

SUMMONING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: TURN TO “JUST PEACE”

Eli S. McCarthy, Ph.D.
Georgetown University

esm52@georgetown.edu
510-717-8867

Abstract:

In this paper, I integrate key developments into a “just peace” moral analysis and argue for the Catholic Church to also develop and embrace a “just peace” approach. First, I describe present Catholic social teaching and the present threads I see related to just peace. Second, I describe the ecumenical turns to just peace and Glen Stassen’s just peacemaking, which has similarities to present Catholic social teaching. Third, I offer a critical analysis of Catholic social teaching and just peacemaking to propose a turn to a freshly integrated “just peace” approach.

Introduction

Themes closely related to just peace have been re-emerging in Catholic social teaching, particularly with the witness of Pope Francis. Nevertheless, the official teaching still remains largely linked to a “just war” approach, which is often relied on by many Catholics in leadership. Even though the ecumenically developed “just peacemaking” practices have been around for at least twenty years, contemporary debates too often continue the traditional pacifism vs. just war frame, whether discussed in Catholic circles, classrooms, scholarship, popular conversation, media, political or military discourse.¹ Yet, while both pacifism and “just war” have notable critics, the “just war” concept has faced increasing scrutiny from both military actors and in Catholic social teaching. Meanwhile, more recent theological scholarship has been developing just peacemaking, just peace criteria that apply to all stages of conflict, a just peace ethic, the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, and just peace churches, signaling an emerging synthesis about the potential validity and content of a turn to emphasize a “just peace” approach.

In this paper, I offer a fresh integration of these key developments in a “just peace” moral analysis and argue for the Catholic Church to similarly develop and turn to a “just peace” approach.² First, I describe present Catholic social teaching by focusing on the present threads I

see related to just peace. Second, I describe the complementary ecumenical turns to just peace and Glen Stassen's collaborative effort on just peacemaking, which has similarities to present Catholic social teaching. Third, I offer a critical analysis of Catholic social teaching and just peacemaking to propose a turn to a freshly integrated "just peace" approach, which I think should consider at least a shift away from the *language* or *frame* of "just war." To be clear, this article is primarily about integrating developments of "just peace" and demonstrating the value of leading with or centering on this approach. Hence, I do not attempt a thorough analysis or refutation of "just war" approaches and their specific content. However, for the sake of enhancing the significance of my argument there is some attention to key limits of the basic "just war" concept, i.e. that war can be justifiable, an activity of justice, or a way to bring about justice; whether one leans more to the revisionist or realist approaches.³ In turn, my argument as far as it relates to "just war" in this article is primarily about shifting emphasis and turning away from the *language* of "just war" more so than dealing with the specific criteria or approach. Yet, toward the end I make some brief references to issues with the criteria simply for the sake of showing some differences with just peace criteria. Before concluding this article, I end with public policy examples and some key challenges to help advance the development and embrace of a possible "just peace" approach for Catholic social teaching.

As people of hope we are consoled by God's promise that "justice and peace shall embrace."⁴ This image is the embodiment of God's vision for our world- God's shalom. Shalom is often translated as "peace," but its Hebrew roots imply a deeper meaning of peace that goes beyond cessation of violence toward a holistic vision of well-being, healing, and restoration involving all areas of social and economic life. As people of faith we are called to join with God

in this active work and are especially reminded both that peace requires justice-making *and* justice requires peace-making.

Jesus Christ, the presence and manifestation of God's love on earth, concretizes these themes in a set of formative and core practices. "Jesus lived in a warzone, under foreign military occupation, in periods of civil war and violent insurgency against the foreign occupiers and the domestic leaders who cooperated with occupying forces. He and his family were refugees and fled genocide."⁵ Yet, Jesus makes it clear that he was not in favor of a negative peace based on the sword. Instead, Jesus models the way of just peace by becoming vulnerable, inviting participation in the Reign of God, caring for the outcasts and prioritizing those in urgent need, loving and forgiving enemies, people building, challenging the religious, political, economic, and military powers, healing and trauma healing of persons and communities, praying and fasting, along with risking and offering his life on the cross to expose and transcend both injustice and violence.

Jesus centers Shalom on the embodiment of mercy and compassion in the Good Samaritan story. Jesus draws us to "righteousness," which refers to living in accord with the will of God. We know this will primarily through how Jesus lives, hence the "new commandment" from Jesus is to "love *as I have* loved you," i.e. the nonviolent love of neighbor, strangers and enemies. With Jesus' focus on healing and reconciliation, even with enemies, we have been increasingly learning that the kind of justice Christ leans us toward is restorative justice, i.e. focus on the wounds to relationships and how to heal those wounds.

Catholic Threads of Just Peace

It is still true today that official Catholic Social Teaching supports both a deep commitment to nonviolence and to the acceptance of just war criteria, but with a narrowing

application of such just war criteria to situations of mass atrocities like genocide or ethnic cleansing. However, official Catholic moral theology and social teaching has been going through some significant developments regarding the relationship between justice and peace. With the years around Vatican II re-appropriating Jesus as the center of moral theology, along with the return to virtue ethics as a primary approach, and the extension of the call to holiness to the laity, we have embarked on a turning to just peace.⁶ In 1963, Pope John XXIII legitimated human dignity and human rights as integral to peace on earth. He held that it was “contrary to reason to consider war as a suitable way to restore rights.”⁷ Pope Paul VI illuminated that peace comes via development and the Church grew to better address structural injustice. He also amplified the phrase, “if you want peace work for justice.”⁸ In terms of violence, he stated clearly “the Church cannot accept violence, especially the force of arms,”⁹ and repeated Vatican II’s position that it is “our clear duty to strain every muscle as we work for the time when all war can be completely outlawed.”¹⁰ Pope John Paul II spoke of peace via development, human rights, solidarity, and nonviolence. He specifically said in 1979 that “violence is evil...violence is a lie, for it goes against the truth of our faith, the truth of our humanity. Violence destroys what it claims to defend: the dignity, the life, the freedom of human beings.”¹¹ Further, he exhorted persons not to follow leaders who:

“train you in the way of inflicting death...Give yourself to the service of life, not the work of death. Do not think that courage and strength are proved by killing and destruction. True courage lies in working for peace...Violence is the enemy of justice. *Only peace can lead the way to true justice.*”(my italics)¹²

In his 1991 encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, Pope John Paul further explicitly de-links the notion of war and justice calling us “to reject definitively the idea that justice can be sought through recourse to war.”¹³ With this deep recognition of the disconnect between violence and dignity as

well as justice, in 2002 Pope John Paul II further illuminates this reality by extending Pope Paul the VI's idea of no peace without justice, to "no peace without justice and no justice without forgiveness."¹⁴ This is an essential move to recognizing justice requires peacemaking and justice as restorative, which we are still growing into as a Catholic Church.

In 1993, the U.S. Catholic Bishops extended the ethic of nonviolence beyond potential individual commitments and acknowledge that a nonviolent ethic is plausible for the public order, as they raise increasing and serious questions about "just war." These turns notably arise out of a more prominent attention to spirituality, especially in terms of character and "peaceable virtues."¹⁵

More recently, Pope Benedict proclaimed that the love of enemies is the nucleus of the Christian revolution and violence degrades the dignity of both victim and perpetrator.¹⁶ Further, a five year International Theological Commission produced an extensive document approved by the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, which de-legitimated any Christian justification of violence:

"The revelation inscribed in the event of Jesus Christ, which universally manifests the love of God, enables the religious justification of violence to be neutralized on the basis of the Christological and Trinitarian truth of God."¹⁷

Pope Francis has enthusiastically returned our attention to Jesus' focus on mercy as the center of Shalom and the alternative to violence. Pope Francis calls war the "suicide of humanity"¹⁸ and calls us to "give up the way of arms."¹⁹ He recognizes the reflectivity of means and ends, "Never has the use of violence brought peace in its wake. War brings on war! Violence brings on violence."²⁰ For instance, the premise that "might is right" has engendered immense inequality and acts of violence.²¹ Challenging the basic Augustinian claim that "war should be waged when necessary,"²² Francis proclaims that "war is never a necessity, nor is it inevitable. Another way

can always be found.”²³ Further, he recognizes that “war always does grave harm to the environment.”²⁴ Pope Francis calls us even deeper by saying that “fraternal love can only be gratuitous; it can never be a means of repaying others for what they have done or will do for us. That is why it is possible to love our enemies.”²⁵ He even de-links justice and killing by saying “justice can never be wrought by killing a human being.”²⁶

Thus, he leans us into the process of disarmament, “I make my own the appeal of my predecessors for the non-proliferation of arms and for disarmament of all parties, *beginning with* (my emphasis) nuclear and chemical weapons disarmament.”²⁷ In contrast to war, violence, and the storing up of weapons, Pope Francis proclaims:

“The true force of the Christian is the force of truth and of love, which means rejecting all violence. Faith and violence are incompatible! Faith and violence are incompatible! But faith and strength go together. The Christian is not violent, but he is strong. And with what strength? That of meekness, the force of meekness, the force of love.”²⁸

In fact, he even goes further and challenges one of the core assumptions about courage, particularly in U.S. society and policy, with a prophetic tone:

*“Peacemaking calls for courage, much more so than warfare. (my italics) It calls for the courage to say yes to encounter and no to conflict: yes to dialogue and no to violence; yes to negotiations and no to hostilities.”*²⁹

Francis clearly rejects the deeply ingrained U.S. assumption, i.e. civil religion that “peace comes through military strength.” For instance, he says “To speak about peace without making it is contradictory, and those who speak about peace while promoting war, for example through the sale of weapons, are hypocrites. It is very simple.”³⁰

These are pretty remarkable developments for Catholics as many also presently appreciate the concrete care for the poor and marginalized Pope Francis offers. However, it remains to be seen how these trends eventually impact the Catholic Church’s still present, even if quite

tentative, acceptance of the “just war” concept and at times the use of violence or the threat of violence in situations of mass atrocities. A notable illustration of the nuance Pope Francis illuminates is with the atrocities of the Islamic State. He declared it was “licit to stop the unjust aggressor. I underscore the verb ‘stop;’ I don’t say bomb, make war -- stop him.”³¹ Further, like Francis of Assisi with the Sultan, the pontiff also insisted that although dialogue with ISIS may seem for many “almost impossible,” for his part, “the door is always open.”³² In the context of his earlier statements, the door is open and I think the challenge is upon Catholics to discern creative, effective nonviolent resistance approaches even in situations of mass atrocities.

In sum, the increasing recognition of the interconnection of justice and peace, of the return to Jesus as the model for Christian ethics, of the shared call to holiness and increasing role of virtue ethics, of violence as destructive of human dignity and as the enemy of justice, of justice as restorative, of the public role of a nonviolent ethic, of war as the suicide of humanity and ineffective for bringing peace, of faith as incompatible with violence, and of peacemaking as much more courageous than warfare all suggest a very difficult if not perhaps faltering future for the notion of war as “just” and further even the explicit legitimation of violence in official Catholic teaching and practice. But, we are not there yet.

However, a very promising recent conference on nonviolence and just peace was co-sponsored by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. The outcome document called the Catholic Church to re-commit to the centrality of Gospel nonviolence and develop a new framework of Just Peace, while no longer using or teaching the just war theory.³³

Ecumenical Turns and Just peacemaking

Notably, during a period of ecumenical opening in the Catholic Church, the turning to elements of just peace in official Catholic Church teaching has been coupled with an ecumenical

turning of other Christian church organizations. The United Church of Christ formerly declared itself a “Just Peace Church” in 1985 and numerous congregations followed, declaring themselves “Just Peace Churches.” The United Methodist Church recognized that war is incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ, and thus, has rejected war as an instrument of national foreign policy.³⁴ And more recently, on November 8, 2013, the World Council of Churches adopted the “Way of Just Peace” as part of its 10th Assembly.³⁵ A 2011 World Council of Churches document entitled, “Ecumenical Call to Just peace,” declared the concept and the mentality of “just war” to be obsolete.³⁶

Even though there is a shared basic *concept* of “just war,” i.e. that war can be justifiable, an activity of justice, or a way to justice, there are of course different aspects of this concept emphasized and approaches to “just war” theory. For instance, these include revisionist and realist; strong presumptions against war and presumptions for justice; cultural-spiritual grounding and legal norms, etc. Some approaches are better than others. For instance, some “revisionist” approaches suggest that “just war” theory now leads to a “practical pacifism” in light of modern weapons. In general, the “revisionist” approach is more aligned with present Catholic social teaching. I would argue that this “revisionist” or strong presumption against war approach is generally better than more “realist” approaches, but it still could sway towards war as the circumstances of modernity or technology change.

Nevertheless, regardless of the different approaches or expressions, theologians have been illuminating further serious issues with the function, language and basic *concept* of “just war.” First, in large part, it has proven largely ineffective in achieving its intended purpose, namely, limiting the scourge of war. For instance, we see war itself and the weapons of war growing in destructiveness and harm to civilians as well as frequent blowback. Further, it

appears that “just war” has much more often been used to “justify” war, particularly by political and military decision-makers, but also by some theologians and Catholic leaders.³⁷ Second, the “just war” approach to conflict, even in “revisionist” forms, also fails to create conditions for or lead us toward a *sustainable* peace, i.e. peacebuilding. It often fails to cultivate the kinds of people that imagine and engage a broad-range of effective nonviolent resistance or peacemaking practices.

Third, the “just war” concept and particularly the language also tends to perpetuate habits of violence in a society, thus undermining its’ often stated purpose of limiting war. It does this in part as an example of Johan Galtung’s “cultural violence” concept, because as a concept, that war can be justifiable or just, it often functions as one cultural idea among many to legitimate direct and structural violence. This is one reason why we can’t just say the historical use of “just war” mostly to justify war is *simply* a “mis-use” of the approach due to human sin. The language itself functions to enable, make more likely, or perpetuate such use. Further, this cultural legitimization occurs in part on the structural level by the preparations for war and the limited resistance to such increasing preparations, notable even among many “revisionist” just war theorists. Fourth, others point out that the “just war” concept and mentality also tends to address war as a discrete event rather than a continuing presence in modern culture:

“...reject the dichotomized rhetoric inherent in current discussions of war that refuses to acknowledge the interrelationship between domestic, national and international violence. Just war theory perpetuates dichotomized views of war because it does *not define war as something that exists within the system that perpetuates the culture of violence*. Rather, it looks at each war as a specific event, analyzing each on a case-by-case basis. This is a reactive theory that cannot deal with the underlying

problems inherent in the surrounding system that are the causes of conflict."³⁸

Fifth, in practice, using the “just war” language diminishes our capacity to consistently embody and often even name war as always a tragedy, which opens the door further to habits and a culture that too often glorifies violent “heroes;” and turns us away from *the* model of virtue and holiness, i.e. Jesus Christ.

There are of course different ways to respond to these limits, but I am arguing in this article that these limits enhance the significance of developing and embracing a turn to a “just peace” approach. As one related response, Glen Stassen coordinated with other Christian (including Catholic) theologians to develop a just peacemaking, which consists of a set of normative practices arising into view by using the analogical imagination with the scriptural witness.³⁹ Stassen wanted to address a different question than the permissibility for war that many pacifists and just war advocates debate, and attend to the question of what practices have worked to prevent war and make us into peacemakers. Although he thought just peacemaking should take priority, he appears open to a complementary relationship with a “just war” approach for now.

Just peacemaking consists of ten practices: support nonviolent direct action; take independent initiatives to reduce threat; use cooperative conflict resolution; acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness; advance democracy, human rights, and interdependence; foster just and sustainable economic development; work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system; strengthen the UN and international efforts for cooperation and human rights; reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade; encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations.⁴⁰

These function as “practice norms,” i.e. historically verifiable effective practices, to guide action in preventing war. As conflicts develop, the ethic challenges us and especially our governments to engage these practices adequately before even approaching anything like a “just war” analysis. However, there is no full consensus in this group of authors as to whether violence is legitimated as a response to situations of intense violence, such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, etc. under the responsibility to protect frame.

There is much overlap with just peacemaking and present official Catholic social teaching as described above. For instance, in Catholic social teaching the turn to virtue certainly resonates with identifying core practices, such as the “practice norm” approach in just peacemaking. The increasing questions about just war resonate with a need for something more, such as a just peacemaking approach. The increasing appreciation for strategic nonviolent resistance resonates with some core practices of just peacemaking. The present permission in Catholic social teaching to legitimate war or violence in situations of genocide or ethnic cleansing under the responsibility to protect frame or international law also resonates with *some* of the authors in Stassen’s group in the just peacemaking approach.

Critical Analysis and Argument

However, there are key limits to Stassen’s just peacemaking and present official Catholic social teaching. For this paper, these include not yet developing or integrating some key elements of a just peace approach, and legitimating war as justifiable, an activity of justice or a way to bring about justice by using the *language* and concept of “just war.”⁴¹ Yet, I also sense something more developing in the movements of Catholic social teaching. Therefore, in this section, I briefly explore a relevant critique and corrective, analyze a potential development with

the Catholic contribution of Maryann Cusimano Love, and explain my argument for a fuller turning to a virtue-based “just peace” approach.

Through the different editions of just peacemaking, the approach encountered various critiques.⁴² Jarem Sawatsky offered a very helpful alternative analysis called *Just peace Ethics*. He worked out of the experience of restorative justice and peacebuilding scholar-practitioners to discover a shared imagination that guided their work. Sawatsky develops this school of thought by illuminating a deeper interconnection and interdependency between justice and peace, a qualification of justice as restorative, and an explicit virtue-based approach that can cross narratives or traditions. Although just peacemaking certainly integrates justice and peace, the emphasis is on preventing war. Thus, the level of integration of justice and peace in just peacemaking does not yet probe the depth of their relationship. Sawatsky explores this depth by going beyond the prevention of war to the broader issues of conflict and harm.

Regarding the explicit virtue-based approach, while virtues are the means to human flourishing, they are also constitutive, i.e. part of the end, which is human flourishing. Thus, Sawatsky argues that a just peace ethic calls forth “means/ends consistency” or “reflectivity.” The “how” must be consistent in character with the “what” we hope to accomplish, if we are *in reality* reach such an accomplishment.⁴³ I would elaborate here and argue that means and ends are reflective to the degree feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of the end sought are reflected in the means. We may not get these perfectly aligned in this world, but we should do our best in practice and *expect* the consequences for mis-alignment. For example, means/ends *inconsistency* includes parents who spank or abuse their children thinking it will get them to be more attentive and cooperative; schools relying primarily on suspension, expulsion or arrest to induce community-building behavior; nonviolent movements which dehumanize their adversary; or

countries that go to war claiming to obtain a just peace and ensure human rights. I know these examples represent different levels of intensity, but also they are not simply a question of proportionality.⁴⁴ By using analogy with these examples, to the degree inconsistency is apparent, than this will linger in different forms or take the form of serious blowback until we address the inconsistency and heal the harm this often causes to relationships and communities.

This strong attention to “means/ends” consistency directly challenges some authors of just peacemaking and in Catholic social teaching that consider armed intervention at times as justifiable, as an activity of justice, or a way to just peace. It also challenges those who argue that military action and the other practices of just peacemaking can simply “serve the same end.”⁴⁵ Further, this approach finds inadequate just peacemaking calling for merely “reducing *offensive* weapons.” Overall, such just peace ethics amplifies and deepens just peacemaking and Catholic social teaching’s attention to cultivating peacemakers in grassroots organizations and Christian communities, particularly toward transforming conflict, healing harm, and better preventing war.

In large part, as a response to such limits to just peacemaking and Catholic social teaching, as well as increasing critiques of the language and concept of “just war;” Maryann Cusimano Love as a political scientist at Catholic University of America has developed the “just peace criteria” as grounded in the way of Christ and as evolving from the insights of Catholic organizations such as Caritas International and Catholic Relief Services. According to Cusimano Love, the tradition of just peace has been “hiding in plain sight” and is not a new development, but given to us by Jesus.⁴⁶ She argues that these criteria apply to *all stages* of conflict, including once violence has broken out. They include: just cause- dignity, life, common good; right intention as positive peace; participatory process for decision-making; right relationship: vertical (between high visibility leaders, middle range, and grassroots) and horizontal (across but within

a social level); reconciliation; restoration- as material, psychological, spiritual; and sustainability.⁴⁷ Her right relationship criterion finds resonance with a leading peacebuilder John Paul Lederach, who particularly points out the need to bring equal emphasis to the vertical relationship building as with the horizontal.⁴⁸ Cusimano Love's proposal would function as criteria for determining specific actions or sets of actions we might choose to engage conflict before, during, or after direct violence breaks out. For example, I would argue that if we apply the just peace criteria to a nonviolent resistance movement as a use of force against a dictator, then holding up signs saying "Kill Milosevic" or "Milosevic is an A-hole" would not meet the just peace criteria. These actions fail to uphold the dignity of the oppressor, not to mention the oppressed, as her just cause criterion calls for, and they fail to meet the reconciliation criterion calling for activity that heals wounds and draws people toward reconciling relationship. In comparison, relying on the common criteria or content of the "just war" approach to violence rarely illuminates with such clarity the dignity of the oppressor or adversary.

Likewise, if we use the just peace criteria to assess President Obama's plan to bomb Syria in 2013, then I argue we would see how this fails to promote the common good and life of *all* people, which the just cause criterion requires; how it fails the restoration criterion by likely destroying some needed infrastructure; and how it fails the participatory process criterion as many Syrian civilian, nonviolent resistance leaders were not effectively included in the decision and were against the bombing. Some argued that the bombing would have deterred Assad and drawn us toward conditions where a political agreement or reconciliation could more likely arise. In contrast to this "just war" approach, the just peace criteria and lens help us better identify the problem with this argument. For instance, with the just peace criteria the act itself needs to draw parties closer to conciliation, rather using a destructive and dehumanizing act with a stated

intention for future reconciliation. By dehumanizing, I mean the act lowers our empathy for others, such as those who will suffer from the bombing, and it is in discord with being and living as a gift, i.e. our dignity. Thus, if we rely on the just war criteria to analyze Obama's plan then we likely miss a lot or devalue key pieces, such as dignity, common good of all people (not just the majority), participatory process, and reconciliation. Further, relying on a just war approach we ended up with most of the leading politicians and military advisors saying it met just war criteria, while many theologians and particular Bishops argued various points of view for and against. Thankfully, Pope Francis transcended this distorting discourse based on "just war" approaches by speaking out against war and for just peace practices such as calling for global fasting and prayer, seeing the other as brothers, encounter, negotiation, humanitarian assistance, and the laying down of weapons. He spoke forcefully, "Never has the use of violence brought peace in its wake. War brings on war!"⁴⁹ Soon the Catholic voice generally coalesced against the bombing. Meanwhile, "just peace" practices such as global prayer, organizing political pressure, and diplomatic initiatives actually prevented the bombing. Unfortunately, other key just peace practices were ignored and the war has continued in other ways.

There are a number of issues to work out with this proposed form of just peace criteria, but one of them is how to apply the reconciliation criterion. For instance, is a boycott or sit-in reconciling? Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi would both argue yes, assuming a just cause, because they help illuminate the deeper conflict and thus, the truth of the conflict. By offering "truth force" or nonviolent force, they provide a window to see the deeper *needs* of all parties, even if the adversary interprets the action as frustrating their "wants," i.e. as "coercive."⁵⁰ This acknowledges and tries to address in part Cahill's concern about Stassen's just peacemaking not adequately explaining the role of "coercion." These above actions of nonviolent force or

resistance help an often broken-down or lip service dialogue either re-start or become more authentic in order to better transform the conflict.

However, Satyagraha as “truth-force” is a moral commitment to integrative power which inevitably draws people closer, is in accord with our dignity, and is active in nonviolence, whether in the form of dialogue (constructive program) or civil disobedience (obstructive program). Gandhi and King made judgements about the forms of nonviolent force (constructive or obstructive) based on a vision of human flourishing and corresponding virtues, including nonviolence as a virtue. Thus, the particular form of nonviolent resistance was less about a moral commitment to discerning an *exception* to when they might use “force” or “implicitly” drawing on the “just war ethic” as some have argued.⁵¹ In contrast, the moral commitment to force being integrative power and to nonviolence as a virtue is more aligned with their approach and just peace. In turn, when nonviolent resistance was considered the orientation, mentality, moral commitment, and content of the just peace criteria correspond much better with their overall approach in discerning which action to take.

In a similar trajectory, I want to build on their work by arguing for a more virtue ethic approach to “just peace” by focusing us on the question “what kinds of people are we becoming?” This approach can also help us to focus on developing the character, habits, virtue and core practices of peacemaking so that we are better prepared to imagine nonviolent ways to engage conflict, to choose, and to sustain those ways through difficult situations. Thus, in the context of Vatican II’s extension of the call to holiness to laity and building on the Catholic trajectory of Franz Tillman, Bernard Haring, William Spohn, and Lisa Cahill, I am drawing on an argument recently made for a distinct and central virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, cultivated by seven core practices.⁵² This virtue approach to nonviolent peacemaking, and the broader just

peace approach, is not the same as pacifism understood as a “rule against violence,” in large part because it challenges us to become better people and societies in engaging conflict.⁵³ This virtue-based argument is also built off the work of Stanley Hauerwas, Gandhi (Hindu), Abdul Ghaffar Khan (Muslim), and Martin Luther King. The virtue is defined as a habit of realizing the goods of a conciliatory love that draws enemies toward friendship, and the truth of our ultimate unity and equal dignity.⁵⁴ This virtue would uplift other related virtues, such as mercy, solidarity, hospitality, and humility as well as qualify key virtues such as courage and justice, e.g. towards restorative justice. The corresponding practices to this virtue, which could also improve the just peacemaking practices include: prayer or meditation oriented to nonviolence, including for some creating and using an optional Eucharistic prayer with explicit references to Jesus’ love of enemies; training/education in nonviolent peacemaking and resistance, including forming nonviolent peacemaking communities and engaging in nonviolent resistance; attention to religious or spiritual factors, especially in government policy discourse, and intra/er-religious dialogue; constructive program or social uplift with particular focus on the poor and marginalized; conflict transformation and restorative justice; unarmed civilian peacekeeping or protection; and nonviolent civilian-based defense.

By conflict transformation I follow John Paul Lederach, who describes it as envisioning and responding “to the ebb and flow of social conflict as life-giving opportunities.”⁵⁵ *Conflict is not held to be problematic and something merely to manage or resolve*, but rather as a creative opportunity for personal, relational, structural, and cultural growth or transformation.⁵⁶ In contrast, conflict management or conflict resolution approaches too often yield violent responses or short-lived peace agreements between elites, as the roots of the conflict are left unaddressed. For example, the “violent responses” may take the form of police repression to a nonviolent

social movement since they are “stirring up conflict” and the conflict needs “managed,” or the form of military actions/wars to “resolve” a conflict as a “just war” lens often suggests.

This approach to conflict as being potentially creative and constructive is important for understanding the power and strategic effectiveness of nonviolent resistance. Gene Sharp has identified key sources of power and pillars of support of oppressive regimes, which nonviolent resistance movements should strategically focus on diminishing.⁵⁷ In this strategic approach, the resistance can achieve its political goals and shift power away from the oppressor even without a “change of heart” by the oppressor. Recent history has demonstrated that this has worked against some of the most ruthless leaders, particularly when there is wise strategic planning.⁵⁸ In fact, recent research has discovered that contemporary nonviolent resistance movements have been *twice as* successful in achieving their political objectives as violent revolutions. Even more telling, successful nonviolent movements have led to basic “durable democracies” at least *ten times* (some argue 30 times) more often than “successful” violent revolutions.⁵⁹ To the degree such nonviolent resistance movements become integrated with the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, I suggest their success would be even higher, especially regarding durable democracy and more significantly a sustainable just peace.

Unarmed civilian peacekeeping or protection entails an outside party intervening in a conflict as non-partisan, with compassion for all parties, without violence, with the aim of defusing violence, and of creating a space for reconciliation and peace building. This proven practice includes tactics such as protective presence and accompaniment, proactive engagement with armed actors, physical interposition, monitoring/documenting, modeling nonviolent behavior, connecting local persons to national and international resources, and providing safe places from violence or for restorative dialogue.⁶⁰

Civilian-Based Defense entails using nonviolent resistance to defend against military invasion, occupation or *coups d'etat*. For instance, the resisters do not necessarily physically prevent invading troops from entering their territory. Yet, most people in some way participate in the resistance, taking responsibility for their defense rather than delegating it to an elite group.⁶¹ This primarily entails non-cooperation with key orders of the opponent and perhaps creation of a parallel institutions or government, to the point of making it inconvenient to nearly impossible for the occupying force to benefit or even stay. Taking different forms civilian-based defense has developed a number of times in the past century and some governments recently incorporated it into their defense planning. Past examples include the 1923 resistance to Wolfgang Kapp's attempted *coup d'etat* in Germany,⁶² the Norwegian and Danish resistance against German occupation during WWII,⁶³ the Czechoslovakian resistance against Soviet occupation in 1968,⁶⁴ the Baltic countries in 1990-91,⁶⁵ and the Philippines in 1986. Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, and Lithuania have incorporated civilian-based defense into their defense planning by providing research and development funds to create nonviolent methods to prevent military occupation.⁶⁶

To summarize this section, the just peacemaking practices are helpful in thinking about how to prevent war and how to hold governments accountable to these practices, particularly when they argue for engaging in a war. However, they don't directly address the "just war" criteria and the unhealthy psycho-social reality this framework too often enables. Cusimano Love does and she argues that the just peace criteria should actually at least take priority to using "just war" criteria, if not ultimately, as I wonder, perhaps serve as an alternative to "just war" criteria because they are more expansive across all stages of conflict as well as more conducive to actually cultivating a just peace.

As with Catholic social teaching, Stassen and Cusimano Love both desire for us to become better and more just peacemakers. I am building on this shared desire and transforming their proposed frameworks by offering an orienting virtue ethic along with the focused question, “what kinds of people are we becoming?” This virtue approach builds out Pope Francis’ wisdom that “peacemaking is much more courageous than warfare.”⁶⁷ Further, this virtue would amplify the development of character and the kind of imagination, which engages and creatively applies, extends, and even corrects the core practices of Stassen’s just peacemaking as well as Catholic social teaching. For instance, the virtue includes the core practice of a constructive program, which helps clarify that nonviolence functions primarily as a constructive endeavor more so than being limited to obstructive activity. This virtue would also include other aspects that are underdeveloped or missing from just peacemaking and to some extent from Catholic social teaching, such as conflict transformation, unarmed civilian protection, care for creation through the related virtue of solidarity, (missing from just peacemaking) and nonviolent civilian-based defense. This virtue ethic would challenge the just peacemaking practice of merely reducing “*offensive* weapons” as both an unclear distinction and inadequate. Further, persons would better imagine alternatives to, further marginalize, and at least *culturally* de-legitimize the use of violence even if legally permitted by part of the UN’s responsibility to protect agreement, which still has support in Catholic social teaching and in some authors of just peacemaking.

The just peacemaking practices may help prevent some wars, but the virtue-based just peace approach described above would likely do a better job of preventing and transforming violence, which ultimately strengthens the prevention of war as well as the capacity to defuse active wars.⁶⁸ This virtue-based approach would also prepare us better to orient, apply and develop the just peace criteria of Cusimano Love, perhaps as a way to move beyond “just war”

language. Moving beyond the concept and language of “just war” would be one step to building off Pope Francis who de-links justice from killing.⁶⁹ For the Catholic Church, I suspect we would more clearly sense the call to develop and embrace a fuller turn to a “just peace” approach.

Public Policy Examples and Challenges

The turn to “just peace” in our Catholic communities and theology also has significant implications for how we analyze public policy as the practices above suggest. I suggest we begin by framing our moral policy analysis oriented by just peace, understood as illuminating human dignity, ensuring human rights and cultivating thriving relationships.⁷⁰ Examples of drawing on the “just peace” lens to apply to contemporary issues have been articulated, e.g. regarding the issue of lethal drones, nuclear weapons, the conflict in Syria, and ISIS.⁷¹

Earlier I referred to some ways just peace criteria would apply to an earlier stage in the conflict in Syria. To further illustrate an integrated “just peace” approach, I turn briefly to the issue of lethal drones, which have also been analyzed by an official Catholic organization using a “just war” approach.⁷² I would begin with the question, “what kinds of people are we becoming,” particularly by using lethal drones to address conflict? With this lens along with the just peace criteria and core practices identified above, we are more likely to identify and commit to transformative peacemaking practices, rather than use lethal drones. As a reminder, the just peace criteria include: just cause- dignity, life, common good; right intention as positive peace; participatory decision-making process; right relationship: vertical (between high visibility leaders, middle range, and grassroots) and horizontal (across but within a social level); reconciliation; restoration- as material, psychological, spiritual; and sustainability.⁷³

Including the affected communities in our attention to “kinds of people we are becoming,” we would more likely identify how lethal drones increase fear and anxiety in communities by their constant hovering and the risk of being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Fear and anxiety builds distrust in a community. Thus, they would struggle to meet the just peace criterion of just cause that requires the common good of *all*, the criterion of participatory process, and the criterion of sustainability. With a “just peace” approach grounded in the orienting question above, we would also see how lethal drones exacerbate impersonal ways of engaging conflict or what Pope Francis calls the “technocratic paradigm.”⁷⁴ We become increasingly less capable and willing to engage various conflicts in humanizing ways that are in accord with our human dignity. We become less likely to create conditions to defuse the hostility by using effective, transformative practices, such as development programs, restorative justice practices, nonviolent civilian resistance training, or unarmed civilian protection mechanisms. Thus, the use of lethal drones struggles to meet the just peace criterion of drawing us toward restoration. We likely increase a habit of avoiding root causes, which also can impact other policy issues such as immigration or environmental justice. Even if one or more armed persons are killed by lethal drones, it is quite predictable and often bears out, that more armed persons will arise particularly from the trauma induced. We also diminish key virtues, such as solidarity with all people, especially the poor and marginalized; courage, that risks one's life to lift up the dignity of all people; and even justice, particularly healing harm to relationships via restorative justice. In this light, lethal drones seem quite inconsistent with human dignity.⁷⁵

In contrast, a “just war” approach tends to begin with the question, “what conditions might be necessary for the use of lethal drones to be considered justifiable or just?” The common tendency even by some religious leaders is to primarily identify some desired limits such as

developing international standards on lethal drones, more transparency, only if imminent threat, proportionate violence, no “intention” to harm civilians, and as a last resort.⁷⁶ Yet, “proportionate” violence is too often ambiguous, and good “intention” is too easily claimed while minimizing the moral value of actual effects on civilians, not to mention others. There is often a more narrow or truncated view of alternative practices before reaching “last resort.” Further, there is often inadequate attention if any to building peace, addressing root causes, or considering the kinds of habits we are developing. Thus, in the context of the U.S. and our present habits of engaging conflict, lethal drones largely continue unabated with little concern from many. A fuller turn to “just peace” is sorely needed, particularly by the Catholic Church.

If such a turn were to take place, some might raise important questions which need addressed. First, even if the Catholic Church turns to just peace, what happens when governments seek military action or go to war? How do we engage the dialogue and set limits on war? Won’t we be dismissed and ignored in the key circles of decision-making? The fact is that people like Maryann Cusimano Love are already using her just peace criteria in high level U.S. government circles, and she’s not being dismissed. Further, I suggest we engage the dialogue beforehand, during, and after violent conflict by making clear arguments about effective concrete just peace practices. We also use the just peace criteria to guide actions to prevent, defuse, and heal; as well as to hold accountable actions chosen by others. We keep attention on the question, “what kind of people we are becoming” and the virtues or vices being cultivated. As Catholics, we should refuse to risk impressions of war as an activity of justice, as the “just war” language too often does.⁷⁷ Yet, keeping clear the distinction between justice and legality, the present legal code, both domestically and internationally, has legal limits on war which will still function. I am not necessarily suggesting all people simply drop these legal limits, i.e. legalized *content* of a

“just war” approach, even though many continue to ignore international law regarding war.⁷⁸

Yet, gradually with persistence and especially through transforming civil society via God’s grace, we as Catholics should work to develop such law to increasingly incorporate and turn to just peace practices and criteria. This would be more consistent with Vatican II’s call to strain every muscle to outlaw war.⁷⁹

Second, should we as the Catholic Church use both sets of criteria? Should we just shift the language from “just war” to “limited war?” A shift to “limited war” criteria would certainly be better than mixing war with the notion of justice, and may illuminate better some of the good intentions in the “just war” tradition. Part of the process of any full turning to just peace will entail both sets of criteria being drawn on by some, compared, and worked out in concrete cases. However, without the *turn* to a just peace approach—criteria, practice norms, core virtues—then we as the Catholic Church continue to in principle legitimate war as a practice as long as it is “limited.” Such religious legitimation and more so the practice of war itself already has and will likely continue to obstruct the development of our imagination, will, and practice of just peace approaches, and thus, leave us too easily influenced, determined, and co-opted by those in political, economic, and military positions of power. Some examples of this obstruction include: a prominent Christian scholar of “just war” ethics refusing to learn about the emerging practice of unarmed civilian protection because they deemed it “not their area of expertise;” a major Catholic advocacy organization in Washington D.C. still having no awareness of this specific practice, although the organized practice has been around for 25-30 years; and how rarely Catholic leaders speak about or promote nonviolent resistance (esp. boycotts, strikes, civil disobedience, etc.) to injustice and violence. I suspect that we as Catholics, and even all Christians, need to make a clearer turn to “just peace” and advance its’ development.

Third, what about the grave atrocity cases, especially when the lethal threat is immediate? Shouldn't governments intervene with military action when "necessary"? Shouldn't the Catholic Church be supportive of saving the "innocent" and ensuring human rights? Even when the lethal threat is immediate and grave, the church as the Body of Christ in this world should urgently offer and participate in just peace ways of analysis, advocacy, and intervention before, *during*, and after such moments. The Catholic Church need not and I suggest should not be engaged in providing explicit justification or legitimation for military violence.

When the level of dehumanization is so high, then what is "necessary" is not so much lethal violence, but the willingness to risk one's life for the sake of the dignity of *all* people. Pope Francis clearly said "war is never a necessity, nor is it inevitable. Another way can always be found."⁸⁰ Facing squarely the reality of sin and evil in our world, just peace interventions should expect higher potential for suffering or even death *in such moments*, rather than settle for the too popular position of taking military action or doing nothing.⁸¹ Although the potential for suffering and death is higher in such moments compared to other stages of conflict, the level of suffering and death compared to military intervention is much lower often in the short-run but almost certainly in the long-run. Nevertheless, if governments or the UN decide based on present international law for military action in such atrocity cases, the Catholic Church's role is less about condemning those *persons* who took such action. Instead, I suggest the Catholic's role is more about clearly naming such violent *action* as a tragedy, a failure on the way of just peace, as well as inconsistent with human dignity and a culture of human rights for all. Further, and more importantly in such cases, the Catholic's role is also more about keeping a just peace approach front and center; and to advocate even in the midst of violence, for creative just peace practices to defuse, stop, and transform the violence. This would mean during and after the violence,

Catholics should clearly take a restorative justice approach to all actors, which include the human need for accountability.⁸² During and after the violence, the Catholic Church should advocate for addressing the root causes, promote public mourning rituals for the violence, and urgently call for the government actors particularly, but also the Catholic Church to significantly increase nonviolent intervention strategies as well as investments in such training and institutions.⁸³

Conclusion

As a way of concluding, I offer some practical recommendations around Catholic communities to help advance this development toward a “just peace” approach for Catholic social teaching. Becoming virtuous and just peace people requires communities of formation. In 1986, Susan Thistlethwaite developed an integrated “Just Peace Church” program for the United Church of Christ, which includes the call to “move beyond just war thinking.”⁸⁴ This includes training in nonviolent peacemaking skills, explicit encouragement of any young members discerning a call to be conscientious objectors to war, and exploring with military industries the opportunities to become just peace industries, etc.⁸⁵ This program would be enhanced with the integration of the just peace criteria and a virtue-based approach as outlined above.⁸⁶ Further, the recent Mennonite-Catholic dialogue explicitly recognized nonviolence as a Christian and human virtue, and they embraced the “Church’s decisive function to incarnate the new order of the Kingdom of God.”⁸⁷ Similar to the United Church of Christ, more and more Catholic parishes, religious institutes, and organizations could explicitly engage a “just peace” discernment in a somewhat analogous way to signing on to the Catholic Climate Covenant.

In sum, Just Peace is both a vision and an ethic. As a vision, it expresses the reality of Shalom and the integration of peace and justice as modeled by Christ. As an ethic, it offers a way

of justice via peace-making and peace via justice-making. This entails an understanding of just peace, which includes a moral commitment to illuminating human dignity, but also ensuring human rights and cultivating thriving relationships. This ethic offers a set of core virtues to form our character and shape core practices, as well as to both orient and better apply a set of just peace criteria for specific actions to engage conflict. As a virtue approach, it is not the same as pacifism “understood as a rule against violence,” but it challenges us to become better people and societies in engaging conflict. The qualification of justice as restorative, the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, and the recognition of means/ends reflectivity are each key elements of this ethic. I have described the present Catholic social teaching, the trajectory of development and argued the Catholic Church should advance these recent key developments toward a turning to a “just peace” analysis and approach, particularly to large-scale conflict and war. I have also offered some initial thoughts on practical steps to advance this turn in our particular faith communities and policy discourse, including an initial shift in *language* or frame from “just war” to “just peace.” More thinking, development, clarification, and application of a “just peace” approach is certainly welcomed and needed.

May the God of Love grace our hearts to turn to “just peace” and the way of Jesus’ love of friends, strangers, and enemies. The centrality and even declared Year of Mercy, which Pope Francis illuminates, urgently invites us in this direction.⁸⁸

¹ As one example of this limited framing, see Nigel Biggar, *In Defence of War*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2013).

² I am also encouraging Catholics who work in government positions and have responsibility for such decisions.

³ U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, “*Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise Our Response*,” (1983) par. 78, 105. Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, *Compendium of Social Doctrine of Church*, (2006) par. 502. Catechism of Catholic Church, (1993), par. 2309-2310.

⁴ Psalm 85:10.

⁵ Maryann Cusimano Love, “What Kind of Peace Do We Seek?” presentation at Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Vatican City, Nov. 11, 2014.

⁶ The extension of the call to holiness to the laity is particularly significant. Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the main architects of Catholic “just war” theory, reserved the counsels of perfection and non-soldiering for the religious. For instance, the counsels of perfection include loving your enemies even when they have no immediate need. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (NY, NY: Benziger Bros., 1947-48), I-II, q.108, a.4, ad.4. Also, Thomas indicated that bishops and clerics *as representatives of Jesus* should be willing to shed their blood *rather than* another’s, and that anyone shedding another’s, even without sin, becomes “irregular.” Aquinas, II-II, q.40, a.2, ad.4.

⁷ Pope John XXIII, *Peace on Earth*, 1963, par. 127.

⁸ Pope Paul VI, World Day of Peace Message, Jan. 1, 1972.

⁹ Pope Paul IV, *Evangelii nuntiani*, no. 37, 1975.

¹⁰ Pope Paul VI, World Day of Peace Message, 1975. Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 1965, par. 81.

¹¹ Pope John Paul II, Homily at Drogheda, Ireland, Sept. 29, 1979, in *The Pope in Ireland: Speeches and Homilies*, (Dublin, Ireland: Veritas Publications, 2004), 18.

¹² Pope John Paul II, Homily at Drogheda, 19-20.

¹³ Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Centesimus Annus*, 23: AAS 83 (1991), 820-821. Also in Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, *Compendium of Social Doctrine*, par. 438.

¹⁴ Pope John Paul II, World Day of Peace Message, 2002.

¹⁵ U.S. Bishops, “Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace,” Nov. 17, 1993.

¹⁶ Pope Benedict, Midday Angelus, 2007. Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, “Instruction on Certain Aspects of the Theology of Liberation,” Aug. 6, 1984; section xi, paragraph 7.

¹⁷ International Theological Commission, “God the Trinity and the Unity of Humanity: Christian Monotheism and its Opposition to Violence,” Dec. 2013.

¹⁸ Pope Francis, Homily, June 2, 2013.

¹⁹ Pope Francis, World Day of Peace Message, Jan. 1, 2014.

²⁰ Pope Francis, Angelus, Aug, 31, 2013.

²¹ Pope Francis, *Laudato Si’*, June 18, 2015, par. 82.

²² Leon Friedman, ed. *The Law of War: A Documentary History* (New York: Random House, 1972), 7.

²³ Pope Francis, “Pope Francis Message to Sant’ Egidio International Peace Meeting in Antwerp,” in Zenit, Sept. 8, 2014. <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/pope-francis-message-to-sant-egidio-international-peace-meeting-in-antwerp>

²⁴ Pope Francis, *Laudato Si’*, June 18, 2015, par. 56.

²⁵ Pope Francis, *Laudato Si’*, June 18, 2015, par. 228.

²⁶ Pope Francis, “No Matter what the Crime, the Death Penalty is Inadmissible,” in *Catholic News Agency*, Mar. 20 2015.

²⁷ Pope Francis, World Day of Peace Message, 2014.

²⁸ Pope Francis, Sunday Angelus, Aug. 19, 2013.

²⁹ Pope Francis, June 9, 2014. <http://www.news.va/en/news/pope-francis-and-the-presidents-of-israel-and-pale>

³⁰ Pope Francis, Interview, June 6, 2015. <http://www.news.va/en/news/the-pope-interviewed-by-journalists-during-return>

³¹ Francis Rocca, “Pope Talks Airstrikes in Iraq, his Health, Possible U.S. Visit,” in Catholic News Service, Aug. 18, 2014. In a November 2014 talk, he does use the phrase regarding Iraq/Syria, “cannot be resolved solely through a military response.” But it is unclear if this is a *description* of those using military means with a *prescription* to do other types of action, or a prescription of both military and other means, particularly in light of his broader message in this talk. <http://ncronline.org/news/global/pope-turkey-military-solutions-cannot-solve-middle-east-violence>

³² John Allen, "Pope Francis says State Terrorism, Extremists Both Worrisome," in Boston Globe, Nov. 26, 2014. <http://www.bostonglobe.com/news/world/2014/11/26/pope-francis-says-state-terrorism-extremists-both-worrisome/3bCKm8JkeSugGFn8HBXSWP/story.html>

³³ Nonviolence and Just Peace Conference, "An Appeal to the Catholic Church to Re-Commit to the Centrality of Gospel Nonviolence," Apr. 11-13, 2016. <http://www.paxchristi.net/news/appeal-catholic-church-recommit-centrality-gospel-nonviolence/5855#sthash.RkIk6WZX.3nEvomDd.dpbs>

³⁴ United Methodist Church, *The Book of Discipline*, (Nashville, TN: United Methodist Publishing House, 2012), 140.

³⁵ World Council of Churches, "Way of Just Peace," Nov. 8, 2013.

³⁶ World Council of Churches, "Ecumenical Call to Just Peace," (2011), par. 23. Yet, they still hold on to the possibility of lawful uses of armed force to protect vulnerable populations; although, this is seen as a "sign of a serious failure and obstacle on the Way of Just Peace." Acknowledging the authority of the UN and international law, they say "as Christians we feel obliged to go further" and challenge "any justifications for use of military power." par. 22-23.

³⁷ Richard McSorley, S.J., *Kill? For Peace?* (Georgetown University, Center for Peace Studies, 1982) 58-59. Also, agreed to by a conversation with US Catholic Conference of Bishops senior staff (2014).

³⁸ Naomi Malone, "From Just War to Just Peace: Revisioning Just War Theory from a Feminist Perspective," (2004), Dissertation, 33, 49. John Langan SJ, "The Just-War Theory After the Gulf War," *Theological Studies* 53, no.1 (1992), p. 99.

³⁹ *Just peacemaking: New Paradigm for Ethics of Peace and War*, ed. G. Stassen. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2008 (3rd Edition). Since the initial edition of just peacemaking in 1998, inter-religious support and applications have developed. See Susan Thistlewaite and Glen Stassen, "Abrahamic Alternatives to War: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Perspectives on Just peacemaking," USIP Special Report, 2007. *Interfaith Just Peacemaking: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Perspectives on the New Paradigm of Peace and War*, ed. By Susan Thistlethwaite, (Palgrave: New York, NY, 2012). Simeon O. Ilesanmi, "So that Peace May Reign: A Study of Just peacemaking Experiments in Africa," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, v 23, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 213-226. Charles Kimball, "The Just Peacemaking Paradigm and Middle East Conflicts," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, v 23, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 227-240.

⁴⁰ Stassen, *Just Peacemaking: New Paradigm*.

⁴¹ U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, "Challenge of Peace: God's Promise Our Response," (1983), par. 78, 105. Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, *Compendium of Social Doctrine of Church*, (2006) par. 502.

⁴² For example, Lisa Sowle Cahill argued that JPT is missing an adequate analysis of the role of sin and coercion. Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Just Peacemaking: Theory, Practice, and Prospects," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* v 23, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 195-212.

⁴³ Sawatsky, *Justice Ethics*, 12-13.

⁴⁴ I choose "inconsistency" here instead of "proportional" for the following reasons. First, inconsistent does include proportionality but it goes deeper with attention to feelings, character/societal habits, and long-term consequences, etc. Second, it has less risk of appearing to justify some evil as long as "more good" seems to come about. Third, it helps to better see how violent force is inconsistent with nonviolent ends, because it is characterized by lowering empathy and de-humanizing both parties. Killing always does this, particularly war, even if it might seem less evil or is called "proportional" in the short-term compared to even more violence. See more in the discussion below on nonviolent force.

⁴⁵ Martin Cook, "Just Peacemaking: Challenges of Humanitarian Intervention," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, v 23, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 243.

⁴⁶ Maryann Cusimano Love, "What Kind of Peace Do We Seek?" presentation at Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Vatican City, Nov. 11, 2014.

⁴⁷ Ibid., "What Kind of Peace Do We Seek?" in *Peacebuilding: Catholic Theology, Ethics, and Praxis*, ed. Schreiter, Appleby, Powers. (Orbis, 2010), p. 76-82.

⁴⁸ John Paul Lederach, "Justpeace," <http://homepage.univie.ac.at/silvia.michal-misak/justpeace.htm>.

⁴⁹ Pope Francis, Angelus, Sept. 1, 2013. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/angelus/2013/documents/papa-francesco_angelus_20130901.html

⁵⁰ Some scholars such as Michael Nagler suggest that such nonviolent force is not “coercive” in the strict sense because it is actually helping the adversary get their authentic needs met, even if they don’t yet recognize them.

⁵¹ Lloyd Steffen, “Gandhi’s Nonviolent Resistance: A Justified Use of Force?” in *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, 15:1 (Spring 2008), 71. Though an interesting read, I have many other concerns about this article which I don’t have space to address here.

⁵² Eli S. McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers: A Virtue Ethic for Catholic Social Teaching and U.S. Policy*, (Wipf and Stock, 2012).

⁵³ But also this is more than a rule against violence because just peace criteria would guide all possible action choices, even if some consider using violence. With the integration of a virtue approach along with the means/ends consistency insight, actually choosing violence becomes quite unlikely if not impossible, especially if clearly based on Gospel nonviolence.

⁵⁴ The virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, distinct from the Thomistic virtue of charity, entails particularly drawing enemies toward friendship, and deals with conflict or acute conflict, which call forth a unique set of paradigmatic practices. The Thomistic virtue of charity particularly cultivates friendship with God, which does include loving what God loves, such as strangers and enemies. Thus, the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking more appropriately fits as a sub-virtue that arises most fully from charity, as does the virtue of mercy in a Thomistic framework.

⁵⁵ John Paul Lederach, *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation*, (Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2003), 390-397.

⁵⁶ Lederach, R. Neufeldt, H. Culbertson, *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring, and Learning Tool Kit*, (Notre Dame, IN: Kroc Institute University of Notre Dame, 2007), 18.

⁵⁷ Gene Sharp, “How Nonviolent Struggle Works,” (Albert Einstein Institute: East Boston, MA, 2013), 5-6. These six sources of power include: authority/legitimacy, human resources, skills/knowledge of key human supporters, intangible factors- psychological/ideological, material resources, and sanctions/enforcement.

⁵⁸ Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Porter Sargent, 2005. This includes leaders like Milosevic, Marcos, Pinochet, along with repressive systems such as the Soviet Union and Apartheid, as well as even Hitler when it was tried, e.g. Denmark, Norway, and the Rosenstrasse Protest.

⁵⁹ Maria Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, *Why Civilian Resistance Works*, (Columbia University Press: New York, NY, 2011), 7, 213-214. Of the three cases given of “successful” violent revolutions that led to basic “durable democracies,” at least 2 are quite questionable and certainly not promising models. The Bangali campaign in 1971 has had major political corruption, coups, military leaders, etc. for 20 yrs. afterwards. The Jewish resistance in 1948 has certainly still maintained significant habits of violence, both direct and structural, e.g. the occupation of Palestine. The Costa Rica campaign ending in 1948 was quite short and mixed with significant nonviolent action, but ultimately they decided to disband their entire military, which still holds today. Thus, “ten times” more likely appears to be an understatement. If we use their numbers and take out these first two, then it’s more like “thirty times” more likely.

⁶⁰ Examples of unarmed civilian peacekeeping/protection include the Nonviolent Peaceforce, Peace Brigades International, Cure Violence, Christian Peacemaker Teams, Meta Peace Team, and the DC Peace Team. See evaluations of Cure Violence: <http://cureviolence.org/results/>. See how the Nonviolent Peaceforce directly saved 14 women and children in South Sudan. <http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/what-we-do/stories-from-the-field/29-south-sudan-news/60-andres-gutierrez-and-derek-oakley-on-their-experience-of-the-violence-in-south-sudan>

⁶¹ Michael Nagler, *Is There No Other Way, The Search for a Nonviolent Future*, (Berkeley: Berkeley Hills Books, 2001), 252-253.

⁶² Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*, (Boston: Porter Sargent, 2005), 91-100; Sternstein, “The Ruhrkampf of 1923,” 106-135.

⁶³ Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 135-142; Skodvin, “Norwegian Nonviolent Resistance,” 136-153. On Denmark see Bennett, “The Resistance Against,” 154-172.

⁶⁴ Nagler, *Is There No Other Way*, 133-136; Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 189-204.

⁶⁵ Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 277-286.

⁶⁶ Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 516. Sharp, “Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System,” (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 125.

⁶⁷ Pope Francis, June 9, 2014. <http://www.news.va/en/news/pope-francis-and-the-presidents-of-israel-and-pale>

⁶⁸ Some of these practice adjustments as mentioned above might include: conflict transformation, reducing all weapons, unarmed civilian protection as modeled by NP, nonviolent civilian-based defense, meditation/prayer, inter/ra-religious dialogue, care for creation, constructive program, no explicit endorsement of lethal military action, etc.

⁶⁹ He says, "justice can never be wrought by killing a human being." Pope Francis, "No Matter what the Crime, the Death Penalty is Inadmissible," in *Catholic News Agency*, Mar. 20 2015.

⁷⁰ Further, under just peace we can also integrate the public health models that increasingly recognize violence as a disease; as well as its' tendency, even when legal, to *primarily* displace or push to another location rather than transform an adversary's violence. On violence as a disease, see the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention. Further, in the Cure Violence organization this means: prevention by interrupting transmission, identify and change the thinking of highest potential transmitters--provide treatment, and change group/cultural norms. Even when tactics of violence *displace* the adversary's violence in the short-term, such violence toward armed actors is often self-perpetuating, as the retributive violence (blowback) that flares up in response will often propitiate more armed intervention in a tit-for-tat escalation. We see this over and over again in wars. Yet, this pattern also shows up in armed police action compared to Cure Violence's unarmed model of intervention, which more readily has a *dispersion* effect on violence. That is, violence generally goes down in the immediate area and in surrounding areas, as well as in the short and long term. John Hopkins School of Public Health, "Evaluation of Baltimore's Safe Streets Program," Jan. 2012. On police displacement, M. Conte, "Jersey City Police Ramping Up Efforts in 7 Areas Driving Gun Violence," in the *Jersey Journal*, July 24, 2014.

⁷¹ Conference of Major Superiors of Men, "Armed Drones: Do They Make us Better People?" May 30, 2013. Maryann Cusimano Love, "What Kind of Peace do we Seek?" paper for Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Vatican City, Nov. 11, 2014. Eli McCarthy, "Just Peace Response to Syria," in *America Magazine* 'In All Things,' Feb. 24, 2012. "Interrupting Hostilities and Seeking Justice in Syria," in *America Magazine* 'In All Things,' Sept. 4, 2013. "Religious Leaders Urge a JustPeace Response to ISIS," in *Huffington Post*, Sept. 19, 2014.

⁷² Bishop Pates, Chair of USCCB International Justice and Peace Committee, "Letter to National Security Advisor Donilon," May 17, 2013. Bishop Cantu, Chair of USCCB International Justice and Peace Committee, "Policy Framework: Letter to National Security Advisor Rice," May 11, 2015.

⁷³ Cusimano Love, "What Kind of Peace Do We Seek?" in *Peacebuilding: Catholic Theology, Ethics, and Praxis*, ed. Schreiter, Appleby, Powers. (Orbis, 2010), p. 76-82.

⁷⁴ Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'*, June 18, 2015, par. 106.

⁷⁵ Conference of Major Superiors of Men, "Armed Drones: Do They Make us Better People?" May 30, 2013. http://www.cmsm.org/documents/05-30-13_CMSM_Statement_Armed_Drones.pdf

⁷⁶ Bishop Pates, Chair of USCCB International Justice and Peace Committee, "Letter to National Security Advisor Donilon," May 17, 2013. Bishop Cantu, Chair of USCCB International Justice and Peace Committee, "Policy Framework: Letter to National Security Advisor Rice," May 11, 2015.

⁷⁷ Pope Francis declared that "justice can never be wrought by killing a human being." Mar. 20, 2105. <http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/popec-francis-no-matter-what-the-crime-the-death-penalty-is-inadmissible-89127/>

⁷⁸ Mary Ellen O'Connell, "The Just War Tradition and International Law against War," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, vol. 35, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2015), 45-47.

⁷⁹ Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 1965, par. 81.

⁸⁰ Pope Francis, "Pope Francis Message to Sant' Egidio International Peace Meeting in Antwerp," in *Zenit*, Sept. 8, 2014. <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/pope-francis-message-to-sant-egidio-international-peace-meeting-in-antwerp>

⁸¹ Cook, "Just Peacemaking: Challenges of Humanitarian Intervention," 245.

⁸² Such restorative approaches could include the rhetoric used to describe the situation; circles to defuse the violence by including persons who might have influence, be supporting, or even directly involved; and Truth and Reconciliation Commissions after the violence.

⁸³ For other responses to common challenges associated with justpeace, but particularly Christian nonviolence, see *A Faith Not Worth Fighting For: Addressing Commonly Asked Questions about Christian Nonviolence*, ed. T. York and J. Bronson Barringer, (Cascade Books: Eugene, OR, 2012).

⁸⁴ Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, *A Just Peace Church*, (United Church of Christ Press: Cleveland, OH, 1986), 134.

⁸⁵ Thistlethwaite, *Just Peace Church*, 84, 127, 146.

⁸⁶ Rev. Emmanuel McCarthy, *The Nonviolent Eucharistic Jesus: A Pastoral Approach*, Wilmington, DE, Center for Christian Nonviolence, 1991.

⁸⁷ www.bridgefolk.net and Report of International Dialogue between Catholic Church and World Mennonite Conference 1998-2003, "Called Together to Be Peacemakers," Aug. 2003, par. 152, 177, 184.

⁸⁸ Pope Francis, *Misericordiae Vultus*, Bull of Induction, Apr. 11, 2015 (Year of Mercy began Dec. 8, 2015) https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_letters/documents/papa-francesco_bolla_20150411_misericordiae-vultus.html