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INTRODUCTION

THE OPENING OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE

When the bells of the Cathedral in Uppsala rang on the evening of Wednesday the 20th of April in 1983, the church was filled to capacity.¹ This day the participants of the service came from countries all over the world. They represented a large spectrum of different Christian denominations and many of them were well known church leaders. Awaiting the procession to enter the Cathedral, the King and the Queen of Sweden had taken their seats. So had the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme and a considerable number of ministers.² 200 singers and among them an ecumenical choir, which had been specially assembled for this occasion, were ready. So were also the large number of photographers and journalists who had come to Uppsala on this day. The TV-cameras were switched on when the procession approached the Dome. The Opening Service of the Life and Peace Conference had started.³

During the four coming days the town of Uppsala was going to be a centre of events. The negotiations of the conference were encircled with arrangements, which were going to take place in almost every corner in the city. Local Christian peace- and youth organizations had prepared musical arrangements, games, street theatres, a gala for peace, a vigil, a candle light procession and peace-cafés, in which people would have possibility to talk with the participants of the conference.⁴ A petition for peace, which had circulated in many different parts of Sweden, would be solemnly presented during the peace gala.⁵ For the organizers this was an opportunity to create a popular manifestation, in order to rouse public opinion in favour of peace. The conference was known as “The Christian Peace Festival”.⁶ It was going to close on Sunday the 24th of April with a mass meeting for peace at Sergel Square in the city centre of Stockholm.⁷

¹ Sveriges Television, Channel 1 (SVT1), Broadcast at 19.00, 1983-04-20
³ SVT1 Broadcast, 19.00, 1983-04-20, Upsala Nya Tidning (UNT) 1983-04-19, 1983-04-20
⁵ Svenska Dagbladet (SvD) 1983-04-23 and Letter from Gösta Hedberg: "Till pastorerna i Svenska Missionsförbundets församlingar" 1983-01-04 File: F83 I in Sundby’s Archive, LPI
⁷ SvD, 1983-04-25
For the participants of the Life and Peace Conference the coming days would imply a full programme entailing speeches, common prayer, Bible studies and contribution to services. Not least, it would imply debates. The aim of their gathering was to compose a common Message that would reject any justification for nuclear war and disassociate the churches from the political doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Their action was one of urgency. The global political situation was marked by the state of tension between the two super powers in the world, the United States and the Soviet Union. The state of tension, upheld in the “terror balance”, was strained. The development and production of nuclear arms in the world had reached an extent never foreseen. The super powers raised the balance to higher and higher levels and in order to keep up with each other, the terror balance turned into an arms race, which swallowed unimaginable resources. The terror balance had been justified as a means for security, as it should deter from a first strike. However, the arms race had created amounts of weapons enough to destroy the entire planet. It had developed into a threat to all humanity. As the super powers had allies in NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and the Warsaw Pact, as well as in countries in the so-called Third World, the terror balance concerned several countries around the world. It had attained global proportions.

Among the participants who had come to Uppsala, there was a deep awareness about the seriousness of the situation. The initiative to the conference had, from the beginning of the preparations, received a broad and positive response. In their response, many churches had proved at a strong willpower to protest against the ongoing development. The ecumenical support was unprecedented: The slightly more than 160 participants came from more than 60 countries and belonged to the Orthodox and Roman Catholic, as well as the Protestant churches.

---

8 “Programme, General Information: Life and Peace – Christian World Conference” File: Operation Vårblomma 1983 II in Sundby’s Archive, LPI
10 Lars Eriksson, Berith Granath, Birger Hallén, FN: Globalt uppdrag, (Stockholm: FN-förbundet, 2005), 212, 236-237
12 Olle Dahlén, “Budskapets politiska profil” in Liv och Fred: Kristen världskonferens, Uppsala 1983, Dahlén et al., eds., (Verbum, 1984), 126
14 Kjell Skjelsbaek, "Kristen etik i frågor som rör fred och krig – en omprövning i atomåldern“ in Liv och fred: Kristen världskonferens, Uppsala 1983, Dahlén et al., eds., (Verbum, 1984), 134-136 and Bengt G. Hallgren,
leadership of the Church of Sweden. However, it was the Member of Parliament and UN delegate Evert Svensson from the Mission Covenant Church in Sweden who had taken the original initiative.\textsuperscript{15} The Archbishop of the Church of Sweden, Olof Sundby, was the Chairman of the conference. As inviter he cooperated with nine church leaders from the other Scandinavian countries. They had, in the preparatory work, foreseen diverging opinions among the delegates and expected intense discussions. Their hope was now that the conference would channel the willpowers of the participants into one, strong, ecumenical voice in the international debate on nuclear war.\textsuperscript{16}

**AIMS AND MAIN QUESTIONS**

Since the Life and Peace Conference was a conference for peace with a strong ecumenical character, I have chosen to concentrate this investigation on the strivings for *peace* and *ecumenics* that were undertaken at the conference. Not least, I will analyse the interrelation between these two dimensions. I aim to perform the analysis in light of two different contexts:

As the participants of the Life and Peace Conference represented the worldwide ecumenical movement, my aim is to view the conference from an international ecumenical perspective. The World Council of Churches (WCC) was a main forum for international ecumenical deliberations at this time and the initiators of the Life and Peace Conference had strong connections to the WCC.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore, the *context of the WCC* will frame my analysis. However, I also consider the Swedish context to be an important part of the framework of the conference. As the conference was organised by the Church of Sweden, my aim is to analyse the concepts in light of the *context of the Church of Sweden*. Within this two-fold contextual framework I raise my main questions:

*How was the concept of ecumenism defined at the Life and Peace Conference?*

*How was the concept of peace defined at the conference?*

*In which ways were the strivings for peace and ecumenism interrelated at the conference?*


EXISTING RESEARCH

Literature

Björn Ryman has written the chronicle “From Life and Peace Conference to Life & Peace Institute” from 2003. His study is primarily based on documents and drafts from the archive of Olof Sundby, which is stored at the Life and Peace Institute in Uppsala. In the chronicle Ryman thoroughly describes the course of events in the preparations and performance of the conference. He accounts for the persons involved in the conference and considers the themes included in the Message.\(^\text{18}\)

The year after the conference had taken place, the conference-report *Liv och Fred: Kristen världskonferens, Uppsala 1983* was compiled. It is the only monograph published, which exclusively deals with the Life and Peace Conference. The report contains the invitation to the conference, in which its motives and agenda are outlined, and presents sermons and speeches that were held during the days in Uppsala. Finally, the Message is presented and commented.\(^\text{19}\)

Close upon the accomplishment of the conference, a few shorter reports were published. These are brief delineations of the conference, in which the authors give accounts of the course of events. Such accounts are given by Metropolitan Aleksiy of Tallinn and Estonia in “The Uppsala World Christian Conference ‘Life and Peace’”, *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, nr. 11, 1983,\(^\text{20}\) Paul A. Crow in “World Conference on Life and Peace: Uppsala, 1983”, *Mid-Stream 22: 1983*,\(^\text{21}\) Bishop Bengt G. Hallgren in “Glimtar från en historisk fredskonferens”, *Växjö stifts hembygdskalender* from 1983,\(^\text{22}\) Alan Geyer in “Unity vs.

---


\(^{19}\) Olle Dahlén et al., eds., *Liv och Fred*


\(^{22}\) Hallgren, "Glimtar”, 142-149
Prophecy at Uppsala”, *The Christian Century* from June 1983,\(^{23}\) and Jim Wallis in “‘Life and Peace’ in Sweden”, *Sojourners 12*, 1983.\(^{24}\)

Three reports that constitute small sections in larger works are the accounts by Ingvar Laxvik, in the biography *Olof Sundby: Ärkebiskop i tiden* from 1992, by Björn Ryman in the work *Nordic Folk Churches: A Contemporary Church History* from 2005 and by Ingmar Brohed in the eighth volume of *Sveriges kyrkohistoria* from 2005. These reports summarize the conference, its aims and results and draw attention to its uniqueness of representation.\(^{25}\)

Accordingly, the literature mainly approaches the conference from the starting point of its course of events. It views the work for the conference, from its initiation to its accomplishment. However, my aim is to interpret the conference from the starting point of another dimension. When I, in my investigation, analyse its conceptualisation of *peace* and *ecumenism*, my intention is rather to inquire into the *conceptual foundations* behind the conference.

**Archival Materials**

The archive of Archbishop Olof Sundby it stored at the *Life and Peace Institute* (LPI) in Uppsala. This archive consists of documents from the work for the conference. These were preserved by Olof Sundby and brought to the LPI after his decease. The documents are assembled in ten files and do not seem to have been handled much since Sundby originally compiled them. It means that all of them are not filed according to subject. Rather the interior order of the documents is characterized by the procedure of work by Olof Sundby. The archive contains multiple categories of documents, such as correspondence, protocols from the different committees, brochures and financial accounts. The documents mainly derive from the preparatory work. For my investigation of the conceptual backgrounds regarding peace and ecumenism, the drafts from sermons and speeches, position papers, reports from group discussions and, not least, the conference Message itself, have been of great value.


At the National Archive in Stockholm, Riksarkivet (RA) documents from the conference are stored in a private archive called Konferens “Liv och Fred” i Uppsala 1983. It is more extensive than Olof Sundby’s archive. It includes 27 archival boxes, which are systematically organized and classified. Its documents cover the same activities as Sundby’s archive and likewise, the major part of the documents proceed from the preparatory work.

The Archive of the Labour Movement, Arbetarrörelsens arkiv (ARAB), in Stockholm stores the archival boxes of Evert Svensson, the original initiator of the conference. The archive is very extensive and testifies to Svensson’s engagement in a vast range of political issues. The documents that concern the Life and Peace Conference are primarily speeches, articles and letters. These are stored in the boxes Korrespondens och verksamhetshandlingar 1/1 1980-30/6 1982 and Fred, nedrustning, JAS 1982-1986.

In these three archives only a few drafts are saved from the group work that took place as part of the conference negotiations. These drafts did neither exist in the Archive of the Church of Sweden, the Archive of the Swedish Mission Covenant Church, the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Archive of Stockholm Diocese. According to the conference’s General Secretary Åke Blomqvist these drafts were not systematically saved, as the main focus of the conference was the final product: The Message.26

Media

The Life and Peace Conference was closely covered by media. Over 200 journalists had come to Uppsala to cover the conference. Moreover, the Swedish Television (SVT) was on the spot to cover three of the services in Uppsala Cathedral, as well as the mass meeting at Sergel Square in Stockholm.27 The close media cover was part of the idea with the conference: Through media its message should reach out and rouse opinion among people.28 Two of the broadcasts, from the opening and the closing services, I have had access to on DVD. The DVD is part of the appendix of this thesis and is available to the reader.29

26 Interview with Åke Blomqvist 2007-01-25
29 The DVD is stored in the CTR (Centre for Theology and Religious Studies) Library Archive together with the copy of this essay.
The Swedish newspapers produced a wide range of reports from the conference. It was also circumscribed in international newspapers, but to a lower degree. Many journalists confined themselves to short accounts on the events in Uppsala, whereas others circumscribed the conference in more extensive analyses. The majority of the journalists drew a lot of attention to the final Message. Attention was also paid to the negotiations. The reports present positive as well as negative voices: Attacks and praises follow each other, as the conference is observed from different angles. The varied evaluations reflect the composite situation, in which the conference was situated and in which its agenda for peace and ecumenism was formulated.

**Interviews**

The published, archival and media material provided partial answers to my questions about the concepts of peace and ecumenism at the conference. I asked my remaining questions to six people, who all had been involved in the work for the Life and Peace Conference.

My questions concerned a few different fields. These fields were covered in the comprehensive questions of my interview-guide. From the interview-guide my specific questions to the interviewees derived. These questions differed a little from interview to interview, due to the different experiences of the interviewees and depending on their different functions at the conference. My interviews were qualitative and, thereby, my questionnaires only formed the background of the dialogue, while the views and standpoints of the interviewees were in the forefront. As my interviews were semi-structured, my questionnaires only outlined the framework of the dialogue. The answers of the interviewees indicated the direction of the dialogue. The differing answers called for different attendant questions. In this way, all interviews were particular, but still relied on the same interview-guide. Accordingly, the answers can, partly, be compared to each other.\(^{30}\)

The notes from the interviews I immediately transcribed after the meetings. The interviewees have had possibility to read and respond to the transcriptions.\(^{31}\) The interview-guide, the questionnaires and the transcriptions have been transferred to a CD, which forms part of the appendix of this thesis and are available to the reader.\(^{32}\) I have interviewed the following people:

---

\(^{30}\) According to guidelines from Alan Bryman, *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*, (Malmö: Liber, 2002), 299-305

\(^{31}\) According to guidelines from Steinar Kvale, *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*, (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 1997), 147-149

\(^{32}\) The CD is stored at the CTR Library Archive together with the copy of this essay.
Åke Blomqvist, the General Secretary of the Life and Peace Conference. He was then the Administrative Director at the Diocese of Stockholm.  

Margareta Grape, who was a member of the International Preparation Committee (IPC) and the Host Committee of the conference. In 1983 she worked as an Administrator for organization of aid, particularly to Latin America, at the Labour Movement International Centre in Stockholm. She was also a member of the board of the Church of Sweden Mission.

Evert Svensson, who delivered the original idea of the conference. In 1983 he was a Member of Parliament and chairman for the Christian Social Democrats in Sweden. He was also Swedish delegate in the UN and in the Conference on Disarmament and Confidence and Security Building Measures in Europe. Evert Svensson is a member of the Mission Covenant Church of Sweden. In addition to the interview, he has compiled and sent me notes from his diary from the time of the preparations and accomplishment of the conference.

Jonas Jonson, who in 1983 worked as Director for the centre of the Diocese of Västerås: Stiftsgården in Rättvik. At this time he was Chairman of the division “Renewal and Congregational Life” in the WCC. He was one of the participants at the Life and Peace Conference.

Bengt Hallgren, who at the time of the conference was Dean of the Diocese of Växjö as well as Chairman of the Committee for Faith and Witness in the Swedish Ecumenical Council. He participated in the preparations and performance of the conference. As part of the preparations, he participated in a journey to Bucharest to invite Patriarch Pimen to the conference. Bengt Hallgren was a close friend of Olof Sundby.

Bernt Jonsson, who was one of the observers at the conference. At this time he worked for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a specialist on peace- and disarmament issues. He is a member of the Mission Covenant Church of Sweden. Bernt Jonsson has been the Director of the Life & Peace Institute, which was founded in 1985 as a result of the Life and Peace Conference.

---

33 Åke Blomqvist works as municipal commissioner for the Liberal Party in Huddinge and is group leader for the Liberal Party. He is Chairman for the Church Council and the Vestry in Huddinge parish and a member of the Council of the Church of Sweden.
34 Margareta Grape is the Director of Foreign Affairs in the Church of Sweden.
35 In 1983 Evert Svensson was also vice Chairman and group leader for the Social Democrats in the Social Committee, deputy member of the Foreign Committee and a member of the board of the parliament group.
36 Jonas Jonson is Bishop Emeritus for the Diocese of Strängnäs. He is Professor in Missiology and has been a member of the Central Committee of the WCC. Jonas Jonson has been the Assistant General Secretary of the LWF, as well as Chairman of the Cooperation Committee between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church.
37 Bengt Hallgren is Bishop Emeritus for the Diocese of Härnösand and PhD in Ethics.
38 Bernt Jonsson has worked as a journalist at Radio Uppland and has also been the Editor-in-Chief for the magazine Sändaren.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Studying the material, I have discerned three themes that recur frequently in the different sources. These are the doctrine of just war, the doctrine of the kingdom of God and the idea of the church as mediator in international conflict. I consider these three themes as foundational for the understanding of the strivings towards peace and ecumenism at the Life and Peace Conference. Therefore, these themes will form the theoretical framework of my thesis. Also the analysis is structured according to these three themes.

The Doctrine of Just War

In the preparations for the Life and Peace Conference the doctrine of just war, justum bellum (Lat.), was closely studied. The doctrine was a starting point in the negotiations at the conference. Besides pacifism, the doctrine of just war had constituted the dominant Christian approach to warfare through history. Both approaches were represented among the participants. It was feared that these different approaches would split the conference. On the other hand the nuclear age had created new premises, in relation to which there was hope to arrive at common positions.

According to Richard B. Miller, the theories of pacifism and just war share common grounds, not least in the profound distrust of violence. This recognizes that the just war theory actually has a pacifist starting point: War is regarded as an evil, which is to be prevented. Peace is the goal for the advocates of both theories and is considered to be a crucial precondition for order in society. But in contrast to pacifism, in which the abolition of violence is the supreme goal, the doctrine of just war allows violence under certain conditions. When the Church Father Augustine (354-430) formulated his theory on just war, defence of the innocent was a guiding principle. Although he considered war to be a sin, he held that passivity in the presence of aggression towards innocent people was an even more severe sin. In other words, he justified acts of violence under specific circumstances. Also his follower Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) justified war under certain conditions. For him, violence was legitimate only in defence of the structures of justice that were upheld in the political order and law,

40 Richard B. Miller, Interpretations of Conflict: Ethics, Pacifism and the Just War Theory (The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 106-107
which Aquinas meant existed due to needs and purposes inherent in nature. The teaching of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas made just war theory to an inherent part of Christian ethics and their statements have provided important guidelines for the establishment of the modern Christian theory on just war.

The peace researcher Kjell-Åke Nordqvist presents a set of seven criteria, which form the modern Christian just war theory. These concern the “right to warfare” (jus ad bellum): Firstly, just war needs a just cause. A just war promotes protection of the innocent and restoration of a just order. Secondly, a just war is initiated by a legitimate authority. Thirdly, a war is just only of it is the last resort and, fourthly, if there is proportionality between its good aims and the damage it causes. Fifthly, a just war requires consent to comparative justice. This fifth criterion is designed to illuminate the ambiguity of all conflicts, not least as the just war theory in history has been misused to legitimise unjust wars and crusade mentality. It aims to acknowledge the limits of the category “just cause” and to question any claim on the absolute truth. The sixth and seventh criteria concern “right warfare” (jus in bello): A just war may not be indiscriminate. It must not target non-combatants as children, elderly, ill or wounded people. The last criterion regards the human suffering, which may not be out of proportion to the aims of peace, security and justice. The doctrine of just war challenged the participants of the Life and Peace Conference in their considerations of the Christian answer to the issue of war in the nuclear age.

The Kingdom of God

God and Man in the Realization of the Kingdom

According to Gordon D. Kaufman nuclear armament had brought humanity into a completely new historical situation. It had changed the perspective on eschatology. Kaufman maintained that many Western Christian traditions were characterized by an expectation of a final judgement at the end of time. But it was God, not man, who was expected to bring

---

42 Kjell-Åke Nordqvist, From “Just War” to Justified Intervention: A Theory of International Responsibility, (Department of Theology, Uppsala University, 1998), 31
44 Nordqvist, From “Just War”, 33-39
45 Villa-Vicencio, “Just War”, 626, Nordquist, From “Just War”, 37-38
47 Eschatology: The doctrine of the last things. (From Gr. eschaton: last).
history to an end. Even though God’s consummation of history was imagined as the ultimate catastrophe, it was approached with hope, because it would bring about God’s final victory over evil and imply salvation for the faithful. In contrast to the nuclear holocaust man was about to effect, God’s consummation of history was considered meaningful. The prospect of a nuclear holocaust, empty of any redeeming value, did according to Kaufman bring despair and insecurity in the attempts to approach eschatological issues. Such insecurity and despair characterized the era, in which the Life and Peace Conference took place. However, the literature and sources from the work of the conference also breathe hope and expectation. They testify to the existence of a strong will to resolve the nuclear crisis and save the creation. It is strongly expressed that man’s role is not to bring God’s creation into a nuclear holocaust, but to be God’s servants in the process of the fulfilment of history in striving towards a realization of the kingdom of God.

This confident anticipation of the kingdom characterized the different eschatological interpretations, which Georgia Harkness presented in her investigation Understanding the Kingdom of God. Yet, she pointed at the diverse understandings of the role of God and the role of man in the consummation of history, which the different interpretations provided. In the interpretation that Harkness designated prophetic eschatology, God’s sovereignty and man’s obedience with God’s rule were emphasised. Man was impelled to strive for justice and love in this world. In accordance with liberal theology, prophetic eschatology represented a high view on human potentiality. It highlighted the human brotherhood and God’s immanence in the world. Within the field of prophetic eschatology, Harkness especially illuminated the theology of Walter Rauschenbusch, who was a prominent figure in the Social Gospel Movement. For him the idea of the kingdom of God embraced a moral and ethical ideal, which provided guidance for direct action towards a transformation of society. Prophetic eschatology had a strong teleological character. The telos (Gr.), the goal, of the Christian pilgrimage was the kingdom of God. However, the realization of the kingdom rested on the moral reconstruction of humanity and this reconstruction could only be realized through the


50 For further reading: Walter Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel, (Nashville, Abingdon, 1978)
redeeming love of Christ. Accordingly, participation in the strivings towards a realization of the kingdom of God was an outcome of redemption. Christ redeemed, but the redeemed established the kingdom. Yet, Harkness levelled criticism against prophetic eschatology in the sense that its emphasis on human effort tended to overshadow the very precondition of the establishment of the kingdom: The act of God.  

In contrast with prophetic eschatology and its accent on human effort, Harkness presented the approach of *apocalyptic eschatology*. Within this approach she especially called attention to the New Testament scholars Johannes Weiss (1863-1914) and Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965). Both of them downplayed the role of man in the eschatological process. For them, God was to establish the kingdom through his divine irruption.  

Jesus was not a moral teacher who encouraged his disciples to strive for a realization of the kingdom on earth. God’s kingdom did rather have a transcendent character. As Weiss, Schweitzer stressed the futurity and inconceivability of the kingdom on earth. He reacted strongly against the liberal approach and claimed that the hope for God’s kingdom and the will of making revolution were incompatible. For Schweitzer, only repentance could give man a place in the future kingdom. However, having rejected the ethical interpretation of the kingdom, Schweitzer suggested that an “interim ethic”, in expectation of the divine irruption, would provide guidance for those repenting. Nevertheless, Harkness levelled criticism also against apocalyptic eschatology. She maintained that its emphasis on God’s sovereign action resulted in a playing down of man’s responsibility to follow the ethical imperatives of Jesus.

The issue about man’s actual role in the realization of the kingdom of God has also been considered by the two theologians Stanley Hauerwas and Mark Schwerwindt. The distinction between the interpretations that Harkness designated as *apocalyptic* and *prophetic eschatology* was sharply reflected when they compared Rauschenbusch’s theory with Wolfhart Pannenberg’s notion of the kingdom of God. According to Pannenberg, God alone would establish the kingdom. This kingdom was not conceivable in this world, but would

52 Harkness, *Understanding*, 32-37  
55 Harkness, *Understanding*, 35-37  
break through in the future by a cosmic drama, in which human action did not play a decisive role. His approach was in glaring contrast to that of Rauschenbusch, for whom the notion of the kingdom constituted a programme for Christian revolution. According to Rauschenbusch church and world were equally called to, here and now, shape a new social order, built up through fraternal socialism and political democracy. Accordingly, the interpretations of the kingdom did not only display different notions about the role of God and the role of man in the process of its realization. They also displayed a polarization on the issue of time: If the kingdom was to be realized in the future or in the present. Harkness presented a third interpretation, which brought these opposites together.

This interpretation was called realized eschatology and was designed by the New Testament scholar C. H. Dodd. According to Dodd, the kingdom has already become present on earth through the coming of the Messiah. Through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, the eternal questions were uncovered for humanity. Eschatology was realized and history became a vehicle for the eternal. Dodd’s approach did neither suggest that the kingdom would be realised through an apocalyptic irruption from the transcendent world, nor that it could be established through a social process. The kingdom was viewed both as a future phenomenon and as a present reality. Its source was transcendent. But the presence of the kingdom on earth did not imply that everyone could enter it. Its presence implied new ethical requirements for entrance into it. These requirements were not only designed for an interim period. They were eternal, moral ideals for those who strived for a life within the kingdom.

The Responsibility of Man in the Realization of the Kingdom
The anticipation of the kingdom of God, expressed at the Life and Peace Conference, involved a strong sense of responsibility to act for the benefit of world peace. Accordingly, the notion of the kingdom of God did, at the conference, have a direct connection to the issues about the formation of world society.

58 Hauerwas, Schwerwindt, “The Kingdom”, 129-130
59 Harkness, Understanding, 44
61 Harkness, Understanding, 44-46
62 Redaktionskommittén, “Inbjudan”, 8-17 and ”Utkast till aide-memoire”, 5-6
In the *Theology of Hope*, which was formulated by Jürgen Moltmann in the 1960s, the anticipation of the kingdom of God was central. In Moltmann’s theology the expectation of a divine irruption was not at all opposed to the strivings for transformation of society, but rather a precondition for them. God’s promises of the future divine breakthrough were, for him, the motivating force for action. In his suffering and death on the cross, Christ identified with the poor and the sinners of this world. Through his representative death he drew the whole creation into his life. Therefore his resurrection and future eternal life would include all creation. Through the resurrection God communicated his promise of a new, redeemed existence in the coming of his kingdom. Moltmann’s eschatological approach was dialectic: The contradiction between the cross and the resurrection mirrored the contradiction between the present and the promised realities. But the resurrection did not leave this world without effect. It started a historical process, in which the present and promised realities were dialectically interlinked, as thesis and antithesis. Action for transformation of society directed the process towards the future kingdom. To forward this process was, according to Moltmann, the universal mission of the church.

*Liberation Theology*, which grew strong during the 1960s, connected to the Theology of Hope, but further accentuated the practical consequences of God’s promise of the coming kingdom. For the Liberation theologians the function of eschatology was the forth bringing of a transformation of the world. True orthodoxy was orthopraxy. In its social analysis and historical approach Liberation theology was influenced by elements of Marxist theory. It was strongly connected to the *context* in which it developed: In the concrete situation of massive poverty and starvation of the Latin American people. God had chosen to reveal himself in the poor and oppressed and therefore salvation was about liberation from oppressing structures. Sin was understood in terms of unfair structures of society, rather than in the sense of individual moral acts. Consequently, a life in faith involved strivings for justice. One of the

---

66 Kolden, “On Speaking”, 155
front figures of Liberation theology, Gustavo Gutiérrez, highlighted the Exodus of the people of Israel from the land of Egypt and described it as paradigmatic. God’s salvation of the people from slavery was the beginning of a new existence, in which a just and fraternal society could be built. The salvation involved a fundamental break with the past disorder. A new order was created.68 On the basis of God’s presence among the poor and due to his promises, the poor were, as the People of God, enabled to strive towards the establishment of the kingdom.69 Through the establishment of the kingdom on Earth, the sphere of this world and the world beyond would approach each other.70

**A Movement in Transition**

At the time of the Life and Peace Conference the ecumenical movement was a movement in transition. This transition characterized the life of the WCC.71 The increased attention to Liberation Theology contributed to the transition.72 According to Philip Potter there was, during the 1960s, a growing awareness in the ecumenical movement about the situation in the Third World. Decolonisation had entailed autonomy for many churches in these countries. It implied that the World Council of Churches, which until then had been dominated by churches from the Northern parts of the world, suddenly received many new members. The widening of the Council involved a comprehension of many new perspectives, but also of new tensions. The Third World churches contributed to a shift in concerns. A main reason behind this shift was that the ecumenical doctrines, which traditionally had been debated in Western Theology, did not correspond to the situation of the churches in the Third World.73

Per Frostin has highlighted the differences between Western Christianity and the Christianity of the Third World and delineated the framework of a new paradigm of Third World Theology.74 The theory of the paradigm was formulated by the philosopher of Science Thomas Kuhn. In opposition to the advocates of positivism, who maintained that science was pursued from an objective point of view, Kuhn claimed that scientific research was directed
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by certain systems of norms, which he called paradigms. A paradigm indicated which questions were relevant and it stated the rules of research. In other words, Kuhn claimed that there is no such thing as a neutral form of science. However, paradigms did not only refer to science, but could also represent systems of theories, values and beliefs that dominated life in a community.\textsuperscript{75} It was to such systems Frostin referred.

Frostin outlined the new paradigm of the Third World Theology in five points: First of all, he asked for the interlocutor of theology: Who ask the questions that Theology is imposed to answer? In Liberation Theology, which formed the very basis of the new paradigm, the poor were the interlocutors. Consequently, the task of theology was the consideration of social structures and not of ideas, as in Western theology. Secondly, Frostin highlighted the perception of God. While Western Theology displayed great interest in issues about the divine nature and existence, Third World theologians emphasised God’s action against social systems of oppression. Thirdly, Frostin stressed that conflict analysis was given a prominent position in the new paradigm. This was due to the starting point of Liberation Theology, which was taken in the conflicted context of the poor and victimized. Fourthly, philosophy was the most important intellectual tool in Western Theology, but in the new paradigm social science assumed that role. This fourth difference indicated on a reorientation of epistemology: The classical Western epistemology, as formulated by Plato, Descartes and Kant, was challenged by the new forms of sociology of knowledge, as influenced by Marx, Engels and Mannheim. Lastly, Frostin pointed out that intellectual reflection was primary to praxis in Western Theology, while the dialectics between theory and praxis was emphasised in the new paradigm, but with an emphasis on praxis.\textsuperscript{76}

The meeting between these two theological systems has also been reflected by Konrad Raiser. He has analysed the large changes that the ecumenical movement, with the WCC at the forefront, experienced during the 1960s and onwards. He described these changes as a paradigm shift.\textsuperscript{77} According to the theory of Thomas Kuhn, the framework of an old paradigm usually becomes too limited to offer relevant explanations, when new discoveries progress. The old paradigm then falls into a crisis, declines and makes room for the development of a
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new paradigm. The paradigm shifts contributed to scientific development or, as Kuhn meant, to scientific revolution. In the transition of the ecumenical movement, Raiser identified the two encountering theological systems, the Third World Theology and the Western Theology, as two different ecumenical paradigms. Western Theology, which preceded and was challenged by the new paradigm of Third World Theology formed, according to Raiser, an own paradigm, which he designated the paradigm of Christocentric Universalism. This paradigm dominated the ecumenical discourse from the initiation of the WCC in 1948 until the 1960s. Apart from the criteria that Frostin ascribed the system of Western Theology, Raiser also emphasised that this paradigm implied a Christocentric understanding of church unity: The goal of ecumenism was a visible unity of the churches in the body of Christ. This paradigm involved a universal view on world history. It was understood eschatologically, as a progress of God’s salvation in the light of God’s action in Jesus Christ. Thereby, the world-embracing nature of Christian faith was manifested. When the paradigm of Christocentric Universalism was challenged by the new paradigm of Third World Theology, the ecumenical movement experienced changes, which characterized the context in which the Life and Peace Conference took place.

The Church as Mediator in International Conflict

The engagement of the churches in issues of secular society, which increased in connection to the emergence of the paradigm of Third World Theology, raised ambiguity within the ecumenical movement. The theologians were criticised for having retreated from their proper task and abandoned vertical analysis of theology for the benefit of horizontal observations of society. Reflection on the nature of the church retreated into the background, while debates about its function came to the fore. This shift to a socially engaged ecumenism was evident in the Life and Peace Conference in which, I contend, a functional approach to ecumenism was dominant. The delegates from the different churches had gathered in order to act for peace. Accordingly, they assumed a role as mediators in international conflict.
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According to Ernst Lange, the new functional emphasis in the ecumenical strivings for peace and survival of humankind, indirectly served church unity.83 The Life and Peace Conference certainly functioned for peace in the world, but did it also serve the interior peace between the churches? Through analysing the conference in the light of its mediating function, my aim is to inquire into the nature of the relationship between its concepts of peace and ecumenics. The mediating function of the Life and Peace Conference connects to its contextual framework in the Church of Sweden.

The paradigm shift in the ecumenical movement, from Christocentric Universalism to Third World Theology, had influenced theology in the Church of Sweden.84 Lars Lindberg emphasised that Swedish theology during the 20th century developed from being confessional to ecumenical.85 According to Sven-Erik Brodd, the ecumenical theology of the WCC had its breakthrough in the Church of Sweden during the 1970s and 80s. Swedish theology had become increasingly pragmatic from 1945 and onwards. The fourth assembly of the WCC in Uppsala in 1968 was an important milestone in this transition.86 The transition implied a shift in emphasis, from individual to social ethics. It entailed increased attention to social action. According to Peter Lodberg and Björn Ryman, the entry of this pragmatic theology marked dissociation from interpretations of the Lutheran *Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms* that tended to isolate Christian living and thinking from the matters of the world. The doctrine had been increasingly called in question since the 1930s.87 Gustaf Törnvall has analysed earlier interpretations of the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms. The notion of the *spiritual kingdom* and the *worldly kingdom* was central in Luther’s teaching. Törnvall argues that Lutheran theologians in a too large extent limited the world of the believer to the spiritual kingdom. Society, the worldly kingdom, was regarded as a strange world, secluded from the spiritual. Religious life was located to man’s interior sphere and not to the exterior, social, field.88
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Ecumenical theology, however, gave new impulses to Lutheran theology. The paradigm shift implied that the issues of the world, not least of the Third World, were increasingly focused in the life of the Church of Sweden. Social issues were integrated in religious life. In this way the distance between the spiritual and the worldly spheres was narrowed in the theological approach of the Church of Sweden.

According to Brodd, the very springboard of the theological reorientation, towards a more pragmatic theology, was the ecumenical efforts of the Archbishop of the Church of Sweden Nathan Söderblom. The international ecumenical orientation of the Church of Sweden has frequently been referred to as “the heritage of Söderblom”. Söderblom’s ecumenical engagement was transmitted and consolidated by many of his successors. Olof Sundby was one of them. As initiators to the Life and Peace Conference, Olof Sundby as well as Evert Svensson stressed the continuity with Nathan Söderblom’s work for peace and ecumenics in the 1910s and 20s and not least with his initiative to the Ecumenical Conference for Life and Work in Stockholm in 1925. At the time of the Life and Peace Conference Sweden was, as in Söderblom’s time, a neutral country and the Church of Sweden an active participant in the international ecumenical movement. Thanks to these characteristics, the Church of Sweden still presented favourable conditions as an organiser of a Christian peace conference. Sweden was internationally known as a peace-negotiating nation, not least in the light of the peace efforts of Olof Palme. In the Swedish political sphere, there was an interest in the special possibilities of the Swedish churches in the field of peace making. Unlike the political actors, the churches were parts of a segment in society, in which contacts with parties on both sides of the iron curtain were still possible.

Thomas Scheffler has highlighted the special mediating possibilities of religious leaders in international conflict. Their diplomatic activities are labelled faith-based diplomacy. In contrast to political leaders, religious leaders usually have long experience in the field of
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reconciliation and humanitarian issues. Often they are parts of worldwide networks, from which they can count on assistance. Moreover, their spheres embrace people in multiple segments of society. The importance of the collaboration between different fields of society in the endeavours for peace has been emphasised. Stephen Goodwin has highlighted the interdependency between different “tracks” of diplomacy in the making of a sustainable peace. These are “track one diplomacy”, which refers to political high-level diplomacy and “track two diplomacy”, which aims at diplomacy at the organizational level. In this track faith based diplomacy and the churches’ endeavours for peace are included. Lastly, there is the “track three diplomacy”, which relates to negotiations at the grass-roots level of society. Accordingly, in being a common interest of the churches and the political sphere, the Life and Peace Conference testified to collaboration between track one and track two diplomacy.

Douglas Johnston and Brian Cox have featured both strengths and weaknesses of faith based diplomacy. Religious actors are not infrequently part of the root of conflicts. Religion can motivate peace, but also war. Due to its transcendent element, religion generally has a great influence on the individual’s conception of reality and truth. In this way, religious leaders usually have great power over the individual’s choice of making peace or going to war. They are important fellow-players in the work for world peace. Accordingly, the impact of the religious leaders is a power to count with in national and international politics and conflict handling.

HYPOTHESIS
In order to find out about the definitions of peace and ecumenics and the relationship between these concepts at the Life and Peace Conference, I will regard the conference in the light of its different contexts. I hypothesize that the conference was situated in a fusion of contexts, which was crucial for the development and interrelation of the two concepts that I am investigating. The contexts that I am considering are, as described, the context of the WCC and the context of the Church of Sweden. However, I will also view the conference in the light of the two different ecumenical theological contexts, which converged in the paradigm shift.

of the ecumenical movement: The *paradigm of Third World Theology* and the *paradigm of Christocentric Universalism*. Accordingly, my hypothesis is that the concepts of peace and ecumenics and the nature of the relationship between them, mirror the fusion of contexts, in which the Life and Peace Conference was situated.

**DELIMITATIONS**

In the preparations and accomplishment of the Life and Peace Conference many Swedish Free Churches played a great and active role. My analysis is, however, delimited to the context of the Church of Sweden because of its role as organiser of the conference and because the conference was taking place in continuity with the work of Archbishop Nathan Söderblom. The transformation of the ecumenical movement is mainly referred to within the context of the WCC. However, this transformation was closely connected to reforms that took place within the Roman Catholic Church during the 1960s, not least in connection to the Second Vatican Council.\(^\text{100}\) My analysis is delimited to the context of the WCC for a variety of reasons: There were strong connections to the WCC among the organisers, the conference reflected many of its theological positions, the WCC had a global extent and many of the conference participants belonged to its member churches. The investigation does not concentrate on the aftermath of the conference. Only its immediate results are described, since it is the conceptual foundations, formed during the preparations and accomplishment of the conference, that are in focus of my investigation.

**METHOD**

In his article “Ekumenikvetenskapliga forskningslinjer” from 1996 Sven-Erik Brodd discerns different periods, in which ecumenical research assumes different methodologies. In the period between the middle of the 1960s and the middle of the 1990s, which is the period when the Life and Peace Conference took place, *contextual methods* received an increasing prominence in theological methodology.\(^\text{101}\) According to Frostin, the breakthrough of the paradigm of Third World Theology implied a call for contextual methodology.\(^\text{102}\) Owing to the great changes in the ecumenical movement, theological issues were no longer isolated from their immediate contexts. Through contextual methodology dogmatic issues were
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approached from the viewpoint of their social, historical and cultural frameworks. In this way ecumenical research became interdisciplinary.\textsuperscript{103} Since my aim is to analyse the concepts of peace and ecumenics in the light of different contexts, contextual methodology provides a useful tool for my analysis. However, it is in the light of the fusion of contexts at the conference that I will analyse the development and interrelation of the concepts. Therefore, a method to interpret this fusion is also essential for my analysis.

Thomas Kuhn’s theory of the paradigm has, by Stellan Dahlgren and Anders Florén, been compared with Hans-Georg Gadamer’s theory of horizons. In contrast to Kuhn, who insisted that the paradigms were untranslatable, Gadamer maintained that dialogue between different contexts indeed was possible through a fusion of their horizons.\textsuperscript{104} This train of thought was developed by Sigurdur Árni Thórdarson, when he formulated his contextual method of liminal thinking. The method of liminal thinking attends to conversation between people across the limits of different contexts. Presenting his method, Thórdarson starts with highlighting the effects of globalisation. As the world has developed into “one global village”, social, cultural and intellectual plurality has become increasingly apparent. This plurality has displayed the limitedness of all social, cultural and intellectual systems. The exposure of this limitedness has caused a relativisation of common grounds. The lack of common grounds has, in turn, caused a lack of communication. According to Thórdarson, however, limitedness does not mean that communication is impossible. Rapid social changes, such as failure of growth or sudden threat of a nuclear catastrophe, might bring old systems of meaning into crisis, if they cannot offer relevant explanations on the new situation. The limitedness and lack of common grounds might then lead men into categories or ideologies that draw them apart from each other. It is in these situations Thórdarson means that the limitedness can be used in a reverse way: As a resource for communication across the barriers.

The method of liminal thinking is carried through in four steps. Firstly, it involves questioning in order to reveal biases and highlight particularities by each partner. It is in the play of questions and answers between differing partners that unity emerges, Thórdarson explains. Secondly, the method implies mutual construction of liminal worlds from the side of each partner. The liminal world is built up through self-reflection and is a precondition for the third
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step, which comprises the common construction of a *shared liminal world* between the partners. The encounter with the other’s self-reflection contributes to the construction of common grounds. The shared liminal world is, though, a fragile construction, which is constantly developing and which needs to be continuously re-examined in the process towards mutual understanding. Thórdarson stresses that the method of liminal thinking accentuates the differences and simultaneously allows a conversation that aims at a possible unity. He maintains, that for theology in a pluralist world it provides a viable path that is possible to follow, both within the framework of theological context and in connection to intercultural and interconfessional encounters.\(^\text{105}\)

For my investigation of the concepts of peace and ecumenics at the Life and Peace Conference, the method of liminal thinking provides significant tools. It brings a conceptual instrument to interpret the fusion of contexts, in the light of which I will analyse the two concepts. It frames the process of the assembly towards an agreement in the cluster of encountering contexts. It also poses the challenge to find out if the limitedness of the contexts contributed to divisions, or if it was a resource for constructing a common ground in a shared liminal world. In constructing a shared liminal world, the method of liminal thinking gives a prominent place to the perspective of the actor: A perspective that is applicable to the accomplishment of the Life and Peace Conference, in which the initiatives of individual actors was crucial.

ANALYSIS

MEDIATORS FOR PEACE

The Initiative

The first seed to the Life and Peace Conference was sown in 1980. Evert Svensson was active as a Swedish commissioner in the UN General Assembly when the idea of a Christian world conference for peace came to him. The issues of disarmament and peace had for many years been part of his engagement, not least through his leadership of the Christian Social Democrats in Sweden. This engagement widened when he, in the end of the 1970s, was appointed by the Swedish Government to become a commissioner, partly in the UN and partly in the Conference on Disarmament and Confidence and Security Building Measures in Europe, which assembled in Madrid.106

In the Era of the Second Cold War

At the end of the 1970s the arms race was at the focus of the deliberations in the UN as well as at the Madrid Conference. The international political climate had suddenly turned sharper and a new era called “the Second Cold War” had set in.107 The political detente, which had prevailed during the 1970s, shifted into a policy of confrontation between the two superpowers. The tone hardened when decisions were made to set out nuclear missiles close to the border that divided the two blocs: From NATO’s side in West Germany and from the side of the Warsaw Pact in Poland.108 Moreover, the new president of the United States, Ronald Reagan, initiated a scientific venture that in popular speech was called the “Star Wars”. It aimed at creating weapons that put Soviet nuclear missiles out of action before they reached the American continent. The initiative roused strong condemnations from the Soviet leader Jurij Andropov. The trial of strength was resumed and the process of rearmament gained new speed.109 The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 had been an igniting spark for the
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Second Cold War. It had caused a deadlock in the deliberations of the Security Council of the UN, but it had also marked the entrance of Third World countries into the arms race. Consequently, the armament stockpiles grew also in these parts of the world. As the Third World countries, voluntarily or involuntarily, were drawn into the conflict as allies to the super powers, the cold war attained global dimensions.

Also in the negotiations of the Madrid Conference, Evert Svensson witnessed a deadlock. Detente was the aim of this conference and it was planned to be realised in two phases: Through confidence building and disarmament. The negotiations on confidence building were successful, but when the issue of disarmament was raised, the deliberations halted. This was, however, the most urgent issue to deal with in order to prevent a nuclear holocaust, Svensson underscored. In addition to his experiences as a commissioner, he had listened to testimonies by eyewitnesses to the nuclear catastrophe in Hiroshima in 1945. Conscious of the great dangers that the escalating arms race entailed, he highlighted the necessity to act in resistance against the armament. This resistance was a struggle for the survival of the human species.

The Churches as Creators of Public Opinion

In 1978 the UN Security Council had arranged its first extra session on disarmament. The Council had established that arms limitation was a concern common to all states and had appointed an action programme towards disarmament and confidence building. Its second extra session was going to take place in the summer of 1982. Svensson stressed that in order to realize the goals of this programme, public opinion played an essential role. He emphasised that the churches had members on all continents. They influenced life for people in many parts of society. Furthermore, they were connected through international networks, such as the WCC. Svensson claimed that the churches were powerful actors in the struggle to rouse public opinion. If the churches were mobilised and gathered around a common
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statement for disarmament, they would contribute greatly to this struggle. He emphasised that the resistance against the arms race was to be a natural part of the churches’ engagement, as the notion of peace was at the heart of the Gospel. His awareness of the acute situation in the world and his conviction about the power of the churches fostered the idea of an international Christian conference for peace and survival. In mind he had the Ecumenical Assembly in Stockholm 1925, initiated by the Archbishop of the Church of Sweden Nathan Söderblom. This conference was held in the shadow of the First World War and in presentiment of the Second. The Stockholm Conference aimed at a common action, from the side of the churches, for a lasting peace. This conference could be repeated, Svensson thought, but this time with focus on the prevention of nuclear war. In the spring 1980 he contacted the current Archbishop of the Church of Sweden, Olof Sundby, and presented his idea. The Archbishop answered that he would consider the proposal during the summer. Evert Svensson thought, however, that the summer was long and in June he wrote a letter to the Archbishop to remind him of the conference. This time Sundby approved of the idea and the preparatory process started.

The Preparatory Process

The Initial Steps

During the autumn of 1980 and the winter of 1981 Evert Svensson and Olof Sundby anchored the idea of the Christian peace conference in the churches and with the authorities. The conference was planned to precede the second extra session of the UN Security Council on disarmament in the summer of 1982, with the aim of influencing the outcome of this session. Svensson received positive response when he, in connection to his commissions in Madrid and the UN, presented the idea. The UN Deputy Secretary General Jan Mårtensson promised full support to the conference. The Swedish Prime Minister Thorbjörn Fälldin and the Government approved the proposal and granted their economic and moral support. Also
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the leader of the Social Democratic Party, Olof Palme, answered with enthusiasm. The idea gained a broad support in the Swedish Parliament. Moreover, Sundby got positive response when he presented the proposal at the Swedish Bishops’ Assembly in January 1981. Thereafter, Sundby anchored the idea in the WCC and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). The wide support encouraged the initiators to realize their vision.

During his whole ministry Olof Sundby had been ecumenically engaged. However, his social and international commitment had deepened when the ecumenical breakthrough and increased concentration on global issues took place in the Church of Sweden at the end of the 1960s. Not least, two of his children, who both were active in the left-wing movement, made him increasingly committed to social issues. A great deal of attention was paid to Olof Sundby when he in 1975 admonished the director and owner of the Swedish company ASEA for their making investments in the apartheid-governed South Africa. Sundby was a member of the LWF Executive Committee between 1972 and 1977 and at the fifth assembly of the WCC in Nairobi he became one of its six Presidents. Not only on the international, but also on the national arena, Olof Sundby testified to an ecumenical engagement. He attended carefully to the agreements between the Church of Sweden and the different Swedish Free Churches. In capacity as Archbishop and Chairman of the Swedish Ecumenical Council he had a special opportunity to provide for these relationships. As a successor to Nathan Söderblom and as a central ecumenical figure, nationally and internationally, Olof Sundby was the obvious leader and Chairman of the peace conference.

In the initial phase of the preparations the Director of the Mission Covenant Church of Sweden, Gösta Hedberg, and the Director of the Swedish Baptist Congregations, David Lagergren, were contacted. Hedberg was appointed vice Chairman of the conference. Among those connected to the inaugural work were also Bishop Martin Löbbe, the Minister of Education Jan-Erik Wikström and the NGO-ambassador and Liberal politician Olle Dahlén.
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Together with Olof Sundby and Evert Svensson they formed an advisory committee that initiated the preparatory work.\textsuperscript{132} Like Evert Svensson and Jan-Erik Wikström, Olle Dahlén was active in the Mission Covenant Church of Sweden. They entered the work for the conference as churchmen and not in their capacity as politicians. In his commission, Olle Dahlén was positioned at the Foreign Ministry and was responsible for the Governmental contacts with Swedish and international Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO’s). As the churches and ecumenical organizations constituted an important part of the NGO’s, Dahlén had a wide network of contacts among the churches. Moreover, he was the Chairman of the WCC section CCIA (The Churches’ Commission on International Affairs).\textsuperscript{133} Olle Dahlén played a key role in the organization of the conference.\textsuperscript{134}

\textit{A Pan-Christian Meeting in the Spirit of Nathan Söderblom}

The committee aimed at creating an extraordinary event in an extraordinary situation. The very goal of the venture was to express the total engagement of all Christianity in the struggle for peace. The churches were to show their collective concern for disarmament, in order to put the strongest possible moral pressure on the leading politicians of the super powers and their allies. The committee was in a hurry. This was going to be a measure for survival, maybe in the last minute. According to their plans the peace conference would provide a forum, in which its participants in a common statement would formulate their requirements on the political leaders. Moreover, a global Christian programme for peace and disarmament was planned to be produced during the conference. The committee emphasised, however, that the conference was \textit{not} to be dominated by plenary sessions and negotiations. Rather the spiritual life, the worship, services and intercessions, would characterize the meeting. A main purpose of the conference was to gather representatives from the \textit{whole} of Christianity, without dependence on the established ecumenical organizations. The vision of the collaborators was to gather a \textit{full pan-Christian meeting}. That would mean representation not only from the member churches of the WCC, but also from the non-members, as the Roman Catholic Church. The committee underscored, that if this plan succeeded, the conference would mark a breakthrough in the ecumenical movement. But the visions did not halt at a pan-Christian assembly. The committee also aimed at bringing about an ecumenical circle of invikers.
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consisting in the top leaders of the churches in the world. This circle was planned to consist in the Holy Father in Rome, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarch of the Russian-Orthodox Church in Moscow, the Bishop of Tanzania, the Primate of the Anglican Church in Canada, one representative from the Evangelical churches in the United States and, as a representative of the host church, the Archbishop of the Church of Sweden. A participation of the Holy Father would confirm the pan-Christian character of the conference and mark an important ecumenical breakthrough.

The concept pan-Christian was used by Nathan Söderblom when he, during the First World War, worked for an international, ecumenical peace conference for leaders of the Christian churches. After the war his vision was realized, though not as a full pan-Christian meeting. At the meeting, which took place in Stockholm in 1925, leaders from the Protestant churches and the Orthodox Church participated, but there were no representatives from the Roman Catholic Church. Nevertheless, the “Stockholm Conference” is regarded as an important milestone for the emergence of the modern ecumenical movement. The conference, which Olof Sundby was about to realize, aimed at being an equivalent to the Stockholm Conference. This time the initiators did, however, count with a realization of a full pan-Christian representation, perhaps even in the circle of inviters.

According to Olle Dahlén the comparison with the Stockholm Conference was irrelevant. In 1925 ecumenical cooperation was not a widespread phenomenon, neither in Sweden, nor internationally. In the 1980s, on the other hand, the ecumenical network was well established. It provided favourable conditions for peace work. If the ecumenists of 1925 were pioneers, peace work should be a matter of course among the ecumenists of the 1980s. Willem Adolf Visser’t Hooft, the first General Secretary of the WCC, agreed with this reasoning. He stated
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that the comparison with the Stockholm Conference was interesting only in the sense that Söderblom was deeply concerned with peace and justice. In that way, the peace conference would be a link in the tradition, which derived from Söderblom. Visser’t Hooft emphasised that the Stockholm Conference took place in the aftermath and not in fear of a world war and it was in a time when Western Christianity was still dominating ecumenism. Furthermore, the participants of the Stockholm Conference dealt with general principles of peace, rather than making concrete proposals.  

Nevertheless, the continuity with the work of Söderblom and the 1925 Stockholm Conference was going to be accentuated throughout the preparations and accomplishment of the conference. An exhibition on Nathan Söderblom was arranged during the conference and the letter of invitation to the conference concluded with a prayer for peace written by Söderblom. The conference was originally planned to take place in Stockholm. Its name, “Life and Peace”, directly derived from the theme of the Stockholm Conference and the name of its subsequent organization “Life and Work”. It is fair to assert that the Life and Peace Conference was initiated in the spirit of Nathan Söderblom. In spite of differences in preconditions and contextual setting, the heritage from Söderblom turned out to be a cornerstone in the agenda of the Life and Peace Conference. Apart from the deep concern about peace and justice, I consider that there are further comparable elements between the two conferences.

Nathan Söderblom had been eager to gather church leaders from the combating nations of the First World War. Similarly, the purpose of the Life and Peace Conference was to assemble church leaders from both sides of the cold war. On both occasions, there was a trust in the mediating power of the churches. The ability of the churches to connect to each other across
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the borders of national confrontation and aggression was emphasised.\textsuperscript{150} According to Söderblom, this ability brought the churches together in a supranational community.\textsuperscript{151} For him, the Lutheran confession was a foundation for ecumenical cooperation. It did not require unity in dogma or institutional structure. It provided a platform for unity in spirit and action: Two elements, which according to Söderblom were essential for ecumenism.\textsuperscript{152} I contend that unity in spirit and action was of primary interest also in the realization of the Life and Peace Conference: The conference was a spiritual meeting, but it also played a functional role, as its participants tried to agree on concrete proposals on disarmament and a common action programme for peace.

Nathan Söderblom persisted that the Church of Sweden, through its historical episcopate, apostolic succession and continuity with the medieval liturgy, was connected with the church of all times. Yet, its conception of ministry allowed community also with churches that lacked apostolic succession.\textsuperscript{153} Due to its Lutheran confession, it owned special possibilities to create a platform for ecumenical collaboration.\textsuperscript{154} Moreover, it was a church in a neutral country. In contrast to its sister churches, which suffered through the war, the Church of Sweden had large possibilities to work for peace.\textsuperscript{155} Owing to these features, Söderblom characterized the Church of Sweden as a bridge church for international, ecumenical cooperation. As such, the Church of Sweden had a special responsibility to gather the churches for peace work.\textsuperscript{156} Söderblom emphasised that the churches were to repent for not having contributed to peace through history. In his position as a newly ordained Archbishop for the church of a neutral country at the time of the outbreak of war he felt the calling to act on behalf of peace.\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{150} Nathan Söderblom, Kristenhetens möte i Stockholm: Ekumeniska mötet, augusti 1925: Historik, aktstycken, grundtankar, personligheter, eftermäle, (Stockholm: SKD, 1926), 456-457, Interview with Margareta Grape 2007-01-23
\textsuperscript{151} Nathan Söderblom, Kyrkan och freden, (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers förlag, 1930), 17, 46
\textsuperscript{154} Aulén, Hundra års, 129
\textsuperscript{155} Nathan Söderblom, Neutral egenrättfärdighet: Botdagspredikan, (Lund: Berlingska boktryckeriet, 1916), 2
\textsuperscript{156} Brodd, Evangelisk katolicitet, 124, Lars Österlin, ”Sveriges världshistoriska uppgift: Nationalism och internationalism i Svenska kyrkan vid 1900-talets början” in Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift, Harry Lenhammar, ed., (Uppsala: Svenska kyrkohistoriska föreningen, 1992), 180
\textsuperscript{157} Söderblom, Neutral egenrättfärdighet, 1-2 and Lars Österlin, Korstågen till Kina: Linjer i protestantisk Kinamission, (Malmö: Sekel bokförlag, 2005), 106
The calling into the mission for peace was emphasised also by the organisers of the Life and Peace Conference. The invitation to the conference commenced with two Bible verses: The words of Paul in Rom. 8:6: “...the mind on the spirit is life and peace” and Jesus’ words in John 14:27 “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you”. The organisers underscored that it was the responsibility, even the duty, of the churches to protect life and peace, since it characterized the mind of the spirit and was a gift from Christ to humanity. However, the churches had not lived up to this responsibility through history. On the contrary, they had often contributed to conflicts. Therefore, repentance was a strong feature also in the prayers at the conference. According to Ryman, the Church of Sweden, with Archbishop Olof Sundby at the head, aimed at manifesting its function as a bridge church in the footsteps of Nathan Söderblom. I consider, however, that as such, it was not the Lutheran confession that was highlighted as its uniting element and nor its continuity with the medieval liturgy, apostolic succession or historical episcopate. I contend that, in connection to the Life and Peace Conference, the Church of Sweden was rather characterised as a bridge church due to its strong historical and contemporary anchorage in the ecumenical movement and owing to its position in a neutral country with an established international reputation as a peace-negotiating nation.

In the preparations and accomplishment of the Life and Peace Conference, not only Nathan Söderblom was referred to as being an important Swedish peace-negotiating leader. There was also reference to the former UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld and, not least, the contemporary politician Olof Palme. Palme was in 1980 appointed by the UN to mediate in the war between Iran and Iraq. As the preparations for the Life and Peace Conference were going on, Palme simultaneously directed the international Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. The negotiating efforts of Olof Palme strongly
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contributed to the international reputation of Sweden as a peace-negotiating nation.\textsuperscript{165} Palme was highly respected and even regarded as an “icon” by many members in the WCC, thanks to his efforts for global peace and engagement in issues of development in the Third World.\textsuperscript{166} According to Margareta Grape, the Church of Sweden’s arrangement of the Life and Peace Conference is to be viewed partly in light of the contemporary Swedish initiatives for peace, partly in view of its heritage from Nathan Söderblom. This heritage had evolved a long tradition of engagement in the issues of peace and ecumenics. Regarding its favourable situation in a neutral nation, known for its peace-negotiation activities, there was in the Church of Sweden a widespread feeling of responsibility to work ecumenically in the service of peace.\textsuperscript{167} Just as Nathan Söderblom, Olof Sundby had, in his ministry as Archbishop of the Church of Sweden, been given useful tools in order to act for peace through ecumenical cooperation in a time when war was an impending threat. In the footsteps of Nathan Söderblom, he used these tools and summoned to a pan-Christian meeting for peace.

As soon as Olof Sundby had received a positive response from the WCC to the idea of the conference, he headed towards Rome and the Vatican.\textsuperscript{168} On the 3\textsuperscript{rd} of March 1981 Sundby visited Archbishop Silvestrini, with whom he deliberated the plans for the conference and the vision about an ecumenical circle of inviters.\textsuperscript{169} The Holy Father had been informed about the plans already in November 1980, when Olof Sundby had visited him in the Vatican. This was the first time since the time of the Reformation that an Archbishop of the Church of Sweden visited the Holy Father in Rome. Sundby was promised support for the conference. To which extent was, however, not clear.\textsuperscript{170} In order to create an ecumenical circle of inviters, Sundby undertook two more journeys: To the Patriarch Justin in Bucharest and to the Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie. To the other proposed inviters he sent messengers.\textsuperscript{171} In a letter from the secretary of the Vatican State, Cardinal Casaroli, in June 1981 it was made clear that the Pope would not be part of the circle of inviters. Yet, Sundby was promised advanced representation from the Roman Catholic Church at the conference. Customarily the Holy
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Father did not participate in invitations or appeals as promoter or signatory. Furthermore, Sundby was informed that the Patriarch Pimen in Moscow had plans that prevented him from coming to the conference. The ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople, on his side, was doubtful about the venture. Thereby an ecumenical circle of inviters of influential church leaders was suddenly out of question. The plans of Patriarch Pimen appeared to have large consequences for the organisation of the Life and Peace Conference. The Patriarch had decided to organise an inter-religious world conference for peace in Moscow in the spring of 1982, which was exactly the time at which the Life and Peace Conference was planned to take place. In other words, a new point of time was to be fixed. All at once, two important links failed the organisation of the conference. The organisers had to start anew.

**A Second Start**

A new point of time was soon fixed. The WCC was going to arrange its sixth assembly in Vancouver in the summer of 1983. If it was held in advance of that assembly, the results of the Life and Peace Conference might influence its deliberations. Therefore, the conference was planned for the spring of 1983. To create a new circle of inviters was, however, more tricky. Olof Sundby introduced the idea of having church leaders from the Nordic countries to act as inviters. He emphasised that the Nordic countries were known for their promotion of negotiations for peace and disarmament. In the beginning of the 1980s negotiations were going on concerning a non-nuclear zone in the Nordic countries, aiming at a nuclear-free Europe. He stressed that the Nordic states had a key position between the blocs in the East and West. This was primarily due to Sweden’s neutrality. He also highlighted the Danish and Norwegian association to NATO, on the one hand, and the geographical closeness of the neutral Finland to the Soviet Union, on the other. Accordingly, the Nordic states had different political starting points, but nevertheless a close cooperation. These were according to Sundby factors, which equipped the churches in the Nordic countries with special possibilities for
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common action for peace. Sundby also pointed at the established position of the Nordic states in the UN and their close relations with countries in the Third World. In relation to population and resources, the Nordic countries were among the foremost aid contributors in the world. Moreover, they were small countries, without international political claims or aspirations. Having considered these favourable conditions, Sundby contacted the Archbishop of Finland Mikko Juva and the Primates of Oslo and Copenhagen Bishop Andreas Aarflot and Bishop Ole Bertelsen, introduced them to his idea and proposed a meeting in Uppsala. They agreed to come and a meeting took place in the House of the Archbishop in Uppsala on the 24th of November 1981.

At this meeting, Sundby informed his colleagues about the plans of the conference. At the last meeting of the WCC Central Committee the initiative had received positive response. The initiative from the neutral Sweden had been viewed in contrast to Patriarch Pimen’s initiative, which church leaders from both blocs regarded as politically lopsided in favour of the Soviet policy. Located on neutral ground, the Life and Peace Conference would provide a more favourable starting point for the participants in the elaboration of their demands on the political leaders of the two blocs. Sundby pointed at the efforts of Nathan Söderblom. In his work for peace, he had connected church leaders across national and confessional boarders. Together they had formed a movement, capable for common action. To express their opinion was a moral duty of the church leaders, Sundby claimed. Over time this duty had grown.

Sundby received different reactions from his Nordic colleagues. Most sceptical was the Norwegian Bishop Andreas Aarflot. He agreed that church leaders had a special responsibility to promote peace, but was doubtful about the effectiveness of a conference, which only involved church leaders. In spite of the endorsements of the initiative, he did not expect a success equal to the 1925 Stockholm Conference. He questioned the impact of a Nordic
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invitation and did not in the first place agree to sign the invitation.\footnote{Letter from Bishop Andreas Aarflot to Archbishop Olof Sundby 1981-12-21, File: Operation Vårblomma 1983 II in Sundby's Archive, LPI and Letter from Bishop Andreas Aarflot to Archbishop Olof Sundby 1981-10-23, File: Operation Vårblomma 1982 in Sundby’s Archive, LPI} His main criticism concerned the theme of the conference, which he regarded too narrow. He objected to a concentration on the nuclear threat and preferred a wider approach to the issue of peace. Otherwise the conference risked ending up as a propagandistic battlefield in favour of separate groupings. There was a great peril of getting a lopsided result, he claimed.\footnote{Letter from Aarflot to Sundby 1981-10-23 and Letter from Aarflot to Sundby 1982-01-28} Aarflot’s scepticism was contrasted with Archbishop Juva’s enthusiasm. Juva did not expect a political lopsidedness. He stressed that the concentration on the nuclear threat and human survival would unite rather than split the participants. A great task of the participants would be to contribute to increased international mutual confidence.\footnote{Sundby, Perry, “Förtroligt: Protokollsanteckningar”}

Ryman explains that Juva, as Archbishop for a neutral country bordering on the Soviet Union, was accustomed to peaceful diplomacy. This was not the case of Aarflot, who was Primate in a country that also bordered to the Soviet Union, but which was NATO-associated. His scepticism and dependence on the Norwegian public opinion might be related to these conditions, Ryman emphasises.\footnote{Ryman, “From Life and Peace, 68} Bishop Bertelsen from Denmark supported the conference and stressed that the church in those days was one of few places in society where people openly could discuss issues of disarmament and peace. At the meeting in Uppsala the four Bishops deliberated the idea of creating a wider ecumenical circle of inviters. As new participants they suggested the Roman-Catholic Bishop Hans Martensen from Copenhagen, the Orthodox Bishop Paavali from Helsinki, Bishop Pétur Sigurgeirsson from Iceland, the Director of the Mission Covenant Church in Sweden Gösta Hedberg and Director of the Mission Covenant Church in Norway Björn Öyvind Fjeld. All of them agreed join the circle, as did Bishop Aarflot in March 1982.\footnote{Sundby, Perry, “Förtroligt: Protokollsanteckningar” and Letter from Bishop Andreas Aarflot to Archbishop Olof Sundby 1982-03-10 File: Operation Vårblomma 1983 II in Sundby’s Archive LPI}

\textit{Constructing an Organisation}

As the point of time was fixed and the circle of inviters established, an organisation was constructed for the preparatory work. Åke Blomqvist was, as the General Secretary of the conference, the spider in the web of this organisation. During the preparatory period he ran the conference office from the Secretariat of the Stockholm Diocese, for which he was Administrative Director. At his side, he had the Secretary Ingrid Fagerström. Their work involved economical issues and handling of the extensive correspondence that preceded the
conference. Furthermore, they administered the many fields of the preparatory work.\textsuperscript{191} Worship, venue, mass media, youth festival, public manifestation, translation, hotel and transportation. For every field a team had been set up. These teams had been formed by the conference’s \textit{Organisation Committee}, which was conducted by Olle Dahlén. The organisation committee consisted in a few members from the \textit{Host Committee}.\textsuperscript{192} The Host Committee was characterized as the board of the conference and the Organisation Committee as its executive agency.\textsuperscript{193} The Host Committee, which was ecumenically composite, had twenty members who were all Swedish.\textsuperscript{194} The international character of the conference was, however, strong from the beginning of the working process. In the autumn of 1982 Olle Dahlén summoned the conference’s \textit{International Preparatory Committee (IPC)}.\textsuperscript{195}

The task of the IPC was to facilitate the Message, which it would be the main responsibility of the conference participants to compose. The drafting committee, which during the conference was to finalize the Message, was crystallized out of the IPC. The twenty-seven members of the IPC all held strategic positions within their churches and owned special expertise in the field of Christian positions towards the nuclear threat.\textsuperscript{196} They represented different continents and military blocs and belonged to diverse church families.\textsuperscript{197} This wideness of representation had been a loadstar in the selection of the members. Also in the selection of the participants of the conference, a wide and balanced representation was emphasised. Therefore the selections were made in cooperation with international and regional ecumenical bodies and church organisations.\textsuperscript{198} The participants invited were mainly church leaders. Experts on peace making and theology were also participating in the conference.\textsuperscript{199}
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In spite of the emphasis on a breadth of representation, the participants of the Life and Peace Conference were invited in personal capacity and not as representatives for their church family or political bloc. It was their personal view that was of importance in the composition of the Message.\textsuperscript{200} The organisers of the conference received criticism because of the low degree of female participants.\textsuperscript{201} There was an awareness of this problem among the organisers already during the preparatory period.\textsuperscript{202} The conference mainly addressed church leaders and such a “high-level representation” aimed at achieving a strong anchorage of the conference Message in different churches and in society. However, not many women held high-level positions in the churches in the beginning of the 1980s.\textsuperscript{203}

Apart from leading the organisation committee and coordinating the work of the teams and the IPC, Olle Dahlén made a crucial effort in order to summon the conference participants. Sundby and Dahlén cooperated closely on the issue of the invitations. Nevertheless, it was Dahlén who undertook the major part of the journeys around the world, in order to convince leaders of different churches and ecumenical organisations to participate in the conference.\textsuperscript{204} Not least through his diplomacy and his vast network of contacts, gained through his chairmanship in the CCIA and his position as NGO-ambassador, he was successful in establishing the connections, which made the Life and Peace Conference possible to realize.\textsuperscript{205} The foundational precondition of his work was, however, provided by the Government and the Foreign Office. By them Dahlén was given possibility to undertake the journeys within the framework of his commission as NGO-ambassador.\textsuperscript{206} To a great extent the approach of the Life and Peace Conference corresponded with the peace-negotiating policy of the Swedish Foreign Office.\textsuperscript{207} Accordingly, the accomplishment of the conference was of great interest to the Swedish Government.\textsuperscript{208} The conference received large financial support from the Swedish Foreign Office. Allowances and collections from the Church of
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Sweden, the Swedish Free Churches and a few other Nordic churches also contributed to its financing. Beside that, the Life and Peace Conference was financed by generous subventions from the Church of Sweden Fund, which was controlled by the Government, since the Church of Sweden at this time was a state church.209

Evert Svensson emphasises that the support from the Government was necessary for the realization of the Life and Peace Conference. Nevertheless, he underscores that the initiative to the Life and Peace Conference was not a political one. It was his personal initiative. In order to avoid any political characterization of the conference, he did not work in the forefront of the organisation. He did, however, contribute to the preparatory work, not least through his efforts in the UN, where he had spent an extra year as a delegate in order to establish the idea of the conference.210 The initiative to the Life and Peace Conference aroused great interest and enthusiasm among individuals, churches and peace organisations in Sweden and internationally. Even before the conference had started, the initiative had given rise to public opinion.211 Evert Svensson’s vision was taking shape.

Concluding Remarks

In the polarized world situation of the Second Cold War, characterised by the division between the two super powers, the Life and Peace Conference aimed at creating a platform in between the two blocs, on which church representatives from both sides could meet in dialogue. The character of the churches, as a segment in the world society that crossed national and political borders, made the creation of this platform possible. The ecumenical cooperation, which linked the churches together to a united segment, was at the Life and Peace Conference infused by the spirit of Nathan Söderblom. My view is that the organisers adopted Söderblom’s emphasis on unity in action and spirit as being fundamental elements for this ecumenical cooperation. At the conference the action for peace was the uniting aim. Yet, the importance of the conference’s spiritual character is underscored in the preparatory material. The spiritual unity was essential at the conference, but it did not exclude unity in engagement concerning the matters of the world. In accordance with Gustaf Törnvall’s interpretation of Luther, the spiritual and the worldly kingdoms were not regarded as separate entities. Rather the interior, spiritual, sphere and the exterior, social sphere were seen as
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210 Interview with Evert Svensson 2007-01-19
211 Ryman, ”From Life and Peace”, 70
conditioning each other in the life of the believer. In focussing on the role of the church leadership in international peace making, the conference testified to a reasoning that corresponded to the principles of faith based diplomacy: By representing a transcendent, spiritual reality the church leadership were forming convictions, which had practical consequences for choices and actions of the individual. In accordance with the contemporary context of the WCC and the guidelines of the paradigm of Third World Theology, the theological approach of the Life and Peace Conference was functional, pragmatic and socio-ethically oriented. Simultaneously, the very starting point was taken in the work of Nathan Söderblom, who represented a different time and context. Through the Life and Peace Conference the Church of Sweden manifested itself as a bridge church in the footsteps of Nathan Söderblom. However, its organisers did not adopt his view on the Lutheran confession as the foundation of ecumenical cooperation. Swedish theology had, following Lars Lindberg, developed from being confessional to ecumenical. The heritage from Söderblom was, at the conference, rather expressed through actions of responsibility, repentance and calling in the work for peace through ecumenical cooperation. The Life and Peace Conference was strongly characterised by the WCC context as well as the context of the Church of Sweden. But, not least, it was a result of the engagement of individual actors who, just as Söderblom, used the tools they were given in order to mediate for peace.

RESISTERS OF THE NUCLEAR WAR

The Composition of a Common Message

All those who assembled in the Cathedral in Uppsala on Wednesday the 20\textsuperscript{th} of April in 1983 were part of the great \textit{manifestation} that the Life and Peace Conference formed. The manifestation, which was brought about by the pure presence of the multitude of church representatives and members of the Swedish Government, was one out of three foundational elements of the conference. The second element was the \textit{worship} and the third was the composition of the \textit{Message}.

\textit{The Procedure}

As mentioned, the \textit{Message} had been planned by the IPC during the winter and spring of 1983. The minister and researcher Göran Lantz from the Church of Sweden composed a memorandum for the conference, to which the IPC members responded in so-called “position

\textsuperscript{212} Ryman, ”From Life and Peace”, 74, Perry, Sundby, ”Minnesanteckningar från samling å Ersta ” and Sundby, ”PM about a proposed conference” 1981-03-03
papers”. This memorandum formed the agenda for the conference negotiations. It was called the “Life and Peace Document” and was part of the invitation to the conference. The composition of the Message was a process lasting from the second to the fourth day of the conference. This work was joined with Bible studies and speeches. These were important for the course of the negotiations, as were the sermons. The drafting committee, formulating the Message, worked in parallel with the discussions of the assembly. The participants discussed the Message in smaller working groups, as well as in the large assembly. The Drafting Committee was, continuously, given reports and guidelines from the deliberations. The negotiations took place in the Lecture Hall of Uppsala University and were steered by a presidium of eight persons. During the days of negotiation, three drafts of the Message were going to be rejected. Only the fourth became the final one, since it had been approved by nearly all participants. The deliberations were closely followed by observers, advisors, accredited visitors, public visitors and, not least, by media.

Guiding Documents
Kjell-Åke Nordqvist has presented three documents, to which the conference participants related and which reflected the wide spectrum of opinions among them. These documents concerned the use, production and threat of using nuclear weapons, as well as the eventuality of a so-called “limited nuclear war”. The statements were made by different church agencies shortly before the Life and Peace Conference. Firstly, the Church of England had in 1982 presented the report “The Church and the Bomb”, in which the use of nuclear weapons was condemned. Yet, no position was adopted in this report concerning the issues of possession and threat of use. Secondly, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops had, at the time of the Life and Peace Conference, produced the first drafts of a Pastoral Letter called “The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response”. In this letter the Bishops dissociated themselves from the use of nuclear weapons against inhabited areas as well as with plans of
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first strike. Against a limited nuclear war, however, no manifest position was taken. The system of deterrence, which implied the practice of mutual threat to use nuclear weapons, was accepted, though only as a springboard towards disarmament.\textsuperscript{220} Thirdly, the WCC, to which a majority of the conference participants belonged, made a statement in connection to their hearing on nuclear weapons and disarmament in 1981 "Before It’s Too Late: The Challenge of Nuclear Disarmament". In this statement not only the use, but also the production, possession and threat to use nuclear weapons was condemned. Deterrence was evaluated as an impassable way towards international security. The statement marked dissociation from limited nuclear war and plans of first strike, but also encouraged Christians to refuse cooperation in projects concerning nuclear weapons and the use of them.\textsuperscript{221} Noteworthy is, that the WCC at this meeting discussed the possibility of viewing the resistance towards nuclear weapons as a matter of confession, a status confessionis.\textsuperscript{222} This question was posed also at the Life and Peace Conference, but did not gain enough support to be endorsed.\textsuperscript{223}

That deterrence was no viable path towards international security was a position held also by the UN’s international Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, for which the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme had been the Chairman. Their report “Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament”, which was delivered in 1982, was yet another important statement to which the participants of the Life and Peace Conference related. The Commission, whose members originated from countries in both blocs as well as neutral states, pleaded for a replacement of the mutual deterrence with the conduct of common security.\textsuperscript{224} All states had right to maintenance of national security. Still, the Commission held that nuclear armament did neither increase the national, nor the international security, because of the devastating consequences of an eventual nuclear war.\textsuperscript{225} Therefore, international security policy needed a new point of departure. That would be a common security built on mutual confidence. A first important step towards common security would be a strengthening
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Condemning the Nuclear War

There was a striking agreement among the participants concerning the condemnation of nuclear war. In the assembly there were just war theorists as well as pacifists. Nevertheless, they were all united in the condemnation of the use of nuclear weapons. When the production of nuclear weapons had escalated in the era of the Second Cold War, the relevance of the just war doctrine had increasingly been called into question. The exercise of the doctrine had arrived at a turning point. Yet, this turning point appeared to be the springboard towards a consensus among the delegates at the Life and Peace Conference. Göran Lantz had, in the preparatory work of the conference, composed a paper on the development of the just war doctrine and stated that the nuclear era had brought this ancient doctrine into a crisis. A nuclear war involved the risk of total extinction of the whole of humanity. Therefore, it could not possibly fulfil the criteria of the just war theory, especially not the criterion of proportionality. Neither would a nuclear war fulfil the criterion of discernment, as it would strike against children, elderly, ill and wounded people. Considering these devastating consequences, the Life and Peace Document posed the question if there, in the nuclear age, at all could be life without peace. During the 1970s and 80s just war theorists and pacifists arrived at a larger consensus, since many adherents to the just war theory now associated with the standpoint of nuclear pacifism. This standpoint precluded nuclear war from the category of just war. I conclude that the consensus at the Life and Peace Conference, concerning the use of nuclear weapons, was an expression of this development.
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A Message Requiring Immediate Disarmament

In the final Message the conference participants stated that nuclear warfare never could be justified. It was to be condemned by the Church’s teaching. They challenged the Governments to make effective unilateral and multilateral actions for peace and disarmament. Moreover, they insisted on a total elimination of all nuclear weapons within the time limit of five years.\(^{235}\) The Life and Peace Conference attracted much attention due to this radical statement.\(^{236}\)

**Split Positions on the Issue of Deterrence**

The initial consensus did, however, turn into disagreement as the debate about the nuclear weapons proceeded.\(^{237}\) The Life and Peace Document had stated that the conference aimed at answering not only the question if the use, but also if the *production* and *threat of using* such weapons would be against the will of God.\(^{238}\) Olle Dahlén had, already before the conference, pointed out these two issues as probable tight spots.\(^{239}\) As it turned out, they nearly caused a deadlock of the negotiations.\(^{240}\) The divergent opinions on these issues reflected the participants’ different attitudes to the *doctrine of deterrence*. The relation between the two super powers was steered by this doctrine of security, which was based on the principle of retribution in case of attack from the adversary. The equal capability of the super powers of giving each other mutual assured destruction was assumed to be the very peace keeping factor.\(^{241}\) As the balancing of this capability, the terror balance, rather had turned into a competition in superiority, the organisers of the Life and Peace Conference called the doctrine of deterrence into question. The widespread trust in this doctrine was, according to Sundby, the motor of the arms race.\(^{242}\)

**Deterrence: A Moral Dilemma**

Among those participants critical to the doctrine of deterrence, the great distrust, fear and division that characterised the current relations between nations and peoples was considered to be a consequence of the praxis of the doctrine. In spite of the absence of military
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confrontation, it was questioned if the present world state could be labelled as peace.\textsuperscript{243} According to Reverend Alan Geyer from the Methodist Church in the United States, the doctrine of deterrence contributed to an increased hatred, which resulted in dehumanisation of the adversary.\textsuperscript{244} Christa Lewek, member of the High Consistory in the GDR, maintained that the current international security system depended upon credible images of the enemy. The doctrine of deterrence encouraged a hostile rhetoric, which generated a depiction of the adversary as an ever-ready aggressor, regardless his actual behaviour. This rendered mutual acquaintance difficult. Instead, it generated black-white stereotypes, which were decisive for the construction of biases and tensed relationships.\textsuperscript{245} Moreover, these increasingly tensed relationships aggravated the risk of an actual military confrontation.\textsuperscript{246}

The system of deterrence was based on\textit{ willingness} to revenge and\textit{ readiness} to stage retaliation that would strike on millions of innocent people. Detailed plans, on how to accomplish mass destruction, were outlined.\textsuperscript{247} The churches were not exempted from responsibility, since Christians were parts of the societies that produced the weapons.\textsuperscript{248} Professor René Coste from the Roman Catholic Church in France underscored, that this development was the most outrageous scandal in history. From a Christian moral point of view, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence called for rigorous criticism.\textsuperscript{249} According to Professor John Pobee from the Anglican Church in Ghana, the system of deterrence seduced many Christians into seeking security in armament rather than in God, who was the true protector of mankind and nations. For this Christians were to repent. He referred to the prophet Isaiah (31: 1, 5):\textsuperscript{250}

\begin{quote}
Woe those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult the LORD!...Like birds hovering, so the LORD of hosts will protect Jerusalem; he will protect and deliver it, he will spare and rescue it.\textsuperscript{251}
\end{quote}
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The widespread association to the doctrine of deterrence had, according to Alan Geyer, turned into an utmost belief in the power of fear: The antithesis to the power of love. But power, based on physical strength and threat of violence, was not enough for the realisation of genuine peace, the Lutheran Archbishop John Vikström from Finland emphasised. Science and technology had become idols, in which man put greater faith than in God. Being used in service of war and destruction, these idols had betrayed man. The trust in human power and knowledge had left man helpless and fearful amidst the destructive forces he himself had created. Was then the threat of destroying life on earth the only source of peace that remained? No, Vikström underscored. If man had faith in God and his promises and followed his commandments a peace would be fostered that would be more than exterior orders. That would be a peace based on life, justice and freedom. A prayer during the morning service of the second day read:

We pray for the big powers that they may not put their trust in the arms race and nuclear weapons but may seek peace which comes from God.

Those critical to the system of deterrence stressed that the reliance on the doctrine of deterrence entailed great risks. According to René Coste the doctrine lulled people into an illusion of security. It was based on an assumption of human infallibility and absolute reliability of technical systems. Moreover, new weapons had been designed for staging a “limited nuclear war”. But the realization of a limited nuclear war was an impossibility, the critics emphasised. Wars always risked expanding. Moreover, the plans on a limited nuclear war made a first strike more likely. Consequently, the new weapons changed the premises of the doctrine of deterrence, which now not only demanded readiness to retaliate, but also to attack.

Deterrence: Upholding the Balance

Not all participants agreed that nuclear deterrence created an illusion of security. The world was a more secure place as long as the terror balance subsisted, the Lutheran Bishop David W. Preuss from USA emphasised. According to him, the terror balance was also to be seen in light of its peace-making function. Dr. Neville Linton from the Methodist Church in Trinidad
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underscored that thanks to the terror balance the world had not yet experienced a Third World War.\textsuperscript{258} To promote the system of deterrence did not necessarily mean to defend all its aspects. Few accepted the intention to attack centres of civilian population. Deterrence was commonly viewed as a step towards disarmament and not as an end in itself.\textsuperscript{259} In the present reality it was considered to be the best of choices. The advocators emphasised that they faced the world as it was, not as it ought to be. They were realists and not idealists. The system of deterrence was assessed to give a sort of peace, which was less than the idealists’ desires, but which at some time benefited all.\textsuperscript{260} The old Roman motto, that one should arm for war if one wanted peace, “Si vis pacem, para bellum”, was still valid.\textsuperscript{261} The system of deterrence protected the nation state, which was the best-known means of securing peace and a relatively just order. The state had a duty to defend its inhabitants and political values. It was a utopia that a nation state would take a pacifist stance, since that would destabilize the system of mutually assured destruction and increase the likelihood of nuclear war.\textsuperscript{262} Journalists were criticising the organisers of the Life and Peace Conference for not highlighting these assertions, which proved that deterrence well could be morally justified.\textsuperscript{263}

The conference was censured for its one-sided focus on the problem of nuclear armament. Since the Soviet Union was superior in possession of conventional weapons and the United States in nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament would destabilize the terror balance in favour of the Soviet security policy.\textsuperscript{264} The Archbishop of the Church of Sweden was criticised for having turned into a politician who, with pacifist motives, interfered in the top-level international politics.\textsuperscript{265} Olof Sundby, himself a former officer in the reserve, answered to this criticism that the conference’s focus on nuclear weapons was due to the acute threat that these weapons levelled at the world.\textsuperscript{266} The conference also received criticism for not dealing with the issue of peace from the viewpoint of freedom. Cases of persecuted Christians in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union were highlighted by journalists, as well as by people who
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demonstrated outside Uppsala Cathedral during the conference. They claimed that the selection of conference participants was lopsided in favour of the Soviet policy and called into question why no representatives from the persecuted churches participated in the conference. On the contrary, there was a rich representation from those churches approved to by the Soviet regime and, consistently, there was a poor representation of American church leaders who supported the agenda of their government. The conference was pointed out as a mouthpiece of Soviet security policy. This criticism was sharply rejected by the organisers of the conference: Exit permits for representatives from the persecuted churches would have been very difficult to bring about. Regarding the aspect of political freedom, the time was not considered sufficient in order to deliberate the issue of peace from the viewpoint of separate cases. Moreover, it was emphasised that the participants had been carefully selected in close cooperation with regional ecumenical organisations and that great efforts had been made in order to achieve a wide representation regarding theological as well as political affiliations.

A Message of Compromise

The conference participants stated in the Message that the emergence of the nuclear weapons had brought the world into a new age of terror. They declared that the concept of limited nuclear war had rendered the doctrine of nuclear deterrence increasingly dangerous and appealed for pledges by the Governments for no-first-use of nuclear weapons. The current political and military doctrine of nuclear deterrence had to be challenged. However, the conference was marked by the split positions on the issue of deterrence, also within the different confessional affiliations that were represented. The doctrine of deterrence formed the tight spot that was debated until the very last minutes of the conference. The drafting committee even spent the night before Saturday, which was the last day of negotiations, figuring out new formulations. When still no common position was achieved on Saturday afternoon and the time for the press conference was exceeded, the Orthodox Professor Vitaly
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Borovoy from Switzerland delivered the timely formulations that released the negotiations from interlocking. The formulations implied a compromise. They mirrored the different standpoints that were represented in the assembly.275

Most of us believe that from the Christian standpoint reliance upon the threat and possible use of nuclear weapons is unacceptable as a way of avoiding war. Some are willing to tolerate nuclear deterrence only as a temporary measure in the absence of alternatives. To most of us, however, the possession of nuclear weapons is inconsistent with the faith in God, our concept of creation and with our membership in Christ’s universal body. Nuclear deterrence is essentially dehumanising, it increases fear and hatred, and entrenches confrontation between “the enemy and us”. Most of us therefore believe that the existence of these weapons contradicts the will of God. For all of us obedience to that will demands a resolute effort within a specified time-limit for their total elimination.276

The Churches as Actors for Common Security

Upholding a World Conscience

The disagreement turned into renewed agreement when the topic of the churches’ common task and interior capability was brought up for discussion. René Coste emphasised that the churches were obliged to awaken a world conscience of solidarity. In a civilization permeated by distrust, the churches played an important role in the promotion of values such as fellowship, cooperation, dialogue and responsibility for future generations.277 The UN Deputy Secretary General Jan Mårtensson stressed the importance of the development of an international conscience, in order to realise the UN’s goal of a peaceful world civilization. In having great impact on people’s values and outlooks, the churches were significant actors in the construction of such a conscience.278 The interdependence based on military interlocking was to be replaced by an interdependence built on judicial, non-violent, communication in line with the UN’s regulations.279 In his speech to the Life and Peace Conference Olof Palme emphasised that the churches also played a crucial role in the construction of mutual confidence between nations.280
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Building Mutual Confidence

According to Olof Sundby, the churches were important *peace educators* in the divided world society.\(^{281}\) The critical state in the world called for a new moral world order.\(^{282}\) Not technical development, but further education in moral issues, was the key to the locked positions. By their special competence in the field of moral issues, the churches could leave a considerable contribution to peace education.\(^{283}\) This sense of morality was based in the human objective of living a life in the imitation of Christ, the Prince of Peace.\(^{284}\) In his sermon at the Opening Service, Sundby quoted the prophet Isaiah.\(^{285}\)

> For every boot of the trampling warrior in battle tumult and every garment rolled in blood will be burned as fuel to the fire. For to us a child is born, to us a son is given: and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called “Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Prince of Peace”. (Is. 9: 5-6)

> He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. (Is. 2:4)\(^{286}\)

Christians should, contrary to the principle of vengeance, live a life in the service of others and through their faith in Christ mediate hope, consolation and confidence to a humanity that lived under constant threat of war.\(^{287}\) The churches were called to incorporate the reconciliation they preached. In view of their interior wars and dissensions through history, the churches did, however, risk loosing credibility in their role as peace educators.\(^{288}\) John Pobee highlighted the present situation, in which Christians from both blocs armed themselves against their Christian brothers and sisters on the other side of the border. He agitated against the mutual indifference that was shown regarding this fact and referred to Revelation:\(^{289}\)

> I know your works; you are neither cold nor hot. Would that you were cold or hot! So because you are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew you out of my mouth.... so be zealous and repent. (Rev. 15-16, 19)\(^{290}\)
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According to Sundby, the church had to set its hopes to the great changes that had taken place in the last century, during which the churches had developed an *internationalism* that was contrasted to the widespread nationalism in the world.²⁹¹ According to Dr. Andrew Kirk from the Church of England, being a Christian meant being an internationalist.²⁹² He pointed out that the issue of nationhood might cause conflicts of loyalty for a Christian. He challenged the participants by posing the question if not the loyalty to one’s nation was relative in comparison to one’s loyalty to the church. The nation was transitory and designed for the limited and ambiguous life of the human being in the world, but the church was permanent and would remain in the fulfilment of God’s promises of a new heaven and a new earth. Consequently, Christians were rather obliged to stress their solidarity with Christians in other countries than with non-Christians in their own nation.²⁹³

John Stott emphasised that God’s commonwealth existed beyond borders of nationality, gender and ethnicity. In their mission of being a sign and incorporation of the kingdom of God, the churches were to model this border-crossing community in the world.²⁹⁴ The trans-national ecumenical network did, according to Christa Lewek, provide the churches with unique tools for dismantling the enemy images that upheld the system of deterrence. The process towards a renewed mutual confidence would, first of all, imply self-critical investigation of what portraits of the adversary the own Christian tradition might support. Secondly, it would entail identification of stereotypes and reciprocal critical correction of publicly accepted or unreasoned conceptions of the enemy. Subsequently, common activities aiming at a deepened mutual understanding would take place at different levels of the churches’ organization. Mutual accountability between the churches promoted growing reciprocal understanding at the political level, Lewek maintained.²⁹⁵ In this way the churches could work together as a vehicle for international confidence building.²⁹⁶

*A Message on Common Security*

The participants of the Life and Peace Conference confessed in the Message their failure to live out the Gospel and challenge the arms race. For this they repented. They stated that
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security of nations was not created through seeking superiority over others. Only common security made all secure. They promoted the creation of an alternative international security system, based on common security and interlinked with steps towards disarmament. In favour of these strivings, the authority of the UN was to be upheld and extended. The participants challenged the Governments to implement and broaden confident building measures between East and West in the military and humanitarian spheres. The churches were encouraged to develop peace education programmes, to support Governments to develop strategies for common security and to change distorted enemy images. Moreover, Christians were urged to non-cooperation with their nation’s preparations for nuclear war and inspired to explore possible non-violent use of civil obedience as means of protest against nuclear armament.297

Concluding Remarks
The Life and Peace Conference did not aim at a peace that only implied exterior order. It aimed at a wider peace concept, which was based on the trust in God as the source of peace and which implied justice, freedom, solidarity and fellowship. These intrinsic values of peace the churches were expected to spread in their mission as upholders of a world conscience. The churches were, by political authorities from the UN and the Swedish Government, acknowledged as important actors in constructing an international conscience and building mutual confidence between nations. Faith based diplomacy was a recognized force. When used in the service of peace, the religion’s impact on patterns of norms and values was a great resource. The close cooperation between the churches and political authorities in the accomplishment of the conference displayed the interaction between track-one and track-two diplomacy. The churches were also acknowledged as important peacemakers owing to their international character. The ecumenical network connected Christians from different political camps. Seen from the perspective of Thórdarson’s method of liminal thinking, Christians had been drawn apart from each other through affiliation to different ideologies. They had become isolated in their own liminal worlds and lost their common ground. But through the ecumenical network they were provided with a platform for sharing their liminal worlds, in order to construct new common grounds. I conclude that the Life and Peace Conference provided such a platform for liminal sharing between the churches. Their mutual confidence, which was the fruit of the liminal sharing, was by the participants regarded as the very precondition for the churches of being a vehicle for international confidence building.

297 “The Message”, 4-7, 9-11
It is my view that the approach of the Life and Peace Conference further can be compared to the ideas of Nathan Söderblom. Just as the conference participants, Söderblom maintained that the churches were to create a conscience among the peoples, which was characterized by solidarity and justice. In common action and spirit, the churches were to work out the ethical credo and form the very soul of the League of Nations, the forerunner to the UN. He emphasised that the Christian community existed beyond the limits of nationality and ethnicity. It was based on the principles of human equality and love to one’s neighbour and was therefore a model for the wider world community. Nevertheless, Söderblom stressed that the realization of these theses was dependent on ecumenical cooperation between the churches. Just as the conference participants, he maintained that without interior peace the churches were not worthy of imitation. For Söderblom, the law and administration of justice was the royal road to peace. He referred to the words of the prophet Isaiah (2:4), which also Sundby quoted in his opening sermon. Söderblom stressed that the prophet not only indicated the mode of procedure, but also the point of time for the entrance of world peace: Only when justice had been administrated for the peoples, they would beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Therefore, the churches were obliged to support the construction of a supranational legal system that would regulate the international relations. Söderblom, who during his last years became increasingly radicalised, although not pacifist, in his peace policy, insisted on a rule fixed by the churches, which prescribed the Christian not to follow the own Government’s order on war of aggression. Just as was proclaimed in the Message of the Life and Peace Conference, he advocated loyalty to the international Christian community, rather than to the single nation.
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PROMOTERS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Agents for the Peace of Humanity

It is possible to trace lines of thought between the Life and Peace Conference and the Fourth General Assembly of the WCC in 1968, which also took place in Uppsala. Konrad Raiser explained that the paradigm of Christocentric Universalism, which had dominated the discourse of the WCC from its very start in 1948, declined in the end of the 1960s. Simultaneously the new paradigm of Third World Theology developed. This paradigm shift marked a critical juncture in the history of the WCC. The definite breakthrough of the new paradigm took place in connection to the fourth assembly of the WCC in Uppsala in 1968. Peter Lodberg did, however, maintain that the reorientation of the ecumenical movement had begun already at the WCC conference on Church and Society in 1966. At this assembly, world development had been considered in terms of revolutionary change of the social world order, rather than in the sense of assistance and aid. Ernst Lange described this reorientation as a shift from theology to anthropology, from theoretical reflection to direct involvement. The focus of attention had moved into the area of social ethics. Carl-Reinhold Bråkenhielm explained that the socio-political engagement of the churches was newly awakened at the assembly in 1968, but deepened gradually. By the time of the Life and Peace Conference, it was solidly anchored. The Message was a forceful expression of this engagement, in which the “vertical” dimension of faith and the “horizontal” dimension of life, the spiritual and the worldly kingdoms, were brought together. Not everyone approved of the close connection between the spiritual and social spheres, but the fact that over 150 church leaders and experts from about 60 countries were gathered around the Message was a sign of the times.

The successive anchorage of the ideas from 1968 was a process, which permeated the discourse of the WCC. It was said that the world had set the agenda at the assembly in Uppsala 1968. Its unofficial theme was “the unity of humankind”. Liberation Theology, which was a strong underlying feature in the paradigm of Third World Theology, confronted
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the ecumenical movement with challenges that questioned the very agenda of ecumenism. According to José Míguez Bonino, the ecumenical movement was called to widen its scope. Its task was not only to work for unity in faith, but also for unity in the consequences of faith: in social and political action. Therefore, the starting point of ecumenism was to be taken in the concrete and particular contexts of the poor and suffering. Its approach was not to be transcendent. According to Bonino, ecumenism did not only mean the unity of the church, but also the unity of humanity. Consequently, identification with the poor and suffering humanity was, for the church, the only way to identify with Christ. At the assembly in 1968 the growing global interdependence was highlighted. In this situation the churches were called to work for a peaceful community of all humanity. In this way, the goal of the ecumenical movement was redefined. Its aim was no longer solely the unity of the churches, as in the paradigm of Christocentric Universalism, but also the unity of mankind. The unity of the churches was to be a sign to humanity wherever the unity of human society was threatened. In the aftermath of the Uppsala assembly 1968, the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC initiated the study programme “The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind.”

The new goal of the unity of humankind was guiding, when the fifth assembly of the WCC in Nairobi in 1975 formulated a new ideal for society: The “Just, Participatory and Sustainable Society” (JPSS). Lewis S. Mudge maintains that this assembly manifested the growing impact of Liberation Theology on ecumenical thought and action. The ideal of the “Responsible Society”, which had been a leading criterion for the work of the WCC since its initiation in 1948, was increasingly criticised, not least by the new member churches in the Third World. The ideal of the responsible society had been formulated in the aftermath of the Second World War, when there was a strong concern to construct a peaceful dialogue between the world’s Eastern and Western powers. It was a social-ethical criterion, against which capitalism as well as communism could be critically evaluated. The responsible society was a democratic society, in which the citizens and the political authority were responsibility for justice and public order. But for the members from the Third World, who for long time
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had lived under colonizing structures, the responsible society appeared to support a status quo, rather than the revolutionary social change they urged for.\textsuperscript{316} The new ideal of a just, participatory and sustainable society, on the other hand, arose from the concrete reality of the poor. As it was an ideal of a just society, it combated systematic injustice, which was the root of poverty. As a participatory society, it would make the poor subjects and not objects of their own history. As a sustainable society, it was governed in faithfulness with God’s creation, which it sought to preserve from environmental damage and uneven distribution of resources.\textsuperscript{317} The agenda of the JPSS guided the work of the WCC until its sixth assembly in Vancouver in the summer of 1983.\textsuperscript{318} Accordingly, the guidelines of the JPSS belonged to the contextual framework, in which the Life and Peace Conference was accomplished.

\textbf{No Peace without Justice}

\textit{A Global Approach}

More than one third of the participants at the Life and Peace Conference came from countries in the so-called Third World.\textsuperscript{319} Their approach to the issue of peace exceeded the conference’s theme, which focussed more narrowly on the nuclear threat. Their contribution to the negotiations threw different light on the concept of peace. This stirred the conference agenda up.\textsuperscript{320} In the age of globalisation, the issue of \textit{peace} could not possibly be discussed without consideration of the \textit{justice}. This was forcefully expressed in the sermon of the Brasilian Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Arns already at the Opening Service of the conference.\textsuperscript{321} The words of the prophet Isaiah (32:17) “And the effect of righteousness shall be peace” were highlighted.\textsuperscript{322} The views of the participants from the Third World were met with much sympathy from the other participants. The issues of justice and human rights had, indeed,
been treated in the Life and Peace Document. Already in the preparatory work of the Organization Committee and the IPC these issues had been of great concern. The organisers explained that the reasons for the delimitation of the theme to the nuclear threat were partly the acuteness of this threat, partly the conference’s time limits. Nevertheless, the issues of justice and human rights constantly turned up during the negotiations of the Message. Third World representatives maintained, that if the conference agenda was to be followed, the issue of peace would exclusively be dealt with from the starting point of the rich countries in the Northern part of the world. At a conference that gathered church leaders from the whole world, peace was to be deliberated from a global point of view. Through their contributions to the debate, the global tension that existed between North and South, and not merely between East and West, was highlighted and deliberated. This tension did not concern balance of terror, but rather the lack of balance in the distribution of the earth’s resources.

The threat of nuclear war was, certainly, levelled against the Third World too. Yet, its people could do nothing about it. In the Third World starvation, poverty and oppression were more immediate threats to life and peace than nuclear weapons produced in distant societies. Nevertheless, it was emphasised that the starvation and poverty in the Third World was a consequence of the arms race. If the resources spent on arms in the First and Second Worlds had been invested in food and health care in the Third World, much suffering would have been prevented and the cleavage between the world’s rich and poor countries would not have been so deep. Disarmament and development were immediately connected. After the presentation of the first draft of the conference Message, on the Friday afternoon the 22nd of April, there was a widely spread discontent among the participants from the Third World. In this draft, the issue of justice had been allotted a remote place. After that, speaker after speaker raised the issues of injustice and violation of the human rights in the Third World, in
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order to get these themes reflected in the Message. The peace concept of the conference was to be widened, these participants maintained. They argued that if peace was promoted in accordance with the Old Testament concept *shalom*, the conference would embrace a more comprehensive peace concept.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^0\)

**Shalom: A Nuanced Concept**

In the Old Testament literature the Hebrew word *shalom* was used to express interior, personal as well as exterior, structural dimensions of peace. It described personal health and well-being, as well as the individual’s redemption.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^1\) It signified friendliness and restoration of relationships.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^2\) In the larger, structural, context *shalom* designated well-being of the family, the household and the whole nation.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^3\) It denoted contractual peace agreements and embraced the aspect of repayment and restitution. It also designated the abstract dimensions of completeness and totality. Everything that God’s blessing implied was comprehended by the word *shalom*.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^4\) *Shalom* did not only refer to the present. It also aimed at the hope of the new covenant between God and his people in the future. This new community, in which God ruled the nations, was described by the prophet Isaiah (2: 3-4), who told that “nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore”.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^5\) Accordingly, *shalom* implied the “horizontal” peace between human beings, as well as the “vertical” peace between God and man. Peace with God was the very condition for the realization of *shalom* on earth.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^6\) Importantly, *shalom* between human beings did not simply imply absence of war. It also signified social harmony and just living conditions.\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^7\) The very precondition of *shalom* was that the social well-being was constructed by justice, *tsedhaqah*. (Heb.).\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^8\)

**A Message on Justice**

The viewpoints of the participants from the Third World had a clear breakthrough in the final Message of the Life and Peace Conference. It was stated that the struggle for peace involved more than overcoming violent conflict. This struggle also involved resistance against unjust
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structures. The participants established that peace and justice were inseparably linked. Therefore, they appealed to the churches to mobilise opinion in the interest of peace and justice. They encouraged the churches to search out causes of conflict and trace connections between disarmament and development. They also declared that peace through justice implied equal distribution of the earth’s resources and political systems in which people were participating in preserving and enhancing their rights. The participants challenged the governments to desist from violation of the human rights in the name of national security and to convert the huge military expenditures to peaceful production, especially for the needs of the poor people in the world. The Message highlighted the international weapons trade, which highly increased the number of oppressive military regimes that fostered injustice and violated human rights. The global tension and increased prevalence of weapons created local flashpoints, which risked evolving into nuclear war. For this reason, the participants pleaded for a strict international control over the buying and selling of armaments.\footnote{“The Message”, 5-11 and Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, “Just Peace”, Chicago Theological Seminary, at: ctschicago.edu/pdf/Just_Peace_Germany.pdf, 3, 6-8}

According to the Anglican Dean and later Bishop of Oxford Richard Harries, an important aspect that was not faced in the Message was the tension and eventual contradiction between the endeavours for peace and the struggle for justice. Struggles for justice always ended in conflict, sometimes even in armed conflict. Should then the Christian stress peace or justice most? Harries inquired. He meant that the neglect of this problem gave the conference an air of unreality.\footnote{Church Times 1983-04-29}

Striving towards the Kingdom of God

\textit{Current Struggle and Future Hope}

The tension between the “not yet” and the “but already” in the fulfilment of the kingdom of God was reflected in the deliberations between the participants at the Life and Peace Conference. Elements of \textit{realized eschatology} were salient in the discussion, as the kingdom was viewed both in terms of its futurity and its presence. God’s kingdom was a kingdom of \textit{shalom}: Their very ideal and goal. However, they were not unanimous about the actual role of man in its realization. In one prominent train of thought, elements of \textit{apocalyptic eschatology} were highlighted, emphasising the “not yet”:\footnote{“The Message”, 5-11 and Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, “Just Peace”, Chicago Theological Seminary, at: ctschicago.edu/pdf/Just_Peace_Germany.pdf, 3, 6-8}
Reverend John Stott from the Church of England underscored that even though the original sin had made man unable to fully realize God’s kingdom on earth, Christians were to be hopeful about the future. God would construct what man had failed to. He referred to Mark’s Gospel and stressed that Christians were not to despair when they heard “rumours of wars” (Mk 13:7), because it was “the beginning of the birth-pangs” (Mk 13:8). Out of the ruins of the old order, God would rebirth the universe. Stott also commented on the Second Letter of Peter (3:13), which told that: “…according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells”. He stressed that in striving towards the realization of the kingdom of God, this vision was a source of inspiration. According to Björn Öyvind Fjeld, the kingdom of God was to be viewed in light of its future character. The fulfilment of God’s kingdom would be effected through an eschatological breakthrough, when God would create a new heaven and a new earth. The kingdom of God was already realized, though not completely, through the strivings of the Christian community. The peace of the world would never fully comprehend the eschatological dimension of God’s shalom. René Coste emphasised that man could never create a kingdom identical to the divine. The churches’ strivings were merely a stage on the way towards its consummation. Only Christ would realize God’s kingdom at his advent.

Opposite to the emphasis of “not yet” was the train of thought that more stressed the “but already” of the kingdom. The significance of the act of man was emphasised, in accordance with prophetic eschatology, the Theology of Hope and Liberation Theology:

Olof Sundby underscored that the message of God’s peace, as the very source of human peace, was at the heart of the Gospel. The Gospel was the foundation and motive of the church. Therefore, the churches were called to struggle for world peace. By these endeavours they would spread the eschatological hope about God’s kingdom. According to Alan Geyer, the alarming military development accentuated the Christian calling to promote God’s kingdom of peace. The folly belief in the terror balance and the idolatry of military technology had shaken the very foundations of existence. It was possible for man to end history. This development had plunged man into participation in the utmost things. Therefore,
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man had to be confronted with the width of his responsibility. In order to change the course of events, the churches were called to socio-political action. These common Christian efforts for world peace would foster the interior peace between the churches. The socio-political action was emphasised also by Alan Boesak from South Africa, President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. Striving towards the kingdom of God implied promotion of peace through justice, he stressed. The administration of justice was, for the people in the Third World, closely connected to the struggle for liberation from oppression, starvation and poverty. In this way, the notion of the kingdom of God was viewed as a corrective to worldly social orders. A hymn had been written especially for the Life and Peace Conference by the hymn writer Reverend Fred Kaan from the Reformed Church in England. Its second and third verses read:

We cry from the fright of our daily scene
for strength to say ‘no’ to all that is mean:
designs bearing chaos, extinction of life,
all energy wasted on weapons of death

Come with us, Lord-love, in protest and march,
and help us to fire with passion our church,
to match all our statements and lofty resolve
with being – unresting – in action involved.

Towards a Unity of all Humanity

The negotiations at the Life and Peace Conference reflected a third approach to the realization of the kingdom of God, which did not contrast the aspects of “not yet” and “but already”, but rather brought them together.

This approach was an outcome of Eastern Patristic thought and had been an important feature in the ecumenical theology of the WCC since the end of the 1960s. In the WCC programme “The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind”, initiated in the aftermath of the assembly in Uppsala 1968, the kingdom of God was not only understood as a reality of the future, but also as a goal to strive towards in the presence. Man was in his nature understood as an image of God, an *imago Dei* (Lat.). In every human being there was a “divine spark”. It was this divine presence that made man truly himself. The nature of *imago Dei* determined
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man to deification, *theosis* (Gr.), life in God.\(^{351}\) *Theosis* was the very consummation of salvation.\(^{352}\) Only in communion with God was man fully himself. This meant that God was “participable”.\(^{353}\) The community between the three persons of the Trinity; the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, was characterized by participation in and, simultaneously, by maintenance of each person’s unique features and works. This community in diversity was in Greek called *perichoresis*.\(^{354}\) The term illustrated the movement, in which all of the three persons stretched out to embrace and enfold each other in communion and participation.\(^{355}\) The movement of *perichoresis* has been understood as excluding the existence of any hierarchy between the persons of the Trinity. The term depicted their oneness as well as them being three autonomous persons. *Perichoresis* has been interpreted as being the divine analogy for the unity of humankind and of human society, in which cultural diversities could be reconciled in a unity of plurality.\(^{356}\) Being created in the image of God, the Holy Spirit worked in every human being. Trinitarian life was opened for the participation of man.\(^{357}\)

The *perichoresis* of the Trinity gave a pattern for the unity of the churches: A unity that the churches were called to mediate to all humanity. This was a work, provided by the Trinity, which aimed at drawing humanity into the communion with God. Its utmost goal was salvation through humanity’s deification, *theosis*.\(^{358}\) For the churches, this task implied the liberation of man from the dependency and slavery of this world. Accordingly, being a Christian involved commitment to make the world more just and more human. This commitment was an inherent part of salvation history. Nevertheless, it was only in the future fulfilment of the kingdom of God that the full convergence of the unity of the church and the unity of mankind would take place. The unity of the church worked as an *anticipation* of the unity of mankind.\(^{359}\) In this way, the eschatological process towards the unity of mankind, in
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which the churches played a key role, embraced the tension between the “not yet” and the “but already” in the realization of the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{360}

At the Life and Peace Conference, this complex of thought was reflected. It was emphasised that the source of \textit{shalom} was the Trinitarian peaceful relation between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the \textit{perichoresis}. Accordingly, the peaceful community that the churches were called to promote for all humanity was to be created in analogy with the Trinitarian community.\textsuperscript{361} According to the Finnish Lutheran Dean Maunu Sinnemäki, the churches anticipated the coming event of the realization of God’s kingdom when they worked for peace among men.\textsuperscript{362} A significant contribution of the churches in the work for peace was their common ecumenical strivings towards a unity of the churches. This unity anticipated the future unity of humanity and was a sign that delivered hope to a world permeated by division and conflict.\textsuperscript{363} The word \textit{ecumenism} was now to be understood in its original sense, as \textit{oikoumene} (Gr.): The whole, inhabited world. A multiplicity of national, political and religious identities were to be included in the all-embracing peace movement of ecumenism.\textsuperscript{364} Consequently, the churches were to cooperate with people of other faiths, yes, with all men of good will, in their endeavours for peace.\textsuperscript{365} However, the \textit{nature} of the relations with people of other or no faith was hardly discussed during the conference. In focus was the conference’s \textit{functional} goal: Cooperation in the making of world peace.

The Bible study, which was conducted by Allan Boesak, treated the passage in the Letter of Paul to the Ephesians that concerned the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles in Christ (2:14-22).\textsuperscript{366}

\begin{quote}
For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end. (Eph. 2:14-16)\textsuperscript{367}
\end{quote}
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According to Carl-Reinhold Bråkenhielm, the reconciliation in Christ was interpreted in more general terms at the conference. It was understood in terms of the coming unity of all humanity. In Christ all humanity was one universal family. By giving himself on the cross for the salvation of all people, Christ had abolished all barriers caused by nationality, ethnicity or social culture. The unity in the calling of Christ to salvation and reconciliation and the community in the kinship with Adam, were realities that should make all humanity turn around when they were facing the abyss of extinction that they had created for themselves through their internal divisions.

A Message on the Peace of All Humanity

In the Message it was stated that the prevailing world order, which caused and sustained misery and insecurity, was under God’s judgement. The threat to use nuclear weapons, capable of extinguishing the human race, represented an ultimate arrogance against God, who alone ruled over life and death. Humanity faced the final choice between life and death. Accordingly, humanity had reached a juncture, at which the churches were called to live and proclaim the message of the Gospel with new urgency. The churches were called to be a sign of future hope for a humanity that lived under threat of extinction. Due to their calling to promote peace, the churches could not escape political involvement.

The participants stated that the churches urgently had to seek cooperation with men and women of good will, who did not share their faith, but were united in their desire to create conditions for peace. They challenged the churches to support individuals and groups involved in peace work, whether Christian or other. They also challenged the churches to cooperate in the movement towards Christian unity and stated that the interior division between the churches weakened their witness to peace. They highlighted the movement towards Christian unity as a great sign of hope and stressed that at this precise moment in history, when division threatened the survival of humanity, the Holy Spirit was leading his people to discover a unity that transcended all divisions. Moreover, the Message promoted political systems that preserved and enhanced the dignity of all human beings, as created in the image of God. The participants challenged the governments to desist from offence of this
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dignity. Life in abundance and peace as the fruit of justice were gifts that God offered through Christ to all humanity, the Message declared.  

Concluding Remarks
The participants at the Life and Peace Conference approached the issue of the realization of the kingdom of God slightly different. Their viewpoints mirrored a spectrum of different approaches to eschatology. Realized eschatology, acknowledging the kingdom as already present through the coming of Christ, was foundational in the discussions. Some participants emphasised God’s act in the irruptive coming of the kingdom, as was the principal thesis of apocalyptic eschatology. Some rather emphasised the act of man in the construction of the kingdom here and now, as was suggested in Liberation Theology and prophetic eschatology. Simultaneously, the expectation of God’s future establishment of his kingdom was a salient trait. In accordance with the Theology of Hope, this expectation encouraged socio-political action. In the approach that aimed at a unity of all humanity, the “not yet” and the “but already” of the realization of the kingdom of God converged. In the endeavours of drawing humanity into the perichoretical community of the Trinity, the churches contributed to the realization of theosis and anticipated the coming of the kingdom of God.

In spite of different emphases, all agreed about the urgent need for action, in order to change the course of history in favour of peace. This common social engagement corresponded to the incentives of the new paradigm of Third World Theology. Not least were the requirements for a greater emphasis on just social structures and human rights an expression of the effectiveness of this paradigm. The context of the WCC, which at this time included members from the whole world, influenced the Life and Peace Conference. Consequently, the conference’s original theme of nuclear war, which primarily concerned the countries in the Northern part of the world, was rejected. It did not correspond to peace as it was outlined in the prevailing paradigm. Accordingly, there was initially a discrepancy between the aims of the conference and its participants’ conceptions of global peace. This discrepancy was overcome, as the scope of approaches was widened.

Promoting a Just Peace
The peace concept that was adopted by the Life and Peace Conference was advocated in terms of shalom. Simultaneously with the carrying out of the Life and Peace Conference, a
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movement emerged in ecumenical organisations and churches over the world, advocating a 
just peace. Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite defines just peace exactly as shalom.\textsuperscript{372} Although the 
term “just peace” was not used at the Life and Peace Conference, I conclude that the 
conference’s course of discussion corresponded with just peace theory, especially when 
considering the contribution from the Third World participants.

The theory of just peace differed from the theory of just war in that it not merely indicated the 
circumstances under which violence was legitimate, but rather marked imperatives for 
prevention of violence. Violence was prevented when the roots of conflict were searched and 
elimininated. Just as the conference participants, the just peace theorists emphasised that the 
roots of conflict to a large extent were hidden in unjust global and societal structures. 
Correspondingly, it was stressed that the promotion of peace necessitated the creation of just 
social and economic conditions. If justice was violated, peace was put at risk. If there was no 
peace, injustice would soon prevail. Just as was stated at the conference, human rights and 
international law had a central place in the theory of just peace. Just peace was not simply 
about distribution of global resources. It was about creating a global “common good”. This 
common good should be interpreted in terms of protection of human rights, through 
attendance to international law. Human rights were by just peace theorists closely related to 
development politics, just as they were by the conference participants.\textsuperscript{373} The chain of issues 
that were interlinked with the promotion of the human rights testify to the vast complex of 
international concerns that were relevant to consider in the realisation of a just peace. I 
contend, that it was exactly this vast complex of issues that the participants from the Third 
World were aiming at when they suggested a widening of the conception of peace at the Life 
and Peace Conference.

I would also like to highlight the reciprocity between the model for construction of a just 
peace and the method of liminal thinking. In likeness with the mutual construction of liminal 
worlds, the first step towards a just peace was the acknowledgement of one’s own and the 
other’s tradition and identity. Thereafter, the partners would strive towards a mutual 
understanding and recognition of each other. Comparably with the setting up of a shared
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liminal world, just peace called for construction of common ground. The basis of this
common ground was the one unique human nature. The construction of the common ground
required renouncement of principles and symbols that justified the ongoing conflict.
Characteristic for the setting up and enhancement of just peace was, however, the strong
emphasis on *rule*. International law, as it was performed through the United Nations, provided
an arena on which each party had to modify its cultural conventions and clarify the reciprocal
respect of particular identities, mutual rights and duties. This normative and contractual
dimension was regarded as central for a durable just peace.\(^{374}\) Corresponding to the method of
liminal sharing, I conclude that the work of the Life and Peace Conference can be referred to
in terms of just peace formation.

**Anticipating Ecumenism as Koinonia**

In accordance with the new paradigm of Third World Theology, the conference adopted a
wide conception of *ecumenism*. The unity of the churches was no longer the sole aim of the
cumenical movement, but a key element in the strivings towards a more far-reaching goal:
The *unity of the whole humanity* in the realization of the kingdom of God. For the strivings
towards this goal the *perichoresis* of the persons of the *Trinity* was referred to as a model for
ecumenical peaceful relations. Nevertheless, it was emphasised that the core of the human
unity was the community in Christ, modelled as unity in the *body of Christ*. In other words,
the participants did not work from the starting point of *one* ecumenical model or goal. The
unity of humanity, the Trinity and the body of Christ were all models or goals referred to in
the illustration of the ecumenical potential for peacemaking. I contend that the ecumenical
approach of the Life and Peace Conference anticipated the ecumenical concept of *koinonia*
(Gr.).

The concept of *koinonia* emerged as a motivating idea of the ecumenical movement in the
beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century, but came to the fore as an ecumenical model at the Faith and
Order Conference in Santiago de Compostela in 1993.\(^{375}\) Accordingly, it was not applied to at
the Life and Peace Conference. Still, its guiding principles were salient in the conference’s
ekumenical approach: *Koinonia*, which commonly is translated as “community”, might be
illustrated as the Christian unity in the *body of Christ*. It also depicted the *perichoresis* of the

\(^{374}\) Pierre Allan, Alexis Keller, *What is a Just Peace?* (Oxford University Press, 2006), 197-209 and Thórdarson,
“Reconstructing”, 267-269

\(^{375}\) J.-M.R. Tillard, ”Koinonia” in *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement, 2\(^{nd}\) edition*, N. Lossky et. al., eds.,
(Geneva: WCC Publications, 2002), 646-647
persons of the Trinity, into which all humanity was to be drawn in the future theosis.\textsuperscript{376} Accordingly, it also referred to relations of Christians with people of other or no faith. The concept of koinonia originated in the word koinon, which signified what were in common, irrespective religious belongings. In line with the concept of koinonia, the Life and Peace Conference promoted values as fellowship, participation, interrelation, respect for differences and sharing of the earth’s resources. In likeness with the concept, the conference also stressed that all human beings were created in the imago Dei and called to communion with God and one another.\textsuperscript{377} Koinonia signified the “vertical” relation between God and man as much as the “horizontal” relation between human beings.\textsuperscript{378} God’s shalom was to permeate all human relations and, just as was emphasised at the Life and Peace Conference, koinonia conveyed shalom based on justice.\textsuperscript{379}

**The Closing of the Conference**

There was a widespread satisfaction among the participants about the final Message. All participants approved of the fourth and last draft, save for ten persons, among which nine abstained and only one was negative.\textsuperscript{380} Relieved, the members of the drafting committee ran to the Closing Service in Uppsala Cathedral, which had been delayed for several minutes, expecting the arrival of the final Message.\textsuperscript{381} Though announced in the agenda, the Message was, however, not recited during the service.\textsuperscript{382} At the end of the closing worship there was a sending forth in the name of peace, when Archbishop John Vikström quoted the Great Commission, “Go therefore and make disciples”. At that point teenager girls and boys passed among the participants and placed wooden crosses around their necks and whispered to each person: “Go to your home country and work for peace”.\textsuperscript{383} The Life and Peace Conference ended next day in Stockholm. Many of the conference participants had contributed to services in different parishes in Stockholm that day. In processions of demonstrators from the four

---


\textsuperscript{379} Best, Gassmann, *On the Way*, 272 and “The Message”, 5

\textsuperscript{380} Crow, “World Conference”, 2

\textsuperscript{381} Interview with Åke Blomqvist 2007-01-25


\textsuperscript{383} Crow, “World Conference”, 3
cardinal points about 10 000 persons gathered at the Sergel Square in Stockholm city for a great manifestation for peace. At this open-air meeting the Life and Peace Conference concluded.384

Immediate Outcomes of the Message

The most visible result of the Life and Peace Conference was the establishment of the Life and Peace Institute in 1985.385 It was a direct follow-up of the directions of the Message, which requested the creation of an international Christian peace institute, in order to develop peace programmes that encouraged Christians to search out causes of conflict, think theologically, explore Christian concepts of non-violent resistance to evil and trace the connections between disarmament and development.386

The sixth General Assembly of the WCC in Vancouver, which the Life and Peace Conference had aimed at influencing, included the issues of the Message in its agenda. These issues were, however, only attended by one of its committees and, accordingly, it constituted merely a limited part of its programme.387 It must be remembered, however, that the WCC Assemblies primarily considered statements produced by churches or ecumenical organizations.388 The Message of the Life and Peace Conference was, on the other hand, a statement produced by individuals who only represented themselves in their decisions.389 That made the Message less authoritative officially.

I conclude that the Message rather had a character of manifestation.

Nevertheless, the Message of the Life and Peace Conference was thoroughly deliberated at the Swedish National Christian Meeting in Jönköping in 1983.390 At this meeting the Swedish churches and congregations acknowledged the Message in its entirety.391

The Life and Peace Conference did not primarily affect the churches on the local, grassroots level. It was a conference that first and foremost addressed church leaders and politicians.392

Among them the Life and Peace Conference served as a contribution of the churches to the

385 Ryman, “From Life and Peace”, 79
386 “The Message”, 11
387 Interview with Jonas Jonson 2007-01-26
389 “Rules of Procedure”
390 In Swedish: Kristna Riksmötet, “J-83”.
391 Interview with Evert Svensson 2007-01-19
392 Interview with Åke Blomqvist 2007-01-25 and Interview with Evert Svensson 2007-01-19
international debate about peacemaking in the Second Cold War era.\textsuperscript{393} A principal result of the conference was the broad influx of over 150 church leaders and experts around the far-reaching demands of the Message.\textsuperscript{394} Not least, the Life and Peace Conference was going down in history thanks to its broad international and confessional representation, which was manifesting the international Christian concern for peace.\textsuperscript{395}

\textsuperscript{393} Interview with Margareta Grape 2007-01-23
\textsuperscript{394} Dahlén, ”Budskapets”, 127-128
\textsuperscript{395} Skjelsbaek, ”Kristen etik”, 135
CONCLUSION

The concepts of peace and ecumenism, which prevailed and were mutually interrelated at the Life and Peace Conference, should, in my view, be seen in the light of the fusion of contexts in which the conference was situated: At an institutional level the conference can be seen as a bridge between the WCC and the Church of Sweden; at a theological level it was characterized by interaction between the Western theological paradigm of Christian Universalism and the emerging paradigm of Third World Theology.

The Concept of Peace

I conclude that the concept of peace at the Life and Peace Conference was characterized by the notion of just peace, but expressed in terms of shalom. It was an approach to peace that gave consideration to the roots of conflict. These roots were, in accordance with the paradigm of Third World Theology, discerned in unjust social and global structures. Peace implied, in other words, the establishment of justice. The negotiations at the conference started with reference to the criteria of just war, establishing that nuclear war could not be reconciled with these criteria. However, the negotiations ended in statements on the necessity to create a just peace, in which the prevention of war was emphasised, in order to create a global common good. This common good was to be based on human rights and international law, promoted through a strengthened UN. In this manner the conference’s concept of peace was enlarged to embrace a global approach. The unjust relations between the North and South were attended to as well as the tensed relationships between East and West. This approach corresponded with the contemporary global approach of the WCC. Furthermore, the peace promoted at the Life and Peace Conference was based on international common security, in contrast with the strivings for national military superiority that dominated Cold War politics. The emphasis on common security mirrored the contemporary Swedish foreign policy, for which Olof Palme was a prominent figure. However, I assume that the peace concept of the Life and Peace Conference was not limited to exterior, societal dimensions. As it aimed at the ideal of shalom, it was primarily a peace between man and God. This “vertical” dimension of peace was the very condition of the “horizontal” peace between human beings. Genuine peace was constructed on the trust in God rather than dependence on human power. The kingdom of God, which was a kingdom of shalom, could only be fulfilled by a divine act. Nevertheless, it was emphasised that the common mission of the churches was to strive towards its realization in promoting a peace of all humanity.
The Concept of Ecumenism

I conclude that the concept of ecumenism at the Life and Peace Conference corresponded to the ecumenical conception of koinonia. During the conference, the unity of humanity was highlighted as a primary ecumenical goal. This goal was immediately connected to the strivings towards the realization of the kingdom of God. Through drawing humanity into the perichoretical communion with God, the churches contributed to the humanity’s deification, theosis, which was the ultimate consummation of salvation. In this mission, the churches anticipated the future coming of the kingdom of God, in which the unity of the church and the unity of humanity finally would converge. The focus on the unity of humanity indicated on the effectiveness of the paradigm of Third World Theology. Ecumenism was to be understood in its original Greek sense, as oikoumene: The whole inhabited world. Simultaneously, the paradigm of Christian Universalism was reflected, when the Christian unity in the body of Christ was modelled as the very core of the unity of humanity. Accordingly, the concept of ecumenism at the Life and Peace Conference addressed both Christian unity and the unity of all humanity. The ecumenical concept of koinonia comprises the ecumenical models from both paradigms. The unity of the churches was understood as the key element in the ecumenical strivings towards the realization of the unity of humanity. Unity among the churches in both action and spirit were fundamental in these strivings. The notions of the unity of the churches and the unity of Christian individuals were used interchangeably at the conference. However, I conclude that the ecumenical approach of the Life and Peace Conference was functional: Rather than reflection on the mode of its ecumenical structure, it aimed at practical co-operation in service of world peace.

Even though the ecumenical concept of the Life and Peace Conference was expanded beyond the life of the churches, to the unity of all humanity, it remained ecclesiocentric. The unity in Christ was the core of the unity of humanity. In this respect the conference did not reflect the work of the WCC, which since 1971 had been developing a programme on “dialogue with people of living faiths and ideologies” (DFI). Guidelines for this work were published by the WCC in 1979. At the Life and Peace Conference, however, the relations to people of other faiths were merely referred to in terms of cooperation for the sake of peace. Its ecumenical concept did not embrace other religions. In this way, the Life and Peace Conference deviated from the context of the WCC.

396 See: "Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies” on www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/interreligious/77glines-e.html
The Interrelation of Ecumenism and Peace

I conclude that the strivings for peace and ecumenism were interrelated through the mediating role that the churches assumed at the Life and Peace Conference. The conference participants promoted a peace based on international common security. Simultaneously, they stressed the common role of the churches as builders of mutual international confidence for the establishment of the common security. The participants advocated a strengthened authority of the UN. At the same time, they emphasised the churches’ common mission to be upholders of an international conscience, in order to realise a peaceful world civilization. The churches were to model the peaceful community for the rest of the world. In order to set a good example, the interior peace between the churches was of utmost importance. Now, the relations between the churches were not only peaceful. Consequently, the common Christian striving for world peace was a driving force for the improvement of the ecumenical relations. In this way, I contend that ecumenism and peace work conditioned each other in the work at the Life and Peace Conference.

I conclude that ecumenism, at the conference, was not seen as an end in itself, but as an important means for creating a peaceful community of all humanity. The special possibilities for peace work that the churches were equipped with, in being a worldwide border-crossing community, were emphasised. These possibilities laid a responsibility upon the churches to act as mediators in international conflict. In accordance with the contemporary context of the WCC, the Life and Peace Conference placed loyalty to the international community of the churches above loyalty individual nations. However, it was also acknowledged that churches through history had promoted conflicts. The conference emphasised that religion could be a source of peace as well as a source of conflict, as it had large influence on individuals’ conceptions of truth and reality. I conclude that the participants worked along the guidelines of faith-based diplomacy, when they encouraged religious leaders to use their power of influence in the service of peace. If religious leaders through common ecumenical efforts worked for peace, they could show that religion was a force to count with in international peacemaking.

I contend that the Life and Peace Conference promoted a just peace. The establishment of a just peace relied on attention to the common ground in the unique human nature. This, I conclude, corresponded with the new goal of ecumenism, which was exactly the unity of
humanity: A goal developed within the paradigm of Third World Theology. This goal entailed co-operation of Christians with people of other or no faith in the endeavours for world peace.

The Life and Peace Conference was organised within the context of the Church of Sweden, which in accordance with the heritage from Nathan Söderblom was taking on the role of being a bridge church for the establishment of ecumenical and international peaceful relations. The analysis in this dissertation has shown that the Life and Peace Conference certainly worked as a bridge, or a platform, for such relationships. In terms of the theoretical foundations of this dissertation, the conference can be said to have provided space for the creation of a shared liminal world, in accordance with Thórdarson’s method of liminal thinking. Liminal sharing was an important condition for the dismantling of enemy pictures, as stressed by Lewek, and the construction of a just peace, as outlined by Allan and Keller. It may thus be concluded that the contexts of the WCC and the Church of Sweden and the paradigms of Third World Theology and Christian Universalism provided crucial preconditions for the accomplishment of the Life and Peace Conference. Nevertheless, I conclude that the perspective of liminal sharing clarifies the importance of the individual actors, in making the shared liminal world a concrete reality: Thanks to the endeavours of individual actors, that took place in interplay with the prevailing contexts, the Life and Peace Conference accomplished its goal of manifesting a common ecumenical position for peace.
SAMMANFATTNING
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INTRODUCTION

It is with great joy we publish the Message of the Life and Peace, Christian World Conference, which was held in Uppsala, Sweden, 20-23 of April, 1983.

For us in the Nordic countries who invited to this Conference it was a great satisfaction that 150 Church leaders and Christian experts from 62 countries accepted to attend. The participants came from many different churches and political backgrounds. Nevertheless, it was possible to unite on most of the crucial issues which are threatening the very survival of humanity, mainly because of the arms race and in particular the devastating nuclear weapons.

However, we all agreed that without justice the arms race will not be stopped and we will not have peace. The economic systems have to care for and equitably distribute the resources of the earth. The principles of self-determination of the nations and non-interference must be upheld and all forms of discrimination must be eliminated.

We urge the participants of the Conference as well as other Christian leaders to bring the Message to the attention of their Governments.

The Message is adopted, and now is the time to go from words to deeds.

Yours in Christ,

On behalf of the Host Committee

Deo Sundby
Archbishop

Gösta Hedberg
President of Free Church council

Olle Dahlén
Ambassador

Ake Blomqvist
Secretary General

THE MESSAGE

We, the participants from many churches in sixty nations gathered together in Uppsala, Sweden from 20th-23rd April 1983 for the Christian World Conference on Life and Peace, send greetings in the name of God the Father who created all things, God the Son who is the Prince of Peace, and God the Holy Spirit who gives life to the world.

During our days together we have debated with deep feeling and a sense of urgency issues of life and death, war and peace, conflict and human dignity which affect people everywhere.

Although we have not reached complete agreement on all points which have arisen, we unanimously affirm our conviction that life in abundance, and the peace which is the fruit of justice, are gifts God offers through Christ to all humankind.

1. THE CHRISTIAN CONCERN FOR LIFE AND PEACE

The Christian gospel is a gospel of peace. From the beginning that gospel has been preached in a violent world. Today, however, we witness violence real or potential, on an unprecedented scale. Institutionalized violence of unjust social, political, military and economic systems holds the whole world in bondage. The advent of nuclear weapons has ushered in a new age of terror. For the first time in history we human beings, always possessed of limited power to destroy, are now capable of wiping out the civilization which has been built up over the previous centuries. Humanity is face to face with the final choice between life and death. The production and threat to use nuclear weapons capable of annihilating
the human race demonstrates an ultimate arrogance before God who alone disposes of life and death.

It is at this crucial juncture in human affairs that Christians are called to proclaim and live the gospel with renewed urgency. That gospel is a message of life and peace, of hope and love, but also of judgment.

God judges the present world order which causes and sustains extensive misery and produces an increasing sense of insecurity.

We have treated the creation as if it were our own, not God’s. As a result we have abused and have disrupted the environment. Because of the misdirection of resources into armaments, millions die, not only in military conflicts, but because they are denied the basic necessities of life. We have not effectively challenged the arms race, which magnifies fear and mistrust, nor the folly of nations which in the pursuit of “security through strength”, increase the world’s insecurity and impede reconciliation.

But the gospel which reveals God’s judgement on human sin proclaims also the hope of salvation. Through the redemptive sacrifice of Christ God has promised that all people can find salvation, come to know the truth (1 Tim. 2:4), and be reconciled (Ephes 2:14). Christians pray and work for peace, not only because their Lord commands it, but because in doing so they affirm their conviction that peace is possible over against the pessimism that declares the contrary.

Moreover, we who have come from many different churches see a great sign of hope in the movements towards Christian unity. At this precise moment in history when division threatens the very survival of the human race the Holy Spirit is driving His people to discover and demonstrate a unity that transcends all divisions.

As we have considered the Christian concern for life and peace we have repented for our failure to preach and practise the gospel of justice, love and reconciliation. We confess that we have not always called war into question as a means of settling conflicts. We have been moved the more urgently to seek cooperation with men and women of goodwill who do not share our faith, but are one with us in our common deep desire to create the conditions of peace.

The world of 1983 is far from peace. Young people are becoming impatient and even losing hope for the future. The poor are crying for a more just and participatory society. Thus, it was with a sense of urgency and deep feeling that we discussed issues of life and death, war and peace.

II. SPECIFIC ISSUES

1) PEACE AND JUSTICE. The Scriptures teach that peace and justice are inseparably linked. There can be no peace without justice. To work for peace is therefore to work for justice as the foundation of peace. This means striving for economic systems which both care for and equitably distribute earth’s resources. Peace through justice also calls for political systems within which all people can participate in regaining, preserving and enhancing of their rights and dignity as beings created in the image of God.

For the victims of injustice the struggle for peace makes little sense, unless linked to justice. The present catastrophe of millions starving to death and suffering injustice is of a higher priority for the poor and the oppressed of the world than the impending nuclear catastrophe.

The peoples of the Third World remind us that the struggle for peace involves more than overcoming the perils of violent conflict. It means taking initiatives to create a world in which relationships between nations are based on a more equitable economic and moral world order.

Local Flashpoints and Global Tension. Global tension often erupts at local flashpoints – such as in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Falklands/Malvinas, Rep. South Africa, Namibia, Angola, Horn of Africa, Lebanon, Israel, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kampuchea, Vietnam – all in the Third World. The roots of these violent flashes go deep into unjust local and international structures of domination and exploitation. It is the existence of these unjust structures that increases the possibility of a nuclear holocaust.

Christians working for peace should pay equal attention to these situations as to East-West tensions or to European security.

2) WAR. From New Testament times, many Christians have opposed all warfare as contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The traditional doctrine of “the just war” has always begun with a moral presumption against war, insisting that any resort to war can only be a last resort when all peaceful alternatives have been exhausted. It has also insisted that senseless, hopeless war without any meaningful prospect of achieving justice cannot be condoned. It has carefully argued that force used in war must be controlled and discriminate, and that non-combatants must not be objects of direct attack. Modern warfare which uses weapons of mass and indiscriminate slaughter whether by nuclear war or not may threaten the very foundations of life itself.

The traditional tenets of the Church’s teaching. We conscientiously agreed that nuclear warfare, which is warfare, would be likely to escalate, cannot be justified.

The doctrine of nuclear deterrence. The current Geneva and political doctrine of nuclear deterrence is challenged. The dangers of nuclear proliferation, arms accident, and the increasing sophistication of tactics, leading to the concept of the so-called “limited nuclear war”, all render the doctrine of nuclear deterrence increasingly dubious and dangerous from every point of view. Most of us believe that from the Christian stand-point reliance upon the threat and possible use of nuclear weapons is unacceptable as a way of avoiding war. Some are willing to tolerate nuclear deterrence only as a temporary measure in the absence of alternatives. To most of us, however, the possession of nuclear weapons is inconsistent with our faith in God, our concept of creation and with our membership in Christ’s universal body. Nuclear deterrence is essentially dehumanising, it increases fear and hatred, and entrenches confrontation between “the enemy and us”. Most of us therefore believe that the existence of these weapons contradicts the will of God. For all of us obedience to that will demands a resolute effort within a specified time-limit for their total elimination.

4) COMMON SECURITY. The security of one nation cannot be achieved by being endangered by the security of others or by seeking military superiority over others. Only common security makes one and all secure. The devising of an alternative international security system based on the principle of common security, and resolute steps towards disarmament should go hand in hand.

5) THE ARMS TRADE. The international arms trade is sinister, cynical and unprincipled. Its growth has gone hand-in-hand with the increase in the number of oppressive military regimes, which violate human rights and foster injustice. It has also provided the munitions for the scores of wars fought mainly on Third World soil since the last world war. This trade must be condemned and internationally controlled.

III. CHALLENGING GOVERNMENTS

Christian people not only want peace, they are re-
required to make peace. That means that for the churches there is no escape from political involvement with all its pain and inevitable compromise.

Work for peace with justice demands willingness to walk the way of the Cross and to take risks to one's self. We express our solidarity with our brothers and sisters all over the world who are persecuted, tortured and even killed, for daring to oppose injustice and oppression. We appeal to governments to desist from violating the dignity and rights of human beings, in the name of "national security" or "over-riding national interests".

The participants in the Conference on Life and Peace coming from different countries and backgrounds, urge the Churches to address themselves to the governments of their own countries for the secular powers, like us, stand under the judgement of God. Whilst there will be need in different areas to challenge governments on different specific issues, the following are some of the recommendations we make as affecting the whole world.

We call on the nations negotiating at Geneva, Vienna and Madrid to intensify their efforts to bring these negotiations to positive conclusions.

We must press for controlled and verifiable measures of multilateral disarmament leading to the total elimination of all nuclear weapons within five years.

As interim measures we urge:

1. A freeze on further manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons.
2. Immediate agreement on a Comprehensive Test Ban treaty. Effective non-proliferation measures.
3. Establishment of nuclear-free zones.
4. Effective unilateral actions for peace and disarmament.
5. Pledges by Governments for no-first use of nuclear weapons.

As further measures we urge:

1. The upholding and extension of the authority of the United Nations, international law and support to full implementation of the Helsinki agreement.
2. The implementation and broadening of confidence-building measures between East and West in both military and humanitarian spheres, such as those agreed upon in the Helsinki Final Act.
3. The upholding of principles of self determination and non-interference, the elimination of all forms of discrimination, and the pursuit of the goal of a new international economic order based on justice and solidarity.
4. Strict international control over the buying and selling of armaments.
5. The conversion of military expenditure and technology to peaceful productions, especially for the real needs of the poor of the world.

IV. GUIDELINES FOR ACTION BY THE CHURCHES

The impending nuclear terror demands that the churches give high priority to the peace question. A church which acquiesces in the predicament of this hour denies the call of its Lord. We humbly confess that as Christians we have been unfaithful to the Lord. Our own divisions as Christians weaken our witness to peace. As citizens of nuclear states some of us bear a greater shame. We repent, all together.

But now we must accept the forgiveness of the Lord and move forward from despondency and self-condemnation, to trusting obedience and faithful witness to the Prince of Peace.

We therefore appeal to the churches

1) To proclaim Jesus Christ in both word and deed as the life and peace of the world.
2) To develop peace education programme. These programmes should encourage Christians to think theologically; to search out the causes of conflict; to explore Christian concepts of non-violent resistance to evil; and to trace the connections between disarmament and development. To this end the possibility of creating an international Christian peace institute should be explored.
3) To support individuals and groups involved in specific peace work, whether Christian or other, and to uphold the right of conscientious objection to military service.
4) To strive in the mobilisation of public opinion in the interests of peace and justice.
5) To support politicians and governments in plans to develop strategies for peace and systems of common security.
6) To encourage persistent and informed prayer for peace.

The destiny of humanity hangs in the balance. The choice between life and death is before us. But we do not lose hope. Our hope is in the Risen Lord, the Lord of life, who has overcome death by his own death. We shall not be daunted by the might of the mighty. The immensity of the issues will not immobilise us. We will not despair. We will pray and act, in faith, hope, and love.