As Christians, we live in hope. However serious the challenge we face, we always know that within the human community we will find the needed gifts, wisdom, and compassion to move forward. We know also that through our communal efforts the Spirit is at work renewing the face of the earth. As one of the Cateret Islanders stated after they had been given new land to settle their families, "We have plenty of friends now. It's begun."

Discussion Questions

1. If scientists determine that polar ice caps are melting at a dangerous level, what moral obligation do we have to respond to this news—and what should our response look like?
2. What obligations do we have to ensure a relatively comfortable life for the children of this generation without endangering the same expectations for future generations?
3. What duties do we have toward other species?
4. How morally significant are scientific conclusions that are less than one hundred percent certain?
5. Choose an environmental issue and use the four points noted above as a framework to think about it. How might this framework differ from another framework for thinking about an environmental issue?

Chapter 7

Gerard F. Powers

Catholic Peacebuilding

If Catholic Social Teaching (CST) is the church's best-kept secret, peacebuilding is CST's best-kept secret. But, one might object, isn't the church's teaching on just war and pacifism among the oldest and best known parts of CST? Although this is true, peacebuilding is much broader than the ethics of war. The United Nations (UN), governments, and many scholars define peacebuilding as efforts to promote economic, social, and political reconstruction and reconciliation after internal conflicts with a primary focus on governments and public policies. In this chapter peacebuilding is defined more broadly to cover the church's teaching and practice related to the entire conflict cycle (before, during, and after war), as well as both interstate and intrastate conflicts. This involves not only government actors and public policies and institutions, but also a range of other actors, factors, and practices at all levels that are integral to healing broken societies and building and sustaining a just peace. The church's peacebuilding involves a broad spectrum of activities, from advocacy and mass mobilization to facilitation of peace negotiations and participation in truth and reconciliation processes. This broad approach to peace is evident in the following anecdotes.

Iraq. On Ash Wednesday 2003, Cardinal Pio Laghi, Pope John Paul II's special envoy, met with President George Bush at the White House to deliver a message from the pope urging the president not to go to war in Iraq. The pope's letter repeated what had become his common refrain—and that of church leaders in the United States and around the world—in

the months leading up to the war: "War is not the answer!" The answer, according to the pope, was negotiation and dialogue. In his press statement after the meeting, Cardinal Laghi explained that Iraq should be handled within the framework of the UN and international law. He concluded that military intervention, especially intervention justified by a doctrine of preventive war, would be illegal and immoral. He decried "the grave consequences" of going to war in Iraq, "the suffering of the people of Iraq" and "further instability in the region and a new gulf between Islam and Christianity."[1]

President Bush repeated what he said many times before and after: in effect, that war *was* the answer. He dismissed the cardinal's dire warnings and instead insisted that war would not only eliminate the gathering danger posed by a "rogue" regime with ties to global terrorist networks and weapons of mass destruction, but war would also bring freedom for the people of Iraq, new stability to the region, and would be a catalyst for the spread of democracy throughout the Middle East. In what observers considered an unprecedented snub and an indication of the White House's desire to mute the pope's moral critique, Cardinal Laghi was not permitted the usual privilege of talking with the media on White House grounds.

The LRA in Northern Uganda. The video *Kony 2012* was incredibly successful in bringing attention to the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), an extremist group that has terrorized populations in Northern Uganda and neighboring countries for many years. Fifteen years before that video went viral, Roman Catholic Archbishop John Baptist Odama joined with his Anglican, Muslim, and Orthodox counterparts to form the Acholi Religious Leaders' Peace Initiative. Archbishop Odama had the courage to risk his life and go four times into the bush, alone and with the other religious leaders, to meet Joseph Kony, the brutal LRA leader (and former altar boy) who has been indicted for war crimes by the International Criminal Court (ICC). Their appeals to stop the violence and pursue a negotiated peace are widely credited with helping to convince Kony to enter formal peace negotiations. Given their role and the credibility they have with the Acholi people, the religious leaders were invited to be official facilitators of the peace process. As facilitators, they were outspoken in opposing the ICC indictments, arguing that they were obstacles to

1. See "On File," *Origins* 32, no. 39 (March 13, 2003): 642.

finalizing a peace agreement and an unnecessary imposition given that traditional Acholi methods of accountability and reconciliation would be more appropriate.

Sudan. On July 9, 2011, South Sudan became an independent state that January after a referendum on independence that many feared would ignite a new genocidal conflict in a country that had seen little else in the past half century. The independence referendum was part of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, which brought a cease-fire in a conflict that had raged in southern Sudan from 1955 to 1972 and again from 1983 to 2005. The path to a cease-fire and full independence would not have been laid without a multipronged peacebuilding effort by the Catholic and Anglican Churches. These churches were, for all intents and purposes, the only functioning institutions in southern Sudan. They were responsible for most education, health care, humanitarian aid, development programs, and human rights monitoring. Moreover, their "People-to-People" peace process in the 1990s helped reconcile warring tribes in southern Sudan, their parallel civil society peace process helped cement the 2005 peace agreement, and their civic education campaign and logistical support were instrumental in ensuring a peaceful and credible referendum on independence.

The fact that these anecdotes would be news to even otherwise well-informed Catholics illustrate why it is appropriate to say that peacebuilding is CST's best-kept secret. The church is able to play a significant role in peacebuilding in these and other cases because it brings three sets of assets—what political scientists call "soft power"—to the peace puzzle: (1) ritual, spirituality, theology, and social teaching; (2) the people power of the people of God; and (3) enormous institutional capacity.

Places like Sudan and Northern Uganda are laboratories of Catholic peacebuilding—not fluff courses like Rocks for Jocks, but something more like Organic Chemistry. It is not enough to understand the church's official teachings on war and peace, as foundational as those are. A full understanding of the church's approach to peace requires considering how this teaching finds institutional expression through the work of countless Catholic educational institutions, lay organizations, and church agencies from the Vatican to the local parish. It is through these institutions that individuals are formed in their faith and (hopefully) come to embrace peacebuilding as part of their Christian vocation. It is this combination

of the church's teaching on peace, its faith-filled artisans of peace, and its institutional work for peace that makes the Catholic peace tradition a living tradition. It is also a living tradition insofar as the church's peacebuilding practices are informed by its teaching and, in turn, inform new developments in official teaching. Robert Schreiter calls this interplay between practice and teaching a practical theology of peacebuilding.[2]

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the "signs of the times" related to contemporary issues of war and peace. The bulk of the chapter then considers the church's peacebuilding assets in more detail. It concludes with a successful student-led initiative for peacebuilding.

Signs of the Times: The Reality of War and Peace

The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World begins by saying that in order to serve the world as Christ did, the church has "the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel."[3] While the theological implications of this passage are much disputed, it is clear that the church cannot be a peacebuilder absent a cogent analysis of today's conflicts and ways of resolving them.

The Iraq war, the LRA, and the break-up of Sudan highlight several features of today's conflicts.[4] First, since the end of the Cold War, most violent conflicts are intrastate, not interstate. These internal conflicts are often less about ideology and more about identity—religious, ethnic, tribal, or national. The problem of conflict, therefore, is often inseparable from the problem of failed and failing states riveted by identity conflicts.

Second, since 9/11, the threat posed by global terrorist networks and other nongovernmental actors has dominated international affairs, as terrorists networks often thrive in failed and failing states.

2. Robert Schreiter, "A Practical Theology of Healing, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation," in *Peacebuilding: Catholic Theology, Ethics and Praxis*, ed. R. Schreiter, S. Appleby, and G. Powers (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 366 [hereinafter *Peacebuilding*].

3. *Gaudium et Spes*, 4. Translations of Vatican II documents in this chapter are from *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott (New York: The America Press, 1966).

4. See *Human Security Report 2012* (Vancouver: Human Security Press, 2012).

Third, since World War II, civilians, not soldiers, have become the main victims of war, and many of these victims are not directly targeted by armed actors but are indirect casualties of war.

Fourth, the world no longer faces the threat of global nuclear war, a defining characteristic of international affairs during the Cold War. But the threat of nuclear proliferation and nuclear use remains a central concern while nuclear disarmament, dismissed as a utopian dream just a few decades ago, is now the rallying cry of "hawks" like Henry Kissinger and the stated policy goal of the United States and Russia.

Fifth, like the splitting of the atom, rapidly evolving technology continues to pose new ethical challenges, from the proliferating use of drones to cyber warfare.

Finally, since the end of the Cold War, peacebuilding has become a cottage industry among secular actors at all levels, from the establishment of the UN Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 to countless grassroots' peacebuilding initiatives by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Similarly, the Catholic Church has seen a proliferation of programs that consciously seek to nurture the peacebuilding capacity of the church. Most well-known is Sant'Egidio, a lay community based in Rome that was instrumental in facilitating a peace agreement in Mozambique in 1992.[5] Less well-known is the peacebuilding of Catholic Relief Services and other Caritas agencies.[6]

These (and other) "signs of the times" pose challenges to CST and Catholic action. The first set of challenges relate to the ethics of war. The principal challenge during the Cold War was the morality of nuclear deterrence amid a superpower arms race that threatened global annihilation. The principal challenge in the 1990s was the morality of humanitarian intervention in the face of genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, Kosovo, and East Timor. The principal challenges of the 2000s have been the ethics of counterterrorism, the preventive war doctrine used to justify

5. See, for example, Andrea Bartoli, "Mediating Peace in Mozambique: The Role of the Community of Sant'Egidio," in *Herding Cats*, ed. P. Aall, C. Crocker, and F. Hampson (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1999), 245–73.

6. See *Pursuing Just Peace*, ed. M. Rogers, T. Bamat, and J. Ideh (Baltimore: CRS, 2008) [hereinafter *Pursuing Just Peace*]; *Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual* (The Vatican: Caritas Internationalis, 2002, 2006).

the Iraq intervention, and the ethics of occupation (or *just post bellum*) in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The second set of challenges relates to the need for further development of a broader peacebuilding ethic. In addressing the roots of terrorism, stopping nuclear proliferation, preventing and ameliorating identity conflicts, and promoting the nation-building and reconciliation needed in places like South Sudan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, the common challenge is peacebuilding. Just as just-war norms are often racing to keep pace with new technology and strategies of warfare, a peacebuilding ethic needs to catch up to the practice of peacebuilding.

The Church's Peacebuilding Assets: Ritual, Spirituality, Theology, and Ethics

The Catholic Church is a large, complex, and incredibly diverse global religious institution that brings a rather unique mix of ideals, people, and institutions to the challenges of peacebuilding. Most articles on Catholic approaches to war and peace focus on the first, most fundamental, set of assets: beliefs, spirituality, and social teachings. Two distinct but complementary and interrelated methods are used to address two distinct but overlapping audiences. Teaching addressed to Catholics emphasizes the biblical conception of peace, the centrality of peace in the church's sacraments and mission, and a distinctively Christian theological and ethical approach to war and peace. Teaching addressed to the wider community uses the natural law tradition, which presumes that the demands of justice and peace are knowable and binding on all persons, regardless of their religious convictions. A short article cannot begin to do justice to the breadth and complexity of Catholic teaching on peace, but the following elements of the church's approach will serve as a starting point: peacebuilding as vocation, the role of spirituality and sacraments, a cosmopolitan ethic, a positive conception of peace, solidarity, the centrality of international law and institutions, just war and nonviolence, and a theology and ethics of peacebuilding.[7]

7. For a more detailed overview of the elements of peacebuilding, see Gerard Powers, "Catholic Approaches to Security and Peace," in *The Routledge Handbook of Religion and Security*, ed. C. Seiple, D. Hoover, and P. Otis (Routledge, 2012), 33–44; and Gerard Powers, "From an Ethics of War to an Ethics of Peacebuilding," in *From Just War to Modern Peace Ethics*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Justenhoven and William Barbieri (Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 275–312.

The foundation for individual Catholics and the church as a whole is an understanding of peacebuilding not as an optional commitment but as integral to our *Christian vocation* and, therefore, central to the mission of the church. This sense of vocation and mission give peacebuilding a depth and texture that is distinct from most secular approaches. Understanding the dynamics of conflict, training in conflict resolution skills, education to change attitudes, and developing strategies of social change are essential. But, frankly, some of this work sometimes looks and feels a bit like "drive-by" peacebuilding. What motivates and sustains Cardinal Laghi, Archbishop Odama, members of Sant'Egidio's Mozambique mediation team, and countless other peacebuilders around the world is a deeper sense of vocation or mission. For bishops and priests, peacebuilding is an integral part of their roles as teachers and pastors; for the laity, peacebuilding is an integral part of assuming their principal responsibility for transforming the social order in light of the gospel through their work, family, and civic activities.

Cultivating peaceable virtues is a *sine qua non* of the peacebuilding vocation. As the U.S. bishops said in *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace*:

> True peacemaking can be a matter of policy only if it is first a matter of the heart. . . . Amid the violence of contemporary culture and in response to the growing contempt for human life, the Church must seek to foster communities where peaceable virtues can take root and be nourished. We need to nurture among ourselves *faith and hope* to strengthen our spirits by placing our trust in God, rather than in ourselves; *courage and compassion* that move us to action; *humility and kindness* so that we can put the needs and interests of others ahead of our own; *patience and perseverance* to endure the long struggle for justice; and *civility and charity* so that we can treat others with respect and love.[8]

8. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace* (Washington, DC: USCC Office of Publishing, 1993), 6.

In other words, the peacebuilding vocation entails being individuals and a church that personify a certain kind of character—individuals and a community who are "habitually disposed to love and seek justice for their neighbors as if such a disposition were a second nature."[9]

Since peacebuilding is part of our Christian vocation, peace is integral to the church's *sacramental life and a healthy spirituality*. In fact, John Paul Lederach, a prominent Mennonite peace studies scholar who has worked with the Catholic Church in Uganda, Colombia, the Philippines, and elsewhere, points out that in situations of protracted conflict like these, the church's sacramental tradition, particularly the Eucharist, "stands as an important, perhaps unique, contribution of the Catholic tradition" because it has the power to mobilize "both the sacramental and the moral imagination in reference to reconciliation, restoring the broken community, and taking personal and corporate responsibility for the suffering of others."[10] The sacrament of reconciliation can be part of a process of trauma healing on a personal level and also can serve as a metaphor for post-war communal reconciliation. Spiritualities of nonviolence and reconciliation offer ways to integrate peacebuilding into the faith life of Christian communities in ways that sustain them during the often long, arduous struggle against violence and injustice.[11]

The central role of ritual, sacrament, and spirituality in the church's peacebuilding work was evident in Sudan. Veteran missionary John Ashworth argues that the "value added" by the church amid the well-funded secular NGOs, powerful foreign governments, the UN, warring factions, and other actors was its ability to bring about "transformation, metanoia."[12] It was not surprising that the centerpiece of the church's program of civic education, logistical support, and monitoring for the

9. Daniel M. Bell, *Just War as Christian Discipleship: Recentering the Tradition in the Church Rather Than the State* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009), 83.

10. John Paul Lederach, "The Long Journey Back to Humanity: Catholic Peacebuilding with Armed Actors," in *Peacebuilding*, 51.

11. See Robert Schreiter, "The Catholic Social Imaginary and Peacebuilding: Ritual, Sacrament, and Spirituality," in *Peacebuilding*, 221–39.

12. Interview with John Ashworth, long-time advisor to Catholic Relief Services and other church agencies in Sudan, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana, April 1, 2013.

2011 independence referendum was "101 Days of Prayer for Peace." When religious leaders were selected to play a leading role in the government's reconciliation commission in 2013, they made it clear that they considered the process to be ultimately about religious, not just political, reconciliation.

A third element of Catholic peacebuilding is its grounding in a *cosmopolitan or communitarian ethic*. This ethic is more compatible with notions of "human security" than "national security," the preoccupation of the varieties of political realism that tend to dominate U.S. foreign policy debates.[13] It is a human-centric, not state-centric, ethic. The duty to protect national security and state-centric principles of sovereignty, the equality of states, and nonintervention are critically important. But they are not absolutes. These principles are instrumental norms that serve the more fundamental principles of the dignity of the human person and the common good. While the United States has, at times, been a leader on human rights, its emphasis is on civil and political rights, and even this limited human rights agenda rarely trumps military, political, or economic interests. As Mark Ensalaco and Ron Pagnucco explain in more detail in chapter 8, a Catholic approach includes not only civil and political rights but also economic, social, and cultural rights.[14] U.S. policy, like that of all countries, is focused primarily on the national common good, defined primarily in terms of political, economic, and military security. In Catholic teaching, a state's first obligation is to protect the national common good, but states—especially the most powerful—also have a heavy obligation to protect and promote the global common good. Unlike realist approaches that exclude or marginalize religion and

13. The United Nations Development Programme used the concept of human security in its 1994 *Human Development Report*. The concept focuses on the security of individuals rather than states, the focus of traditional notions of national security. A narrow definition focuses on violent threats whereas the broader definition used in the 1994 Report defines security in terms of freedom from hunger, disease, pollution, affronts to human dignity, threats to livelihoods, and other harms as well as violence. See Human Security Report Project: http://www.hsrgroup.org/ (accessed July 2, 2013).

14. See in this volume chapter 8 on human rights, by Ron Pagnucco and Mark Ensalaco and chapter 9 on solidarity by Ron Pagnucco and Peter Gichure; *Gaudium et Spes*, 74.

morality, this cosmopolitan ethic insists that religion and morality must be factors in policymaking.

A fourth element of Catholic peacebuilding is a *positive conception of peace*. Like much of U.S. foreign policy and international relations theory, a major function of Catholic teaching, particularly the just-war tradition, is to maintain a negative peace (that is, avoiding war and helping to prevent and manage violent conflicts around the world). But Catholic teaching is not satisfied with preventing, limiting, and stopping violence and war. Catholic teaching also insists on the much more ambitious goal of building a positive peace.

Kenneth Himes describes three ways of talking of positive peace in CST, each of which reinforces and complements the others. The Shalom of Isaiah, where the wolf and lamb lie down together (Isa 11:6), is the *eschatological meaning* of peace. The *spiritual meaning* of peace is the interior peace that comes through communion with, and by being part of, the Body of Christ. *Tranquilitas ordinis* is the *political meaning* of peace—the peace of a rightly ordered political community—with people living in truth, charity, freedom, and justice directed toward the common good.[15] This political peace is not merely a utopian ideal but something that is achievable in human history. As Pope Paul VI noted, moving beyond a state of affairs where war is a sad necessity is a moral obligation akin to abolishing slavery and eradicating diseases.[16]

Solidarity is a fifth element of Catholic teaching.[17] As Ron Pagnucco and Peter Gichure explain in chapter 9, solidarity reminds us that one's own good is intimately bound up with that of the wider community. Solidarity challenges the idea that international relations is a zero-sum game in which the pursuit of U.S. interests invariably puts the United States in competition and conflict with other countries. It calls for collaboration, not competition, among individuals, groups, and nations to

15. Kenneth Himes, "Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching," in *Peacebuilding*, 268–69.

16. Pope Paul VI, "Homily on the World Day of Peace" (January 1, 1970), cited in Himes, "Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching," 280.

17. See chapter 9 in this volume by Ron Pagnucco and Peter Gichure, "The Challenge of Solidarity: A Catholic Perspective."

build structures of cooperative security that can promote authentic human development and the common good.[18]

In considering the ethics of war, solidarity reinforces the duty of care owed civilians (that is, in targeting decisions, civilians should be treated as if they were our own parents, siblings, and children). Solidarity suggests a special option for the victims of war akin to the option for the poor. Solidarity also impels the church to overcome, through its own peacebuilding and accompaniment efforts, the chasm that divides the world's zones of peace and prosperity from the zones of war and deprivation. Lederach finds that church actors in places like Colombia and Uganda consistently emphasize the church's role of accompaniment, "the quality of being present with, being alongside people as they make a journey." According to Lederach, "[s]ociologically, the church is, literally, present in and with the communities most affected by violence. Theologically, Church leaders consider their active presence, their engagement with both victims and perpetrators, as an expression of their pastoral vocation." Consequently, they rarely use secular terms, such as mediation or negotiation, to describe their engagement with armed actors but prefer terms such as "pastoral dialogue."[19]

Strengthening *international law and international institutions* is a concrete manifestation of the virtue of solidarity and a necessary means to achieve both a negative and positive peace. For many realists, the terms "international community" and "world order" are oxymorons. Given a quasi-anarchic collection of mostly competing states, they argue that the shared values and common institutions needed for a genuine international community do not exist. Catholic teaching is realistic about the weaknesses of the current international system but insists that there are universally shared values—natural law—that can and must find expression in international law and institutions.[20] While realists focus on collective security

18. See Himes, "Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching," in *Peacebuilding*, 273–75.

19. Lederach, "The Long Journey Back to Humanity," in *Peacebuilding*, 43, 48–50.

20. Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005), 433–34 [hereinafter *Compendium*].

alliances like NATO to defend the shared interests of groups of allied states, Catholic teaching envisions a cooperative security regime based on the shared values of all states and the people they do, or at least should, represent.

The UN and other international institutions are central to this vision of cooperative security.[21] The church does not support a "global superstate" that would limit or replace the role of individual nations and local communities in addressing conflict. That would violate an element of the principle of subsidiarity: authority should be exercised at the *lowest level possible*.[22] But the UN and other international institutions are intended to fulfill a second element of subsidiarity: authority should be exercised at the *highest level necessary*. These institutions contribute to global solidarity by developing norms to govern armed conflict, such as the Geneva Conventions, and helping to resolve complex conflicts, such as those borne of failed and failing states, that individual nations are unwilling or unable to address.[23] In response to the obvious inadequacies of international norms and institutions, the church has supported major reforms, as well as more serious measures to counter the indifference, lack of political will, and lack of resources that impede international peacebuilding.

A seventh element is the church's rich tradition of reflection on *just war and nonviolence*. Of the four main approaches to the ethics of war—holy war, amoral realism, just or limited war, and pacifism or principled nonviolence—only the latter two are now considered options for Christians. Contemporary holy war is exemplified by Al Qaeda's so-called jihad against the West and extreme forms of religious nationalism. Amoral realism claims that national security interests trump moral and legal norms in war and that "war is hell" and therefore somehow beyond morality. Both holy war and amoral realism violate Catholic teaching because they assume, for different reasons, that war can be unlimited or at least not subject to moral constraints. Catholic teaching is realistic insofar as

21. The Second Vatican Council urged "the establishment of some universal public authority acknowledged as such by all, and endowed with effective power to safeguard, on the behalf of all, security, regard for justice, and respect for rights" (*Gaudium et Spes*, 82).

22. *Compendium*, 441.

23. Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, 140.

it accepts that in a sinful world without an international authority to control and resolve conflict, military force is sometimes a tragic necessity to establish or maintain order. But Catholic teaching rejects total war and the notion that national security, vital interests, and the "necessities" of war trump norms.

The just war tradition and pacifism, or principled nonviolence, are the two morally legitimate approaches to the ethics of war. In their 1983 peace pastoral, the U.S. Catholic bishops suggested that the two traditions share a common starting point: a strong presumption "in favor of peace and against war," a starting point which makes them "distinct but interdependent methods of evaluating warfare."[24] Some Catholics have always embraced the principled nonviolence of those like Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement who believe nonviolence is central to the gospel. But since Vatican II and especially since the end of the Cold War, nonviolence has received greater emphasis and legitimacy in official church teaching. Papal and other statements are replete with condemnations of the "savagery" and "scourge" of war, descriptions of war as "an adventure without return" and a "defeat for humanity," and hortatory appeals, such as "war never again" and "war is not the answer."[25] The experience of total war in the twentieth century, the threat of a nuclear holocaust, and the fact that civilians have increasingly been the main victims of war have led the church to be deeply skeptical of the ability of modern war to meet just-war criteria. At the same time, successful nonviolent change, from the demise of Marcos in the Philippines to the mostly peaceful dissolution of the Soviet bloc, has demonstrated the efficacy of nonviolence.[26]

Nevertheless, principled nonviolence is considered an option for individuals, not governments. In the words of the Second Vatican Council,

24. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response* (Washington, DC: USCCB Publishing Office, 1983), 51.

25. *Compendium*, 497.

26. Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus* (1991), 23. For John Paul's teaching on war, see Drew Christiansen, "Catholic Peacemaking, 1991–2005: The Legacy of Pope John Paul II," *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* 4, no. 2 (Fall 2006). A growing body of literature analyzes the efficacy of nonviolent resistance. See, for example, Erica Chenoweth and Maria J. Stephan, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).

faced with aggression, "governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted."[27] The just-war criteria limit when, why, and how force may be used. The *jus ad bellum* criteria restrict resort to war: just cause, comparative justice, legitimate authority, right intention, probability of success, proportionality, and last resort. *Jus in bello* criteria restrict the conduct of war: noncombatant immunity, proportionality, and right intention.[28]

In public policy debates on U.S. military interventions, the just war versus pacifism debate is of marginal relevance. The more relevant debate is between two different interpretations of the just war tradition. The more permissive approach of the traditionalists begins with a presumption in favor of justice and considers war a tool of statecraft, making it easier to justify resort to military force.[29] President Bush's moral justification for preventive war in Iraq represents the most permissive of this interpretation. Cardinal Laghi's arguments against war in 2003 reflected the increasingly strict, or restrictive, approach of official teaching. This approach begins with a strong presumption against war and considers war a failure of statecraft. This latter approach creates a hermeneutic

27. *Gaudium et Spes*, 79. The just-war tradition has been deeply skeptical of revolutionary violence because revolutionaries lack clear legitimate authority, and revolutionary violence often blurs the distinction between combatants and noncombatants. See James Turner Johnson, *Can Modern War Be Just?* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 54–55. According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (New York: Image Books, 1995), 2243, "Armed resistance to oppression by political authority is not legitimate, unless all the following conditions are met: (1) there is certain, grave, and prolonged violation of fundamental rights; (2) all other means of redress have been exhausted; (3) such resistance will not provoke worse disorders; (4) there is well-founded hope of success; and (5) it is impossible reasonably to foresee any better solution."

28. U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1993), 12–14.

29. See George Weigel, "The Development of Just War Thinking in the Post-Cold War World: An American Perspective," in *The Price of Peace: Just War in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. C. Reed and D. Ryall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). See also George Weigel, *Faith, Reason, and the War against Jihadism: A Call to Action* (New York: Doubleday, 2007).

which interprets the just-war criteria narrowly, making it very difficult to justify military force.[30]

The challenge for adherents of either interpretation of just war and proponents of principled nonviolence is to enlarge the (rather tired) debate over the ethics of war. All sides must reflect much more seriously and systematically on a wider *theology and ethic of just peace or peacebuilding*, an area where they should be able to find common ground. The just-war tradition and an ethic of peacebuilding are inherently complementary approaches. Properly used, the just-war tradition is an element of peacebuilding. The U.S. bishops, for example, have used just-war criteria as a form of conflict prevention, opposing military intervention in Iraq in 1991 and 2003. Adherence to *jus in bello* norms of civilian immunity and proportionality not only limit violence during war but also enhance prospects for a peace agreement and postwar reconciliation.

As helpful as it can be as a form of peacebuilding, however, the just-war approach risks becoming a sort of procedural checklist unmoored from its deeper foundations in social ethics unless it is linked to a broader peacebuilding ethic. Cardinal Laghi was not relying solely on just-war arguments to prevent the Iraq War; his arguments reflected a much wider ethic of peacebuilding. His appeal to the power of dialogue (even when dealing with one of the world's worst dictators), the importance of upholding and strengthening international law, and the need to defer to the UN on Iraq reflect a broader cosmopolitan ethic of a just peace without which his just-war arguments are incomprehensible.

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P), adopted at the 2005 World Summit, is another example of the interrelationship between an ethics of war and an ethics of peacebuilding. R2P is based on the principle that in cases of serious human rights violations, such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing, principles of order (state-centric norms of

30. J. Bryan Hehir, a principal author of the U.S. bishops' peace pastoral, is a leading proponent of this strict interpretation. See Hehir, "From the Pastoral Constitution of Vatican II to *The Challenge of Peace*," in *Catholics and Nuclear War*, ed. Philip J. Murnion (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 71–87. For an overview of the U.S. bishops' application of this strict approach to U.S. military interventions since the 1980s, see Gerard Powers, "The U.S. Bishops and War since the Peace Pastoral," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 27, no. 2 (Winter 2009): 73–96.

sovereignty and nonintervention) must give way to principles of justice (human-centric norms of human rights). It was developed as an alternative to the "humanitarian" military interventions in Kosovo and Bosnia. R2P's first two pillars are about conflict prevention: the state's responsibility to protect its own citizens and the international community's obligation to assist states in doing so. If a state is unwilling or unable to protect its own citizens, even with international support, then the third pillar envisions collective action through the Security Council to protect citizens.

In his 2008 address at the United Nations, Pope Benedict endorsed R2P in the name of protecting basic human dignity and human rights.[31] On the controversial issue of intervention under pillar three, church statements contend that the international community has not only a right but a duty of humanitarian intervention in the face of threats to the survival of whole groups or serious violations of basic human rights. While strong priority is given nonmilitary forms of intervention, it can be legitimate as a last resort for the international community to "take concrete measures to disarm the aggressor" and protect innocent victims.[32] While there might be exceptional cases, intervention should be through the UN Security Council in accord with the UN Charter so as to help ensure, as the U.S. bishops have said, that "humanitarian intervention is an authentic act of international solidarity and not a cloak for great power dominance."[33]

The genius of R2P is that it combines a peacebuilding ethic (pillars 1 and 2) with an intervention ethic (pillar 3). But R2P's intervention ethic needs to be supplemented by a post-intervention ethic. The Iraq intervention, while very different from that envisioned by R2P, is a case in point. Once the United States invaded Iraq, the moral debate changed from an ethics of intervention to an ethics of exit and faced a host of issues not addressed by the just-war tradition or pacifism. If it was immoral to intervene, was it immoral to stay? What did the United States, as a *de jure* and then *de facto* occupying power, owe Iraqis? Was it the responsibility of the United States to help bring about reconciliation among Iraqis, and, if so, what did that entail?[34] Some of these are issues related to an emerging

31. Benedict XVI, Address to UN General Assembly, April 18, 2008.

32. *Compendium*, 220, quoting John Paul II, 2000 World Day of Peace Message, 11.

33. *Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace*, 16.

34. Bishop William Skylstad, president, USCCB, "Call for Dialogue and Action on Responsible Transition in Iraq," November 13, 2006; Gerard Powers, "Our Moral Duty in Iraq," *America* (February 18, 2008): 13–16; George Lopez, "Ethics Outflanked," *America* (March 6, 2006): 14–18.

theory of a *jus post bellum*, but some of them involve a wider set of issues that have not been addressed in depth in official CST.[35]

In some ways, the practice of peacebuilding is ahead of the theology and ethics of peacebuilding. Reading the peacebuilding "signs of the times" today requires a much better mapping and analysis of the mostly unheralded peacebuilding work of the Catholic community around the world. It also requires identifying ways in which existing teaching can be enriched by insights from practice and practice can be enriched by developments in teaching. For example, the field of conflict resolution could inform CST.[36] From civil war in Syria to dealing with the Lord's Resistance Army, the church has called for dialogue and negotiation as an alternative to military force. But as Himes points out, the church's communitarian ethic can present an overly optimistic sense of the ability to resolve deep-seated conflicts like these through negotiation.[37]

Catholic teaching also provides little guidance on how to deal with the ethical dilemmas and tradeoffs usually present in such cases. Bishops

35. Several chapters in *Peacebuilding* address post-intervention issues: Daniel Philpott, "Reconciliation: A Catholic Ethic for Peacebuilding in the Political Order"; Maryann Cusimano Love, "What Kind of Peace Do We Seek? Emerging Norms of Peacebuilding in Key Political Institutions"; Peter-John Pearson, "Pursuing Truth, Reconciliation, and Human Dignity in South Africa: Lessons for Catholic Peacebuilding"; and Robert Schreiter, "A Practical Theology of Healing, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation." See also Brian Orend, "Justice after War," *Ethics and International Affairs* 16, no. 1 (April 2002): 43–56; Gary Bass, "*Jus Post Bellum*," in *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 384–412; William Bole, Drew Christiansen, and Robert Hennemeyer, *Forgiveness in International Politics* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004).

36. The literature on conflict resolution and peace studies is vast. See, for example, *Strategies of Peace: Transforming Conflict in a Violent World*, ed. D. Philpott and G. Powers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*, ed. C. Crocker, F. Hampson, and P. Aall (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2007); *Human Rights and Conflict: Exploring the Links between Rights, Law, and Peacebuilding*, ed. J. Mertus and J. W. Helsing (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2006).

37. See Himes, "Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching," in *Peacebuilding*, 282.

rom war-torn places like Northern Uganda, Rwanda, and Colombia wake ıp in the morning worrying, not about the next round of confirmations ır parish openings, but about how they can prevent full-scale war from ıreaking out in their dioceses between different tribes or rebel groups. What does it mean to celebrate the Eucharist in parishes where these ıiolent groups and their victims share a pew at Sunday Mass?

The Vatican supported the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) as a critical means to strengthen international norms and nternational institutions. Yet the Acholi Religious Leaders in Uganda trongly opposed the first indictments handed down by the ICC because hey undermined prospects for achieving a peace agreement with the .RA's indicted leaders. How should one weigh the tradeoffs between chieving a negative peace and holding war criminals accountable? From ıudan to Northern Ireland, the church has taken a variety of positions on he issue of secession, a key concern in about half the world's conflicts, ıut these positions are based almost entirely on pragmatism because there s little in CST on the question. In short, there are a variety of areas in need ıf further development of a theology and ethics of peacebuilding.

To review, the first set of Catholic peacebuilding assets includes a ariety of elements: a commitment to peacebuilding as vocation, a spiri- ual and sacramental imagination, a cosmopolitan ethic centered on ıuman dignity and the common good, a positive conception of peace, ın embrace of solidarity, support for international law and institutions, highly restrictive approach to just war with a priority given nonviolent nethods, and a broader theology and ethics of peacebuilding to address ssues beyond the ethics of war.

The Church's Peacebuilding Assets: People Power and Institutional Presence

The church's teachings and rituals are of little more than academic mportance if they are not lived; if they do not shape people's lives and he life of the institutional church. That the church's teaching on peace s, indeed, a living tradition is most evident in the stories and writings of rather small pantheon of past and present Catholic peacebuilding saints. ıome are well known: St. Francis of Assisi, Archbishop Oscar Romero, Dorothy Day. The risk in focusing on these figures is that we can end up

with the impression that peacebuilding is an exceptional thing, a counsel of perfection, not something all of us are called to and capable of. In fact, countless ordinary Catholics reside in every conflict zone in the world and are performing courageous but mostly unheralded acts of peacebuilding. They are bishops like Paride Taban, a kind of "religious elder statesman" who has been selected to be vice chairman of the official reconciliation commission in South Sudan. But most are priests, women religious, and laypeople who are working for Catholic Relief Services or Solidarity with Sudan, or a local parish trying desperately to keep competing tribes from turning the village into a free-fire zone.

But it is not just about individuals; it is also about the people power of the people of God. The Catholic Church in the Philippines invented the term with its mass mobilization to overthrow the long-standing dictator Ferdinand Marcos in 1986.[38] Also in the 1980s, the Catholic Church was a prime mover behind the Solidarity trade union movement in Poland, which negotiated an end to five decades of communist rule in 1989, the first domino to fall in the demise of the Soviet bloc. In the United States, following their widely acclaimed pastorals on peace (1983) and the economy (1986), the bishops undertook a much more focused effort, beginning in the late 1980s, to develop diocesan and parish education and advocacy networks around issues of justice and peace. In the 1990s and early 2000s, the Catholic Campaign to Ban Landmines and the campaign for debt relief for poor countries were two of the most sustained and successful efforts to mobilize large numbers of Catholics around complex policy issues.

An often overlooked dimension of Catholic peacebuilding is its institutional context. The church's moral and religious power and its people power are mediated through an extensive set of institutions, from local parishes and grassroots peace organizations to Vatican offices and global development agencies. An increasing number of people, mostly youth, are skeptical of or indifferent to institutions, especially religious institutions. But the fact is that the Catholic peace tradition would not be a

38. Peter Ackerman and Jack Duvall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 369–95; Christina A. Astorga, "Culture, Religion, and Moral Vision: A Theological Discourse on the Filipino People Power Revolution of 1986," *Theological Studies* 67 (2006): 567–601.

living tradition without Catholic institutions, and Catholic institutions are part of what makes Catholic peacebuilding distinctive.

In South Sudan, for example, the dearth of political and civil society institutions of the kind taken for granted in developed countries like the United States left the church to fill the void. As mentioned earlier, the church there played a substitute political role, providing most of the education, health care, humanitarian aid, development programs, and human rights monitoring, sponsoring civil society peace processes that contributed to the 2005 peace agreement, and undertaking a civic education campaign and logistical support for the referendum on independence. The church can play these kinds of roles because, unlike many international NGOs, development agencies, and governmental institutions, it is an indigenous institution deeply rooted in the fabric of society that does not withdraw when violence erupts.

According to Lederach, in war-torn areas like South Sudan, Uganda, Congo, the southern Philippines, and Colombia, the church's "ubiquitous presence" gives the church a "unique if not unprecedented presence in the landscape of . . . conflict." In these areas, the church has relationships with every level and nearly every area of conflict, creating a depth and breadth of access that few religious or secular institutions enjoy. He concludes, "There are few places where the infrastructure and ecclesiology of church structure so neatly aligns with the multilevel and multifaceted demands of peacebuilding."[39]

A distinctive element of Catholic peacebuilding is that the church is not only an indigenous local actor, but it is also one of the world's largest and most complex transnational institutions. Its global reach is greater than the U.S. government, the UN, and the world's largest corporations. The 1.2 billion Catholics are served by more than 200,000 parishes, 400,000 priests, 700,000 religious sisters, and hundreds of thousands of lay staff in Catholic schools, health care agencies, charities, and other institutions. In comparison, Walmart, one of the world's largest corporations, has 10,800 stores in 27 countries with 2.2 million employees.[40]

39. Lederach, "The Long Journey Back to Humanity," in *Peacebuilding*, 50–51.

40. *Annuario Pontificio* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2013); Walmart website accessed June 15, 2013: http://corporate.walmart.com/our-story/?povid=P1171-C1093.2766-L5.

The church's peacebuilding work is done through a variety of entities. The widely respected Vatican foreign service, with representatives serving 179 states, the UN, and other international organizations and regional organizations, such as the European Union, are deeply involved in promoting peace and justice. There are also staffed peace and justice offices at the Vatican, at over 100 regional and national bishops' conferences, and at thousands of dioceses and some parishes. Many of the 164 national Catholic caritas agencies have programs devoted specifically to peacebuilding. In South Sudan alone, Catholic Relief Services spent four million dollars on peacebuilding in 2010-2011. The church's peacebuilding work is also done by a multiplicity of lay movements, such as Focolare, and independent organizations, such as the Sant'Egidio Community and Pax Christi International, which have affiliates in dozens of countries. Catholic institutions and individuals also play a prominent role in many interfaith organizations, such as Religions for Peace. The 135,000 Catholic elementary and high schools worldwide provide education and formation in CST, and 1,358 Catholic universities teach, research, and provide expertise to the church and the wider public on matters of peace and justice.[41]

Through this extensive institutional infrastructure, the church has an enormous capacity for peacebuilding. It is the most vertically integrated religious institution, with a hierarchical structure with clearly defined leaders. The church has institutions at all levels and clear lines of teaching and organizational authority (though it is quite decentralized in its operations). Its vertical integration is complemented by a capacity for what sociologists call "horizontal integration," the ecclesial bonds of solidarity that unite the Catholic community across geographical, cultural, national, and economic divides.

The Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative in northern Uganda, for example, operated at many levels. They formed local and later district-level peace committees within northern Uganda to educate their own people about peacebuilding, to address land issues, to organize peace rallies and prayers, to mediate local conflicts, and to develop programs

41. *Annuario Pontificio* 2013. One example of collaboration for peace among universities and various Catholic institutions is the Catholic Peacebuilding Network at http://cpn.nd.edu/.

of trauma healing. They advocated on national legislation on amnesty and were official observers at the peace negotiations. They worked closely with their religious counterparts in the United States as well as other key countries and the UN to bring greater attention to an often-ignored conflict. They also urged these governmental bodies to play a constructive role in the peace process by, among other things, supporting indigenous alternatives to the indictments handed down by the International Criminal Court.[42]

Another example of how the church's vertical and horizontal integration can contribute to peacebuilding is the Catholic Peacebuilding Network (CPN). The CPN is a network of university institutes, bishops' conferences, development agencies, and independent peace organizations. It enhances the study and practice of Catholic peacebuilding by: (1) deepening engagement among scholars and practitioners, (2) improving understanding of best practices in peacebuilding, (3) further developing a theology and ethics of peace, and (4) enhancing the peacebuilding capacity of the church in conflict areas. Starting with seven partner institutions in 2004, the CPN numbered twenty-two in 2013. Through a series of international conferences around the world, CPN has enabled scholars to engage directly with Catholic peacebuilders in several dozen countries suffering from conflict and has facilitated sharing of best practices among these peacebuilders, who often have little contact with their counterparts in other conflict zones. Because it can bring together a diverse array of Catholic institutions engaged in peacebuilding to assist with strategic planning, training, and other needs of the church, CPN has been able to contribute to the development of the peacebuilding capacity of the church in the Great Lakes Region of Africa, Colombia, and the Philippines.

These and other examples illustrate how the Catholic peace tradition is a living tradition because it shapes the minds, hearts, and souls of people. But the way the church reaches people and mobilizes them to act in effective, sustained ways that can engage the multiple factors, actors, and levels of conflict is through its remarkable presence as a global institution that is deeply rooted in the local.

42. Kelsie Thompson, "Uganda: Alliances for Peace: The Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative," in *Pursuing Just* Peace, 133–44.

Conclusion: The Special Responsibility of Catholics in the United States

Underlying the exchange between Cardinal Laghi and President Bush over Iraq was a very different view of what "the rest of the world" means to the United States and what the United States means to the rest of the world. The Bush administration's preventive war doctrine was premised on a U.S. exceptionalism and the maintenance of U.S. military, political, and economic dominance through a policy of what some have called "muscular unilateralism."[43] The Obama administration's stated policies are generally less muscular and unilateral, but they, too, reflect how deeply ingrained these tendencies are in U.S. foreign policy.

Cardinal Laghi's vision of the U.S. role in the world could not have been more different. With power comes responsibility, so Laghi assumed that the United States, by virtue of its unique power, not its unique virtue, bears a heavy moral burden to know what the rest of the world means and what U.S. actions mean to the rest of the world. These actions include promoting the global common good, building a system of cooperative security that will ultimately make war obsolete, and reaching out in solidarity to other nations, especially those most in need.

U.S. power and influence notwithstanding, it is not always obvious to ordinary Americans—or to most students—what they can do to promote peace in places like Iraq, Uganda, and South Sudan. The student mobilization on college campuses in support of a peaceful independence referendum in South Sudan is a good example of what can be done. One initiative stood out because it went beyond typical student social justice activities and harnessed the national visibility enjoyed by athletics in the name of peace.

The University of Notre Dame, St. Mary's College, and Holy Cross College undertook a major educational and advocacy campaign that was led by student government and a not-so-usual-suspect: the nationally ranked Notre Dame men's lacrosse team. The catalyst was a visit from Sudanese bishops to Notre Dame in October 2010, which inspired Notre Dame's student senate to issue a resolution in support of the church's

43. Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth, "American Primacy in Perspective," *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 4 (July/August 2002): 20.

peacebuilding efforts. The student senate resolution in turn prompted the lacrosse team to do something different. Instead of the usual participation in charity events, they decided to take up Sudan as their social issue for the year. They educated themselves through briefings by faculty and Sudanese students. They then teamed up with the men's basketball team, student government, and other groups at Notre Dame, St. Mary's, and Holy Cross, and, with sponsorship by Adidas, hosted a major rally for peace in Sudan and a Playing for Peace basketball tournament.

In addition to the rally, more than one thousand students signed a petition to President Barak Obama urging his administration to do more to support peace in Sudan. That petition was followed by a delegation of Notre Dame students, led by the assistant lacrosse coach, to Washington, D.C. The delegation met with senior leaders at the White House, State Department, and Congress, as well as with executives at Catholic Relief Services, the largest development agency in South Sudan. That delegation was followed by student blogs on Sudan that were distributed by major NGOs working on the issue. The Playing for Peace in Sudan campaign culminated in an April 10, 2011, nationally televised broadcast of the Notre Dame-Georgetown lacrosse game, in which ESPN devoted its halftime show to a video and discussion of Playing for Peace in Sudan.

Playing for Peace in South Sudan could be a model for similar initiatives on college campuses around the country on other issues. It shows what can be done when Catholics creatively deploy the church's rich spiritual and ethical tradition, people power, and institutional assets to help build peace. It also shows what can happen when students have an understanding, consistent with CST, of what "the rest of the world" means to them.

Discussion Questions

1. Is peacebuilding integral to the faith of individual Catholics and the mission of the church? What is the basis for your answer (for example, Scripture, theology, CST)?
2. Watch the clip from the movie, *Hotel Rwanda* (50:52-54:50—UN evacuates foreigners from hotel). Who is most able to be a peacebuilder in that situation—the UN General or the priest?

3. Think of specific examples of Catholic peacebuilding. What "assets" did the Catholic community bring, and was there anything distinctively Catholic about the peacebuilding?
4. Are just war and pacifism really two complementary parts of the Catholic tradition, as the bishops' presumption against war suggests, or are they fundamentally incompatible?
5. Is the just-war tradition a form of conflict prevention, conflict mitigation, and post-conflict reconciliation, or is it mainly a way to legitimize war?