

Glen Stassen

http://www.fuller.edu/provost/faculty/dbsearch/final_record.asp?id=81

further information

http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm

Just Peacemaking

http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm

New Paradigm: Just Peacemaking Theory

New Paradigm: Just Peacemaking Theory

http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm

Bulletin of the Council of Societies for the Study of Religion

Glen Stassen, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA 91182

Twenty-three scholars have just produced a consensus just peacemaking theory, designed to take its place beside pacifism and just war theory. Our work together began in preparation for a panel presentation at the annual meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics, January, 1993. It struck a chord: there was standing room only and intense discussion. Our first major working conference was held in the fall of 1994 at the Abbey of Gethsemani (Thomas Merton's monastery), which graciously hosted, fed, and lodged us, and has served as treasurer for the project. We have been exchanging and rewriting papers since, and a core group has been meeting each year at the annual meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics. The consensus-reaching working conference took place at the Carter Center in Atlanta Oct. 11-13, 1996. The result is a ten-point Just Peacemaking Theory, a book, *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War*, ed. Glen Stassen (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1998), and various shorter publications, and the intention to apply it to crises as they occur.

In Atlanta, during our Quaker-meeting-style worship service, Edward L. Long, Jr., said "this project will take hold, if it does, not because we created it but because it meets the historical moment. It is a *kairos* moment, a moment of meaning and spiritual inbreaking, because people want to know what is happening in our time."

The Historical *Kairos*

Several historical forces have come together in our time to produce the just peacemaking theory:

1. Over fifty years ago the world was stunned by the horror of the devastation of World War II and the threat of atomic and nuclear weapons. The reality of that universally perceived threat persuaded people and institutions to develop new networks and practices that would make another world war and the use of nuclear weapons less likely. Now over fifty years have passed and so far we have avoided those two specters. New practices are actually getting results in ways many have not noticed. We believe we live in a moment of kairos when it can serve useful purposes to name these practices, to call attention to them, to support them ethically.
2. In this new era after the Cold War, symbolized by the turn of the millennium, people lack a clear vision of what sort of peacemaking is effective and is happening. Hence they do not know how they can contribute. The result is confusion, cognitive dissonance, apathy, and inward-turning--ironically just when the opportunity, and need, for spreading the zones of peace is most at hand.

Just peacemaking theory is intended to give a road map for people, grass-roots groups, voluntary associations, groups in churches, synagogues, mosques, meetings. It shows what people can do to fan the flames of peace. So Paul Schroeder, the eminent diplomatic historian, writes in his paper:

This makes just peacemaking into a task for action by ordinary citizens individually and in groups to sustain, criticize, goad, influence, reform, and lead the many kinds of voluntary associations, governmental and private, which can contribute to transcending the contradictions and managing and overcoming the conflicts of an anarchic international society.... It is our task to encourage and strengthen the underlying trends that enable cooperation to fly.

3. In our time there is a growing sense of the inadequacy of the debate between just war theory and pacifism. Debates dominated by those paradigms inevitably focus on whether or not to make war. That crucial question will not go away if the just peacemaking paradigm succeeds.

But in that debate, another question regularly gets slighted: What essential steps should be taken to make peace? Have they been taken, or should they yet be taken?

The just peacemaking question fills out the original intention of the other two paradigms. It encourages pacifists to be what their name, derived from the Latin, *pacem-facere*, means: peace-makers. And it calls just war theorists to fill in the contents of their underdeveloped principles of last resort and just intention--to spell out what resorts must be tried before trying the last resort and what intention there is about restoring a just and enduring peace--and then to act on them.

4. Most of the church statements on peace issued by major Christian denominations during the 1980s call for the development of a just peacemaking theory or a theology of peace. For example, In their pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, the U.S. Catholic Bishops say: Recognition of the Church's responsibility to join with others in the work of peace is a major force behind the call today to develop a theology of peace. Much of the history of Catholic theology on war and peace has focused on limiting the resort to force in human affairs; this task is still necessary,... but it is not a sufficient response....

A fresh reappraisal which includes a developed theology of peace will require contributions from several sectors of the Church's life: biblical studies, systematic and moral theology, ecclesiology, and the experience and insights of members of the Church who have struggled in various ways to make and keep the peace in this often violent age.

Official statements of the Presbyterian Church, United Methodist Church, and United Church of Christ similarly stated that while the two predominant paradigms of limiting the resort to force, just war theory and pacifism, are still necessary, we also need a positive theory of just peacemaking. In addition, several Christian ethicists from different denominations, both just war theorists and pacifists, have authored books calling for the development of a just peacemaking theory. Key authors of all those church statements and books participated in the project to develop a consensus just peacemaking theory.^[1]

The Ten Practices of Just Peacemaking

Here are the ten practices of just peacemaking, with excerpts and paraphrases from the explanatory papers. We divide the practices into three groups: cooperative forces, justice, and peacemaking initiatives. The first grouping, cooperative forces, may be seen as a dimension of love, realistically rather than sentimentally understood: a key dimension of love in scriptural teaching is breaking down barriers to community and participation in cooperative community. Justice, the second grouping, is a central biblical theme. And growing numbers of us interpret grace-based peacemaking in terms of peacemaking initiatives, or transforming initiatives. All three are checks and balances against sin. So our groupings may be seen, for those who have eyes to see, as translations from specifically faith-based perspectives. Or they may be seen as grounded in various faith perspectives, or as simply empirically based.

A. Strengthen Cooperative Forces

1. Recognize emerging cooperative forces in the international system, and work with them.

Historically, cooperative institutions like the League of Nations have broken down for six reasons that we name. But "these basic obstacles no longer have the same force today. Four trends have so altered the conditions and practices of international relations as to make it possible now, where it was not possible before, to form and sustain voluntary associations for peace and other valuable common purposes that are in fact working. The continued existence and

success of organizations like NATO, the European Union, the UN, and others go a long way to make it demonstrable fact. To argue otherwise seems a bit like arguing that manned heavier-than-air flight is not possible for the same reasons it was impossible before 1903." These four trends or forces are the decline in the utility of war; the priority of trade and the economy over war; the strength of international exchanges, communications, transactions, and networks; and the gradual ascendancy of liberal representative democracy and a mixture of welfare-state and laissez-faire market economy. We should act so as to strengthen these trends and the international associations that they make possible.^[2]

2. Strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights.

International relations increasingly involve not only the traditional military-diplomatic arena, but also the modern arena of economic interdependence, where governments are exposed to the forces of a global market they do not control. Additionally there is the growingly important third arena of demands for "people power," or for "citizens' say." The information revolution makes it harder for governments to control people's minds, and popular pressures can now set much of the agenda of foreign policies. States float in a sea of forces from outside their borders or from among their people. Acting alone, states cannot solve problems of trade, debt, interest rates; of pollution, ozone depletion, acid rain, depletion of fish stocks, global warming; of migrations and refugees seeking asylum; of military security when weapons rapidly penetrate borders. Therefore, as we approach the turning of the centuries, collective action is increasingly necessary. U.S. citizens should press their government to pay its dues to the United Nations, and to act in small and large crises in ways that strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations, of regional organizations, and of multilateral peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace building. Many multilateral practices are building effectiveness to resolve conflicts, to monitor, nurture, and even enforce truces and replace violent conflict with beginning cooperation. They are organizing to meet human needs for food, hygiene, medicine, education, and economic interaction. Furthermore, most wars now happen within states, not between states; therefore, collective action needs to include UN-approved humanitarian intervention in cases like the former Yugoslavia, Haiti, Somalia, and Rwanda "when a state's condition or behavior results in... grave and massive violations of human rights."^[3]

B. Advance Justice for All

3. Promote democracy, human rights, and religious liberty.

Extensive empirical evidence shows that the spreading of democracy and respect for human rights, including religious liberty, is widening the zones of peace.^[4]

Democracies do not make war on each other. Established democracies fought *no wars* against one another during the entire twentieth century. And they generally devote lower shares of their national products to military expenditures, which decreases threats to other countries. Influences that played significant parts in *producing* the recent extensive wave of transitions to democracy include changes in some religious institutions (including transnational ones) from primarily defending the status quo to opposing governmental authoritarianism; citizens' groups and non-governmental organizations dedicated to human rights; and states and international organizations more actively promoting human rights and democracy.

The empirical evidence also supports practices described by the first two papers: "Ties of economic interdependence--international trade and investment--form an important supplement to shared democracy in promoting peace." The degree that nations are engaged in international

organizations like the various arms of the United Nations, and regional and functional institutions, is also a clear predictive factor that they will be much less likely to engage in war. Powerful threats to democracy's spread exist: grim economic conditions in numerous struggling democracies; ethnic, racial, nationalistic, and religious conflict; instabilities during the transition to democracy; external threats from nondemocratic neighbors.

The possibility of a widespread and growing zone of peace requires a network of persons who are willing to work together to gain public attention for those they are trying to protect from human rights violations. And it requires financial and expert help to strengthen the just and sustainable economic development of struggling democracies.

4. Foster just and sustainable economic development.

A just peace requires an equitable world economy in which extreme differences in wealth, power, and participation are progressively overcome. Sustainable development occurs where the needs of today are met without threatening the needs of tomorrow--where those who lack adequate material and economic resources gain access, and those who have learn to control resource use and prevent future exhaustion. Ecological destruction threatens the ability to meet needs.

A key to sustainable economic development in the Middle East is agreements between Jordan and Israel about the river Jordan, between Sudan and Egypt about the quantity of water each will take from the Nile, and talks to include other Nile Basin countries. Without these, poverty and war would surely increase.

A key to economic development in East Asian countries, especially Korea and Taiwan, has been land reform that made wealth more equitable and thus created a sizable local market for developing firms. By contrast, Latin America lacks real land reform and equality, and therefore local consumers cannot afford to buy products produced by local industries.

"Focusing on the poor and providing them with opportunities is not only Scripturally based, it is also strategically crucial in the development sense.... Experience shows that not only are the majority of the poor extremely creative and entrepreneurial in eking a living out of the few resources to which they have access, but also that giving them access to resources, information, and opportunities produces impressive results."^[5]

C. Take Peacemaking Initiatives

5. Reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade.

A key factor in the decrease of war between nations is that weapons have become so destructive that war is not worth the price. The offense cannot destroy the defense before it does huge retaliatory damage. Reducing offensive weapons and shifting toward defensive force structures strengthens that equation. For example, Gorbachev removed half the Soviet Union's tanks from Central Europe and all its river-crossing equipment. This freed NATO to agree to get rid of all medium-range and shorter-range nuclear weapons on both sides from Eastern and Western Europe--the first dramatic step in ending the Cold War peacefully. Now START II mandates reductions of the combined U.S. and Russian nuclear warheads from 47,000 to 15,500.

Agreements have been reached to ban the production of chemical and biological weapons, and to destroy their stockpiles. Many former National Security advisors from both parties recommend reducing strategic (long-range) nuclear warheads from 3,500 to 1,000 each.

The war in Bosnia is the counter-example that proves the rule: Serbia controlled the former Yugoslavian army and its weapons. They had the offensive weapons to make war without expecting a destructive counterattack.

As nations turn toward democracy and human rights, their governments no longer need large militaries to keep them in power. As the ten practices of peacemaking reduce the threat in their environment, nations feel less need for weapons. As they struggle with their deep indebtedness, they have less ability to buy weapons. The International Monetary Fund now requires big reductions in weapons expenditures before granting loans. For these reasons, arms imports by developing nations in 1995 dropped to one-quarter of their peak in 1988.

But the power of money invested by arms manufacturers in politicians' campaigns is a major obstacle to reductions. So is the ideology of the national security state, as well as real or perceived security needs. Support for reductions requires sharp curtailment of campaign spending, and reductions in threats to security.^[6]

6. Support nonviolent direct action.

Nonviolent Direct Action came to our attention primarily as the method used effectively by Gandhi in India and Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement in the United States. Now it is spreading widely, ending dictatorship in the Philippines, ending rule by the Shah in Iran, bringing about nonviolent revolutions in Poland, East Germany, and Central Europe, transforming injustice into democratic change in human rights movements in Guatemala, Argentina, and elsewhere in Latin America, in the nonviolent parts of the Intifadah campaign in Palestine and the freedom campaign in South Africa, and in many other countries.^[7] Contrast the failures of violent campaigns in Bosnia, Somalia, and Northern Ireland. Governments and people have the obligation to make room for and to support nonviolent direct action.

7. Take independent initiatives to reduce hostility.

The recently developed strategy of independent initiatives successfully achieved: Austria's freeing from Soviet domination in the 1950s in exchange for Austrian neutrality and non-offensive military; the Atmospheric Test Ban Treaty of 1963 after Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy halted atmospheric testing unilaterally; dramatic reductions in nuclear weapons via the series of initiatives by Gorbachev and the U.S. Congress, and then President Bush; and recent peacemaking breakthroughs via small initiatives taken by Israel and its Arab neighbors, and by adversaries in Northern Ireland.

Independent initiatives: 1) are independent of the slow process of negotiation; 2) are designed to decrease threat perception and distrust by the other side but not to leave the initiator weak; 3) are visible and verifiable actions, 4) have a timing announced in advance, and carried out regardless of the other side's bluster; 5) have their purpose clearly announced--to shift toward de-escalation and to invite reciprocation; 6) come in a series; if the other side refrains from reciprocating, small initiatives should continue in order to keep inviting reciprocation.

The strategy was advocated in Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian, and U.C.C. statements in the 1980s, but needs to be understood more widely so it can be noticed when it causes breakthroughs, and so citizens can press governments to take independent initiatives.^[8]

8. Use partnership conflict resolution.

Conflict resolution is becoming a well-known practice, seen dramatically in the work of President Carter in the Camp David Accords between Egypt and Israel, and more recently in Haiti and North Korea. A key test of the seriousness of governments' claims to be seeking peace is whether they develop imaginative solutions that show they understand their adversary's perspectives and needs.

We prefer the term, **partnership** conflict resolution, taken from the concept of **security partnership**, which recognizes that in the real world of threat and potential destruction, our security depends on our adversary's sense of security, and theirs on ours. 1) We mean active

partnership in developing solutions, not merely passive cooperation. 2) We seek to help adversaries listen to each other and experience each others' perspectives, including practicing cultural literacy to go beyond the surface positions and even the strategic interests of the adversaries in order to include aspects of culture, spirituality, story, history and emotion. 3) We seek long term solutions which help prevent future conflict, even as we work to heal and resolve immediate conflict. 4) We seek justice as a core component for sustainable peace echoing Dr. King, who said "Peace is not the absence of tension, but the presence of justice."^[9]

9. Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice; seek repentance and forgiveness.

The supporting paper by Alan Geyer gives numerous historical examples of the imperative and the power of the practice of repentance and forgiveness in peacemaking. He writes:

The single most important initiative in German Chancellor Willy Brandt's ostpolitik was the quest for reconciliation with then-Communist Poland. Poland, after all, was the first country to be blitzkrieged by the Nazi war machine and the country with the largest number of Holocaust victims (perhaps 3,000,000). In December 1970, Brandt courageously (with no sure guarantee of parliamentary approval) signed a treaty accepting the Oder-Neisse frontier and therewith the cession of 40,000 square miles of German territory (Silesia and parts of Pomerania and East Prussia--a decision personally dramatized by his kneeling silently at the Warsaw war memorial as an act of atonement for German offenses against the Polish people. That Brandt, of all people, should assume such a posture of repentance was especially remarkable in view of his own anti-Nazi credentials and his exile in Norway throughout the war. It was an extraordinarily winsome, powerful, long-lasting act of personal leadership. It made peace a human possibility.

10. Encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations.

Just peacemaking requires associations of citizens organized independently of governments, and linked together across boundaries of nation, class, and race, to learn peacemaking practices and press governments to employ these practices; governments should protect such associations in law, and give them accurate information.

The existence of a growing worldwide people's movement constitutes one more historical force that makes just peacemaking theory possible. A transnational network of groups, including faith groups, can partially transcend captivity by narrow national or ideological perspectives. Citizens' groups are not so committed to status-quo institutional maintenance as bureaucracies often are, nor so isolated and only temporarily engaged as individuals often are, and so can provide long-term perseverance in peacemaking. They can serve as voices for the voiceless, as they did in churches in East Germany and in women's groups in Guatemala.^[10] They can help to initiate, foster, or support transforming initiatives, where existing parties need support and courage to take risks to break out of the cycles which perpetuate violence and injustice. A citizens' network of NGO's and INGO's can often be a source of information and knowledge that persons in positions of governmental authority lack or resist acknowledging. They can criticize injustice and can initiate repentance and forgiveness. They can nurture a spirituality that sustains courage when just peacemaking is unpopular, hope when despair or cynicism is tempting, and grace and forgiveness when just peacemaking fails.

The Shift to Practice Norms

At the working conference at the Abbey of Gethsemani, a form of the fact/value split arose. The question was raised whether we should emphasize moral principles or political strategies. That led us to move toward more abstract, historically disembodied principles or ideals, rather than historically situated practices. It led us away from concreteness and historical actuality. It was ironic--or providential--that this struggle between empirical description and moral imperative

took place at the Abbey of Gethsemani--where right before our eyes the monks were actually, empirically, engaging in the normative practice of prayer, beginning at 3:20 each morning. A few of us participated in those early morning prayers, and the monks' normative practice may have been what led us forward into integrated embodiment.

We found our re-integration by explicitly turning to the ethics of normative practices. Several ethicists of different stripe have written recently of practices as normative for ethics: first John Howard Yoder and Michael Walzer, followed by Sharon Welch, Theophus Smith, Larry Rasmussen, Stanley Hauerwas, James William McClendon, and others. [\[11\]](#) Casting our just peacemaking theory in the form of normative practices did several things for us.

It brought together the empirical research of the international relations experts among us and the ethical arguments of the Christian ethicists and moral theologians.

It brought together the realists and the advocates of a liberal-democratic peace, the pacifists, and the empiricists and historians among us. Realism says the world is characterized by power struggles and conflicts of interest, and history does not take leaps, so we have to learn to deal with it as it is. Idealists say we should focus on ideals, and imagine how we can move the world toward those ideals. Practices happen, empirically, in the real world, in the context of real threat, power struggle, and drive for security. They make power's expression in war less likely and peace more likely.

It remedied the tension we experienced about the role of justice in peacemaking. When justice means historically actual practices that restore community, and we acknowledge our own complicity in injustice, then we can participate in modest and realistic ways that do lead to peace. When on the other hand justice is thought of as an absolute ideal, or a truth that we know, the result often is self-righteous crusading or postponing peace until the kingdom arrives in its fullness.

Focusing on practices grounded our normative recommendations in peacemaking processes that are in fact taking place in our historical period and growing via positive feedback loops. If we do begin to notice that these ten practices are: 1) already happening; 2) resolving conflicts; 3) proving useful and therefore spreading; 4) making reliance on war unlikely in many regions; then we do sense that ours is an historic moment when we may be able to encourage a transition from war as normal to war as abnormal. We are expressing not just a wish, but calling those who have eyes to see to notice what new processes of deliverance are happening among us and spreading globally. We are not urging disembodied ideals or ahistorical oughts to impose on an alien history they do not fit, but adding support to what is serving functional needs in the midst of the power realities.

But these practices are perceived by those who have eyes to see from the perspective of peace and justice, and some faith and hope. So there is no fact/value split in the perceiving, either: the empirical practices that we present are not merely a dispassionate statistical summary. Not all practices in our time are normative by any means. There are powerful economic interests, and natural drives for national security, that can work good or evil. There are interests that do not want to make peace, and interests that think they want to make peace, but perceive things in such a way, and with such loyalties, that their actions work in cross purposes to peace. Some think the way to peace is to wipe out the enemy. There are enormous forces of evil: nuclear weapons and their delivery systems; chemical and biological weapons; devastating poverty and its offspring--population explosion; ecological devastation and nonrenewable energy consumption; ethnic and religious wars within nations like Cambodia, Bosnia, and Zaire. "Some 2 million children have died in dozens of wars during the past decade.... This is more than three times the number of

battlefield deaths of American soldiers in all their wars since 1776.... Today, civilians account for more than 90 percent of war casualties."^[12] Whatever peacemaking practices we may point to need to work their way into areas where they are still foreign. Each practice recognizes and seeks to resolve, lessen, discipline, or check and balance one or more of these forces.

Focusing on practices enabled us to unite in spite of our differing faiths, perspectives, and methodologies. We believe the practices are ethically normative because they bring peace, they solve problems, they promote justice and cooperation. Each of us has additional reasons. Evangelicals among our group do our ethics with more biblical concreteness; mainline Protestants among us prefer more general theological grounding or middle axioms; peace-church members want arguments explicitly theological and faith-based; Roman Catholics work with general moral norms, natural law, and natural rights; and some who do not identify as explicitly faith-based shy away from faith-based reasons. All of us appeal explicitly to persons and groups of various faiths who will join with us in seeking to make peace.

The process has dramatically deepened our engagement and commitment to what we are doing together, has convinced us that in fact we are in touch with an historical learning that is happening in our time and from which we can find guidance, and has enabled us to reach unanimous consensus on the ten practices.

Conclusion

To aid recall, one could slightly shift the order of the ten practices for a moment and achieve an easily remembered acronym that commemorates two cities that have known destruction, rebuilding, and peacemaking: D.C. GUERNICA:

D Democracy, human Rights, religious Liberty

C Cooperative forces

G Grassroots groups

U UN and international organizations

E Economic and sustainable development

R Reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade

N Nonviolent direct action

I Independent initiatives

C Conflict resolution

A Acknowledge responsibility, repent, forgive

We argue that governments and citizens, and gatherings of people of faith, have an obligation to support these peacemaking practices both in long-term work to build conditions that make peace more likely, and in crisis situations where peacemaking initiatives can make war less likely.

They can guide people in prodding governments to engage in realistic peacemaking. In crisis situations, these are initiatives that should be tried before the last resort of war. We believe that whether a government employs these practices is a test of the sincerity of its claims that it is trying to make peace.

In this short space, however, I could do no more than mention a few examples of how the practices work. Nor could I make the normative ethical arguments that I would like to make, and deal with the objections that I would like to deal with. Much more will be done in future publications by the members of our group, and others.

We recognize our work is incomplete. We hope to offer our best thinking, and ask: does it do real work? Does it make new sense of our historical context, and point to faith-based, meaningful action and prayer in that context? Can these ten practices of just peacemaking help people participate in the peacemaking practices and forces that are in fact changing our world? Do they

grapple with realistic evils that cause war and destroy peace? What can you add, and what improvements can you offer? How would you and others relate them to your and their faith or core beliefs and values? We are addressing all persons of various faiths or no claimed faith who are concerned about peacemaking or who could become concerned if they had a map that would make sense of events and of peacemaking trends for them, and would indicate directions their participation could take.

Endnotes

[1]. Participants are: Steven Brion-Meisels, Cochair of Peace Action; David Bronkema, Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology, Yale U.; John Cartwright, Boston U.; Michael Dyson, Communication Studies, U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; Duane Friesen, Bethel College; Alan Geyer, Wesley Theological Seminary; Barbara Green, Office of Social Policy, United Methodist Church; Gary Gunderson, The Carter Center; Theodore Koontz, Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary; John Langan, S. J., Chicago Loyola U.; Edward L. Long, Jr., Emeritus Professor, Drew U.; David Lumsdaine, International Relations, Yale U.; Patricia McCullough, Past Cochair, Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign; Rodger Payne, International Relations, U. of Louisville; Peter Paris, Princeton Theological Seminary; Bruce Russett, International Relations, Yale U.; Paul Schroeder, International History, U. of Illinois; Michael J. Smith, International Relations, U. Of Virginia; Glen Stassen, Fuller Theological Seminary; David Steele, Center for Strategic and International Studies; Ronald Stone, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary; Susan Thistlethwaite, Chicago Theological Seminary; Judy Gundry Volf, New Testament, Fuller Theological Seminary. (Where specialty is not named, it is Moral Theology or Christian Ethics.)

[2]. Paper for the project by Paul Schroeder.

[3]. Paper by Michael J. Smith.

[4]. Paper by Bruce Russett, with some material from John Langan, S.J., on human rights and religious liberty. For some of the extensive empirical evidence, see Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993). Spencer Weart, *Never at War: Why Democracies Will Never Fight Each Other* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997). Bruce Russett, "Counterfactuals about War and Its Absence," in Philip Tetlock and Aaron Belkin, eds., *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological, and Psychological Perspectives* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).

[5]. Rodger Payne, David Lumsdaine, David Bronkema.

[6]. Barbara Green and Glen Stassen.

[ednref7](#)

[7]. Paper by Susan Thistlethwaite, John Cartwright, and Gary Gunderson. For more extensive examples and engaging narrative, see Daniel Buttry, *Christian Peacemaking*, (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1994).

[8]. Glen Stassen.

[9]. Steven Brion-Meisels, David Steele, and Edward L. Long, Jr.

[10]. Paper by Duane Friesen. For the work of groups in churches to bring about the East German nonviolent revolution, See Jörg Swoboda, *Revolution of the Candles*, trans. Richard Pierard (Atlanta: Mercer University Press, 1997); Michelle Tooley, *Voices of the Voiceless* (Scottsdale: Herald Press), 1997.

[11]. Yoder, *Royal Priesthood*(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), pp. 12ff., and 359ff.; Yoder, *Body Politics* (Nashville; Discipleship Resources, 1993); Theophus Smith, *Conjuring*

Culture(New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 3, 172, 214-6, 253; Sharon Welch, A Feminist Ethic of Risk, pp. 4, 25ff., 75f., 91, 154-8; Michael Walzer mines historically situated practices for the shared moral understandings that they reveal throughout Obligations (New York: Basic Books, 1970), Just and Unjust Wars (New York: Basic Books, 1977), and Spheres of Justice (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Larry L. Rasmussen, Moral Fragments and Moral Community (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), *passim*; Stanley Hauerwas, Against the Nations: War and Survival in Liberal Society (Notre Dame: U. Of Notre Dame Press, 1992), pp. 169-208; In Good Company: The Church as Polis (Notre Dame: U. of Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 11, 14, 28, 73ff., 176-80); A Community of Character, Notre Dame: UND Press, 1981, p. 63); James Wm. McClendon, Jr., Systematic Theology: Ethics(Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1986), pp. 165ff., 180ff., and chapters 6 and 8; and transforming initiatives in Stassen, Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), and Stassen, Yeager, and Yoder, Authentic Transformation: A New Vision of Christ and Culture (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996). See also the U.S. Catholic Bishops in The Challenge of Peace, sections III and IV. [\[12\]](#). Desmond Tutu, "Stop Killing the Children," *The Washington Post*, November 24, 1996, p. C7.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm>.

[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Wesleyan Quadrilateral](#) > [Reason: Theological Perspectives](#) > [Just Peacemaking](#)

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Just Peacemaking [brown type; a model is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm>]

In recent years an approach called Just Peacemaking has emerged in the United States. Seeking to go beyond the debate between pacifism and just war theory, it concentrates on practices to prevent war and bring about peace.

- ❖ Background [<http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#background>]
- ❖ Roots [<http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#roots>]
- ❖ Theological Basis [<http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#theologicalbasis>]
- ❖ Ten Practices [<http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemakinging.htm#practices>]
- ❖ Application [<http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemakingping.htm#application>]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#background>

Background

Just war peacemaking theory has come into focus through the efforts of 23 scholars under the leadership of Professor [Glen H. Stassen](#) [http://www.fuller.edu/provost/faculty/dbsearch/final_record.asp?id=81] of Fuller Theological Seminary. They came together at the 1993 annual meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics and held conferences in 1994 and 1996. They presented their consensus in a book entitled *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1998. 2nd edition, 2004).

For further background, see [Articles Explaining Just Peacemaking Theory](#) [http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm] on Professor Stassen's website. They include:

- Explanation of What Just Peacemaking Is
- Brief Summary of Just Peacemaking
- New Paradigm: Just Peacemaking Theory (PDF version of #1)
- Published Articles about Just Peacemaking



[end box]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#roots>

Roots

The roots of just peacemaking theory are found in four denominational statements issued from 1980 to 1986. They are:

Peacemaking: the Believers' Calling. [<http://www.pcusa.org/peacemaking/believers.pdf>] A report adopted by the 192nd General Assembly (1980), United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. This 42-page document affirms, "The church is faithful to Christ when it is engaged in peacemaking." It analyzes the new global reality and presents theological and ethical bases for peacemaking and for policymaking.

The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response.

[<http://www.usccb.org/publishing/interpol.shtml#peacemaking>] A pastoral letter on war and peace from the National Conference of Bishops (1983). Much of the focus of this statement is upon nuclear weapons and the danger of nuclear war. But a part on "The Promotion of Peace: Proposals and Policies" includes a section on efforts to develop non-violent means of conflict resolution (pp. 69-72) and another part deals with "Shaping a Peaceful World" (pp. 73-78).

Affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church,

[<http://www.ucc.org/justice/jpc.htm>] A pronouncement of the Fifteenth General Synod (1985). The General Synod defined "just peace" as the interrelation of friendship, justice, and common security from violence. The pronouncement calls the church to a vision of shalom rooted in peace with justice and places the UCC General Synod in opposition to the institution of war.

In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace.

[<http://cokebury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] A foundation document and pastoral letter from the United Methodist Council of Bishops (1986). This document offers 20 guiding principles for a theology of a just peace (pp. 36-37). The bishops' policies for a just peace concentrate on achieving a nuclear free world, but they also deal with the need for common security (pp.78-79) and education for peaceful alternatives. The latter presents techniques of peaceable political action, including nonviolent direct action (pp. 79-81).

Glen Stassen provides an analysis of these statements in chapter 9 of *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992). ▲

[end box]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#theoreticalbasis>

Theological Basis

The 23 scholars who developed the set of ideas on Just Peacemaking decided to concentrate on specific practices rather than seek agreement on theology. Professor Stassen explained why.

Focusing on practices enabled us to unite in spite of our differing faiths, perspectives, and methodologies. We believe the practices are ethically normative because they bring peace, they solve problems, they promote justice and cooperation. Each of us has additional reasons. Evangelicals among our group do our ethics with more biblical concreteness; mainline Protestants among us prefer more general theological grounding or middle axioms; peace-church members want arguments explicitly theological and faith-based; Roman Catholics work with general moral norms, natural law, and natural rights; and some who do not identify as explicitly faith-based shy away from faith-based

reasons. All of us appeal explicitly to persons and groups of various faiths who will join with us in seeking to make peace. (from New Paradigm: Just Peacemaking Theory.)
http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm

But because these scholars did not seek a consensus on a theology for just peacemaking, this does not preclude development of a theological basis in the future. ▲

[end box]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#practices>

Ten Practices

The 23 scholars brought their ideas together in a book entitled *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War*, edited by Glen Stassen (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1998. Second edition, 2004). The ten practices are grouped in three sets:

I. PEACEMAKING INITIATIVES

1. Support nonviolent direct action.
2. Take independent initiatives to reduce threat.
3. Use cooperative conflict resolution.
4. Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness.

II. JUSTICE

5. Advance democracy, human rights, and religious liberty.
6. Foster just and sustainable economic development.

III. LOVE AND COMMUNITY

7. Work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system.
8. Strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights.
9. Reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade.
10. Encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations.

Professor Stassen has observed: "If we do begin to notice that these ten practices are: 1) already happening; 2) resolving conflicts; 3) proving useful and therefore spreading; 4) making reliance on war unlikely in many regions; then we do sense that ours is an historic moment when we may be able to encourage a transition from war as normal to war as abnormal. We are expressing not just a wish, but calling those who have eyes to see to notice what new processes of deliverance are happening among us and spreading globally. We are not urging disembodied ideals or ahistorical oughts to impose on an alien history they do not fit, but adding support to what is serving functional needs in the midst of the power realities."

Note: Further information on experience with nonviolent action

[<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm>] is offered elsewhere on this website. Practical ideas for achieving nuclear disarmament are presented at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/> ▲

[end box]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm#application>

Application

Glen Stassen's Ideas

In a series of [Articles Explaining Just Peacemaking Theory](http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm),

[http://www.fullerseminary.net/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm]

Professor Stassen presents ideas on how to apply the principles of just peacemaking in concrete situations, including:

- How Just Peacemaking Theory Can make Sense of the Bombing of Kosovo
- Attacking Iraq from a Just Peacemaking Perspective
- Turning Attention to Just Peacemaking Initiatives that Prevent Terrorism

Dealing with Saddam Hussein

In the early months of 2003 leading up to the Iraq War, Jim Wallis, executive director and editor-in-chief of Sojourners, developed "[An Alternative to War for Defeating Saddam Hussein](http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=action.6_point_plan)."

[http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=action.6_point_plan] Offered as a third way between war and ineffectual responses, the plan had six points.

1. Remove Saddam Hussein and the Baath Party from power.

"The U.N. Security Council should establish an international tribunal to indict Saddam and his top officials for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Indicting Saddam would send a clear signal to the world that he has no future. It would set into motion both internal and external forces that might remove him from power."

2. Enforce coercive disarmament.

a. Military enforcement. "Removing Saddam must be coupled with greatly intensified inspections to fully enforce all U.N. Security Council resolutions that relate to Iraq since the 1991 Gulf war."

b. Strengthen the arms embargo.

3. Foster a democratic Iraq.

4. Organize a massive humanitarian effort now for the people of Iraq.

5. Recommit to a "Roadmap to Peace" in the Middle East.

6. Reinvigorate and sustain the "war against terrorism."

On February 18, 2003 a U.S. religious delegation presented this plan to British Prime Minister Blair. They included Jim Wallis, John Bryson Chane, Episcopal bishop, Washington, D.C.; Clifton Kirkpatrick, stated clerk, Presbyterian Church USA; Melvin Talbert, ecumenical officer, United Methodist Council of Bishops; and Dan Weiss, immediate past general secretary, American Baptist Churches in the USA.

Dealing with Terrorism

[Examples to be added.]

[end box]



Just Peacemaking:

Ten Practices for Abolishing War

(Pilgrim Press: August, 1998)

Summary of the theory for the panel on Just Peacemaking Theory

at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion

Orlando, Florida, November, 1998

Part One: PEACEMAKING INITIATIVES

1. Support nonviolent direct action.

Nonviolent Direct Action is spreading widely, ending dictatorship in the Philippines, ending rule by the Shah in Iran, bringing about nonviolent revolutions in Poland, East Germany, and Central Europe, transforming injustice into democratic change in human rights movements in Guatemala, Argentina, and elsewhere in Latin America, in South Africa.... Governments and people have the obligation to make room for and to support nonviolent direct action.

2. Take independent initiatives to reduce threat.

Independent initiatives: 1) are independent of the slow process of negotiation; 2) decrease threat perception and distrust but do not leave the initiator weak; 3) are verifiable actions; 4) and carried out at the announced time regardless of the other side's bluster; 5) have their purpose clearly announced--to shift toward de-escalation and to invite reciprocation; 6) come in a series; initiatives should continue in order to keep inviting reciprocation. This new practice has been crucial in several recent breakthroughs.

3. Use cooperative conflict resolution.

1) Active partnership in developing solutions, not merely passive cooperation. 2) Adversaries listen to each other and experience each others' perspectives, including culture, spirituality, story, history and emotion. 3) Seek longterm solutions which help prevent future conflict. 4) Seek justice as a core component for sustainable peace.

4. Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness.

Until recently, it was widely agreed that nations would not express regret, acknowledge responsibility, or give forgiveness. But Germany since World War II, Japan and Korea, Clinton in Africa, the U.S. finally toward Japanese-Americans during World War II, the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and other actions described by Shriver, *An Ethic for Enemies* and Wink, *When Powers Fall*, show a crucial new practice is emerging that can heal longstanding bitternesses.

Part Two: JUSTICE

5. Advance democracy, human rights, and religious liberty.

Extensive empirical evidence shows that the spreading of democracy and respect for human rights, including religious liberty, is widening the zones of peace. Democracies fought *no wars* against one another during the entire twentieth century. They had fewer civil wars. And they generally devoted lower shares of their national products to military expenditures, which decreases threats to other countries.

Ties of economic interdependence by trade and investment also decrease the incidence of war. Engagement in international organizations like the UN and regional institutions is a clear predictive factor that they will be much less likely to engage in war.

6. Foster just and sustainable economic development.

Sustainable development occurs where the needs of today are met without threatening the needs of tomorrow--where those who lack adequate material and economic resources gain access, and those who have learn to control resource use and prevent future exhaustion.

A key to economic development in East Asian countries, especially Korea and Taiwan, has been land reform that made wealth more equitable and thus created a sizable local market for developing firms. By contrast, Latin America lacks real land reform and equality, and therefore local consumers cannot afford to buy products produced by local industries.

Part Three: LOVE AND COMMUNITY

7. Work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system.

Four trends have so altered the conditions and practices of international relations as to make it possible now, where it was not possible before, to form and sustain voluntary associations for peace and other valuable common purposes that are in fact working: the decline in the utility of war; the priority of trade and the economy over war; the strength of international exchanges, communications, transactions, and networks; and the gradual ascendancy of liberal representative democracy and a mixture of welfare-state and laissez-faire market economy. We should act so as to strengthen these trends and the international associations that they make possible.

8. Strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights.

Acting alone, states cannot solve problems of trade, debt, interest rates; of pollution, ozone depletion, acid rain, depletion of fish stocks, global warming; of migrations and refugees seeking asylum; of military security when weapons rapidly penetrate borders.

Therefore, collective action is increasingly necessary. U.S. citizens should press their government to pay its UN dues and to act in ways that strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations, of regional organizations, and of multilateral peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace building. They resolve conflicts, monitor, nurture, and even enforce truces. They meet human needs for food, hygiene, medicine, education, and economic interaction. Most wars now happen within states, not between states; therefore, collective action needs to include UN-approved humanitarian intervention in cases like the former Yugoslavia, Haiti, Somalia, and Rwanda "when a state's condition or behavior results in... grave and massive violations of human rights."

9. Reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade.

A key factor in the decrease of war between nations is that weapons have become so destructive that war is not worth the price. Reducing offensive weapons and shifting toward defensive force structures strengthens that equation. Banning chemical and biological weapons, and reducing strategic (long-range) nuclear warheads from 3,500 to 1,000 each, are key steps.

Arms imports by developing nations in 1995 dropped to one-quarter of their peak in 1988. But the power of money invested by arms manufacturers in politicians' campaigns is a major obstacle to reductions.

10. Encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations.

The existence of a growing worldwide people's movement constitutes one more historical force that makes just peacemaking theory possible. They learn peacemaking practices and press governments to employ these practices; governments should protect such associations in law, and give them accurate information.

Each practice is recent in its widespread use, and is causing significant change. Together they exert strong influence, decreasing wars. Each is empirically happening and being effective in abolishing some wars. Each faces significant obstacles and blocking forces that are named in the

chapters. We contend that just peacemaking practices are ethically obligatory for persons, groups, and governments to strengthen them and help overcome the blocking forces.

Just Peacemaking

Christian Ethicists Advocate Just Peacemaking as Corollary to Just War

by **Alexandra Alter**

<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week820/exclusive.html>

General Assembly Backgrounder: “Just Peacemaking”

Presbyterian

<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/oldnews/1998/98178.htm>

Just Peacemaking Initiatives Can Prevent Terrorism

By Glen Stassen,

Lewis Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics

Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA

http://www.christianethicstoday.com/Issue/041/Just%20Peacemaking%20Initiatives%20Can%20Prevent%20Terrorism%20By%20Glen%20Stassen_041_09_.htm

Winning The Peace

For peacemaking to be effective, we must not only say no to war, but provide viable alternatives.

by Glen Stassen

Sojourners Includes Wallis 6 pt. Iraq plan

http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=magazine.article&mode=printer_friendly&issue=soj0501&article=050111

Taking Our Own Advice

The 1998 General Assembly Statement Just Peacemaking and the Call for International Intervention for Humanitarian Rescue

By Earl S. Johnson Jr.

<http://www.pres-outlook.com/HTML/ejohnson032403.html>

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/jpc6.htm>

How a just war without a just peace became a holy war

By Jay Lintner
February 18, 2002

Presbyterian

Peacemaking: the Believers Calling
<http://www.pcusa.org/peacemaking/believers.pdf>
43 p.

Biblical Basis for Peacemaking

by Peggy Cowan,
Department of Religion,
Maryville College
<http://www.pcusa.org/peacemaking/basis.htm>

Publications About Just Peacemaking Theory
(that I know of, as of July, 2004)

Evidence that just peacemaking theory is becoming established as the third ethic of peace and war, the new paradigm.

Just peacemaking theory has its origins in the book-length calls to peacemaking issued by the U. S. Catholic bishops in *The Challenge of Peace*, the Presbyterian Church, USA in *Peacemaking: the Believers Calling*, The United Church of Christ in *The Just Peace Church*, and the U. S. Methodist church in *In Defense of Creation*.

I analyze those origins in *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), chapter 9. Ronald H. Stone traces the origins yet earlier in *The Ultimate Imperative: An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (Cleveland: Pilgrim, 1999).

Our jointly authored consensus statement of the new paradigm, *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1998 and 2004), has sold 5,000 copies, and Pilgrim Press is now publishing a revised edition.

Glen Stassen, *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives*.

J. Milburn Thompson, "Humanitarian Intervention, Just Peacemaking and the United Nations," *Concilium: The Return of the Just War*, ed. María Pilar Aquino and Dietmar Mieth (London: SCM Press, 2002), 83-93.

Martin L. Cook, "Just Peacemaking: Challenges of Humanitarian Intervention," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 241-254.

Lisa Sowle Cahill, "Just Peacemaking: Theory, Practice, and Prospects," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 195-212.

Simeon O. Ilesanmi, "So that Peace May Reign: A Study of Just Peacemaking Experiments in Africa," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 213-226.

Charles Kimball, "The Just Peacemaking Paradigm and Middle East Conflicts," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 227-240.

Ronald H. Stone, "Realist Criticism of Just Peacemaking Theory," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 255-264.

Glen H. Stassen, "The Unity, Realism, and Obligatoriness of Just Peacemaking Theory," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 171-194.

Theodore J. Koontz and Michael L. Westmoreland-White, "A Just Peacemaking Bibliography," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23/1 (Spring/Summer 2003), 269-284.

Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, "New Wars, Old Wineskins," *Strike Terror No More: Theology, Ethics and the New War* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002).

Duane Friesen, "Just Peacemaking," with Glen Stassen, in *Transforming Violence: Linking Local and Global Peacemaking* ed. Robert Herr and Judy Zimmerman Herr (Scottsdale and Waterloo: Herald Press, 1998).

Larry Rasmussen has written an article arguing for just peacemaking theory, "Just Peacemaking: Recent Christian Revisions" (forthcoming).

Charles Kimball's widely read *When Religion Becomes Evil* (HarperSanFrancisco: 2002) suggests the ten practices of just peacemaking as antidote to the evil dimensions of religion gone astray.

Ronald Stone's textbook in Christian ethics, *The Ultimate Imperative: An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (Cleveland: Pilgrim, 1999), has a full exposition of just peacemaking theory.

Edward Leroy Long, Jr., *Facing Terrorism: Responding as Christians* (Westminster/John Knox: 2004) compares just peacemaking theory with a law enforcement model (which I consider

incorporated in the international law dimensions of just peacemaking theory), and these two together against the present crusade approach.

The issue plenary during the annual meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics in January, 2004 was devoted to addresses by Paul Schroeder, George Lopez, Ronald Stone, and Glen Stassen on just peacemaking theory's power to suggest more effective approaches to foreign policy.

The addresses by Schroeder and Stassen will be published in the *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* (Fall 2004). Mine will be entitled "Just Peacemaking Theory as Hermeneutical Key: For International Cooperation in Preventing Terrorism."

Peace Action, the largest grassroots U. S. peace organization (formerly Sane/Freeze), is adopting its new long-range strategy, entitled "Real Security through International Cooperation and Human Rights." The strategy is based on just peacemaking theory.

Jim Wallis's Six-Point alternative to war against Iraq implemented just peacemaking theory. See www.sojo.net and my forthcoming article in the August 2004 *Sojourners*.

The Presbyterian Church has adopted just peacemaking as its practice, though with a thinned understanding of what just peacemaking means.

The phrase, "just peacemaking," is now cropping up in various places; it is becoming a term that people write or speak about, though without mentioning the ten specific practices.

I am writing a book for Westminster/John Knox comparing just peacemaking with just war, pacifism, and realism as they approach five wars in our history and currently.

I have published several articles on just peacemaking theory:

"New Paradigm: Just Peacemaking Theory," *CSSR Bulletin* (Spring, 1997).

"Just Peacemaking: A New Paradigm for our New World," in *Christians and Politics Beyond the Culture Wars: An Agenda for Engagement*, ed. David P. Gushee (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 211-227.

"Preventing Violence: What Works?" *Park Ridge Center Bulletin* (May/June, 2000)

A short article on the war on terrorism in *The Christian Century*, 2001.

"Just Peacemaking," in Eve S. Clayton, *The Finest Robe, The Essential Vision: Reconciliation in the 21st Century* (St. Davids, PA: Institute for Global Engagement, 2002).

"Turning Attention to Just Peacemaking Initiatives that Prevent Terrorism," *The Council of Societies for the Study of Religion Bulletin* 31/3 (September, 2002), 59-65.

"Just Peacemaking Initiatives Can Prevent Terrorism," *Christian Ethics Today* 8/4 (October 2002, 8-9.

"Just Peacemaking in a Post-Sept. 11 World," *The Semi*, September 11, 2002, 5.

"Just Peacemaking," *First Evangelical Church Association Bulletin*, Issue 6 (August 1999), 26-29.

Glen Stassen and David Gushee *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003). Chapter 7 summarizes just peacemaking theory, and chapter 8 applies it to preventing homicides in the United States. The book won the *Christianity Today* award for best book in theology or ethics in 2003.

Glen Stassen and Michael L. Westmoreland-White, "Defining Violence and Nonviolence" in *Teaching Peace: Nonviolence and the Liberal Arts*, edited by J. Denny Weaver and Gerald Biesecker-Mast (Rowman and Littlefield: 2003).

"Jesus and Just Peacemaking Theory," in Kenneth Chase and Alan Jacobs, eds., *Must Christianity Be Violent? Reflections on History, Practice, and Theology* (Brazos: 2003).

A forthcoming article in *Sojourners* (August, 2004) on just peacemaking theory as alternative to the war in Iraq as seen in Jim Wallis's six-point plan.

War and Peacemaking Organizations, in *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism* (Routledge: 2003).

"Just Peacemaking Theory as Deliverance from Vicious Cycles of Unilateralism, Injustice, and Terrorism," in *Christian Reflection* (2004).

"The Ethics of War and Peacemaking" in Ronald Sider and Diane Knippers, eds., *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy* (Baker: 2005).

"The Value of Making an Apology," op-ed article for the Sunday *Chicago Tribune*, April 25, 2004.

UCC

A Just Peace Church

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/just.htm>

The Just Peace Church vision is a hallmark of United Church of Christ theological identity.

For nearly two decades, the Just Peace Church program has been a grassroots movement of UCC congregations committed to corporately naming and boldly proclaiming a public identity as a justice doing, peace-seeking church.

□

The movement traces its history to the 1985 General Synod, when a [Just Peace Pronouncement](#) called upon all settings of the UCC to be a Just Peace Church, underscoring the words of Dr. Robert V. Moss, the second president of the UCC, who wrote in 1971, "We now need to put as much effort into defining a just peace as we have done in the past in defining a just war."

The General Synod defined "just peace" as the interrelation of friendship, justice, and common security from violence. The pronouncement called the church to a vision of shalom rooted in peace with justice and placed the UCC General Synod in opposition to the institution of war.

Over the years, the Just Peace Church identity has become an important symbol for many of our congregations, as both a means of shaping congregational identity and as a theological framework for doing justice-based theological reflection.

For many Just Peace congregations, this identity has helped to underscore their ministries of direct service, legislative advocacy, and courageous witness. The approach has differed from place to place: Some became immersed in anti-war and anti-militarism issues, while some focused their energies on U.S. policies affecting central America. Others strengthened their multi-racial, multi-cultural witness. Some developed neighborhood ministries, while others translated their just-peace identity to be a fitting starting place for eventually becoming "Open and Affirming" or "Whole Earth" churches. Justice and Witness Ministries is committed to a revitalized Just Peace Church movement, wherein congregations will be empowered and resourced to create an even stronger justice and peace witness for decades to come. In coming months, we hope you will be hearing more about the Just Peace movement in the UCC—as conversations expand and deepen in various settings around our church.

What does it mean to be a Just Peace Church in times like these? This is the question we have been asking ourselves and others. Your responses are most helpful in shaping the new directions of our collective movement.

Does your church consider itself to be a Just Peace congregation? Do you have thoughts to share about the direction of the Just Peace Church program? Contact the Rev. Loey Powell at 216-736-3715 or powelll@ucc.org.

Pronouncement on affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/jpc.htm>

General Synod 15 pronouncement

85-GS-50 VOTED: The Fifteenth General Synod adopts the pronouncement "Affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church."

Summary

Affirms the United Church of Christ to be a Just Peace Church and defines Just Peace as the interrelation of friendship, justice, and common security from violence. Places the United Church of Christ General Synod in opposition to the institution of war.

Background

The Thirteenth General Synod called upon the United Church of Christ to become a Peace Church and the Fourteenth General Synod asked a Peace Theology Development Team to recommend to the Fifteenth General Synod theology, policy, and structure for enabling the United Church of Christ to be a peacemaking church. This pronouncement is based on insights from all three of the historic approaches of Christians to issues of war and peace—pacifism, just war, and crusade—but attempts to move beyond these traditions to an understanding rooted in the vision of shalom, linking peace, and justice. Since Just

War criteria itself now rules out war under modern conditions, it is imperative to move beyond Just War thinking to the Theology of a Just Peace.

Biblical and theological foundations

A Just Peace is grounded in God's activity in creation. Creation shows the desire of God to sustain the world and not destroy. The creation anticipates what is to come: the history-long relationship between God and humanity and the coming vision of shalom.

Just Peace is grounded in covenant relationship. God creates and calls us into covenant, God's gift of friendship: "I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore" (Ezekiel 37:26). When God's abiding presence is embraced, human well-being results, or Shalom, which can be translated Just Peace.

A Just Peace is grounded in the reconciling activity of Jesus Christ. Human sin is the rejection of the covenant of friendship with God and one another and the creation and perpetuation of structures of evil. Through God's own suffering love in the cross, the power of these structures has been broken and the possibility for relationship restored.

A Just Peace is grounded in the presence of the Holy Spirit. God sends the Holy Spirit to continue the struggle to overcome the powers ranged against human bonding. Thus, our hope for a Just Peace does not rest on human efforts alone, but on God's promise that we will "have life and have it abundantly" (John 10:10).

A Just Peace is grounded in the community of reconciliation: the Just Peace Church. Jesus, who is our peace (Ephesians 2:14), performed signs of forgiveness and healing and made manifest that God's reign is for those who are in need. The church is a continuation of that servant manifestation. As a Just Peace Church, we embody a Christ fully engaged in human events. The church is thus a real countervailing power to those forces that divide, that perpetuate human enmity and injustice, and that destroy.

Just Peace is grounded in hope. Shalom is the vision that pulls all creation toward a time when weapons are swept off the earth and all creatures lie down together without fear; where all have their own fig tree and dwell secure from want. As Christians, we offer this conviction to the world: Peace is possible.

Statement of Christian conviction

A. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms a Just Peace as the presence and interrelation of friendship, justice, and common security from violence. The General Synod affirms the following as marks of a Just Peace theology:

Peace is possible. A Just Peace is a basic gift of God and is the force and vision moving human history. The meaning of a Just Peace and God's activity in human history, especially the life and witness of Jesus, is understood through the Bible, church history, and the voices of the oppressed and those in the struggle for justice and peace. Nonviolent conflict is a normal and healthy reflection of diversity; working through conflict constructively should lead to growth of both individuals and nations.

Nonviolence is a Christian response to conflict shown to us by Jesus. We have barely begun to explore this little known process of reconciliation. Violence can and must be minimized, even eliminated in most situations. However, because evil and violence are embedded in human nature and institutions, they will remain present in some form. War can and must be eliminated.

The State should be based upon participatory consent and should be primarily responsible for developing justice and well-being, enforcing law, and minimizing violence in the process.

International structures of friendship, justice, and common security from violence are necessary and possible at this point in history in order to eliminate the institution of war and move toward a Just Peace. Unexpected initiatives of friendship and reconciliation can transform interpersonal and international relationships, and are essential to restoring community.

B. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church. The General Synod affirms the following as marks of a Just Peace Church, calling upon each local church to become: A community of hope, believing a Just Peace is possible, working toward this end, and communicating to the larger world the excitement and possibility of a Just Peace.

A community of worship and celebration, centering its identity in justice and peacemaking and the Good News of peace that is Jesus Christ.

A community of biblical and theological reflection, studying the Scriptures, the Christian story, and the working of the Spirit in the struggle against injustice and oppression.

A community of spiritual nurture and support, loving one another and giving one another strength in the struggle for a Just Peace.

A community of honest and open conflict, a zone of freedom where differences may be expressed, explored, and worked through in mutual understanding and growth.

A community of empowerment, renewing and training people for making peace/doing justice.

A community of financial support, developing programs and institutions for a Just Peace.

A community of solidarity with the poor, seeking to be present in places of oppression, poverty, and violence, and standing with the oppressed in the struggle to resist and change this evil.

A community of loyalty to God and to the whole human community over any nation or rival idolatry.

A community that recognizes no enemies, willing to risk and be vulnerable, willing to take surprising initiatives to transform situations of enmity. A community of repentance, confessing its own guilt and involvement in structural injustice and violence, ready to acknowledge its entanglement in evil, seeking to turn toward new life.

A community of resistance, standing against social structures comfortable with violence and injustice.

A community of sacrifice and commitment, ready to go the extra mile, and then another mile, in the search for justice and peace.

A community of political and social engagement, in regular dialogue with the political order, participating in peace and justice advocacy networks, witnessing to a Just Peace in the community and in the nation, joining the social and political struggle to implement a Just Peace.

C. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms friendship as essential to a Just Peace.

1. We affirm the unity of the whole human community and oppose any use of nationalism to divide this covenant of friendship.

2. We reject all labeling of others as enemies and the creation of institutions that perpetuate enemy relations.

3. We affirm diversity among peoples and nations and the growth and change that can emerge from the interchange of differing value systems, ideologies, religions and political and economic systems.

4. We affirm nonviolent conflict as inevitable and valuable, an expression of diversity and essential to healthy relationships among people and nations.

5. We affirm all nations developing global community and interchange, including:

a. freedom of travel,

b. free exchange of ideas and open dialogue,

c. scientific, cultural, and religious exchanges,

d. public education that portrays other nations fairly, breaking down enemy stereotypes and images, and

e. knowledge of foreign languages.

D. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms justice as essential to a Just Peace.

1. We affirm all nations working together to insure that people everywhere will be able to meet their basic needs, including the right of every person to:

a. food and clean water,

b. adequate health care,

c. decent housing,

d. meaningful employment,

e. basic education,

f. participation in community decision-making and the political process,

g. freedom of worship and religious expression,

h. protection from torture, and

i. protection of rights without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or national or social origin.

2. We affirm the establishment of a more just international order in which:

a. trade barriers, tariffs, and debt burdens do not work against the interests of poor people, and developing nations,

b. poor nations have a greater share in the policies and management of global economic institutions.

3. We affirm economic policies that target aid to the most needy: the rural poor, women, nations with poor natural resources or structural problems, and the poor within each nation.

4. We affirm economic policies that will further the interests of the poor within each nation:

a. promoting popular participation,

b. empowering the poor to make effective demand on social systems,

c. encouraging decentralization and greater community control,

d. providing for the participation of women in development,

- e. redistributing existing assets, including land, and distributing more equitably future benefits of growth,
 - f. reducing current concentrations of economic and political power, and
 - g. providing for self-reliant development, particularly in food production.
5. We affirm nations transferring funds from military expenditures into programs that will aid the poor and developing strategies of converting military industries to Just Peace industries.
6. We oppose the injustices resulting from the development of national security states that currently repress the poor in organizing society against an external enemy.
7. We affirm a free and open press within each nation, without hindrance from government.
- E. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms common security from violence as essential to a Just Peace.
1. We affirm that national security includes four interrelated components:
- a. provision for general well-being,
 - b. cultivation of justice,
 - c. provision for defense of a nation, and
 - d. creation of political atmosphere and structure in which a Just Peace can flourish and the risk of war is diminished or eliminated.
2. We affirm the right and obligation of governments to use civil authority to prevent lawlessness and protect human rights. Such force must not be excessive and must always be in the context of the primary responsibility of the state in creating social justice and promoting human welfare. Any use of force must be based in the participatory consent of the people.
3. We affirm that war must be eliminated as an instrument of national policy and the global economy must be more just. To meet these goals, international institutions must be strengthened.
4. We affirm our support for the United Nations, which should be strengthened developing the following:
- a. more authority in disputes among countries,
 - b. peacekeeping forces, including a permanent force of at least 5000, able to police border disputes and intervene when called to do so by the U.N.,
 - c. peacemaking teams, trained in mediation, conflict intervention, and conflict resolution,
 - d. support for international peace academies,
 - e. a global satellite surveillance system to provide military intelligence to the common community,
 - f. international agreements to limit military establishments and the international arms trade,
 - g. an international ban on the development, testing, use, and possession of nuclear and bio-chemical weapons of mass destruction, and
 - h. an international ban on all weapons in space and all national development of space-based defense systems and Strategic Defense Initiatives.
5. We affirm our support for the International Court of Justice and for the strengthening of international law, including:
- a. the Law of the Sea Treaty,
 - b. universal ratification of the International Covenants and Conventions which seek to implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and
 - c. recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and removal of restrictions, such as the Connally Amendment, which impair the Court's effective functioning.
6. We reject any use or threat to use weapons and forces of mass destruction and any doctrine of deterrence based primarily on using such weapons. We also reject unilateral, full-scale disarmament as a currently accepted path out of the present international dilemma. We affirm the development of new policies of common security, using a combination of negotiated agreements, new international institutions and institutional power, nonviolent strategies, unilateral initiatives to lessen tensions, and new policies that will make the global economy more just.
7. We affirm the mutual and verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons as the most important step in breaking the escalating dynamics of the arms race and call upon the United States, the U.S.S.R., and other nations to take unilateral initiatives toward implementing such a freeze, contingent on the other side responding, until such time as a comprehensive freeze can be negotiated.
8. We declare our opposition to all weapons of mass destruction. All nations should:
- a. declare that they will never use such weapons,
 - b. cease immediately the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons,
 - c. begin dismantling these arsenals, and

d. while the process of dismantling is going on, negotiate comprehensive treaties banning all such future weapons by any nation.

9. We declare our opposition to war, violence, and terrorism. All nations should:

a. declare that they will never attack another nation,

b. make unilateral initiatives toward dismantling their military arsenals, calling on other nations to reciprocate, and

c. develop mechanisms for international law, international peacekeeping, and international conflict resolution.

Address by Rev. Allan Boesak

President Avery Post introduced Rev. Allan Boesak, President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, who addressed the General Synod. (See Appendix 14.)

President Post then called on Rev. Charles Cobb to lead General Synod in prayer.

Proposal for action on organizing the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace church

The Assistant Moderator, Ms. Janeece L. Dent, called on Rev. Virginia Derr, who moved the Proposal for Action, "Organizing the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church" with additions as follows: Section IV, I, add after first paragraph:

"We commend to all local churches the use of the World Peace Prayer, using the example of the Benedictine Sisters who pray this specific prayer each day at 12 noon:

Lead me/us from death to life,

from falsehood to truth.

Lead me/us from despair to hope,

from fear to trust.

Lead me/us from hate to love,

from war to peace.

Let peace fill our heart, our

world, our universe."

Section IV, 4, paragraph 2, after first sentence add following sentence:

"We call upon local churches to be understanding and even supportive of persons who out of individual conscience take the responsibility for such non-violent extraordinary witness."

After discussion, Rev. Ross McGuire moved an amendment as follows:

Reword IV, 4, paragraph 2 to read:

"While respecting the claims of responsible governments on the loyalty and good will of their people, because the times are now so critical, we call our churches to recognize and support the right of persons to witness in extraordinary as well as ordinary ways for a just peace.

"Such a witness may include acts of non-violent challenge to laws and policies which promote war and injustice in the world and a willingness to go to jail to call attention to specific outrages."

Following discussion, the motion was defeated.

Mr. Jeffrey Schragg of the Business Committee moved to divide the question, separating Section VI, "Call for Increased Funding," "All Church Offerings," from the proposal for action so that it could be considered during the report of Committee 13. The motion was adopted.

After further discussion, it was,

85-GS-51 VOTED: The Fifteenth General Synod adopts the Proposal for Action "Organizing the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church."

Summary

Calls upon churches to organize themselves so as to be effective instruments of God's Just Peace. Calls for organizing the United Church of Christ regionally and nationally for more effective Just Peace witness. Calls for a two-year Just Peace offering and effective long-range funding.

Background

This Proposal for Action builds on the proposed pronouncement, also submitted to the Fifteenth General Synod, "Affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church." Like the pronouncement, the Proposal for Action has been developed in response to the request of the Fourteenth General Synod to recommend theology, policy, and structure for enabling the United Church of Christ to be a peace-making church.

Directional statement

The Fifteenth General Synod calls on all in the United Church of Christ to recognize that the creating of a Just Peace is central to their identity as Christians and to their Baptism into the Christian community.

A. Call To Local Churches

The Fifteenth General Synod calls on local churches to organize their common life so as to make a difference in the achieving of a Just Peace and the ending of the institution of war.

The Fifteenth General Synod calls for the development of four key components within local churches: spiritual development, Just Peace education, political advocacy, and community witness.

1. We call all local churches to the inward journey of spiritual nurture: prayer for a Just Peace, study of the Scriptures, theological reflection upon the work of the Holy Spirit, and celebration and worship that center the life of the community in the power and reality of the God who creates a Just Peace. We call for the development of Christian community that nurtures and supports members in the search for a Just Peace. We commend to all local churches the use of the World Peace Prayer, using the example of the Benedictine Sisters who pray this specific prayer each day at 12 noon:

Lead me/us from death to life,
from falsehood to truth.

Lead me/us from despair to hope,
from fear to trust.

Lead me/us from hate to love,
from war to peace.

Let peace fill our hearts,our
world, our universe.

2. We call all local churches to the inward journey of education. Knowing that there are no easy answers to the creating of a Just Peace, we call for churches to establish the climate where all points of view can be respected and all honest feelings and opinions shared in the search for new answers and directions. We call for a steady program of Just Peace education and a steady flow of information on Just Peace issues into the life of the congregation.

3. We call all local churches to the outward journey of political witness, enabling all members to join the search for the politics of a Just Peace. Just Peace is both a religious concept and a political concept, and participation in the political arena is essential. We call for each church to appoint a contact person for the United Church of Christ Peace Advocacy and Hunger/Economic Justice Networks to follow closely those political issues most critical to the development of a Just Peace and to alert members of the local church when it is most appropriate to write or contact their Senators and Representatives.

4. We call all local churches to the outward journey of community witness. We call for local churches to make their convictions known in their communities through public forums, media, and presence in the public arena. We call for local churches to help shape public opinion and the climate in which the issues of a Just Peace are shaped. We call for churches to explore with military industries the opportunities for conversion into Just Peace industries. We call for evangelistic outreach, inviting others to join in the search for a Just Peace.

Because the times are so critical, we call for extraordinary witness as well as ordinary political involvement to break the power of the structural evils that prevent a Just Peace. We call upon local churches to be understanding and even supportive of persons who out of individual conscience take the responsibility for such nonviolent extraordinary witness. Examples of such witness might include: becoming a conscientious objector to war; refusing acceptance of employment with any project related to nuclear and biochemical weapons and warfare; refusing any and all assignments to use weapons of mass destruction as a member of the military; withholding tax money in protest of the excessively militaristic policies of our government; and engaging in acts of non-violent civil disobedience, willingly going to jail to call attention to specific outrages.

B. Call to Conferences and National Bodies

The Fifteenth General Synod calls upon Conferences and national bodies of the United Church of Christ to organize their common life so as to make a difference in the achieving of a Just Peace and the ending of the institution of war.

The Fifteenth General Synod calls for the development of four key components in developing the United Church of Christ so that it can make a real difference over the next years: regional centers, Washington advocacy, international presence, and national programs.

1. We call upon Conferences to develop regional centers able to link local churches into effective regional and national strategies. A variety of options are possible at the Association and Conference levels:

The development of regional United Church of Christ peace centers that resource local groups through educational, organizational, advocacy, and funding efforts;

The development of ecumenical regional Just Peace centers, in partnership with other denominations;
The funding of part-time, contract, or full-time Just Peace staff at the Association or Conference; and
The funding of ecumenical peace staff in states or metropolitan areas.

2. We call for the strengthening of our advocacy work in Washington, D.C., with more funding to develop the capacity of the United Church of Christ to make its witness known in the national political arena, to expand its capacity for policy analysis, to increase its presence on Capitol Hill in shaping legislation, to develop stronger communication links with churches around the country to share political developments and urge action, and to build coalitions.

3. We call upon the United Church of Christ Board for World Ministries to explore and develop new models of peace and justice ministries globally to address particular situations of injustice, oppression, and real or potential violence, and to develop communication links between Christians in these critical situations and Christians in the United States, developing global partnership and global awareness in the search for a Just Peace.

4. We call upon all national bodies to continue to develop effective programs of advocacy, empowerment, and education. We call for more resources to develop national strategies of advocacy and action to increase the witness of the United Church of Christ for a Just Peace. We call for the Office for Church in Society to facilitate the coordination of this work.

Implementation

Churches, Conferences, and national bodies, including the Office for Church in Society, the Executive Council, the United Church Board for World Ministries, and the Stewardship Council, have been requested in this Call to Action to respond to various directions. These bodies are responsible for developing the strategies and programs to fulfill the goals outlined here.

Note: Implementation of this Proposal for action is subject to the availability of funds.

How a just war without a just peace became a holy war

By Jay Lintner

February 18, 2002

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/jpc6.htm>

"Only Justice Can Stop a Curse"

A Just Peace Reflection on our National Crisis

By Dr. Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite

President and Professor of Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/jpc1.htm>