

# Standing Commission on Peace

## CONTENTS

Membership

Summary of the Commission's Work and a List of Consultants

Report

Introduction

Part I: A Model of Peacemaking from Central America

Part II: Continuing Peace Efforts in South Africa

Part III: Peacemaking Efforts within the Church

Part IV: Broader Issues of Violence and Peace

Conclusion

Financial Report

Resolutions for the General Convention

Goals and Objectives

Proposed Budget for the Coming Triennium

Proposed Resolution for Budget Appropriation

Appendix: Pertinent Resolutions on Peace and Justice

## MEMBERSHIP

The Rt. Rev. Maurice M. Benitez (1991), Texas

The Rt. Rev. Wesley Frensdorff (1988), Arizona

The Rt. Rev. John T. Walker (1991), Washington

The Rev. Jane Garrett (1991), Vermont

The Rev. Nathaniel W. Pierce, *Chair* (1988), Massachusetts

The Rev. George F. Regas (1988), Los Angeles

The Hon. Hugh R. Jones (1991)\*, Central New York

Ms. Joanne Maynard (1988), Montana

Dr. Allan M. Parrent (1988), Virginia

Mr. Lawrence S. Poston, *Vice Chair* (1988), Chicago

Mr. Lee Davis Thames, *Secretary* (1991), Mississippi

Ms. Thelma Wilson (1991), Nicaragua

\*Executive Council liaison

### *Representatives of the Commission at General Convention*

In the House of Bishops, the Rt. Rev. Wesley Frensdorff or the Rt. Rev. John T. Walker are authorized by the commission to receive nonsubstantive amendments to the report. In the House of Deputies, the Rev. Jane Garrett or Ms. Joanne Maynard are authorized by the commission to receive such amendments.

## SUMMARY OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK AND A LIST OF CONSULTANTS

The Standing Commission on Peace met seven times during the triennium and benefited from the presentations of the following individuals and groups; organizations are listed for purposes of identification only.

*April 1986 (Alexandria, Virginia)*

Under the leadership of the Rt. Rev. John T. Walker, the commission gathered

for its first meeting. Officers were elected and meeting dates were selected for the triennium.

*November 1986 (Houston, Texas)*

Mr. Guillermo Cochez, Jr., an attorney in Panama; he was an observer for the elections in El Salvador and presently serves as the vice president of the Christian Democratic party in Panama;

Mr. Humberto Belli, a former Communist who converted to Christianity in 1977; he served as the editor of the editorial page of *La Prensa* before it was closed down by the government; he is currently a professor at the University of Steubenville in Ohio;

Mr. Michael Conroy, Professor of Central America Studies at the University of Texas and Director of the Central American Resource Center.

*March 1987 (Nicaragua)*

Comite Nacional de Derechos Humanos (National Human Rights Committee)—founded before the revolution—now in opposition to the government;

Commission Nicaraguense para la Promocion y Proteccion de los Derechos Humanos (Nicaraguan Commission for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights)—founded after the revolution—pro-government;

SERPAAJ—Servicio de Paz y Justicia—founded by Nobel Peace Prize recipient Adolfo Perez Esquivel; the Nicaragua chapter has offices in the Episcopal Diocesan Center;

*Barricada*—the official newspaper of Frente Sandinista;

*La Prensa*—oldest newspaper, which was closed down by the government in August 1986; their offices still operate;

*El Nuevo Diario*—founded after the revolution when the Chamorro family (owners of *La Prensa*) had a split in opinions; their original policy was middle-of-the-road;

Mr. Stephen Kinzer, a reporter for the *New York Times*, who has lived in Nicaragua for 10 years;

The Rt. Rev. Sturdie Downs, Episcopal Bishop of Nicaragua, and members of his staff;

A representative of Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo, Roman Catholic leader;

The People's Church—committed to liberation theology, this group has developed house churches among the poor and supports the revolution; the Roman Catholic hierarchy is critical of it;

Rene Nunez Tellez—Commandante Ortega's chief of staff and a key member of the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

*June 1987 (Chicago, Illinois)*

The Rev. Edward M. Copland, Rector of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, Evanston, Illinois;

Robert Pettit and Sallie Pettit of the Ecumenical Refugee Council, Inc., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

*September 1987 (Alexandria, Virginia)*

Lt. General Max Noah, Comptroller of the U.S. Army;

Major General Robert Bunker, Director, Management Directorate, Office Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

*November 1987 (New York, New York)*

The Most Rev. Edmond L. Browning, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church;

Ms. Judy Gillespie, Executive for World Mission; Ms. Diane Porter, Deputy for Public Ministries; the Rev. Charles Cesaretti, Deputy to the Presiding Bishop for Anglican Affairs.

*January 1988 (Pasadena, California)*

The Rev. Walter W. Hannum, General Director of the Episcopal Church Missionary Community and member of the Standing Commission on World Mission;

Dr. Judith Glass, Executive Director, and Marty E. Coleman, Director of Outreach, for the Interfaith Center to Reverse the Arms Race, Pasadena.

The commission would also like to express its appreciation to the Rev. Donald Nickerson, Executive Officer of the General Convention, who was kind enough to attend two of our meetings. The commission did not have a regular staff person during the triennium.

### REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

#### Introduction

What is to be the shape of the peacemaking ministry of the Episcopal Church in the latter part of the twentieth century? In attempting to provide an answer to this question, we offer a brief review of the significant events that gave rise to the creation of the Standing Commission on Peace.

In 1962, the House of Bishops issued a Pastoral Letter on War and Peace that said in part: "Because of the nature of the Christian faith, Christians have an imperative obligation to pray and work for peace among men and nations. Questions of war and peace are not remote and peripheral concerns for the committed Christian; they grow out of basic understandings of man and his destiny which are inherent in the Christian revelation."

It would be 15 years before these words, and indeed the entire pastoral, would begin to take root within the Episcopal Church, perhaps because of the divisions and emotions engendered by the Vietnam War. In 1977, the movement for a commission of the General Convention, which would attempt the task of giving the 1962 pastoral some substance, began to take shape. A proposal for a Joint Commission on Peace ("Joint" meant that it would be a three-year, temporary body) was placed before the 1979 General Convention and approved.

That first Joint Commission on Peace (JCP) was given the task by the 1979 General Convention of presenting "a comprehensive program for implementing the 1962 House of Bishops' Pastoral Letter as it pertains to peace and war." The JCP argued for a "bottom-up" approach to peacemaking in its 1982 report, which was prefaced by and grounded in a substantial biblical, historical, and theological rationale (since adopted by the 1985 General Convention as "an official statement on the issues of war and peace"). In addition, the 1982 report urged that all institutions and individuals within the Episcopal Church be encouraged and enabled "to exercise their responsibility and commitment as followers of Christ to become peacemakers."

Acting upon the recommendation of that first JCP, the 1982 General Convention created a second Joint Commission on Peace, directing it "in collaboration with other commissions of the Convention and committees of Executive Council, the dioceses, and the seminaries of the Church, to develop a greater awareness of the centrality of peacemaking to their several missions and responsibilities," to report on progress made to the 1985 General Convention, and to make further recommendations for action.

---

The second JCP recommended a number of important actions to the 1985 General Convention, all of which were adopted and implemented:

1. A Standing (i.e., permanent) Commission on Peace was created and funded.
2. Financial support was provided to the Anglican Peace and Justice Network under the auspices of the Anglican Consultative Council and the Archbishop of Canterbury.
3. A strong resolution on Central America, modeled after one proposed by the commission, was adopted. The text of this resolution, which has served as a legislative basis for much of our work, will be found in the Appendix.
4. Most recently, a Peace and Justice Officer has been added to the staff of the Church Center under the auspices of the Executive Council.

Though Convention encouraged a church-wide study on the issue of nuclear deterrence, much remains to be done on the issue, to which we will return later in this report.

The first JCP emphasized the inherent responsibility of each baptized person to exercise a peace ministry, a ministry rooted in Scripture and theology and given to all of us at the time of our baptism, while the second JCP recommended the administrative and institutional changes necessary to nurture and support such a ministry. This, in turn, brings us to the task of the Standing Commission on Peace (SCP) as it reports to the 1988 General Convention.

This report comes at a time of increased hope for progress toward a more peaceful world environment, at least in the area of relations between the two major nuclear powers. The agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to remove all intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) from the continent of Europe is a modest but welcome first step toward what may be the even more significant reduction of strategic nuclear forces. While it is too early to tell if this is the beginning of a new era in super-power relations, and of continuing progress in the reduction of both nuclear and conventional force levels, it is on balance a positive step.

In the course of our work during the triennium, we found ourselves deeply concerned about the issue of violence in some of its other manifestations. Whether as far away as the third world or as close to home as the home itself, violence seems to be increasing everywhere. We begin our report with a specific model of peacemaking, which emerged from our experience in Nicaragua. We follow that with some thoughts on peacemaking efforts within the Church and a consideration of the deeper roots of violence.

### *Part I: A Model of Peacemaking from Central America*

In 1985, the JCP had urged Episcopalians to visit Central America, and, indeed, we felt that further comment from the Standing Commission on Peace (SCP) on this critical situation would be inappropriate unless we were willing to make such a visit ourselves. We were also particularly conscious of the resolution from the Diocese of Nicaragua that was passed in 1983 and reaffirmed in 1984 and that said in part: "[We] make an appeal to the entire Anglican Communion, and especially to our churches in Central America, that they do all they possibly can to influence their members, their communities, and their governments to help in the steps taken for peace in Central America and by so doing avoid war among brothers." (For the full text, see Appendix.)

When Ms. Thelma Wilson, a member of the SCP and a resident of Nicaragua, invited us to visit her country, we had ample reason for accepting. As a result, six members of the commission spent March 2-6, 1987, in Managua talking with people from a variety of perspectives, including the Episcopal Bishop of Nicaragua and members of his staff.

We saw first hand the effects of the war in Nicaragua. The Diocese of Nicaragua, *a diocese of our own Church*, has suffered grievously. In this arena of conflict, what would be an appropriate recommendation to the General Convention? Another biblical and theological statement seemed redundant, and another resolution seemed unnecessary.

In his book *Way of the Cross—Way of Justice* (Orbis Books, 1980, translated from the Portuguese by John Drury), Leonardo Boff cites Luke 23:26:

As they led him away, they laid hold of one Simon the Cyrenean who was coming in from the fields. They put a crossbeam on Simon's shoulder for him to carry along behind Jesus.

Boff goes on to say:

Simon certainly had nothing to do with Jesus. He did not know who he was, much less that he himself was helping the Son of God and the Liberator of the World. But that does not matter. What matters is that in a moment of need Simon was capable of lending his shoulders to one whose own had given out, of offering his strength to one who had none left, of taking on himself the cross which the other man could no longer carry.

It is important to be familiar with, to take cognizance of, people and situations. It is important to know that Jesus is the Lord, that he represents the personal and definitive visit of God to humanity. It is important to realize that we must be sensitively aware of the urgent needs of others, especially of those who are most poor, dirty, and foul-smelling.

But knowing is not the decisive thing. The decisive thing is real, effective action. It is not those who know and say "Lord, Lord" who will be saved but rather those who do what God asks. Salvation takes place when we make the leap from theory to real, authentic practice. (page 36)

What Boff seems to be saying here is that Simon of Cyrene can be a model for Christians in the United States as we seek to reach out to our brothers and sisters in Central America. Passing resolutions and funding "peace desks" have their value, but Simon went beyond that; he carried the cross for another in need.

As the Spirit worked within us during our visit to Nicaragua, the idea of a ministry of healing, support, and reconciliation gained a strong endorsement from our commission. The important principles for this model of working for peace that emerged from our work are as follows:

1. Mission strategy can and should consider areas of conflict as suitable places for intensified missionary support.
2. An indigenous Anglican presence is a prerequisite.
3. The local diocese should be encouraged to identify a project that would bring healing and reconciliation to people who are suffering as a result of the conflict.
4. The project, if possible, should offer Episcopalians an opportunity to give time and expertise, not just money, and should be selected with that principle of direct participation in view.
5. While there must be some accountability for the expenditure of any funds, the community that is being served must be able to preserve that degree of autonomy that is necessary to respond flexibly and creatively to local needs. Such control at the local level is especially important with respect to the approval and training of volunteers from other parts of the world.
6. Financial and volunteer support should come from a broad base of Episcopalians and not just from national church funds. Specifically, dioceses and parishes should be informed about projects and should have the option of

coming on board as participants, subject to appropriate liaison both with PECUSA and the local diocese being served.

We have recognized that there are many places in the world where war and violence prevail, where oppression and terrorism are daily fare. Any of these might command the attention of the SCP. However, we have chosen to focus our attention on Central America because it is part of the Episcopal Church, U.S.A., and we were able to visit that area.

For more than a hundred years, Central America has been caught up in the political policies of many presidents and congresses of the United States. The results have been disastrous for the people of that region. The many efforts of our government to stabilize life in the area by means of a military presence have produced, especially in Nicaragua, a strong anti-American stance. The effect of the present situation has caused many in Nicaragua to view the United States as the real enemy.

The Church of England, and later the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., have had a long interest and involvement in Central America. We have also had a long commitment to peacemaking. It is important, therefore, that we engage in a healing process that may assist in bringing about reconciliation among the peoples of Central America, and between several of those nations and the United States. Our partnership in mission with them should extend to the seeking of peace together.

In order to accomplish this, we call upon the Episcopal Church to give broad support to a program of healing for Central America. We propose that the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief seek to raise \$1,500,000 over a six-year period, beginning with the upcoming triennium, to assist the Episcopal Church in Central America in its peacemaking and healing ministries. We cite particular needs in El Salvador and Nicaragua, where war has ravaged both countryside and people. The suffering and pain in these countries are due to wars in which our country has been directly involved. We would further cite the terrible burdens borne by Costa Rica, Honduras, and Guatemala due either to refugee problems or to despotism and a denial of human rights.

As this work is developed, the leaders of the Ninth Province and the Church's Commission on World Mission as well as the Church in each country should be involved in determining projects and appropriate allocation of funds.

We believe that the resolutions of the 1982 and 1985 General Conventions on Central America, and the concern expressed by the second JCP in its 1985 report, all point to ample evidence of a broad concern within the Episcopal Church for what is happening in Central America in general, and Nicaragua in particular. Given these six years of reports, resolutions, prayers, and shared concern, we commend to your thoughtful attention this specific proposal for action, not only as a model for peacemaking, but also as one practical and authentic response to the deplorable violence in Central America.

We believe that this proposal is a historic opportunity for the Episcopal Church to participate in a peacemaking, healing ministry in a place that has suffered so much in recent years. More importantly, it serves as a model of peacemaking that deserves broad support within the Church.

### *Part II: Continuing Peace Efforts in South Africa*

It is difficult just now to know what role our Church can play in the extremely difficult situation that continues in South Africa. Since 1985, nearly all of our church

institutions have divested themselves of stock in companies that have done or still do business in South Africa. The U.S. Congress passed in 1986 a bill calling for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. In the same period of time, a majority of the major American companies in South Africa have sold their business holdings there and come home.

Because of the success of the major effort on the part of church groups and others, we raise the question of the effect of the activities of the anti-apartheid groups and governmental sanctions against South Africa. The answer at this point must be that apartheid is alive and well and the government of the Republic of South Africa is stronger than ever. On the face of it, it would appear that the anti-apartheid movement has been a failure. However, we believe that the final decision is not yet in.

While the immediate result has been to strengthen the government's hand, it must also be said that world-wide awareness of the situation in South Africa has encouraged church and labor leaders in that country who represent the hopes and aspirations of the black, Asian, and colored majority. The Afrikaner Church has finally decided that apartheid cannot be justified on the basis of Scripture or theology. This is a major breakthrough.

Our effort in South Africa should be to assist the Church (Anglican, Dutch Reformed, and others) and the black leadership in South Africa toward a peaceful end to apartheid; to negotiate majority participation in the political life of that country; and to help them realize a greater share in the nation's wealth. It remains unconscionable that 24 million people are ruled and have their lives and destinies determined by a small white minority. The alternative to a peaceful settlement is too terrible to contemplate. If our efforts have failed so far, then we must seek other options.

First, we must always look to the black leadership for advice as to our appropriate role. We cannot from outside decide for these oppressed the direction their revolution should take. The Church must continue in conversation with Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Rev. Alan Boesak, the Rev. Beyers Naude, Winnie Mandela, Dr. Oliver Tambo of the African National Congress, and others, especially leaders of the trade unions. Together these men and women represent the vast majority of the disenfranchised people of South Africa. We must, therefore, take our lead from them.

Second, we can give concrete aid by assisting students who need financial assistance to begin or complete their academic training at the university or graduate school levels. We can also help by providing funds for on-the-job experience outside of South Africa when possible.

Third, we must continue the pressure. Because of the anti-apartheid movement, the U.S. Government has finally decided to make some belated changes in its policy and also found a stronger voice to protest the actions of the Botha government. That pressure should take the form of a demand that our Congress continue and increase trade restrictions and other forms of sanctions. The picketing of the South African Embassy should be maintained. We can learn from our Jewish friends who have never ceased in their picketing near the Soviet Embassy and a maintenance of pressure on the U.S. Government.

Finally, and extremely important, we can pray that the Holy Spirit would change the hearts of many of the white Christians in South Africa.

This may all seem quite inadequate. However, we realize that we are limited as to what we can do. It may be that pressure and external support for those who work from within is all that we can do. We offer prayer as a significant effort because what we are

dealing with here is not godless atheistic communism versus a Christian democratic government. What we have is Christian demagogues against other Christians whose only crime is to have been born black or colored. We have here a Christian minority persecuting others born in the image of God and therefore entitled to the same love and concern that we are called upon to give to one another.

In our baptismal rite, when we reaffirm our faith we are asked: "Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbor as your self? Will you . . . respect the dignity of every human being?" The answer is obvious.

### *Part III: Peacemaking Efforts within the Church*

#### A. Domestic Work

During the past triennium, the commission has been impressed by the significant advances in the ministry related to peace and justice within the Episcopal Church. The report of the first JCP argued for a "bottom-up" approach to peacemaking, and there are encouraging signs that this is in fact happening.

Increased diocesan activity has necessitated staff support in the Episcopal Church Center. The publication of *Christ Is Risen—A Study Guide about Russian Orthodox Christianity* under the auspices of the Education for Mission and Ministry division of the Episcopal Church has been a valuable resource in the effort to foster greater understanding of the Russian peoples by members of the Episcopal Church.

In addition, the appointment, as of January 1, 1988, of a public ministries team including a Staff Officer for Peace and Justice, and an expansion of the national Church's presence in Washington, D.C., is a hopeful sign of a deeper commitment to peacemaking by the Episcopal Church. There is a need for national staff to support networks among the dioceses and congregations of the Church. Such support should include gathering and distributing resources. Many diocesan peace commissions have initiated creative and important programs that deserve to be shared with a wider community.

The commission also encourages the Episcopal Church at every level to cooperate and work with ecumenical and interfaith organizations engaged in peacemaking.

One notable untapped resource in the work for peace is the members of our Church who serve in the armed forces. At a meeting in Alexandria in the fall of 1987, the commission (which numbered among its members an officer of the U.S. Army Reserve) had occasion to meet with two high-ranking Pentagon generals who are Episcopalians. In a wide-ranging and candid discussion of nearly three hours' duration, the commission members and these career officers shared their perceptions of what constitutes the Church's role in peacemaking and how this role relates to the military establishment.

We came away convinced anew, as previous commissions have been, that many individual members of the armed forces are dealing conscientiously with the relationship between their faith and their profession. Indeed, the responsibility to consider their daily work in light of their faith is one to which all Christians are called. In confronting issues unknown to many a civilian, members of the armed forces may have thought through the difficult issues of war and peace at much greater depth than many of those who are not and have never been in uniform. These officers, too, believe that their task is to make peace, to prevent war, and by definition they have had to give the highest of priorities to the protection of the lives of those whom they may have had occasion to command. The thoughts the two generals contributed to our deliberations were a healthy reminder to us that ours is a pluralistic Church, and that we can come together

---

united as Christians even when we disagree on the means by which we attain the ends of peace and social justice.

As we have said, the large number of Episcopalians who are professionals in the armed forces constitute a remarkable resource for the Church. Their voices, no more but surely no less than those representing a range of other views, are essential to informed dialogue at the parish and diocesan levels. Too often, we suspect, they have felt excluded from such discussion by the tenor of some recent resolutions at General Convention and other decision-making levels of the Church. Yet our Church is their home too, and our task is to minister to them as well as to those who, in reviewing the same evidence regarding modern warfare, may have come to very different conclusions.

Finally, in response to a request from the House of Bishops, the second JCP conducted a survey of some of the principal theoretical and ethical implications of our policy of reliance on nuclear deterrence, and offered the results of its thinking to the bishops in the form of a paper serving as a basis for discussion and study at the 1984 meeting of the House of Bishops. That commission recommended that such a study be extended to the entire Church. In 1987, this Standing Commission asked that the House of Bishops in turn express itself on this issue in order to provide guidance for Episcopalians. That has not yet taken place, but we continue to believe that some response from our bishops would be an appropriate act of episcopal leadership, and would demonstrate a willingness to continue to reason from the work of preparation already undertaken by the previous Commission on Peace.

In the years ahead, it will be important to support local initiatives concerned with peace and justice while the national Episcopal Church continues the work of promoting peacemaking as a fundamental dimension of what it means to be a Christian.

### B. International Work

The JCP in its report to the 1985 General Convention, *To Make Peace*, recommended that the Episcopal Church support the establishment of an Anglican Peace and Justice Network and, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, commit \$60,000 over the triennium to realize this idea. The General Convention supported this recommendation, and in each year (1986, 1987, and 1988) provided \$20,000 through the Anglican Consultative Council for the network.

The establishment of an Anglican Peace and Justice Network was affirmed by the Anglican Consultative Council at the meeting held in 1984 in Lagos, Nigeria. The funding by the Episcopal Church enabled the initial gathering of persons from across the Communion to meet and to organize. The vision was to bring those persons responsible in the 27 Anglican provinces together for the purposes of consultation, communication, and coordination. It was perceived early on that the Communion as a whole and individual provinces would benefit by the identification of individuals in each place and linking these persons together in a network of information sharing, reflection, and support. Of particular and urgent concern was the situation in the Church of the Province of Southern Africa, although the needs of the Province of Jerusalem and the Middle East soon came to the fore.

With funding available from the Episcopal Church, an invitation was sent to each province to send a representative to meet to test the viability of such a Communion-wide network. At the organizational meeting in London, where the office of the Anglican Consultative Council is housed, 12 representatives gathered to discuss the needs and future of the proposed network, and draw up a purpose statement. Each representative

was appointed by the primate of the province, and each reported on the peace and justice program of that province.

In the spring of 1986, the network, now grown to 21 representatives, met in Jerusalem and was hosted by the Bishop of Jerusalem, the Rt. Rev. Samir Kafity. The task at this meeting was to respond to a request from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the ACC to produce a working paper on peace and justice for the Lambeth Conference scheduled for July 1988. In the fall of 1986, the working paper was completed and had wide distribution across the Communion. In the United States, it was distributed as an insert in *The Episcopalian* and is also available in quantity from Forward Movement Publications. This working paper has provided the structure for the preparatory document on Christianity and the Social Order for the Lambeth Conference.

In 1987, 24 of the 27 Anglican provinces were represented at the network gathering in Singapore. Meeting just prior to the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC-7), the network discussed and shared with the Council resolutions on Southern Africa, the Middle East, and the international debt. Members of the network have been called by the Archbishop of Canterbury to serve as support staff to the ACC and to the Lambeth Conference.

The support by the Episcopal Church has been key in the establishment and support of the network. All the funds have been shared through the ACC and have enabled the participation of representatives from provinces that would find participation financially impossible without support for travel.

We believe that the work of the Anglican Peace and Justice Network is worthy of the continuing support of the Episcopal Church, although we would expect other provinces in the Anglican Communion to share in the costs involved. Further, we would suggest that provincial representation on the network should include a person from a body like the SCP. As we seek ways in which the Episcopal Church can strengthen its peacemaking ministry, we believe that it is important for the SCP to be in communication with representatives of the Anglican provinces for the purpose of developing a better understanding of the needs of others in the Communion.

#### *Part IV: Broader Issues of Violence and Peace*

In the foregoing sections of this report, we have focused on Central America, which has been at the center of the commission's concerns during this last triennium; on South Africa; and on peacemaking activities—and peacemaking imperatives—within the Church. What has distinguished our work from that of the antecedent joint commissions has been the relatively brief attention we have given to the nuclear arms race and the nuclear deterrent. The first JCP report, after laying out some Gospel principles relating to war and the place war has held in Christian history, went on to ask about the impact of nuclear strategy and nuclear war-making capabilities on the just war tradition, while the second JCP, at the request of the House of Bishops, examined the issue of deterrence itself in considerable detail. (See Part III.A. above.)

[See *To Make Peace* (Forward Movement Publications, 1982), pp. 12-13 in particular, on nuclear weapons in the context of the just war, and *To Make Peace—Part II* (Forward Movement Publications, 1985), pp.10-13, and for the full document submitted to the House of Bishops, Part II, Appendix A, pp. 20-29.]

These issues continue to be of great importance to the Church, and they have not been absent from the attention of this commission. In Part II, we touched briefly on our frustration over the fact that there has not been further movement in the policy-making bodies of the Church, including bishops and laity, on the critical issue of the morality of nuclear deterrence. The issues growing out of the nuclear arms race are no less, and

---

almost certainly more, urgent now than they were in 1980, and must continue to command the attention of the Church. Nonetheless, in the space that remains we wish to turn to some other questions that provide a broader context for the examination of nuclear arms. For even if nuclear weapons could be destroyed tomorrow, and the knowledge of how to make them were miraculously eradicated from our consciousness, we would still be confronting the twin challenges of more local kinds of violence and global survival as a whole. And even in a nuclear-free world, we would still have to deal with the consequences of demonizing, instead of loving, our enemies. We will explore both these topics in this part of our report.

### *Violence as a Continuum*

Our first premise is that both violence, and the peacemaking that must heal the consequences of violence as well as forestall its recurrence, proceed along a spectrum. At one end lies the personal violence directed against oneself, a member of one's family, an immediate neighbor, or a child; at the other end, either as a consequence of nuclear war or of a less dramatic but no less effective depletion of earth's resources, lies what is sometimes unpretily called ecocide, the wanton destruction of creation. We have given particular attention to the abuse of children and this larger abuse of the environment in the discussion that follows.

#### A. Violence Against Children

In her several books on child-rearing practices, the Swiss psychonanalyst Alice Miller has made it clear that until the general public becomes aware that society as a whole suffers from the "soul murder" of children, we are "groping in a dark labyrinth—in spite of all our well-meaning efforts to bring about disarmament among nations." Can the Church undertake a serious effort at peacemaking without looking at personal and family violence, without trying to understand why it would be possible for someone to want to kill others, even take the lives of large numbers of human beings? We think not.

Whether it be emotional and psychological abuse resulting from something so pervasive as constant parental irritability, the gross physical abuse experienced by battered children bearing the wounds of parental and teacher anger, alcoholism, or sexual abuse, it is becoming increasingly clear that domestic violence is endemic in our culture and that children carry the scars, visible and invisible, of such abuse for years, often for their lifetime.

It has been demonstrated, for example, that abused persons are more likely than those who are not to suffer from distrust, anxiety, depression, suicidal tendencies, and a variety of other self-destructive behaviors. By the same token, those who have been severely victimized in childhood tend as adults to re-enact their victimization, hurting others. The children of parents who rely on raw physical force or threats for discipline, it has been shown, tend not to console or help another distressed child or even to notice that they have caused distress. And they are much more likely than others to start fights or otherwise engage in unprovoked aggression. Punishments that degrade and humiliate a child are destructive. But even more subtle parental messages, such as those conveyed by persistent scowls, frowns, and sarcasm, can increase a child's aggressiveness at school. Only if a child is able to express pain and anger will he or she be able to overcome the consequences of suffering. Alas, more often than not, parents cannot tolerate reactions such as crying, sadness, and rage. Forbidding them, they create a breeding ground for future violence.

In spite of evidence that harsh punishment can lead to rage, hatred, retribution,

aggression, and even murderousness, corporal punishment is still permitted in public schools in 42 states. Still more astonishing is the fact that many of the apologies for violence against children come from the Christian community itself. A perusal of books on child rearing in the average Christian bookstore indicates general agreement among such authors that pain and suffering are necessary aspects of punishment. Actual methods vary from book to book but, in general, physical assault by hands, belts, whips, rods, and paddles against children's bodies from infancy through adolescence is frequently justified with biblical references. The theology of judgment and retribution that provides the rationale for this abuse depends, at the same time, on such violence for its energy and intensity.

Rutgers historian Philip Greven believes that our "collective silence" concerning corporal punishment "probably is rooted in our collective experiences with physical punishment both as children and as adults." Most Americans, he says, have experienced it, still practice it, and don't want to know the consequences. Turning a deaf ear to the implications of violence against children, we open society to increasing levels of personal and interpersonal violence. Even nuclear warfare, unleashed as it can be by the touch of a button, may be the means by which the cruel fantasies of the severely abused will be acted out.

It is, therefore, imperative that we recognize both the roots of the violence that surrounds us and the potential implications of our failure to interrupt the cycle. This is not to suggest that discipline be abandoned but rather that it be properly understood as instruction that enables one to develop desirable values and a self-control that enhances self-respect. The best way to teach is still that method demonstrated by Jesus and recounted in the Gospels: to teach by being living examples of the values we espouse. We learn best by a process of identification with the people whom we admire. Punishment, especially painful punishment, teaches that might makes right, arouses resistance, and leaves children feeling degraded. At the very least, physical punishment should be the last, not the first, course of action. Should not the Church take more responsibility for helping people learn how to pass on the values we proclaim?

Only by understanding the basis of abusive and aggressive behavior can we help parents and children modify it—moving forward step by step, generation by generation. The danger we face, if we neglect this aspect of peacemaking, was eloquently expressed in March 1986 by Greven at a Harvard Medical School Conference on Abuse and Victimization: "The survival of life on earth depends upon our ability to halt the violence that we inflict upon children. If we are to forestall the apocalypse that so many Americans believe is upon us, we must recognize that the end of the world begins with the striking of a single child."

#### B. Violence Against the Environment

At the other end of the spectrum from personal violence of the sort evidenced by child abuse is the abuse of the planet. Those who question the extent of our reliance on weapons of mass destruction often point out that nuclear war could mean not only the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives but severe, perhaps incalculable and irreversible, damage to the environment. The report of the first JCP (1982) pointed to "the Christian conviction that humankind has been given dominion over the earth to tend it, develop it, and care for it as good stewards." It then pointed out that "the impact of large-scale nuclear explosions, fire damage, and long-term contamination on the very natural order upon which we are all dependent" could not have been envisioned by the original proponents of the just-war tradition. Reporting before the advent of the theory that a nuclear exchange could lead to a "nuclear winter," and before the Chernobyl disaster, the commission called attention to "a growing awareness among the peoples of

the earth that this planet is physically one unit, united by oceans, biosphere, climate, and air . . .” The list of examples cited in 1982 might continue ad infinitum: the disappearance of wilderness areas, the destruction of fragile ecosystems through a mixture of natural causes and human intervention, the renewed use of consumable energy sources with the return to the automobile after the oil embargo, the depletion of the ozone layer, and the overcrowding of the airways. The issue of ecology, however, has not figured prominently in either of the preceding JCP reports.

As a theological issue, the relationship of humankind to the earth is a very old one, adumbrated as early as the events presented mythically in Genesis. The Garden of Eden is the primordial location in the Hebrew Scriptures in which, for what seems a tragically brief time, human beings lived in perfect harmony with a natural world that God sees as good. In the first of the two creation stories, man is created only after the rest of nature and given “dominion” over it. The concept of dominion is inextricably bound up with the premise that man is God’s supreme agent on earth and acts in accordance with the divine plan. In the Fall, however, human beings become estranged from this natural order, and the toil that the earth will require if it is to bring forth more than “thorns and thistles” (Gen. 3.18) symbolizes the estrangement between Adam and his Creator. Dominion over the earth is thus justifiable if grounded on proper stewardship. The earth is given to us in trust, and we rule it only so long as we recognize that it is our habitation, not our possession. Jeremiah 2.7 sets this forth with compelling simplicity:

“And I brought you into a plentiful land  
to enjoy its fruits and its good things.  
But when you came in you defiled my land,  
and made my heritage an abomination.”

The opposite of dominion, in the enlarged sense in which we prefer to employ it here (i.e., respectful stewardship) is domination. Chapter 29 of the *Tao Te Ching* describes this in terms of the Taoist belief that the natural world is to be befriended, and that those who would “shape it to their will” never succeed.

Unlike Taoism, or the buoyant Judaism of Deuteronomy 8:7-8, or the creation-oriented spirituality of some Native American religions, Christianity has not traditionally sprung to mind as a principal source for a theology of the environment. To be sure, the doctrine of the Incarnation (nature as host to the divine), with its attendant premise that the linking of body and spirit is no liability, and that of the Resurrection (that matter can partake of the condition of salvation) would appear to have guaranteed a more central place for the environment in Christian theology. In fact, the opposite has been the case. It is no happenstance that modern science is associated with the Western world, with the three Semitically based religions and their strongly materialist element, and principally—after the earlier contributions of Islam during the Middle Ages—with the Christian and post-Christian nation states and the Christian and Jewish scientists in them. On the whole, to the mindset of dispassionate scientific inquiry in the West, there has been joined a spirit of economic exploitation that sees the natural world as an object to be dominated or conquered.

Some attribute the relative silence of Christian writers on this subject to the exclusively fall-and-redemption model of spirituality that has dominated theology in the Western Church since Augustine. Yet a persistent minority tradition in Christianity, represented by such writers as St. Francis, Julian of Norwich, Meister Eckhardt, and John Woolman, has found a new flowering in the present days. The number of studies of a Christian-based ecology has dramatically increased beginning in the late 1960s. We

welcome this development as a corrective to a too exclusive understanding of nature as only a stage for the drama of God's mighty acts in history.

We hear much these days of the desensitization of humanity that has resulted from the mass bombings and the concentration camps of the Second World War and the use of concentrated firepower in third world settings since that time. For many, abortion offers another example of such desensitization, and in our preceding section on child abuse we have suggested that violence can be a chain explosion set off in early childhood. Yet it would be overly pessimistic to ignore the evidence of rising sensitivity in other areas of human affairs. One evidence can be seen in the increase of various secular as well as religious environmental movements. Another is the moral revulsion that arose against the use of gas in combat after World War I, and a general reluctance to discuss the prospects for biological and chemical warfare. We have no basis for belief that such a reluctance extends to research, and our hope for the abstention from the use of such weapons may ultimately rest on prudential restraint rather than moral principle. Nonetheless, the very reticence surrounding the use of such weapons at best suggests a recognition that such use would be morally repugnant because it is so pervasive an affront to the right use of God's gifts and the findings of science.

Our Church is like other institutions of society in that heightened awareness of familial and school violence, and enhanced environmental sensitivity, are both sparking renewed discussion within our own Anglican Communion. Here we have only introduced, not resolved, a complicated set of questions. We call upon the Church to rediscover that part of its theological tradition that sees both our children and our globe as sacred, to be cherished in peace, not bodily dominated or warred upon. We number among our laity many whose calling it is to be expert in these areas and who can contribute their skills to the education of our parishes and dioceses. Without such a dialogue, the problems of militarism and nuclear war cannot be seen in the broader context they require to be more fully understood.

### C. Learning to Love Our Enemies

Our first premise, stated above, is that violence exists on a spectrum that ranges from the personal to the global. Our second premise is that in a world in which the potential for violence exists at all levels, the temptation to demonize those whom we perceive to be our opponents is ever-present and sometimes overwhelming. To demonize, as we see it, is to remove all traces of individuality and humanity from the enemy; it is to fail to mark God's presence in the faces of those whom we deem hostile to our individual or our national interest. In the phrase of the first JCP (1982), it is to create "dehumanizing stereotypes." The answer is not to sentimentalize our enemies or to render ourselves helpless before an aggressor, but to recognize that to be fully human in God's eyes is to acknowledge a common humanity with others that provides the basis for reconciliation. The Gospel imperative is clear: "You have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be the sons [and daughters] of your Father in heaven." (Mt. 5:43-45)

How can we love our enemies? It may be both the most demanding and most ignored imperative of the Gospel. In the words, again, of the 1982 JCP report, "Most Christians have tried to love some personal enemy. But applying the gospel injunction toward our nation's enemies is another matter. Like the Christian faith itself, it has not so much been tried and found wanting as it has been found difficult and not tried." "Who is my enemy?" is the corollary question to "Who is my neighbor?" The latter is more easily answered when it does not challenge us at our deepest interior level. Jesus'

command to love one another is more easily acknowledged when applied primarily to the neighbor or friend, especially in his or her need. On the other hand, the command to love our enemies shakes us to the core because it calls us to respond much more radically and contrary to our natural responses. To be able to love our enemies truly requires interior transformation.

Our response to the demand to love our enemies may be the best indicator of how profoundly we are transformed in and by the Gospel. Not only is this critical in our personal relations, if we are to be reconciled and effective instruments of reconciliation, but it also is crucial for policy at the national level. At the heart of our national policy regarding those we consider our enemies is often a call to fear, to mistrust, and to remain separated from them. Often we appear as slaves to what Sam Keen calls "our hostile imagination." This is one of the major impediments in the peacemaking process. It is critical, therefore, as Christians in a secular state, to challenge that impediment from our own religious perspective. To do so we must come to know ourselves better and to understand the process by which the human psyche creates enemies, and in resisting them takes on the very qualities that we claim to hate and fight against. To learn to love enemies it is essential also to get to know them. This is inhibited both by geography and national policy. Particular effort must be made to overcome those limitations.

The second JCP report (1985) placed special emphasis on overcoming such limitations through international person-to-person peace missions that involved travel by groups of American Christians to the Soviet Union and Central America. This commission, as we have already reported, has attempted to emulate the efforts of the groups by visiting Nicaragua, and some parishes and dioceses (notably the Diocese of Washington) have sponsored such journeys. In December 1987, at the time of the Washington summit, Americans on the streets of our capital had the opportunity to glimpse and even shake hands with the principal Soviet leader. And the exchange of New Year's messages on the television networks of the United States and the Soviet Union by our President and the Soviet General Secretary has been a salutary reminder of the extent to which simple, direct communication can at least begin to clear away the fog of clichés and misperceptions that have complicated the task of understanding an adversary.

The key word, however, is *begin*, and this leads us to utter a caution. Worthwhile though such contacts are, they represent only a very small proportion of what is required. They cannot be made a justification for premature rejoicing when not only misperceptions but deep anxieties and very real differences of attitude and philosophy remain between two powers with a long history of rivalry, mutual antipathy, and distrust. For this reason, we would argue that short-term contacts are not enough. We urge the development of year-long visits on the model of international student exchanges that would permit Americans and Soviets (and Americans and representatives of other powers we have viewed as hostile) the opportunity to learn in depth about each other's culture and aspirations. Something of what we envision was represented a decade or more ago by the Hostages for Peace Program, in which the voluntary exchange of Soviet and American citizens was advanced not only as one way of accomplishing many of the educational ends such a program serves, but as dramatizing our common vulnerability in a world in which all of us might be said to be hostages to the weapons we have created. The helpful creation of educational materials on the Soviet Union already resulting from the efforts of our national staff needs to be supplemented, though of course not supplanted, by direct exchanges supported by our Church at the national, diocesan, and parochial levels.

The Church should be called, and thereby call others, to a deep examination of the Gospel imperative to love our enemies and to explore both this and other ways in which our responses as individuals and as a nation can make us more effective instruments of peace.

#### *Implications for Program*

1. As a way of broadening the discussion within the Church to reflect the fact that violence exists on a continuum, we urge that such issues as domestic violence (including the abuse of children) and the abuse of our environment receive increased attention at the national level of the Church as concerns centrally related to peacemaking, stewardship, world mission, and human health. Parishes, dioceses, and provinces should be encouraged to the shaping of policy that can then figure in the development of program priorities.

2. While loving one's enemies is a Gospel imperative long known if little honored, it must be encouraged by support systems within the Church that enable Christians to learn more about the "enemy" face to face as well as through more traditional kinds of educational resources.

3. While as Christians we should recognize humbly our own failures in applying such a Gospel imperative in practice, this should not deter us from offering it up as a symbol of hope in war-torn areas of the world where religion divides as well as unites people. In particular, we suggest that the next Standing Commission on Peace might turn its attention to the Middle East as an area that, like Central America, cries out for healing and reconciliation, not just mutual tolerance and respect.

4. As previous commissions have noted, peace and justice are inextricably linked. The present Standing Commission on Peace agrees with the previous Joint Commission on Peace that the name of this commission should reflect this relationship. We would note the names of the Anglican Peace and Justice Network and the Peace and Justice Officer as indicative of this unbreakable linkage. Therefore, we are recommending that the name of this commission be the Standing Commission on Peace and Justice, as previously recommended.

#### *Conclusion (written by the Chair alone)*

In my work on the issues of violence, war, peace, and justice, I have come to value the truth of what our bishops said in their pastoral letter of 1962:

Because of the nature of the Christian faith, Christians have an imperative obligation to pray and work for peace among men and nations. Questions of war and peace are not remote and peripheral concerns for the committed Christian; they grow out of basic understandings of man and his destiny which are inherent in the Christian revelation.

As a recent writer has observed: "The question for me, as peacemaking came to be a question, was one of soul, of center. The soul of peacemaking was simply the will to give one's life. As war sanctioned the taking of life, peacemaking must sanction the giving of life."

As we struggle to develop the work for peace and justice within the Episcopal Church, I believe that we are in fact dealing not only with the soul of our Church, but our own souls as well. For the work for peace and justice not only requires us to examine what we do as individuals, as a community, and as a Church in the world, but it also challenges us to examine our innermost convictions and beliefs, and reflect on them in the light of the Gospel. We have endeavored to explore these issues in this report.

## THE BLUE BOOK

---

Progress can only come as inner transformation, nurtured by the Holy Spirit, changes us. For Christ came into the world "to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, and to guide our feet into the way of peace" (Lk 1:79).

(The Rev.) Nathaniel W. Pierce, *Chair*

### FINANCIAL REPORT

<i>Income</i>	<i>1986</i>	<i>1987</i>	<i>1988</i>
Appropriated by Convention	\$37,510	\$35,030	\$36,750
Revised by PB&F Challenge	6,957	25,305	7,010
Received from the Diocese of Massachusetts		871	
<i>Expenses</i>			
General meetings	\$ 6,507	\$14,964	\$ 6,000*
Consultants	450	200	300
Site Study in Nicaragua		1,445	

\*Estimated; actual figures were not available at the time the report was due.

### RESOLUTIONS FOR THE GENERAL CONVENTION

#### Resolution #A143

Changing the Name of the Standing Commission on Peace

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Title I, Canon 1, Section 2(n)(6) be amended to read as follows (new wording in italics):**

(6). There shall be a standing Commission on Peace *and Justice* consisting of 12 members (3 Bishops, 3 Presbyters or Deacons, and 6 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to develop recommendations and strategies which will be of concrete assistance to this Church in furthering the work on issues of peace with justice.

**EXPLANATION:** This change is recommended not only because, as we have said, peace and justice are inextricably linked in human affairs, but also because it would bring the commission's name into harmony with the Peace and Justice Officer at the Episcopal Church Center and, in the larger Church, the Anglican Peace and Justice Network.

#### Resolution #A144

Financial Support for the Anglican Peace and Justice Network

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the 69th General Convention appropriate the total sum of \$45,000 for the 1989-1991 triennium from the Program Development Budget of the Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury solely for the support of the work of the Anglican Peace and Justice Network and to be paid as follows: \$20,000 in 1989, \$15,000 in 1990, and \$10,000 in 1991.**

#### Resolution #A145

Citizen Exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the 69th General Convention support the principle of residential exchanges of U.S. Episcopalians and Soviet-bloc citizens, and request that the Peace and Justice Officer of the Episcopal**

**Church Center, under the direction of Executive Council through the Public Ministries Team, assist provinces, dioceses, and parishes in preparing for and implementing such exchanges.**

**Resolution #A146**

Ministry of Healing and Reconciliation in Central America

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the 69th General Convention endorse the call of the Standing Commission on Peace to support a substantial ministry of healing and reconciliation in Central America; and be it further**

*Resolved*, **That the Presiding Bishop and the Executive Council be urged to seek funding of \$1.5 million over a six-year period beginning in 1989 to support this program.**

EXPLANATION: The Standing Commission on Peace envisions the possible use of the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief as a means of carrying out this resolution.

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

In considering the mandate that "It shall be the duty of the [Standing] Commission [on Peace] to develop recommendations and strategies which will be of concrete assistance to this Church in furthering the work on issues of peace with justice." The commission recommends that during the next triennium attention be given to the Middle East. (See Implications for Program above.)

**PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE COMING TRIENNIUM**

	<i>1989</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>
Meeting expenses	\$14,400	\$33,300	\$ 9,400
Consultants	500	1,500	500
Miscellaneous	100	200	100
Total	\$15,000	\$35,000	\$10,000

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR BUDGET APPROPRIATION**

**Resolution #A147**

Funding for the Standing Commission on Peace

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the sum of \$60,000 be appropriated for the triennium 1989-1991 from the Assessment Budget of the General Convention for the expenses of the Standing Commission on Peace.**

**APPENDIX: PERTINENT RESOLUTIONS ON PEACE AND JUSTICE**

*Resolution D023, passed at the 68th General Convention (1985)*

**WORK FOR PEACE IN NICARAGUA AND ALL CENTRAL AMERICA**

*Resolved*, the House of Bishops concurring, **That this 68th General Convention calls upon the United States government and all other governments involved to:**

- (a) cease all covert and overt aid to the contras and all other military forces in Nicaragua;
- (b) cease all embargoes and other activities aimed at destabilizing the government of Nicaragua;
- (c) affirm and respect the principles of national sovereignty, self-determination and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of Nicaragua; and
- (d) seek a negotiated settlement based on the 21 points of the Contadora Group; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this General Convention expresses its support of the Diocese of Nicaragua in its appeal to the entire Anglican Communion, and especially to our churches in Central America, that they do all they possibly can to influence their members, their communities and their governments, to help in the steps taken for peace in Central America and by so doing avoid war among brothers and sisters; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this Convention be directed to communicate this Resolution to the President of the United States and the members of Congress, and the governments of the USSR, Cuba, and Israel.

#### **Resolutions from the Episcopal Church in Nicaragua**

1. The following resolution, adopted in November 1983, was unanimously reaffirmed (two abstentions) by members of the 15th National Diocesan Convention of the Episcopal Church of Nicaragua assembled in Bluefields, Nicaragua, on September 9, 1984.

The 14th Diocesan Convention of the Episcopal Church of Nicaragua (Anglican) convened in Bluefields during the days of November 19 & 20, 1983, hereby makes known to the people of Nicaragua the following:

Considering that our government and people have demonstrated their desire for peace and good will internationally; and

Considering that the United Nations, the Organization of the American States, and the Group of Contadora comprised of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama have recommended political and not military solutions in the region; and

Considering that the above organizations have recommended non-intervention of the world's power groups in the Central American area and the removal of foreign military forces in the Central American countries; and

Considering that Nicaragua is constantly being assaulted, with strong possibilities of an invasion; and

Considering that the attacks from both north and south of our frontiers have caused large losses in our economy and in human lives; and

Considering that the Reagan administration has publicly admitted U.S. aid to the contra revolutionaries with money and arms and the U.S. intention to destroy the Nicaragua revolution; and

Considering that the economic assistance given by the Reagan administration is an open violation of the actual international laws; and

Considering that the Nicaraguan government has made concrete proposals of peace to the Reagan administration as well as to the governments and people of Central America, we hereby resolve on the following:

To condemn most energetically the economic and military aggression of the Reagan administration toward Nicaragua, and also other countries that are contributing to this political interference in the matters of other states;

To make an appeal to the entire Anglican Communion, and especially to our churches in Central America, that they do all they possibly can to influence their members, their communities, and their governments to help in the steps taken for peace in Central America and by so doing avoid war among brothers; and

That each member of the Episcopal Church of Nicaragua try to defend by concrete actions the lives and future of our children, our youth, and our aged people, showing love toward our fellowmen, as our church teaches us to do.

May the peace of God be with all the people of Central America.

2. This resolution was passed by the Diocesan Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Nicaragua on November 2, 1987, at Bluefields, Nicaragua.

*Whereas*, For the last seven years Nicaragua has been involved in a war due to the constant attacks of the contra revolutionary troops; and

*Whereas*, These attacks have caused great losses of both human and material resources; and

*Whereas*, The Episcopal Church of Nicaragua in its Convention in 1983 passed a resolution of solidarity to achieve peace in Central America, and this same resolution was reaffirmed by the Convention in 1984; and

*Whereas*, The General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America in Anaheim, California, in 1985 passed a resolution to support the efforts for peace in Central America and especially Nicaragua; and

*Whereas*, The five presidents of Central America met in Guatemala in August of 1987 and signed agreements to achieve peace in Central America; be it

*Resolved*, (1) That this 18th Convention of the Episcopal Church of Nicaragua give its support to these new efforts by the presidents of Central America to achieve peace in the area as expressed in the document referred to as Esquipulas II;

(2) Call once again upon the Anglican Communion and especially the churches in Central America, the Caribbean, and Latin America to do all in their power to influence their members, their communities, and their governments to give their support to these new efforts to achieve peace in Central America and avoid a war among human beings;

(3) Call upon members of the Episcopal Church to consciously and through concrete actions live up to the Christian vocation to be peacemakers.