

Peace

by Julian Zeyher-Quattlender

Version 1.0 | Published 1 May 2026 | DOI <https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-114295>

Other language version: Frieden (Deutsch)

This article offers an overview of how “peace” is understood, perceived, and conceptualized as an ethical task within the Christian tradition. Focusing on the Protestant tradition, it first defines the discipline of Christian peace ethics and introduces its range of tasks. This is followed by an overview of the genesis of Christian peace ethics that concentrates on central developments in the history of theology, discourses, and textual sources. The outline of contemporary threats to peace that follows demonstrates the real-world relevance of Christian peace ethics and its orientation toward concrete problems and reality. The fourth section sketches theological perspectives that can guide an ethical approach to the theme of peace.

Table of Contents

1. Christian Peace Ethics

1.1. Definition

1.2. Theological-ethical profile

1.3. Range of tasks and interdisciplinary positioning

2. Historical Genesis

3. Contemporary Threats to Peace

4. Theological Perspectives

Recommended Literature

Citations

Citation Style

Metadata

Editorial Note

Links to other media and further information regarding this topic can be found in the German version of this article.

1. Christian Peace Ethics

1.1. Definition

Christian peace ethics is an academic reflection on human efforts to promote, enable, and take responsibility for peace within the horizon of the Christian faith tradition.

It therefore asks “about the reasons, and forms of human responsibility, for peace”^[1] and reflects on the goals and means of peace-promoting actions, omissions, and behavior. Grounded in the central distinction drawn by the peace researcher Johan Galtung ^{GND} – between a narrow concept of peace (“negative peace”) characterized solely by the absence of direct violence and a broader concept of peace (“positive peace”) ^[2] that, in addition to the absence of direct violence, includes the absence of oppressive and exploitative dynamics (so-called “structural violence”) – ethical reflection on peace is aimed not only at limiting and ending violence as well as the “civilization of conflict resolution”^[3] but also at constructing positive conditions that advance peace, such as the “humanization of living conditions.”^[4] It does so by promoting freedom and alleviating hardship and fear and also by means of the “protection of cultural diversity.”^[5]

1.2. Theological-ethical profile

Christian peace ethics aims to promote a form of knowledge that is critical and normative in orientation and that can become effective in peace policy at various levels (i.e., state and society, institutions, individuals).^[6] As such, it views the human being not only as the personal subject of ethics but also always as embedded in a network of intersubjective, institutional, as well as – and this is what distinguishes it from non-religious peace ethics – religious relations. Based on the specifically Christian theological concept of “peace,” Christian peace ethics strives to shape the diversity of life-relationships so that they influence each other in the best possible positive way.^[7]

Christian peace ethics is rooted in the fundamental Christian conviction that all human efforts to achieve peace (“imperative of peace”) are, at bottom, motivated by the peace established and promised by God (“indicative of peace”) (Num 6:24-26; Rom 1:7; Rom 5:1), a peace that God wants to permeate the world.^[8] The gift of peace therefore accrues to human beings as an obligatory ethical task – namely, to preserve and strengthen the responsibility for the peace upon which they depend.^[9] This peacemaking ethos (Mt 5:9) is based on God’s act of reconciliation in Jesus Christ (2 Cor 5:19). In the spirit of love of neighbor, love of enemies, and non-violence towards humans and nature, this ethos seeks to embody itself as a radically new – and even confrontational – reality in all areas of earthly life. It thereby anticipates the promised perfection of peace in the Kingdom of God.^[10] However, human beings are not the guarantors of peace but are instead dependent upon the peace that God creates. A comprehensive realization and perfection of peace in this world by our own means is therefore unrealizable. Accordingly, the theological concept of peace cannot simply be reduced to political objectives (e.g., the realization of social justice). It instead functions as a goal that Christian peace efforts only ever approximate in their respective contemporary historical situations and that, ultimately, eludes definition.^[11] Following Ernst-Otto Czempiel’s ^{GND} classic description of peace, according to which peace is to be characterized not as a state but rather as a process,^[12] Christian peace ethics can only be constituted as an ethical process.^[13]

1.3. Range of tasks and interdisciplinary positioning

Peace ethics is carried out constructively as an interdisciplinary project. That is, its broad range of tasks can only be adequately handled in a scientific manner through the interplay of the social sciences, normatively oriented sciences, natural sciences (e.g. in technology assessment, cf. art. Theology of Technology), and legal sciences (in particular, international law). As a normative science, Christian peace ethics contributes to ethical reflection by seeking to make

the Christian faith tradition fruitful as a source for normatively orientated knowledge that addresses current challenges for peace.

As developed by the peace and conflict researcher Ines-Jacqueline Werkner ^{GND}, the division of peace ethics' tasks into four main fields has proven particularly useful for the purposes of a systematization of the overall discipline: power, law, justice, and violence:^[14]

Power or power relations are decisive factors for the preservation and facilitation of external and internal peace. Insofar as they "represent the result of regulated and legitimate rule" on the one hand but can also trigger conflicts on the other, questions about the structure and general conditions of power constitute a fundamental part of peace ethic's research program.^[15] In addition to state power structures, peace ethics also takes into account – for example, by incorporating postcolonial theoretical approaches – non-state actors, implicit power relations in the sense of cultural violence, as well as global and historically evolved power asymmetries and dependencies. A second field within peace ethics is law. Law is always seen as a product that emerges from the interaction between ethics and legal norms – that is, positive (national) legal norms are influenced by contextually determined developments and discourses in peace ethics. Peace ethics is, in turn, based on the current legal norms that it interprets in a manner that promotes peace. Numerous other discourses in peace ethics revolve around the third category of justice. Justice is central to peace ethic's conceptions of justification and legitimization (such as the doctrine of just war or the political-ethical model of just peace). It also means that peace ethics takes into account fundamental philosophical considerations concerning the tensions and ambivalences in the concept of justice itself as well as the debates about different understandings of justice. A fourth central field of research focuses on the phenomenon of violence, the containment of which is a central and permanent challenge for the peaceful coexistence of people. Here, too, peace ethics adopts an approach that is sensitive to ambivalence, i.e., violence should be taken seriously in both its order-creating and order-destroying potential. Nevertheless, in light of the UN's general prohibition of war and violence [Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter], peace ethics adopts a critical perspective toward violence. The concept of peace stands in inherent conflict with a reality characterized by violence.^[16]

As a specialist discipline, Christian peace ethics is networked in many – and sometimes tense – ways with other actors in a spectrum of peace-related work that is continually becoming more complex. It differs from peace policy, which perceives peacebuilding and peacekeeping as a political task, from peace practice, which focuses primarily on the practical relevance and social formation of peace (peace movement, peace services), and also from peace pedagogy (or peace nurturing/education), which conceptualizes how responsibility for peace can be recognized and implemented pedagogically. Christian peace ethics differentiates itself from these insofar as it remains at the scientific-ethical level of reflection. As such, Christian peace ethics represents one dimension among others within the Church's broader theology of peace.^[17] Its scientific-ethical and methodological perspective has large overlaps with peace studies (the status of which is, however, disputed),^[18] political ethics, the ethics of international relations, and, naturally, practical philosophy as a whole. Research on reconciliation^[19] also corresponds closely in many areas with peace ethic's research focus. As "peace ethics in action,"^[20] military ethics deals with the ethical issues faced by soldiers and aids them in the formation of ethical judgments. The Protestant Church in Germany participates in this task through the Protestant Chaplaincy in the Federal Armed Forces (*Bundeswehr*).

2. Historical Genesis

The idea of peace as a legal status (*pax romana*) was dominant within the Greco-Roman tradition. By means of its encounter with the biblical understanding of peace, it was expanded upon in the early Church so as to include a communal-forming and eschatological dimension of meaning that went beyond the political meaning. The early Christian understanding of peace as a good pertaining to salvation – something that manifests itself liturgically in, among other things, the "greeting of peace" – came into tension with the traditional legal-political understanding of peace. This is evident in some of the consequences that early Christians derived from the biblical promises of peace –

for example, the rejection of military service based upon the injunction to love one's enemies.^[21] Although the early Church did not generally deny that political power functioned as a means to establish peace, it maintained for the most part – see, for example, Tertullian ^{GND} – that Christians were not promised a powerful Christ of war but rather a peace-loving Christ.^[22] However, as Christianity developed over the course of the 4th century from a minority religion into an imperial Church, the early Church's rejection of all deadly violence waned. Theologians increasingly turned to the question of how the phenomenon of violence and the human tendency towards violence could be dealt with in a theologically appropriate way. In his *De Civitate Dei*,^[23] St. Augustine ^{GND} (345–430 CE) sketched the first ideal of a Christian conception of the state. With its foundational distinction between *civitas terrena* (earthly city) and *civitas Dei* (the city of God), this text had an immense influence on medieval Europe. Later developed by Thomas Aquinas ^{GND}, Augustine's teaching on just war (*bellum iustum*) was equally significant in terms of its historical impact.^[24] It proposes criteria that subject the use of violence in war to certain limits. It adheres to the fundamental conviction that killing is only justified if it serves to restore order and if the means deployed do not undermine this goal. Despite this new attention to the political-ethical and earthly dimension of peace, the medieval tradition still retained the multidimensionality of the patristic concept of peace and even further developed its soteriological and eschatological layers of meaning – for example, by linking it to ideas of justice, unity, peace, healing relationships, security, and love. Within the Reformation period, Martin Luther's ^{GND} development of the Augustinian tradition in his so-called "Two Kingdoms doctrine" – articulated in his 1523 treatise *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei*^[25] – proved to be central in the history of its impact, at least for Protestant ethics. The Lutheran understanding of peace corresponds in many ways to that of Huldrych Zwingli ^{GND} and John Calvin ^{GND}. Luther theologically reformulated the issue of the maintenance of external peace into a question about the compatibility of the commandment to love one's neighbor (Luke 10:27) and the prohibition against killing (Exodus 20:13; Deuteronomy 5:17). In contrast to other strands of the Reformation such as the historically peaceful churches (e.g., the Mennonites, Quakers, Church of the Brethren)^[26] that adhere to the categorical renunciation of violence in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, Luther was convinced that killing to protect the weak (i.e., out of love for one's neighbor) is licit in cases of extreme necessity. Nevertheless, Luther denounced wars of aggression and religious wars as unjust more clearly than the tradition before him did. Secular and ecclesiastical power began to diverge after the Reformation, leading to the emancipation of the political sphere that in turn slowly began organizing itself into state structures. This was accompanied by the increasing significance of law. With its wide-ranging potential to establish peace, law was viewed as an authority in the 1648 Peace of Westphalia that transcended the conflicting confessional perspectives.^[27] A new version of natural law developed out of this focus on law in the 17th century. It framed the human as such, regardless of confessional affiliation, as a living being oriented towards the realization of peace.^[28] In the form of drafts of contracts – for example, the idea of a European League of Nations or Immanuel Kant's ^{GND} 1795 *On Perpetual Peace*^[29] – a more universal understanding of peace was developed in the 18th century. In contrast, the bellicose and nationalist movements that emerged in the 19th and 20th centuries were critical of this hope for peace. They regarded war as necessary for the health of nations^[30] (cf. art. Internationalism/ Nationalism) and saw peace as being realized through the self-assertion of a nation in war. With the founding of peace societies in New York and London in 1815/16 and in Germany – initiated by Bertha von Suttner ^{GND} – in 1892, a new peace movement emerged with the common goal of ending war as a means for resolving conflict. The lawyer Émile Arnaud ^{GND} coined the term pacifism in this period, a term that has been – and still is today – the subject of various and sometimes controversial attempts to define. With its accompanying enthusiasm for war, the First World War was a catastrophe for the peace movements, but it also strengthened ecumenical cooperation between the churches in their joint efforts to achieve peace. For instance, the "World Alliance of Churches for Promoting International Friendship" was founded on 1 August 1914, while the ecumenical organization "Life and Work" (Movement for Practical Christianity) was established in the autumn of 1919. In their efforts to align and unite the peace efforts of churches across the globe, they became central pillars within the ecumenical movement in the ensuing decades. The rise of National Socialism and the Second World War created enormous internal upheaval within German Protestantism in particular. It culminated in the struggle within the Protestant Church between the National Socialist-oriented German Christians and the Confessing Church, with the

latter seeking to protect the Protestant Church from attacks by certain German Christians and National Socialists. With an explicit emphasis on the claim that the state's right to use force is linked solely to its task of ensuring peace and justice (Thesis 5), the Barmen Theological Declaration of 31 May 1934 formulated a theological response that was critical of totalitarianism and the nationalist politicization of German theology. This declaration attained politically symbolic and identity-forming significance for the post-war German churches. The peace ethics of the theologian and resistance fighter Dietrich Bonhoeffer ^{GND} is often regarded as particularly significant for Protestant peace ethics during this period. As a multifaceted testimony to peace, his life is proof that Christian pacifism cannot always categorically renounce violence.

After the post-war founding of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948, the issue of peace remained a focus of ecumenical work. An ecumenical agreement was reached at the founding meeting that the validity of the "doctrine of just war" could no longer be taken for granted. However, the issue of war and military service remained highly controversial. In a hard-won commitment to plurality, the WCC states that the rejection of all acts of war *and* the acceptance of war as an act of obedience to the state and the law should both be taken seriously as legitimate Christian positions. This fundamental controversy is also present in the German Church documents and EKD statements that focus on the question of peace between East and West Germany. The nuclear threat strongly influenced these discourses on peace-ethics. The Heidelberg Theses of 1959, for instance, emphasized the idea of complementarity: the Church must "recognize the renunciation of weapons as a Christian way of acting."^[31] At the same time, however, it must also "recognize that participation in the attempt to secure peace in freedom through the existence of nuclear weapons is still today a legitimate Christian way of acting."^[32] Church brotherhoods and, in particular, the Reformed Alliance strongly opposed this position on nuclear deterrence and countered it with the claim: "no without any yes."^[33] The most extensive outline of a peace ethics from the German-speaking Protestant world that addresses theologically the challenge of peace in the nuclear age is Wolfgang Huber ^{GND} and Hans-Richard Reuter's ^{GND} 1990 *Friedensethik*.^[34] In addition to the issue of the nuclear bomb, questions about (global) justice and the human-ecological conditions of peace as well as the fight against racism increasingly became the subject of post-war discourses in peace ethics. This ultimately led to the development of liberation theologies. Members of the Protestant Church offered significant support to the peace and environmental movement that reached its peak in the 1980s. The creation and reception history of the German Protestant Church's 1981 Peace Statement *Frieden wahren, fördern und erneuern*^[35] is indicative of this highly emotional discourse. Within the Protestant Church, institutions such as the *Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft* (FEST), the Protestant academies, and the Protestant Church congresses in both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany promoted an institutionalized discourse on peace ethics.

The 2007 Peace Statement, *Aus Gottes Frieden leben – für gerechten Frieden sorgen*,^[36] exemplifies the discourses in peace ethics that, after the reunification of Germany, developed in the 1990s and 2000s among German-speaking Protestants. The text is based on the political and ethical model of just peace. It can be seen as the first fundamentally ecumenical^[37] attempt to process theologically the new global political challenges that followed upon the religiously and ethnically motivated genocides of the 1990s (e.g., Rwanda, Srebrenica) and the Islamist-motivated terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

3. Contemporary Threats to Peace

Pandemics, the renaissance of imperial geopolitics, neo-colonial dynamics within the globalized economic system, and climate change (cf. art. Climate Ethics) are the most urgent current challenges for peace ethics. Dealing with them adequately will require the development of innovative models that are sensitive to the requirements of intergenerational justice as well as to religious and cultural pluralism. They will likely also require recourse to models of judgment that have long been considered obsolete in peace ethics (for example, from works on nuclear

deterrence). At the same time, there is an increased need for ethical reflection and focus on the use of autoregulatory weapon systems and on forms of “hybrid warfare.”^[38]

4. Theological Perspectives

While peace ethics in the Anglo-American world has continued to concentrate on criteria for just war,^[39] the German-speaking ecumenical world has turned to the political-ethical model of “just peace” as a guide for dealing theologically and ecclesiastically with challenges facing peace ethics.^[40] In contrast to the teaching on “just war,” this model no longer seeks to conceptualize a Christian position from the perspective of war but more so from the perspective of peace. The just peace model is based on three fundamental pillars: The (1) *priority of non-violence and civil conflict resolution* emphasizes clearly that, from a Christian perspective, non-violent means and ways of securing peace should always have priority. The second pillar maintains that (2) *the order of peace is a legal order*, i.e., peace should be established through law. International law serves an important peacekeeping function in international contexts. The third pillar – namely, (3) *an ethics of law-preserving force* – acknowledges the fact that the use of force as a means to uphold the law is indispensable. In light of pillar two, the use of violence is restricted to the enforcement of the law and is subject to specific criteria.^[41] At the same time, however, the model maintains that even the use of “law-preserving violence” remains fraught with guilt and that, from the perspective of Christianity, there is never any just or justified use of violence that is without problems.^[42] Overall, the model of just peace can be seen as a viable compromise insofar as it attempts to do justice to both the commandment to love one’s neighbor (cf. art. Love) and the principle of non-violence. Nonetheless, numerous aspects – such as the clear commitment to legal pacifism and political liberalism or the above-mentioned paradigm shift away from the concept of “just war” – remained controversial within the German speaking context. This gave rise to widespread, interdisciplinary consultations and discussions concerning Church policy that ultimately led to an immense complexification of the concept of just peace.^[43] The upheavals in international security at the beginning of the 2020s further intensified this dynamic and led to calls for a more “realistic” Protestant peace ethics that was better adapted to the situation and context.^[44] Criticism of the concept of just peace also emerged among those involved in the Church’s peace work who thought that the commitment to the mere primacy of non-violence did not go far enough. They instead called for the Church’s stance to shift in the direction of a more thorough commitment to non-violence. The Protestant Church in Baden played a leading role in this with the development of the scenario *Sicherheit neu denken – von der militärischen zur zivilen Sicherheitspolitik* (“Rethinking security – From Military to Civilian Security Policy”).^[45]

Recommended Literature

For recommended literature, see the German version of this article.

Citations

- ¹ Huber, Wolfgang/Reuter, Hans-Richard, *Friedensethik*, Stuttgart 1990, 17, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ² Cf. Galtung, Johan, *Strukturelle Gewalt*. Beiträge zur Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1975, 32. For a criticism of the conceptual vagueness of Galtung’s positive concept of peace, cf. Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline, *Zum Friedensbegriff in der Friedensforschung*, in: Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Ebeling, Klaus (Eds.), *Handbuch Friedensethik*, Wiesbaden 2017, 23–25. Equally as controversial is Galtung’s concept of “structural violence.”
- ³ Ebeling, Klaus, *Militär und Ethik*. Moral- und militärkritische Reflexionen zum Selbstverständnis der Bundeswehr, Stuttgart 2006, 39, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ⁴ Ebeling, *Militär*, 39, translation by Dylan S. Belton.

- ⁵ Senghaas, Dieter/Senghaas-Knobloch, Eva, Dimensionen des Friedens, in: Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Ebeling, Klaus (Hrsg.), Handbuch Friedensethik, Wiesbaden 2017, 33, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ⁶ Cf. Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline, Einführung in das Handbuch, in: Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Ebeling, Klaus (Eds.), Handbuch Friedensethik, Wiesbaden 2017, 4.
- ⁷ Cf. Jüngel, Eberhard, Zum Wesen des Friedens. Frieden als Kategorie theologischer Anthropologie, München 1983, 65.
- ⁸ Cf. Jüngel, Wesen, 57f.
- ⁹ Cf. Jüngel, Wesen, 67.
- ¹⁰ Cf. Reuter, Hans-Richard, Art. Frieden VIII. Politisch, politologisch, sozialetisch, in: RGG⁴ 3 (2000), 365.
- ¹¹ Cf. Reuter, Frieden, 365.
- ¹² Cf. Czempel, Ernst-Otto, Friedensstrategien. Eine systematische Darstellung außenpolitischer Theorien von Machiavelli bis Madariaga, Opladen ²1998.
- ¹³ Cf. Werkner, Einführung, 4.
- ¹⁴ Cf. Werkner, Einführung, 3f. Mit der Aufnahme des Feldes der Gewalt erweitert sie die Aufschlüsselung der Aufgaben der Friedensethik bei Huber/Reuter, Friedensethik, 126–131.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Werkner, Einführung, 3.
- ¹⁶ Cf. Werkner, Einführung, 4.
- ¹⁷ On „Friedenstheologie“ cf. Kirchenamt der EKD, Auf dem Weg zu einer Kirche der Gerechtigkeit und des Friedens. Ein friedentheologisches Lesebuch, Leipzig 2019.
- ¹⁸ Cf. Jaberg, Sabine, Friedensforschung, in: Gießmann, Hans J./Rinke, Bernhard (Eds.), Handbuch Frieden, Wiesbaden 2011, 53–69.
- ¹⁹ Cf. Schell, Maximilian, Produktive Irritationen. Das Leitbild des Gerechten Friedens und die interdisziplinäre Versöhnungsforschung im Gespräch, in: ZEE 67 (2023), 275–288.
- ²⁰ Ev. Kirchenamt für die Bundeswehr, Friedensethik im Einsatz. Ein Handbuch der Evangelischen Seelsorge in der Bundeswehr, Gütersloh 2009.
- ²¹ Cf. Justin, Apol. I, 14.
- ²² Cf. Tertullian, Adv. Marc. III, 21.
- ²³ Cf. Thimme, Wilhelm (Ed.), Augustinus. Vom Gottesstaat (2 Bände), Zürich 1955.
- ²⁴ Cf. Looney, Aaron, Die Lehre vom gerechten Krieg im frühen Christentum. Augustinus, in: Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Ebeling, Klaus (Eds.), Handbuch Friedensethik, Wiesbaden 2017, 225–237; Fuchs, Marko J., Die Lehre vom gerechten Krieg im Mittelalter. Thomas von Aquin, in: Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Ebeling, Klaus (Eds.), Handbuch Friedensethik, Wiesbaden 2017, 239–249.
- ²⁵ Cf. Luther, Martin, Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei (1523), WA 11, Weimar 1900, Nachdruck Graz 1960, 229–281. For an interpretation, cf. Zeyher-Quattlender, Julian, Du sollst nicht töten (lassen)? Eine Rekonstruktion der Friedensethik Dietrich Bonhoeffers aus der Perspektive Öffentlicher Theologie in aktueller Absicht, Leipzig 2021, 115–215.
- ²⁶ Cf. dazu Enns, Fernando, Die Historischen Friedenskirchen. Ekklesiologische Aspekte des Gerechten Friedens, in: Jäger, Sarah/Enns, Fernando (Eds.), Gerechter Frieden als ekklesiologische Herausforderung, Wiesbaden 2019, 171–197.
- ²⁷ Cf. Scheliha, Arnulf von, Protestantische Ethik des Politischen, Tübingen 2013, 51.
- ²⁸ Cf. Grotius, Hugo, De iuri belli a pacis libri tres (1625). Lateinisch und Deutsch, hrsg. und übers. von Walter Schätzel, Tübingen 1950.
- ²⁹ Cf. Kant, Immanuel, Zum ewigen Frieden (1795). Gesammelte Schriften VIII, hrsg. von der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1902ff., 341–386.

- ³⁰ For example, Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, Über die wissenschaftlichen Behandlungsarten des Naturrechts, seine Stelle in der praktischen Philosophie, und sein Verhältnis zu den positiven Rechtswissenschaften (1802–1803), Jenaer Schriften, hrsg. von Gerd Irrlitz, Berlin/Boston 1972, 337–428.
- ³¹ Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Frieden wahren, fördern und erneuern. Eine Denkschrift der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, Gütersloh 1982, 82, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ³² EKD, Frieden wahren, 83, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ³³ Cf. Moderamen des Reformierten Bundes (Hrsg.), Das Bekenntnis zu Jesus Christus und die Friedensverantwortung der Kirche. Eine Erklärung des Moderamens des Reformierten Bundes, Gütersloh 1982, translation by Dylan S. Belton.
- ³⁴ Cf. Huber/Reuter, Friedensethik.
- ³⁵ EKD, Frieden wahren.
- ³⁶ Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aus Gottes Frieden leben – für gerechten Frieden sorgen, Gütersloh 2007.
- ³⁷ In addition to the EKD’s memorandum on peace from 2007, the German bishops’ pastoral statement from 2000 also promotes the notion of just peace.
- ³⁸ Cf. Kunkel, Nicole, Autoregulative Weapons Systems. Automatization Challenging Peace Ethics, in: Puzio, Anna et al. (Eds.), Alexa, wie hast du’s mit der Religion? Theologische Zugänge zu Technik und Künstlicher Intelligenz, Darmstadt 2023, 191–206.
- ³⁹ Cf., for example, Walzer, Michael, Just and Unjust Wars. A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations, New York 1992 [1977]; McMahan, Jeff, Killing in War, Oxford 2009.
- ⁴⁰ Cf. EKD, Gottes Frieden; Werkner/Ebeling, Handbuch, 343–409; Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline, Gerechter Frieden. Im Spannungsfeld zwischen ziviler Konfliktbearbeitung und rechtserhaltender Gewalt, Wiesbaden 2021.
- ⁴¹ Cf. EKD, Gottes Frieden, Ziff. 102.
- ⁴² Cf. EKD, Gottes Frieden, Ziff. 103.
- ⁴³ Cf. Werkner, Ines-Jacqueline/Jäger, Sarah, Buchreihe „Gerechter Frieden“, 26 Bände, Wiesbaden 2018–2022.
- ⁴⁴ Cf. Evangelisches Kirchenamt für die Bundeswehr, Maß des Möglichen. Perspektiven evangelischer Friedensethik angesichts des Ukrainekrieges, Berlin 2023. Die Autor:innen sind Dirck Ackermann, Reiner Anselm, Katja Bruns, Michael Haspel, Friedrich Lohmann, Roger Mielke und Bernd Oberdorfer.
- ⁴⁵ Cf. Becker, Ralf et al., Sicherheit neu denken. Von der militärischen zur zivilen Sicherheitspolitik – Ein Szenario bis zum Jahr 2040, Karlsruhe 2018.

Citation Style

Zeyher-Quattlander, Julian: „Peace“, Version 1.0, in: Online Lexicon for Systematic Theology, ISSN 3052-685X, 1 May 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-114295>

Metadata

DOI	https://doi.org/10.15496/publikation-114295
Creative Commons Licence	Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs CC BY-NC-ND (4.0)
Type	

peer reviewed by	<u>Hans-Richard Reuter</u>
Translator(s)	<u>Dylan S. Belton</u>
Index Theologicus (IxTheo)	<u>Just Peace</u> , <u>Law-Upholding Violence</u> , <u>Pacifism</u> , <u>Peace Ethics</u> , <u>Protestant Church in Germany (EKD)</u> , <u>Theology of Peace</u> , <u>World Council of Churches</u>
Subject Headings (LOC)	<u>Just Peace</u> , <u>Law-Upholding Violence</u> , <u>Pacifism</u> , <u>Peace Ethics</u> , <u>Protestant Church in Germany (EKD)</u> , <u>Theology of Peace</u> , <u>World Council of Churches</u>
Keyword	<u>Just Peace</u> , <u>Law-Upholding Violence</u> , <u>Pacifism</u> , <u>Peace Ethics</u> , <u>Protestant Church in Germany (EKD)</u> , <u>Theology of Peace</u> , <u>World Council of Churches</u>
Mentioned People	<u>Émile Arnaud</u> , <u>Augustine of Hippo</u> , <u>Dietrich Bonhoeffer</u> , <u>John Calvin</u> , <u>Ernst-Otto Czempel</u> , <u>Galtung, Johan</u> , <u>Wolfgang Huber</u> , <u>Immanuel Kant</u> , <u>Martin Luther</u> , <u>Hans-Richard Reuter</u> , <u>Bertha von Suttner</u> , <u>Tertullian</u> , <u>Thomas Aquinas</u> , <u>Ines-Jacqueline Werkner</u> , <u>Ulrich Zwingli</u>

KEYWORDS

Just Peace

Law-Upholding Violence

Pacifism

Peace Ethics

Protestant Church in Germany (EKD)

Theology of Peace

World Council of Churches