  
 the cross. He is weak and powerless in the world,  
 and that is precisely the way, the only way, in which  
 he is with us and helps us". (22)

The Church of England too, as a national Church, has had its problems  
 connected with the relationship of Church and State. Alan Wilkinson  
 in his book The Church of England and the First World War examines  
 just how much and how little influence the Church exerted over  
 politicians and generals. He suggests that perhaps it really was  
 minimal when viewed from the standpoint of political and military  
 leaders, but not inconsiderable when seen through the eyes of Church



historians. "Church leaders were, and are, too ready to confuse secular deference to their office with the exercise of decisive influence". (23)

(111) 1 Peter 2. 13-17

1 Peter 2, 4-10 describes the Christian community in a series of Old Testament images designed to emphasize the continuity between the Israel of the Old Covenant and the Church of the New Covenant. The Church, too, is a holy nation and a royal priesthood, deriving its existence and its status from the election of God. The Church is to have a priestly function as well as being chosen by God as a special people possessed in a unique way by God. They are to have a prophetic and an evangelistic role in the world - showing forth the "excellencies" or the "mighty works" of God. Just as Israel in Isaiah 43, 10: 44, 8 was called to be witnesses of God so too the Church inherits this vocation bringing people from darkness into light.

Against this background the epistle goes on to describe the relationship of these newly chosen or recently elected people to their fellowmen generally (2, 11-12); to the civil authorities (2, 13-17); to those who are their masters (2, 18-25); and lastly to their marriage partners (3, 1-7).

The Christian is to regard himself as a sojourner, a man of faith, like Abraham who had gone out from his native place on a pilgrimage not knowing where he was going but simply in faith and obedience to a divine command (Gen 12. 14). Having their citizenship in the heavenly places imposes upon them certain standards of behaviour. C.E.B. Cranfield describes the conflict situation within the life of each Christian.

"In each Christian's life a war is being waged, or rather it is one scene of operations in the great war between God and evil. The town of MANSOUL

(the Christian's self) has long been in enemy hands, occupied territory. But outside in the great war the enemy has suffered a decisive defeat - the decisive defeat - and the possession of Mansoul is being disputed. Christ, the victor of the great decisive battle, has sent the Holy Spirit to establish a bridgehead in occupied territory and gain a footing in Mansoul. The bridgehead has been established, and the town called to rise up and attack the occupying troops (the fleshly lusts). Now a deadly combat is going on in Mansoul between the occupation troops on the one side and on the other, the Holy Spirit, the liberator, assisted by the citizens". (24)

*Whether Emperors or governors*

In regard to the civil authorities, *βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν* Christians are to be subjects loyal to every human institution (*πᾶσα ἄνθρωπινα κτίσις*) for the sake of Christ the Lord (*ἰδὲ τὸν κύριον*). It is God's will that the Christian should be an exemplary citizen if only to stifle foolish criticism. Christians are to obey the authorities, not in any spirit of servility or pretext for evil (*ἐπικὰ λυμῆν τῶν κακίᾳς*) but as free men (*ἐλεύθεροι*), who are servants of God (*δοῦλοι Θεοῦ*). As model citizens of the State, Christians are to honour (*τιμῶντες*) their Emperor and fellow citizens, to love (*ἀγαπᾶτε*) their fellow Christians, and to do all this in the fear of God (*τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε*).

The injunction to be subject to every human institution (*πᾶσα ἄνθρωπινα κτίσις*) poses two difficulties; one is linguistic whilst

the other is theological. Linguistically the problem centres on the word  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  which derives from the verb  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  to create.

Elsewhere in the New Testament this particular family of words is used only of God's creating. In view of this it is difficult to think of  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  as being in any sense an institution of man ( $\zeta\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\zeta$ ).

H.G. Selwyn however says that the word is "the regular Greek term for the founding of a city and it is in this sense rather than in the Old Testament sense of a divine creation that it is employed here .....

Whereas St Paul emphasises the divine origin of the State, St. Peter speaks rather of its divinely ordained functions: the institution itself, together with those of the household and the family, he takes for granted". (25) Cranfield in the main agrees with him and says that since the word  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is qualified by  $\zeta\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\zeta$  it must relate to human beings. He therefore translates the phrase "be subject to every man" signifying a voluntary subordination of oneself to others, putting the interest and welfare of others above one's own. Here Cranfield puts his finger on the theological difficulty for man is not being forced into a position of subordination but he accepts it voluntarily. The Christian, as citizen, expresses this subordination by "readily and ungrudgingly for the Lord's sake shouldering his responsibilities and recognizing in the lawful claims of the State of his obligation to his neighbour".

(26)

Some scholars have argued that the conjunction of the two phrases, "for the Lord's sake" and "every human institution" suggests that the Christian is to serve two masters - God and man. This is clearly against the teaching of Jesus (MT 6. 24; 22.21) and the early Church (Acts 4, 19-20) and should therefore be discounted. Cranfield further sees the

Christian as being subject not only to the King (or Emperor) but also to Governors who are sent by the King and therefore bear his authority.

"The original reference was to Nero - so the citizen's obligation is not dependent on the personal goodness of the ruler but on the office or function". (27)

St Peter sums up the purpose of the State in God's intention - "it is for vengeance on evil doers and for praise to them that do well".

Rewards and punishments are clearly seen to be part of the social pattern of government. Motives may not be the highest but then the State contains all sorts and conditions of men amongst whom are Christians. There must be something "to curb the exercises of man's sinfulness" says Cranfield and then to establish some sort of pattern for living even while mankind is separated by reason of his own disobedience. Like Romans 13. 1-7

St Peter's First Epistle affirms the authority of government and the duty of all citizens including Christians to obey. Obligations are there for all; some to fulfil by virtue of selfish motives and others (presumably Christian) for conscience sake.

If there happens to be a conflict of duty - whether to God or Caesar then the Christian will show his real loyalty to the government (Caesar) by disobeying any unlawful commands (cf Acts 4. 19; 5.29). The Emperor is to be honoured (*τιμωτε*) while God is to be feared (*φοβεισθε*) and this distinction clearly shows in cases of doubt or conflict where the Christian's duty really lies. Proverbs has a similar phrase "my Son, fear thou the Lord and the King" (Prov 24. 21) but Peter does not use the same word for what we owe to God is unique.

C.K. Barrett and F.W. Beare both remind us that some scholars think that

Peter could not have written such words had Christians been subject to all the horrors of persecution. "That the Christian theological estimate of the State was dependent upon the degree of comfort in which Christians were permitted to live ... is an illusion" says Barrett. (28)

Whether or not there are two sections to 1 Peter it remains fairly clear that a common theme underlines both sections and that both sections can stand together without too much trouble. The Christian's attitude to the State, regardless of persecution is still unaffected and largely remains so until Revelation 13 when for the first time perhaps a different attitude is experienced.

#### (IV) Revelation 13. 1-18

The Apocalypse of John was considerably later than the rest in being received into the canon of Christian literature. *Its essentially Hebraic imagery must have confused many Christians with a Gentile background.*

*It contains however* a particular insight into how the Bible regards some forms of political authority. It seems to contrast vividly with the attitude towards the State that we have examined so far. In the Revelation of St. John the State no longer appears as the servant of God but rather as some fiendish beast who can be nothing other than a manifestation of the evil one himself. Although the author never uses the word 'Antichrist' one still gets a strong impression that this is exactly the identity of the figure being introduced from Chapter 11 onwards.

The history of the Jewish nation from time immemorial is the history of a people constantly being threatened and punished by all sorts of enemies.

Alan Richardson tells us that:

"From beginning to end the Old Testament is constantly aware of the darker face of Empire. From Nimrod, the 'mighty hunter', who built Nineveh and whose name became proverbial when conquerors were spoken of (Gen 10.9) to the Assyrians whom Yahweh raised up to chastise Israel (Isaiah 10, 5-19), to the Prince of Tyre who set up his imperial power as if he were God (Ezek 28, 1-10), to Babylon itself, whose very name remained for centuries the symbol of brutal domination, or to Antiochus Epiphanes, the original 'abomination of desolation' (Dan 9. 28; 11.31), the Old Testament teaches that the power which derives from God has been used by heathen overlords for their own aggrandizement and not for the righteous purpose of orderly rule and enrichment of life for which it was instituted by God".

(29)

*It is to this aspect of secular power that the Apocalypse bears witness.*  
 While <sup>elsewhere</sup> in the New Testament there is a deeply rooted conviction about the State and that is that it is created by God for the well being of its members, it can also be open to abuse,

It can be manipulated, it can be influenced, it can be poisoned. It need not be a willing co-operation in its transformation; indeed C.K. Barrett says its rather like a horse that normally serves its master but can suddenly take the bit between its teeth and refuse to obey any commands. What can happen to other areas of creation - principalities, powers and even man, can also happen to the State. All of them can rebel and become disobedient to the claims of God. The Roman Empire at the

end of the first century began to demand of its citizens the worship of the Emperor as a God.

"The Emperor was no longer the restraining force who prevented the man of sin from assuming the role of God; he was the man of sin, who assumed the role of God and made use of the State as the form of his self-manifestation". (30)

Revelation can only be understood when set against the background of real historical facts and political situations. It is not a book about the future with its emphasis on what might or might not happen. It is a book about a State that went from bad to worse dragging with it *many* innocent people who found themselves caught up in something they could neither understand nor prevent. Eventually Domitian was murdered by a member of his own household and the man-god died as any man would. His murderer was acclaimed as a hero, praised for his courage and generally thanked by the members of the Senate. Domitian, the man of sin, passed into the *annals* of history and history, like the Senate, condemned him for the outrages he had perpetrated.

The two infamous beasts of Revelation are *merely* attempts to portray in picture language the State and the Emperor. The first beast represents the combined forces of all the political rule opposed to God in the world. The second beast represents the pagan cult of Emperor worship. It seems to perform all the particular functions of priest, prophet and grand inquisitor marking those who are found to be acceptable to the State.

Both beasts are eventually destroyed at *Armageddon*. Revelation is therefore a story about the ultimate overthrow of evil and the establishment of God's righteous Kingdom. It is not entirely phrased or told in terms easily understood or acceptable today but none the less it is about a "power" that comes "from above" and which is acceptable for it is of God. There is also another "power" which is essentially evil and *denominical* which is not of God. This notion of opposing forces is an ancient one and not restricted to the Judeo-Christian tradition. What is peculiar however is that to both Jews and Christians the Satan figure is always a created being and therefore subordinate to God who is the creator. He seems to exist only as long as God allows it.

R H Preston and A T Hanson in their commentary on Revelation of Saint John the Divine say that one astonishing feature gradually becomes apparent as we study this passage:

"Satan has produced a parody of the divine dispensation. The Dragon, the First Beast and the Second Beast (each of the last two proceeding from one before it), correspond to the Trinity. Nero Redivivus (Domitian) is Satan Incarnate. There is even a death and resurrection in the death and return of Nero. Even more, Satan produces a world church, with certain marks of its own to distinguish its members from the rest of the world". (31)

The profound thought that seems to underly these tremendous pictures is that man is made to worship some absolute power and that if he does not worship the true and real power behind the universe he will create and make a God for himself and then give absolute allegiance to the God of

his own making. Preston and Hanson see in Revelation some tremendous powers of insight and foresight. They confess that

"The events which culminated in World War II have provided an annoying confirmation of John's insight. In John's day men worshipped the god of power, incarnate in the Roman Emperor, propagated by the Imperial Cultus. In our day we have seen millions of civilized Europeans giving wholehearted allegiance to the God of the Germans, incarnate in Adolf Hitler, propagated by the Nazi's Party; and millions of Japanese living and dying for the God of Japan's destiny, incarnate in the Mikado, and propagated by the State Shinto worship. Dozens of minor parallels could be culled from history, from the divine status of the Egyptian Pharaohs to the Syncretistic Emperor worship invented by Akbar, Mogul Emperor of India in the seventeenth century. All are summed up in this brilliant chapter of Revelation". (32)

Whether or not we can accept this particular *analogy* of Preston and Hanson and I think it might well be stretching the analogy a bit too far, we must nevertheless agree in the main that Revelation was written to support and strengthen Christians at a time when to confess Christ as Lord was to sign one's own death warrant. Hence the call to resist, so apparently different from the call to obey in Romans and 1 Peter.

The New Testament, whilst not a political textbook, none the less contains *some* of advice about the not always friendly political institutions of ancient Rome. In so doing it makes some interesting points about the

nature and office of government and of civil obligation. Three of these points demand careful consideration by those who seek to formulate a Christian understanding of Church and State.

The authority of government, as the New Testament sees it, is ideal and permanent. It comes from God, not from human judgments about governments or about this or that public act of government. The view that governments exist only by God's consent implies that anarchy can never be a real option for a Christian. The follower of Christ is not free to object to the principle of government per se.

It is true that, at first glance, it may seem that the New Testament does not present, as uniform, an understanding of the authority of government as preceding paragraphs might suggest. It was noted earlier that the New Testament appears to have an ambivalent attitude towards the State. This may in part be due to the fact that the Roman government was more helpful and protective at some times than at others. If certain exegetical propositions are firmly based however the ambivalence may be due, not so much to the accidental attitudes of governments at different times and in different places, as to ambiguities deeply rooted in the fallen nature of all creation including man and his institutions. The ambiguities are inherent in the very structures of earthly existence and hence the conflict that mankind has so often to resolve them to the best of his ability.

This thought is in a measure implicit in Cranfield's treatment of 1 Peter 2: 13-17, and in part prompts his insistence that a key phrase ( $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota$ ) be translated 'every man'. Christians are to be subject to every man as evidence that in Christ there is a new creation.

The Christian is one who has been translated from the Kingdom of darkness to the Kingdom of light. But if he denies or forsakes Christ he falls again under the dominion of darkness.

A similar view lies at the heart of the current debate about the 'powers'. If (ἐξουσία) has a double reference to earthly rulers and spiritual powers, then there are powers that stand behind and influence social and political life. If, too, these 'powers' have been defeated in Christ but the effects of that defeat are not yet visible, there are grounds for the belief that there is a duality about the 'powers'. The struggle goes with the powers, sometimes the 'servants of God' and at other times rebellious, in that they usurp the ultimacy that belongs only to God. The very structure of our fallen creation creates the ambiguity in which the governing authorities are sometimes servants of God and at other times Satanic.

It is precisely this point that the Book of Revelation underlines. The beasts, though created by God, have turned away from him and sought power and authority from Satan. Since they have chosen to serve the Kingdoms of this world rather than of our God and His Christ they are no longer worthy to be obeyed by the saints of God. Indeed they are to be denounced as *Antichrist*.

If this line of argument be sound then the New Testament does not speak with a divided voice about Church and State as is sometimes claimed. Rather it asserts a common view that political institutions, like all created things, reflect the fallenness of creation. Governments, no less than individuals, can rebel against God in seeking an ultimate authority

that is not properly theirs. When a government moves from being 'authoritative' to being 'authoritarian' it can incur the very real danger of serving Satan rather than God, and so becoming anti-Christ.

The office of government is to order society, punishing evil and rewarding good (Romans 13: 3-4, 1 Peter 2: 14). In assigning this office to government the New Testament expresses no moral preference for one form of government rather than another, nor does it offer any moral judgements about what governments do.

Similarly, it makes no distinctions between Christians and non-Christians, at least in the Pauline and Petrine passages. Christians are to obey the State preferably because conscience tells them so to do, rather than because the State compels them so to do. Even when <sup>the</sup> State and Christian conscience are at variance Christians are to recognise that it legitimately belongs to the right of government to compel obedience from Christians.

Growing persecution, of course, made this a delicate issue, so that by the time of Domitian the Book of Revelation can insist that when it comes to compelling a choice between Christ and Caesar, the Christian has only one course open - persecution to the point of martyrdom.

This raises a third issue as to whether it is ever proper for a Christian to oppose government, and, if so, by what means. Is it proper, for instance, for Christians to oppose evil governments by force of arms as the Maccabees opposed Antiochus Epiphanes? The New Testament leaves the question largely unanswered. Consequently, Christians to this day differ in their understanding of when and in what manner they may properly oppose

the State.

The Pietistic view, taking its stand on the 'givenness' of government, argues that it is never proper for a Christian to oppose government. Any given government exists because God permits it so to do. Therefore it is entitled to respect and obedience, however repressive it may be. This view has long been held in certain Lutheran circles. Whatever is, is the will of God and we must accept it. The validity of this position has been questioned in recent times by the rise of extremely repressive governments *such as* Nazi Germany, Russia *and Uganda* but it still appears to enjoy widespread support at least in conservative circles.

An opposite view begins from the distinction between proper and improper government. Calvin held that civil disobedience is justified if a government violates its office as the servant of God.

What is ordained is not a particular government but the concept of proper government, the principle of government as such. If a government fails properly to fulfil its divinely appointed functions it loses its authority, and becomes an unjust government which men may disobey. One should notice however the grounds for such disobedience. It is not because the Calvinist is against government. Rather he is for proper government. How far should such disobedience go? Does the Calvinistic position offer a justification for the Christian's participation in violence?

Certainly John Knox pushed it to this extent in Reformation Scotland, *like the*

*Julian* Dietrich Bonhoeffer in Nazi Germany. Others, however, would limit it to forms of civil disobedience that stop short of violence. Yet others would argue that the quest for proper government should not go beyond the means of protest legitimately open to citizens like the use of the media, the public forum, the ballot box, and the discussion group.

A third position is the pacifist one, usually associated with groups such as the Mennonites. John Howard Yoder, himself a Mennonite, has powerfully restated this position in terms of 'revolutionary subordination' in his book The Politics of Jesus.

Yoder begins by drawing an analogy between the advice Paul gives to women and slaves, and that offered to Christians about their relationship to the State. He rightly argues that such advice would not have been necessary if the liberating influence of the Gospel had not already exposed the fallen nature of patterns of dominance and submission. In a society fully redeemed such patterns would have no place.

Since they are already realising their true worth in Jesus Christ, they should not waste their efforts in attempting to change the larger patterns of society. Freedom is realisable within the present social order 'by voluntarily accepting subordination' and recognising 'the relative unimportance of such social distinctions when seen in the light of the coming fulfilment of God's purposes'. This recalls Cranfield's treatment of 1 Peter 2: 13-17.

Jesus, too, instructed his disciples to discard patterns of dominance as unworthy of their calling as servants (Mark 10: 42ff; Matt 20: 25ff; Luke 22: 25ff) Therefore the Christian should reject "governmental domination" by accepting the obligations of "the voluntary subordination of one who knows another regime is normative".

At first glance it could seem that Yoder is simply rejecting government per se, as some Christian groups have done. This is not so. Whatever

the merits or demerits of a particular government may be, Yoder holds we must submit to it because God commands us so to do. But this does not mean that we must approve that Government's policies or even obey its every dictate. A conscientious objector is still submitting to government if he accepts the penalties imposed for disobedience of a lawful order. As Yoder sees it a Christian must share God's providential patience with governments, however tyrannical. He must hope and pray for governments who will promote social justice without committing gross injustices. He may even talk with governments about issues of concern. But he cannot participate as an agent of government simply because a government's policies apparently coincide with a Christian position. Nor is he free to resist governments by force if they are unjust. "He listens to the beat of a different drummer, and lives a lifestyle different from that of the fallen world".

Whatever posture Christians adopt towards government, "pietistic", "Calvinist" or "pacifist", they must avoid the temptation to fall into idolatrous patterns and pay homage to finite powers in ways that make such powers rivals of the power of God. There have often been easily made truces between the household of faith and the citadels of political power.

In countering the threat of idolatry the New Testament points continually to the centrality of Christ as the creating and sustaining source of all powers visible and invisible, and the supreme exemplar of the redeeming and reconciling power of God. Jesus is not only the one who presently and mysteriously holds all things together; he is also the one who invites us into fellowship with himself. Those in fellowship with Jesus must submit all things, even politics, to the judgement of the cross which turns

the world's scale of values entirely on its head.

That the State is an instrument of God in some form or other is fairly clear from our study of the Scriptures. To say that this doctrine has been upheld by Christian rulers is also fairly self evident but one sometimes wonders about contemporary society and its place in relation to the Kingdom of God. There seem to be many States and rulers all *eager to claim the support of* Christianity but whose lives and actions seem to be in contradiction to the faith and morality they profess. W.A.Whitehouse in an essay called "The State and the Divine Law" points out that in addition to these particular States there are others who are completely secular in their nature. Power for these States lies, in reality, with the people who happen to be *welding* the biggest stick.

He concludes that

"Politicians grow increasingly unsure of their ground when they seek to base action on principle rather than expediency. If the State is a divine instrument, it must be subject in some clear way to the divine law, and it is hard to see how this may be held as true in the case of any of the contemporary States". (34)

Some sort of moral responsibility is implied in all Christian thinking when we talk of being under the law of God. There is a morality that should guide all our actions and arbitrate within society to determine laws for the good of all its people. However it is clear that this presupposes a prior understanding of the place which the State has in the purpose of God for the present world, and upon this presupposition

Christians are not agreed. We are reminded by W A Whitehouse that the whole matter was brought to the fore by Karl Barth and Alfred de Quervain both of whom speak of politics as being part and parcel of the service one renders to God. The question raised is implied in the Declaration of Barmen which was the standard adopted by the German Confessional Church in 1934:

"We reject the false doctrine that there are spheres of life in which we belong, not to Jesus, but to other masters; realms where we do not need to be justified and sanctified by Him". (35)

The authority of God upon which this political theory and practice is supposed to exist needs to be reexamined in the light of the teaching of Jesus in the Gospel narratives. We need to ask some rather fundamental questions as to whether or not modern political theory and practice is based upon natural reason and natural law or upon revelation and supernatural theology. It seems that the reality of the State, together with its offices designed for the support and welfare of its peoples, was something in existence long before the redeeming work of Christ. Christian belief and practice is something which comes afterwards. "The divine law that issues from grace does not abolish human law that issues from natural reason". (36) We must ask in what context the doctrine of a natural law was conceived and we must pursue a little further the implied political theory and practice understood by the Kingdom of God as established by Jesus Christ.

According to Professor Whitehouse there is a difference in the concept of the relationship between Church and State which is exemplified by Roman and Protestant traditions. On the one hand "Quas Primas", an

encyclical issued by Pope Pius XI, to celebrate a new Church festival called the Feast of Christ the King, would clearly indicate that Roman Catholic thinking puts Christ at the centre of all things and that the State is clearly subject to the spiritual authority of the Church. Protestant theology however has not been so optimistic about the place of the Church within the political framework of the State. If a ruler is also a follower of Christ then naturally he will be inclined to accept a Christian political philosophy but it is not altogether necessary. If he is not a believer he can still rule, accepting as the basis for his government Law, as opposed to the findings of the Gospel. His political duties are then being discharged on the basis of an authority delegated to the State by God for the preservation of law and order. Two distinct political theories seem to be evolving following the two main streams of Christian thought and practice. The Roman Catholic Church, favouring the spiritual supremacy of the Church over the State, whilst the Protestants, on the whole, see Church and State in almost separate compartments possibly pursuing even diverse interests. In both cases however there is a similarity in that both Roman Catholic and Protestant thinking see a radical separation of the Kingdom of God from the earthly Kingdoms. However it is from within the Kingdom of God, from within the Church itself, that a believer can learn to live in a truly political way. He can learn that politics are concerned only with the natural life of men and that the State is truly an ordinance of God for it allows and provides for the proper environment in which man can live and act as a political animal.

*The temptation to confuse theology with political philosophy must however be resisted.*

There is a proper independence of civil government from ecclesiastical.

Christ however can work, through his followers, in the political realm.

State and Church are seen then to be side by side, both capable of being influenced by Christ and presumably both capable of denying or ignoring this influence. *Authority both* in Church and State is exercised by sinners. However it can be argued that the difference between Church and State lies in the fact that the former can claim to be liberated from sin by the atonement and redeeming work of Christ. What then is the fate of the State? W A Whitehouse would argue that

"Any State is a sinful organism, acting in a sinful situation, but by virtue of Christ's redeeming work and the subjection of the State to him, it is possible for that State so to act that, in the name of Jesus Christ, its action may be upheld as right. When it does so, that action will also be affirmed as reasonable and just by all men of good will and right reason. This is the truth behind the classical doctrine of Natural Law ..... Thus, through the existence of the State and the discharging of political responsibilities, all men enjoy a measure of the freedom which Christ has bought for mankind. The State, in its own limited way, serves the purpose of the Kingdom of God established in Jesus Christ". (37)

CHURCH AND STATE

1. C K Barrett New Testament Essays p.1
2. Ibid p.4
3. Ibid p.6
4. B H Branscombe The Gospel of Mark p. 213
5. Ibid p. 213
6. A B J Rawlinson St Mark p. 165
7. Barrett p.7-9
8. Ibid p.10
9. Rawlinson p.165
10. Barrett p.11
11. Ibid p.11-13
12. Ibid p.14
13. Emil Brunner The Gospel according to St. Mark p.110
14. Alan Richardson The Political Christ p.80
15. Ibid p.96
16. Ibid p.98
17. Professor Labulovski at a lecture given at the World Council  
of Churches to Military Chaplains Sept 1981
18. Richardson p.100
19. Ibid p.102
20. D Bonhoeffer Letters & Papers from Prison p.4-5
21. J Macquarrie Op cit p.48
22. D Bonhoeffer Ibid p. 360
23. Op cit p.2
24. C H B Cranfield The First Epistle of Peter p.55
25. H G Selwyn First Epistle of St. Peter p.172
26. Cranfield p.58

27. Ibid p.59
28. Barrett p.18
29. Richardson p.83
30. Barrett p.19
31. Op cit p.96
32. Ibid p.98
33. John Yoder The Politics of Jesus p.20
34. Op Cit p.199
35. Ibid p.200
36. Whitehouse-"The State and the Divine Law" p.202 in The State in Catholic Thought. p.112 by Rommen.
37. Ibid p.210

THE FIRST WORLD WAR

World War 1 took the nation and the church by surprise. With hindsight it is easy to be wise and see the problems of Europe unveiling themselves in the period that led up to the beginning of hostilities but at the time Tinsington Tatlow, the General Secretary of SCM writes "few of us had thought about the question of Christianity and war". At the SCM Summer Conference of 23 July 1914 war seemed so "utterly remote". (1) The Church and the Churches of Great Britain were enjoying the calm before the storm. Life was good. "God was in his heaven and all was well with the world". The Archbishop of ~~Canterbury~~ Randall Davidson, "a shrewd but cautious Statesman, always in close touch with government circles, had been lulled into thinking that war between England and Germany was inconceivable". (2) At the time when the two nations were on the verge of breaking relations with each other, the Kaiser's chief chaplain was actually asking the Anglican church if *it* could attend celebrations to mark the 400th year of the Reformation in 1917. The Archbishop's reply however shows his anxiety at the world state, the inconceivable might well have been conceived.

"..... the present condition of public affairs is such as to cause all of us the keenest anxiety and to absorb our daily interest. You are, I am sure, joining together with us in daily prayer to Almighty God that by his mercy the possibility of international conflict may be removed far from us. War between two great Christian nations of kindred race and sympathies is, or ought to be, unthinkable in the twentieth century of the Gospel of the Prince of Peace". (3)

At the beginning of August 1914, Dean Inge wrote in his Diary:

"how unprepared we and everybody else were for the terrible news ... our people were thinking of three things - their summer holiday, the danger of civil war in Ireland, and the abominable outrages of the Suffragettes". (4)

By late August however war had begun and men in uniform became commonplace in a very short time. Thousands rallied to the call and enlisted to fight the foe. War was a reality! It was something with which the nation had to contend. The church too had to face up to the prospect of war and what it meant in both theological terms and practical terms. As usual there was no common voice to be heard anywhere though Randall Davidson tried his utmost to provide a *modus vivendi* so that Christians of all persuasions could continue their work and their worship. What to do about the Forces however was another thing. Surprisingly there was a tremendous response from clergymen all over Britain. We are told by G K A Bell that

"The Archbishop was in touch with the Chaplain General (Bishop Taylor Smith) about the Army's needs; and the number of offers already made for service as chaplains was far beyond the number that could be used (900 beyond the requirements on 1st Sept)" (5)

Many clergymen were *enlisting* as combatants at least for the *duration* of hostilities.

From the very beginning of the war there was a conflict issue and clergymen had to face up to some agonizing times trying to work out where their duty lay. Frank Richards, a private soldier

writing in his book, Old Soldiers never die, describes some of the current attitudes towards those clergy who were always advocating conscription for the common man. He calls them "a funny crowd: they prayed for Victory and thundered from the pulpits for the enemy to be smitten hip and thigh, but did not believe in doing any of the smiting themselves". (6) Other clergy were given a rough time by the civilian population at large -- some were accosted by bands of small boys who, thumb to nose, shouted 'Kitchener wants you! To join or not to join seemed to be the main problem for many clergymen. The church could offer no real advice and so, as is often the case, conscience became the arbiter. The main issue at stake however, as far as the Archbishop was concerned was whether or not to allow his clergy to become combatants. On this question he wrote:

"I recognise the prima facie argument which can be used by the younger clergy, or by others on their behalf in support of such action (volunteering) (but) I am led to the conclusion that I have been right in maintaining from the first that the position of an actual combatant in our army is incompatible with the position of one who has sought and received Holy Orders. The whole idea which underlines and surrounds Ordination implies this. We have a calling of our own of quite a specific kind, and throughout the whole history of the church, authoritative expression has been given to the paramount obligation of that calling. Under this obligation those who have been ordained to the ministry of word and Sacrament ought, even in time of actual warfare, to regard that ministry, whether at home or in the field, as their

special contribution to the country's service". (7)

In France most of the clergy conscripted were in fact combatant and of the 32,699 who joined the Forces 4,618 were killed. They did much, according to Wilkinson, to moderate anti-clericalism, though the sacrifice of the clergy in the end did nothing to ameliorate the alienation of the French working classes from the church and clergy. Despite the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury a few Anglican priests did join up as combatants and though some succeeded in coping very well with the transition others began to wonder what they were doing. To get used to the idea of killing, using a cold bayonet, focussing upon a particular man in order to fire a bullet at him - these actions and ideas proved to be the downfall of some. Others found that perpetual fatigues, like moving swill bins around in a Salvation Army canteen, a waste of time when their professionalism could be used elsewhere.

The Archbishop was to give support to all sorts of recruiting campaigns in the early stages of the war effort but he always continued to uphold the non-combatant status of the clergyman. Bishops and senior clergy all over Great Britain gave their support to Kitchener in his efforts to build up a credible force for duty in Europe, many of them touring the country making speeches on behalf of the war effort. (8) One of the most vociferous of these was the Bishop of London - A.F. Winnington-Ingram. Alan Wilkinson writes about him:

"Untroubled by doubts, ambiguities or much self knowledge, equipped as a popular preacher by his experience as a missionary, made familiar with the thought forms of ordinary people by his experience

in the West End .... much in demand as a Speaker to men in Universities and Parishes, he could always be relied upon for enthusiastic, if sometimes naive and sentimental patriotism". (9)

August 1914 found the Bishop in camp at Northbourne with the London Rifle Brigade whose Chaplain he had been since 1901. As a result of a very patriotic sermon preached to these Territorial soldiers while on camp, they enlisted almost to a man, for service abroad. In the Advent of that same year he gave three addresses to the Guildhall on the subject of National Freedom, Honour and Faith saying virtually what the whole nation was longing to hear - "Go on with the war". The Chaplains in France wanted him to visit them and in the Spring of 1915 opportunity came. He was invited by Field Marshall Sir John French who wrote to him :

"Dear Bishop,

Five minutes of you cheers me up. Come out for ten days".

Winnington-Ingram chose Holy Week and Easter for his visit which was a huge success with the men.

"The Bishop summed up his own impression of the tour by saying to his Chaplain, 'I have had the experience of my life'".

Sir John French wrote a Despatch to Lord Kitchener, in which, after saying that there was scarcely a unit in the Command which the Bishop did not meet, and that personal fatigue and even danger were completely ignored by him he continued, 'I am anxious to place upon record my deep sense of the

good effect produced throughout the  
 Army by this self sacrificing devotion on the  
 part of the Bishop of London, to whom I feel  
 personally very deeply indebted. '

I have once more to remark on the devotion to  
 duty, courage and contempt of danger which has  
 characterized the soul of the Chaplains of the  
 Army throughout the campaign". (10)

Later on, the next year, the Bishop marched in pouring rain,  
 identifying himself with over 3000 troops, to St Paul's Cathedral  
 where he addressed them on "the soul of the nation". It was a most  
 stirring occasion by all accounts and ended with a call to  
 pray, to repent, to serve and to save. However patriotic the Bishop  
 of London might have been there were those whose understanding and  
 interpretation of the Gospel was different and who did all in their  
 power to draw attention to the pacifist cause. *Those* in places  
 and positions of authority and influence can do much to colour  
 beliefs and opinions. The Bishops of Hereford and Lincoln were both  
 leading proponents of the pacifist lobby but once the war got  
 under way they modified their views slightly in favour of the justice  
 which, they claimed, our nation was upholding. The Archbishop of  
 Canterbury made his position quite clear :

"Eagerly desirous of peace, foremost to the  
 best of our power in furthering it, keen  
 especially to promote the close fellowship  
 of Germany and England, we have nevertheless  
 been driven to declare that, dear to us as  
 peace is, the principles of truth and honour are  
 yet more dear" (11)

The neutrality of Belgium was ignored by the Kaiser and so many fence-sitting people originally in favour of neutrality came down on the side of his effort. Should Britain could see no conflict problem when it was with early German operations against Belgian neutrality. There was such genuine co-operation between Allied Churches, faced as they were, with a common enemy. The Archbishop of Rouen allowed Anglican Chaplains to use some Catholic Chapels for conducting services. Davidson thanked him for this kindness and in reply drew attention to

"We look to the bravery of our soldiers for the success of our arms; we look still more to heaven. That is why each one of us prays fervently, in perfect integrity of faith (en toute droiture de foi); that is why also we seek to bring all those who are fighting to God, as often as we may, in religious worship .... and may the Victory of England, of Russia, of Belgium and of France be complete and swift. Their cause is that of justice and of true civilization, it is the cause, we do not doubt that Providence has taken in hand". (12)

There was great dissatisfaction with the supply of Army Chaplains as the early months of the war began to take a tremendous toll. There was little or no co-ordination between the Chaplain General's office and the Bishops. It was difficult to <sup>discover</sup> from the War Office an exact statement of how many Chaplains were wanted and the Bishops, on their side, were being continually hampered by the

threat that their clergy might well be called up like other men. Parish churches they maintained had just as much a part to play in the war effort as any other part of industry. The morale of the people at home was vital if the troops at the front were not to be worried by domestic problems. Eventually the Archbishop appointed Bishop L H Gwynne as Deputy Chaplain General. He was a man much loved and respected by all the Chaplains under his command as P R Barry testifies in his book Period of my Life:

"Many of us, I think, would have gone under or have suffered shipwreck of their faith had it not been for the pastoral care and guidance of the great and saintly Bishop Gwynne, Father in God to a whole generation of young men". (13)

Whilst the Chaplain General, Bishop Taylor Smith, could still wrangle about the churchmanship of recruits, refusing to allow so called "High Church Priests" into his department, Bishop Gwynne got on with the real job of looking after his men in a most laudable fashion by all accounts. (14) Leadership in the Chaplains' Department was very poor. By the end of 1917 the number of Chaplains joining the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) did not keep up with those who for one reason or another were leaving. The Chaplain General thought it was due to lack of volunteers but the Archbishop said it was purely an administrative problem which he proposed to rectify.

"The result was a system which met the need admirably, but really meant the taking over by Lambeth of the main responsibility for communicating with the

Diocesan Bishops, and securing a steady flow of the right men into the Chaplains' Department". (15)

In effect it meant that Lambeth now virtually had control of the Chaplains' Department. By the beginning of 1918 the war was in a terrible state and Haig issued his famous order to the troops

"with our backs to the wall, and believing in the justice of our cause, each one of us must fight on to the end".

As a consequence a Manpower Bill was introduced into the House of Commons which raised the conscription age to 50-55 and on this occasion the clergy were no longer to be exempted from compulsory military service. The Bill was introduced on the 9th April 1918, six days later the decision was reversed but nevertheless in a letter to the Bishops of London, Winchester and Southwark, the Archbishop of Canterbury said

"we ought to bid the clergy, who are willing to do so, volunteer for service, preferably non-combatant, but not exclusively so".

Here we can see a weakening in the early stand he took against clergymen joining up as combatants. For as long as the war had been in progress his clergy had been criticised and often ridiculed for not being too obviously identified with the sacrifices and the war effort of their parishioners. Despite his principles, Archbishop Davidson was a man who sympathised with his clergy and the conflict in which many of them lived caused him considerable anxiety. He did not want

anyone to think that the clergy of the Church of England were found wanting when the call to arms came and so in the end he relented and allowed some to join as combatants. A typical response is shown by G.K.A. Bell in his book :

"The Bishop of Bristol, May 11, 1918, sent the Archbishop the following summary:  
 Total number of clergy in the Bristol Diocese August 4, 1914, 310. Of these 71 had been commissioned as chaplains in the Navy or Army, 4 were serving as combatants, 4 working in Church Army huts. Of the 124 of military age (May 1918) 41 alone were immediately available; and of these 19 would become Army Chaplains, 10 have volunteered for non-combatant service, 4 for combatant, 8 for work in Church Army huts abroad". (16)

In the early days, the training a recruit chaplain received was abysmal, if indeed he was given any training at all. Many, coming straight from University and Ordination, some from country vicarages or city parishes, had no concept of what trench fighting was like. They were ignorant of the simplest techniques of how to stay alive and how best to minister to men in the most adverse conditions. *The Chaplains' Department had, it seemed, no training, no advice and no help to offer* and consequently it is not surprising that so many young chaplains found themselves as square pegs in round holes. In the mobilization plans there was no provision made for even the most fundamental support required by chaplains if they were to be at all effective. There were no plans for transportation of men or baggage, no plans to accommodate

them, feed them or even pay for them. The sooner they bought their uniforms and joined their regiments the better. F.R. Barry, later to become Bishop of Southwell, joined the Forces in 1915 as a young chaplain straight from college. He was posted to Egypt and found himself on board a troopship wondering what his role was:

"I had very little idea what to do, no one had given me any kind of briefing. But I managed to take a few services on board and to get round the officers and men". (17)

On reaching Egypt he was once again faced with the problem of what to do. Having seen how bored the men were he decided to buy an Arab style tent and set up a club and canteen.

"This little effort changed the whole tone of the camp, and it gave me a much needed confidence. I had hitherto lived a very sheltered existence and hardly encountered human life in the raw, and I had been scared stiff at the prospect of living with 'brutal and licentious' soldiers. But now I had been taken into their hearts". (18)

It was not long before Barry was posted to France where, within no time at all, he was in action with his men experiencing a fear such as he had never experienced in his life before.

".... about half my brigade was annihilated. I had never seen a dead man before, much less bloody bits and pieces of men, and as near as

nothing I turned and ran. They thought I was brave, but in fact I was too innocent fully to appreciate the dangers". (19)

Most chaplains spent their evenings in rest huts or leisure tents talking with the men and trying to break down social and intellectual barriers. It was this sort of experience which led the famous Reverend Tubby Clayton of The Buffs to open his house at Poperinghe. There, weary with battle fatigue, men would resort, just for a few hours of peace and quiet. In an Upper Room there was a small chapel set aside with the now well known notice above the entrance "Abandon rank all ye who enter here". It was in places like this, furnished with any bits of furniture, packing cases and chairs, that chaplains did what they could to make relevant the claims of God and bring to men the reality of the presence of God, even in places like the Somme and Mons and Paschendale. Men like Geoffrey Studdert-Kennedy wearing his chaplain's khaki can still be pictured by old soldiers handing out his woodbines, in almost a sacramental fashion. The recreation hut and places like it, offered to chaplains a base, a centre for their activities, and a foundation for their ministry.

Wars however are not fought in recreation huts <sup>the</sup> and since a majority of soldiers were in the front line, <sup>the</sup> chaplains had to be there too, sharing in all the blood and mud and sweat and tears. How else could they show the men something of the love of God in the incarnation? At first chaplains apparently were discouraged from "going up the line". It was thought that they would be in the way or that if one of them was killed it would be bad for morale. Some Commanding Officers, not realising what the role of a chaplain was, would sympathise with

them on a quiet day for not having much to do in the way of burials. To stay in the comparative safety of dressing stations situated to the rear of the combat zone meant that many soldiers thought their chaplains were cowards. Eventually this rather stupid administrative order forbidding chaplains to go forward was rescinded and chaplains began to accompany their troops into battle.

We have already noted Studdert Kennedy's exposition of his understanding of the chaplain's ministry to men in the front line:

"Live with the men; go everywhere they go. Make up your mind you will share all their risks, and more if you can do any good. The line is the key to the whole business. Work in the very front, and they will listen to you; but if you stay behind, you're wasting your time. Men will forgive you anything but lack of courage and devotion".

(20)

When describing his work to another chaplain called Theodore Bayley Hardy, who was killed ten months later having won the D.S.O., M.C., and V.C., he said,

"the more Padres who died in battle doing Christian deeds the better; most of us would be more useful dead than alive".

When talking about spiritual opportunities he said:

"There is very little; its all muddled and mixed. Take a box of fags in your haversack

and a great deal of love in your heart, and go up to them; laugh with them, joke with them. You can pray with them sometimes; but pray for them always". (21)

Life in the trenches was a living hell, the memory of it a nightmare which still terrifies the men who experienced it. Much has been written about the horror of it all and for the chaplain there was no exception. He was part and parcel of it in everything except the carrying of weapons.

The physical, mental and spiritual torture experienced by both chaplains and men has been captured forever in the prose and poetry of the time and none have been better at it than men like Wilfred Owen, Siegfried Sassoon, David Jones, Studdert Kennedy, Robert Graves and Rudyard Kipling. The important thing as far as the conflict situation is concerned is to examine something of the social and religious revolution which probably had its origins in the Industrial Revolution but seemingly only came to light during 1914-18. F.R. Barry in his autobiography writes:

"We young chaplains were 'thrown' into a ministry for which nothing in our experience had prepared us. I myself had only just been ordained priest, hopelessly ignorant and inexperienced, and should perhaps never have been allowed to go. But all of us, apart from a few regulars, came from academic or churchy circles, in which we had worked along traditional

lines within an enclosed ecclesiastical world. Now we found ourselves called to serve a mass of men under intense moral and physical strain, to whom most of what we had been taught to preach seemed to be almost totally irrelevant. The war revealed to us for the first time and with a very heart-searching shock what we ought to have known long before — the results of the Industrial Revolution in the alienation of the workers, who were now the armies, from the life of the Church. At first we were worried about the superficial things like their bawdy language and their womanising. (What else did we expect was likely to happen when men, separated from their wives and in the highest condition of physical vigour, were subjected to intense sex-stimulation by constant exposure to violence and killing?) But we soon learnt that these were superficial. Our real problems were very much deeper than that. Religion apparently meant nothing to them. Was this something for which we should upbraid men who were enduring far more than we were? Or could there be something lacking in the religion? For we learnt in battle how splendid and how noble these apparently irreligious people were. How were these grand qualities related to the Gospel that we had been ordained to preach? We could not conclude, of course, that they did not need it: but what message had the Gospel for them, in so evil a situation, of which the devil seemed to be in control, how could we go on believing in God at all, as the

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? We had to face the ultimate challenge to faith, first for ourselves, then for the men to whom we had been sent to minister". (22)

Chaplains then, as indeed today, had to examine their faith, work out in the best way they could a theology to carry them through the appalling conditions of trench warfare when thousands of brave courageous men were being killed and maimed every day during some big offensive. What did God have to say to the Chaplains as well as to those they served? What sort of help did the church give to its ministers as they tried to meet the needs of soldiers who could not understand the reason for all the suffering that surrounded them? What sort of Gospel does one preach when life expectancy for young subalterns was but a few weeks at the most?

"To the ordinary soldier the chaplain seemed socially a class apart, both by background and rank. When Dick Sheppard invited some soldiers to communion, they told him that they thought it was a service for officers. The chaplain was also apart, because while he supported the war, sometimes in a bellicose fashion, he did not fight himself. On to the chaplain was projected the charge that if only the church had really been obeying Christ, there would have been no war at all. Many hoped that the church would have a wider vision than the politicians, and would transcend nationalism, and they were angry and depressed when it sometimes seemed that the Church

in each country was only concerned to give religious sanctions for that country's particular cause". (23)

Many chaplains kept themselves busy censoring letters, running troop entertainments, holding church parades and so on. They were little better than general Welfare Officers, it seems, and yet they were doing something which seemed, under the circumstances, to be relevant to the needs of the day. Alan Wilkinson spends some considerable time drawing a somewhat odious comparison between the effectiveness of the Roman Catholic clergy and those of other denominations. There was a certain professionalism in the Roman Catholic approach to the men. They had an answer for every occasion and a ritual to follow it up. The Church of England had its rituals too, as allowed by the Prayer Book but the most important ritual was that of commending a dying soul to God. Here the Roman Church surpassed all others in the trenches where death was commonplace. There was a definite ritual, possibly not understood by the men but certainly appreciated by them. All the other clergy could do was provide some words of comfort, a cigarette and a prayer. There was nothing tangible like the rite of Holy Unction. Many scholars and military men would agree that Wilkinson is right to draw the comparison as he does. The common soldier knows nothing of the Bible, knows nothing of the Prayer Book and seldom says anything but the most rudimentary prayers to a God of whose real existence he is not sure. They need something visible and tangible. They need the ritual even if it is only for some superstitions or quasi magical reasons.

"The Church of England had no method of popular prayer as simple and objective

as the rosary or traditional Catholic litanies. Moreover, the Roman Catholic priest was able to rely on his role as a priest, in a way which was not possible for the Anglican chaplain. The latter arrived trailing behind him the image of the stage parson, who was upper class, naive, shockable, only really at home with women, and who never did any proper work: a well meaning but ineffective comic figure like the local clergyman Sasson recalled who would tell soldiers about to go to France to trust their Saviour, concluding, 'And now God go with you. I will go with you as far as the station". (24)

Donald Hankey, a Christian officer killed on the Somme, wrote an excellent little book called The Beloved Captain. In it he describes, from an intelligent layman's point of view, the difficulties of the church in meeting the great social and theological need expressed by the soldiers during the war. In a chapter called "The religion of the inarticulate" he describes the huge gulf that separates the working man's religion from that of the churchman. The working man, now soldier, had all the attributes of being a christian but never did he connect these values with the Gospel as proclaimed by the church and her chaplains. Christianity was for men and women of a different class structure. It was certainly not for the working man. The working man thinks that :

"Christianity consists in believing the Bible and setting up to be better than your neighbours. By believing the Bible he means

believing that Jonah was swallowed by a whale. By setting up to be better than your neighbours he means not drinking, not swearing, and preferably not smoking, being close fisted with your money, avoiding the companionship of doubtful characters and refusing to acknowledge that such have any claim upon you".

Donald Hankey then goes on to say:

"This is surely nothing short of tragedy. Here were men who believed absolutely in the Christian virtues of unselfishness, generosity, charity and humility, without ever connecting them in their minds with Christ; and at the same time what they did associate with Christianity was just on a par with the formalism and smug self-righteousness which Christ spent His whole life in trying to destroy". (25)

After the war was over there was a long report published called The Army and Religion which *examined* the main difficulties.

It was the product of many church traditions and came to fruition after questionnaires had been sent to hundreds of soldiers and ex soldiers of all ranks, from Generals to Privates.

It corroborated all the evidence of men like Hankey, Studdert Kennedy, Sasson and Wilfred Owen. There was a gap and the problem then, as now, is to know how to bridge the gap between those who are highly

religious (or superstitious) but inarticulate, and those who are more articulate and can join in the worship of the church in a meaningful way. F.R. Barry however is not so convinced that chaplains did not reach the men:

"We would give Holy Communion in the dugouts, minister to the wounded and dying, share, so far as we might, in what the troops endured. (But we did not share the worst thing of all that those kind and often sensitive men had to suffer: we did not have to kill other human beings). We did what we could to serve them in Christ's name - and surely the distribution of cigarettes was a relevant form of the cup of cold water - and they understood that this was why we were doing it. They did not regard us as just Welfare Officers. In some dim way they discovered that they needed what the ministry of the Church sought to offer". (26)

*The chaplains found difficulty not only* in making the Gospel relevant to the men they served *but also in* identifying with the church *at* home. As the war dragged on and the casualty lists grew longer, people in the trenches wondered what the home-front was like and there developed a deep distrust of politicians, churchmen and indeed the whole establishment that had come to represent home. Soldiers began to distrust civilians and indeed chaplains began to have serious doubts about the church and its leaders back home. Harry Blackburne, then an Assistant Chaplain General in France, was very rude to the Archbishop of Canterbury when he was out visiting the troops.

"The bishops are sitting like a lot of old hens on eggs which they do not know how to hatch" he said.

We are told that:

"Convocation's contribution to the war effort was to spend these years in prolonged debates about reservation and the use of vestments ('Getting ready for the men coming back!'), finally to announce to a war-torn nation that henceforth the celebrant at the Eucharist might lawfully be dressed in a white alb plain".

*Barry admitted that there were some grounds for complaint*

"It was one of the characteristics of the clergy, and indeed of the Church of England as a whole, that when they are faced with fundamental questions they run away into secondary issues, following the line of least resistance, and take refuge in administrative programmes". (27)

This may well have been the case when viewed from the mud and filth of the trenches but it must be pointed out, in fairness to Randall Davidson, that in the Autumn of 1916 there was a mission of witness to the whole of the Church of England and indeed to the whole people of England, "to call the men and women of England to earnest and honest repentance". It received tremendous support from the Archbishop himself but seems to have had the effect of a damp squib as far as the nation was concerned. Horatio Bottomley, the editor

of the weekly magazine John Bull wrote "What right has the Church to talk to our splendid men about repentance? They don't need repentance; they are saints, every one of them". (28) It was an ill-informed and somewhat facile remark to make but it did show the extent to which the nation was alienated from the most basic teachings of the Church for it obviously had the concept of the seriousness of sin. Alan Wilkinson tells the story of a soldier called George Coppard, a one time choir boy, who in 1916 recalled a previous Good Friday and the three hour Services he had attended:

"All that was over and seemed meaningless

... my identity disc and pay book said my religion was C. of E. To me and most Tommies this meant compulsion to attend church parade on Sundays if the company happened to be well out of the fighting zone."

Coppard had had a glimpse of a chaplain every now and again, but never anywhere near the trenches. He had heard a talk by Studdert Kennedy about his visits to the front line. A Sergeant saw him and said "Who are you?". "I'm the Church", replied Kennedy. "Then what the bloody hell are you doing here?" asked the Sergeant. (29) This attitude unfortunately was true of many soldiers who never saw chaplains except perhaps on church parades or Sundays. "Six days invisible and on the seventh incomprehensible" was the cry and in some respects it still can be the cry of today for the chaplain can never be in two places at the same time. It is physically impossible to be seen by all of the men all of the time. Underlying remarks like, these, of course, is a basic ignorance about the chaplain's role, not only in the world but in the church as well. The modern soldier of today might well ask

a similar question: "What are the chaplains for?" To provide a quick answer is to reduce the Gospel into a nutshell and even then it cannot be easily accepted for the basic premise is, by and large, unacceptable by the majority of modern soldiers. The trouble experienced by many chaplains during the war was that their training in no way equipped them for their task of ministering to those who were, to all intents, outside the church. They were given a sound academic training but hardly anything in the way of priestly training. Once they left the security of the parochial organisation they were literally like fish out of water. Wilkinson sums it up when he says:

"Both Anglican chaplains and soldiers arrived at the front with virtually no commonly accepted sacramental shorthand with which to communicate, either with God or with each other". (30)

Studdert Kennedy, always outspoken sometimes to the point of being downright rude, was very worried about most of the traditional teaching that christians had received, for it found no place in the religion of soldiers in the trenches. What, for example did "Thy will be done" mean as another gas attack took place? What did the words "preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life" mean as another soldier was killed or mutilated by a shell? Only a God who not only suffered with Christ on the cross but was suffering now made any sense, he maintained. In some sense the war was a re-enactment of the Passion of Christ.

*In 'Dead and Buried' he wrote:*

"I was crucified in Cambrai  
And again outside Bapaume  
I was scourged for miles along the Albert Road,  
I was driven, pierced and bleeding,  
With a million maggots feeding  
On the body that I carried as my load". (31)

Deaths must be seen redemptively, he thought. It seemed to be the only way he could reconcile the horror with what he had come to believe. How other chaplains reconciled the reality of life in the trenches with their teaching and preaching about an all-loving God, is a mystery that the majority have kept to themselves. Some found the war to be a crime against humanity but nevertheless they stayed where they were because they saw it to be their duty. Others were intensely puzzled by the paradox of God allowing his children to behave towards each other in such an inhuman way. Some, like Charles Raven, who later became a pacifist, saw it as part of a great cosmic struggle. Neville Talbot described the work of chaplains as "hens trying to lay eggs on moving staircases". It was such a formidable task for the soldier to discover the true treasure of Christianity; he wrote in November 1917:

"Men must dig in that strange field of Christianity though its odd and in part misleading, part repellent surface: it is a mosaic of kill-joyism and Balaam's ass's ears, and Noah and Mothers' Meetings and Athanasian damns and the Archbishop of Canterbury with £15,000 a year - through to the treasure".

"Why is it that men who show so much Christianity in their lives do not delight consciously in Christ himself?" (32)

There was the inevitable problem of rank that tended to separate both officers and chaplains from their men. Some found it an insurmountable barrier, others discovered that it could be used to help their men against an overbearing authority. Some, like Edward Woods, later Bishop of Lichfield, knew that whatever rank meant he had to deserve it, for the soldier could easily see beyond the rank on his shoulder to the man and his underlying character. Obviously there were two worlds and the chaplain lived in the officer's world and this is exactly where most soldiers would be happiest to have him.

The church at home did nothing to help the chaplains ~~to~~ know their men better. "One appeal in two church newspapers produced only six replies for 15,000 men". (33) There was, in consequence, the feeling that whatever the chaplain did, the church at home was not really interested let alone supportive. Once the channel had been crossed they were on their own. Sometimes this had a liberating effect and chaplains would devise and hold informal services which would never have happened with the more traditional and conservative congregations at home. Men of all denominations received the Holy Communion from the hands of priests who in normal circumstances would have been most rigorous in applying all sorts of rules and regulations. Others discovered just how little the average Englishman thinks about religion.

"If the chaplain is there (as one General had asserted) to preach only on duty, honour, and discipline (that is to reinforce morale), then the result will be a 'shorn and pedestrian religion'; but perhaps this is the real avenue to God for many Englishmen". (34)

There was the perennial problem of how to cope with role expectations  
and these varied greatly from Generals to privates.

To listen too much to those who were ready, at all times, to advise on matters of religion meant that, often the chaplains did not communicate to those who mattered most. It was easy by all accounts to form a small élitist religious club and wallow in the warmth of its appreciation, for chaplain, like everyone else, likes to be wanted, and particularly the chaplain in the <sup>Circumstances</sup> of the 1914-18 war.

The inherent danger in such a ministry was obvious. Chaplains needed to be ministered to and in some cases needed more pastoral care than the Bishops could provide. Conferences for the ordained were consequently organised so that the valuable time and energy of a Bishop should not be wasted in travelling about. By the January of 1917 Bishop Gwynne urged the setting up of a permanent centre for instruction, retreats, fellowship and prayer. B.K. Cunningham, who had previously been Warden of the Theological College at Farnham until the war had closed it, became the new Warden of a house at St. Omer. During the next two years over 900 chaplains were to attend courses of various kinds. Attendance was compulsory and though initially there was resentment at this, nearly all came to appreciate what was being done for them and B.K. (as he was known) won the hearts of many through his simplicity and sanctity. (35) F.R. Barry was to comment that between them Bishop Gwynne and B.K. Cunningham saved many chaplains from mental or moral breakdown, and sustained all in their dangers and adversities. To attend the school was to be reminded of another world which some were in danger of forgetting. The chaplains, like the soldiers, were weary and in great need of both spiritual and physical refreshment.

"Some had grown slack and depressed, a few had fallen into grave sin. The romance of conducting worship in barns and eucharists on packing cases had palled. As B.K. said, 'the combatant might try to shut his heart to all feeling; the chaplain could or should not'. Most chaplains as Christian leaders inevitably felt more keenly than others the tremendous strain of constantly trying to reconcile their beliefs with the war. The pressures on the chaplain to become merely the mouthpiece of the military authorities were very great. Sometimes unsure of his role, treated as a jack-of-all-trades, sometimes feeling neither accepted by officers nor by men as a priest, wearied with indifference and misunderstanding, tired of innuendoes that if he was a 'real man' he would be fighting, it was tempting for him to try to solve all these tensions by a display of bellicosity". (36)

B.K. Cunningham endeavoured to sum up the lessons he had learned from running the chaplains' school at St. Omer :

"My own opinion is that the pre-war theological system, as judged by the padres it produced, did not come well out of the experience of war; the devotional training had been along too narrow lines and depended too much on favourable environment, and when that was no longer given the padre was apt to lose his bearings". (37)

At the end of the war, when men had time to reflect on what the war had meant to them, there was a whole host of books written on almost every subject imaginable. Some books were the product of chaplains themselves and were born out of their experiences in the trenches and amongst other chaplains. One particular book compiled by seventeen temporary Church of England chaplains on active service in France and Flanders was called The Church in the Furnace. F.B. Macnutt was editor and it was dedicated to all those chaplains who died on active service or who were killed. Macnutt writes that the essays are

"the expression of thoughts which have come to us, under the intense stress and strain of Active Service, about the life and work of the Church as we left it when we embarked for the Front, and as we see it now from afar ..... one thing is certain; we can never again be content with much that we accepted as quite natural in those far away days before we came out here". (38)

Seventeen chaplains tackle the most difficult problems they have encountered, ranging from faith to the Church to worship and the training of the clergy. No punches are pulled! In retrospect F.R. Barry, one of the contributors, called the book "half-baked and arrogant" and yet he said that, after many years, he still thought along similar lines. It was an attempt to come to grips with the theology of warfare and relate it to the almost inhuman conditions under which men lived and died. It was an attempt to show how inadequate had been all their teaching prior to ordination. It was an attempt to understand how godless soldiers could express the nature of God in their lives and by

their self sacrificial actions. It was an attempt to come to terms with the essence of life and death as seen in the years 1914-18. The very name of the book suggests that the church needs purging of the dross that it has collected over the centuries; it needs refining and polishing up in order to meet new conditions and circumstances. Macnutt suggests that the church should try to discover a "moral equivalent to war" in peacetime; something to fight for, something important enough to die for.

The church is too soft, it makes no real demands on its members. Would

that it was like the army, suggests another contributor *Geoffrey Gordon*

*Bishop of Jarrow*. All classes shared a common danger in the war and yet

they would not share with each other in the Body of Christ. Neville

*Bishop of Exeter*  
Talbot, another essayist and chaplain, criticises the training of the clergy. They are far too amateurish and lack any real understanding of men and life.

"There is truth in the judgment that the theological colleges help to make 'parsons' of men at the expense of their humanity and naturalness, and to produce the mind which is clerical and yet not truly professional. In a word, the colleges represent a process of half-baking". (39)

*Bishop of Oxford*

Kenneth Kirk dealt with the coming home of the chaplains and the sort

of things they would expect from the church. Studdert Kennedy attacked

the church for its failure to appreciate the soldier and communicate

with him at the level of his own value judgments. Eric Milner-White *(later Dean of York)*

talked about worship and the way things would have to change to

accommodate the masses: times, patterns of worship, content, form and so

on. The Church in the Furnace was an attempt to be radical and yet

constructive. Wilkinson notes however that at least two of the contributors have been "neutralized" by the church so that their radical aspirations tended to fade with the prospect of promotion.

Another book well worth mentioning in some detail is called The Army and Religion. It is the result of an enquiry which suggested itself to one of the writers whilst working with the YMCA during the war. *In the light of* the nature of religion during the war and *the reaction of soldiers* to it, it was thought that an enquiry should be made into every aspect and across the denominational borders, so that the Church at home may then consider its findings and make any subsequent changes thought necessary.

"Nearly three hundred memoranda, often of considerable length, resting on the evidence of many hundred witnesses, have been thus obtained from men of all ranks, Generals down to privates, chaplains, doctors, nurses, but leaders and workers, and also from Committees appointed at the great Bases in England and France to collect evidence". (40)

There were two joint conveners of the committee: Bishop E.S. Talbot of Winchester and Dr. D.S. Cairns, Professor of the United Free Church College in Aberdeen. Three questions were sent out to correspondents:

- (1) What are the men thinking about Religion, Morality and Society?
- (2) *Have the changes made by the war* made any real difference to men's moral outlook and religious feelings?
- (3) What sort of relationship have the men with the churches? What do they think of the Churches? (41)

The enquiry was to be divided into two parts; firstly quoting the evidence of the witnesses and then in the second part explaining it, analysing it and drawing conclusions from it.

"The war has shed a revealing light on the past. Far reaching changes will result from our new knowledge. Those who survive the war must bring in a better day worth the tremendous price which has been paid. This responsibility lies most of all on the Church.....

A fuller understanding of the fact is essential .... The mind of the young manhood of the country, represented in the Army, is the heart of that situation ..... The church needs to know their faith and ideals .... There has been a drift of the younger men away from the Churches. What is the cause of their estrangement from Christ?" (42)

These were the sort of questions on the lips of anyone who thought, even superficially, about the state of the church. Some refuge was taken in the fact that even after all sorts of materialistic and anti-religious propaganda had been hurled at the working classes once the dangers of the front line had been reached belief on the part of the men returned again.

"The men of the British armies, however dim their faith may be, do in the hour of danger, at least believe in God, 'the great and terrible God'".

"The soldier has got religion, I am not sure that he has got Christianity" said one who had great

experience of soldiers in France. This particular saying was seized on as expressing the heart of the situation." (43)

Belief in the trenches, however, seems to be related to and almost governed by times of crisis and periods of stress. Once the crisis period is over belief tends to disappear. Men on the whole still hang on to a belief about the immortality of the soul though a few modernists apparently follow the epicurean thoughts of Omar Khayyam, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die". When under greater examination much of the thinking about life after death was seen to be very superficial and almost instructive and so the reaction on the religious impact of the war ends with the hope that the churches will do their best to clear up any doubts that exist and not try to hide them. Men were puzzled about the nature of an Almighty God particularly in view of all the suffering. There was a tendency to put a low value on human life in the face of the war machine and this in turn led to a more cynical view of God. Can the God who controls such a world also be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? As opposed to a somewhat hazy view of God, Jesus Christ was a much more positive figure, though not very manly. There is

"universal respect for him, though the heroic side of his character seems largely unknown. There is little knowledge of him as the Son of God, the atoning sacrifice, or as the source of living power". (44)

The churches consequently are urged to preach about a living Christ who is also a giver of life and power. There had been no great religious revival in the trenches and those who thought otherwise were going to be

greatly disappointed. Men were still largely *obsessed with* the obvious advantages of material possessions. There was not much spirituality in evidence and yet the kindness and sympathy and thoughtfulness of soldiers was but an expression of a morality or spirituality they never knew they possessed. E.R. Whickham in his book Church and people in an Industrial City writes that:

Men discovered values which they never associated with religion or morality - again a characteristic evidenced in a thousand ways in working-class life back home, and throughout the years before - that comradeship and solidarity were the essence of life, that the damning sins were not 'wangling', drunkenness, impurity or profanity, but cowardice, selfishness, snobbishness and tyranny". (45)

Chaplains often compared and contrasted the comradeship of the trenches with the lack of friendship and fellowship in the churches. The aims and objects of the II, which had its conception in the trenches and its birth in the early post war years, were to try and recapture something of the spirit of the trenches and entuse and revitalize both nation and the church. It was fairly obvious that when war started men were not equipped for the reality and the horror of what ensued. Not only was their military education not good enough in the early stages, nothing was good enough to help them cope with the intense battle fatigue they experienced and the knowledge that the next bullet or bomb "might have their name on it". The failures of education in general and religious education in particular were apparent. "Throughout our evidence", says the writers of The Army and Religion "two complaints

recur (1) that there is an absence of serious thought about religion and (2) that there is ignorance of the facts and truths of Christianity".  
(46)

One officer writes:

"For the type of christian who believed that only through the consciously accepted grace of God could truly good deeds be done, or who thought in terms of 'good' and 'bad' men, the war produced many puzzling paradoxes. 'Unredeemed human nature is infinitely nobler than I had dreamed.' The natural man is still a bit of rare material, capable of being moulded into something magnificent".

Another Commanding officer *lists a number of general virtues.*

"All the peevishness and selfishness and churlishness of people seems burnt clean away. And with all of this there is ..... an indescribable boyishness of mind and of understanding that makes them the most lovable people on God's earth and the quaintest also. They sing their silly little songs and make their feeble little jokes and have not the faintest idea what splendid souls they are, and therein lies their great charm. They may not yet have entered the Kingdom of Heaven, but when they do, it will

be as a little child". (47)

In a chapter called Rights and Wrongs the report lists a whole lot of general virtues of soldiers on the credit side, as it were; whereas on the debit side, the shadowy darker side, there is also a list including: petty dishonesty, profanity and unclean speech, gambling, drunkenness and immorality -- the gravest evil! Wilkinson's comment here needs last part:

"The surprise with which such discoveries were greeted by the Committee suggests narrow

acquaintance with the paradoxes of human nature". (48)

It is to be wondered what the Committee would think of today's permissive and liberated society where there is little separation of the sexes and certainly nothing of the violence and death that sometimes acted as a prelude to sexual encounters during the war years. However in 1914-18 the chaplains had different values for men and it must have caused them considerable worry and anxiety to say that their soldiers they so much admired could, at the same time, be so immoral and unclean about it. The minister working with a church but in civilian tries to understand the problems and writes:

"The moral weaknesses of the men are inevitable (owing to conditions of life, etc). The men on Gallipoli had an intelligible craving for pickles. Drunkenness, immorality are another form of pickles .... The cheeriest bunch of men I ever met perhaps were patients in a venereal hospital at Basra". (49)

Perhaps they were cheerful because they had temporarily been taken out of the fighting line!

Clearly, The Church was not the tremendous influence that it might have been, should have been and possibly thought it was. One officer criticised what it had to offer --

"When you go to church the bloody thing they offer you is the most damned insipid thing imaginable" .... "It was the tragic cry of a soul that had asked the church for bread and had been given a stone". (50)

Only about 20% of the men had any regular contact with the churches though it was apparently noticeable that the proportion was higher in Scotland.

"The divisions within and between the churches produced confusion and rivalry. The clergy were out of touch; they were professional people, living in large houses, a cut above the ordinary people. In a chaplain personality counted for everything; the fact that he was ordained counted for nothing. The churches did not support social justice. The Church of England was State-endowed. Churches still had reserved pews. The churches were autocratic bodies in a democratic world. The churches seemed stuck in the 16th and 17th centuries, unable to recognize the spirit in contemporary movements like that for the emancipation of women". (51)

That the churches were out of touch was obvious to most students of history. Common to most criticisms of the work of the churches was that in the most dreadful conflagration in the history of mankind not only did they do nothing to prevent it, they did not do or say anything

which was memorable during it. The Gospel they preached was insipid and the life lived by their clergy and people was divisive. Perhaps the saddest thing of all was that, by all accounts, they were unaware of their shortcomings except for the few who were perceptive enough to read the signs of the times and bold enough to act upon them. Soldiers were said by one senior chaplain to be living on a sort of religious and spiritual capital, the interest of which had been spent long before, and now it was the capital itself that was being eroded. Before the war nothing new had been added to the capital which had been built up by previous generations and now during the war everything was in danger of being used up altogether. Both chaplains and committed christians found *all that* the churches had to offer *were only* the trimmings of a faith that once had sustained heroes.

"Even after four years of war the Committee believed that the churches did not yet realise the extent of the lack of religious belief and practice: they were living in a fool's paradise". (52)

It was recognised that the Industrial Revolution and its consequential movement of population, at a time when the church's resources were incapable of dealing with the new population increases, was the cause of the present malaise.

"For a number of years before the war it had become increasingly plain that the religious life of the country was out-growing the existing ecclesiastical divisions .... The rigid ecclesiastical structures are no longer adequate for the necessities of our spiritual life". (53)

The report gave a fairly true reflection of religion in the Army and emphasized the deficiencies of the church both before and during the War. After striking a rather gloomy and pessimistic note it ends on a high note of optimism. In its final chapter on 'The Central Necessity' it states that when in times past the church has needed renewal then Jesus Christ returns and provides the fresh impetus. It will happen again for

"if Jesus Christ were to come among us today, doing the same deeds and saying the same things in our modern speech, is it too much to say that he would revolutionise our whole current conceptions of God? .....

The future is lit up with promise. In the wreck of the old order we divine the beginning of the new .... The long battle of defence and retreat is over, the moment for a great common advance has begun. It is impossible for the man who trusts in God not to rejoice". (54)

Wilkinson rightly criticises the report for its failure to identify the real causes for the war in the first place. Then, having recognised that the work of the incognito Christ is still *continues* the report fails to take this into account for its future missionary activity. Its attitude to the psychological and ethical understanding of human nature is too naive and simplistic. It has been argued that until the church examines and analyses fallen human nature and then attempts to redeem the unredeemed, it will never understand human nature. To preach at it will not save it. Scholars have said that there has to be some real incarnational identification followed up by

the work of atonement, through the cross and death of Christ, before there can be a resurrection of a new body capable of new behaviour through new and enlightened relationships to the living Lord. With ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~assignment~~ <sup>most historians would claim that the optimism with which</sup> the Report concluded ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> certainly unwarranted. Lastly it did not listen to the advice of the Roman Catholic Baron Von Hügel who distrusted the simplicity of the Chairman, Bishop Talbot, who was one of those men who so admired the virtues and qualities of the British soldier that "he was in danger of reducing Theology to Tommy-ness". Hensley Henson, in a sermon 'A Kingdom that cannot be shaken', criticised the report for its "mood of self-condemnation, its strain of half ecstatic exaggeration, and its misunderstanding of both religion and Society". (55)

At the end of the war the churches had the unenviable task of recruiting men into Holy Orders. By the time of the signing of the Armistice the total number of clergymen in uniform was 3,475 of whom 1,985 were Anglicans. The total number of Anglicans commissioned during the whole war was 3,030. Of the 172 who were killed or who died as a result of wounds 88 were Anglican. Four chaplains were awarded the Victoria Cross and many others were commended for acts of bravery and courage in the face of the enemy. But the war ended in November 1918 and both men and chaplains had to be repatriated and face the rigours of a Great Britain in the 1920s. At Le Touquet in France F.R. Barry was made Principal of a new school for chaplains. Bishop Gwynne had obtained a promise from the military hierarchy that men "volunteering for the church" should have a school of their own and so Le Touquet came into being. The church at home decided to set up some sort of testing place for these Service candidates and so the Central Advisory Council for

the training of the Ministry came into being, *though only in a rudimentary way.* Pre-theological training took place at Le Touquet. Archbishop Randall Davidson visited and addressed the men in challenging style:

"You are sharers with me in the tremendous responsibilities of these days .... Each of you has a tremendous responsibility upon him, not only because of the peculiar opportunities of the calling which you are preparing yourselves to follow, but because of the greatness of the times, because of the deep significance of the foundations, *which now must be laid* on the ruins of a broken civilization". (56)

It was at Le Touquet that Archbishop Davidson issued his famous "pledge" that henceforth no man accepted for ordination by competent authority after due testing, should be debarred by lack of means for training. This was a momentous decision and opened the gates for subsequent student grants, *which* led inevitably to a change *in* the whole shape of the Anglican ministry. Out of the conflict of the trenches during World War 1 came the new look and the fresh impetus which was to carry the churches into the future - full of hope and optimism that the Kingdom of God would indeed be established in the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere.

1. Alan Wilkinson, The Church of England and the First World War p.14
2. Op cit p.17
3. G.K.A. Bell, Randall Davidson, Vol II p.732
4. Op cit A.Wilkinson p.91
5. Op cit G. Bell p.739
6. Op cit A. Wilkinson p.39
7. Op cit G. Bell p.739
8. See A. Wilkinson p.32-56
9. Op cit A. Wilkinson p.35
10. S.C. Carpenter Winnington-Ingram Op cit p.283-285
11. G. Bell p.742
12. Ibid p.745
13. Op cit F. Barry p.58-59
14. See R. Lloyd, The Church of England p.216
15. Bell p.849
16. Ibid p.890
17. F.R. Barry Period of my Life p.52
18. Ibid p.53
19. Ibid p.54
20. A. Wilkinson p.138
21. Ibid p.138
22. F.R. Barry p.57
23. A.Wilkinson p.132
24. Ibid p.133
25. D. Hankey The Beloved Captain p.64-65
26. F.R. Barry p.61
27. Ibid p.63
28. R.Lloyd p.229

29. A. Wilkinson p. 122
30. Ibid p. 135
31. A. Wilkinson p. 138
32. Ibid p. 145
33. A. Wilkinson p. 147
34. Ibid p. 149
35. Ibid p. 151
36. Ibid p. 152
37. Ibid p. 152
38. The Church in the Furnace -- a series of essays edited by  
F.B. Macnutt p. X (Preface)
39. Ibid p. 275
40. The Army and Religion -- p. VI (Preface)
41. Ibid p. XIII to XV
42. Ibid p. XXII
43. Ibid p. 7
44. Ibid p. 31
45. W.R. Whickham Church and People in an Industrial City p. 208
46. Army and Religion p. 109
47. Ibid p. 127
48. A. Wilkinson p. 162
49. Army and Religion p. 148
50. Ibid p. 57
51. A. Wilkinson p. 163
52. Ibid p. 165
53. Army and Religion p. 425
54. Ibid p. 443-444
55. A. Wilkinson p. 325
56. F.R. Barry p. 67

THE AGE OF THE NUCLEAR DETERRENTA Theological and Historical Survey

On the 6 August 1945 when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, the minds of men, inured though they had become to the horrors of a war that had raged since 1939, and ever mindful of a previous bloodbath in 1914-18, experienced a great shock. The world had suddenly come face to face with a nightmare situation of its own creation. Like the discovery of fire, atomic power was here to stay and it could be used in exactly the same sort of way -- for good or evil! With the discovery of fire,

"Man found a way of bringing back at will the sun's warmth and light, stored up as energy in the fuel he burnt. But the latest atomic fire which has been stolen from heaven comes from a far more distant past and more awe inspiring source than the sun's heat. It was imprisoned in the nucleus in some great cauldron when the stars were made, in regions packed with energy to an almost unimaginable extent. These prodigious forces wound up the springs which the atomic explosion releases. It has been called cosmic force, and is of a different order altogether from the gentle changes in the outer envelope of the atom where energy is stored up by the sun's mild rays and can be released again when we burn our fuel". (1)

It is clear that the prospects for atomic power were in themselves

frightening. Society became alarmed at its own power to destroy itself, not simply as human political structures but as the guardian of civilisation and the human race itself. In 1946 the British Council of Churches produced a report called The Era of Atomic Power in which the problem for the world was discussed and outlined.

"The military uses of the new discovery have overshadowed all other applications of atomic energy, since, unless a war with atomic bombs can be prevented, the question of its use for peaceful purposes loses all importance". (2)

Men and women voiced their acute anxiety that there could be no defence against atomic weapons. Alarm and despondency were in danger of infiltrating the whole of civilised society.

"Our lives, they said, are overshadowed by the fact that man for the first time in history is now equipped with the power to blot out in a moment of wickedness or folly our entire civilisation". (3)

Both social and political consequences were regarded as horrific—so much so that survival became a matter of who could "press the button" first. Certain high ranking individuals became the sole arbiters of whether to attack first or retaliate. There would be no time to discuss, weigh up the pros and cons or mediate. Having just witnessed two world wars it seemed that mankind was on the verge of something even more devastating and yet at the same time was incapable of putting any stop to it. The birth rate was in danger of dropping alarmingly and people were afraid that society might not have the faith to reproduce itself in the face of such destruction and devastation.

In those early post war days Hiroshima and Nagasaki underlined two major questions to which society had to find an answer in order to survive. The first, what can mankind hope for and work for in the future knowing that the end of civilisation might just be around the next corner? Secondly, can the almost limitless powers of the atom be curbed and what sort of society must evolve so that these frightening powers cease to be a menace? The Commission set to work and saw that with faith and hope a future could be faced in which the possession of atomic power need not be a ground for fear. Three attitudes began to emerge which were called secular futurism, the way of withdrawal and the way of responsible citizenship. (4)

Secular futurism depends largely upon some form of "social engineering" to bring about a state of affairs in which mankind can make progress. Society is manipulated by all sorts of pressures so that, in some measure, people are in danger of being no more than pawns in a game of political chess. On the other hand, power, instead of being the slave of society, becomes the God to be worshipped, the end which justifies the means. There then enters society a kind of power mysticism which is akin to religious devotion.

"Continuous association with technological processes begets a sense of the relentless power of the machine. Man's life seems thus to be set in the midst of limitless and unimaginable power".

In becoming its agent, in delighting in its strength, man begins to find the fulfilment of his destiny and so he becomes its slave working for greater power in order to create greater power.

The attitude of withdrawal on the other hand is indicative of the deep seated scepticism of the ends of modern society. It need not be a negative thing and may find expression in the attempts by man to discover an alternative life style in the face of such overwhelming power. By and large however it is a form of escapism that eventually can lead to the breakdown of political involvement, democracy as we know it, and in the end, despair. The alternative, which surely must be the Christian answer, is to see progress and history as inevitable and not necessarily evil. The Commission asserts with confidence that the democratic traditions of western civilisation still have health in them and the power to continue to grow and live. Consequently it is the duty of those who believe history to have a real significance to assent to responsible citizenship of this society, not as it is, but as it might be, and to devote themselves to working out its potentialities in the new conditions it has to meet. The Church is seen to have a peculiar responsibility to

"restore men's confidence in the endeavours  
by which power is progressively brought  
under social control and made subservient to  
the ends of justice and by which the rights  
and liberties of individual men and women  
are secured and preserved". (5)

How responsible citizenship throughout the world can be achieved is another matter. In the interests of justice and peace, power as such must have limitations imposed upon it by a system of legal sanctions. Here again there are problems to overcome because each nation state has its own ideas and morality between states is always difficult to achieve especially where power is concerned. It could be argued that

"sovereign nations have only achieved

some degree of harmony in their internal relations by externalising their conflicts and projecting their aggressive and anti-social instincts into their relations with the outside world: and so long as mankind continues to be organised on the basis of the nation state and the idea of nationalism dominates his political thinking, there is no escape from war as the ultimate mechanism of political change". (6)

The Commission then reaches the point in their deliberations where two conclusions are seen to be possible. One can either build up a strong nation and find security therein or succumb and accept the domination of a strong nation. It could be argued that both of these conclusions are a recipe for despair.

The third *possible option* according to some of the scholars is to democratise the world. In this way, it is argued, power can be curbed, harnessed and used for the good of society.

"Power is inseparable from the relations of men in society and is essential to the nature of the State. The renunciation by a nation of the power to defend its people and institutions against attack, would not be the extension but the abandonment of democratic principles". (7)

However the very nature of atomic weapons is such that many people are

sorely tempted to compromise their democratic principles in favour of renouncing atomic bombs altogether. Herein lies the heart of the Christian dilemma and no easy answer can be found as can be seen by the following examination of possibilities.

In the late 1940s any nation that contemplated unilateral disarmament was aware of the consequences.

"An attempt in the atomic age to remain a Great Power while renouncing the use of the atomic bomb would be equivalent to an attempt, in the naval age, to wage naval war without the use of capital ships". (8)

To disarm does not mean immunity from attack particularly when the geographical and strategic position of the British Isles is fully realised.

Perhaps a World Community where a balance of power and law is maintained might be the answer? *Realists argued that his option was impracticable.* Nevertheless the concept gave birth to the United Nations Organisation and Great Britain declared itself in favour at the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations held on 10th January 1946. *Faith* in the democratic way once again began to rise because people could see that the negotiating table gave more hope to the world than the battle field. However the Soviet Union *adapted a different approach to international relations. This arose from her rampant nationalism which asserted itself against the prevailing tide of democratisation.* It was seen that Russia began to emerge as the crucial obstacle to any sort of

world community. She entered into a period of withdrawal from the international stage and consequently nations began again to fear for their safety not only on a national level but as far as any World Community hopes were concerned.

It quickly became a "stand-off" situation. On the one side there was democracy with its emphasis on a free society whilst on the other side ranged the forces of totalitarianism and the police state. The Commission reluctantly came to the conclusion that "with this clash of irreconcilable ways" the immediate future was having to cope. War need not happen but the western powers might well have to face up to the *unwelcome* fact that force might have to be used if their convictions and way of life were threatened. Any hope for a World Community consequently remained a hope on the drawing board of political architects. *According to the political theorists Russia and her satellites* were going to remain the stumbling block to world peace for many years to come. The division between Eastern and Western political philosophies was to find expression in such things as the Iron Curtain, the Berlin Wall, and a cold war situation that has dominated the world scene for the last thirty-five years.

The dilemma facing the Christian Church and indeed the world was obvious. On the one hand the future of our way of life was threatened whilst on the other hand the only way to defend it was to use, or be prepared to use, weapons of such mass destruction that the mind could hardly contemplate.

"The only way in which we can be relieved  
from the necessity of such a desperate choice  
is that proposed by the heads of the American,

Canadian and British nations, and endorsed by the United Nations, namely, that steps should be taken for 'the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction'. But if this effort should fail, and until the end is achieved, the choice between two equally intolerable alternatives remains to torture the Christian conscience". (9)

The depth of the serious dilemma, introduced by the United Nations agreement, to have atomic weapons was highlighted when compared to the Nazi war crimes which were unfolded at the trials of Nuremberg. The Times Newspaper of 2 April 1946 contained horror stories, during the cross examination of Von Ribbentrop, that Germans had ordered the destruction of villages in Croatia which "included women and children". (10)

The bombing of Hiroshima involved similar atrocities on a far bigger scale and yet there was no charge of wanton destruction brought against the allies in this respect. One could perhaps argue that such bombing in the end of the day saved lives but such arguments can be used to commit all sorts of barbarities. Perhaps it might be compared to large scale bombing by the Allies of German and Japanese cities. Here again such a comparison hardly <sup>could be used to</sup> justify the use of an atomic bomb but really questions indiscriminate bombing on the scale employed. All the time there seems to be a hardening in the attitude towards suffering as the spiral of the increased means to inflict it goes on advancing.

There is a greater toleration and a greater effort to understand the need for increasing the stock of weapons of both mass and indiscriminate destruction. The Christian must be forever on his guard against the lowering of his standards.

"It is difficult, even if it were desirable, for the general public to exercise any control or influence over military decisions in time of war. The information on which a judgment can be based is not available, and there is a natural and proper reluctance to hamper the government in the discharge of its critical responsibilities. But unless those who do take crucial decisions on behalf of the nation can be called upon subsequently to justify their actions at the bar of public opinion, democratic responsibility is at an end. In a democratic State, Christians are justified in obeying its call to take part in what is claimed to be a righteous war, only if they are able to satisfy themselves that the ends for which the war was embarked upon have not been gravely compromised". (11)

Some members of the Commission were of the considered opinion that under no circumstances should a Christian approve the use of the atomic bomb or indeed any similar weapon of wholesale massacre. *In opposition*

*to* this uncompromising attitude others were no less insistent in claiming that it was equally a Christian responsibility to defend the fundamental rights and liberties of men and institutions. The

main stream of Christianity has always recognised the legitimacy of war for a just cause. If the cause is right then it could be argued that

"it cannot be altered or diminished by technical advances and the introduction of new weapons, even though the resulting problems may be far more acute". (12)

A far more important issue must surely be in how to prevent war altogether. . . . Perhaps <sup>for</sup> the first time the important issue of deterrence enters into the political field. No effective means have ever been considered to deter a would-be aggressor except perhaps the fear of a reprisal. If the nature of war has altered so much then perhaps the time has also arrived to change one's attitude towards it as well. War waged with modern weapons would be the height of lunacy and so a new determination to find a solution to political problems becomes vital. However if there is a nation intent on waging war and is clearly guilty of aggression then it is argued that that nation will have to be stopped, not only for the safety of itself but for the safety of the whole world. Police action on the part of the whole international community is required so that the potential aggressor is *deterred* by the thought of what might happen to him if he continues his aggression. Hence

"if greatly superior power can be concentrated in the hands of the United Nations, or of a group of nations determined, and known to be determined, to go to war for that reason, and for that reason alone, this might be expected to act as a sufficient deterrent and thereby prevent the outbreak of war". (13)

The dilemma however still remains. The atom bomb has been considered as a political measure to prevent war but what happens if it has to be used? What happens if the threat of reprisal has to be put into action? This is the problem! We either eliminate these weapons altogether and build up a series of checks throughout the world so that the elimination is effective or we live with the problem and face the dilemma. Control can be effective if all nations agree to it in good faith but if they do not then a stalemate has been reached and the world must live with the impasse. The Commission came to the conclusion that it had

"to live with the dilemma, refusing peace of mind which obliviousness to either disturbing alternative might bring, is a necessary discipline through which we must pass in order that the solution may in the providence of God in due time overtake us. Only through such a discipline also can we come to understand the deeper dilemma of our whole society, of which the ambiguities of war are only one expression". (14)

At the invitation of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury another Commission was set up to discuss the issues of the earlier report and also examine the implications of other new weapons of war namely chemical and biological in addition to the atomic bomb. This report was published in 1948 and called The Church and the Atom. The writers were still very much influenced by the overwhelming thought that civilisation was on the verge of self destruction. Lessons were re-learnt from a study of history and Dr Arnold Toynbee pointed out that similar civilisations to ours had disintegrated in the past due to similar economic and political problems.

In our case these were exacerbated by the problem of power and its control. He further pointed out that civilisations failed because they did not respond to the challenge of their particular day and age. Three symptoms of this decline and fall stand out in our own generation, all of them he said representing the loss of internal unity in one respect or another. There was loss of social unity resulting from an unequal distribution of benefits. This was followed by a loss of religious unity, including the cultural, moral, economic and spiritual dimensions of life centred on religion. Lastly he claimed there was a schism in men's souls that cried out for reconciliation at all levels of existence - personal, social and with God. (15)

In the vexed question of the morality of warfare this particular Church of England Commission endeavoured to

"disentangle the moral question from that over insistence on the divine right of Western democracy which in the Era of Atomic Power tended to darken counsel". (16)

Since the war against Hitler was so obviously a righteous war it was but an easy step to think that Western civilization had been created by God and was continually being used by him in his endeavours to promote the Kingdom of God throughout his world. The morality of defence became the burning issue of the day for the Church and the debate continued in an effort to discover, if possible, what the Christian responsibility to a defence policy might be. People of all persuasions met together to talk about the very real possibility of yet another war. The threat was very great and the consequences of engagement were catastrophic. Under this particular shadow some scholars maintain that

people can be forgiven for thinking in negative terms. They had come to think that the most important issue was how to conduct themselves in a nuclear war situation. Once again the critical issue seemed to be one of behaviour during a war. It was pointed out that this can often lead to a series of rules and regulations about what not to do instead of concentrating on a more positive attitude. Many scholars argue that in many ways the Church, like the Jewish Church before it, tends to fall too easily into accepting a provisional ethic which concentrates on what not to do. There is always the temptation for all commentators to keep their hands clean and so avoid the more difficult choice facing the world of what can be done rather than what cannot. There must be some sort of real understanding and identification with those who have to carry the political burden of decision making. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath" is surely one of the most revolutionary statements in the whole of Holy Scripture. The Sabbath was instituted <sup>should be performed</sup> that something special <sup>^</sup> in it. It was not to be circumscribed by rules and regulations "to keep it holy". So much of Christian ethics seems to be a reversion to this sort of legalism, against which Our Lord spoke very strongly. Another example which seems to have a bearing on the subject is the forbidding of adultery. The Church is quick to proscribe certain sexual behaviour but it is slow to tell the world what to do with sexuality. The problem that faced the Church then and to a large extent still faces the Church today is what to do with the nuclear weapons with which we defend ourselves. The bomb, like sex, seems to be here to stay.

As early as June 1946 plans for nuclear disarmament had been tabled by

the United States at the first session of the Atomic Energy Commission. The proposals included an International Control Agency so that nuclear weapons and their manufacture could be monitored and controlled. The Soviet Union unfortunately used its veto in the General Assembly of the United Nations and so the Commission broke up in disarray. After carrying out a series of atomic bomb tests the Soviet Union left the Commission in 1950.

Discussions in the Conventional Armaments Commission proved equally fruitless. The Western view, accepted by the majority, was that international confidence was a pre-requisite of disarmament, which therefore must be preceded by disclosure of the existing military strength of all countries and by the establishment of an effective verification system. The Soviet Union however demanded a general reduction of armed forces by one-third, but without being willing to disclose the size of its own forces or armaments". (17)

The basic problems involved in trying to reach disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union were described by a statement issued by Britain, Canada, China, France and the United States on 24th October 1949 following the breakdown of negotiations in the Atomic Energy Commission :

"It is apparent that there is a fundamental difference not only on methods but also on aims. All the sponsoring powers other than the USSR put world security first, and are

prepared to accept innovations in traditional concepts of international cooperation, national sovereignty and economic organisation, where these are necessary for security. The Government of the USSR puts its sovereignty first and is unwilling to accept measures that may infringe upon it, or interfere with its rigid exercise of unimpeded state sovereignty". (18)

Obviously these differences continued to be reflected in all of the negotiations which followed. A nuclear stalemate had obviously been reached and for the next thirty years or so this stalemate has ensured a balance of Power in the world, of such fine proportions, that a peace of unsure quality has resulted but, nevertheless, it is a peace. The efforts to improve the world situation are far too numerous to mention but they can be seen tabulated in chronological order in a booklet prepared by the Reference Division of the Central Office of Information in London called Arms Control and Disarmament. (19)

The sad conclusion that emerges from a study of the various attempts to find a solution to the problem is that the fundamental antagonism already experienced between the Soviet Union and the West is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. There seems no prospect at all of a convergence of political systems and the possibility of a genuine rapprochement, or even of establishing 'normal' relations, is seemingly ruled out by two factors above all. The first is the active Soviet Commitment to Marxist-Leninist doctrines, which look for the world-wide triumph of the Communist revolution. These doctrines, and the policies which go with them, cannot but be perceived as being

deeply provocative by Western Countries committed to freedom, democracy and self determination. The second factor is the apparent impossibility for the Soviet regime, relying as it does on force, secret police and isolation, to move towards the 'normal' relations with Western Countries which alone could begin to disperse the distrust of recent decades. Given these obstacles to a genuine rapprochement, apparently inseparable as they are, the best hopes for preserving peace between the Soviet Union and the West must evidently lie in a continuing perception by each side that the risks involved in opening hostilities far outweigh any prospects of advantage. This is just another way of saying that peace between the two sides will continue, into the foreseeable future, to depend on mutual deterrence through a balance of terror.

"Thus it seems that the freedom of nations - freedom as we understand it in the West - is only guaranteed by the certainty that mortal blow will be answered by mortal blow. That, however, is a precarious guarantee. It rests, for example, on a technical detail, that the blow cannot be so rapid or so absolute as to preclude a counter blow". (20)

Both aeroplanes and submarines are circling the world all of the time to ensure that blow will indeed be met by blow. The problem is both technical and also one of principle for it seems to many that *if we rely on weapons for our survival which we dare not use a considerable element of bluff is involved.*

The bombs that are carried to safeguard peace and freedom must never be used for if they do there will be nothing left.

However, they protect us just the same, if everyone knows they will never be used! Both sides can then live and act as though the weapons did not exist. However, we must be determined to use them if forced into such a situation *that one day they may really* have to be used. According to Paskins and Dockrill in their latest book The Ethics of War.

"Nuclear weapons are thought to structure both peace and war.... Before 1939 it was possible to think about international relations without having to do much thinking about bombing and to theorise about bombing without the need for any profound study of the international system. Today the two are seen as inextricably bound up and it would be mere ignorant folly to attempt a consideration of one without reference to the other". (21)

Paskins and Dockrill define this approach as one of "overriding risk". The Soviet Union is contained within the borders of the Eastern Bloc countries and the West, instead of trying to match the forces of the Warsaw Pact, decide to rely on the nuclear deterrent for its defence policy. Massive retaliation is the threat of the West if one Russian soldier crosses certain well defined lines into West Germany or Berlin. However much Russia may want to expand westwards she would not dare do so for fear of retaliation. The "overriding risk" theory then becomes a political tool in the hands of both sides.

"If all the major participants in international relations can do this, one has a system of "overriding risk" in that each power has the

ability to settle quarrels by creating overriding risks ..... If the system is to work the risks that are being created must be real and appreciable risks. The Soviet Union will not be prevented from seizing Berlin unless the Russians believe that there is a real possibility that NATO will resort to nuclear war as a result". (22)

This gives rise to the celebrated problem of "credibility" which is the other side of "overriding risk". *One constant factor in the situation is the use of conventional forces in West Germany*

Ever since the last War British Forces in some considerable numbers have been stationed in Germany as part of our NATO commitment.

"Suppose for example that the Warsaw Pact forces cross the border into West Germany and suppose that the credibility problem is that NATO cannot expect USSR to believe that the United States will wage war, risking its own devastation to protect Germany. Then, so the theory goes, if we develop in Europe forces capable of fighting a holding action in Germany then the Russians will have reason to believe the threat and will not initiate the military action, or will desist when faced with resolute resistance." (23)

There are many versions of this argument. One holds that what is

important is the presence of large numbers of NATO troops because their presence demonstrates the concern of the West and with it the concern not to let NATO soldiers die. Another claims that what is required is a range of so called tactical nuclear weapons designed for short range use on a nuclear battlefield. Another theory is that the United States can be seen to have no alternative but fight a nuclear war and consequently NATO can threaten, for example, to "lose control" in a conventional weapons way and then, politically, the situation would escalate to the point where nuclear weapons would have to be employed.

It is sometimes argued that nuclear deterrence is no longer as important as it was in the period 1949-1962. Some scholars are already discussing the prohibitive costs of waging a nuclear war in an economically interdependent world and that perhaps the future will see national interests being advanced more cheaply by waging war by proxy on non-military battlefields. There will always be some people who claim that deterrence is a theory which cannot be proven. No one to date knows if it will ever work, so they say. Paskins and Dockrill suggest that such an argument is sceptical, unjustified and intriguingly mistaken. *The thought that an army is defeated plays its part in the defeat and the enemy must be convinced of this fact.* They argue that this is in essence very similar to the doctrine of deterrence, that is persuading Russia that the USA will wage nuclear war.

"If it is currently impossible to know whether deterrence works, that is not because such things cannot be found out but because the evidence is not available to us". (24)

Whichever *form* the argument *takes* there is the continual underlying *assumption* that in the "shadow boxing" period of deterrence

that civilians will be killed.

Weapons exist that are designed for action against cities as well as forces and under present circumstances it would be extremely difficult to separate one from the other both as far as the weapons were concerned and as far as the population was concerned. Giulio Douhet is quoted by Paskins and Dockrill <sup>as</sup> saying that 'in a war between nations the

damage cannot be restricted merely to paid gladiators'. *A most important part of the* theory of deterrence is to see that there

is complete involvement before any major decision regarding the use of nuclear weapons is taken. This is not a moral point but a pre-moral point; not an ethical point but a logical one. There must, of necessity, be involvement of a political nature in the whole theory of deterrence and political power in democratic countries is the expression of the political will of the people. Paskins balances a strong case for pacifism, *by a powerful argument in favour of fighting.*

On the one hand he would maintain that war is always morally dubious at best, and at worst it *implies involvement* in a series of events *which have got* completely out of hand. In the end for example, much against their will, people are implicated in events which are grossly abhorrent but they have no power to alter the course of these events. He suggests that as a creative action, as a positive move, we ought to withdraw from NATO. (The Balance of Power would hardly be disturbed by our withdrawal). In order to balance his pacifist views he puts forward an equally forceful argument for fighting based upon three main ideas. Firstly as human beings we have a sense of gratitude to our own people and if they are engaged in a war for survival *we should naturally want to be*

identified with them. Secondly death is not the worst that can happen - at least not a meaningful death. To fight and die for a just cause is not meaningless. Paskins finally argues that there is something rather insipid about people who meekly submit to death. When they rise up and fight, against all sorts of odds, there is a suggestion that humanity is still alive and kicking. (25)

Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker sees it all up as it might appear to a visitor from another planet

"You are not. You have discovered means to destroy your lives and upon your lives decisions depends whether you will use them or not. Let you act in such a manner that this decision is irreversible; instead you exhibit this danger by voting over you to some form of other decision, thus of course you are not. You are not taking account of the danger. In reverse, you do not act, you take no relevant action. Your own decisions is split. This is not. You are not taking account of the danger, you are very consistent and very deliberate. Let your logic be the logic of madness". (26)

He is torn apart by the dilemma facing the whole of Christendom and examines both sides of the issue with clarity and fair-mindedness coming, in the end, to the conclusion, a personal one he hastens to emphasise, that as an individual he cannot support or condone the use of nuclear weapons. This personal dilemma is further examined by the British Council of Churches (BCC) Resolution of October 1963

in their publication The British Nuclear Deterrent. The Working Group of the BCC was divided between those who concluded that

"it is not acceptable to christian conscience for our country to have any truck with thermo nuclear weapons"

and the other side, representing the majority, who saw some future in a supernational control of such weapons.

"The majority of the Working Group see it as a Christian possibility, and therefore a duty, to help mankind to master the destructive power it now possesses. It follows that our task is to discern the responsible risks and the abatements of national sovereignty which should be urged upon governments, in order to achieve supranational control of nuclear weapons and the ending of competition in this field. The moral content of such a policy lies in the fact that such action represents an immediate practical step towards the goal of abolishing all reliance on these weapons; it also lies, of course, in a determination to reach that goal and to prevent catastrophe meanwhile". (27)

It was in 1961 that I first visited Berlin and saw for myself in the Summer of that year the terrible things the government responsible for the Eastern Sector were doing. It was the beginning of the Berlin Wall, a wall designed with seemingly one object in mind, to keep those who lived behind it continuously behind it. The Wall has

remained and it has grown, not only physically but in psychological terms designed to frighten people and scare them from any attempts to leave the Eastern Sector. (I mention it here only to show that not only was the world subject to the nightmare of having to live with the threat of nuclear destruction, there was also a continual psychological pressure being brought about by Russia and her Satellites so that although actual warfare did not break out people referred to these times as the cold war). Shortly afterwards in October 1962 President Kennedy of the United States had to test the theory behind the so called "Balance of Power". Russia seemingly was trying to set up a nuclear missile base in Cuba and consequently some of her warships and container vessels were intercepted and the famous Cuban missile crisis came to a head. Russia's bluff was called and threats were issued and the world held its breath whilst President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev shadow-boxed their way out of trouble. As a result of this a 'hot-line' was established between Washington and Moscow a year later and a partial Test Ban Treaty was signed in Moscow by Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States. Unfortunately a year later still, in 1964, China tested its first nuclear device. Once again a crop of books and pamphlets were produced on the subject of Peace and how to keep it. There seemed to be no end to the number of nations who could arm themselves with nuclear devices and consequently the threat of destruction loomed even larger. To balance the ever present threat, Churchmen began to emphasize the road to Peace and indeed two stimulating booklets were produced along these lines by SCM Press. (28) We were asked by their writers and contributors to consider our image of 'World Order', 'World Government' and 'Peace'. Kenneth Johnstone, Chairman of the International Department of the British Council of Churches asked some very fundamental questions

in his essay entitled Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament.

"How exactly do we envisage any of these ideals? In what order of precedence do we place Justice, Peace and Liberty, usually invoked as the guardian trinity of the new world order? How do we propose to reconcile the independence of Sovereign States with the requirements of World Government?" (29)

Arising out of these questions the Churches must also work out some theological answers. What for example is the theology of power in international affairs; or the theology of nationalism? What is the theology of war in the world in which we live today? Mr. Johnstone prophesies that both Church and State, as institutions, may well grow apart once more, but he pleads for the Church to remain active in the world of politics and power and not to retire into

"the gratifying role of outside observer and critic, the hair robed prophet bursting into the Secular Council Chamber with an occasional denunciation or an even rarer word of approval". (30)

The military chaplain has sat on the touchlines of all this debate. He has never been invited to join in any theological discussions. His expertise at the 'coal face' of peace keeping has never been requested. For years he has ministered to those whose job it has been to maintain peace throughout the world. For years he has been regarded by many as being on the periphery of international

theological debate, yet for years he has had more than a ring side seat, he has, in fact, been in the boxing ring. For him there was none of the luxury of sniping at a distance because he was involved. He was identified with those whose job it was to maintain the weapons, patrol the borders and defend the cause. He it was, who, within this context, endeavoured to examine his conscience *and tried to discover an answer to his difficult problem.* It may be that his vocation as a priest or minister in uniform was questioned, it may be that he had to find his own peace in a different environment, it may be that he came through the long dark night of doubt with a clearer vision of his role in society. For many military chaplains there is a certain turmoil, a conflict to be resolved, a theological dilemma to be answered but, by and large, as he ministers to his flock the day to day pressures <sup>which</sup> he faces are simply those of his colleagues in the parochial ministry. The luxury of debate, the stimulus of discussion, the cut and thrust of argument is largely denied him for he lives and ministers in a sort of theological vacuum, isolated from his ordained brethren and largely ignored by the Church he is called by God to serve. Once a year perhaps he attends a training session where he can meet with others of a similar background and air some of the urgent problems of the day. Once a year those who organise the time spent together have to decide upon which area of theological debate to focus. Obviously for those who see no problem there is no need to spend valuable time, discussing it and so the programme is often born of a subjective desire on the part of the organiser to pursue something closer to his own wishes. It might be argued that perhaps theology itself is a luxury these days and Churchmen would rather spend time on liturgical reform than discuss the problems to do with world order. Perhaps our apparent

lack of interest in the theology of defence as opposed to its practical application in military terms is a reaction against a former age when everything was seen in theological terms. We are reminded by Thomas Corbishley S.J. in an essay of his on The Theology of World Order that

"In the high Middle Ages when the theological Establishment was really flourishing, it would doubtless have been suggested that a secure world order would be more or less identical with a world-wide christendom." (31)

Today however it is infinitely more difficult because we live in a largely secular world where it is virtually impossible to deduce, from christian principles of belief and morality, any single pattern of the world as it ought to be. In principle there is no one clear, concrete imperative, whether in the field of politics, economics, culture or history, which can be deduced from Christian teaching as *the* only right course. The Christian then is left with a variety of legitimate choices of behaviour and thought, all of which could be ways of expressing his Christian discipleship. Father Thomas Corbishley expands this concept with relation to our present problems and the necessity of having some sort of world order in which to prosper the affairs of humanity, peacefully. He finds a basic correlation in the underlying concept of universal law and morality. Both he maintains are necessary for world order and peace between men and nations. He quotes at length Pope John XXIII's Encyclical Pacem in Terris and

concludes that :

"Today, the common good of all nations involves problems that affect people all the world over. These problems can be solved only by a public authority which has the power, the form and the competent agencies for dealing with them and whose sphere of influence is the entire globe. We cannot, therefore, escape the conclusion that the moral order itself demands the establishment of some sort of world government". (32)

In the words of Edmund Burke :

"There is but one law for all, namely the law which governs all law, the law of our Creator, the law of human justice and equity - the law of nature and of nations". (33)

Even though human beings may have more immediate allegiances and more specific duties to family, tribe, nation and so on, the experience of history nevertheless reinforces the teaching of Christianity that the human family as a whole prospers when these lesser loyalties are subsumed under a universal system of law, justice and charity. It is to this end that we work and pray.

In all our discussions about International affairs and the relationship between sovereign states the christian must be on his guard against the temptation to speak with the authority of God himself. Gone are the days when the Emperor would kneel at the

feet of the Pope. Gone are the days when ecclesiastical opinion is expressed as the divine imperative and rulers obey the voice of the Church. The voice of the Church however is more than the voice of each individual Christian. There is a balance *which* acts as a sort of national conscience. The Church must be alive to its role within the sovereign state to remind men and societies of the truth of God and the will of God. Alan R Booth expresses it as follows:

"The role of the Churches is to deepen and illuminate the debate, to expose and criticise existing presuppositions, and to put the various considerations in their proper order of priority, rather than to conclude the process of policy making. It is the role of the servant rather than the master, of the prophet who calls men to the truth rather than the King who has the say-so. In this sense the Pope must recognize and respect the authority of the Emperor while accepting pastoral responsibility for him in his job. He must shun the desire to be a back-seat driving Emperor, because frankly he would make a very bad one". (34)

Mr Booth then proceeds to examine various traditional roles of the Church in its relation to International Affairs. *Perhaps* *here may* be found some guiding principles as to the role of the Military Chaplain.

The Church is to be "evangelical" in the sense that in international

affairs it will act in such a way as will best commend ~~The~~ Gospel which it is charged to preach. It must be sensitive to the needs of men and women but never over estimate the importance of the praise of men and women. The servant of God in this respect may be

"one from whom men hide their faces, so that he is despised and men esteem him not" (Isaiah 53<sup>3</sup>)

"Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you .." (Luke 6<sup>26</sup>)

Commending the Gospel or being evangelical demands a certain integrity of spirit, a humanity, an understanding of the need and the problem. It is not just a religious public relations job where the emphasis is on good relations with the public sometimes to the detriment of the Gospel or to the manipulation of truth.

The Church is to be "moral" in the sense that it should look for a modus vivendi for the world rather than assume a negative approach and build fences which tend to concentrate on limits which must not be crossed. Here we may compare the doctrine of the just war. In the end, instead of having good advice about what one can do in a difficult situation, all there is is a list of things one cannot do! The Church must try to share the burden of international decision making rather than impose limitations in a *legalistic way*. Morality is to do with the whole of life - not just with a series of incidents which are to be viewed in a sort of legalistic way, otherwise there will always be a conflict where one set of valid principles will clash with another. Once this happens a compromise solution invariably has to be found and this is not necessarily the right one in the

circumstances.

"Moralized issues" (says Mr. Booth) "tend to be those calling for unconditional surrender. One has therefore to ask whether the Churches should be seeking out the 'moral issues' (in this limited sense) and calling attention to them - or should exert themselves to demythologise international affairs". (35)

The Church is to be "prophetic" in the sense that it should proclaim the truth *in all circumstances*. It should not simply denounce certain actions or statements without also accepting the responsibility for suggesting better alternatives. The Church should never be cut off from the Society it serves. It should never become a spectator in the game of life but always a player. The temptation of all spectators is to be over critical and too judgemental. The true prophet Mr. Booth reminds us is the man,

"not of denunciation but of proclamation. He seeks no power, but is a vessel content to be broken for the sake of the precious truth he then pours out. His job is much nearer that of 'deepening the political debate' than of propounding detailed policies". (36)

The Church is to be "progressive" in the sense that it is working towards a better society where truer justice exists and where greater compassion is the goal for all men. The status quo should not be accepted for its own sake but should be continually examined in the

light of new political and international situations.

The Church must always witness to the real situation as it discovers it. It should involve itself in the real cut and thrust of debate rather than set itself up as a political censor. Mr. Booth sees the Christian community <sup>as</sup> being the guardian of man's humanity and therefore the Church must do all it can to keep before the public and the official mind the dangers of dehumanization particularly where nuclear war is concerned. The Church must realise that, under present circumstances, humanity shares a common destiny. In the ultimate sense the whole of humanity is involved and we sink or swim together. Every attempt by man to particularize, to affirm his own rights or extend his own powers, is a "cutting off your nose to spite your face". Human relationships across the international borders, across racial borders, across every border matter more than national sovereignty when the Christian insists on proclaiming love of God. The Christian must affirm what already exists. In this sense there is an eschatological perception which means that all our efforts have a certain provisional nature about them and therefore we must not over emphasise one particular political opinion as opposed to another. The effect of this is often to render relative what men and nations, in their self righteousness, want to regard as absolute. We must always be prepared to question man's assertion that he and he alone is in harmony with the ultimate reality.

The practical issues Mr. Booth reminds us which are open to all Christians is to join in the great discussions and debates, to see in the cut and thrust of international issues, a morality which has to do with all the

questions of the moment. We must endeavour to elucidate and illuminate the really profound nature of choice. The facts we have to wrestle with and the ground upon which we have to fight are not necessarily ones we might have chosen for ourselves. Often the answer might not necessarily be "the Christian answer", but to seek for an answer is, in itself, the right thing to do. The Church must never be seen to be organised 'over against' the world but be part and parcel of it having special insights into the nature of our human predicament and destiny. In this way it can be the incarnate body of its Lord redeeming mankind by suffering with it and not apart from it.

Professor Donald Mackinnon in his book Borderlands of Theology is clearly worried in case, over the years, the Church has been persuaded to accept as normal behaviour the violence in contemporary society as though there was no means of controlling it. If men acknowledge that some acts are wrong but feel urged to do them or feel compelled to do them, then

"they can no more plead the defence of superior orders at the judgment-seat of God than at an earthly Nuremberg". (37)

Donald Mackinnon is at pains to tell us that there can be much danger in the principle NECESSITAS NON HABET LEGEM for it can open the flood-gates to any sort of behaviour which can then be justified. Moral theologians, he says, must not just quieten the conscience - if necessary they must awaken it to the flash point of revolt.

"..... if moral theologians and canonists write today as if their task were in effect primarily that of justifying obedience to the

powers that be, of stifling rather than arousing conscience in this field, of giving nice pat answers to the troubled, their responsibility is a very terrible one. I would say that their task is a very different one -- that of interpreting spiritually and strengthening the revolt against such things as atomic war that is surely there in the world. It is a revolt which takes many forms but is ultimately one in conviction that human beings were not made to do these things to each other". (38)

Mackinnon seems to be quite horrified at the thought that "we must learn to live with the bomb" as the 1959 report of the British Council of Churches suggested. He is all in favour of breaking "asunder the fetters of the past", of dispensing with "devotion to the State establishment of the Church of England (a singularly unattractive 'sacred cow' though the animal still has her devotees)", of doing away with conventional piety for the sake of it. In no way can he support the attitude of what he calls the professional Christian Layman who embraces

"a kind of acquiescent determinism which in turn dignifies conformism with title of responsible behaviour". (39)

When discussing the use of the hydrogen bomb he maintains, in the opinion of many scholars quite rightly, that neither government nor individuals can escape the responsibility of their decisions. He

conclude us that

"the bomb has been developed by man who have chosen to develop it because the alternative of failing to do so seemed infeasible. If we are prisoners, the cage is one of our own fashioning". (40)

In some ways he is saddened by the thought that the "just war" tradition has been allowed to lapse over the years and says that part of the predicament the nations find themselves in at present is due to this omission. Faskins and Lockhill however deal to a great extent with the "just war" tradition. In part. For Faskins, the ethical philosopher, takes very seriously the principles of proportion and discrimination which form part of this just war theory. Area bombing and the indiscriminate nuclear striking of civilian targets are judged to be morally wrong. The death of ones own soldiers, he maintains would be preferable to the death of enemy non-combatants. The traditional justification, that those who take up arms deserve to be punished by death, he rejects in favour of his own saying that in certain deaths are meaningful then they might be acceptable. (41)

And modern total war with universal conscription it is wondered if any sort of death can ever be meaningful! Modern weapons are of such sophisticated technology that some can be used indiscriminately to knock out the enemy without actually killing him. In any case Faskins never really comes to terms with the theory that attack is sometimes the best form of defence, hence the bombing of factories and military installations that were fairly normal practice during World War II. Scholars like Faskins and to some extent Mackinnon nevertheless see

the result of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg as something which still repudiates "the idea that military necessity was a kind of moral sovereign". The present situation is such that mankind seems forced into accepting one or other of extremes - "either Belsen or Hiroshima" and this Mackinnon maintains is a nightmare choice for anyone to have to make. He reminds us that if the Hydrogen bomb is ever used then vast numbers of the world's population will be obliterated. He then compares this possibility with the action of German soldiers, who during the trials at Nuremberg pleaded as defence the fact that they were acting under superior orders.

"We seemed to exact from him  
 (the German soldier), on service in  
 the field, a critical appraisal of  
 the validity of what he was asked to  
 do which we are slow ourselves to attempt  
 more generally as civilians". (42)

In our general acquiescence to the whole defence strategy, in allowing *defence expenditure* to grow into alarming proportions we are guilty of irresponsibility towards the society in which we live. Mackinnon seems to think that we have *borne the burden* far too long and that perhaps some sort of quiet revolt is needed. Modern methods of war he *insists* are not a kind of sovereign source of moral principles, they are methods and not lords. We must take care that the methods, the means, do not become in themselves the ends. If we expect the poor German soldier to say "No" whilst serving at the front of battle surely his civilian counterpart during peace can come to the same conclusion he insists.

Mackinnon *next examines*

the ethical problems connected with the nuclear deterrent or the "balance of terror". For the deterrent to work a society has been fashioned which accepts *by a kind of* social contract ~~a permanent~~ stalemate in order to keep the "balance of terror" at the right level. To break out from the situation would be mutually destructive and so the nations of the world have got to accept the situation or face the dire consequences. Mackinnon would argue that this sort of social philosophy was only a second best based upon utility and offering very little real hope to the world. He then analyses the notion of deterrence as follows :

"If war is an instrument of policy, then in the world of 'the great deterrent', war has no place; for an occasion of mutual destruction cannot conceivably be regarded as an instrument of policy". (43)

In the great debate about deterrents it is always stressed that the only effective weapons system is one which works solely by virtue of its deterrent factor, "the idea of its existence operates as a dissuasive from its employment". The image <sup>which</sup> men form in their minds about the possible ~~use~~ of the great deterrent being used is supposed to prevent them using it. Mackinnon then argues that if, in fact, it is used it can no longer properly be called a deterrent. No one could possibly disagree with the line of argument but the fact remains that for over thirty five years the deterrent has, in fact, deterred. If men are committed to a peace based upon a "balance of terror" then inspection of opposing stockpiles is essential in order to ensure

that the balance is properly maintained. If the West is determined to keep the peace and never initiates an act of aggression it follows that it must always be in a reactive situation. Mackinnon asks if this is a genuine resolve or simply a piece of play-acting. "If the readiness to react is not expressive of a genuine resolve, does not the whole system collapse?" *Like everyone else he is worried*

at the prospect of using tactical nuclear weapons in a conventional mode simply in order to make up for a numerical deficiency in conventional weapons. The fear of escalation is very real and though the *possibility of controlling* tactical nuclear weapons is considerably better than <sup>with</sup> strategic nuclear weapons, it is still doubtful if complete control in a war situation could ever be maintained. The use of tactical nuclear weapons is much in debate at the current time with the placing of such weapons systems as "Trident" and "Cruise" in a state of perpetual readiness. There has also been recent talk *in* America, under the Reagan administration *of the* use of the Neutron Bomb - an enhanced radiation shell designed to destroy people but leave buildings and other inanimate objects intact. The prospect of having these neutron bombs positioned in Europe was and still is causing some alarm among NATO Countries. The Dutch for example were convinced that such a weapon as the neutron bomb blurs the distinction between nuclear and conventional forces and so lowers the nuclear threshold. The dilemma *posed by such a weapon* is quite serious for, on the surface, it appears as though the neutron bomb could be used in a battlefield context only and so safeguard the rest of the countryside. However limited its use might be the devastation caused by it in Europe for instance would be colossal and so its attraction as an extension of the more acceptable conventional weapons system is very

doubtful. Mackinnon writing in 1968 was already well aware of the use of tactical nuclear weapons. He was obviously not fooled by all the canvassing that took place on their behalf by the British Council of Churches and the Christian Frontier Council. He points out that those "very high-minded persons who move in these exalted circles are at all costs anxious to avoid an open breach between Christ and Caesar". As a result the problems of escalation are never fully realised.

~~not those~~ concerning the limits beyond which the use of tactical nuclear weapons would not be counterbalanced. "Dare one advertise limits" he asks? "If they are not advertised how will any side know when the limit has been reached?" The use of these tactical weapons is greatly in dispute with the very problems aired by Professor Mackinnon being debated by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland some twelve years later.

"The history of debates on Disarmament in the General Assembly over recent years has shown the existence in the Church of two main opposing views about the dangers of the escalating arms race and the outbreak of nuclear war. In this continuing debate, there has been agreement that war, preparation for war, especially nuclear war, is abhorrent to the Christian conscience; has no part in God's design for this world; is demonic and an offence to God. It is the prime example today of how man, created in God's image, and destined for God's high purposes, is nevertheless inextricably estranged in a sinful world, where even his most moral decisions are infested by evil or his best choices are compromises" (44)

The two main responses to this situation have been unilateral nuclear disarmament on the one hand or a reluctant support of a mutual nuclear deterrent, by maintaining a balance of power on the other hand.

Arguments have been produced at all levels, but in 1981 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had its attention drawn to what some members believed to be a new situation. This, so called new situation consists of three main factors. First there is the decision by NATO and the British Government to invest in a new generation of missiles of greater power. Secondly there is the possibility that both NATO and the British Government are prepared to fight a "limited nuclear war" in Europe only stopping short of the use of inter-continental ballistic missiles. Thirdly there is *much* secrecy surrounding Governmental decisions about modernisation of the missile stockpile and the ability of the United Kingdom to defend itself.

The possibility of a new approach to a fairly old problem was provided by the World Disarmament Campaign launched in Britain in April 1980, and since then developed in other countries. This particular organisation has two distinct but complementary goals: to mobilise people everywhere to demand comprehensive disarmament and then try to find an alternative way of securing world peace other than the nuclear deterrent. It aims specifically at the 1982 United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament and is already circulating member states demanding: the abolition of nuclear weapons, the abolition, by stages, of conventional arms leading to a complete and general disarmament and finally the transfer of all military expenditure to end world poverty.

The committee responsible for preparing the report submitted to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was *much concerned* about the

extreme urgency of the situation which clearly calls for

"more radical and more immediate action.

If NATO and Her Majesty's Government

are ready, as it now appears, to fight, if

need be, a limited nuclear war, then

Christians in Britain have laid on their

consciences the responsibility not just for

the possession of nuclear weapons but for

their potential use in warfare, resulting

in death and destruction on an unbelievable

scale and in incalculable damage to the

material environment and to future generations.

We believe this to be a moral offence wholly

incompatible with our Christian faith". (45)

The committee goes further and advocates that the whole defence strategy of Britain be reviewed in the light of the Trident programme and that future policies should incorporate unilateral disarmament as being more in harmony with the Gospel message in a nuclear age. (At the subsequent debate the *advocates* <sup>of unilateral disarmament</sup> were defeated by a majority of 2 to 1).

Despite the vote, it is clear that great moral issues are at stake and that following the lines of Professor Mackinnon much more work has to be done and many more questions have to be asked regarding the nuclear deterrent policy for defence. Our consciences must be always alert and wide awake for the future of our civilization depends upon it.

"If Hiroshima has any validity, its validity lay in its denial of the thesis that absolutism could be given to an individual. If this be so, then the mere command of a superior, allegedly our master in wisdom and insight as well as power, does not acquit us from the duty of considering for ourselves whether on any count the use of thermo-nuclear weapons of war is justified". (46)

The morality of the situation is personal as well as corporate because we all have to live with our consciences and face the seat of Judgment when the day comes. What men and women have fashioned so they can change. We are not slaves of what we have made but can turn anything to our best advantage if we have the courage to do so. Perhaps *in all* the circumstances thirty five years of relative peace *are* much to our advantage. A bird in the proverbial hand may still be worth two in the bush.

NUCLEAR DETERRENT

1. "The Listener" of 30 August 1945 quoted by The Era of Atomic Power, a report on behalf of the British Council of Churches (BCC).
2. Op cit p.9
3. Ibid p.12
4. Ibid p.24
5. Ibid p.30
6. Ibid p.39
7. Ibid p.40
8. Ibid p.41
9. Ibid p.48
10. Op cit p.50
11. Ibid p.51
12. Ibid p.53
13. Ibid p.54
14. Ibid p.57
15. See The Church and the Atom pp 14-16 - a report published in 1948 on behalf of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York June 1946.
16. Ibid p.30
17. Arms Control and Disarmament p.4 (Central Office of Information)
18. Ibid p.4
19. Ibid pp 34-38
20. C.F. Weizsäcker Ethical and Political Problems of the Atomic Age p.9
21. Op cit p.59

22. Ibid p.66
23. Ibid p.67
24. Ibid p.68
25. Op cit p.112-140
26. Weizsäcker p.15
27. Op cit p.39
28. The Road to Peace and Peace is still the Prize (1941)
29. The Road to Peace p.17
30. Ibid p.18
31. Ibid p.42
32. Ibid p.49
33. Op cit p.49
34. Peace is still the Prize p.52
35. Ibid
36. Ibid
37. D. Mackinnon Borderlands of Theology p.177
38. Ibid p.183
39. Ibid p. 37-38
40. Ibid p.185
41. Paskins & Dockrill p. 225
42. Mackinnon p.190
43. Ibid p. 194
44. Church and Nation p.121
45. Ibid p. 121-122
46. Mackinnon p.201

THE CHAPLAINS' ROLE IN THE WORLD OF THE NUCLEAR DETERRENT

On the face of it there is something fundamentally disturbing about the profession of the faith of Jesus Christ and the *work* of a priest or minister within the Armed Forces where everyone is trained to kill (or nearly everyone). Most Military Chaplains would be incapable of any feeling if they were not sensitive to the tensions and the conflict that exists, particularly in today's world of the balance of power or the balance of terror. In the light of the foregoing discussion about Nuclear Deterrence it is important that we examine the role of the Military Chaplain and see if there is perhaps some theology, or ethical philosophy, whereby the Chaplain can order his life, come to terms with his conflict and practice his faith in an honest whole-hearted way.

He may turn to the Church for help and guidance, putting his problem fairly and squarely with the bench of Bishops, with Synod, or the Church Assembly. Alan Wilkinson in his book The Church of England and the First World War suggests that there is a dearth of writing and serious historical comment on the role of the Churches during the years 1914-1918 and that this was probably due to the fact that historical commentators either found the subject uncongenial or the influence of the Churches minimal. (1)

In the period leading up to the start of hostilities in World War I the Church was very active in *the* social field and its work in this area of man's deprivation was obviously much appreciated. However some historians have now concluded that while tolerance, kindness,

sympathy and compassion were all on the increase it is fair to say that any ~~more~~ transcendental Gospel, <sup>which</sup> the Church sought to proclaim largely fell on deaf ears. C F C Masterman makes the comment in his book The Condition of England in 1909 that

"The tide is ebbing within and without the Churches. The drift is towards a non-dogmatic affirmation of a general kindness and good fellowship, with an emphasis rather on the service of men than the fulfilment of the will of God.... It is the passing of a whole civilisation away from the faith in which it was founded and out of which it was fashioned". (2)

Many scholars like Wilkinson would agree with Masterman's analysis of the situation. After the war Chaplains too were eager to contribute their understanding of the situation and consequently many reports like The Army and Religion were published. It is a sad reflection on the Church that she was much criticised for her lack of teaching, her lack of involvement, her inability to communicate with the working classes in uniform and her treatment of those clergymen who volunteered for service with the colours.

In a recent article in Theology, Margaret Thrall surveys the current attitudes of the Bishops of the Church of England towards nuclear weapons and concludes: "The official contribution of the Church of England has been minimal or non-existent during the first two and a half decades of the nuclear era". (3) Leslie Paul is convinced that the Church is a compromised institution:

"Such is the situation of the Church of England. One

which it shares with every other great Church. It is tempting to say, this has nothing to do with Christ, let it end and let us start again .... The struggle of the Churches for incorruptibility in the midst of the corruption adds profoundly to our religious understanding of the tragedy and hope of man's situation, and what it means in the absence of hope to be the recipient of grace .... We have to remember that the Church is a "sinning Church". (4)

Paskins and Dockrill ( ) suggest that the present state of affairs with regard to the nuclear stalemate and the balance of terror is part of some evolutionary pattern with little or no moral guidance. Towards the end of their book they write:

"We undertook to try and show what the ethics of war is like. We began with a contemporary problem - the bombing of cities practised by States against one another, practised by insurgents and counter-insurgents, threatened in nuclear deterrence. We pointed out that the bombing of cities has evolved in an almost complete moral vacuum. It is the work of men with a job to do, a job other than the elaboration, clarification, defence and application of morality". (5)

It is in this moral vacuum that military chaplains find themselves today. The particular denominations they represent in the Forces endorse their licences and allow them to operate amongst men and women in uniform but seldom is any help or guidance given to them

for their peculiar type of ministry. After some initial training the Chaplain generally tends to be on his own as far as spiritual and moral guidance is concerned though every year there is a training seminar which endeavours to bring him up to date on some particular aspect of the Faith. However he has to live with his own conscience, come to terms with it or ignore it. In the military society of today he has to cope with all the aspects of nuclear, chemical and biological warfare. As far as the practical side is concerned he gets his training, as indeed does every soldier, but with any moral problems that may arise he is virtually left to his own devices. The operational side of the Forces tends not to think too deeply about the morality of nuclear strike weapons whereas the Chaplain, by his training and vocation, is brought face to face with the whole conflict situation. He must think of war and the possibility of war in moral terms. Raskins asserts that those who have done little to push into the political arena the moral issues relating to war are no better than criminals. (6) The famous Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals showed the world that every individual is responsible and indeed accountable for his own actions or the lack of them. No one can hide behind the orders of some superior being whether he is in uniform or Parliament. Where does the real blame lie one wonders? Is any member of society without blame?

Modern warfare is a most complicated affair, not only militarily speaking but <sup>also</sup> politically and ethically. It is questionable if anyone is beyond its reach or outside its compass. Even civilians, traditionally invulnerable, are now subject to all sorts of unpleasant things. In the past one could argue that it was wrong to hurt civilians. Then it became a matter of opinion as to whether or not civilians were involved in the war effort. There might follow a long list of possible exceptions

so that in the end the rule about not hurting civilians becomes more of a problem than an aid to solving problems. Most Christians however seem to arrive at their moral decisions in a much less academic and intellectual way. They have a basic underlying concept of right and wrong action and pursuing this they tend to judge the morality or otherwise of actions in a fairly down to earth pragmatic way. The Reverend Alan Booth, now a retired Methodist Minister, lectured to some members of the Royal Army Chaplains' Department in 1978 about his personal conflict problems and experiences when he was a member of the Student Christian Movement International at the outbreak of World War II.

"When I think of my own life in the Christian Faith,

I would say that few questions have absorbed me more than the one about role conflict, because of the times in which I have lived. My teenage life occurred in that period after the first world war, in the late twenties, when seniors talked with a kind of neurotic awe about an experience which they called "the trenches" and where the whole of the Christian Church had been so shocked that there was a powerful wave of pacifism as a consequence. Never again was there to be a war to end wars! So it was that in my student days, caught in that kind of atmosphere with a great many men of great sanctity and devotion, perceiving the Christian Faith in a new way and accepting it to condemn any resort to that sort of mass savagery again, that we were faced with the challenge of a totalitarian world in the thirties.

It meant a painful and agonizing reappraisal of the pacifist position and it was not the kind of appraisal

you do sitting in your study writing books and articles. For my generation it was a 'will you or will you not get involved in the next world war?'

It was quite simply a decision of life and death". (7)

Whenever the pacifist syllogism is being aired it needs to be earthed in a real situation and not simply discussed in an academic way.

Professor T B Jessop in an article called "The Morality of Pacifism and the Nuclear Deterrent" draws a clear distinction between the clean rightness of a concept with its black and white areas clearly defined, as opposed to the somewhat blurred definition of reality. The reality of a situation is a blend, a compound, a mixture of all sorts of circumstances and pressures whereas conceptually speaking the rightness or wrongness of actions are clearly distinguishable. In reality the "rightness" of an action becomes the "best possible action in the circumstances". There are occasions when the only available choice is that between two evils and to choose the lesser evil is the only right thing to do. (8) William Temple, when writing about the First World War described it as a "painful and vexatious interruption of a manner of life which it was hoped we might resume before long". However he saw the Second World War in an altogether different light. In Sep 1939 he could write:

"The prevailing conviction is that Nazi tyranny and oppression are destroying the traditional excellencies of European civilization and must be eliminated for the good of mankind".

Speaking for the Christian conscience Tremonger in his biography of Archbishop Temple writes:

"All the more for this reason (the reason of conscience) he found himself called to vindicate the character of God and to justify taking up arms in the name of the Prince of Peace".

In answer to the continual questioning of Pacifists Temple maintained that by and large the pacifist syllogism was too naive in such a complex situation. <sup>To the question</sup> "Was logic not the enemy of truth?" He replied that in a fallen world the rightness of most acts is only relative.

"To kill is right, if at all, relatively not absolutely; that is, it can only be right in special circumstances. But in those circumstances it is absolutely right." (9)

An interesting tangent on the whole ethical issue was raised by R M Adams in an article called "Autonomy and Theological Ethics". Normally most ethical scholars would have said that moral rightness and wrongness of actions consists in obedience to God's commands. Mr Adams' contention is that this sort of obedience is incompatible with a "proper regard for the virtue of autonomy". He quotes a recent critic of the divine command type of ethics:

"There is no room in morality for commands, whether they are the father's, the schoolmaster's or the priest's. There is still no room for them when they are God's commands. A moral agent is only in very special circumstances permitted to shelter behind the excuse, 'I was ordered to do it'. In morality we are responsible even for those actions which are responses to commands. We are responsible

for obeying commands. Some commands given by some people ought not to be obeyed. It would be wicked to obey them". (10)

We can here compare many soldiers who claimed immunity from the law because they were simply obeying commands. In effect abdicated from their moral responsibilities.

The conscientious soldier still feels it to be a duty to obey his superiors in a conscientious way. The cynical soldier has no conscience in the matter and consequently obeys simply to save his own skin otherwise he will be in trouble with the authorities. One shows responsibility whilst the other does not. However it seems to be an immature responsibility for it never questions the right of the one who commands obedience. If God commands us to love our neighbours, do we obey because he says so or because we know it right to love our neighbours? If we obey simply because God commands we may not be at all responsible. Autonomy is the other side of the argument. An autonomous soldier would be prepared to disobey orders if he thought they were wrong. In many ways he is like a fanatic and consequently worse than the conscientious soldier who simply obeys commands right or wrong. However motive here must enter into the discussion because if the motive is right it might also be right for the autonomous soldier to disobey orders whereas the conscientious one who obeys orders, <sup>Consequences</sup> whatever the  $\wedge$ , takes no notice of motives. The chief difference between the autonomous soldier and the conscientious soldier lies in the fact that the latter does what he does in order to obey whereas the autonomous soldier is prepared to disobey in order to do what he thinks is right <sup>Consequences</sup> whatever the  $\wedge$  "Evil doing is worse, and well doing is better, if done for its own sake and

not just from obedience. This suggests another reason why one might think that divine command ethics leaves less room than it ought to for autonomy". It is better to do well because of the intrinsic goodness of the action rather than simply in obedience to commands. "So perhaps the introduction of divine commands in ethics threatens to debase our motivation in well doing". Here Mr Adams quotes Paul Tillich:

"Autonomy asserts that man ... is his own law.

Heteronomy asserts that man ... must be subjected to a law, foreign and superior to him. Theonomy asserts that the superior law is at the same time, the innermost law of man himself, rooted in the divine ground which is man's own ground". (11)

A person, *even a soldier*, is theonomous to the extent that the following is true of him: he regards his moral principles as given him by God, but he also prizes them for their own sake. He acts in accordance with moral principles because not only does he love God but also he loves what God loves. "He has the motivational goods both of obedience and of autonomy". In conclusion Mr Adams would say that the theonomous person is the most responsible person in an ethical situation because he is motivated not only out of his love for God but also because he loves the moral principles for their own sake. (12)

Following on from this rather interesting discussion about autonomy and responsibility in Christian ethical traditions it is right that some time should be spent looking at the Pacifist arguments particularly in view of modern warfare. There seems to be roughly three main groups of Christians who respond to that modern situation. There is the group

who hold that military action is the ultimate sanction of the rule of law and that citizens must be taught that it is their duty to defend the law, by force if necessary. Then there is a second group who would refuse all kinds of military service convinced that an absolute witness against war and for peace is for them the will of God. Lastly, in broad terms, there is the group who would hold that, even though entering a war may well be a Christian's duty in particular circumstances, modern warfare, with its mass destruction, can never be an act of justice in the sense of it being a Just War, requiring a just cause and just means. The Just War tradition, which for years has played a most important role in all Christian thoughts and action over the centuries is now challenged *owing to the development of nuclear weapons.*

However the peace movement and the movement towards disarmament is not so easily defined. It reflects a wide variety of opinions and approaches. For some a general and a complete disarmament is the only step towards a world free of conflict tensions and injustices. Others no less committed to a peaceful world work towards *multilateral* nuclear disarmament with inspections of backpiles to ensure equal and fair shares for all. Some are in favour of unilateral disarmament, some in favour of limitation of arms and a slowing down of the race and some would support treaties such as SALT II. There seems to be no cohesive peace movement and certainly *Single comprehensive* no manifesto as such. Our national security rests on a somewhat complicated balance of power or terror based upon a doctrine of deterrence. Great Britain cannot, as it is argued, hope to "go it alone". She must rely upon collective security and a network of alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). There are consequently two foundations upon which our security depends at the moment. The only way

forward is to adopt the course which at the moment is seemingly acceptable by the majority :

- (a) Contain the Balance of Terror, as NATO has done since 1945
- (b) Pursue bilateral or even *multilateral* negotiations to slow down the arms race (SALT II for example)
- (c) Endeavour to prevent, by common agreement, the spread of conventional weapons including biological and chemical weapons
- (d) Try to remove the causes, social, economic, political for conflict, fear and distrust between nations

These problems were discussed in a recent report from the Board for Social Responsibility called Defence and Disarmament: Christians in a violent world. According to Graham Dowell, writing in Crucible the Report was sadly lacking in sound theological input. To be fair however the Report did emphasise the need to provide some remedy for the causes of fear and distrust though working on the theory that "you put your money where your mouth is". Great Britain seemed to be hell bent on spending even more, not less, on defence and consequently the slice of the financial cake was smaller for *causes like* disaster relief.

When it comes to the concept of deterrence itself G Dowell quotes the Bishop of Durham, Dr Habgood, in a sermon preached to mark the 30th Anniversary of NATO. Such an occasion was full of ambiguity

"The ambiguity of the human condition, that evil is found in the very citadels of human goodness, that we human beings are as easily trapped by our own strengths

as by our weaknesses, and may be destroyed

as much by our achievements as by our failures". (13)

Hence we find ourselves in a monstrous paradox that in the defence of our freedoms and in the name of peace, necessity drives us to accept a terrifying situation where terror is heaped on terror until there seems no end of the nightmare. We enter into a spiral, an escalation of arms, both nuclear and conventional until there is no escape, except perhaps an economic escape in that we can no longer afford the cost of staying in the race, though scientists inform us that nuclear weapons are among the most cheap to manufacture and provide. Fear is a most important factor to bear in mind, at either end of the spectrum, for the only way our fear can be reduced according to some politicians is to increase the fear of our enemies. Sometimes weakness in itself can be a cause for aggression. Open government is advocated with free access to each others "secrets". Above all there is a need for realism. The unilateral answer, advocated by so many of today's politicians and churches is too naive. Graham Dowell quotes Bonhoeffer

"There can be a peace which is worse than struggle.

But it must be a struggle out of love for the other,  
a struggle of spirit and not of the flesh .....

"There is no peace unless righteousness and truth are  
preserved".

There is no easy answer to our dilemmas; the dilemmas posed by the defence policies supported by our government democratically elected and the seemingly uncompromising demands of the Kingdom of God.

"The dangers we run if we pursue our present course - the growth of militarism, especially in developing countries; the spectres of nuclear pollution, accident or conflict; above all, the unforgiveable waste of human resources - all these may at long last be compelling the Churches to abandon conformity and make a confessional stance". (14)

This indeed is exactly what the Netherlands Reformed Church has succeeded in doing. Their stand is courageous and . . . unique amongst European Churches. However the publication of their "Kernbewapening" has caused consternation amongst those Christians serving in their Armed Forces. Some members of the forces took to the streets in Holland and joined Anti-Nuclear War marches and demonstrations whilst still dressed in their military uniforms. The anti-nuclear lobby was given a tremendous morale boost whereas the militarists could only offer half hearted comments about . . . lack of discipline, military trades unionism and freedom. The conflict amongst Dutch military chaplains however was quite plain to see. They met and consulted with each other in the hopes of finding a modus operandi for themselves and their men in the light of these new political and indeed ecclesiastical initiatives.

"After mutual consultation the following conclusions were provisionally reached:

- (a) The Protestant Chaplains have found the directives of such great importance that they have taken the necessary steps to start discussions (publications, lessons, study groups) within the Royal Netherlands Navy about the Church's testimony;

- (b) The Protestant Chaplains, by their attitude, wanted to express that they stand beside the personnel of the Royal Netherlands Navy". (15)

After further consultation, discussion and study, questions were still being raised about the role of the Chaplains and these were submitted to the Synod of the Reformed Church.

"The Christian presence in a non-Christian world asks for renewed consideration. How are we to serve God, not outside, but within the power structures of this world? How do we bring the message of peace to a "War Service"? What do self-denial and trust in God mean in our existence amongst various delicate balances of power (between married people, parents and children, in industrial relations and between national and international relations). To what extent can Christians differ in their choice of violence or non-violence as a means for getting justice and freedom, without forgetting that the other fellow is a fellow Christian?" (16)

In his book, On Being the Church in the World, Bishop John Robinson examines the controversial and sometimes conflicting role of the Christian in the world, "in, but not of the world"; always too little in the world and too much of the world. This thought was examined by the Dutch Naval Chaplains in their discussions and teaching. How does a Christian live in a world

"amidst the conflicting, questionable and at times thoroughly bad structures, is preeminently a question which is becoming a topic with the Chaplains of the Forces and which at the same time fades away; a question which puts itself forward and which is suppressed simultaneously". (17)

The Dutch Chaplains agonize about their problem. If the Church's testimony is that God wants life and not death, preservation and not destruction, order and not chaos, then it follows, that everything in conflict with these ends must be rejected. They give as an example the arms race which opposes in an "unreassuringly diabolic way God's intention". How are they to react to such an arms race? What must they advise their men to do? Just they

- (a) state clearly what the attitude of the Chaplaincy is and of the individual Chaplain in particular
- (b) try to develop the conscience of the military man so that he can make his own decisions". (10)

Some questions inevitably arise demanding serious attention: *What will happen to members of the Forces who may be encouraged to leave on conscientious grounds?* Is the Church prepared to look after them having advised them to leave the military sphere of employment? What will become of the Chaplaincy service? If the Church and State are divided, *the government which, after all, has been elected by democratic processes, might prohibit military chaplains from expressing the views of the Church which they legally represent in the service.* In the light of all these possibilities it may be that chaplains will have to leave the Forces and then what will become of their men, both spiritually and pastorally?

Suppose the military chaplain is against nuclear arms, can he continue to stand beside the men in the Forces when the Royal Netherlands Navy, as part of the Dutch Forces, which is a member of NATO, use nuclear arms?

If so, can he do his work conscientiously in an organisation which operates against his Church's teachings and where he is a guide for men who act clearly against God's intentions with mankind and the world?" (19)

It seems that none of these questions have been answered by the Church in Holland and so, at the present time, Chaplains in the Dutch Forces continue to hold, in tension and conflict, their dilemma as well as their jobs in the Forces. At the moment other Chaplains in NATO forces are beginning to wonder if they too will have to face the same problems as their brothers in Holland. There could, in the foreseeable future in Great Britain, be a situation whereby the Church is left undecided about its place in the nuclear arms debate *while* a left wing government could conceivably alter its ground to an anti-nuclear stance. Under these circumstances the Dutch problem would not arise. It is only when Church and State decide differently, as in Holland, that the servicemen and their chaplains are out on a limb serving an armed force contrary to the will of the Church. Could it be argued perhaps that in Great Britain politicians are leading the Church in areas of public morality? Obviously there are theological problems to face at the very outset. We know well that the Lord we follow, the Gospel we preach and the records we have of what Jesus said, make it quite clear that those who opposed him were still nevertheless the object of his love and not his hate. "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; to him who smites you on the cheek, turn the other one also". These were not just words preached by Jesus on a mountainside, they were actually the way he lived. "Nothing can separate us from the love of God" means for Christians that nothing can separate us and our

enemies from the love of God. Both sides in any dispute are within the orbit of God's love.

Life, at the moment, is in danger of becoming a mixture of divided loyalties all stemming from peculiar and sometimes distorted views of the nature of God. Some scholars would suggest that because of our inability to live at peace with our neighbours that God suffers. Yet in medieval times the concept of a suffering God was unacceptable.

The God, <sup>worshipped by</sup> one section of the community, is kind and gentle, courteous and forbearing. The advocates of this sort of God <sup>fail to</sup> see soldiers coming within the orbit of his love, except as sinners. Other scholars maintain that this view of God is not properly balanced because he is also very much a God of power and might.

He is a creative God, making things happen by the use of his creative power -- "God spoke .... and it was done". Now, it could be maintained that, whether divine or human <sup>power</sup>, is not a very popular concept among many people today, except perhaps for <sup>the rather naive notion of</sup> "Flower power".

The psychology for rejecting power is difficult to follow except that in the words of Lord Acton "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely".

The concept of God as absolute power is for many people an offence and yet it is at the very heart of our faith. What makes the mystery complete is that God uses his power in self denying love, in showing mercy and pity, in redeeming and reconciling. There is no hint of abuse or corruption. It is part of God's nature and the secret of the Incarnation. A child first meets God as power when he discovers the force of heat by burning his fingers. The world he discovers is not his to control therefore he sets limits upon himself in order to keep alive. His first understanding of God is as a God of power, who hurts him sometimes, who prevents him from doing things and who is

bigger and stronger than he. The God who holds the world and the human race in the palm of his hand is a God of power. To worship and indeed see only one facet of his character is to have an unbalanced view of the world he created. Modern society is in danger, according to some theologians, of worshipping only the compassionate, loving, caring aspects of God's personality and consequently we are in danger of being cosy and complacent whereas **there** is another aspect, that of power, and this continually challenges us in a most radical way.

*One curious* feature in the behaviour of many people at the moment which might be relevant. Evidence exists of a moral ambiguity in our present society. The very people who have turned away in horror and revulsion from thoughts of war are often found actively engaged in supporting revolutionaries and Freedom fighters elsewhere. In the introduction to a little book produced and published by the World Council of Churches (WCC) there is a quotation from their conference on Disarmament held in April of 1978 which clearly states the hard line taken on such matters by the WCC.

"We are now living in the shadow of an arms race more intense, more costly, more widespread and more dangerous than the world has ever known. Never before has the human race been as close as it is now to total self destruction. Today's arms race is an unparalleled waste of human and material resources; it threatens to turn the whole world into an armed camp; it aids repression and violates human rights; it promotes violence and insecurity in place of the security in

whose name it is undertaken; it frustrates humanity's aspirations for justice and peace; it has no part in God's design for His World; it is demonic". (20)

E Regehr the writer of Militarism is at great pains to emphasise the problems caused by the arms race particularly to underdeveloped countries in the Third World. *The transfer of nuclear weapons to the Third World :* in recent years *has led to political and economic dependence and in the end control by the supplying country.*

"The gross violation of human rights in Countries dominated by externally supplied and trained armed forces represents one of the most tragic consequences of the worldwide arms race. In too many instances "defence" forces are used to violate the security of the people, maintaining instead the security of special interests". (21)

In some questions for discussion Regehr writes:

"The Global arms cost has reached \$ 400 billion a year and is growing. According to the annual report,

'World military and Social Expenditure, 1978:'

- The average family pays more in taxes to support the world arms race than to educate its children.
- Only one government in three spends as much to safeguard the health of its citizens as to protect them against military attack.
- Developing countries, despite severe food shortages,

use five times as much foreign exchange for the import of arms as for agricultural machinery.....  
 What do you think about the relationship between the lack of basic human necessities and the vast amounts of resources used for war preparation? Can we have both guns and butter?" (22)

These are questions all Christians must have to face sooner or later. Many scholars today would argue that the next major world confrontation will not be on an East versus West axis but between the North and the South, or *broadly* between the industrialized wealthy countries of the North and the poor underdeveloped countries of the South. One thing is certain, WCC grants to some underdeveloped countries in South Africa are actually being spent on arms to support the South African Peoples organisation against the government of South Africa. Is this not adding to the arms race? Is the World Council of Churches not being too involved in political situations that are closely connected to revolution through violence? Recently The Salvation Army has decided to withdraw its support of the World Council of Churches on this very issue. It has been said that the WCC preaches a doctrine of anti-militarism and yet practices it by its financial programmes. "More notice might be taken of its pronouncements if it could show to the world a pair of clean hands and a pure heart" said a spokesman for the Salvation Army. John Macquarrie examines the whole field of human relations in connection with the *ethic of peace*. He points out that while certain elements in human society are turning away from war the very same people are actively involved in revolution of one sort and another. He tells us that during the

early Church Christians generally followed the paths of non-resistance and non violence. "The blood of the martyrs proved indeed to be the seed of the <sup>early</sup> Church". But after the Emperor Constantine had established his position by force of arms, Christian attitudes began to change.

"In the new situation we find St Augustine for instance, writing to a young man: 'Do not think that it is impossible for anyone to please God while engaged in active military service!' Yet it would be wrong to conclude cynically that the change in the Church's situation was the sole cause that led to the abandonment of pacifist attitudes. An ambiguity had been there from the beginning. For while the New Testament had its teaching on non-resistance, it also had a quite definite teaching on the Christian's duty to the State. Christianity did not mean dropping out of the world, but living in tension or dialectic with the world. And it is impossible to do this without in some ways participating in the corporate sins of the world, including its violence". (23)

The Christian Church of today is still divided on the pacifist issue. Military Chaplains are continually being harassed by those who maintain that to serve in the army in defence of the realm is an evil thing to do. Perhaps there are greater evils in the world. John Macquarrie, like Alan Booth, tells the story of Bertrand Russell's conversion away from a strictly pacifist attitude at the time of Hitler's rise to totalitarian power. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was another pacifist who, in the face of great evil and great provocation became actively concerned to bring about the downfall of Hitler. Some scholars have argued that

in some circumstances perhaps violence and war are seen to be the only desperate solution to desperate problems. We are reminded by Paskins, however, that

"those who dismiss pacifism as unrealistic take it for granted that resort to war is a realistic thing to do, and obviously so. Such an assumption is unwarranted by experience: Clausewitz and the pre-pacifist Tolstoy are but two of the many well informed students of war who insist on the uncontrolled character of war, the reliance on chance, the gift of oneself to luck, the loss of moral courage over one's own actions that is an inevitable consequence of engaging in action with a military dimension. In short, the dismissal of pacifism as unrealistic is based on a facile lack of realism. Pacifists often point out that they are not urging people to be totally passive in response to violent repression, that the techniques of non violent resistance developed by Gandhi, Martin Luther King and others provide in many situations a real alternative to reliance upon violence. The automatic reply is that non violence was all very well against the British in India and in support of Civil Rights in the US but would be hopeless against a more ruthless enemy - look at Hitler's extermination camps and Stalin's murder of millions". (24)

Macquarrie points out that when one is dealing with a completely ruthless enemy who rejects any restraint arising from an acknowledg-

ment of a natural law, then it might well be argued that one is thrown back on violence. (25) Against all of this however, it is still arguable that since the early Christians chose death as preferable to taking up arms against the might and tyranny of the Roman Empire, Christians of today should be prepared to accept the same fate. Perhaps one should not forget that in terms of eschatological hopes the early Christians were convinced that the end was fairly imminent. Death, one way or another, followed by the glorious hope of eternity and the realised Kingdom was something that influenced the minds of many early Christians. After two thousand years however thoughts of eschatology are not so imbued with a sense of urgency. It might be argued that the quality of life itself is of more importance than a readiness to face death. It is not the intention to get involved in the whole problem of Christians and violent revolution. It is agreed that this is a subject that has some considerable bearing on the present problem and it has been dealt with in detail by scholars like J Deotis Roberts, H Arendt, and J G Davies and many others. (26) Professor Davies for example writes that:

"It is only when they have total respect for human beings, joined to a profound love of peace, that Christians may engage in revolution and seek to differentiate between the means they employ". (27)

Relevant to this consideration is a statement in the leading article of "The Times" (10 December 1974)

"Most Christians are not pacifists. They believe in the right of an oppressed or attacked people to take up arms in its own defence. But it is the

special role of the clergy to keep alive the virtue of compassion in the nation at war, to remind the fighter that his enemy is also his brother and that public peril cannot justify private hate".

This role ~~should not~~ be confined to the clergy. Indeed it is something incumbent upon all Christians so to behave. At the end of his chapter on peace and violence Macquarris wonders if Bonhoeffer was justified in changing his mind and as a consequence taking up a rather violent and revolutionary stance against the evils of Hitler and Nazi Germany. On moral questions like this he says:

"There is always some ambiguity. As Christians and as human beings we have to take the risk of moral action amid the ambiguities of life. It is impossible to say unequivocally that there was no better way than the one Bonhoeffer took or that his action can be totally justified. But it does seem clear that what would have been wrong on his part would have been to refuse the ambiguous decision and do what so many of his fellow citizens and fellow churchmen were doing - that is to say, nothing at all in the face of what was happening. As against their non-action, Bonhoeffer's action is justified a thousand times over". (28)

The ambiguity of the situation is further experienced by the Christian in his perception of the character of God where both love

and power are held together in the one personality.

At a recent Conference for Military Chaplains held in Geneva 14 - 18 September 1981 this idea was described by one of the theologians as being one of "complementarianism". Professor Dr Honecker from Bonn University introduced this concept in order to describe a situation which could possibly face two people of similar beliefs. At the point of decision both could take up opposite points of view and yet both be complementary to each other. For instance, faced by the issue of defence, one person sees it his duty to become a soldier, another to become a pacifist. Each has some reservations about his decision, hence the ambiguity. The other person then represents his reservations. Each complements the other in displaying the whole truth of the situation. The danger lies in failing to appreciate this delicate balance in the pluralism of a modern human society. When one side begins to force its views upon the other side then democracy ceases to have any meaning. At one time in the history of the world men could talk of the beneficial effects of certain uses of force. The extension of the British Empire could have arguably been regarded as an extension and an advance of humanity.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

"It is indeed a warped, perverse and silly morality which would forbid a course of conquest that has turned whole continents into the seats of mighty and flourishing civilized nations". (29)

After World War I however such an attitude to the use of force, even when used as a means to good ends, has to be justified. This change of attitudes has probably been brought about by the increasing

destructiveness of war. There is a growing sense of obligation which some scholars argue has been prompted by man's reason, sympathy and understanding of his universality. John Stuart Mill writing in 1861 in an essay on "Utilitarianism" says that:

"The same superiority of intelligence (which broadens the range of interests), joined to the power of sympathising with human beings generally enables him to attach himself to the collective idea of his tribe, his country or mankind, in such a manner that any act hurtful to them raises his instinct of sympathy and urges him to resistance". (30)

It has therefore been argued that men find it difficult to ignore the effect of force on others and this in turn leads to restraint upon the type of force to be used. The continual need to justify the use of force could be said to be moral progress.

"The belief that growing rationality must result in moral progress is of course largely rooted in the assumption that reason not only enables man to comprehend the interests and the claims of others but compels him to apply the same criteria to the claims of others that he applies to his own. To this extent justice is the result - in Reinhold Niebuhr's phrase - of reason's insistence upon consistency. But if it is reason that bids man to treat equals equally, it is not reason - or, at least, it is not reason alone - that tells him who are, or ought to be, equals. Moreover the same reason that bids man act

consistently also enables him to demonstrate that apparently similar actions are nonetheless dissimilar in their significance and in consequence must be judged differently. Thus the ingenuity of some governments demonstrates that apparently similar actions constitute legitimate self-defence when taken by themselves and aggression when taken by an adversary". (31)

To "love ones enemies" could be taken to be a command addressed to the individual as opposed to the group. To pursue a social morality directly from a personal morality can be very misleading. Can nations respond to events <sup>in the same way</sup> as individuals can? Nations and groups are normally bound together by some sort of common interest and the bigger the group the less elaborate and sophisticated must be the binding interest. Individuals in any group can transcend their self interest but groups or nations find it difficult. What groups and nations tend to have in common is their humanity. Humanity is certainly more obvious than sanctity! To ask a group or a nation to "love its enemies" is to ask what must seem to be virtually impossible. Can America, in any realistic sense, ever love Russia? Can the Army in Northern Ireland, in any realistic sense, ever love the IRA? Can Catholics in Ireland love Protestants? All that can be hoped for is that these groups of nations and diverse societies relate to each other justly. <sup>Structures have to be built</sup> In order to facilitate the operation of justice between groups and nations

One group, it could be argued, by its own dynamism, could pursue its own interests to the limit unless safeguards were implanted to prevent such self interest taking over. <sup>Here</sup> The inherent danger is that the structures

themselves can become so powerful that they can get out of hand, for example in a police state. Alternative power structures are then sought in order to provide checks and balances. Thus justice is finally achieved and the majority of the people are the happier for it. Social groups are not then asked to trust each other for this could be asking too much in the face of one group's determination to realise its own self interest. Structures then take the place of trust and relations can be stabilized so that life and commerce and industry can continue without fear of unfair competition. Love taken seriously in this context means building structures to support justice and prevent the arbitrary imposition of one interest upon another. This means that nations have armies and police forces in order to support their external and internal structures. In this sense power has a role to play in the direct support of structures which guarantee some sort of justice in world affairs and in national politics. The army then has its place in the bigger world picture. Within the army too, within its structured society, there is needed a sense of justice otherwise certain factions might tend to dominate and the army be taken over and even misused or abused to support a particular group rather than the cause of justice. Here the role of the military chaplain is paramount for he acts as a sort of conscience within the very structures of the forces of power. He can see to it, and often does by his presence, that the dynamism of the forces is directed in the right way, for just and legitimate ends. If he fails in this he fails in being a chaplain worthy of his salt or indeed of his calling. As the Church is to the Society around it so must the chaplain be to his unit. Over the past 2000 years Society has frequently changed and the record of the Christian Church during these changes is not insignificant. *Despite some arguable features*

<sup>on the whole</sup>  
 the influence of the Church has <sup>been</sup> for good. It has seen its  
 role in preserving law and order and justice. It has identified itself  
 with Empires and Kingdoms. It has been influential in all the major  
 areas of progress. It has upheld the structures of our Society with  
 a clear conscience and a good heart. However some scholars of  
 political science would say that the signs of the times are changing.  
 Structures are being examined and found wanting. Society seems to be  
 on the threshold of seeking new structures, new paradigms and new  
 patterns for living. <sup>are needed</sup> New wine skins <sup>for</sup> all  
<sup>which is</sup> the new wine <sup>being</sup> produced. It can be argued that the Christian in  
 today's world sees himself, not so much <sup>as</sup> preserving law and order, <sup>but</sup>  
*as a participant in a new society like the Jews of old in Babylonia.* Once  
 again we are being asked to become political sojourners and pilgrims.  
 Our concern for the defence of the status quo should be continually  
 examined in the light of new embryonic movements towards the future.  
 Our concern for defence is that it should become part of this movement  
 for the future as well as a power for stability in the present and  
 not simply a mindless refrigeration of the past. Many Christians  
 are asking serious questions about the place and the future of so  
 called "Freedom Fighters" in Africa and South America. Some are even  
 beginning to wonder if it is God's will that we should be "red" rather  
 than dead and that we should be allowed to sit by some Communist  
 totalitarian waters weeping as did the Jews of old. To justify the  
 cost, in both human and financial terms, of defence, it is very  
 necessary to be sure that the cause we are defending is right. There  
 is a real danger here because none of the wars of history has been so  
 horrible as the wars of religion, when both sides thought that they  
 were right. It is easy to argue that people are fighting on God's

side and that concessions are impossible because of it. Another hard line is therefore assumed and the conflict becomes more than ever difficult to resolve. One of the hardest problems for Chaplains in the military environment is to support men and women in defence of warlike activities, and yet somehow still preserve, in their own minds, an understanding that all our causes can be ambiguous. None of our causes can ever coincide with the cause of God and yet it is equally true to say that none of us would ever support a cause that did not contain some element of Christianity in it. Even in the last war, despite the nature of Hitler's regime, there was a curious ambiguity about it. The Archbishop of Canterbury felt deeply about this ambiguity and could never bring himself to write prayers for victory. In a letter to the Archbishop of York in February 1944 he wrote:

"I am afraid I distress you by the fact that the forms of prayer which I draw up do not contain direct prayers for victory .....

I am of course prepared to say ..... 'Grant us victory if it be thy will..... I have always tried to draw up prayers which do not range us over against our fellow Christians in Germany or elsewhere, because it seems to me that the primary concern in prayer must be the approach to the Father of all men, with recognition that all His other children have the same right of approach, and that if we pray as our Lord taught us, we are never praying against each other, because we are always praying not that what we want shall be done, that that what God wants shall be done, and that we may be used for doing it .....

I think the maintenance of the spiritual fellowship of all Christians is for the Church a concern that takes precedence even of the military defeat of Nazi-ism". (32)

When the war was ended it was possible for Christians fighting on opposite sides to meet again, build up trust and respect and endeavour to resolve their superficial differences in a common allegiance to their Lord and master.

Whatever the future may hold in store for the world it is evident that we live in a world steeped in sin and far from achieving God's will. In such a world often the best thing that can be done is to effect a compromise between good and evil. Sometimes the choice is between two evils for that is the only choice available. It is nevertheless right to do it because it is the best possible thing to do and then in the words of William Temple:

"We have to do the best we can, being what we are, in the circumstances where we are - and then God be merciful to us sinners". (33)

Perhaps <sup>if</sup> in the end of the day we are not prepared to accept the dictum that "might is right", ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> abundance of power seems to be required and this is what the world has got.

"The arguments about the deterrent have lost their sting. The Soviet 'threat' does not now appear as menacing as once it did to British government. Britain no longer claims first class status or even

a 'special relationship' with the United States. Bureaucratic momentum may keep the deterrent in being, but only while the cost is modest, and the civilian nuclear programme has long been separate from the military enterprise. The public debate has been muted until recently. The deterrent remains and is likely to do so. It satisfies a basic urge for independence, for a say in the holocaust, a macabre form of participation. The possibility of acting provides an element of reassurance which governments, no matter how pragmatic in opposition, may go to considerable lengths to preserve to a surprising degree of public approval. Interdependence in the every day management of the deterrent when it matters little cannot hide its principle rationale - an independent role in basic security matters in the last resort". (34)

In July 1979 the Church of England Synod debated a report on defence and disarmament prepared by a working party convened by the International Affairs Committee of the Board for Social Responsibility. In discussing the two main areas of its programme it came in for much criticism, owing to its lack of theological insight *in failing* to distinguish between members of the Forces and civilians involved in a war, *as well as* to recognise the difference between nuclear weapons and conventional weapons. However it did point out that "a government's first duty is to provide for the security of its people". It further showed that twice in this century the government of the United Kingdom had failed because it did not defend its people from

aggression taking place. The writers of the report were concerned that the failure to prevent aggression in 1939 and 1914 should not be experienced a third time. *They agreed that it must never happen but failed to reach agreement on the way to prevent it,*

"Today the concept of deterrence - of warning any aggressor of certain retribution - is enshrined in the doctrine of collective security, in the case of the Western World, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). It warns that an attack on one country will activate the defence of fifteen countries; and in the present state of technology, this means that if nuclear weapons are used by an aggressor, they will be used against him. It is a precaution unprecedented in history, and it seems to work". (35)

Defence is important but yet the arms race continues to increase with each generation of new weapons being produced. The piling up of arsenals has been described by two former US Secretaries for Defence, as disgusting and obscene. All civilised people may well recognise the case for disarmament, however, no one seems to be agreed on how to achieve it.

Lambeth Conferences since 1930 have all stated that:

"war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ".

The Roman Catholic Bishops in September 1978 called for:

"a balanced reduction of Armed Forces and conventional weapons; the halting and reversing of the nuclear arms race and the prohibition of the development of other weapons of mass destruction".

The Pope in January 1979 said that Christians should be prepared to "make gestures of peace, even audacious ones, to break free from vicious circles .... peace is our work" he concluded. All these generalities are helpful in some degree but the report still left us with three major options: to support pacifism; to support a disarmament programme laterally to argue in favour of a uni-lateral programme. The report found in favour of the doctrine first put forward by Sir Winston Churchill as he fought hard to bring to an end the cold war situation of the 1960s - "We arm to parley". The policy of Britain's nuclear deterrent was examined and the fact that even "military authorities are the first to recognise that this is not a military decision but a political and moral one" <sup>was noted.</sup> If Britain does withdraw from the nuclear pact she also has to withdraw from NATO because the defensive strategy of NATO is based upon nuclear weapons. If she was to withdraw she would leave the "dirty work" for others to do and this does not seem to be either ethical or practical. According to some scholars the report was theologically very weak. People were looking to the Church for answers and finding none. It was clear that there was no clear solution to the age old Christian dilemma. Canon Paul Oestreicher then proposed a motion that the Synod

"grateful that the Church's role in preserving and promoting peace has been opened up by the report, urges the Board for Social Responsibility to explore how the theological debate relating to discipleship in this field might be more effectively and purposefully conducted throughout the Church of England in the light of the witness and insights of the whole Ecumenical Movement".

Though he considered himself a pacifist he did not find it difficult "to break bread with those who take upon themselves the guilt of violence". He did not believe that the pacifist was less guilty than the soldier; all shared the guilt of the violence which went on in society, and in the so called small wars in which there was so much suffering.

It is to the Church of England's shame and to the shame of the Synod in particular that it had taken the Synod so long to wrestle with these important questions. Until the Church can produce some definitive statement the pacifist and the militarist will continue to carry on the battle to decide the structure of our earthly societies. In the end of the day, by whatever the means, may mankind continue to enjoy the peace of God that passes all understanding.

1. Wilkinson Op cit p.2
2. Ibid p.7
3. Ibid p.4 (See Theology August 1972 p148)
4. Ibid p.4
5. B Paskins & M Dockrill The Ethics of War p. 313
6. Ibid p. 314
7. Alan R Booth - Correspondence to RACHD Centre 1978
8. F E Jessop - "The Morality of Pacifism and the Nuclear Deterrent"  
(RAF Chaplains)
9. F A Irononger - William Temple p. 542
10. Graeme de Gaaff, "God and Morality" in I T Ramsey  
Christian Ethics and Contemporary Philosophy p. 34.
11. Paul Tillich, The Protestant Era pp 56f
12. R M Adams "Autonomy and Theological Ethics" in  
Religious Studies No 15 (Cambridge U Press)
13. Graham Dowell, "Defence, Disarmament and Christian Obedience,"  
in Crucible April/June 1980 p.70
14. Ibid p.76
15. Letter from Dutch Naval Chaplains to the Synod of the  
Reformed Church of the Netherlands
- 16.-19. Ibid
20. Ernie Ragahr Militarism (World Council of Churches) p. IX
21. Ibid p.44
22. Ibid p.51
23. J Macquarrie The Concept of Peace p.49
24. Paskins and Dockrill p. 256
25. Macquarrie Op cit p.51
26. See J Deotis Roberts, "Liberation and Reconciliation " in  
H. Arendt, On violence p. 79.
27. J G Davies Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution p. 175
28. Macquarrie p.61

29. Howard K Beale Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power p. 160
30. Everymans Library John Stuart Mill p. 63
31. Robert E Osgood and Robert W Tucker, Force, Order and Justice p. 199
32. Iremonger p. 557
33. Ibid p. 542
34. British Defence Policy in a Changing World Ed J Baylis p. 153
35. Defence and Disarmament - A report by the Church of England Committee for Social Responsibility No. 9 p.7

THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Background History.

Some people would maintain that the beginnings of the "Irish problem" can be traced to 1916 when on Easter Monday republican supporters led an uprising in Dublin and from the captured General Post Office, declared Ireland a republic. Others would claim that 1690 is a much more appropriate date for the start of the troubles. In fact the arrival in Ireland of Henry II in 1171 first drew together two of the four strands that constitute the background of today's problem. Henry brought his considerable army to Ireland as a precautionary measure because some of his barons had already settled in parts of that country and had become local rulers. Henry, fearful lest any of them should become too powerful and become a threat to his throne, used his army to remind both English and Irish alike that he was still the supreme power in the land. Since that day Great Britain has been involved in Irish affairs - as a civilizing or an oppressing force, depending upon the point of view. There were many crises in the long blood stained history of that country but perhaps the most significant occurred in the period 1920-22 when the British Government declared illegal both Sinn Fein (the political wing of the Irish Republican Army) and the "Irish government" meeting in the Dail in Dublin. This particular government was formed by those seventy-three Sinn Fein candidates who were properly elected to Westminster in the 1918 election but refused to take their seats. The situation ended in the all too familiar stalemate resulting in a savage guerilla war waged by the Irish Republican Army (IRA) against the forces of law and order. Atrocities and reprisals took place on both sides. Britain could no doubt win a war on military grounds but to do so

would entail abandoning her political influence. The IRA could not win militarily but on the other hand it had the support of the people.

A compromise solution came in two parts. Two parliaments would be set up - one in Belfast the other in Dublin. It proved to be a recipe for political disaster and yet another failure to solve the Irish problem was witnessed when civil war broke out. Eventually a "treaty" allowing Irish "independence" was signed in 1921 but still there were unacceptable strings attached and so the Southern Irish pressed for the division of Ireland and the North, oddly enough, supported the desire to be divided. By 1936 De Valera, the prime minister of Southern Ireland had produced a new constitution that made the country a republic in everything but name. Ireland became neutral during World War II. On Easter Monday 1949 Ireland was proclaimed a republic. In the same year Westminster passed the Ireland Act which established two constitutional points of great importance. The first was that the constitutional position of Northern Ireland could not be changed without the consent of the Northern Ireland Parliament at Stormont. The second was that the imperial government could not intervene in Ulster's internal affairs unless a breakdown in law and order occurred. This was the basis of the Downing Street Declaration of August 1969, which dispatched British troops to quell the Belfast riots. Only a month before the Reverend Ian Paisley, the leader of the more vociferous loyalists, told an assembly at Castleneagh that all loyal Orangemen were engaged in what he called "the great battle of Biblical Protestantism against popery". By early August Catholics, loyalists and Police were clashing with greater violence and an increasing disregard for public life and property. The Apprentice Boys' march

and actions in Derry on 12 August so provoked the city's Catholics that they attacked the marchers and the police. People everywhere in the province were terror stricken, intimidated and vulnerable to attack, and Northern Ireland was on the verge of Civil War. Civil War, it has been said, started in Belfast on 14 August 1969. That night extremists on both sides and B-Specials, an auxiliary - largely Protestant-police force, went on a spree of shooting and arson that claimed eight lives. Prime minister Harold Wilson had no alternative and sent six thousand officers and men into West Belfast in order to restore law and order. Thus Britain, after a physical absence of less than fifty years was again directly involved in the affairs of Northern Ireland.

On the 30th August 1969 The Times said

"There are two communities in Northern Ireland, different in their origins, nursing different historical myths, possessing distinguishable cultures, having different songs and heroes, and wearing different denominations of the same religion. Religion is the clearest badge of these differences. But the conflict is not about religion. It is about the self-assertion of two distinct communities, one of which is dominant in the public affairs of the province".

#### Life in Northern Ireland today.

Generally speaking the people of Northern Ireland are a decent, hard-working, friendly people whose main characteristic is kindness. Their terrible tragedy is that it is they upon whom "the sins of their

forefathers" are being visited. They are an insecure people and this insecurity manifests itself in a belligerent independent spirit. They do not really understand the connections between the spiritual, moral and social values they hold so near and dear. Nor do they understand the standpoint of those who hold different values. Consequently in addition to their insecurity they have become insular and at times defensively aggressive, lest their inadequacy become exposed for all to see and ridicule. In this way, of course, they are consequently no different from any of their neighbours in England, Scotland or Wales or, for that matter, anywhere else in the world.

To these people came a large proportion of the British Army in 1969. Force levels have fluctuated according to the size of the threat at any particular time and in relation to the deployment of troops worldwide. With each battalion a Chaplain has been posted. His job has been summarised as follows: to minister to soldiers, to liaise with local clergy and congregations, to keep in touch with families of soldiers, to be responsible for visiting next of kin and families of wounded soldiers, to provide a meeting ground for peace talks at the local level. In order, however, to understand more clearly the conflict situation for Chaplains, of all denominations, serving in Northern Ireland it will be necessary to consider the views, prejudices and practices of the average Ulsterman - both Protestant and Catholic. (I shall use these labels for they are the most convenient and most easily recognisable bearing in mind the quotation from The Times which indicates that the conflict is not simply about religion).

All of the people in Northern Ireland are British. They owe their allegiance to Queen Elizabeth II, are represented at Westminster and pay their taxes as do other citizens of the United Kingdom. Although

this is a political and constitutional fact of life for everyone, only the Protestants feel British. A survey published in 1971 by Professor Richard Rose showed that about 70% of all Protestants approved of Northern Ireland's Constitution whereas the figure for Catholics was about 30%. (1)

Historically, as we have seen, the province comprises two distinct groups of peoples: descendants of the native Catholic Irish and descendants of the Transplanted Protestant English and Scots. In Ulster today these divisions continue to be clearly apparent. The 1961 census showed that there were 413,000 Presbyterians, 345,000 Church of Ireland members, 72,000 Methodists and 498,000 Roman Catholics. The Catholics still resent the 'invasion' that cost them their land and the others still resent and despise the traditions and religion of the 'natives'. Thus the primary cause of tension was, and still is, ethnic. Religion, as opposed to race, is the easiest peg upon which to hang all the differences endemic to the Northern Irish people as opposed to those who have similar ethnic problems in South Africa, Canada, America or Brixton and Bradford. The centuries old ethnic division in Ulster colours all contemporary thinking about the province and its problems. One faction equates England's ruling of Ireland with colonialism, chauvinism, and economic subjection; the other sees it as an exercise in loyalty and in preserving national boundaries, coupled with an attempt perhaps to civilize the 'natives'.

Differences are built into the population almost from birth. Children are taught only those aspects of history that are considered beneficial to their particular group. Thus one group of children can learn about Cromwell's massacres at Drogheda and Lifford, the

callousness of the British Government during the great famine, and the brutality of the Black and Tans, whilst the other group is carefully nurtured on the glorious Protestant Victory at the Boyne, the sacrifice of hundreds of loyal Ulstermen at the Battle of the Somme in 1916 and the treason of the Easter Rebellion in the same year. The need for security is forever being sought by both groups of people. Catholics in the North feel insecure because they are in the minority and consequently they turn to their kinsfolk in the South. This action is immediately interpreted as an act of betrayal by the Protestants who in their turn feel insecure *as a minority in Ireland as a whole* and so they tend to look to the British for support. Republican Ireland sees this as a threat and so the whole vicious cycle keeps on revolving towards destruction.

The Unionist party has governed Northern Ireland from the time of its inception until the imposition of direct rule. It advocates unity with Britain and has so presented its policies that any opposition, no matter how plausible, is seen as undermining the authority of the Unionist party and therefore detrimental to the province as a whole. The Northern Ireland Labour Party for example languished because it could not separate industrial relations from the wider issues of the State in general. Each Protestant vote for Labour can split the loyalist front and so enable the Catholics to assume a stronger position. Every election is consequently fought on constitutional and not on social and economic issues. *Seemingly* faced with the choice of supporting the status quo or dismantling it, all Protestants voted for the Unionist party. Safety and security could be seen in solidarity. In a survey of 1966 the extent to which union with Britain and loyalty to the Crown have been made

*following statistics.*

the preserve of the Unionist party is indicated *by the* 82% of all Protestants voted and 81% voted Unionist. Only 2% of Catholics voted Unionist and 40% of Catholics did not vote at all. Over the years Unionism has become symbolically and *indeed* actually linked with the Orange Order and the existence of a separate government at Stormont. The Orange Order is largely drawn from local Church congregations and each lodge has its Chaplain and membership initiation ceremonies wherein a man must agree to "love, uphold and defend the Protestant religion ... (and) strenuously oppose the fatal errors and doctrines of the Church of Rome". *The influence of Stormont is* equally significant, being made up of fifty-two seats in the House of Commons and twenty-six in the Senate. The Government of Ireland Act 1922 made it quite clear that Stormont had the power to pass laws for "the peace, order and good government of Northern Ireland". The fact that such laws could be passed was of equal importance to the fact that the laws themselves were designed largely to support Unionism.

The present troubles have in no way diminished the cause of Ulster's Protestants. They are in no mood to seek peace at any price and efforts on behalf of Her Majesty's Government to find a solution involving the Republic of Southern Ireland are regarded by most right wing Protestants with complete dismay and unbelief. They are determined not to give in to the IRA and this determination was underlined by a large majority who voted in the 1973 plebiscite to retain the province's ties with Great Britain. Professor Rose discovered in his survey that 52% of Protestants were prepared to endorse any methods, including violence, to keep Northern Ireland Protestant. 73% of the membership of the Orange Order were in this particular category. Protestants are further upset by what they believe to be gross mis-

representation of their case by the world's news media. Emotive catch phrases have been used such as "civil rights" and "ghetto" together with the interpretation that Protestants are invariably classified as "baddies" while Catholics are "oppressed goodies". Such alleged biased reporting, particularly in America, has meant that the Protestants have closed ranks. They believe that they should not be made scapegoats for the conflict to which they are only one party. Civil Rights movements are claimed by many Protestants to be simply fronts for the Communist Party. Constitutionally the Catholics too are British but they "feel" Irish. To them the border that divides their country is an artificial border imposed upon them by the British Government. The Unionist Party, it is maintained, does not speak on behalf of the Catholic working man and consequently he does not support it. Instead he finds a political unity with the South which tends to articulate the spiritual and cultural identity he already knows to exist. What Catholics see of democracy in the North they tend to regard as false and want no part of it preferring to be excluded altogether than share in something which is against their best interests. Since the province votes along strictly sectarian lines, and since the Protestants outnumber the Catholics by a ratio of roughly two to one, the Catholics can never hope to achieve any sort of real political power. This frustration and political impotence has led many of them to seek influence and power through organisations such as the IRA and its political counterpart. Catholics have always demanded universal franchise in local government elections and the redrawing of local election boundaries. They maintained that the whole machinery for elections was geared in favour of Protestants who imposed certain conditions on the electorate prior to an election and then controlled housing, education and social services after they came to power. Thus in a real sense the Catholics found themselves out off from and unable

to attain political power.

Catholics, terrified by the brutality of early Protestant attacks in 1969 at first welcomed the British Army as saviours. Not long afterwards, however they turned to the IRA for protection and made both physical and political secession. The gun and the bomb <sup>then became</sup> their political weapons. Eventually they were persuaded to transfer their allegiance to the SDLP (Social and Democratic Labour Party) under the leadership of the moderates: Gerry Pitt, John Hume, Austin Currie and others. In this way the Catholics could register their rejection of the IRA and still have a voice that did not depend on the gun or intimidation to back it up.

Northern Ireland is a very religious country -- in the 1951 census only sixty four people out of 1,370,921 claimed to be atheists. Twenty years later 84% of all Ulster people believed in the providence of God in some measure or other. Religion and ~~is~~ is consequently regarded as important to the Irish. It has been said that one of the troubles with the Irish is that they are far too religious and not Christian enough. Their religion is *far from uniting them.* The Protestant is by and large fed on a diet of fairly strong *Calvinism* with an emphasis on the sufficiency of the Bible to lead to Salvation. They emphasize the personal relationship with Jesus Christ and consequently they regard as suspect any effort on the part of the Church to set itself up as an authority to dictate belief or behaviour. Rightly or wrongly they see in the Roman Church an exclusivity and authoritarianism that fundamentally contradicts the tenets of their faith.

The average Catholic sees his religious faith, <sup>as</sup> validated by two thousand years of history and tradition. The *Church stands* alongside the Bible and with an equal or even greater authority than the Bible. This doctrinal variance, so unimportant to non-religious people remains the primary unresolved issue of Irish Christendom. From it the two irreconcilable traditions of Northern Ireland christianity flow. Differences are further exacerbated by fundamentally different attitudes in such emotionally charged areas as education, interfaith marriage and general morality. These different attitudes at all levels of society tend to give rise to real community tensions and are central to an understanding of the problem. Religion along with politics and economics is undoubtedly a decisive and practical factor that divides the population and keeps it divided. Nevertheless, there are many Christians on both sides of that divide, and in this fact lies both the hope for and the tragedy of Ulster. However much the church leaders are in contact with each other, agree in denouncing violence, and consider the positions taken by their more extreme members as parodies of the Gospel, however much they emphasise that "the Churches as such" are not involved in the conflict, they will not be believed until the churches as institutions, take unmistakable steps to dissociate themselves from other sectarian institutions.

The Protestant Churches in the North are interlocked in personnel and structure with the political and social institutions of Unionist Rule. Similarly in the South, the Catholic Church has unquestioned political influence and power. In the words of a Catholic Sociologist, A.E.W. Spencer, there is a "sybiotic relationship between political and religious institutions in the two ethnic communities of Ireland

- an informal but very strong alliance that results in the mutual support and protection of religion and politics". (2) Though different in character, the two alliances intensify each other and the general consensus of opinion is that if possible they ought to be brought to an end simultaneously. It is obvious that clergy representing both sides of the sectarian divide continue to give their support to marches and funerals of extremists. At a meeting of the committee on Society, Development and Peace of the World Council of Churches (WORLDPEACE) in November 1973 representatives saw the need for the churches to communicate in some unmistakable fashion, through significant actions which would be widely understood, their basic rejection of sectarian "myths" such as the resurrection myth of the Rising in Easter Week, and that of King Billy on his famous white charger leading his people through some sort of Exodus Passover on 12 July each year. These myths were little short of heresy and blasphemy. There would obviously have to be joint action on the part of both churches for unless they acted jointly in condemning them and at the same time emphasising the liberating and reconciling message of the Gospel, the breaking of the bond between church and community might well result in a psychological trauma which could intensify the desperation of the extremists and lose valuable support for the churches. Fear is the predominant emotion in Ulster today. Nobody knows where the next bomb will explode or who will be its victim. Everyone is "on edge" and some psychiatrists maintain that children brought up in this atmosphere may never fully recover from the mental and spiritual *damage* of the past few years. As far as the security forces are concerned there is evidence that the symptoms of "shell shock" so common in the first world war are now beginning to manifest themselves in soldiers who have experienced many tours on the streets of Northern Ireland.

Insecurity runs a close second to fear when trying to get at the heart of the problems. People on both sides of the great divide feel that the principles they believe in and stand for are being called into question by events beyond their control.

In the military dimension it is clear that no specifically military victory can or indeed should be won. The British forces, even when fully stretched, cannot contain the outbursts of extremist groups and ~~wherever~~ violence occurs it is difficult to contain it within reasonable bounds. More and more security regulations are in force but each new week brings with it new explosions with more and more people being killed or injured. The Birmingham bombings, the hunger strikes and marches, the deaths of IRA leaders, various unguarded statements by politicians, journalists or church leaders all contribute to an escalation of hatred and violence. The security situation in which the British soldier is involved is clearly linked to the political one in several different ways. Terrorism is seen to be used as an alternative to political action especially when that is denied or thought to be ineffective. It is seen by extremists, on both sides, to be an outspoken response to a violent situation or to the feeling of impotence when events get out of control. Because it uses, and obviously must use, equivalent violence, counter-terrorism on the part of the security forces keeps the conflict active and ensures that gunmen are protected by a community of people who may be basically out of sympathy with them. (3)

Since the British army is inhibited by various pressures both within and without its ranks, more repressive measures will not be used and so the effect of reducing the level of violence until

a political solution can be found will never in the present climate of opinion be achieved. It is considered by some that political pressure in Britain may eventually force the army to withdraw. In the meantime, it appears that a substantial military occupation can at best prevent a rapid deterioration of the situation and may, in some ways, even be an obstacle to its ultimate solution. Leaving aside the political significance of the army's role in Northern Ireland the government in Westminster is faced with the moral and political dilemma of using both forces and weapons against urban guerillas<sup>a situation</sup> which might be thought to be morally and politically unacceptable in a democratic society. This implication is relevant elsewhere in Europe, wherever an army is used to bolster up or maintain a political system. (4)

"The roles of the police and of the army in a democratic society could be more carefully examined and better means devised of ensuring that they did not inevitably support an elite. The extension of terrorism to the British mainland could be the occasion for a great increase in governmental control; it could lead to the formation of private armies ready to support the status quo against dissident groups or industrial unrest; it could gain wider credence for the doctrine that the armed forces are there to defend the regime against internal threats as much as the nation against external foes. It might also lead, however, to a basic and, much needed study on the roots of violence in Western Society". (5)

The problem of Ulster is not isolated, it is not one that is peculiar to the British people and temperament. It is a problem lying under the surface of many countries endeavouring to follow a democratic way of government. By its very nature democracy harbours a variety of political extremes and it is with extremists that problems of identification with the status quo exist. Perhaps it is that extremists, by their very nature, are in the vanguard of those who seek to expose injustice. It is unfortunate that often their voice is ignored in political circles and therefore resort to violence and terrorism is often the only way they can express themselves. It is against this sort of moral, political and social unrest, that the British Army came in 1969. For over twelve years it has served the people of Ulster, acting as a human wall of partition, in the hopes that political answers could be found to prevent further bloodshed and the sacrifices of many hundreds of innocent people. With the army came its chaplains, of all denominations to work, to worship and to witness not only to their men and women in uniform but also to the civilian population.

#### Some conflict problems for Chaplains.

Questions based upon those submitted originally by Gordon Zahn but re-written for a Northern Ireland context were sent to fifty Chaplains serving currently in the British Army of the Rhine. (These are shown in Annex J). Thirty five replies were received from Chaplains who had all served in Ulster and who had been awarded the General Service medal for duty in Northern Ireland. Of the remaining fifteen some chose not to answer and some had not yet been sent to Ireland. Some Chaplains who answered had served in the province for up to ten tours of four months each in addition to a full tour of two years accompanied in many cases by their wives and families.

Living conditions in Ulster for both soldiers and the Chaplains who serve them are not very satisfactory though each unit and regiment has done its best to improve on the situation inherited from its predecessor. *The daily routine of life consists of* three periods of four hours on duty separated by three periods of equal length off-duty. Whilst on patrol the soldier presents himself as a target for any gun or bomb attack and this attack can come from any direction. As a consequence he must be continuously on the alert ever fearful that at any moment one <sup>or more</sup> of his patrol will be killed.

*In an* ambush where abandoned vehicles are filled with explosives and detonated electronically from a safe distance by unknown and unseen terrorists. Death and injury are experienced over and over again and this leads to the soldier being in a constant fearful state wondering if the next tour of duty on the streets of Belfast or Londonderry will be his last.

During rest periods he sleeps if he can, reads, watches television or films and generally does what he has to maintain himself and his equipment for duty again. He is, by and large, not allowed to wander around the streets off-duty and so any shopping he needs is generally undertaken by the Chaplain who is free to come and go as long as he wears civilian clothes. Once he dresses in uniform he must join a patrol and be grateful to them for their protection. To ask a patrol of five or six men to protect an unarmed man in uniform is often to ask too much and consequently many Chaplains prefer to visit their men on duty wearing civilian clothes and the white collar of a clergyman. In this way he can identify himself with both soldiers and civilians and in no way does he jeopardise the safety of men who have enough to do looking after themselves.

The Chaplain holds informal services at frequent intervals in a variety of situations ranging from factory floors, bus shelters, hotels, car parks, hedge rows, and defensive strong points to Chapels and church rooms set aside for sacramental use. Invariably there are only a few who can take advantage of this informal worship but at least once a week the majority appreciate a corporate act of praise and thanksgiving where their friends and loved ones are commended to God's keeping. As the Chaplain goes about his daily job there are many cases when his advice is sought and even his prayers are requested. A smile, a knowing wink, a nod of recognition are sometimes all the Chaplain can give as he moves around a city street but yet it is sufficient to let his men, in uniform, know that he is identified with them in their dreadful duties. He is often called upon to try and give a reason for the troubles of Ireland for to the common soldier it is obvious that religion has some *part* to play and theologically God must be saying something somewhere. The great difficulty and stumbling block to those of little or no faith at all is that those who would claim to be Christians in both word and deed are often those who are the most militant. Those who are often the most voluble in their acclamation of the Gospel are those who are also the most vociferous in their support of sectarianism. The Chaplain is often called upon to distinguish true religion from false with nothing to guide him in his quest but an honest examination of the situation as he finds it - "for by their fruits they shall be known". Sometimes he is faced with a conflict situation involving soldiers and civilians where the reasons are not at all clear. In these cases only 23% of chaplains would automatically support their soldiers whereas the remainder would support the maintenance of Law and Order. However the same conflict situation with IRA gunmen elicited a significant

response with almost 60% of Chaplains supporting their soldiers, right or wrong. (6) Although the Chaplain will do his best to be objective it is not always as easy as it seems because his sympathies are invariably with those with whom he is identified and amongst whom he serves. The local priest or minister invariably supports his people for the same reasons. To know the truth in these difficult circumstances is very hard and often a compromise solution is sought and achieved.

Some people would maintain that the role of the Chaplain, as a priest or minister, in Northern Ireland, is consequently threatened by his identification with either soldiers or H.M. Government or the Church itself. In reply to this question every Chaplain (100%) replied that being identified with soldiers was in no way a threat to his priestly or ministerial role. 10% found that identification with a particular church *could be* a problem whereas 30% would say that supporting the Government might well be a threat to their role as priests and ministers. (7) There seems to be little conflict over the general and overall task of being Chaplains to soldiers serving in Ulster but obviously in detail there are occasions when conflict can arise. Chaplains can get angry when they see soldiers carelessly trespassing over people's gardens or recklessly driving through washing hanging on lines. There have been occasions when Chaplains have been present when houses have been searched. It is easy to sympathise with a family who have been woken up in the early hours of the morning and subjected to a routine search. Soldiers, their uniforms and their weapons, can easily terrify people not used to them. Families hurling abuse and spitting at soldiers can easily terrify soldiers. Loyalty under these circumstances is difficult to place and sometimes difficult to understand. 35% of civilian clergymen have questioned the presence

of Chaplains in Northern Ireland and have mentioned it to the Chaplains involved. Soldiers see no problem with Chaplains being with them and indeed quite the reverse, they welcome their presence. Civilians, like civilian clergymen, however, are also puzzled and about 21% see a conflict situation arising. (8) Loyalty is a peculiar phenomenon and is often expressed in terms that relate to the smallest group with which one is identified. The loyalty of soldiers is to the regiment, the company, the platoon and finally the section. Similarly civilians will often express their citizenship in terms of the smallest group for example, that which relates to the street in which they live. Often a soldier can see the need for justice within a society and he will fight to uphold it but if that same justice is focussed upon himself when in trouble he then tends to despise it and if possible ignore it. Justice and truth can sometimes be sacrificed on the altar of loyalty. Clearly the army in Northern Ireland can become part of the problem of Northern Ireland and the Chaplain has his work cut out to present the will of God in particular circumstances with truth, courage and determination. In one particular instance a young corporal was charged and convicted in a court martial for planting evidence. The officer corps found him guilty but the soldiers of his section could not understand how justice could be so one sided. Justice is often regarded as being almost meaningless but loyalty, a sort of tribal/clan loyalty is upheld and maintained. One Chaplain was on patrol with his men when they were attacked by a gang of Roman Catholic Youths. Seeing the Chaplain about to be beaten up and punched a soldier came to his rescue. The loyalty of the soldier to his Chaplain was greater than anything else and yet the soldier was a Roman Catholic and his uncle a member of the IRA. Soldiers can relax in Protestant areas but are constantly "on guard" in Roman Catholic areas. Despite lectures and talks on the causes of the problems of Ulster the

soldier still sees the conflict as being religious - Catholic versus Protestant. Christianity is something different and often the soldier sees his Chaplain, regardless of denomination, as the champion of Christianity rather than the representative of a particular denomination. It is as though there is an army Christianity and a civilian Christianity; the one acceptable to the soldier whereas the other is not and this, despite the fact that the soldier too, invariably, comes from a rather narrow doctrarian background at home.

When asked what they considered to be the three most important tasks of a Chaplain once he arrives with his men in Ulster there was a fairly mixed response with 35% being concerned to identify with soldiers in whatever task they were given. By this identification and involvement many chaplains thought that it was easier to communicate with their men in a realistic and relevant way. 42% however felt it to be their duty to concentrate on the spiritual well being of their soldiers whereas the rest were content to be pastors and care for them in a general way. In the majority of cases soldiers and their welfare were placed first in any order of priority. Next came those Chaplains who saw it their duty to liaise with the local clergy in an attempt to build bridges between the army and the local population. At first, <sup>was</sup> much valuable work done along these lines and co-operation of this sort often took the steam out of potentially explosive situations. Chaplains still visit the local clergy and discuss common problems but after ten years or so people have grown accustomed to the "troubles" and seem resigned to them in an almost fatalistic sort of way.

Although not given pride of place, another very important task a Chaplain performs is keeping in close touch with families back in the United Kingdom or in Germany. He normally visits the families once

or twice during every four month tour and takes with him recorded messages, video tapes which he plays in club rooms, presents and personal gifts. He is the link man with husbands and fathers and upon return to Northern Ireland reciprocal messages and gifts are brought from wives and families. It is important for the soldiers' morale to know that all is well at home. (9)

It is interesting to see how Chaplains react to their tour of duty. Some consider preaching the Gospel at every available opportunity to be the most important thing they can do. Others rarely seem to preach and yet by their presence and identification they are perhaps saying it all. Most Commanding Officers consider having a Chaplain with them is of tremendous benefit, not only as far as morale is concerned but also in the practical ways he can assist, being free to move about and talk with the local population. Chaplains are trusted men in Northern Ireland and though some have been injured I am sure it happened accidentally. The IRA respects the presence of a clergyman and often he is the only representative of the forces with whom they will talk. Talking is perhaps the most important thing people can do in Northern Ireland. Already there is plenty of it done but it is to be encouraged for it is still preferable to throwing abuse, stones and bombs.

In some recent articles in the national press it has been mentioned that IRA suspects were being tortured in order to reveal important information. Torture appears to have begun with the introduction of internment in August 1971. The General Officer Commanding the army in Northern Ireland at the time was reported to have opposed the introduction of internment. Some of those detained without trial were, according to Adam Roberts in his article "The British Forces and

"Politics", subjected by troops and police to extremely unpleasant interrogation methods, including hooding, a noise machine, wall-standing, and deprivation of diet and sleep . (10)

Consequent allegations of torture led to two reports published on behalf of the British Government by Sir Edmund Compton in 1971 and one the following year by Lord Parker. It was in a minority report submitted by Lord Gardiner that the army's methods of interrogation were criticised. He claimed that by any standards they were illegal. His criticism was accepted by the government and future use of such interrogation procedures was prohibited. When asked if Chaplains ever felt the use of torture to be justified 95% replied with a most categorical "No" and under "no circumstances". A very small minority were of the opinion that some forms of "interrogative torture" were acceptable and that it was more important to save lives than to be worried about the comfort of IRA sympathisers. In any human situation, like the Northern Ireland problem, people are going to get hurt. The Chaplain must do all in his power to minimise the brutality and emphasise the common humanity. If *they ever witnessed* torture taking place 78% would report the fact immediately to higher authority and strongly urge that it is stopped. 35% of Chaplains would order it to be stopped there and then, despite the fact that they have no executive authority in any command situation. Having reported such occurrences to higher authority if Chaplains still thought that torture was taking place they would continue to protest, being prepared to take the matter outside military circles in an attempt to prevent such practices. (10)

In respect of conflict between a Chaplain's duties and those which he has to perform as an officer 30% could see that on occasions there

could be a real problem. This was normally resolved by emphasising the priestly or ministerial role for often the conflict lay, not with the Chaplain, but with the officers or soldiers he accompanied. Over 20% pointed out, in answer to this question, that a Chaplain is only an officer by virtue of the fact that he is ordained. As an officer he has no other function to perform. 70% saw no conflict situation arising in respect of their military commission. (11) When asked whether or not a possible conflict situation might arise about 50% of those who replied said that they were aware of its existence and had given thought to it but that the problem, if it existed at all, was easily resolved in favour of the Chaplaincy service. The remainder could not envisage any conflict situation ever arising. (12) Even where the question of morale was concerned the Chaplain's first duty was as a priest or a pastor. 63% were quite adamant that they were not there to bolster morale. Some made the point that they were Christian priests and ministers and not political commissars. Others could see the value of keeping morale high under very difficult circumstances but "not at the expense of truth". (13)

When asked, as a final question, whether anything about the role of a Chaplain in Northern Ireland gives cause for conflict the majority, 85% answered a very emphatic 'No'. Others were worried about the by product, as far as soldiers were concerned, of broken marriages. Some were concerned in a very general way about the general tendency to debase all moral values whilst on active service.

The conditions of service, cramped and confined with no space or time to rise above the basic instinct to survive, <sup>were, in their opinion, largely to blame.</sup> There is so much hatred in the province that something of its nature must be absorbed by the soldier as he goes about his thankless task. Pornography is blatantly on show everywhere. Crudity and vulgarity are commonplace

and one meets it not only in the barrack room but on the streets and in the market places. The Northern Ireland situation has been referred to as "the Corporals' war" for it is at the level of this young leader that the army functions. A Corporal in his early twenties may be technically well qualified to lead soldiers into a battle situation under war time conditions but he *may not be* the right person to cope with an internal security problem where the community is so hostile and yet speaks his language and appears, on the surface, to be like his own people back home. Little effort seems to be made in teaching Corporals and other junior ranks something of their moral and social responsibilities.

Another Chaplain voiced his concern about the obvious signs exhibited for all to see of the broken body of Christ. He was worried about some Churches actually supporting by word and deed what he called "the evil" of Northern Ireland. There is much evidence of hypocrisy, pretence, mistrust and bigotry but it is distressing for Christian priests and ministers to find a lot of it within the Christian worshipping community.

(14). One disappointing feature of life in Northern Ireland is the use *made of it by* the news media. Very seldom does the truth ever get portrayed but rather some "glamorised version" which makes for good pictures and has news content. There are times when reporters have been known to pay little boys to throw stones at soldiers so that the boredom of a dull and quiet day can be relieved. Sometimes when a protest march has occurred reporters and photographers have asked for it to be staged again in order to improve on the quality of pictures. The camera does not lie, so we are told, and yet I have been in crowd situations when soldiers have been tormented by the use made, by women, of long old fashioned hat pins. The only thing the camera captured was the soldiers'

reactions of anger and raised hands. It is very difficult, on these occasions, to talk to soldiers about the essential meaning of truth and love.

Theologically the Irish situation has much to teach us. Christians everywhere are united with those in Ireland. The soldier finds this hard to understand for he is hated and despised by the same people with whom he prays in Church. Especially is this true of Roman Catholics and their Chaplains who are regarded by their fellow churchmen in Northern Ireland as traitors and renegades. Roman Catholic soldiers have a particularly bad time in Northern Ireland and it was not until fairly recently that Irish men were allowed to serve in the province. There have been many reprisals against the families of British soldiers on both sides of the Irish border. Further, the Irish situation presents to most soldiers a scandal particularly to those who are half persuaded of the truth of Christianity. As far as the ecumenical scene is concerned it has received *a terrible* set back with a distinct polarisation of men and women into opposite camps. There is a great need for understanding, for toleration, for repentance, for reconciliation - all great Christian themes. (15)

Reconciliation must involve renewal. We would do worse than remember some words of the Roman Catholic Bishop Ardagh and Clonmacnois.

"The bullets of the one side as of the other have no political labels, just as the tears at the gravesides of both sets of victims have no colour. In pain and grief, in death and bereavement, we are not political enemies, we are only human beings,

... We are not republicans or unionists,  
 we are only poor common weeping human beings.  
 And Christ is their to share our sorrow. He  
 is not there to speak words of comfort. He  
 is not there even only as a mourner. He is  
 there as one of the innocent victims of  
 oppression, intimidation and heartless violence". (16)

The great themes of freedom and unity are paradoxical in the Northern Ireland situation and yet they are closely related to each other. For one community, freedom implies a united Ireland; for the other, union with Britain. In either case it continues to spell division between both communities. The churches claiming to preserve liberty and unity have been, if anything, divisive and yet it cannot be doubted that freedom and unity are what the people of Northern Ireland really want. The end of sectarianism is not the establishment of inter-church relations but the fashioning of a church in Ireland which is really one church because it will seek to minister to every person in Ireland. Each of the official churches remains for the time being the church of one or other group or community and in that sense there can be no real reconciling spirit.

The conflict in Northern Ireland is a microcosm of the difficulties of life in the modern western world; the tensions that occur when the historic force of migration brings together people of different religions and races; the distortion in men's relationships when they respond to the competition for material goods in a society that places a high value on their attainment; the problems of operating a democracy when

minorities seek to change the society by violent means. How Christianity fares in that context should be of interest to both Christians and non-Christians in Northern Ireland and throughout the world, because for all parties the question is the same. Does Christianity have any relevance? This question is of the utmost importance to the future of Ireland and indeed the rest of the world. However Christians must come to realise that it is Christianity and not religion wherein their future hope of peace lies and *the ground of their hopes will lie in taking Christ out into the world.* All men are created in the image of God and therefore this image is shared in common with the rest of mankind and everyone has equal worth. This does not mean that all men are the same; their differences, just as much as their intrinsic value, need to be preserved. Justice is consequently the great underlying theme which ought to be at the heart of all thinking and doing in Northern Ireland, a justice that respects the individual without necessarily patronising him. Ulster has a higher proportion of people attending church than most other parts of the world. Why then has all this religion not caused an improvement in social relations over the years? Why has it, instead, become the axis of the present conflict? Why is religion at the heart of the great divide? Perhaps it is that there is too much religion and not enough Christianity for it is evident that the two are not synonymous. Religion in Northern Ireland is much more akin to sectarianism and sectarianism is something that both Catholics and Protestants have in common. Christians must consequently learn to cross sectarian barriers, as many are in fact so doing and thereby they witness to the world the oneness of the human family under the fatherhood of God. Historical, political and social barriers cannot be moved overnight just as theological and doctrinal differences cannot be easily

washed away in the twinkling of an eye, but nevertheless Christians are committed to the breaking down of barriers, to working for new social structures and to building up the body of Christ in love. They are required to discover ways and means whereby reconciliation can take place. Carrymella is an example of the sort of place where these hopes for the future of Ulster are being realised in a very positive, dynamic and yet soul-searching way. The so called 'charismatic movement' too has helped to break down the traditional barriers that divide congregations. These and many other examples are to be found in Northern Ireland for many people have come to realise that amidst the hatred and fear, amidst the bomb and the bullet, the only hope for Irish people is the broken body of Christ upon a cross that reconciles both man to God and man to man.

On the political scene there is a great need for people in Northern Ireland to know that they are not going to be abandoned to their fate.

"The primary positive commitment of the Government must be to the reduction of the existing level of lawlessness and violence in the province. Successive British Governments have gradually sought to transfer the weight of responsibility for maintaining peace and order to the Royal Ulster Constabulary, and this process should continue. But this should not become the pretext for withdrawing the Army at a time when an essentially military threat still exists ..... the Army has become a factor in the political situation. It has been criticised for failing to end the violence in Northern Ireland and for being partial towards one side or another in the conflict. From time to time the view has been expressed that if the Army were withdrawn the

political leaders of the Northern Irish people would at last realise that they had no alternative but to resolve their differences". (17)

This view should not be dismissed without careful consideration for a strong military presence might well remove from the political scene any sense of urgency to find a solution. There has been a considerable effort to persuade soldiers to refuse service in Northern Ireland and this has had *an* exaggerated coverage in the news media but little or no effect amongst the soldiers themselves. Service in Northern Ireland is *far from* enjoyable, but most soldiers know the reasons they are there. They would welcome a political solution and see their withdrawal as leading to a solution eventually. However most soldiers would see their withdrawal as possibly a sign that Britain was, herself, pulling out of her responsibilities towards the Province and this would have a most serious effect on any attempts to negotiate a settlement.

"We cannot in fact unilaterally disentangle ourselves from the affairs of a province which owes its separate political existence to a desire for a continuing relationship with Great Britain and an unwillingness to be absorbed into the Republic of Ireland". (18)

There is an ideological commitment to armed and violent struggle, proclaimed by both the 'official' and 'provisional' IRA, and any political solution which ignored this would never be a solution in the long term.

"The Churches in Ireland have learnt the lesson that it

is not sufficient to denounce the manifestations of violence: there must be a real attempt to identify and eradicate those elements in the nation's life (including those contributed by the Churches) which feed violence or the attitudes underlying it". (19)

All of us need to support and pray for any attempts to find reconciliation and improve relations between all sorts and conditions of people in Northern Ireland. Soldiers are losing their lives in the cause of peace. Chaplains find that their main cause for conflict is to continue to support the sacrifice of their soldiers whilst politicians and churchmen still argue about principles rather than agree about solutions.

1. R. Rose, Governing without consensus.
2. S.G. Mackie Ireland's conflict diminishes me Op cit p.12
3. Violence and Northern Ireland, a report issued by the New  
Ulster Movement in June 1972
4. A. M. Lee "To what is Northern Ireland's Civil War relevant?"  
-- published in Holy Cross Quarterly Vol 6 1974 p.98-100
5. Mackie Op cit p.10
6. Appendix J question 10
7. " " 4
8. " " 3
9. " " 1
10. Adam Roberts "The British Armed Forces and Politics" in Wolfe  
and Erickson; Armed Services and Society p. 544
11. Appendix J question 9
12. " " 5
13. " " 6
14. " " 12
15. " " 14
16. C.B. Daly, Violence in Ireland p.114
17. Giles Ecclestone and Eric Elliott, The Irish Problem and Ourselves p.17
18. Ibid p.18
19. Ibid p.20

CONCLUSION.

The military chaplain, as an integral member of the Forces, provides those in command with the only practical way to offer religious ministrations to *their men who are* often divorced from the civilian environment or actively engaged in combat. Accepting that the *raison d'être* of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is just and good then those who maintain it need more than just military discipline. High morale is also essential and men deprived of the opportunity to practice their religion will undoubtedly lack that positive spirit that ultimately wins victories. Likewise spiritual support at home given to wives and families will cause an increase in the morale of the soldier who is absent, confident that his family is cared for in this respect. Northern Ireland has shown how important it is to keep open the channels of communication <sup>*not only*</sup> between all sides in the dispute, but also between soldiers and their separated loved ones. Religious Services are often required, particularly when there is a real fear that death and all its consequences might have to be faced. While denominational practices differ, sacramental practices offering great comfort to the sick, the wounded and the dying, have to be celebrated. The provision of such basic services requires the presence of a clergyman who knows what he is doing, not only as far as his Church is concerned but also as far as the Army and basic field craft is concerned, neither of which can be learned overnight. In such circumstances, for purposes of command control and logistical support, it is imperative that they belong to the organisation they serve. During wartime the chaplain's role is also recognised by international law, and his status and *right* to perform religious services are protected and enhanced by the Geneva Convention. Under the Geneva

Convention Articles of 12 August 1949 chaplains are regarded as non-combatants and are not to be considered as prisoners of war. In order that they are afforded all their rights, immunities and protection under the Articles, chaplains must be attached to the Armed Forces as members of the Armed Forces. Under International Law, in time of war, an army without military chaplains would have to do without the ministrations provided by the chaplaincy service *for* soldiers <sup>who</sup> were detained as prisoners of war. Likewise a civilianized chaplaincy service would lack the protection of the conventions necessary to perform their duties effectively. (1)

From a purely practical point of view the role of the military chaplain is important because invariably soldiers are stationed in foreign parts of the world, sometimes so remote that it is impossible to provide normal chaplaincy services. In wartime this need is even more highlighted. Would the critics of the role of the military chaplain be prepared to ignore the claims of soldiers to spiritual food and light? Are those who are criminals to be given more opportunities to receive God's word and sacraments than members of the Forces? In any walk of life that does not follow the will of God, assuming of course that one can discern the will of God in every given situation, is there not an incongruity? War is incongruous with the will of God but sometimes the cost of peace is *no less* congruous if it means slavery and injustice and intolerance. One lives in an evil world where sometimes compromise is the better of two evils.

The role of the present NATO Forces is *explicitly* one of peace-keeping. The nuclear deterrent is doing its job! Where religion and politics in the past have failed mankind in its search for peace,

nuclear weapons and the fear they conjure up are succeeding. No one in their right senses would agree that the world has found the best solution to its problems but at least there is a breathing space to give people time to work out their own salvation.

The military chaplain of today joins the Forces of his country, not for patriotic reasons but reasons more akin to economics and the opportunity given for him to work with and for young people. Ignorance about the things of God is appalling but the opportunities provided by Commanders are so immense that any failure to promote God's Kingdom is not due in any way to the military command but rather to the inability of chaplains to communicate.

The soldier would prefer his chaplain to be non-combatant. For reasons probably verging on superstition the chaplain is often regarded as a sort of mascot, a good luck charm, someone to ward off evil and leave the blessing of the Almighty. Every Chaplain questioned would agree with the non-combatant status and of course the Geneva Convention would support it. Wilkinson tells of a second world war chaplain who saw his peculiar status in creative terms "a link with home and a link with God - and through his own non-combatancy, a link with peace". (2)

Everyone knows that the chaplain is identified with the Officer Corps in all sectors of the Armed Forces. There is nothing odd about this if he is to maintain his leadership role intact. Soldiers do not want their chaplains to be in situations they cannot respect or indeed from which they cannot be of help in times of crisis. The fact that a uniform is worn, that Chaplains are treated no differently from other officers with regard to postings, quarters and pay is something that the soldier understands and appreciates. Civilian clothing is encouraged

whenever prolonged visits to married quarters take place though it is the experience of many chaplains that even here closer identification takes place when uniform is worn. People want to know that those who minister to them understand their problems and often the civilian clergyman with the best will in the world fails to appreciate this. There is no suggestion that uniform helps to ~~remove~~ the tension between being a priest and an officer, rather it *opens* the way for the priest to function by virtue of closer involvement and identification.

The military chaplain, like any priest worthy of his calling, endeavours to minister to the whole of man and not just that part which might be spiritual. Scholars are almost all in agreement these days that mankind cannot be divided into compartments labelled 'body' 'mind' and 'spirit'. In the giving of a cigarette to a dying man was not Studdert Kennedy entering into some sort of sacramental relationship with the man in a way that was easily acceptable to the man? It may be that the Church needs to see that in the humble act of washing feet the world can see and appreciate not only true service and dedication but also true leadership qualities.

The question of the reinforcement of morale is never very far from those who would criticise the role of the military chaplain. Just as some commanders would over emphasize the role of the chaplain, there are some civilians who would misunderstand it. Morale is an important factor in the life of a soldier at war and it is important to support it, particularly if the war is just in every respect. In the second world war there were few problems for it was clearly seen by the majority to be for a righteous cause. In Vietnam however, morale was low, because the aims and objects of this particular war were not wholly

satisfactory and often the methods used to achieve the end were suspect.

Conscientious objectors are dealt with in a scrupulously honest way. From the very outset the chaplain is involved and his recommendations are given sympathetic consideration. The inherent danger of course is that some soldiers are not so honest in their representation and so the judgement of the chaplain based upon his experience is more than welcomed by conscientious commanders wanting to do the right thing by everyone.

The prophetic role of the chaplain has always been emphasized and underlined, particularly by the Royal Army Chaplains' Department. Those chaplains who have the courage to be prophetic are invariably supported, not only by their senior brethren but also by commanders, for they are regarded as men seeking to do the will of God regardless of the consequences. There are, of course, exceptions to the general rule. Some commanders fail to understand the chaplain or indeed God, whereas other chaplains can be just as obtuse and stick their necks out for an unworthy cause. Moral guidance is seen to be something more than just simple talks about personal relationships. It follows a pattern designed to illuminate the whole of life's rich tapestry - including peace and war issues. Tension and conflict are recognised and used to explain the tension and conflict which one experiences in the whole of the Christian life.

Those who romanticize war are often those who have never experienced its horror, its suffering, and its devastation. The first world war was often depicted by some politicians and churchmen as something glorious but the true spirit was perhaps caught by poets like Wilfred Owen

and Studdert Kennedy. The last person to romanticize is the soldier himself or indeed the Chaplain who has to bury his remains, comfort the bereaved and tend to the wounded. There is nothing glorious about war!

Bearing in mind the multifarious role of the Military Chaplain in the Army of today it is fairly safe to assume that it is one that challenges, stimulates and satisfies. There is never the monotony of dull routine because seldom is any posting or indeed any job ever repeated. Obviously there is paradox, tension and conflict but evidence suggests that there is no more or less than in any other Christian experience where the morality of any situation is not clear or self evident. One would wish, perhaps, for more direction and certainly more guidance from the Church and from moral theologians particularly where the nuclear deterrent debate is concerned.

One thing remains certain however and that is that the servicemen and women will continue to require the comfort, fellowship, ministrations and spiritual help that the Church provides. The Military Chaplain is first and foremost a servant of that Church and will remain so until his authority is legitimately removed. As an ordained member of that Church he will continue to be identified, involved and integrated with those amongst whom he is called to Minister in uniform. One cannot deny to the servicemen that which the convicted criminal enjoys - the privileges and the practices of Holy Church.

I am the man who gives the word,  
If it should come, to use the Bomb.

I am the man who spreads the word  
From him to them if it should come.

I am the man who gets the word  
From him who spreads the word from him.

I am the man who drops the Bomb  
If ordered by the one who's heard  
From him who merely spreads the word  
The first one gives if it should come.

I am the man who loads the Bomb  
That he must drop should orders come  
From him who gets the word passed on  
By one who waits to hear from him.

I am the man who makes the Bomb  
That he must load for him to drop  
If told by one who gets the word  
From one who passes it from him.

I am the man who fills the till,  
Who pays the tax, who foots the bill  
That guarantees the Bomb he makes  
For him to load for him to drop

If orders come from one who gets  
The word passed on to him by one  
Who waits to hear it from the man  
Who gives the word to use the Bomb.

I am the man behind it all  
I am the one responsible.

(3)

1. Geneva Convention Chapters IV & V of 12 Aug 1949  
Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War
2. A. Wilkinson Theology July 81. p.253
3. A poem by Peter Appleton in War and the Creative Arts p.319

SPECIALISED CLERGY AND THE PAROCHIAL MINISTRY

MOTIVES

A major question, and one of the most difficult to answer, is why men go from parochial ministry into a specialised ministry. In this area answers to a questionnaire have grave limitations, and statistics can only provide indications. Nevertheless, the following figures are useful.

Q. Did you enter your present form of ministry	
(a) because you were critical of the parochial system as it operates today?	8
(b) because you felt attracted to new work?	254
(c) for BOTH the above reasons? 28 men did not reply to this question	98

Those clergy who were in categories (b) and (c) were asked to state why they were attracted initially to their present work. This was done by asking them to tick the following reasons in order of importance. The reasons were then classified according to a points system, which indicates the overall priority given to each reason. 1

	Points
(i) Because I felt the particular job I am involved in needed doing	1534
(ii) Because I felt a strong vocation to this work	1529
(iii) Because I had training or particular experience and skills which pointed to this area	1485
(iv) Because I have a personality and temperament more suited to this type of work	1184
(v) Because I felt a specialised ministry offers more opportunity in the area of mission	872
(vi) Because I valued the wider experience which I could see my present job would give me	794
(vii) Because being appointed to a definite post with definite duties in a definite structure, e.g. school, hospital, prison, etc., enables me to minister more effectively	738

(viii)	Other reasons	565
(ix)	Because the post involved would enable me to provide more effectively for my wife and family	304

An analysis of these figures according to the various specialisms involved is given in Appendix D.

The reasons given under (viii) were numerous. Certain reasons recurred constantly. A number of men were frustrated by the present shortage of livings; bachelor clergy mentioned the value of community life; health reasons were often stated. More frequently the reason related to the specialism concerned, e.g. the army gives the opportunity of travel abroad, hospital work gives an opportunity of expanding an interest in healing, etc.

#### COMMENT

The overwhelming evidence of the figures in the tables is that the principal reason for entering a specialised ministry is positive, rather than negative, and is not related for most men to some kind of disillusionment with parochial life. Indeed, the vast majority of all those answering the questionnaire thought that parochial experience was 'very important'.<sup>1</sup> It could be argued that of the 254 men expressing positive reasons for entering a specialism some were subconsciously rationalising their decision to leave parish life. There is no way of finding this out, but any man with conscious criticisms of the parochial system could easily have indicated that he went into a specialism for a combination of reasons.

2(b) The following chart shows the particular reasons why men were attracted to a specialised ministry

	Training & skills pointed to this area	Personality & temperament more suited	More opportunity of mission	Job needed doing	Wider experience	Strong vocation	Could provide more effectively for wife and family	Wanted definite post with definite duties	Other reasons
Church House/BBC	44	14	11	22	14	26	-	28	-
Theological college staff	119	45	16	98	47	106	-	4	28
Industrial chaplains	58	53	69	70	25	58	-	-	33
Hospital chaplains	100	101	45	113	41	139	14	51	50
Church societies	239	144	111	231	115	214	25	8	63
Miscellaneous	31	17	25	35	15	41	-	-	10
Service chaplains	86	190	105	207	199	190	117	111	105
Prison chaplains	21	29	20	29	27	64	14	41	-
School chaplains	192	154	92	168	33	216	63	119	48
Schoolmasters	319	177	213	245	142	226	51	244	58
Chaplains to the deaf and dumb	14	15	13	43	7	45	-	5	21
University chaplains	82	111	29	89	52	25	-	29	65
Diocesan staff + Church training college staff	210	132	123	164	77	179	20	98	84
	1485	1184	872	1534	794	1529	304	738	565
Ranking .....	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(6)	(2)	(9)	(7)	(8)

NB. Men were asked to give points for each reason, according to a pre-defined system, in such a way as to indicate the importance they gave to each reason. The numbers above represent these points. For an explanation of this, see page 108.

/ Notes: .....

Notes

1. 382 men returned questionnaires, not all answered every question.
2. Some questions were about motives and reasons. Questions were then to be answered and given some precedence ranking from 1 to 9, 1 being the most important reason. In an analysis of the results each rank would receive points - 1 getting 9 points, 2 getting 8 points and so on. Evaluation can then be made not only of the number of times a reason is ticked but also of the importance given to the reason.

Table 4.1: COMPARISON OF CLERGYMEN'S AND COMMANDERS' RATINGS FOR  
 11 CHAPLAIN TASK OPTIONS

Ratings Given by:			
Clergymen	Commanders		Task Option Rated
3.62 (1)	4.3 (4)		The chaplain visits with and ministers to the sick and wounded
3.63 (2)	4.4 (5)		The chaplain administers the sacraments and conducts worship services
3.9 (3)	4.1 (3)		The chaplain counsels troops on personal problems
4.5 (4)	3.1 (1)*		*The chaplain helps men gain the spiritual strength that will enable them to perform their duties more effectively despite the suffering and hardships of military operations.
4.6 (5)	12.6 (10)		The chaplain preaches a message of reconciliation, emphasizing that even the enemy must not be hated
4.9 (6)*	3.8 (2)*		*The chaplain helps troops make the difficult personal adjustments required by extended operations in a hostile environment
6.5 (7)	12.8 (11)		The chaplain is concerned with evangelism and conversation
10.6 (8)*	5.6 (6)*		*The chaplain acts as a special staff officer advising the commanding officer.
11.9 (9)*	11.4 (8)*		*The chaplain stresses that obedience to the properly constituted authorities is a Christian duty
12.3 (10)*	6.1 (7)*		*The chaplain helps to bolster the troops fighting spirit and morale
14.8 (11)*	12.5 (9)*		*The chaplain prays that God will grant victory

Notes

1. Items were rated in order of importance from 1 (the most important) to 11 (the least important) therefore the lower the mean scores the greater the degree of importance.
2. The first column above and the third is the mean of all the ratings given by clergymen and commanders
3. Figures in columns (2) and (4) indicate the degree of importance.

Table 4.5: RATINGS OF QUALITIES

by Civilian Clergymen

General Rating	Quality	Rating	Mean Score
"Positive"	God as final ruler	(1)	2.4
	Forgive again and again	(2)	3.6
	Gentle	(3)	4.0
	Loves enemies	(4)	4.2
"Neutral"	Dislikes involvement in violence	(5)	7.0
	Strict	(6)	8.0
	Aggressive	(7)	8.1
"Negative"	Loyalty to United States	(8)	10.4
	Violence to obtain justice	(9)	10.7
	Killing in war	(10)	10.8

Table 4.6: RATINGS OF QUALITIES

by Military Commanders

General Rating	Quality	Rating	Mean Score
"Positive"	Aggressive	(1)	2.8
	Loyalty to United States	(2)	2.9
	Strict	(3)	4.3
	Killing in war	(4)	5.7
	God as final ruler	(5)	5.9
"Neutral"	Violence to obtain justice	(6)	6.7
	Gentle	(7)	7.3
"Negative"	Forgive again and again	(8)	10.3
	Dislikes involvement in violence	(9)	11.0
	Loves enemies	(10)	11.6

Notes on Annex C

1. 4 personal qualities/beliefs were rated almost the same by clergymen and commanders; - "boastful", "kind", "meticulously avoids all foul or improper language" and "quick tempered".
2. The remainder, showing differences are tabulated in Tables 4,5 and 4,6.
3. The "neutral" rated qualities allow for different emphasis and interpretation. This only leaves 4 out of a possible 14 qualities where both professions differ completely. These 4 qualities/beliefs are:

"feels killing in war is justified"	}	both rated positively by COs
"unconditional loyalty to the United States"		

and

"willing to forgive again and again"	}	both rated positively by clergymen
"loves enemies"		

4. Conclusion - differences are not extreme.

Notes on Annex D

1. With respect to the 4 qualities rated differently by clergymen and commanders (3 above) chaplains' ratings are significantly different. They have moved towards the military commanders. The two critical issues, rated negatively by clergymen i.e. "feels killing in war is justified" and "unconditional loyalty to the United States" have both moved into the "neutral" section.

Table 5.3: RATINGS OF QUALITIES <sup>a</sup>

by Military Chaplains			
General Rating	Quality	Rating	Mean Score
"Positive"	God as final ruler	(1)	2.42
	Gentle	(2)	3.73
	Forgive again and again	(3)	4.97
	Loves enemies	(4)	5.86
"Neutral"	Aggressive	(5)	6.97
	Dislikes involvement in violence	(6)	8.21
	Strict	(7)	8.40
	Loyalty to United States	(8)	8.76
	Killing in war	(9)	9.53
"Negative"	Violence to obtain justice	(10)	10.20

a. Ratings have significance described in connection with Table 4.1

Table 5. 1: Comparison of Clergymen's, Chaplains', and Commanders' Ratings for 11 Chaplain Task Options <sup>a.</sup>

Ratings Given by:			
Clergymen	Chaplains	Commanders	Task Option Rated
3.62 (1)	3.5 (2)	4.3 (4)	The chaplain visits with and ministers to the sick and wounded
3.63 (2)	2.6 (1)	4.4 (5)	The chaplain administers the sacraments and conducts worship services
3.9 (3)	4.0 (3)	4.1 (3)	The chaplain counsels troops on personal problems
4.5 (4)	4.9 (4)	3.1 (1)	The chaplain helps men gain the spiritual strength that will enable them to perform their duties more effectively despite the suffering and hardships of military operations
4.6 (5)	5.9 (6)	12.6 (10)	The chaplain preaches a message of reconciliation, emphasizing that even the enemy must not be hated
4.9 (6)	5.6 (5)	3.8 (2)	The chaplain helps troops make the difficult personal adjustments required by extended operations in a hostile environment
6.5 (7)	7.9 (8)	12.8 (11)	The chaplain is concerned with evangelism and conversion
10.6 (8)	7.1 (7)	5.6 (6)	The chaplain acts as a special staff officer advising the commanding officer
11.9 (9)	12.7 (10)	11.4 (8)	The chaplain stresses that obedience to the properly constituted authorities is a Christian duty
12.3 (10)	11.9 (9)	6.1 (7)	The chaplain helps to bolster the troops fighting spirit and morale
14.8 (11)	15.2 (11)	12.5 (9)	The chaplain prays that God will grant victory

With the clergymen, the chaplains, and the commanders, two rating numbers are given for each task-option. The first number (eg 3.62) is the mean of all ratings given the corresponding task option by all members of the group concerned. The second number (an integer presented in parentheses

/Cont'd ....

e.g. (1) shows the overall rank of the corresponding task option for the group concerned; (1) would indicate "most important"; (11) would indicate "least important," etc.

a. Ratings have significance described in connection with Table 4.1

Notes:

1. The above table is simply a comparison of the tables given in Annex B with the evaluation of chaplains added.
2. Chaplains give slightly less emphasis on "prophetic" options than civilian clergymen.
3. Chaplains are less "military" about legitimating than civilian clergymen.
4. The similarity between clergymen and chaplains is most striking. Ministry is defined by both in much the same terms ie chaplains are not greatly influenced by commanders.

ANNEX F  
"Specialised Ministries"  
p. 112

4. Why men find difficulty in returning to parochial ministry

	Lack of liaison with diocese	Financial problems	Discrimination against specialised clergy	Other reasons
Church House/BBC	14	6	9	-
Theological college staff	23	10	4	4
Industrial chaplains	9	2	14	12
Hospital chaplains	32	14	19	17
Church societies	54	8	37	32
Miscellaneous	3	3	6	6
Service chaplains	93	27	57	32
Prison chaplains	6	12	14	4
School chaplains	40	31	39	22
Schoolmasters	70	42	44	22
Chaplains to the deaf and dumb	8	10	6	-
University chaplains	16	-	7	22
Diocesan staff + Church training college staff	35	41	18	45
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>218</b>
	(1)	(4)	(2)	(3)

NB - Men were asked to give points for each reason, according to a predefined system, in such a way as to indicate the importance they gave to each reason. The numbers above represent these points. For an explanation of this, see page 108.

5(a). Are there difficulties in entering a specialised ministry ?

		YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
Church House/BMS	(8)	6	2	-
Theological college staff	(23)	14	3	6
Industrial chaplains	(14)	12	1	1
Hospital chaplains	(28)	21	4	3
Church societies	(53)	27	9	17
Miscellaneous	(8)	4	1	3
Service chaplains	(52)	34	11	6
Prison chaplains	(9)	9	-	-
School chaplains	(45)	20	12	13
Schoolmasters	(65)	45	12	8
Chaplains to the deaf & dumb	(9)	8	-	-
University chaplains	(21)	14	4	3
Diocesan staff & Church training college staff	(47)	34	6	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(382)</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>

NOTE:

1. See Annex A(2) for an explanation of the points system

ANNEX G"Specialised Ministries"p. 113

5(b) An analysis of the particular difficulties involved  
in entering a specialised ministry

	Lack of ecclesio- lastic of sup- port	Lack of infor- mation and publi- city	Quit feel- ings at leav- ing a Parish Minis- try	Housing prob- lems	Prob- lems with pensi- on right- s	Others
Church House/BDS	26	21	-	28	4	-
Theological College staff	21	36	17	23	14	8
Industrial chaplains	42	34	12	46	-	16
Hospital chaplains	41	58	12	57	4	46
Church societies	86	76	30	36	25	26
Miscellaneous	16	4	-	7	15	10
Service chaplains	50	89	33	46	22	53
Prison chaplains	15	18	16	12	12	16
School chaplains	36	51	53	48	34	13
Schoolmasters	155	87	73	104	42	78
Chaplains to the deaf & dumb	18	17	4	17	12	16
University chaplains	23	35	19	25	4	25
Diocesan staff + Church training College staff	115	88	57	99	49	42
Ranking ...	644	614	326	568	237	349
	(1)	(2)	(5)	(3)	(6)	(4)

ANNEX H  
"Specialised Ministries"  
 p. 111

3(a). An analysis of answers to the question 'Do you envisage exercising a full-time parochial ministry at the end of your present appointment, or at some time in the future?'

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
Church House/BBC (8)	-	1	5
Theological college staff (23)	11	3	8
Industrial chaplains (14)	4	3	6
Hospital chaplains (28)	9	7	12
Church societies (53)	23	7	22
Miscellaneous (8)	2	3	3
Service chaplains (52)	25	1	22
Prison chaplains (9)	7	1	1
School chaplains (45)	20	5	17
Schoolmasters (65)	20	8	37
Chaplains to the deaf and dumb (9)	-	3	5
University chaplains (21)	12	2	7
Diocesan staff + Church training college staff (47)	11	13	22
<b>TOTAL (382)</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>167</b>

3(b). An analysis of answers to the question 'Do you envisage exercising a full time parochial ministry at the end of your present appointment or at some time in the future?'

	YES	NO	DO NOT KNOW
Single	30	11	33
Married	114	46	134
Age			
-29	4	2	3
30-39	48	16	59
40-49	38	13	52
50-59	43	11	43
60+	11	15	10
Is this first non-parochial post?			
YES	80	28	87
NO	64	29	80
Graduate	104	35	127
Non-Graduate	40	22	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>167</b>

THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN - A questionnaire by Gordon C Zahn

1. What is your denomination ?
2. What was your age at your last birthday ?
3. In what year were you ordained to the ministry ?
4. How many years in all have you served as a Military Chaplain ?
5. How many of these years, if any, have been wartime service ?
6. Have you had any other military experience ? What kind ? When ?
7. Have you had any other kind of ecclesiastical appointment since ordination ? What kind ? Where ?
8. What single motivation do you feel most strongly influenced your personal decision to become a chaplain ?
9. For Chaplains in general which of the following do you feel gives the military chaplaincy its strongest appeal ?
  - (1) The opportunity to perform a patriotic service.
  - (2) The opportunity to perform a religious service.
10. What do you consider to be the 2 or 3 personal characteristics most essential to a man's success as a chaplain ?
11. The following have been suggested as failings which would limit a chaplain's effectiveness. Which do you regard as the most serious ?
  - (1) Too much emphasis upon spirituality for himself
  - (2) Not 'manly' enough in his dealings with others
  - (3) Too prone to question or criticise the decisions of superior military authority
  - (4) Too 'puritanical' re the behaviour of the men in his spiritual care
  - (5) Any other you would rank above these
12. Is there any personal characteristic which you feel would be most likely to interfere with a man's success as a chaplain?

13. In order of importance what do you consider to be the 3 most important tasks of the military chaplain ?
14. Would you change the list (or the order) in actual wartime situations as contrasted with peacetime situations ?
15. In a sense the military chaplain is the 'pastor' of a special kind of parish. (1) In what ways do you feel your work is the same as that performed by the ordinary civilian pastor ?  
(2) What specific problem(s) accounts for the greatest difference between your work and his ?
16. The objection has been voiced that the presence of a chaplain 'softens' the serviceman or makes 'cowards' of them, that there is no need for chaplains in war, 'anything goes!'
  - (1) How widespread do you think these attitudes are among the regular officers ?
  - (2) If you were faced with such an attitude how would you proceed to answer it ?
17. Military men have sometimes argued that 'with prayer half the battle is won' and that religion in the forces assures the support of God.
  - (1) How widespread do you think such an attitude is among regular officers ?
  - (2) To what extent do you personally agree or disagree with it ?
18. Some people have held that it would be more consistent with a chaplain's religious vocation if he did not have formal military rank or wear a military uniform.
  - (1) In what specific ways, if any, do you think these help the chaplain in his work ?
  - (2) In what specific ways do you think they hinder him in his work ?
19. If you had to choose ONE of the following as the most important function of a battlefield chaplain, which would it be ?
  - (1) Individual spiritual counselling of the men
  - (2) Conducting formal religious services
  - (3) Distributing the sacraments
  - (4) Caring for the wounded and dying
  - (5) Bolstering the fighting spirit of the men and their morale
20. Which of the above would you consider the least important ? Why ?
21. A Chaplain in the German Army tells of finding an Altar prepared for him in advance by one unit and decorated with the swastika as an altar cloth.
  - (1) What do you think he did ?

- (2) What do you think you would have done in such a case ?
- (3) What if it were the Union Jack ?
22. Some people feel it to be a grievous scandal (in the theological sense) for a Christian Clergyman to have served as a Chaplain in Hitler's forces. How do you personally feel about this ?
- 22a. Assuming that a Christian clergyman considered the Hitler regime to be immoral or that its wars were unjust, do you feel it would have been possible for him to serve as a chaplain to the Nazi armies in good conscience ? (If 'No' then why not ? )
23. The Chaplain is both Military Officer and Clergyman. Which do you think is most likely first to come to mind :
- (1) To the Chaplain himself
- (2) To his fellow Officers
- (3) To the men in the ranks
24. How important do you feel denominational differences are in a Chaplain's relationships with other chaplains ? (Examples please)
25. Sometimes the suggestion is advanced that all field or barracks services should be non-denominational (or inter-denominational) in form and content, How would you feel about this ? (If you object then give reasons).
26. Can a Chaplain's duty as a military officer ever be in conflict with his duty as a Christian Clergyman ? (If yes - briefly describe the occasion. How was the conflict resolved ?)
27. In more general terms, assuming that such a conflict were possible, which set of duties should be given precedence by a chaplain ? How often do you think it would in actuality be given precedence: Always; most of the time; seldom; never?
28. From your experience do chaplains (either in trg or personal discussion) give much thought to the possibility of such conflict arising ? (If yes do you think enough time? If No do you think they should ?)
29. How important do you think the chaplain is in the eyes of most of his fellow officers ?
- (1) Absolutely essential                      (2) Important
- (3) Helpful to have around                      (4) Makes little difference one way or the other
- (5) Other (specify)
30. Using the same categories how important do you think the chaplain is in the eyes of the men in the ranks ?

31. In general would you say that the chaplain tends to rate his own contribution
- (1) As more important than his fellow offr's would
  - (2) As less important
  - (3) About the same
32. Same question, but as for 'men in the ranks' instead.
33. One hears stories about the killing of enemy prisoners ....
- (1) Under what circumstances, if any, are such orders justified ?
  - (2) If a CO considered such action necessary what should be the chaplains attitude to such orders ?
34. A variation would be if men were ordered NOT to take prisoners - i.e. to kill rather than accept surrender.
- (1) Under what circumstances are such orders justified ?
  - (2) If a CO considered such action necessary what should be the CF's attitude ? (Consider too the thought that an enemy soldier might be Booby-trapped)
35. In the past some military authorities have taken civilian as hostages to keep the rest of the population under control
- (1) Under what circumstances, if any, do you feel such a practice justified
  - (2) If the CO considered such an action as necessary in a given situation what should be the Chaplain(s) attitude ? (What about your competency to judge ?)
36. Sometimes civilians have been executed in reprisal against some offence committed by others in the civilian population.
- (1) Do you ever feel that such action is justified ?
  - (2) What, if anything should a chaplain do re such action ordered by a Military Commander ?
37. Recently photographs in the national press have shown Viet Cong captives being tortured in order to get them to reveal information.
- (1) Do you feel the use of torture ever justified ? If 'yes' when ?
  - (2) What should a chaplain do if such practices take place in a unit for which he is spiritually responsible ?

38. Let us assume a situation where a policy of bombing civilian areas was initiated in an effort to 'break the enemy morale'.
- (1) Under what circumstance would such a policy be justified, if ever ?
  - (2) Do you think it is the Chaplains prerogative to pass judgment one way or the other on a policy decision like this ?
  - (3) Assuming a Chaplain opposed such a decision what could he do about it ?
39. What if the enemy initiated such bombings and it became a matter of reprisals or retaliation for these or similar offences ?
40. The mass bombings of Dresden in World War II have been criticized as an 'unjustifiable' act of 'terror bombing!'
- (1) How do you feel about such criticism ?
  - (2) Assuming that the criticism is valid what do you think you would have done about it at the time ?
41. Has it been your experience (or observation) that military chaplains do in fact find themselves 'troubled' by issues and problems like those we have just considered ? If 'yes' to what extent and how often ?
42. Would you be more inclined to agree or disagree with the following: 'The nature of war today is such that its no longer possible to maintain the old distinction between 'combatant' and 'non-combatant'?
43. Assuming that this were true, which of the following would you prefer as the logical conclusion to be drawn from it by a Christian ?
- (a) Since it is a matter of 'total war' of nation v. nation, the Christian should resolve his doubts in favour of loyal obedience to duly constituted authority: or
  - (b) Since it is a matter of 'total war' the Christian must refuse to support or take part in it: or
  - (c) some other conclusion.
44. What advice would you give to a serviceman who developed conscientious objections to war when faced with an actual battle situation ? Do you think most chaplains would give the same advice ?
45. In more general terms many would hold it to be true that the Chaplains job is to bolster morale by quieting moral doubts and encouraging the men to get on with the job. How do you feel about this ?
46. Can you personally conceive a situation where the opposite might be true: that is, in which the chaplains primary obligation would be to advise the men to refuse to obey on moral grounds ? If 'yes' give examples.

47. In this connection, assume that you had been a chaplain in the German army and one of the officers who was implicated in the plot against Hitler (July 20th) came to you for spiritual counsel re violating his oath of allegiance. What do you think your advice would have been ?
48. Is there any aspect of the military chaplain's role that has not been given sufficient attention here ?
49. Has this discussion raised any questions throwing new light on some aspect of the military chaplain's role to which you haven't given much thought or of which you had not previously been aware ? (Remember the Handbook). If so what are they ?
- \* 50. What has been your reaction to this questionnaire ? (Not in the original list)

THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN IN NORTHERN IRELAND

1. In order of importance, what do you consider to be the 3 most important tasks of a chaplain in Northern Ireland?
  - a.
  - b.
  - c.
2. The objection has been voiced that the presence of a chaplain in Northern Ireland has an adverse affect on the morale of soldiers. Have you any experience of this? Can you provide details?
3. Has your presence in Northern Ireland ever produced conflict in the minds of :
  - a. Your soldiers?
  - b. Civilian clergyman?
  - c. Civilians?
4. In the Northern Ireland context do you believe that your role as a priest/minister is ever threatened by identification with :
  - a. Soldiers?
  - b. The Church?
  - c. Politicians in HM Government?
5. Can a chaplain's duty as a military officer ever be in conflict with his duty as a priest/minister? (If "Yes", how was the conflict resolved?)
6. From **your** experience do chaplains give much thought to the possibility of conflict arising? Elucidate!
7. How important do you think the chaplain is in the eyes of most of his fellow officers?
  - a. Absolutely essential.
  - b. Important.
  - c. Helpful to have around
  - d. Makes little difference one way or the other
  - e. Other (specify)
8. Using the same categories how important do you think the chaplain is in the eyes of the men in the ranks? Why?
9. Recent articles in the national press have mentioned IRA suspects being tortured in order to get them to reveal information.

- a. Do you feel the use of torture ever justified? If 'Yes' when?
  - b. What should a chaplain do if such practices take place in a unit for which he is spiritually responsible?
10. Assuming that your fundamental loyalty is to God and His Church, how would you react to a conflict situation involving:
- a. Soldiers v civilians
  - b. RC civilians v Protestant civilians
  - c. Soldiers v IRA gunmen
  - d. Soldiers v Children throwing stones etc
  - e. HM Government v H Block prisoners
11. What advice would you give to a soldier who developed conscientious objections to service in Northern Ireland?
12. In more general terms many would hold it to be true that the chaplain's job is to bolster morale by quieting moral doubts and encouraging the men to get on with the job. How do you feel about this particularly in a Northern Ireland context?
13. Can you personally conceive a situation e.g. in Northern Ireland where the opposite might be true: that is, in which the chaplain's primary obligation would be to advise the men to refuse to obey on moral grounds? (Not legal grounds) Please specify
14. Is there anything about the role of the chaplain in Northern Ireland that causes you conflict? If so, please elaborate.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

ACCM	Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry.
CCMF	The Church's Committee for Supplementing Religious Education among men in Her Majesty's Forces.
CIO	Church Information Office
RChD	Royal Army Chaplains' Department.
RAF	Royal Air Force.
SCM	Student Christian Movement.
SPCK	Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge.
USA	United States of America.
MOD	Ministry of Defence

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABERCROMBIE C    The Military Chaplain (Sage) 1977
- ADAMS R M        "Autonomy and Theological Ethics" in Religious Studies  
No. 16 (Cambridge) 1979 pp 191-194.
- ALDERSON J        A Force for Power (Devon and Cornwall Constabulary) 1977.
- Alternative Patterns of Training - A Report by a Working Party for the  
Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry (ACCM) (Church  
Information Office) 1975.
- APPELQUIST A R (Ed) Church, State and Chaplaincy (General Commission on  
Chaplains and Armed Forces USA) 1969.
- ARENDRT H (Ed)    On Violence (Penguin) 1970.
- Arms Control and Disarmament - Central Office of Information (Various)
- The Army and Religion - An interdenominational enquiry on the religious life  
of the nation as a result of the 1914-18 War (MacMillan) 1919.
- BARCLAY W        Ethics in a Permissive Society (Fontana) 1971.
- BARNET C         Britain and Her Army (Penguin) 1970.
- BARON B          The Birth of a Movement (Toc H) 1946.
- BARRETT C K      New Testament Essays (SPCK) 1972.
- BARKY F R        Church and Leadership (SCM) 1945  
Period of My Life (Hodder & Stoughton) 1970
- BAYLIS J (Ed)    The Soldier in Modern Society (Eyre Methuen) 1972
- BEALE H K        Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power  
(Johns Hopkins Press) 1956.
- BELL G K A        Randall Davidson (Oxford) 1935  
Christianity and World Order (Oxford) 1940.
- BELL G K A (Ed) War and the Kingdom of God (Longmans) 1915
- BENNETT J C      The Christian as Citizen (USCL) 1956.
- BONHOEFFER D    Ethics (SCM) 1955  
Letters and Papers from Prison (SCM) 1956.
- BOSANQUET M     The Life and Death of Dietrich Bonhoeffer (Hodder and  
Stoughton) 1968.
- BRANHAM M C     "The Air Force Chaplain's Role" in Air University Review  
(July/August 1978) Vol 29 No. 5 pp 49-53.

- BRANSCOMBE B H     The Gospel of Mark (Hodder & Stoughton) 1952
- The British Nuclear Deterrent - A Report of a Working Group to the British Council of Churches (SCM) 1963
- BRUMWELL M         The Army Chaplain (A & C Black) 1943
- BRUNNER E          The Letter to the Romans (Lutterworth) 1969)
- BUTTERFIELD H     Christianity and History (Fontana) 1957.
- BUCHAN A           War in Modern Society (Watts) 1966.
- BURCHARD W W      "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains" in The American Sociological Review (October 1954) pp 528-535  
The Role of the Military Chaplain (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of California 1953).
- CAREY W            Thinking Straight About This War (Mowbrays) 1939.
- CARPENTER S C     Faith in Time of War (SCM) 1949.  
Winnington Ingram (SCM) 1949.
- CATHERWOOD F      First Things First (Lion) 1979.
- CAWS B W and  
  WAITS R F         What Greater Glory (Blackie) 1974.
- Chaplain         -   A journal for Chaplains serving in the Armed Forces (USA) published by the General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel. Vol 32. No. 2 1975 pp 2-55.
- The Church and the Atom - A Study of the Moral and Theological Aspects of Peace and War by a Commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and York in accordance with a resolution of the Church Assembly. (Church Assembly Press and Publications Board) 1946.
- Civil Strife     -   Published for the Board of Social Responsibility of the General Synod 1971.
- CLAYTON P B        Tales of Talbot House (TOC H) 1919.
- COLLINS L J        Faith under Fire (Frewin) 1966.
- Command         -   A Magazine for the Officers Christian Fellowship of the USA Forces - Vol XVII No. 1 1975.
- CRANFIELD C E B   The Service of God (Epworth) 1965  
The First Epistle of Peter (SCM) 1950.
- The Crisis of the Western World - Broadcast Talks (George Allen and Unwin) 1944.
- DALY C B           Violence in Ireland and the Christian Conscience (Veritas) 1973.
- DAVIES J G         Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution (SCM) 1976.

- DEDRING J           Recent Advances in Peace and Conflict Research (Sage) 1976.
- DEWAR L             Moral Theology in the Modern World (Mowbrays) 1964.
- DOBBIE W G S        Christianity and Military Service (Pickering and Inglis) 1936.
- DOWELL G            "Defence, Disarmament and Christian Obedience" in Crucible  
(April-June 1980) pp 69-76.
- ECCLESTONE G        The Irish Problem and Ourselves (CIO) 1977.  
and ELLIOTT E
- EDWARDS D L         Religion and Change (Hodder & Stoughton) 1969.
- ELIOT T S            Kiplings Verse (Faber) 1941.
- The Era of Atomic Power - A Report of a Commission appointed by the British  
Council of Churches (SCM) 1946.
- FELD M D            The Structure of Violence (Sage) 1977.
- FERGUSON J (Ed)     War and the Creative Arts (MacMillan) 1972.
- FERGUSON J and  
PITT WATSON         Letters on Pacifism (SCM) 1956.
- Field Manual       - of the United States Army 1964.
- FLETCHER J          Situation Ethics (SCM) 1966.
- Force in the Modern World - A document prepared for the Board for Social  
Responsibility (CIO) 1973.
- GIRVETZ H K (Ed)    Contemporary Moral Issues (Wadsworth) 1975
- God's Will in Our Time - A Report presented to the General Assembly of the  
Church of Scotland (SCM) 1942.
- GOLDMAN N L and  
SEGAL G (Ed)        The Social Psychology of Military Service (Sage) 1976.
- GORE C              The War and The Church (Mowbrays) 1914.
- HACKETT J           The Profession of Arms (Times Publishing Co.) 1963.
- HABGOOD J S         The Proliferation of Nuclear Technology (Council on  
Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament) 1977.
- HANKEY D            A Student in Arms (Melrose) 1916  
The Beloved Captain (Geoffrey Bles) 1956.
- HASTINGS A          The Faces of God (Chapman) 1975.
- HEBBLETHWAITE B    Evil, Suffering and Religion (Sheldon) 1976.
- The Hospital Chaplain - A Report of the Working Party appointed by the Joint  
Committee for the Advisory Council for the Church's  
Ministry (CIO) 1973.

- HUNTINGTON S      The Soldier and The State (Vintage Books) 1964.
- HUTCHESON R G      The Churches and the Chaplains (John Knox Press) 1975.
- IREMONGER F A      William Temple (Oxford) 1948
- JANOWITZ M          Military Conflict (Sage) 1975.  
The Professional Soldier (Free Press of Glencoe) 1975.
- JESSOP T E          Law and Love (SCM) 1940.  
The Padre's Hour (CCMC) 1940  
Social Ethics Christian and Natural (Epworth)  
The Morality of Pacifism and the Nuclear Deterrent (MOD) 1975
- KEELING M          What is Right? (SCM) 1969.
- KERNOHAN R D      Scotland's Life and Work. (St Andrews) 1979.
- KEYS C E            An Evaluation of Certain Factors Affecting the Retention  
Rate of Career Chaplains in the United States Army. (An  
unpublished thesis for the Industrial College of the Armed  
Forces, Washington DC. 1969).
- KIRK P              One Army Strong? (Faith Press) 1958.
- LEE A M             "To what is Northern Ireland's Civil War Relevant?" in  
Holy Cross Quarterly Vol 6 1974 pp 98-100.
- LEIDEN C and  
SCHMITT K M        The Politics of Violence (Greenwood) 1968.
- LEWIS R A          "A Contemporary Religious Enigma: Churches and War" in  
Journal of Political and Military Sociology Vol 3 No. 1  
1975 pp 57-70.
- LLOYD R            The Church of England 1900-1965 (SCM) 1966.
- LOVAT, Lord        March Past (Weidenfeld and Nicholson) 1978.
- MACKIE S G        Ireland's Conflict Diminishes Me (WCC) 1975.
- MACKINNON D      Borderlands of Theology (Lutterworth) 1968.
- MACQUARRIE J      The Concept of Peace (London) 1974.
- MACNUTT E B (Ed)   The Church in the Furnace (MacMillan) 1917
- MASCALL E L (Ed)   The Church Looks Ahead (Faber) 1941.
- MAWHINNEY B and  
WELLS R            Conflict and Christianity in Northern Ireland (Lion) 1975.
- McCULLOCK J      We have our Orders (Joseph) 1943.
- MELINSKY H        Patterns of Ministry (CIO) 1974.

Military Chaplaincy - Handbook of the Australian Army 1976.

MILL J S Writings (Everyman)

Ministry - Published for the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry (ACCM) 1972.MOORMAN J R H B K Cunningham (A&C Black) 1947.  
A History of the Church of England (A&C Black) 1953

NORMAN E Christianity and the World Order (Oxford) 1979.

Notes on Religious Instruction in the British Army - Published by the Royal Army Chaplains Department 1947.OSGOOD R E and  
TUCKER R W Force, Order and Justice (John Hopkins Press) 1967.PASKINS B and  
DOCKRILL M The Ethics of War (Duckworth) 1979.PATON W The Church and the War Order (SCM) 1941  
Continental Christianity in War-time (Edinburgh House Press) 1942.Peace is Still the Prize - Sponsored by the Conference on Christian Approaches to Defense and Disarmament (SCM) 1966.

PIPER O A Christian Ethics (Nelson) 1970.

PYM T W and  
GORDON G Papers from Picardy (Constable) 1917.PRESTON R H and  
HANSON A T The Revelation of St. John the Divine (SCM) 1949.RACHD Handbook

RAMSEY I T Christian Ethics and Contemporary Philosophy (SCM) 1966.

RAVEN C E War and the Christian (SCM) 1938.

RAWLINSON A E J The Gospel According to St. Mark (Methven) 1925.

REGEHR E Militarism and the World Military Order (WCC) 1980.

RICHARDSON A The Political Christ (SCM) 1972.

RIDEELL J G and  
DRYBURGH G M Crisis and Challenge (Church of Scotland) 1942.The Road to Peace - Sponsored by the Conference on Christian Approaches to Defense and Disarmament (SCM) 1965.

ROSE R Governing without Consensus (Faber) 1971.

- SASSOON S                      *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer (Faber) 1930*
- Seaford House Papers (1973)    Essays produced by Senior Officers of the Civil Service and Armed Forces attending the Royal College of Defence Studies.
- SELWYN E G                      *First Epistle of St. Peter (MacMillan) 1946.*
- SOANE B                         *Christian Morality and the Use of Force (RACHD) 1979.*
- Specialised Ministries -    A Report of a Working Party of the Ministry Committee of ACCM (CIO) 1971.
- SMITH G V                        *The Bishop of London's visit to the Front (Longmans) 1915.*
- SMYTH J                         *In This Sign Conquer (Mowbray) 1968.*
- SOLT T                         *Saints in Arms (Oxford) 1959.*
- SPURR F C                        *Some Chaplains in Khaki (Kingsgate) Undated.*
- STALLWORTHY J                 *Wilfred Owen (Oxford) 1974.*
- STEVEN W T                      *In This Sign (Regeson Press) 1948.*
- Streit um den Frieden -    Arguments produced on behalf of the Bundeswehr by the German Evangelical Church 1981.
- A Supporting Ministry -    A Report of the Ministry Committee of ACCM (CIO) 1968.
- SWINTON E                        *The Study of War (Clarendon) 1926.*
- TALBOT T and  
BILHEIMER R S                 *Christians and the Prevention of War in an Atomic Age (SCM) 1961.*
- TAYLOR G                        *The Sea Chaplains (Oxford) 1978.*
- TEMPLE W                        *Christian Faith and Life (SCM) 1931.*  
*Christianity and the Social Order (Penguin) 1942.*
- Thinking Ahead -            *The Church's Committee for Supplementing Religious Education among men in Her Majesty's Forces (CCMF) 1940.*
- TILLICH P                        *The Protestant Era (Chicago University) 1957.*
- WALTON R                        *What do Christians Really Believe? (SCM) 1944.*
- WATSON P S                        *The State is a Servant of God (SPCK) 1946.*
- WEATHERHEAD L D                *This is the Victory (Hodder and Stoughton) 1940.*  
*The Will of God (Epworth) 1944.*
- WEHR P and  
WASHBURN M                      *Peace and World Order Systems (Sage) 1976.*
- WEIZSÄCKER C F von            *Ethical and Political Problems of the Atomic Age (SCM) 1958.*

- WHICKHAM E R            Church and People in an Industrial City (Lutterworth) 1958
- WHITEHOUSE W A        "The State and Divine Law" in F W Camfield (Ed)  
Reformation Old and New (Lutterworth) 1947 pp 199-217.
- WILKINSON A            The Church of England and the First World War (SPCK) 1978.  
"The Paradox of the Military Chaplain" in Theology  
(July 1981) pp 249-257.
- WINDASS S              Christianity Versus Violence (Steed and Ward) 1964.
- WOLFE J N and  
ERICKSON J (Ed)        The Armed Services and Society (Edinburgh) 1970.
- WOODWARD C S and  
BLACKBURNE M W        Clergy in Time of War (Hodder and Stoughton) 1939.
- WRIGHT S (Ed)         Front Line Religion (Hodder and Stoughton) 1941.
- YODER T H              The Politics of Jesus (Eerdmans) 1972.
- ZAHN G C                Chaplains in the Royal Air Force: a Study in Role  
Tension (Manchester University) 1969.

