

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE AUCKLAND DIOCESE OF THE  
ANGLICAN CHURCH IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT SINCE 1945**

**A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the Degree  
of  
Master of Arts in Religious Studies  
At  
Massey University  
by  
Kenneth George Stead**

**Massey University**

**Albany Campus**

**1999**

## **ABSTRACT**

The subject of this thesis is the involvement of members of the Auckland Diocese of the Anglican Church in the peace movement since 1945.

An introductory chapter on the development of Christian attitudes towards peace and war concludes that although the Augustinian just war model became the standard Anglican tool for justifying Christian participation in warfare, the limitations on violence explicit in that model also gave a theological justification for opposing modern warfare. The second and third chapters document the activities of the Auckland sub-branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. This organisation, despite its small size, was active in promoting an absolute pacifist view of Christianity. It is suggested that much of its failure was a result of it being over ambitious, expecting people to make a major leap when a series of smaller steps may have been more appropriate. The fourth chapter, on the Vietnam War, contrasts two public marches in Queen Street symbolic of the unwillingness of most Anglicans at this time to consider foreign policy issues independently of considerations of patriotism, but also suggests that disillusionment with Vietnam provided a foundation for anti-nuclear protests. Chapter five is based mainly on the recollections of George Armstrong concerning the peace squadron, but also documents how one inner city parish responded to the challenges of the 1970s and 1980s. The final chapter concludes that Auckland Anglicans were more likely to respond to peace issues in response to some personal feeling of threat than because of a commitment to Biblical principles and that in most instances their theology is used to justify their actions rather than as a reason for those actions.

## **PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This thesis grew from work done as a religious studies student. A research exercise for the degree of Bachelor of Arts (Hons) taking the form of an annotated bibliography identified certain gaps in material available. There was, for example, a considerable amount of material on conscientious objectors, but none on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. This is an attempt to fill some of those gaps.

The thesis was written to pursue a personal interest in the issue of the relationship between war, peace and religion and this has influenced its writing. In particular, it has been influenced by personal beliefs as a practising Christian. These include a belief that the teachings of Christ are pacifist, and a belief that the Bible is inspired scripture.

The willingness of other Christians to assist in this project has proved invaluable.

Christopher Barfoot of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship deserves special thanks for providing full access to his personal records covering many years. Without those records and those of the Wellington sub-branch of the Fellowship housed in the Alexander Turnbull Library the writing of the chapters on this organisation would not have been possible. The assistance of the Auckland diocesan archivist was also appreciated.

As a religious studies student enrolled at a campus with no religious studies lecturer to act as supervisor, I am very grateful to those of the School of Historical and Philosophical Studies, and in particular to Associate Professor Peter Donovan, for arranging for me to enrol as a history student with a history supervisor, Dr Peter Lineham. The financial support of the Post Graduate research Fund also proved invaluable.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable services of Anne Johnston. Anne's willingness to provide emergency typing services during the stressful final weeks of compiling this thesis made all the difference in ensuring its completion. Thank you, Anne, for your very special effort.

## GLOSSARY

**Pacifism** This is used to refer to the total repudiation of violence under all circumstances.

## ABBREVIATIONS

**APF** Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                                | <b>Page</b> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Abstract                                                       | 2           |
| Preface and Acknowledgements                                   | 3           |
| Glossary and Abbreviations                                     | 5           |
| Chapter 1 War, Peace and the Anglican Tradition                | 7           |
| Chapter 2 Anglican Pacifist Fellowship : The Vietnam War Years | 18          |
| Chapter 3 The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship : After Vietnam     | 33          |
| Chapter 4 Vietnam – A Tale of Two Marches                      | 47          |
| Chapter 5 Anti-Nuclear and Anti-Tour Protests                  | 57          |
| Chapter 6 Does Theology Matter?                                | 74          |
| Bibliography                                                   | 90          |

## CHAPTER ONE

### WAR, PEACE AND THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

Few Christians would disagree with the proposition that the teachings of the Bible provide the basis for Christian belief and practise. But the Bible must be interpreted, not least because it covers a diversity of beliefs and practises spanning many centuries. Such questions as the relationship of the Law of Moses to the teachings and example of Jesus can be taxing problems. The Bible provides believers with a means of approaching such problems. God in the person of the Holy Spirit is to provide the believer with the necessary guidance. But how is inspired guidance to be distinguished from human interpretations? If several people holding a diversity of views all claim to have been guided by the Spirit of God, who is to be believed?

As a means of addressing this problem numerous means of testing for inspiration have been devised, but none have met with universal support. It is thus possible for a plurality of doctrines to exist as to the proper Christian response to violence, all based on the same scriptural authority. Yet these diverse views can never be based on scripture alone. Even for those Christians who insist that the Bible is the sole basis of their religious beliefs, the reality is that personal background and experiences and the influences of others will be carried by the believer as he or she attempts to understand the Bible. How the Christian of today will understand the Bible's teachings on violence and non violence will to a large extent be influenced by the past. It is thus necessary to turn to that past to understand the influences

which led some New Zealand Anglicans to actively participate in the “peace movement” during the second half of the twentieth century.

The difficulty is well demonstrated by the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel according to Luke. Jesus instructs his followers to arm themselves with swords, but is satisfied when just two are produced, a number too small for meaningful defence. When one of these swords is used in his defence, Jesus rebukes the wielder. Is the demand for swords in verse 36 to be interpreted as an acceptance by Jesus of killing in self defence, or a part of a staged demonstration that violence could not be justified even in self defence?

In general terms, it may fairly be said that for the first three centuries of its existence the witness of the Church was overwhelmingly pacifist. The official teachings of the Church still surviving nowhere authorise the shedding of human blood, even in self defence or in the name of the state, but contain numerous rejections of violence during the period prior to the accession of Constantine. From the second half of the second century there is evidence of Christian participation in the armed forces. This can, however, be largely attributed to three major factors. The first is that Christians do not always live up to the standards of their faith, necessitating the rebukes recorded in the Fathers. The second is that many Christian soldiers were already legionaries at the times of their conversions, as had been Cornelius before them. The Christian objection was to the shedding of human blood rather than to the holding of a particular office, so it was possible for the Christian legionary to live with the ambiguity of his situation as long as his legion remained at peace. In the event of war, however, the expectation of the Church was that he would not take the lives of enemies. This may have given rise to the third explanation. The legions of Rome were charged not just with

defending the empire against external enemies but also with maintaining internal order as police officers. It appears that the primitive Church did not object to its members acting as police officers provided that they did not shed blood<sup>1</sup>

The quasi-official end of pacifism as the normative position of the Church is generally taken as the Battle of the Malvan Bridge, although it would not have been possible for the Church to so quickly accept the wielding of the sword by Constantine in the name of Christ had it not been for a general and continuing decline in the standards of practise of Christians generally and the acceptance of this decline by Church leaders. Seen in this context, the influence of Augustine in this matter parallels the Pelagian dispute.

Whatever the official theological reasons, the heart of his dispute with Pelagius was the latter's insistence that all Christians should strive to achieve a Christlike standard, whereas Augustine regarded this as a futile denial of the inevitability of ongoing sinfulness. Human depravity was inevitable; all which could be done was to accept this inevitability, rely on God's grace and try to make the best of following Christ. Where Pelagius sought to avoid accommodating the ways of the world, Augustine saw such accommodations as more or less inevitable and sought to mitigate them and commute their consequences within a Christian framework.

Such an accommodation was the Augustinian just war. Warfare was recognised as being innately sinful, as was participation in warfare by a Christian. But such were the consequences of humanity's fall that at times there was no alternative to a believer sinning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, Hodder and Stoughton (London, 1960) pp79-81

There were, therefore, times when it was acceptable for a Christian to reluctantly take human life in order to oppose some other greater sin. Such a killing was still sinful, but if committed for good motives could be justified. The circumstances in which such a killing was justified were limited and it was still necessary for the soldier to repent and make confession. Nevertheless, Augustine's writings on warfare as codified and interpreted by subsequent theologians provided a theological basis for what had since Constantine's day been an uncomfortable accommodation with the ways of the world.

It was within the context of the Augustinian just war that the embryonic Church of England developed. Christianity had found its way to England during the Roman occupation, probably carried by Christian legionaries, but failed to gain widespread acceptance. Subsequent missionary work, particularly by Celtic monks, had met with some success but England, Scotland and Wales were overwhelmingly pagan when Columba began his missionary endeavours on the Scottish isle of Iona.

If the mission of Columba is taken as being the genesis of the Church of England, it may truthfully be said that it was founded through bloodshed. According to tradition, Columba departed from his native Ireland for Iona as penance for having caused a war in which there was heavy loss of life. The Roman Church may have forbidden those in orders from bearing arms, but combat between monks was not uncommon in the Celtic tradition. They were, however, true to Augustine in recognising the underlying sinfulness of such killings, and Columba appears to have accepted his mission to Iona as a penance predicated in terms of gaining for Christ as many souls as the number of believers who had fallen in battle.<sup>2</sup> Nor

---

<sup>2</sup> Brendan Lehane, *Early Celtic Christianity*. Constable and Co. (London, 1994) pp.118-119

was Augustine of Canterbury, who led the Roman mission which introduced Christianity to southern England, entirely averse to the use of violence. As an example, he was quite willing to see the Welsh defeat at the Battle of Chester as constituting a divine punishment for their insistence on following Celtic rather than Roman practices.<sup>3</sup>

It is relatively simple to identify the influence of the Augustinian just war on English thinking, whether it be Bede writing in support of the Battle of Chester being a sign of God's judgement or papal endorsement of the justness of the Norman invasion of 1066. But it is relatively difficult to see the impact of Urban II's call for the first crusade three decades later. The theory of the holiness of crusading is dependent on a theology of indulgence which in turn depends on the acceptance of the existence of purgatory. Those were part of official church teachings up to the time of the Reformation, but from the time of the English Reformation on there was no longer any room for such beliefs. It thus became impossible for the reformed Church of England to support in or advocate any war of crusade in its technical sense. But it would be wrong to assume from that that the crusade had no part in the development of reformed theology. The concept of war as a holy act had taken root.

It was impossible for a Protestant to fight a true crusade – a holy pilgrimage in which the normal presumption of innate sinfulness was replaced by the gaining of divine merit by means of a papal declaration of an indulgence. But while it was the indulgence which made a crusade what it was in a purely legal sense, it was warfare as an act of pilgrimage which lent crusading its spiritual merit. If indulgences and paper authority were anathema to Protestant leaders, pilgrimage was a concept which the reformers could relate to, albeit in a form

---

<sup>3</sup> Lehané, p.141

heavily modified by the omission of remission of time in purgatory. If warfare as a pilgrimage was holy, it was because its cause was holy and because it was prosecuted in a holy fashion. Thus there was a fundamental shift in the perceived nature of war. The sinfulness of warfare was not innate. Rather, it was rendered either sinful or holy by whether it was against or for the dominion of God, and by the motives and conduct of participants. This was a view which was particularly attractive within Calvinism, and this appeal to Calvinists may have played an important role in ensuring that despite the Church of England being the official Church of the leaders of the British Empire throughout its often violent history, the ancient tradition of the innate sinfulness of all warfare remained a significant part of Anglican thinking.

Many attempts ways have been made to explain the origins of the English Civil War, and no attempt is made here to question their validity. But if the war is reduced to the purely religious terms in which its prosecutors insisted on portraying it, it may simplistically be said to have been a conflict between those who wished to continue the process of religious reform, creating a holy theocracy, and those who were content to maintain the status quo. Without doubt the true causes of the conflict were vastly more complex than this, but it was the religious aspect of the war which would influence English theology. The Augustinian model met the needs of the royalists because of its emphasis on princely authority, but also because they could portray themselves as fighting a defensive war to protect the status quo and the rights of the Crown. These limitations were avoided by Cromwell by resort to the reasoning described above.<sup>4</sup> Despite its many abuses, the Augustinian model at least attempted to impose severe limitations on the circumstances in which recourse could be made to war.

---

<sup>4</sup> Bainton pp.148-149

With its theology favouring the royalists, it is likely that its influence not only during the war but also at the time of the Commonwealth and restoration cemented in place the Augustinian view in official post-restoration Anglican thinking.

The Church of England was (and still is) the official English church, with state patronage and state appointment of bishops. This circumstance made it unlikely that it would do other than sanction state diplomacy supported by the threat and if necessary use of armed force, albeit with the quasi-official qualifications of the Augustinian just war. Such theological limitations were not, however, relevant in the cases of nonconformist denominations, which have existed in material numbers in the centuries subsequent to the civil war. It was not uncommon for denominations with Calvinist learnings such as the Congregationalists to remain supporters of wars deemed by the State to be necessary. There were, however, other denominations standing outside the Calvinist tradition advocating pacifism or near-pacifism, of which the Society of Friends is perhaps the best known. There were other groups, such as the Brethren, which if not wholeheartedly pacifist were nevertheless unwilling to wield the sword themselves. Such groups may have exerted no direct role in influencing Anglican thinking, but it is unlikely that they exerted no influence. Many nonconformists were willing to engage in public debate about the appropriateness of Government policy, especially after nonconformists were granted the right to sit in Parliament. The Church of England may have continued to trust in the sword, but it could never entirely escape from the need to relate warfare to questions of righteousness. To the extent that the theoretical conditions of a just war were not satisfied, there were grounds for questioning Christian participation.

Applied to a New Zealand context, it is possible to see this ambivalence in every major conflict. New Zealand had no Established Church, but the tradition of supporting the State was strong and there was a general acceptance that the Government was entitled to Church support in the event of war. But there was also a willingness amongst senior Church leaders to be critical of any injustice in the Government's actions. (In the nineteenth century, a similar willingness to see both sides of an issue is not apparent amongst the laity.) There was thus no contradiction between Selwyn acting as a chaplain to the armed forces during the land wars and his opposition to the Government's war policy. There was similarly no innate contradiction during the Second World War in the Bishop of Wellington, Rt Rev Herbert St Barbe Holland, opposing Government mistreatment of conscientious objectors held in detention while simultaneously supporting the war. The bishop had concluded the war to be justified but those who had reached contrary views deserved the right to act in good conscience.<sup>5</sup>

Whatever the official teachings of the Church, the reality has often been different. The early Church Fathers may speak of peaceable Christians, but long before the Battle of the Milvian Bridge there were Christians who were prepared to defy the official policy by taking up arms. St Martin of Tours, who as a soldier had been court martialled for refusing to fight lest he kill a fellow Christian (and who ironically later became the patron saint of soldiers) was as a bishop praised for his peacefulness. But implicit in the praise for Martin was criticism of other bishops who were somewhat less peaceable even in their dealings with each other. Similarly it is unlikely that there have been many lay Christians who have given a great deal of attention to either the just war theory or its applicability of the just war theory. The

---

<sup>5</sup> David Grant, *Out in the Cold: Pacifists and Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand during World War II*, Reed Methven

reactions of some to war may derive from the guidance of those whom they recognise as leaders. For others, it may be a result of a willingness to follow the example of their peers. For others it may be a privately formed opinion as to what they think is right in a particular situation. If theology forms a part of the decision, it is more likely to take the form of the rationalisation than the rationale.

Such decisions are influenced more by culture and circumstance than by scripture. The slaughter of the First World War had led to an increasing acceptance of Pacifism, in New Zealand particularly among Methodists. But this was always a minority view and was in any case subject to reappraisal over the question of how to oppose Hitler. New Zealanders had in any case a long fear of foreign invasion. In the mid and late nineteenth century the fear was of the Russian Pacific Fleet. With the destruction of the fleet in the war Russo-Japanese conflict the focus of this apprehension shifted to the Imperial Japanese Navy. Following Japan's defeat it became Russian's turn again with a fear of Soviet expansion. But just as the death toll of the First World War had raised questions about the value of that war and of war in general, the potentially high costs of nuclear war raised questions about whether nuclear defence could be justified. There was no need for any knowledge of theology for Christians to fear nuclear warfare (although such cost-benefit analyses had always been implicit in the Augustinian model.)

**The emergence of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship is perhaps surprising given the traditional Anglican support of the state's ability to wage war. It is, however, less surprising if one considers the Anglican tradition of intellectual freedom and willingness to accept a diversity**

of beliefs and practices where there has been a diversity of Biblical interpretations. What is perhaps more surprising is that the New Zealand APF has been more active than any other branch outside England despite a culture of insecurity and conformity which, for example, led to New Zealand treating its Second World War conscientious objectors more harshly than any other self-governing Commonwealth nation. But this needs to be kept in perspective. The New Zealand APF has always had a small membership and even smaller active membership and has made little headway in convincing the wider Church to adopt its absolute renunciation of warfare.

More in keeping with Anglican tradition was opposition to the Vietnam War and to defensive security arrangements incorporating nuclear weaponry. It was implicit in the just war theory that in any conflict at least one side must be fighting an unjust war, and both sides would be unless all stipulated criteria were met. "My country, right or wrong" was never officially an acceptable attitude. It was thus entirely appropriate for the Bishop of Chichester, GKA Bell, to have supported the war against Hitler while opposing the area bombing of German cities. If the model made it possible for the Church to support war in some instances, it was theoretically obliged to oppose war in all others. A theological opposition to either an unjust cause (as a number of New Zealanders perceived the Vietnam War to be) or to the fighting of a war by means which indiscriminately killed both combatants and non-combatants and caused such large-scale destruction as to ensure that the cost would outweigh the benefits (as was perceived with nuclear weaponry) was entirely consistent with and in fact required by the Augustinian model. For secular authorities attempting to gain Church support for warfare the just war theory always held the potential to be a double-edged sword.

Beyond the theoretical issues were the personal insecurities of ordinary New Zealanders. Those who in the autumn of 1942 had faced the threat of Japanese invasion may have been more willing to accept the American nuclear umbrella than those who had never lived with threat of foreign occupation but who feared the prospect of nuclear annihilation. This was a case of an issue which, it could be argued, was just as much secular as theological capturing the popular imagination for reasons other than the teachings of the Church, but with the Church then being enlisted as a vehicle (one among many) for advancing this cause. Whether the Church can be regarded as a cause of this movement through something of the Christian ethic permeating popular culture, or a medium of expression for a movement which had its roots outside the Church, is open to debate. If a guess is to be hazarded, it is that there were probably elements of all three present in the way the Anglican Church in New Zealand reacted to the nuclear issue, tempered always by the strong and sincerely held belief of many Anglicans that nuclear deterrence was a regrettable but necessary measure for maintaining peace. The common feature which is agreed on, whether the believer be a pacifist, a non-pacifist opponent of a particular war or of a particular means of warfare, or a supporter of a war, is that warfare is of its nature evil and that peace must be relentlessly sought by the best means available. The question is always which means are the best ones available. On that there is no agreement, but ample room for respect for those who come to different conclusions.

Although the just war theory was based on the writings of Augustine, it was systematised by later theologians. Despite the debt owed by the theory to others, in this thesis it is referred to as the Augustinian model in accordance with convention and in the interests of convenience.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP : THE VIETNAM WAR YEARS

The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship (APF) was formed in England in 1935 as a group within the Anglican Church committed to the complete repudiation of warfare and the advocacy of the belief that the participation of Christians in warfare is contrary to the Gospel. It rejects as contrary to the teachings of Jesus the Augustinian view that war is sometimes a necessary evil, and that in certain limited circumstances by those circumstances Christian participation in warfare may be justified. The concept of a "necessary evil" is regarded by APF members as being fundamentally at odds with the Gospel, involving a denial of the completeness of God's redeeming power and the defeat of evil on the Cross. The Fellowship instead takes the absolute view that Christians must never compromise on the principles of the faith by resorting to evil as a means of opposing evil.<sup>6</sup> Membership of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship is open to all baptised members of the Church in the Anglican Communion who sign the following pledge:

We, communicant members of the Church of England, or a Church in full communion with it, believing that our membership of the Christian Church involves the complete repudiation of modern war, pledge ourselves to renounce war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Untitled Anglican Pacifist Fellowship (A.P.F.) membership pamphlet

The history of the New Zealand branch of the APF can be traced to 11 June 1947 when Rev Roger Patrick Taylor, vicar of Kaiapoi, Christchurch, wrote to the APF in London requesting membership “prospectuses or whatever you call them” so that a New Zealand branch could be established.<sup>8</sup> The actual founding of this new branch occurred at a meeting of Christchurch Anglican pacifists at 7 Ilam Road on 27 January 1948.<sup>9</sup> As late as the 1960s the nature of the relationship between the English and New Zealand APF was called into question because of a practical problem which had arisen over membership. Several New Zealand Fellowship members were directly enrolled with London but were unknown to the New Zealand branch, even though the New Zealand APF operated independently under its own constitution.

The question was whether or not the New Zealand branch was administratively autonomous and, therefore, responsible for all New Zealand members or was to be treated as a division of the English APF<sup>10</sup>. It was concluded by both English and New Zealand APF executives that the branches of each Anglican province were administratively autonomous and that the New Zealand branch therefore had sole responsibility for New Zealand membership.

Taylor, was a member of a family of pacifist priests, his father and brothers sharing his convictions. His father, Frederick Norman Taylor, was born in London and worked as a priest in Birmingham (where he came under the influence of Bishop Charles Gore) and Berkshire before immigrating to Christchurch in 1913.<sup>11</sup> F N Taylor was a High Church Anglican, as was his son, Roger, who became the first New Zealand APF chairman and

---

<sup>7</sup> APF membership pamphlet

<sup>8</sup> Letter from Taylor to London APF secretary, 11 June 1947, Wellington APF records deposited in the Alexander Turnbull Library, Folder 21

<sup>9</sup> Anglican Pacifist Fellowship New Zealand branch minute book

<sup>10</sup> Report to Wellington sub-branch meeting July 1965. Turnbull Folder 12

remained chairman for many years. Even after relinquishing the chair he remained a dedicated and committed member of the Fellowship, working for the promotion of peace for the rest of his life.

Aucklanders had started joining the New Zealand branch soon after its founding, but in very small numbers. The strongholds of the Fellowship in its early years were Christchurch, where Taylor was so active prior to moving to Dunedin, and Wellington. In December 1954, of a reported national membership of 58, only seven lived in the Diocese of Auckland.<sup>12</sup> No formal organisation of the APF appears to have occurred in Auckland prior to the establishment of a diocesan sub-branch and as a result no formal "Auckland" records are known to have ever existed for the first few years of the New Zealand branch's existence. Most of the early members have died, and the one surviving Auckland member whose membership dates back to 1948, the year of foundation, has been unable to supply any information. Philip Crump stated that his memory of both his own and the Fellowship's activities is now sufficiently vague and unreliable for it to be inappropriate for him to comment on either APF activities generally or his personal involvement. It is, however, known that Crump served as an APF delegate to the 1955 Convention on International Affairs<sup>13</sup>. Little else is known about the activities of Auckland members during this early period apart from references in the records of the Wellington sub-branch of their attendance or non-attendance at annual conferences held in Wellington or Christchurch.

---

<sup>11</sup> Michael Blain, *Clergy in the Diocese of Christchurch 1890-1925: A Directory* (Anglican Diocese of Christchurch, 1994)

<sup>12</sup> Membership list 1954, Turnbull Folder 16

<sup>13</sup> Letter to A.P.F. members from R.P. Taylor, 8 Feb. 1955, Turnbull Folder 13

The Auckland sub-branch came into existence in 1962<sup>14</sup>. As the sub-branch was formally constituted, full formal records were made from this time. However, the records covering most of its existence have been mislaid and attempts at tracing these records have thus far proved fruitless. Most of the following information relating to the period prior to the late 1980s has, therefore, been based on information about the Auckland sub-branch contained in the records of the Wellington sub-branch housed in the Alexander Turnbull Library.

From the inception of the New Zealand branch of the APF it has been a feature of its organisation that a particular diocesan sub-branch serves for a time as the national executive, with all members of that sub-branch being deemed to be part of the executive. Christchurch, Wellington, Auckland and most recently Waikato have all from time to time served as the national executive in this way. At the time of the creation of the Auckland sub-branch, Wellington was serving this role, but on 13 June 1964, at the annual national conference which in this year was held in Auckland, the national executive passed to Auckland. Dean Charles Chandler was appointed chairman, Mrs Margaret Bowater was appointed secretary and Christopher Barfoot served as deputy secretary.<sup>15</sup> This presumably created practical problems, as the majority of Auckland members lived in the Auckland urban area, but Bowater lived on the Coromandel Peninsula (which is in the Auckland Diocese) and Chandler was a priest at Leigh (over seventy kilometres north of Auckland). In consequence the meetings were often chaired by the deputy chairman, Crump, and judging from the large quantity of correspondence between Barfoot in Auckland and Bowater in Thames which has managed to find its way into the Wellington sub-branch files, it is reasonable to suppose that **the total volume of correspondence between them was considerable.**

---

<sup>14</sup> Letter from C. Barfoot to N Mountier. 15 March 1963. Turnbull Folder 5

The actual activities of the Auckland sub-branch and of the New Zealand branch as a whole followed from the perceptions of members as to what the proper roles of the Fellowship should be. The basic objective was to bring the Church to an understanding of Christianity being an essentially pacifist faith, from which followed the practical objectives of proclaiming a theology of peace and demonstrating how this theology could be related to the practise of peacemaking in the real world in both theoretical and practical terms. The perceived role of the Fellowship was, therefore, primarily educational, and this perception has strongly influenced the direction of the APF. So, for example, while it has often written to politicians to seek to influence them to support an anti-nuclear policy, there appears to have been no concerted ongoing campaign to influence the Government in this matter, the Fellowship instead attempting to influence other members of the Church to oppose nuclear weapons. Many of the Anglicans most closely connected with the anti-nuclear movement, at least in Auckland, were not APF members and often not pacifists. The APF has for the most part maintained such a low public profile that even many Anglican pacifists and near pacifists remained unaware of its existence.

The Fellowship has also been strongly influenced by its identification of itself as a specifically Anglican organisation. It has recognised that it is a part of the wider Christian Church and has always been very happy to co-operate with the other like-minded Christian groups such as the Society of Friends and the Christian Pacifist Society. But such co-operation appears to have been piecemeal and ad hoc. The primary emphasis has always been on promoting pacifism within the Anglican Church, so much so that the hope has

---

<sup>15</sup> Annual General Meeting minutes, 13 June 1964, Turnbull Folder 15

occasionally been expressed that the time will come when the Church's Articles of Religion will be amended to state that participation in warfare is not lawful.

It was of great significance to the members of the Auckland sub-branch during the first decade and a half of its existence that one of its most prominent members was the Bishop of Auckland, Eric Gowing, who led the diocese from 1960 to 1978. It appears that Gowing was very willing to use his position as bishop to promote pacifism and peacemaking as normative Christianity and was active in the internal working of the APF. The Fellowship in return was happy to have the name of the bishop associated with its activities, so much so that Gowing can perhaps almost be regarded as having been the unofficial patron of the Auckland sub-branch. Certainly the relationship between the bishop and his fellow Auckland members was warm and co-operative.

The warm relationship between this bishop and the Fellowship was far from typical. An example of the tensions which could exist between the APF and non-pacifists was provided by the Bishop of Wellington, Norman Lesser, taking offence at the Fellowship writing to ordinands and promoting views which he considered to be contrary to their ordination vows.<sup>16</sup> Such explicit opposition from the Church leadership has not, however, been common. Non-pacifist bishops have often been happy for the Fellowship to contribute to the debate on peace issues.

**During the first decade of the Auckland sub-branch's existence two major issues were balloted conscription into the armed forces and New Zealand's participation in the Vietnam**

---

<sup>16</sup> Letter from Bishop Lesser to A.P.F., Turnbull Folder 7

War. All young men were required to register for military training, with penalties for non-registration. Only a portion of those registering were required to undergo compulsory military training, those conscripted being balloted on the basis of birth date. It was possible to register as a conscientious objector with a panel assessing sincerity of those so registered if they were balloted. Those accepted as genuine conscientious objectors were subject to sanctions which included the forfeiture of all wages in excess of the rate paid to a private soldier for a period equivalent to the time which otherwise would have been spent in military training.

Unlike Australia, New Zealand did not send conscripts to fight in Vietnam. There were undoubtedly those who feared that this policy of sending only volunteers might change, but given the small size of New Zealand's involvement in Vietnam this was unlikely as New Zealand could fulfil its commitment with volunteers only. A total of 3890 New Zealanders served in Vietnam between 1965 and 1972, the total commitment never exceeding 543 personnel, peaking in November 1968<sup>17</sup>.

There was, however, sharp division within New Zealand society as to the appropriateness of any New Zealand involvement, following the example set by dissenters in the USA and Australia. Those with memories of the Pacific War generally regarded it as necessary for New Zealand to demonstrate its commitment to a defence relationship with the USA, but a growing minority of citizens took the view that New Zealand should not participate in this conflict. The Auckland APF attempted to address both issues, primarily through efforts at educating Church members in its interpretation of the teachings of the Bible.

In response to the conscription issue Auckland members undertook to produce an information pamphlet targeted at young men approaching registration age<sup>18</sup>. The proposal to produce the pamphlet was made in 1966 and it was written during the second half of 1966, publication occurring early in 1968<sup>19</sup>. It was intended to be a balanced statement setting out the cases both for and against conscientious objection from a Christian perspective. The foreword was written by Bishop Gowing. The Right Rev G M McKenzie declined to write the anti-objection case on the ground that his naval involvement may have biased his thinking, suggesting Rev John Malcolm as more neutral<sup>20</sup>. The anti-conscientious objection case as eventually written by M J Houghton is essentially Augustinian just war in its approach, and expresses the sympathy towards those who refuse to fight which is implicit (and sometimes explicit) in the Augustinian position. The pro-objection case was written by Auckland APF members Christopher Barfoot, Philip Crump and Shaun Pennycook<sup>21</sup>. These three and Miss R Miller were members of the subcommittee charged with its production.<sup>22</sup>

The four page pamphlet was entitled *Military Service : A Guide for Those Required to Register for Military Training*. It was widely distributed to Anglican secondary schools throughout New Zealand, and a small number of schools (including girls' schools) are known to have made distributions to senior pupils, but in most instances it has not been possible to

---

<sup>17</sup> *Army Public Relations : A Brief History of the New Zealand army in South Vietnam 1964-1972*, New Zealand Defence Headquarters (Wellington, 1973) Annex A

<sup>18</sup> Annual General Meeting minutes, New Zealand Branch minute books, 10 Nov. 1966

<sup>19</sup> *Military Service : A Guide for those Required to Register for Military Training*, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship New Zealand Branch (Auckland, 1968)

<sup>20</sup> Letter from G.M. McKenzie to C. Barfoot, 25 Aug. 1967, Turnbull Folder 7

<sup>21</sup> Letter from C. Barfoot to L. Robinson, 23 Aug. 1967

<sup>22</sup> A.G.M. Minutes, 12 Nov. 1966

ascertain whether or not distributions to pupils occurred<sup>23</sup>. There was also distribution to numerous parishes, although the recipients were not always sympathetic. An example is provided by a request from the Archdeacon of Tamaki, David Dunningham, for Barfoot to address his Young Anglicans, who had already read it. Dunningham described them as “militaristic” and “coolly interested” in the pamphlet<sup>24</sup>. It was also distributed to parish clergy through the Anglican Department of Christian Education in Wellington.<sup>25</sup>

Talking to parishes and to groups within parishes was regarded as an important part of the work of the Fellowship and several members frequently offered their services to parishes to talk about their pacifist beliefs. APF members also attempted to educate the members of their own parishes, but those interviewed said that they met with little success. Margaret Bowater was in a particularly good position to perform this ministry, as from 1966 she was the leader of the Senior Anglican Youth Movement and the Inter-Church Senior Youth Fellowship in Thames<sup>26</sup>. She also used her position as worker in the interchurch library in Thames to ensure that a considerable body of material on peace was available, but she reported difficulty in interesting people in reading books on the subject.<sup>27</sup>

Another initiative of the Auckland sub-branch during the time it constituted the national executive was the posting of the official English APF organ “Anglican Pacifist” to all clergy in the Auckland Diocese. The intention to do this was reported to the June 1964 annual conference, held in Auckland, and the publication was distributed for a period of one year.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Report dated Feb. 1968, Turnbull Folder 8

<sup>24</sup> Letter from D. Dunningham to C. Barfoot. 28 Feb. 1968, Turnbull Folder 8

<sup>25</sup> Letter from Director of Dept. for Christian Education to A.P.F., 5 March 1968, Turnbull Folder 8

<sup>26</sup> Letter from M. Bowater to C Barfoot 10 Aug 1966, Turnbull Folder 6

<sup>27</sup> Letter from M Bowater to C Barfoot 15 July 1968, Turnbull Folder 8

<sup>28</sup> A.G.M. Minutes 13 June 1964

In July 1965 Bowater wrote to the APF suggesting that a questionnaire be sent to the clergy of the diocese requesting “constructive criticism or advice...to strengthen our efforts to stimulate deeper Christian concern about matters of peace and war”.<sup>29</sup> This survey was carried out, but the results were considered to be not entirely favourable. The majority of clergy did not respond and many of those who did were critical. This prompted the establishment of a committee consisting of Crump, Barfoot, Waller and Orr to produce a reply to the objections to pacifism raised in the survey, posted to Auckland clergy and New Zealand APF members. It was reported at the November 1966 annual conference that “some favourable comment was received, though it was possible that the paper was too long and involved for many.” At this conference Crump moved that *Challenge*, as the English APF organ was by now named, be distributed to all Anglican secondary schools in New Zealand for display in their libraries.<sup>30</sup> By the time of the November 1967 conference only one secondary school, Rathkeale College in Masterton, had replied accepting *Challenge*.<sup>31</sup> Other sub-branches followed Auckland’s example of *Challenge* mailouts to clergy, starting with Wellington in early 1966<sup>32</sup>.

The Auckland sub-branch also had relations with non-Christian groups involved in activities opposing New Zealand involvement in the Vietnam War. It was affiliated to the Auckland Council on Vietnam, and worked with the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation.<sup>33</sup> It has not proved possible to locate within the APF’s own records any information detailing the extent of these involvements, but both the extent of involvement and the differences between the Christians

<sup>29</sup> Letter from M. Bowater 26 July 1965, Turnbull Folder 6

<sup>30</sup> A.G.M. minutes 11 Nov. 1966

<sup>31</sup> Letter from C. Barfoot to “Dean” (Chandler?) 17 Nov. 1967, Turnbull Folder 7

<sup>32</sup> Letter Wellington branch to C. Barfoot 2 Apr. 1966 Turnbull Folder 7

of the APF and non-Christians from other affiliated groups appear to have caused some tensions between the groups. It was felt necessary to organise two meetings between Auckland APF members and members of Progressive Youth, the Peace Council and the Communist Party to address those tensions. This was largely a consequence of the disparate motivations of those involved in opposition to the war. Some, such as APF members, objected to war per se. Some other Christians believed that participation in warfare could be justified but that this particular war was unjust. Some were non-Christians who opposed the war on ethical grounds and some were communists whose motivation for opposing New Zealand support for the South Vietnamese Government was a desire for a military victory by the communist North Vietnamese some no doubt were motivated by this being the latest cause to give a sense of purpose and belonging. Such diversity of beliefs and motivations within the anti-war movement was potentially divisive, making necessary the attempts at identifying common ground. These discussions were described by Barfoot as "most helpful in the common ground discovered and the understandings created".<sup>34</sup>

Certain members of the Fellowship gained reputations in the wider community for leftist leanings. Dean Chandler, whose involvement with the New Zealand Peace Council and World Peace Council included international trips to attend conferences some of which were to communist countries and who was well known for his concerns on social issues, became known amongst his detractors as the Red Dean. Chandler stated that one of his greatest regrets was not having spoken more clearly during the Second World War.<sup>35</sup> Another prominent Auckland member, Florence LeRoy White, was a member of the Peace Council,

---

<sup>33</sup> Interview with Christopher Barfoot

<sup>34</sup> Report from C. Barfoot to APF, 24 Apr 1969. Turnbull Folder 13

<sup>35</sup> APF Newsletter, May 1971. Turnbull Folder 15

the Society for Closer Relations with Russia and the China Friendship Association, and had a picture of Mao on a wall in her house, next to a crucifix.<sup>36</sup> About this she wrote “I find these societies not incompatible with my Christian beliefs.”<sup>37</sup> Kathleen Hall, a member who lived in Weymouth who had been a medical worker in China for twenty years, concluded an outline of her Chinese work with the words “and I was so thankful for the Chinese communists”.<sup>38</sup> But there were other members of the Fellowship who considered their capitalist activities to be not incompatible with their Christian faith. Barfoot, for example, would eventually become a director of Barfoot and Thompson, the largest real estate agency in Auckland, a position he would hold for twenty-five years<sup>39</sup>. The APF active membership also included a disproportionately large number of people who could be described as High Church, raising the question of whether the Oxford Movement’s deep concern for the urban poor may over a century later have influenced to some degree the antipodean APF. Such concern is demonstrated, for example, by Hall. After her return from China she devoted herself to working among Waikato Maori, whom she regarded as having been neglected by the Church prior to the appointment of Bishop Holland.<sup>40</sup>

On the initiative of the Auckland membership a national newsletter was introduced from April 1967 and was issued quarterly. It was standard APF practise throughout New Zealand to issue members with lists of ordinands for whom to pray in the hope that through these prayers the Holy Spirit would influence these ordinands to adopt an acceptance of pacifism as Christian orthodoxy, and Auckland members were included in this activity.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Interview with Rev. Patricia Nicolas

<sup>37</sup> Letter from F. White to APF, 15 Nov. 1964 or 1955, Turnbull Folder 3

<sup>38</sup> Letter from K. Hall to APF secretary 22 June 1959, Turnbull Folder 3

<sup>39</sup> Telephone conversation with C Barfoot, January 1999

<sup>40</sup> As per Note 38

<sup>41</sup> Interview with C Barfoot

At the annual general meeting held in conjunction with the May 1969 annual conference the decision was made to shift the national executive from the Auckland to the Wellington sub-branch<sup>42</sup>. Over the following four years New Zealand forces were withdrawn from Vietnam and balloted conscription was abolished, resulting in the absolute pacifist message of the Fellowship losing much of its immediacy. The focus for Anglicans in general who were interested in peace issues was shifting to opposition to continuing French nuclear testing in the Pacific. Many of those Anglicans who were concerned about this issue were motivated by environmental concerns about atmospheric testing or by concerns about the level of destruction involved in nuclear warfare rather than because of opposition to war per se. In consequence the Fellowship found itself proclaiming a message which did not specifically address the issue at hand in quite the way it had in the 1960s when the questions had been whether or not to participate in a war or prepare for war rather than the means by which wars could be fought. Auckland members had become discouraged because despite their efforts over a period of years, for the Anglican Church was remaining generally non-pacifist. Reports presented by Barfoot on behalf of the Auckland sub-branch and Moutier on behalf of Christchurch to the Wellington sub-branch in January 1974 indicated very little activity by the Fellowship in either centre. Apparently Barfoot and/or Moutier were sufficiently discouraged by a lack of tangible results to question the value of the Fellowship, for the Wellington minutes record that the meeting considered and rejected the suggestion made in the sub branch reports that the APF had outlived its usefulness.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> APF Newsletter May 1969

<sup>43</sup> APF minute book. Wellington meeting 30 Jan 1974

Assessing the impact of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship during the Vietnam War years is made difficult by the problem of separating the influence of the organisation from that of key individuals. Such a separation of influences is necessary in making the assessment because of the roles of certain individuals in the diocesan hierarchy. Certainly Gowing was well known as a vocal critic of New Zealand's involvement in the Vietnam War, but the prominence given to his criticisms had more to do with his status as the Bishop of Auckland than with his membership of the APF. Similarly Chandler's prominence as a critic of the war owed more to his other roles in the Church than to his APF membership, and no doubt much the same could be said about others, albeit to a lesser extent. Indeed, it is likely that many (probably the vast majority) of people who were aware of Gowing's and Chandler's stands against the war were unaware of their APF membership, or even that the Fellowship existed. Yet their ultimate involvement with the APF and willingness to make significant contributions of time to its activities indicates that it was an organisation close to the hearts of these men. It was undoubtedly a source of support for them as they took what were often unpopular stands, and it is reasonable to suppose that they were strengthened and encouraged by this support from like-minded fellow Anglicans.

The dedication and commitment of these more prominent members was matched by that of others who did not gain any great public prominence. Certainly their work, both individually and through their APF membership, had some impact on the Church. But the overwhelming majority of Anglicans were not ready to hear a message of absolute pacifism, while many were very ready to associate any opposition to the Vietnam War or a questioning of defence ties with the United States of America with support for communism. Much of the opposition to the war came from young people who had not lived with the fear of Japanese invasion and

for whom protest was perceived as being part of an international popular youth culture. But this same youth culture which rejected the Vietnam War was just as likely to reject other symbols of "The Establishment", including the Church. The violence associated with some anti-war protests (with accusation and counter-accusation as to whether protesters or police were primarily responsible) perhaps exemplified the extent to which an organisation proclaiming Christian pacifism failed to engage the public mood of the times. As New Zealand's involvement in the Vietnam War drew to a close, the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship found itself in a no-man's-land with no substantial constituency and, with the end of both balloted conscription and the war, no clear cause to provide a focus for its message. The challenge facing the Auckland sub-branch was that of reinvesting itself with its earlier vigour and re-inventing itself as a vital, relevant organisation.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP – AFTER VIETNAM

It is perhaps surprising given the Auckland sub-branch's previous willingness to associate with a wide range of groups opposing the Vietnam war that during the late 1970s and early 1980s there was little official involvement with secular peace organisations beyond ongoing support for the New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies<sup>44</sup>, despite increasing awareness amongst Anglicans and the New Zealand public in general of the anti-nuclear debate. This is particularly surprising in view of the prominence of certain other Auckland Anglicans in the anti-nuclear movement, probably the best known example being Rev George Armstrong's leading role in the Peace Squadron. The support for the Foundation for Peace Studies was entirely consistent with the APF's view of itself as an educational organisation, but even when visits to the Waitemata Harbour of nuclear powered warships of the US Navy became a matter of major public concern and the anti-nuclear movement was gaining increasing support, both inside and outside the Church, the Fellowship had little official contact with anti-nuclear groups, individual Fellowship members instead giving the movement such support as they felt able to provide. An Auckland APF member at the time, Rev Patricia Nicolas, has commented on a tendency to hold meetings of members rather than engage in practical action despite growing public awareness of peace issues.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Barfoot interview

<sup>45</sup> Nicolas interview

Meetings continued to be held periodically in the home of White and from 1982 in the crypt of St Matthew's in the City,<sup>46</sup> but nothing of note appears to have happened until late 1982 when a debate was organised on the proposition "That war and armed violence are incompatible with the Christian faith". The debate was open to all Anglicans and was widely advertised, with Tony Maturin, Barfoot, Joan MacDonald and Rev Patricia Nicolas touring fifteen Auckland parishes prior to the debate, discussing pacifism and peacemaking through the media of sermons, vestry meetings and meetings of women's and youth's groups.<sup>47</sup>

The debate was held on 16 October, several weeks later than originally planned so that, in the words of Barfoot, people could "cool down after the Springbok tour and are able to think of deeper issues"<sup>48</sup>. Up to seventy people at a time were reportedly in attendance.<sup>49</sup> Four invited speakers gave addresses of fifteen minutes each, and then an open discussion session was followed by a time for small group discussions on the Church's attitudes towards violence in both local society and international affairs. During the open discussion session the concept of "structural violence" was introduced to the debate. The claim was that the structures of society could constitute an act of violence against a section of that society, and that in New Zealand society women and Maori were the ones who were thus harmed. It was the handling of the discussion of this question which introduced a note of controversy to the debate.

During the open discussion all of those present were free to express own views on any matter relevant to the proposition of the debate, and it was a person who was not a member of the

---

<sup>46</sup> Nicolas interview

<sup>47</sup> Report to Wellington meeting 2 Nov 1982. Turnbull Folder 14

<sup>48</sup> Letter from C. Barfoot to Wellington sub-branch 3 Nov 1981. Turnbull Folder 14

<sup>49</sup> See Note 4.

Fellowship who introduced the issue of structural violence. According to Nicolas, as a result of a lack of firm chairmanship this person was able to use the session to push a personal political agenda which insisted that the structures of society did constitute acts of violence against women and Maori. This view was presented, Nicolas stated, in a radical manner, with those whose views were contrary having those views treated in an inappropriate manner. Nicolas is herself a person with a deep concern for issues of social justice, and her own attitudes towards these matters give credence to her belief that this session was not well handled by those running the debate and was distasteful for many of those present. However, prominent Wellington members Lance Robinson and the Mander family, who had attended the Auckland debate, commenting on the debate as a whole over all of its sessions, deemed the exercise to have "been a very worthwhile occasion".<sup>50</sup>

Barfoot's comment above suggesting that warfare was a "deeper issue" than apartheid points to an important difference in priorities within the Church. How this affected the APF's own members is discussed later in this chapter. But the difference also affected the ability of the APF to relate to the wider Church. For Barfoot and others encouraging the Church to move towards a pacifist position was the major issue. But as was demonstrated by the introduction to the debate of the concept of structural violence, a range of opinion could exist as to what constituted a peace issue. For many Anglicans the immediacy of South African issues, including the often violent treatment by the South African Government of the opponents of apartheid, made these issues of great importance, perhaps on a par with the contemporary nuclear debate. Many Christians would have considered violent conflict between the South African Government and its own citizens (the "Homelands" not being recognised by the

---

<sup>50</sup> Report to Wellington meeting 2 Nov. 1982. Turnbull Folder 14

opponents of apartheid) to be just as deep an issue as violence between nations. As described later, some APF members concluded that the Fellowship was rendered ineffective by too narrow a focus at a time when other issues of violence were attracting a great deal of attention both within and without the Church.

The questioning of the role of social and political structures as instruments of repression of the marginalised and disenfranchised and the belief that such structures could themselves constitute acts of violence was central to the teachings of, for example, Gustavo Gutierrez, James H Cone and other liberation theologians. If the structures themselves constituted acts of violence, then an act of violence against such a society could be construed as an act of self defence. The role of the anti tour movement could then fall within the ambit of the peace debate. Far from being a "deeper issue", peace could have been deemed by this reasoning to have been the issue in the apartheid debate, peace and justice thus being inseparably linked. This issue was brought into sharper focus for New Zealand when in 1980 a New Zealand priest working in South Africa, Father Michael Lapsley, lost both hands to a parcel bomb.<sup>51</sup> The bombing was widely blamed on the South African Government of which Lapsley was a critic. The APF's failure to engage directly in the ongoing debate of the 1980s as to the appropriate Christian response to such a situation could possibly be regarded as a serious loss of an opportunity to make a contribution to a matter of great moment. It must be said, however, that individually many APF supporters were involved in anti-apartheid activities.

The next significant activity of the Auckland sub-branch was a diocesan consultation on war and peace held prior to the 1988 Lambeth Conference, which was organised by and at the

initiative of the APF. Again the event was widely advertised, but few people attended and most of those who did attend were APF members.<sup>52</sup> So disappointing was the small number of non-members who had been present that in a report delivered to the APF annual conference in June of the following year Tollemache questioned the “worth of even attempting to communicate with the grass-root, pew-sitting Anglican”.<sup>53</sup>

The consultation was held in the hall of St Andrew’s Church, Epsom, following a service of Holy Communion in the church at which the Bishop of Auckland, Bruce Gilberd, was celebrant. Because of other commitments Gilberd was unable to stay for the full meeting and was not a part of the discussions which led to the passing of a resolution. He was, however, able to give an opening address in which he stated that he was opposed to the manufacture, deployment and use of nuclear weapons, but could not accept the full pacifist viewpoint. Following the bishop’s departure there was a lengthy discussion of peace issues followed by the unanimous passing of a resolution that “membership of the Christian Church necessarily involves the complete repudiation of war and all preparation to wage war” and that eight proposals be placed before the Lambeth Conference, including that conscientious objection be the normative response of Christians to war and “that the basis of military chaplaincy be reviewed by the churches to ensure that pastoral duties may be performed without identification with the military system”.<sup>54</sup>

In view of the very small number of people present and the very high proportion who were APF members this “diocesan consultation” cannot be regarded as having in any way fulfilled

---

<sup>51</sup> Alister Taylor (Ed) *New Zealand Who's Who* 1996 Edition. New Zealand Who's Who Aotearoa Ltd (Auckland, 1996) p377

<sup>52</sup> Report in files of C Barfoot.

<sup>53</sup> AGM Minutes 2-5 June 1989, Turnbull Folder 13

its organisers' ambitions of providing the bishop with an authoritative statement of the general views of ordinary Anglicans of his diocese. It can possibly be seen as indicative of the speed with which peace issues lost their relevance in the public mind following the passing into law of anti-nuclear legislation, participation by non members of the APF being insignificant compared with the numbers attending the debate described above held four years earlier, at a time when visits to New Zealand ports by nuclear ships of the US Navy were a controversial reality, although the difference in the nature of the event may also have been a factor affecting attendance.

Three major events dominated APF Auckland branch activities during the 1990s. The first was the 1991 visit of Rev Sidney Hinkes. Hinkes had seen active service during the Second World War as a member of the Parachute Regiment of the British Army, but his war experiences led to him adopting a pacifist position after the termination of hostilities, and he subsequently became a leading member of the APF in Britain. At the expense of the New Zealand APF Hinkes toured every diocese of New Zealand except Polynesia, promoting the message that Christianity is essentially a pacifist faith. Auckland members were involved in preparations for his visit throughout 1990 and early and mid 1991, with his time in the Diocese of Auckland being from 4 August to 30 September.<sup>55</sup>

During this time Hinkes covered most of Auckland, Northland and the Coromandel Peninsula. Attempts at incorporating his visits in the formal programme at the College of St John the Evangelist were unsuccessful because of the college not being approached until after

---

<sup>54</sup> Minutes of meeting, C Barfoot files

<sup>55</sup> Report to APF, C Barfoot files

its formal programme for the year had been settled,<sup>56</sup> leaving only the option of a talk outside the formal study programme. He was able to spend a two hour session with students in the Christian ethics class at the college, and according to C Barfoot it was a lively meeting with an interesting discussion and numerous questions being put to Hinkes.<sup>57</sup> Many individual parishes were visited, with Hinkes delivering sermons and talking to informal gatherings of parishioners in homes. He also addressed the Auckland Synod. It has been impossible to assess the overall impact of this on those to whom Hinkes spoke, but anecdotal evidence from APF members involved in the organisation of the mission suggests a high level of apathy from most Anglicans, with few people attending home meetings and lukewarm responses to sermons, although there is agreement that Hinkes proved to be a knowledgeable and able communicator, who performed admirably in presenting his case. At the request of the New Zealand APF Hinkes wrote a book based on his addresses, but the decision was made to not proceed with publication because the market for such a work was considered to be too small.<sup>58</sup> No significant increase in APF membership was reported during or after his mission. His address to the Auckland synod appears to have been overshadowed by the controversy created by a motion presented to the same synod on behalf of the APF. Hinkes's address was not widely reported and was generally unmentioned even in media reports on the APF motion, despite the relevance to the motion and the subsequent controversy of both his message and his status as a former paratrooper.

The motion presented to the Auckland synod called on all Anglicans to pray for non violent conflict resolution and pledging to renounce all preparations for war, and also calling on the

---

<sup>56</sup> Letter from College to C Barfoot. Barfoot files

<sup>57</sup> Telephone conversation with C Barfoot

<sup>58</sup> Undated report. C Barfoot files

Government of New Zealand to work for the prevention of all kinds of war.<sup>59</sup> It was presented by Rev John Marcon, who although not at that time an APF member was sympathetic to its objectives and who had gained a degree of recognition within the Church for his involvement in the anti-Springbok tour movement. The motion was drafted by APF members and then passed to Marcon to be moved at the synod, it being presented in exactly the form prepared by the APF despite Marcon having reservations about its specific wording, especially the description of warfare as sinful, which he believed was likely to be inflammatory.<sup>60</sup> His reserve proved to be well founded, with the motion generating controversy. It received some support, at least in principle from several synod members, although the view was expressed that it should be amended to denounce war rather than renounce it. But the motion was strongly opposed by Rev John Maclean, who was moved by his own personal experience of war as a soldier, and his deep abhorrence of war, to believe that armed deterrence, including nuclear deterrence, was necessary for the maintenance of peace. Rev Bryan Drake considered the motion to be unscriptural. On the motion of Professor Patrick Lacey, who believed that the motion's description of war as inherently sinful dishonoured the memory of his wartime comrades, but who believed also that it was inappropriate for the synod to vote against it the synod voted 92 to 50 to pass on to the next item on the agenda without voting on the APF motion.<sup>61</sup>

This was not the end of the controversy. Although few people had spoken to the motion prior to Lacey and the resolution to move on to the next agenda item had rendered it virtually a non-event in terms of the formal business of the synod, the debate was reported in the secular

---

<sup>59</sup> Minutes of 1991 Synod, Diocese of Auckland

<sup>60</sup> Interview with Rev Hubert John Marcon

<sup>61</sup> Report from C Barfoot to APF, Barfoot files

news media, the article in the *New Zealand Herald* prompting Marcon to write a letter to the editor making it clear that the motion was not intended to be an attack on the integrity of those who had from honourable motives participated in wars, but rather was prompted by a desire to promote a better and more Christian alternative.<sup>62</sup> A similar defence was published in the diocesan organ, the *AD News*.<sup>63</sup> Marcon had in fact stated in his synod address that it was not his intention to dishonour those who had fought in wars and MacLean remembers that Marcon made this clear.<sup>64</sup> The debate for both Marcon and MacLean was over the theological and pragmatic issues involved in responding to evil, and both APF members and those who opposed the motion were in agreement that those who in good faith participated in warfare believing it to be their Christian duty should be treated with respect. Similarly both Marcon and MacLean were able to agree on the evil of war, but to MacLean it is impossible in this fallen world to completely avoid evil and sometimes necessary to accept the lesser evil in order to oppose the greater. For MacLean, a failure to resort to the lesser evil may sometimes amount to a default acceptance of the greater evil. To Marcon, evil was defeated on the cross and it is never necessary to choose between evils.

A fundamentally different strategy was adopted for the 1992 synod. Marcon, who by now was an APF member, was firmly of the opinion that there was little point in attempting to persuade the synod to renounce warfare when most synod representatives had little understanding of the issues from a scriptural perspective, and he instead favoured an educational response. In an apparent attempt to avoid the controversy and misunderstandings of the previous year, the 1992 motion called on the synod to “affirm the integrity, faith and

---

<sup>62</sup> *New Zealand Herald*, 25 Sept. 1991

<sup>63</sup> *AD News*, Oct 1991, Diocese of Auckland, pp2 and 9

<sup>64</sup> Interview with Rev John MacLean

commitment of servicemen and servicewomen” and to “recognise the courage, faith and integrity of the conscientious objectors” who had been interned, and called upon the Social Justice Council of the Anglican Church to prepare a series of Bible studies on issues of war and peace in conjunction with the APF and other relevant groups. <sup>65</sup>

The motion was passed without dissent and work commenced on the preparation of the studies. Attempts were made to involve armed forces chaplains but the bulk of work on the studies was done by Auckland APF members. A considerable amount of time and effort was expended on their preparation, including a weekend consultation with non-pacifists at which drafts were discussed in detail. Those present included an Air Force chaplain who had fought in Korea and an Air Force apprentice.<sup>66</sup> The completed studies were published in the mid 1990s. They have been offered to parishes throughout New Zealand and were purchased by large numbers of parishes and individual clergy, but it has not been possible to establish how intensively they have been used by individual parishes, nor has it been possible to assess how effective they have been in promoting the views of the Fellowship.

They do however help to illustrate in a manner described below the disagreement which has existed amongst members as to the proper role of the APF.

Opinions of members differ widely concerning the successes and failures of the Fellowship, but there appears to be a consensus that its outcomes have been disappointing. Membership has remained small and the belief that Christianity is a pacifist faith has remained the view of small minority within the Anglican Church. There appears to be little confidence that this will

---

<sup>65</sup> Minutes of 1992 Synod, Diocese of Auckland

change and this has led some members to even question their membership of the Anglican Church. Tollemache, for example, has considered becoming a Quaker<sup>67</sup>, while Macdonald felt unable to continue any formal involvement in the activities of the Christian Church because of its failure to adopt what she considers to be the normative Christian position on a range of issues, including social justice issues and those of peace and violence.<sup>68</sup> Generally, however, APF members seem to be content to remain as Anglicans.

For Macdonald, peacemaking was an integral part of a wider commitment to social justice, and it was in fact this commitment to such issues which led to her involvement in the APF. For others, such as C Barfoot, pacifism was based on Biblical teachings related specifically to peace and violence and is thus approached from a theological perspective.<sup>69</sup> Applied generally to Auckland APF members whose opinions have been sought, this difference between members as to the reasons why they regard pacifism as normative roughly correlates with a contrast which has emerged in their views of the extent to which the Fellowship has been unsuccessful. To Barfoot, its narrow focus on pacifism has been one of its strengths, enabling it to avoid the internal conflicts which have afflicted some more broadly based peace groups. But to Nicolas, this tight focus was itself a source of internal tension, as it resulted in an unwillingness to address issues of family violence and other matters of more immediate concern to people's day to day lives. This was felt to limit both the effectiveness of the organisation and its appeal to a broader catchment.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Barfoot interview

<sup>67</sup> Interview with Hugh Tollemache

<sup>68</sup> Interview with Joan Macdonald

<sup>69</sup> Barfoot interview

<sup>70</sup> Nicolas interview

It is possible to exaggerate the extent of the differences. As an example, Tollemache was able to express the opinion that the narrow focus of the APF had not been a problem or an issue, but he had no hesitation when asked in agreeing that domestic violence was an issue of great importance and concern.<sup>71</sup> But it remains true that for those Auckland APF members whose commitment to peacemaking is rooted in a commitment to social justice, there has been disappointment at a failure to address issues of peace and violence which extend beyond disputes between nations.

Similar dissatisfaction was expressed over the emphasis (or lack of emphasis) on certain consequences of war. An example is provided by a Bible study prepared for the series of studies referred to above. MacDonald prepared a draft study on women and war, which was then refined by MacDonald, Nicolas and P Barfoot. This study was not, however, included in the final published set. MacDonald expressed personal disappointment at this non-inclusion and this disappointment was shared by others. Marcon, for example, considered the material included in the study to be of very great importance and did not know how a study of such significance came to be omitted from the published set. According to C Barfoot, however, the reason was simply that the study was very short and not of a high enough standard for inclusion, with the sub-committee of MacDonald, Nicolas and P Barfoot (C Barfoot's wife) having failed to do the work necessary to raise the standard. In general males interviewed were more inclined to both a doctrinal basis to pacifism and the view that promoting peacemaking between nations and the rejection of participation in war should be the primary focus for APF activities, while female members were more inclined towards a social justice basis and a greater concern for involvement in domestic violence issues. Marcon was an

---

<sup>71</sup> Tollemache interview

obvious exception, straddling both positions. The differences were, however, more differences of degree than of substance, and as those questioned represented only a small proportion of Auckland membership the above conclusions must be regarded as being highly tentative.

In general it may be concluded that over a period of many years the Auckland sub-branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship has faithfully maintained its commitment to witnessing to the Church in promoting a message of non-violence and has had some notable achievements given its small membership. But its basic message that Christianity is a pacifist faith has never received widespread acceptance within the Church. Despite the many relevant issues which have confronted New Zealand Christians during its existence it has failed to capture the attention of the Church, to such an extent that even Anglicans sympathetic to its objectives have often been unaware of its existence. Its inability to engage Anglicans in general even when the nuclear ships controversy was at its height can perhaps be attributed to its promotion of absolute pacifism between nations being too limited a focus. In the words of Nicolas :

I think in the congregations I think in some sense the APF in this age is too specific .  
 I think that pacifism is an important aspect and we should never forget that but I  
 think that somehow the peace movement has somehow taken over from pacifism in  
 some sense. I think that people who want to work for peace are not necessarily  
 always pacifists in a token sense and I somehow think about – and I might be  
 absolutely wrong about this – but just in terms of the parishes I have been involved  
 with both St Matthew's [in-the-City] and St Peter's, Onehunga, I feel that people

generally feel that to take an obvious pacifist position is somehow tying them down in to small a knot but people today look at peace making and may be peace making is a softer option. – I think it probably is but maybe it's what people can deal with more.<sup>72</sup>

The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship has encouraged the Church to take a giant leap of faith when a series of small steps might have been more appropriate. When that leap was not made the result was, for many APF members, deep disappointment.

---

<sup>72</sup> Nicholas interview

## CHAPTER FOUR

### VIETNAM – A TALE OF TWO MARCHES

On the evening of Good Friday 1968 a Vietnam War protest occurred in Queen Street, Auckland. Only a few people were involved in the protest, it was conducted peacefully and it was just one of many protests dealing with the Vietnam War issue. It would be easy to denote no more than two or three sentences to this protest, but to dismiss it so quickly would be a mistake. What made this incident so special was that it was an exclusively Anglican protest, and the dynamics of both the action and the reaction encapsulate the difficulties faced in attempting to come to terms with peace issues within the structures of the Anglican tradition.

For a number of years it had been the practise of the Anglican Church to hold a procession in Queen St on the evening of Good Friday. This was a purely religious event which ordinarily had had no political overtones. A group of students and staff at the College of St John the Evangelist decided to join the 1968 procession carrying placards which they hoped would encourage people to apply the Easter message to the issue of western involvement in the Vietnam War. A report on this incident published in the *New Zealand Herald* states “We were really trying to show that Christ is really involved in every side of things... We were not opposed to American policies, but we carrying these banners in the hope that we could make people think about these things”.<sup>73</sup> This view is supported by the statement of one of the people involved in the demonstration, Rev George Armstrong, who saw the protest in

---

<sup>73</sup> *New Zealand Herald* 13 april 1968, p8

terms of “public liturgy”, a concept of his explained later. In Armstrong’s view it was an attempt to stimulate people to apply Christian principles to the situation.<sup>74</sup> This is not, however, how some others involved in the Queen St procession viewed the protest, and it became a controversial action.

The demonstration had its genesis amongst a group at St John’s spending a period of a few hours studying and discussing issues of suffering and pain the world and listening to tape recordings on the subject of Third World problems from the World Council of Churches. The discussion group felt that they needed to take some form of action, so they decided to join the Good Friday procession carrying placards bearing such slogans as “Christ died for the Vietcong”, “Christ died for LBJ” (US president Lyndon B Johnson), “Christ died for Anzacs” and “Christ died for all”. The slogans were not, according to the protestors, intended to advocate any particular political position, but rather to encourage Christians to address the issues of the day in theological terms.<sup>75</sup>

As remembered by Armstrong, “The clergy at the procession turned the other way and pretended not to see us. One or two of the lay people close to the bishop were very angry about it and wanted to get us out of their procession instead of hijacking it”. The bishop agreed to the exclusion and the St John’s College demonstrators and they were informed that they were not permitted to participate in the procession. As City Council permission was required for marching on a carriageway, with permission extending only to those deemed by organisers to be part of the march, such a restriction was legally enforceable. The demonstrators were however legally entitled to walk parallel with the procession provided

---

<sup>74</sup> Interview with Rev George Armstrong

that they kept themselves to the pedestrian pathway. This they did, much to the consternation of some of those who formed the official procession.<sup>76</sup>

Television and newspaper coverage at the time made both the demonstration and the exclusion of the demonstrators from the public procession matters of national attention, albeit briefly. But it is possible to argue that this event is significant not so much for this publicity as for what it reveals (or at least suggests) about attitudes held within the Church.

It is of interest that Armstrong contrasts the attitude of clergy in the official procession with that of some laity, the former trying to ignore the St John's group while the latter actively opposed their participation. It is tempting to speculate that a greater familiarity with theological issues (although not necessarily of peace issues) and a need to serve congregations holding a diversity of views may have constrained them from adopting a position in opposition to the demonstration in unexpected circumstances for which they had not planned. Some laity, not wishing to be associated by implication with those seeking to add a political dimension to the procession, appear to have felt no such inhibitions. But this is speculation, and the question of motivations would profit from further research.

For the Bishop of Auckland, Eric Gowing, the situation was more complex. As stated in the previous chapter, Gowing was a tireless peacemaker, an active member of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship and an outspoken opponent of New Zealand's involvement in the Vietnam War. It is inconceivable that he was unsupportive of the aim of encouraging theological reflection on the appropriateness of New Zealand's involvement. Furthermore,

---

<sup>75</sup> Armstrong interview

he was supportive of APF and other Anglican involvement in public acts of demonstration on peace issues. But he was also diocesan leader of a church many of whose members did not support his stand, and whose view, deserved to be treated with respect. Furthermore, Armstrong and his companions probably failed to fully appreciate how others would react to the timing of their action. The day commemorating the crucifixion of Christ is for Christians the most sacred day of the year. Gowing, whose own leanings required him to treat such occasions with reverence would not have been impressed by such a demonstration. The Good Friday procession was never intended to be anything more than a religious event and most of those participating were unaware of the plan to politicise the march. Under these circumstances the actions of Gowing are understandable if seen as the responsible actions of a person determined to preserve the integrity of Christian witness, whatever his own personal views on the Vietnam War.

Yet it is possible to wonder whether there may have been something more. The report on this protest in the *New Zealand Herald* quotes Gowing as having wished to discourage the involvement of "that kind of element," which seems a curious choice of words for the bishop to have used of the students and staff of his own theological college. If the *Herald* was accurate in its quoting of Gowing, it raises questions relating to Anglican attitudes towards what was a right and proper way of taking a stand on a particular issue.

Protest marches were quite acceptable and "respectable" in appropriate circumstances. A protest march was organised by concerned citizens for September 1968 protesting against the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia, the march up Queen St being led by city and borough

---

<sup>76</sup> Allan K Davidson, *Selwyn's Legacy*. The College of St. John the Evangelist (Auckland, 1993) pp.225-226

mayors of Auckland, trade union, University and Church leaders, with a number of Christians among the other participants. The protest was one which a broad spectrum of Anglicans would have felt able to support. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by Russian armed forces for the purpose of suppressing the move towards a popular Government with greater personal freedom was an act which received widespread condemnation amongst New Zealanders as well as from the New Zealand Government, and such a protest against an act by communist Russia was just as much a patriotic assertion of the values of New Zealand society as a protest against communist aggression. But matters were less clear cut where New Zealand's past or present allies were concerned. At the time of the Czechoslovakia march some of those involved were contemplating similar protests against French atmospheric nuclear testing in the South Pacific. At this early stage, when opposition to nuclear weapons had not yet become a popular cause, there was unlikely to be such broad support from civic leaders.

At the other end of respectability for peace demonstrations were those organised against the visit to New Zealand in January 1967 of a representative of the Government of South Vietnam, Air Vice-Marshal Ky. A small number of Anglicans served on the committee which organised the Auckland protest against the Ky visit, and one Anglican on this committee, Rev E A Johnston, addressed a protest meeting held in the Auckland Town Hall.<sup>77</sup> Other Anglicans were amongst those involved in the protests. Such a protest was controversial for obvious reasons. South Vietnam was officially an ally. Whatever the reality, the Government of Vietnam was officially represented as supporting the values of freedom and democracy which were later to characterise the Prague Spring. New Zealand's

---

<sup>77</sup> *APF Newsletter*, April 1967

willingness to support by military means the foreign policy of another ally, the United States of America, was seen by many New Zealanders as being necessary to ensure that the USA would continue to safeguard New Zealand. Such considerations made the 1967 Ky protests unpalatable to many New Zealanders who would have seen such actions as unpatriotic, but who would have had little or no difficulty in supporting protests against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

But even for those who were opposed to New Zealand's involvement in the Vietnam War the Ky and Czechoslovakia protests could be seen as falling into very different categories. This was an inevitable consequence of the diversity of views held by protesters against the Vietnam War, ranging from those who opposed New Zealand's military support for South Vietnam because they hoped for a military victory by the community North, to those who opposed war per se. Tactics favoured also varied, with some demonstrators being prepared to resort to violent means. There were some acts of violence carried out by a minority of those opposed to the visit by Air Vice-Marshal Ky, which caused a degree of discomfort for those involved in the protests who did not support such actions. This discomfort extended to those Anglicans involved, not least those who were members of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.

The Good Friday 1968 demonstrators processed peacefully up the footpath of Queen St parallel to the official procession. There was no violence, nor any suggestion of violence. It would be difficult even to describe the demonstrators as protesters, for they were seeking not so much to oppose anything as to encourage the thoughtful, prayerful consideration by their fellow Anglicans of the implications of the teachings of the Christian faith to a major public

issue of the day. The demonstrators were few in number and their placards could be regarded as being balanced and non-partisan.

But it would perhaps have been naïve to believe that such a demonstration would have failed to generate controversy, both among their fellow Anglicans and in the wider community. Any questioning of the appropriateness of supporting the foreign policy of the New Zealand Government while New Zealand was at war would have been considered by some to demonstrate a lack of patriotism. To others it was tantamount to supporting “godless communism” (an expression often used at this time by Christians opposed to communism). For others the appropriation of their non-political march by those with a political agenda would have been unacceptable, while for others there would have been associations in their minds with other protest groups. Whether justified or not, the St John’s College students and staff, armed with their placards, would have created such connotations and a number of Good Friday marchers may have felt uncomfortable at the prospect of being associated with such a group. This could perhaps be compared with the discomfort felt by Anglican pacifists and near pacifists to the violence of some Ky protesters. The impact of any demonstration could easily extend well beyond the objective reality of the event to embrace a range of implicit issues. Those issues were not always ones which rank and file Anglicans were enthusiastic to face.

It is also fair to say that protest marches such as the Ky and Czechoslovakia demonstrations and the Good Friday 1968 incident were not at that time a traditional Anglican method of influencing decision makers or of attempting to educate their fellow Anglicans. Formal methods of approaching potentially controversial issues were normative and public

demonstrations the exception. This is probably a partial explanation of why such Anglican involvement as there was, was most likely to take the form of individual Anglicans or Anglican groups becoming involved in actions primarily of a secular nature in terms of both other groups involved and the forms of protest, which generally did not emphasise any particular specifically Christian consideration. Both the Ky and the Czechoslovakia protests fell into this category. The other explanation is the diversity of views which exist within Anglicanism, which was a factor which caused the Good Friday demonstration to assume a level of reaction out of proportion to the number of people involved or their explicitly expressed message. These three incidents spread over a period of just 21 months thus demonstrate both the limitations and the problems of attempts made to make a public Christian proclamation from within the Anglican Church.

Formal means of demonstrating on peace issues included the use of diocesan synods, both as a forum for debate and as a means of gaining official recognition through the passing of motions. Some examples have been covered in the chapter on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, but numerous other motions were put to synods, with APF members often involved. One such motion followed the 1968 Lambeth Conference.

Since the 1930s the bishops attending successive Lambeth Conferences have regularly passed resolutions that state in various forms that warfare is ultimately incompatible with the Christian faith. This wording "ultimately incompatible" is not to be interpreted as an assertion that these bishops were advocates of absolute pacifism, for the "ultimate" position still leaves room for the traditional Anglican acceptance of the Augustinian just war model. It has nevertheless assumed a great deal of importance amongst Fellowship members. But it

also was the cause of debate and often controversy in the wider church. The limitation was always that the interest was limited to a small number of people. Synod resolutions on this issue often received little attention from the majority of lay Anglicans, and many of those at synod were interested only because as synod representatives they were a captive audience for the debate.

The 1968 Lambeth Conference passed the traditional resolution and prompted a peace motion at the 1969 Auckland Synod. It had originally been intended to move that the synod address the issue of Vietnam directly. The original wording was to call for a complete withdrawal of New Zealand armed forces from Vietnam and, at a time when all young men were required to register for balloted conscription, calling on all young men to consider becoming conscientious objectors. There was, however, a feeling that this could be seen as seditious. It was therefore, agreed that the Lambeth Conference resolutions on war be substituted for the call for withdrawal. There were objections from some synod representatives to the extension of conscientious objection implicit in the motion's wording, although they were prepared to uphold this right. The bishop ruled that the motion had to be taken as a whole, including the call to consider conscientious objection, and the motion was defeated on the vote of the laity.

In hindsight this could be regarded as a period of transition for the Church. It would have been difficult for most New Zealand Anglicans themselves to apply the teachings of the Bible to the question of how the New Zealand Government should react to the Vietnam War. Such applications of the Bible to Government policy were simply not the way things were done. Few were willing to question Government foreign policy on religious grounds, and few clergy felt comfortable about risking controversy within their parishes over such issues.

Furthermore, many Anglicans, both lay and ordained, were firmly of the opinion that the New Zealand Government was correct in taking a stand against godless communism. But the precedents had been set and the first seeds of public dissent sown. Even as the last New Zealand soldiers were leaving Vietnam there was growing disquiet over the effects on New Zealand of a Northern Hemisphere nation's policies of nuclear deterrence.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ANTI-NUCLEAR AND ANTI-TOUR PROTESTS

The mushroom cloud which appeared over Hiroshima on 6 August 1945 was for many a symbol of hope. It brought hope that the most destructive war in human history would soon be over without an invasion of Japan which would have been extremely costly in human terms, and it was a symbol of future world peace and prosperity under the benign protection of the world's largest democracy. For those New Zealanders who had lived with the fear of Japanese invasion following the loss of most of the US Navy Pacific Fleet's capital units and the failure of Britain's Singapore strategy, there was little doubt that the United States of America was a necessary ally. It was the US Navy which had defeated the Imperial Japanese Navy at Midway, Leyte Gulf and other key battles, and it was the US Navy which would protect New Zealand's strategic interests in the future. And if that navy would in the future include units which used nuclear propulsion, that was not a problem. Similarly there was widespread acceptance in the immediate postwar period of the American nuclear arsenal. They were the weapons which had defeated Japan, and they were the weapons which would in the future deter communist aggression.

There was some early opposition to nuclear weapons. An example is provided by Kenneth Prebble, father of Richard Prebble. In the late 1950s a sermon of his was broadcast on radio in which he opposed British nuclear testing (in which the Royal New Zealand Navy was involved) at Kiritimati Atoll (then known as Christmas Island). As a result he was invited to address a public meeting opposing the nuclear tests. He agreed, but later withdrew when he

discovered that communists were involved in the anti-nuclear movement. He remained opposed to nuclear weapons, but played no further public role in the issue. This was partly because of his concern that communists could use his words for their own purposes and partly because he considered a public stand to be inconsistent with his responsibilities as an Anglican vicar towards his parishioners.<sup>78</sup> But there was at this time no widespread anti-nuclear feeling in the diocese.

During the three decades from the late 1940s to the late 1970s a major shift occurred in public thinking in New Zealand. This would be a cause of disagreement within the Anglican Church. Anglicans were split as to whether the US nuclear umbrella was beneficial or a danger to New Zealand's interests, just as the wider New Zealand society was. Similarly the Church held a range of views on the appropriateness of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific. But if there were similarities between the development in thinking inside and outside the Church there were also differences. Whatever other influences may have been involved, there were also theological issues to be considered, and both the Anglican Church's structure and its traditional positions on related matters also affected developments. It is difficult to determine with any degree of reliability the extent to which secular and Christian influences helped determine Anglican thought and actions. Certainly there was some extent to which both practical responses to nuclear issues and the theology which provided the underlying justification grew from secular roots, but the extent of this is open to debate and may have been greater than some of those involved were willing to acknowledge.

---

<sup>78</sup> Telephone interview with Rev. Kenneth Prebble

The wide range of motives is demonstrated by the ubiquity of the expression “nuclear warship”. This term was broadly used to cover three categories of warship: those powered by a nuclear reactor (whether or not they were likely to be carrying nuclear weapons), nuclear capable vessels, ie able to carry and use nuclear weapons (irrespective of whether the ship’s propulsion systems were nuclear or conventional) and nuclear armed warships. The distinction between nuclear capable and nuclear armed was to gain particular significance shortly after David Lange became Prime Minister, but during the Muldoon years when the Peace Squadron was active it was generally assumed that nuclear capable ships were nuclear armed. There was also a failure by some people to differentiate between propulsion systems and armaments, leading to a perception by some people that nuclear powered vessels necessarily carried nuclear weaponry. Thus distinctions between environmental, public safety and peace issues and the motivation of being part of a popular cause became blurred as the opposition to warship visits received increasing public support. Visits by “nuclear warships” became the New Zealand focus for growing international concern over the threat of nuclear war, and the Auckland Peace Squadron was at the leading edge of New Zealand protests.

The traditional Anglican approach to warfare is described in the introductory chapter. To the extent to which the theological justification for warfare was dependent on the Augustinian model there was no shortage of grounds for challenging the legitimacy of nuclear arsenals. The likelihood of a beneficial outcome, the use of the minimum force necessary to secure that outcome, and the avoidance of harm to noncombatants were all arguably incompatible with the use of nuclear weapons. **But there was also an abundance of non-theological reasons for opposing nuclear weaponry, as demonstrated by the considerable support for the anti-nuclear**

movement amongst non-Christians. It is probably fair to say that for many of the Anglicans involved in the movement the primary motivation was not theological in nature.

For some, however, theological concerns were of major importance, with a prominent example being George Armstrong. As mentioned in the previous chapter, for Armstrong public protest was an act of public liturgy. The basic meaning of liturgy is public worship, but in Armstrong's use of the expression public liturgy the meanings of both "public" and "worship" are extended beyond those normally applied to the word "liturgy". Worship becomes a practical action, where God is glorified by the act of actually demonstrating that glory by a practical expression of God's love and concern for the world, and becomes something which is taken to the public through visible actions in the public arena. It may not be unreasonable to suggest that just as to St James a genuine faith must be accompanied by actions which demonstrate that faith, to Armstrong true glorification of God must be accompanied by actions which bring glory to God. To use Armstrong's words,

You have to display somehow and demonstrate something and it is to be done in public, and I think that is probably what is one strand at least, perhaps a major strand in worship itself, in liturgy itself something that is done out there transparent for anybody to see. It's not something you do in a corner. You are hoping that you will convey something by that as well as strengthening something in yourself. So if you see something happening that is deeply hurtful to other people and you see something which is deeply unjust, then you need to demonstrate what you are feeling and believing and what you are hoping for by some kind of public display or demonstration...in fact I have delivered this whole public liturgy notion as a key sort

of interpretation really of one of the roles of the Church which mixes together its very religious role and its very public role. I have done that quite theologically. So that is something of my philosophical stance.<sup>79</sup>

In this respect both means and ends become intimately related. The ends must be the achievement in society of those things which are of God – that is, they must be those things which will build the sort of society which God intended. But in building a society of justice and righteousness it is necessary to use means which themselves are worthy of God – it is not possible to worship God through ungodly actions. To again quote Armstrong:

As a Maori friend of mine said, it's not a question of the ends justifying the means but the means have to actually justify the end, and I've always thought of that. He turned the whole thing around. In other words, if you want justice you have got to practise justice and I think practising justice means being at peace. In a rich sort of sense of the word peace. You don't get justice by just being angry. You get justice by having a deep degree of a sort of peace in yourself and in your relationships with others insofar as it is in your power to do so. They might be coming after you. You can't control them exactly but you and yourself, if you are on about peace you have to be a deeply peaceable person in yourself.

In this same interview Armstrong stated that he was not an absolute pacifist because he could not rule out the possibility of the demands of justice on occasion being incompatible with an absolute stance, but that he did not believe that he would himself resort to violence.

---

<sup>79</sup> Armstrong interview

There is, therefore, a clear contrast between Armstrong and the liberation theologians. For both the ultimate aim is building the Kingdom of God and for both this means an uncompromising to justice. But to the latter it seems impossible to have peace without justice, so that justice becomes a precondition for peace. It may thus sometimes be legitimate to resort to violence in order to bring about justice, because it is only after a just order has been created that true peace can exist. An act of violence may thus be justified as ultimately being an act of peacemaking. Where Armstrong would differ is in seeing the links between peace and justice and between violence and injustice as being of such intimacy as to be inseparable. If there can be no peace without justice, there can also be no justice without peace.

I think they [peace and justice] go together. I am certain they do because if someone says they are breaking the peace in order to get peace that is a very serious thing to do, because if you think you can get to an end by a contrary means then you've got another think coming. It's a very dangerous and tricky thing.

But that did not make him a pacifist, because that would in his view imply that peace must precede justice as a precondition that only after peace had been achieved would it be possible to build a just order. The intimate relationship meant that neither could precede the other, for each is built on the other. It thus becomes inappropriate, in his view, to take the absolute view that there must be a total repudiation of violence in the face of injustice before that injustice can be addressed.

I have always resisted the idea that you have to have peace first before you can get justice. That was Paul Oestreicher's position last time he visited here a few years back and I was horrified when I heard that. I don't think you should delay justice in order to sustain peace. I can see there is a point he was making – a point, but I think it was too short term a point. So justice has always been to me the big thing. So that is why I am not exactly a pacifist, I don't think. Armed struggle and all that sort of thing, although it is always pretty dubious really and it may be a matter of sitting boldly, armed struggle seemed to be a legitimate ethical position. I don't think I would ever find myself adopting it, but I can see some sort of truth in it.

Armstrong can thus be regarded as a person who has sought to integrate the various strands of his concerns in such a way as to create a unified whole. His private concerns become his public ministries; the various aspects of his ministry and calling, whether they be liturgical, pastoral, educational or prophetic, similarly become an integrated unity; and his concerns themselves, whether they be peace or justice, means or ends, conjoin and become dependent upon each other. No aspect of life can be separated from the Christian walk, and no part of that walk can be separated from any other part.

It was this commitment to practical expressions of faith which led to Armstrong playing a prominent role in the opposition to visits to New Zealand ports by ships of the US Navy. He and other Auckland Anglicans played such leading roles in the establishment of the Peace Squadron that it can virtually be said that it was both conceived and born at St John's Theological College. Once established the Auckland Peace Squadron received widespread

secular support, but Anglicans continued to be involved in the leadership, with Armstrong remaining particularly prominent through his role as public spokesman.

The anti-nuclear issue had had a high environmental profile in the early 1970s because of increasing concern over the effects of French atmospheric nuclear tests at Mururoa Atoll. Opposition to French atmospheric testing became Labour Party policy (and therefore Government policy after the 1972 General Election) under the leadership of Norman Kirk. By the time of Kirk's death and Wallace Rowling's succession to the Prime Ministership there was widespread support for the Government's stand, as well as widespread opposition. Armstrong was not actively involved to any great extent at this stage, but came to prominence when the issue broadened beyond that of French nuclear testing to include American warship visits.

I mean people didn't like the French setting off these things at Mururoa. New Zealand sentiment was pretty different about this, so it was a fairly safe issue in one way. Very much Labour Party issue because of Norman Kirk. So the first thing I noticed was that kind of terrific sort of thing against the French letting off bombs and I just was surprised and pleased because this was not something I had any hand in. I came to be thought a bit of a ringleader over the years but in actual fact there were plenty of initiatives being taken by people and some of the [St John's College] students had done this off their own bat and gone on them [the Mururoa protest boats]. But the real impetus on the nuclear came with a nuclear warship visit. It was in 1974/75 that the groundwork was being laid for those nuclear warship visits and that was when the great push was on by Muldoon to become elected...it was Bill

Rowling who mentioned that the pressure was on for visits of nuclear warships, so I whistled some of the St John's people and said let's send a telegram saying that we support you, Bill Rowling, in your opposition to nuclear warship visits. Bill Rowling hadn't said he was specifically against them but we read between the lines, or we thought we could, and anyway it didn't do any harm to assume he was against them. So we sent this telegram that we would support his stand absolutely against pressure from America to receive these visits because it was pressure from America that took us into the Vietnam War... But the real sting in the tail of the telegram we sent was that if such ships did come we would organise a blockade of small boats to kind of bar the entry to the Waitemata Harbour kind of thing. We said that quite specifically and I didn't know how many people would sign the telegram like that from the Theological College but almost everybody I asked was quite happy to sign. I was quite amazed really.

At this point Armstrong's involvement in the Good Friday 1968 Vietnam War protest became useful. He has stated that in 1968 he had been naïve in his expectations regarding the publicity the protest would generate. He and the other protestors had not considered the possibility that there would be television coverage and had not expected it to become a prominent story in the *New Zealand Herald*. The lessons had, however, been learned, and the telegram sent to Rowling was deliberately publicised through copies being sent to the news media.

**The idea of a blockade came, according to Armstrong, from a similar protest organised by Quakers in Baltimore who paddled canoes in front of freighters suspected of carrying**

weapons to West Pakistan (the current Pakistan) during the civil war prompted by East Pakistan's (now Bangladesh) attempt to gain independence.<sup>80</sup> The Peace Squadron was thus a product of the Christian Church, with Auckland Anglicans, and in particular some members of the staff and students at the College of St John the Evangelist playing the leading roles in its creation.

Opposition within the Church was not limited to support for defence links with the USA. There was also concern about the appropriateness of the method used. As an example, Davidson records the concern felt by Bishop Norman of Wellington over the adoption of a protest method which involved breaches of the law of New Zealand. The bishop was of the opinion that Christians should, unless the circumstances were exceptional, limit their actions to legal means. In this instance the circumstances were not considered to be sufficiently exceptional to warrant a breach of this general Christian duty.<sup>81</sup> This disagreement between Norman and Armstrong is important in the light of the stress laid by Armstrong on the intimate inter-relationship between means and ends.

This conflict is described succinctly by Davidson, who quotes Raymond Pelly warden of St John's, as saying that "To be the body of Christ is to identify Evil, and to put YOUR body in its way, so that it can't go on".<sup>82</sup> The issue then can be seen more as one of applying Christian principles than a conflict as to what those general principles were. In general a Christian must abide by the law of the secular state, being under a scriptural injunction to do so as long as this abidance by secular law does not in itself constitute a renunciation of the

---

<sup>80</sup> Elsie Locke, *Peace People*, Hazard Press (Christchurch, 1992) p.310

<sup>81</sup> Davidson, p.275

<sup>82</sup> Davidson p.275

principles of Christianity. If, however, the duty imposed on a Christian by the secular state is in conflict with his or her duty to God, it is God to whom the Christian must be obedient. Seen in these terms the division between Norman and Pelly was perhaps not as great as a superficial reading of Davidson might suggest. To the Bishop, the laws which governed the legitimacy (or in this case illegitimacy) of the Peace Squadron's tactics were not to be challenged, and this may be regarded as a quite legitimate interpretation of the normative Christian position as the relevant maritime laws were not themselves in any way in conflict with the principles of Christianity and there was no shortage of legal means by which to protest against the presence of a nuclear warship in the Waitemata Harbour. To the warden it was the presence of the ship which was the issue rather than the means of protest. To Pelly, there *was* a conflict between duty to God and duty to the secular state, because the ship's presence constituted an evil of such a magnitude that its presence even briefly was unconscionable.

The law was being used to extend protection to a source of evil, an evil which could not be permitted to remain in New Zealand waters.

It is thus possible to reconcile Pelly's and Armstrong's actions with Armstrong's insistence that appropriate means must be used to achieve desirable ends and that both ends and means must be worthy of each. It is also possible to reconcile their views with those of Bishop Norman, although Norman would not have agreed. It remains, however, an important question, as there is often room for dispute as to the precise relationship of the duty of a Christian to the secular state and his or her duty to God.

What started with a relatively small number of students and staff at St John's College rapidly grew to the point where the anti-nuclear movement came to be closely associated with the college. Armstrong acted as the spokesman for the Peace Squadron, some students and staff members were actively involved in Peace Squadron protests and the college became one of a rapidly growing number of groups to symbolically declare itself to be a nuclear free zone. But if there was opposition to this from some at St John's and also in the wider Church, there was also some in the Peace Squadron who were uncomfortable with the relationship. Although staff and students at St John's had played a major role in its establishment, many of those who came to be involved in the squadron were not Anglicans or even Christian. For many of these people the close (albeit unofficial) association between the college and the Peace Squadron seemed inappropriate.

An example of how an individual parish could respond to peace issues is provided by St Matthew's-in-the City. This parish has been selected as an example because as an inner city church it is a natural focus for a wide range of activities beyond those of normal parish ministry, partially as a result of which it has often featured prominently in matters of a controversial nature. As an example, it has for many years been the worship centre of the Auckland (formerly Metropolitan) Community Church, which offers an outreach to homosexual Christians. It tends to attract clergy whose attitudes could be described as liberal, including John Marcon and Patricia Nicolas mentioned in Chapter Three (although Marcon had not yet joined the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship when he was assisting at St Matthew's.)

An assistant priest at the time of the Springbok tour controversy was Rev Andrew Beyer. Beyer became heavily involved in the anti-tour movement and the parish itself came to be associated in people's minds with this movement. This association did not meet with the universal approval of parishioners. A number of parishioners were critical of the actions of Beyer and other anti-tour campaigners at St Matthew's and some left the congregation over this issue. Nor was opposition limited to a portion of the congregation. The vicar's report delivered to the parish Annual General Meeting on 7 March 1982 contains the following paragraphs.

1981 was a year that many New Zealanders were pleased to see end. It was a year which confronted many New Zealanders with much ugliness and challenged many to see where they stood on fundamental issues. For the first time in the experience of many of us, we were given clear evidence of deep divisions in our society and we were shown that many beliefs, held to be part of the New Zealand way of life, were not shared by all in the community. This division which had been evident for many for a long time became exposed at the Waitangi Day celebrations in 1981 and then extremely during the Springbok Tour. The Church as a whole found itself caught up and part of the divisions that cut through the nation as a whole, although the Church's leadership and governing bodies achieved an almost unique unity in their approach to the issue by calling for the abandonment of the Tour and in their call for justice and identification with the victims of racial discrimination and intolerance.

The Auckland Diocesan Synod, hardly a radical body, on two separate occasions twelve months apart, almost unanimously, called for the abandonment of the Springbok Tour and tried to set the call in the context of a call for justice and racial harmony. However, as the Tour proceeded and other issues – such as the maintenance of Law and Order – introduced often as diversions to the primary issue, became prominent, many Church people were troubled and divisions flared within the Church too. When Andrew Beyer was elected, after consultation with me and Archbishop Reeves, to be the Chairperson of an Auckland coalition of groups opposed to the Springbok Tour, a good deal of anger was directed towards Saint Matthew's. Much of this anger was not helpful and was abusive and threatening and we in the Vicarage – usually the only telephone number being answered late at night – received a lot of that abuse. However, other anger was that of people who genuinely felt that such a high profile as Saint Matthew's and Andrew sometimes received was inappropriate and unhelpful. Unfortunately, a few parishioners chose to sever their relationship with us and have gone to worship elsewhere, or perhaps nowhere; others were able to discuss this issue with me or with Andrew and some healing has taken place and we are all the stronger for that. Some parishioners, too, have expressed the belief that the issue is one that has strengthened their faith and commitment to the Church and this congregation.

Beyer retained the support of the parish vestry for his actions throughout this period.

Nevertheless, peace and reconciliation thus became an issue in a very personal sense as the

parish and the Church as a whole sought to come to terms with the divisions generated by the Springbok tour controversy.

Far less controversial was the decision by St Matthew's to declare itself a nuclear weapon free zone. The matter was raised by vestry member Bruce Grey at the March 1982 vestry meeting and it was agreed to discuss the matter the following month.<sup>83</sup> At the April meeting the following resolution was passed:

- i Vestry call a congregational meeting to declare St Matthew's-in-the-City To be a nuclear weapons free zone.
- ii If it was accepted that St Matthew's-in-the-City should be declared a Nuclear weapons free zone, a sign should be erected on the exterior of the Church building acknowledging that.<sup>84</sup>

A special general meeting of parishioners was held after the service on 4 July at which the congregation agreed to the motion.

At the July vestry meeting a subcommittee of Jenny Blood and Andrew Beyer was appointed to prepare a working paper on the proposal. In September Blood reported to vestry that there had been "three or four positive responses to the proposal given to the congregation, and no

---

<sup>83</sup> Minutes of Vestry, St Matthew-in-the-City, 11 March 1982

<sup>84</sup> St. Matthew's vestry minutes 15 Apr. 1982

adverse comments”.<sup>85</sup> On Sunday, 19 September 1982 the parish of St Matthew’s-in-the-City was officially declared to be a nuclear weapons free zone.<sup>86</sup>

The relative ease with which agreement was reached on the nuclear weapons free zone issue was not in evidence two years later when it was proposed to rededicate the chapel at St Matthew’s. It had until this time been known as the Morning Chapel, but at the September 1984 vestry meeting it was proposed to rename it the Peace Chapel.<sup>87</sup> The proposal was put to a meeting of the congregation in October and after “considerable discussion” the motion to rededicate the chapel was passed by eighteen votes to seven.<sup>88</sup> The level of feeling of those who had opposed the renaming of the chapel led Mullane to state in the vicar’s report to the October vestry meeting,

I was not at all happy...because I was left feeling that although everything had been done according to the rules we had ended with a result which was probably not very satisfying to anyone. There is something odd about dedicating a chapel to peace when the process of naming it seems to have led to quite a bit of unresolved conflict. I may be wrong about that assessment and would appreciate discussion about it. However, I am reluctant to move quickly towards any dedication ceremony before there is more discussion and I feel that we ought to take a pause and think about that.<sup>89</sup>

The chapel was rededicated in early 1985.

---

<sup>85</sup> St Matthew’s vestry minutes 9 Sept 1982

<sup>86</sup> Minutes of Special General Meeting, St Matthews-in-the-City, 19 Sept 1982

<sup>87</sup> Vestry minutes 13 Sept 1984

<sup>88</sup> Minutes of Special General Meeting, 7 Oct. 1984

As the last words of this chapter were being written on 1 March 1999 St Matthew's was participating in an international church bell-ringing event to mourn the victims of landmines and celebrate the commencement date of the international Landmine Ban Treaty.<sup>90</sup>

Peace could then itself be a subject of conflict. Where people's personal positions could be threatened over a justice issue or where there was considerable room for dissention as to what constituted just actions, as was the case in the Springbok controversy, taking any stand was likely to create (or bring to the surface) further conflict. The widespread support for an alternative to nuclear weapons based defence probably reflected a growing perception that nuclear weapons constituted a greater threat than the threat they provided a defence against. The Church remains, however, unable to agree on what the proper Christian alternative should be.

---

<sup>89</sup> Vicar's report to Vestry, 11 Oct. 1984

<sup>90</sup> *New Zealand Herald*, 1 March 1999

## CHAPTER SIX

### DOES THEOLOGY MATTER?

The first chapter describes in summary some of the influences on Anglican attitudes towards war and peace. This summary includes references to some of the theologies held by various Christians, but fails to answer a fundamental question. That question is, how did Christians use these theologies? Were they the guiding beliefs which led inexorably to the actions taken, and to what extent were they “justifications” of positions taken for other reasons? Is the Church trying to conform to the teachings of Christ, or is it trying to force the Gospel to conform to the ways of the world

The involvement of Auckland Anglicans in issues of war and peace is not simply about *what* happened. To the extent to which these actions were claimed to have a religious basis, they were public professions of what these men and women considered to be the true Gospel as it applied to these situations. It is impossible to understand historical events fully without understanding the motivations of those involved. Yet gaining this understanding may be difficult or impossible if their true motivations are at variance with those which they are prepared to acknowledge.

The question of the relationship between theology and actions then becomes one of considerable importance. This importance extends well beyond a mere appreciation of the past. The Church's past has intimately shaped its present, just as its past and present will ultimately shape its future. If the Church is to be true to its commission, its message must be

synonymous with the Gospel of Christ. It is insufficient to defend a belief or action by asserting it to be Gospel in situations in which other Christians have adopted contrary positions which are equally asserted to be Gospel. Clearly in this situation factors other than divine inspiration are at work in the process of attempting to discern the true will of God. It is only if this process is understood that it becomes possible to discern that which is truly Gospel from that which is of secular origin.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to even begin to consider the full range of personal experiences which may influence a particular person's interpretations of the Bible. It is, however, possible to ask whether the events covered in the preceding chapters may suggest that certain tendencies existed. For the sake of convenience this is considered under three broad headings : a theological conviction that a particular position should be taken; a theological conviction leading to such a result, perhaps in a manner not originally envisaged; and the adoption of a particular position leading to either the acceptance or the development of supporting theology. All conclusions reached must be regarded as highly tentative and to some extent (perhaps a large extent) speculative. The question is, however, of sufficient moment for even a highly tentative analysis to be warranted.

### **i      A Conviction of Action**

By this is meant a belief that the teachings of the Bible require a particular action to be taken, in contrast to a belief that the Bible requires a particular outcome, from which follows a belief that a particular action is needed to produce that outcome. As an example of this contrast would be that, one person may be motivated to work for peace because of a belief

that this is what the Bible requires. Another person may be motivated to work for justice, but may come to the conclusion that peace is a necessary precondition for or a necessary component of justice.

In relation to the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, this appears to have particularly been the case with those members were not associated with Anglo Catholicism. A number of prominent Auckland members such as Philip Crump, Hugh Tollemache and Christopher Barfoot appear to have arrived at pacifist positions largely because of a belief that the teachings of the Bible, and in particular those of Jesus, required this of them. This does not mean that other issues were any less important to them. On the contrary, they would have had no difficulty whatsoever in agreeing with those motivated primarily for a desire to see justice done that justice is a necessary concern of Christians. Where they would differ is in seeing the renunciation of violence as being an inalienable aspect of normative Christianity. Such questions as whether the achievement of justice is a necessary precondition of peace, thus leaving open the option of violence as a means of achieving the justice from which peace springs, or is something which can only eventuate if it proceeds hand in hand with peace, are questions which do not arise. If there can be no peace without justice, there can also be no justice without peace.

Paradoxically the historical record, at least in respect of the Auckland sub-branch of the APF, suggests that this certainty that normative Christianity is necessarily pacifist may have inhibited their ability to persuade others that this is so. It may be suggested that the analysis of Patricia Nicolas quoted in Chapter Three may well be correct. The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship was ambitious in believing that an entrenched culture of acceptance of warfare as

sometimes necessary could rapidly be changed by a programme of education. This is especially so given the reality that for many Christians the day to day pressures of life occupy far more of their time than Christian education and that fears relating to such things as the domino theory of the cold war may have far more immediacy in people's minds than the teachings of pacifists. However much APF members attempted to relate their message to the real world, the very concept of pacifism probably appeared to many Anglicans to be an abstraction. In those areas where a message of peace may have been perceived as meeting people's needs, for example, conflict resolution as a means of abating domestic violence, the APF failed to address the issues with any great diligence. The reasons for this could properly be regarded as demanding detailed further research.

What was necessary appears to have been to address issues in terms more in keeping with the beliefs of the target audience as to what was important, and the Fellowship seems to have expected a greater leap in thinking than was realistic. What campaigners required to motivate people to move away from traditional defence patterns was some matter which caused "defence" to be perceived as constituting a greater threat than the threat being defended against. The massive destructive power of nuclear weapons and propulsive systems constituted such an issue. The Sermon on the Mount, or Jesus' statement that those who live by the sword will die by the sword, apparently did not have much significance in the minds of most Anglicans.

**This was certainly not the case for all APF members, and there were others for whom the acceptance of a pacifist position was not arrived at primarily from a pacifist interpretation of**

the Bible. What is referred to above should be treated as a generalised tendency in a sample of Auckland membership.

Too small a sample of reasons for becoming involved in peace issues has been obtained from those who were not pacifists to state whether any such tendency existed. Those whose views have been obtained appear to have been led into peace activities by other interests and concerns, but this does not exclude the possibility of others being motivated by a scriptural injunction.

In fairness it must be stated that many of those who believed that just war theology to be valid or who considered nuclear deterrence to be necessary for the maintenance of a just peace, considered themselves to have been similarly motivated by scriptural authority. An example of this is provided by Rev Bryan Drake who wrote to Barfoot<sup>91</sup> explaining his reasons for his opposition to the controversial 1988 APF synod motion. The reasons given by him are principally scriptural and demonstrate a willingness by Drake to apply a thorough scriptural analysis to the question. The conclusion which he reached was radically different from that of Barfoot and supportive of the theology of the just war, but appears to have been based on the same respect for the teachings of the Bible which characterises the statements of Barfoot.

---

<sup>91</sup> Letter from B. Drake to C. Barfoot, Nov 1991, Barfoot files

## ii A Conviction Leading to Action

When George Armstrong carried a Vietnam War placard up Queen Street on Good Friday 1968 he had no way of knowing that this would lead to him being involved years later in the blockading of the Waitemata Harbour in protest against visits by nuclear warships of the United States Navy. That this did happen was largely a consequence of Armstrong's strongly held beliefs as to what constituted proper Christian theology being applied to practical situations, those applications leading to conclusions which in turn led to actions which were not initially foreseen. The precise extent to which his attitude towards protest as a form of "public liturgy" was a product of protest and to which it was the cause needs to be the subject of further research. Once formulated, the concept of protest as "public liturgy" came to be a powerful impetus for further action. Quite apart from this concept of public liturgy, it is possible to find in both his words at the time and in his later recollections a strong basis for his actions in more traditional teachings of the Church. It is for example, possible to discern much of the Old Testament prophet in Armstrong's insistence that the Church must, as practical acts of justice, stand in solidarity with the marginalised, proclaiming to those in Government the need for just governance in accordance with the ways of God.

As stated in the second chapter, it is tempting to speculate that a commitment to justice leading to pacifism may have been a significant factor in the number of Anglican Pacific Fellowship members who could be described as High Church. It appears that for many years High Church Anglicanism was disproportionately highly represented in APF membership compared with its representation in the Anglican Church as a whole although no attempt has been made at undertaking a statistical analysis to confirm this, nor is it likely that such an

analysis would be feasible. It is possibly for this reason that the Auckland sub-branch was not established until some years after the APF had become active in Christchurch and Wellington, as this expression of Anglicanism was not as widely followed in Auckland as in Christchurch.

Certain members of the Auckland sub-branch, for example Florence White and Catherine Hall, demonstrated clearly through their actions a lifelong commitment to and solidarity with those whom they considered to be victims of an unjust order. As had been the case with those St John's College staff and students who had become members of the Peace Squadron, this earlier generation of workers for peace considered striving for justice to be an integral component of Christian witness. There is reason to believe that for many APF members a commitment to justice in all of its manifestations led to a belief that it was necessary to renounce those acts of violence and threats of violence which they perceived as being contrary to the justice which they so fervently sought.

This can of course also be regarded as the basis for the application of just war theology. An example is provided by Rev John MacLean, who opposed the 1988 APF synod motion. In explaining his reasons MacLean used a series of analogies, for example, the rationing of medical services, to argue that there are times when an evil outcome is unavoidable and that the Christian, unable to avoid evil, must minimise that evil. Sometimes this may require violence in the defence of the justice which God requires of Christians.

### iii     **A Theological Justification for Action**

It is always dangerous to attribute to people motivations other than those which they would claim for themselves. There is a high probability of making false attributions, and there is also a significant danger of obscuring the authenticity of the motivations which the individuals concerned did claim. Further, there is always the possibility that the process of reasoning initiated by the action and leading to the theology may have produced entirely valid reasons for continuing with these actions. The theology thus developed may well become an authentic motivation, and dismissing it because it was not the initial reason for some action may well be inappropriate. This analysis must then be treated with caution.

The anti-nuclear movement can be regarded as a prime example of a movement which did not have a specific theological basis, but to which various theologies were applied. This assertion of a lack of a theological basis is open to challenge, and in many individual instances the challenge would be fully justified. It is for example likely that Kenneth Prebble's unease over nuclear testing sprang from a deeply held personal conviction arising from the application of Christian principles to the situation rather than circumstances leading to the adoption of a theological justification. But this was an exception (albeit undoubtedly one of many) rather than the rule. Most of those who became involved in opposition to both nuclear weapons and nuclear propulsion did so for reasons other than Christian theology. Indeed, very large numbers were not even Christian and many would have objected if it had been portrayed as a Christian cause. They were ordinary people with ordinary concerns for their own wellbeing and the wellbeing of their children and grandchildren, who without reading the Bible or any theological treatise on the subject, concluded that nuclear technology

constituted a threat to that wellbeing. It is likely that most of those involved, including the majority of Christians who participated in anti-nuclear activities, would have no argument with the contention that they reached this conclusion independently of the teachings of the Church.

It is, however, insufficient for the Church acting corporately to adopt any particular position on any issue simply because it addresses the concerns of members. The Church is charged with acting in accordance with the teachings and precepts of its founder, precluding any divorce of theology and action. Similarly, any dispute as to whether or not the Church should take a particular stand on any issue needs to be resolved through the application of the principals of the Christian faith if the Church is to be true to its beliefs. When confronted with growing public disquiet over the dangers of nuclear war, the Church found itself needing to apply its teachings retrospectively in the sense that it was being asked to endorse or not endorse positions which many people had already taken. For those members who had adopted anti-nuclear positions and who were attempting to use theology to persuade other members of the Church to endorse their positions there was also a degree of retrospectivity because the arguments they were using to justify their position as Christian were not the original reasons for adopting anti-nuclear beliefs.

A prima facie case exists for believing that theology is being used to justify actions rather than being the cause where a particular theology is applied unevenly. As an example, in the Augustinian model all stipulated conditions needed to be satisfied before a war could be legitimately declared just. It is, therefore, a departure from this model to attach more weight to one stipulation, for example, a just cause, while downplaying another aspect, for example a

reasonable prospect of success. Where such a departure does occur but the justness of a conflict continues to be asserted on the basis of the tradition of a just war, it is reasonable to suspect that this disparity has as its root some reason other than the stated adherence to Augustinian theory.

In relation to the anti-nuclear debate two such departures are particularly prominent amongst those believing that the protection of the USA's nuclear umbrella was a necessary evil consistent with the traditional Anglican position on just wars. The first is that the concept of mutually assured destruction appears to be inconsistent with the traditional understanding of what would constitute a just outcome. The second is that it appears to contravene the traditional interpretation of which has, among other things, involved the exclusion of non-combatants from hostilities. When such anomalies lead those who believe in the necessity of nuclear deterrence suggest that with the advent of nuclear weaponry the time may have come to rethink the relevance of the traditional limitations on warfare, the suspicion must be that a bespoke tailoring of theology to fit some other agenda may be involved.

## **Conclusions**

The primary value of this analysis may lie not so much in the answers which are suggested but in the questions which are raised. A project which was initially envisaged as a documentation of events has increasingly become a speculation into the human dynamics of those events. The tentative suggestions made here regarding the whys of motivations of participants suggest possible avenues for further research. No means were available for testing the relationship between people's expressed motivations and possible motivations

which were unexpressed. Certain aspects of people's backgrounds, for example, Anglo-Catholicism in the cases of some Anglican Pacifist Fellowship members and justice issues for some anti-nuclear campaigners, appear to justify further investigation. So also does the question of why many Anglicans will ordinarily not interest themselves in some issues but under some circumstances will. An example of this is the contrast between the willingness to openly discuss nuclear issues and a reluctance to discuss the underlying theologies such as Christian pacifism and the Augustinian model of a Christian just war. Psychological and sociological considerations are certainly relevant and important, but were beyond what was possible in this thesis.

The chapters on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship dealt primarily with the Auckland sub-branch in keeping with the objectives of the thesis. There is, however, a considerable amount of material available on the activities of other sub-branches, especially Wellington. The APF is unusual among New Zealand religious organisations in being a denominationally based pacifist group working within a denomination which is essentially non-pacifist. Small though the APF may be, it is of sufficient interest to warrant further research. There is also room for researching the lives of various Anglicans involved in some way in peace activities but whose peacemaking has not attracted the attention of studies of peace movements in general as opposed to their specifically religious components.

The following paragraphs appear in the report on nuclear warfare prepared by a working party set up under a resolution of the 1979 General Synod of the Church of England and chaired by the Bishop of Salisbury.

If pacifism was tolerated in Britain and America and rejected in Germany, the doctrine of the just war did not fare much better. In the German Churches it was a dead letter. On the Allied side a defensive war became total war against Germany and Japan, war demanding unconditional surrender, preceded by obliteration bombing of whole cities. In Hamburg and Dresden more civilians died than were to die in Horoshima and Nagasaki. Bishop George Bell, a lone prophetic Christian voice in Britain, condemned this, as did Father John Ford in the US. It was many years before indignation against this point of view gave way to respect for its proponents. The Churches were characterised everywhere by patriotism in the forms of uncritical loyalty.

This was particularly true of the Russian Orthodox Church. It had been cruelly persecuted between the World Wars by Russia's communist rulers. But in the face of German aggression Stalin knew well enough that the Church was a potential focus of patriotic fervour. And so it proved to be. In war the Church revived. The published sermons of its bishops were passionate calls to save Mother Russia from the Germanic hordes. No Russian hearing those sermons would readily surmise that the German armies were made up of human beings. The German invaders, in turn, had largely been brainwashed into believing that Slavs were subhuman, and they behaved accordingly. Yet Hitler's soldiers had the words "God with us" inscribed on their belt buckles. Every German regiment had its Catholic and Protestant Chaplains.<sup>92</sup>

This “uncritical loyalty” had certainly been true of the general population in New Zealand during the Second World War and this is to some extent reflected in the treatment of New Zealand conscientious objectors, which was harsher than other parliamentary democracies involved in the conflict. Social forces and social attitudes drove Christian responses to the call to war, and for most Christians there was no question that Christian duty and patriotic duty were one, and that was the duty to fight. It is unlikely that many New Zealanders responded to M J Savage’s statement that New Zealand was at war by immediately analysing the situation from a theological perspective. In general New Zealanders responded primarily in terms of the expectations of the society in which they lived and in turn influenced others in the same way to do the same. Their response as Christians was secondary in the sense that their religious views supported rather than predicated this response, and it is possible to argue that their religious views were shaped by rather than shapers of their belief in the righteousness of their actions.

A paradigm shift did occur which made it possible to elect a mere four decades later a Government which was prepared to abandon traditional defence alliances if that was the price of abandoning the US nuclear umbrella. This was only possible because of a radical change in social perspectives. It is reasonable to surmise that many of those Christians in the peace squadron, anti-nuclear protest marches and other activities were just as influenced by societal influences as were their non-Christian sailing and marching companions. To the extent that this was the case it is possible to question the extent to which the involvement of Christians could be said to be a specifically Christian involvement. In their pursuit of an objective, Christianity was certainly a support for many of them, but it is likely that in many cases it

---

<sup>92</sup> J.A. Baker (Chairman), *The Church and the Bomb : Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience*, Hodder and Stoughton (Lond, 1982)

was not a determining influence the effect of which had been to lead them to take their stands on peace issues.

In support of this view may be cited the relative lack of influences of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. This lack of influence cannot reasonably be seen solely in terms of a failure of the Fellowship to gain many members or to persuade many Anglicans to renounce participation in warfare. Far more fundamental was the failure, despite repeated attempts, to even persuade the Church to engage in dialogue on the issues when they were presented in Christian rather than secular terms.

There are numerous examples of what is meant by this in the history of the Auckland sub-branch. Despite one of its members, Eric Gowing, having been Bishop of Auckland for many years, and despite the strong and outspoken opposition of Gowing, Chandler and other APF members to the Vietnam War, the APF was generally unable to engage the Church in any soul-searching as to whether the conflict could even be seen as just in Augustinian terms, let alone whether the Augustinian model was valid. Certainly there were those within the Church who did look at the matter in specifically Christian terms, but this generally had little influence on people in the pews. Similarly, direct efforts to influence the Church through education sometimes met with a desire to discuss the issues and sometimes met with opposition, but most often met with apathy. Even when the anti-nuclear movement was at the peak of its activity, there was a marked reluctance to discuss the theology of peace and war even amongst those involved in anti-nuclear activity. This is not to say that those people were necessarily uninterested in what the Bible taught on the subject or how it could be

interpreted, but in the cases of many Christians it would be difficult to establish that the teachings of the Church in general or of specific peace groups within the Church were any more influential in leading to an anti-nuclear viewpoint than was the case with likeminded non-Christians.

It is then reasonable to view the paradigm shift which occurred as originating for many Anglicans in influences enunciated primarily (although not exclusively) by secular commentators, for example concern for the environment and fears of the consequences of nuclear war. But the fact that it was *possible* for the Church to be used by Christians in support of their anti-nuclear positions cannot be explained purely in terms of wider social dynamics. In 1939 there was a general social consensus that war with Germany had become necessary. During the 1960s the opposition to the Vietnam War followed social patterns which were predictable from similar experiences overseas. It was to be expected that university students rather than parish vestries would lead opposition to New Zealand's involvement in Vietnam. But in the late 1970s and early and mid 1980s the social consensus broke down. Both Church and society were split on anti-nuclear, anti-tour and other issues. In the absence of any general social consensus, those Christians who *had* been influenced by theological considerations and who were prepared to act on their convictions were able to influence both Christians and non-Christians in joining them in their endeavours. In this way they helped to shape the new social consensus which was emerging and which made possible the acceptance of the anti-tour and anti-nuclear policies of the Lange administration. What made it possible for such people as George Armstrong to do this was that they did not require of others any profound theological forethought nor did they require of others that they be gripped by their own driving Christian motivations. A person who had no particular personal

views on whether the Bible did or did not have anything to say on US nuclear warships entering the Waitemata Harbour could still respond to the call to get in his or her dinghy or yacht to assist in the blockading of the harbour. Yet even if most of the protestors held no religious beliefs, it would be wrong to dismiss the powerful religious influence which lay behind the peace squadron. Even for the many sailors who held no religious views on the matter, their presence in the blockade had only occurred because of the theologically driven conviction of certain staff and students at the College of St John the Evangelist and certain others within the Auckland Diocese who were prepared to support them that some form of action needed to be taken if they were to be true to their understanding of the Good News of Jesus Christ.

Nor should the opposition from many within the Church to various peace initiatives or the frequent refusals of Synod to side with one or other viewpoint be allowed to diminish the importance to those who held those viewpoints of their interpretations of the teachings of Jesus and of the Bible in general. The Church would do wise to remember the wise counsel of Rabbi Gamaliel : "For if their purpose or activity is of human origin, it will fail. But if it is from God, you will not be able to stop these men; you will only find yourselves fighting against God."<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> *The Holy Bible*, New International Version, Hodder and Stoughton (London, 1979) Acts of Apostles Ch5 verses 38b-39

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1 Taped Interviews

Armstrong, Rev. George Aubrey Whitcombe  
Barfoot, Christopher  
Macdonald, Joan  
MacLean, Rev. John Raglan  
Marcon, Rev. Hubert John  
Nicolas, Rev Patricia Frances  
Tollemache, Lyulph Hugh Tuke

### 2 Telephone Interviews

Barfoot, Christopher  
Nicolas, Rev. Patricia Frances  
Prebble, Rev. Kenneth Ralph

### 3 Other Primary Sources

Records of the Wellington Sub-branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship  
Minute Book of the New Zealand Branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship  
Personal files of Christopher Barfoot  
Personal files of Lyulph Hugh Tuke Tollemache  
Minutes of Vestry and General Meetings of parishioners, Parish of St Matthew-in-the-City  
Minutes of the Synod of the Diocese of Auckland, 1991 and 1992  
Untitled Anglican Pacifist Fellowship membership pamphlet

### 4 Newspapers and Periodicals

*AD News* (Anglican Diocese of Auckland)  
*Auckland Star*  
*Challenge* (Anglican Pacifist Fellowship UK)  
*New Zealand Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Newsletter*  
*The New Zealand Christian Pacifist* (1945-1969), *Peace Bulletin* (1969-1977), *C.P.S. Bulletin* (1978-1986), *The Peacemaker* (1986-Present), *The New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society*  
*New Zealand Herald*

### 5 Theses and Research Exercises

Larsen, Freda, *The Peace Movement in New Zealand 1909-1939*, (Massey University, MA thesis in History 1982)

6 Other Published Sources

*A Brief History of the New Zealand Army in South Vietnam 1964-1972*, Army Public Relations, New Zealand Defence Headquarters (Wellington, 1973)

Bainton, Roland H., *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, Hodder and Stoughton (London, 1960)

Baker, J.A. (Chairman) *The Church and the Bomb : Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience*, Hodder and Stoughton (London, 1982)

Barfoot, Christopher, Crump, Philip, Houghton, J.M. and Pennycook, Shaun, *Military Service : A Guide for those Required to Register for Military Training*, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship (Auckland, 1968)

Blain, Michael, *Clergy in the Diocese of Christchurch 1890-1925: A Directory* Anglican Diocese of Christchurch (Christchurch, 1994)

Cookson, J.E., *Illiberal New Zealand : The Formation of Government Policy on Conscientious Objection, 1940-1*, *NZ Journal of History*, Vol 17, No. 2 (Oct. 1983), University of Auckland, (Auckland, 1983)

Davidson, Allan K., *Selwyn's Legacy*, The College of St. John the Evangelist (Auckland, 1993)

Grant, David, *Out in the Cold : Pacifists and Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand during World War II*, Reed Methven Publishers, (Auckland, 1986)

Lehare, Brendan, *Early Celtic Christianity*, Constable and Co. (London, 1994)

Locke, Elsie, *Peace People*, Hazard Press (Christchurch, 1992)

Price, Eric T., *The Handling of Objectors to Military Service in New Zealand in World War II*, Self published (1986)

Taylor, Alistair (Ed.) *New Zealand Who's Who 1996*, New Zealand Who's Who Aotearoa (Auckland 1996)

*The Holy Bible*, New International Version, Hodder and Stoughton (London, 1979)

Van Haast, H.F., *The New Zealand Law Reports*, The Council of Law Reporting for New Zealand (1940-1942)

Weitzel, R.J., *Pacifists and Anti-Militarists in New Zealand 1909-1914*, *NZ Journal of History*, Vol 7 No.2, (Oct 1973), pp128-147, University Press, (Auckland, 1973)

Young, William J, *Time to Tell of New Zealand's World War II Concentration Camps*,  
Limited Edition Publications, (Tauranga, 1995)