

overcomes evil through the cross and resurrection.

"4. We seek to understand the nonviolent revolutions and armed struggles of our time [~~through the Gospel of Peace~~] by drawing on the traditions of [Christian pacifism,] just war, just peacemaking and active nonviolence, and by cultivating moral imagination through prayer, study, and engagement with friends and enemies. [Even as we actively engage in a peace discernment process, we affirm our responsibility of continuing the long tradition of support by the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) for our sisters and brothers who serve in the U.S. military, veterans, and their families.]

"5. As disciples of Jesus Christ, we commit ourselves [~~to work first for nonviolent change in our personal and communal lives,~~] [earnestly to seek and promote loving, nonviolent responses to conflict in our daily lives, in our communities, and in our world, and] to risk calling our nation back from the practices of empire to the highest ideals of our heritage, and to practice boldly the things that make for peace."

Committee Recommendation

On this Item, the Peacemaking and International Issues Committee, acted as follows:

Approve as Amended

[Counted Vote - Committee]

Affirmative: 66

Negative: 0

Abstaining: 0

Final Text:

Amend the "Process of Discernment for Presbyteries section as follows: [Text to be deleted is shown with brackets and with a strike-through; text to be added or inserted is shown with brackets and with an underline.]

"Process of Discernment for Presbyteries: As the next stage in a six-year process of discernment, the 221st General Assembly (2014) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) directs the Stated Clerk to send to each presbytery, electronically and in print, the following five affirmations and supporting rationale with the request that they discuss and take an advisory vote on each affirmation and send the results of those votes, along with a summary of the floor discussion, back to the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy [by July 1, 2015,] to help guide the preparation of a report on peacemaking directions for the 222nd General Assembly (2016).

"The affirmations for churchwide discussion and advisory vote:

"1. We affirm that peacemaking is essential to our faith in God's reconciling

work in Jesus Christ, whose love and justice challenge hatred and conflict, and whose call gives our church a mission to present alternatives to violence[,] [and] fear, [~~unjustified force,~~] and misused power.

"2. We confess our complicity in the world's violence even as we pray for the Spirit's courage to "unmask idolatries," to speak truth about war and oppression, and to stand with those who suffer[, and to respond to acts and threats of violence with ministries of justice, healing, and reconciliation].

"3. We reclaim [the power and authority of] Jesus [Christ,] [~~as~~] Prince of Peace, [~~Christ the~~] [~~and~~] Reconciler[,] who proclaims God's reign, who inspires the prophetic church, forgiving, healing, and undoing violence, and who overcomes evil through the cross and resurrection.

"4. We seek to understand the nonviolent revolutions and armed struggles of our time [~~through the Gospel of Peace~~] by drawing on the traditions of [Christian pacifism,] just war, just peacemaking and active nonviolence, and by cultivating moral imagination through prayer, study, and engagement with friends and enemies. [Even as we actively engage in a peace discernment process, we affirm our responsibility of continuing the long tradition of support by the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) for our sisters and brothers who serve in the U.S. military, veterans, and their families.]

"5. As disciples of Jesus Christ, we commit ourselves [~~to work first for nonviolent change in our personal and communal lives,~~] [earnestly to seek and promote loving, nonviolent responses to conflict in our daily lives, in our communities, and in our world, and] to risk calling our nation back from the practices of empire to the highest ideals of our heritage, and to practice boldly the things that make for peace."

Recommendation

Convinced, despite years of war, that peacemaking is still the "believers' calling," and inviting Presbyterians across the church to help determine the shape of that calling for a new day, the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy (ACSWP) recommends that the 221st General Assembly (2014) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.):

1. Approve the process below for engaging presbyteries in the second stage of the discernment process initiated by the 219th General Assembly (2010) for final report to the 222nd General Assembly (2016).
2. Approve the five affirmations for presbytery discussion of new directions in our Presbyterian peacemaking witness.
3. Receive the five-part explanatory rationale and summary of focus group findings to be sent out with the affirmations.

In addition to that discernment process, the 221st General Assembly (2014):

4. Commends those congregations and individuals who have affirmed the "Commitment to Peacemaking" and faithfully maintained steady support over the years for the Peacemaking Offering to sustain and adequately staff the Presbyterian Mission Agency peacemaking programs and to fund creative congregational and presbytery initiatives.
5. Directs the Presbyterian Mission Agency to continue to help interpret the discernment process outlined in Recommendations 1.-3. above.

6. Directs the Presbyterian Mission Agency to work with the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy as it develops resources and assists networks to support international peacemaking on current and emerging challenges such as South Sudan and areas in need of reconciliation and reconstruction such as Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Colombia, while addressing domestic peacemaking in such areas as gun violence, violence in families, and concern for returning veterans.

7. Affirms the value of peacemaking as part of the “compassionate prophetic discipleship” of “Presbyterians joyfully engaging in God’s mission for the transformation of the world,” within the vision of the Presbyterian Mission Agency.

Process of Discernment for Presbyteries: As the next stage in a six-year process of discernment, the 221st General Assembly (2014) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) directs the Stated Clerk to send to each presbytery, electronically and in print, the following five affirmations and supporting rationale with the request that they discuss and take an advisory vote on each affirmation and send the results of those votes, along with a summary of the floor discussion, back to the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy to help guide the preparation of a report on peacemaking directions for the 222nd General Assembly (2016).

The affirmations for churchwide discussion and advisory vote:

- 1. We affirm that peacemaking is essential to our faith in God’s reconciling work in Jesus Christ, whose love and justice challenge hatred and conflict, and whose call gives our church a mission to present alternatives to violence and fear, unjustified force, and misused power.**
- 2. We confess our complicity in the world’s violence even as we pray for the Spirit’s courage to “unmask idolatries,” to speak truth about war and oppression, and to stand with those who suffer.**
- 3. We reclaim Jesus as Prince of Peace, Christ the Reconciler who proclaims God’s reign, who inspires the prophetic church, forgiving, healing, and undoing violence, and who overcomes evil through the cross and resurrection.**
- 4. We seek to understand the nonviolent revolutions and armed struggles of our time through the Gospel of Peace by drawing on the traditions of just war, just peacemaking and active nonviolence, and by cultivating moral imagination through prayer, study, and engagement with friends and enemies.**
- 5. As disciples of Jesus Christ, we commit ourselves to work first for nonviolent change in our personal and communal lives, to risk calling our nation back from the practices of empire to the highest ideals of our heritage, and to practice boldly the things that make for peace.**

Rationale

I. Introduction

In a broken and fearful world

the Spirit gives us courage

to pray without ceasing,

to witness among all peoples to Christ as Lord and Savior,

to unmask idolatries in Church and culture,

to hear the voices of peoples long silenced,

and to work with others for justice, freedom, and peace. (*Book of Confessions*, A Brief Statement of Faith (1983). 10.4, Lines 65–71

A. *Title and Purpose*

The commitment of the church to peace and reconciliation has a central role in Christian vocation. For Presbyterians it is a matter of creedal standing, briefly yet powerfully set forth in the Brief Statement of Faith (1991) cited above, and outlined at greater length in The Confession of 1967. Wording from both confessions is echoed in the title of this report. We acknowledge not only a “fearful” but a violent world, even as we hear God’s call in our time to take new risks to challenge our country’s over-reliance on military might and under-investment in “the things that make for peace.” Thus the title invokes The Confession of 1967’s prophetic phrase: “This search [for peace] requires that the nations pursue fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict, even at the risk to national security, to reduce areas of strife and to broaden international understanding” (*Book of Confessions*, 9.45).

B. *Introduction: The Request for Presbytery Votes, and the Organization of this Background Report*

In 2010, on the 30th anniversary of *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling* and the formation of the Peacemaking Program, the 219th General Assembly (2010) authorized the creation of a six-year discernment process to take a new and fresh look at peacemaking in the church's life. The assembly's action combined overtures seeking to review and strengthen the church's policy thinking and program after almost a decade of war, and to examine particularly the nonviolent understanding of Jesus' call to discipleship. A steering committee was appointed to devise opportunities for the broad membership of the church to explore not simply the effectiveness of the church's peacemaking work and its threefold offering, but the basic nature and scope of the Gospel's mandate for peacemaking.

The 220th General Assembly (2012) authorized study materials to be distributed (after testing in committee) and approved a two-stage process of face-to-face discussions in both congregations and councils, and then of presenting a set of concise affirmations to the presbyteries. This is the steering team's report made through the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy and in consultation with the Peacemaking Program. After some background on Presbyterian peace witness and the peace discernment process, we provide a summary of the responses from the discernment groups that helped shape what became five affirmations. The affirmations clearly build on each other, but presbyteries can decide whether to consider the five as a set or vote on them individually to assess the degree to which they may, or may not, represent that presbytery's views.

This background report then provides rationales for each of the five affirmations to be sent to the presbyteries. The five proposed affirmations honor the range of viewpoints within the church while testing new directions; *they are not statements of policy but propositions for serious debate*. We respectfully ask presbyteries—which we know well—to make time on their busy dockets to consider the affirmations. We know it will take some leadership and we pray for gracious listening as well as wise moderating. What might those admittedly general affirmations mean in your presbytery, and for your children, and for our discipleship?

Our Presbyterian process values differences of opinion as efforts to speak the truth in love under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Voting is part of the work of the body to build consensus over time, and Presbyterians do not usually see unanimity or total agreement as necessary for decision. We both take corporate stands, believing that the church as a body should not be silent, and at the same time we affirm that "God alone is Lord of the conscience," making space for dissent. It is for those reasons we would like to see the vote tallies, but it is up to each presbytery to determine how to report, and some may wish to approve their own affirmations or amend the ones presented here.

Recommendations 4.--7. (before the affirmations) clarify continued support for the Peacemaking Program and offering while the discernment process is underway, seeking to keep faith with the decisions of previous assemblies and to address current threats to peace and security.

C. *Background on Presbyterian Peace Witness and Peacemaking*

For focus, we have put a short survey of Christian and Presbyterian approaches to peacemaking prior to 1980 in a brief appendix (A), along with summaries of Just War, Just Peacemaking, and active nonviolence principles.

A key understanding from the later 20th century is that peacemaking has come to be seen as central to Christian witness and as a large enough concept to unite both those tending toward nonviolence or pacifism and those operating within the Just War or justifiable war tradition. Most Presbyterians, in fact, are not absolutists and hold values from both main Christian approaches to war and physical violence. Peacemaking emphasizes common ground. As former chief of chaplains, Kermit Johnson, wrote in an essay on "Just War and Nuclear Deterrence," Just War "Like pacifism, [it] is rooted in the commandment: 'Thou shalt not kill.' It is a presumption against violence, 'the presumption in favor of peace and against war.'"¹ He then went on to consider whether there could be cases of "tragic necessity" when nuclear war could be considered a "lesser evil" and meet the just war criteria.

This is the kind of prayerful thinking that is not always easy, but that thousands of thoughtful Presbyterians have engaged in through the Peacemaking Program and now most recently in the Peace Discernment process. Our church has been gifted with theological ethicists of the first order helping shape public responses to war within and well beyond the church itself. Other Presbyterians in the military and military contractors—and probably all Christians at one time or another—have also grieved the impact of war and simply asked God, "why?" and "for what?" For us as peacemakers, though, that is not the end of it. We believe God answers and calls us to "love our enemies" and—in whatever our situation—to live for that Peaceable Kingdom where all the tears are wiped away.

Presbyterian church thinking about peace not only considers the impacts of major wars in which Presbyterians have fought, but notes the tolerance that has grown since the 1940s for conscientious objection to all war (pacifism) and to specific wars perceived to violate just war and other criteria. This acceptance may have at first recalled the votes in 1936 and 1938 when majorities of the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. voted to remove just war language from the Westminster Confession, which was then the church's only confessional standard. Those votes did not reach the supermajorities needed for constitutional change. Then World War II received strong support from the churches, but the Cold War, the nuclear threat, the Civil Rights movement, and Vietnam led to a new wave of individual conscientious objectors and more understanding of Eisenhower's "military-industrial complex." It was in that context that the church

adopted The Confession of 1967 with its inclusion of strong social ethics concerns for economic and racial justice, family life, and peace:

God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ is the ground of the peace, justice, and freedom among nations which all powers of government are called to serve and defend. The church, in its own life, is called to practice the forgiveness of enemies and to commend to the nations as practical politics the search for cooperation and peace. This search requires that the nations pursue fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict, even at risk to national security, to reduce areas of strife and to broaden international understanding. Reconciliation among nations becomes particularly urgent as countries develop nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, diverting their [hu]manpower and resources from constructive uses and risking the annihilation of [hu]mankind. Although nations may serve God's purposes in history, the church which identifies the sovereignty of any one nation or any one way of life with the cause of God denies the Lordship of Christ and betrays its calling. (*Book of Confessions*, Section 9.45)

That bold declaration grounded the idea of a shared church calling that was developed in *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling*. This document offered a broad biblical, theological, and ethical basis for Christian peacemaking but also identified some more specific directions for that mission: efforts to reverse the worldwide arms race; "conversion of the economy from military to civilian production;" and continuing attention to how justice relates to peace. Because we are asking presbyteries to affirm the work of peacemaking in the first affirmation, we note key developments in Presbyterian peace witness after 1980 in that first of the five rationales.

D. *The Peace Discernment Process*

The present Peace Discernment Process, initiated by the 219th General Assembly (2010) and affirmed by the 220th General Assembly (2012), differs from previous studies in that it seeks broader participation from across the denomination and focuses more on the example and teaching of Jesus and the early church. The full texts of the discernment materials and response forms used are available on-line at: <https://www.pcusa.org/resource/peace-discernment-interim-report-encountering-gosp/>.

These discernment resources, some of which are reflected in this report, were designed to introduce "ministries of peacemaking and justice-seeking that honor the Gospel, the history of the church, and the movement of the Holy Spirit ..." and to inform eventual recommendations of new policy and action (*Minutes*, 2010, Part I, p. 69). The resources were presented to and partly tested by the Peacemaking and International Affairs Committee of the 220th General Assembly (2012), which recommended that the discernment process proceed: <http://pcbiz.org/MeetingPapers/%28S%28tusr3jzthk2ncc5l1qekaul%29%29/IOBView.aspx?m=ro&id=4015&promoid=254>.

Presbyterians in more than forty-five congregations and eighteen presbyteries came together in small "focus groups" to pray, to reflect, to engage in individual and communal discernment, to "seek clarity as to God's call to the church to embrace nonviolence as its fundamental response to the challenges of violence, terror, and war; and identify, explore, and nurture new approaches to active peacemaking and nonviolence" (*Minutes*, 2010, Part I, p. 68).

Most participants found that the Peace Discernment Process encouraged meaningful sharing that was powerful and engaging. They appreciated the opportunity to hear varied perspectives and opinions in a framework where almost everyone had at least one loved one with experience in war. Some were surprised at the level of trust that developed in their small groups, allowing individuals (including veterans) to risk being vulnerable and speak about difficult personal experiences they had had with violence. One participant called it "a very holy process."

E. *Nonviolence, Just War, and Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling*

Presbyterians generally agree that peacemaking is the calling of all believers, but they differ about whether violent means of peacemaking are faithful to Jesus' life and witness. Some focus on Jesus' call to love our enemies and his sacrifice on the cross, and they conclude that violence can never be a faithful Christian response to violence, injustice, or evil in the world. They gravitate toward Christian nonviolence. Others point to Jesus' defense of the poor and oppressed, the weak and vulnerable, and believe that violence or coercion can be justified in restraining evil forces and defending the innocent. Their perspective assumes a public responsibility to maintain order and a policing if not a military function. They gravitate toward the just war tradition. For many participants, the Peace Discernment Process was their first introduction to both the methods of nonviolent action and the criteria of just war.

F. *Lamenting Our Culture of Violence and War*

It is clear, after more than ten years of war, that a majority of Presbyterians are deeply concerned about the enormous human and economic costs of war—the hundreds of thousands killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, the millions displaced, the thousands of U.S. soldiers killed or injured, the trillions of dollars spent, and the damage done to our economy. Understandably, there was a focus on those wars where our country has been most directly involved, but many were aware of other wars and long conflicts initiated and suffered by others. A majority of Presbyterians are also deeply worried about the violence pervasive in U.S. culture—the high incidence of gun violence compared to other countries; school shootings; violence against women; violence in media, sports, and entertainment; and the underlying structural violence of economic injustice and social oppression (racism, sexism, other exclusions).

Many appreciate the important connection between justice and peace. They understand that direct, physical violence is often caused by injustice, and that a genuine peace can only be brought about by working toward justice and equity for all. Many lifted up God's vision of shalom, affirming that peace is a rich mosaic of human flourishing within the global community in the broader context of God's good creation.

G. *A Desire to Learn Peacemaking Skills*

At the same time, many expressed a sense of being overwhelmed by the enormity of the issues, particularly at the national and international level. Weary of the stream of grim news of bombings and terrorism, there were questions about what our years of war had achieved. Some questioned the effectiveness of both social policy statements and the primarily educational approach of the Peacemaking Program, facing a political system dominated by money. They are looking for direction and guidance about how individuals and congregations can take effective action to further justice and peace. In this vein, there seems to be broad interest in learning concrete peacemaking skills that they can use in their daily lives—skills in nonviolent communication, negotiation, mediation, community organizing, social movement building, and nonviolent direct action.

H. *Challenging U.S. Militarism*

While many Presbyterians are not ready to renounce violence as a means of restraining evil or protecting the innocent, most of the discernment participants would nevertheless support:

- Just Peacemaking initiatives to promote justice and prevent war.
- Downsizing the military-industrial-surveillance complex.
- Economic conversion from a war economy to a peace economy.
- Shifting resources from the military to international diplomacy and development.
- Ending policies of preemptive attack, targeted assassination, and torture, which lead to violent "blowback" and which seemed immoral to many discernment group participants.
- Moving the U.S. away from the role of global policeman, finding other ways to support international structures of security cooperation.

Given the high level of motivation in the discernment groups, a representative survey of Presbyterian opinion was commissioned from Presbyterian Research Services. While the questions presented by the Presbyterian Panel survey instrument were necessarily shorter, there is considerable similarity in overall outlook to the written narrative summaries from the discernment groups (http://www.presbyterianmission.org/media/uploads/research/pdfs/nov_2012_panel_summary_violence_and_war.pdf).

With that summary of discernment discussion findings, we turn to the five affirmations that are being proposed as support for an ongoing and enriched peacemaking agenda for the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). The affirmations are offered for discussion, not as policy stands to be either approved or rejected in their present form.

II. Five Affirmations for 21st Century Christian Peacemaking

A. *Affirmation #1: We affirm that peacemaking is essential to our faith in God's reconciling work in Jesus Christ, whose love and justice challenge hatred and conflict, and whose call gives our church a mission to present alternatives to violence and fear, unjustified force and misused power.*

The 192nd General Assembly (1980) of the UPCUSA adopted *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling*, the denomination's most comprehensive policy on matters of international violence and war. It declared that:

- The church is faithful to Christ when it is engaged in peacemaking.
- The church is obedient to Christ when it nurtures and equips God's people as peacemakers.
- The church bears witness to Christ when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace in our world. (<http://oqa.pcusa.org/media/uploads/oqa/pdf/peacemaking.pdf>, pp. 5–6)

Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling broadened the concern for individual conscience to affirm that peacemaking was the calling of all believers, particularly in the face of nuclear and other Cold War dangers. Invoking Isaiah's vision, it emphasized our global interdependence and international connection. With New Testament themes, it presented a holistic understanding of peace and encouraged a wide range of church engagement. It affirmed that "peacemaking is an indispensable ingredient of the church's mission. It is not peripheral or secondary but essential to the church's faithfulness to Christ in our time" (Ibid., p. 18). Since that time, peacemaking has become broadly accepted, integral to our prayers and hymns, and evident in our preaching, teaching, and public witness.

Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling led to the creation of the influential Presbyterian Peacemaking Program and established a special offering to provide funding for it. The Peacemaking Offering, traditionally received on World Communion Sunday, has raised at least \$2 million each year, providing support for the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program and part of the Presbyterian Ministry at the United Nations, as well as peacemaking ministries in local congregations, presbyteries, and synods. The innovation of having the offering go to three levels of the church speaks to the wisdom of developing institutional capacity not only in what is now the Presbyterian Mission Agency, but also bringing together resources for intentional creativity at the regional and community levels.

For more than thirty years, the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program has provided a variety of opportunities and resources to the church, including holding annual peacemaking conferences, publishing curricula for all ages, itinerating international peacemakers around the denomination, organizing international study tours, and supporting UN seminars. Over this period, approximately 50 percent of Presbyterian congregations have affirmed the Commitment to Peacemaking. A majority of Presbyterian congregations have received the Peacemaking Offering at some time, with approximately 20 percent providing a steady base.

1. *Engaging Church, Society, and the World as Peacemakers*

Presbyterians engage in peacemaking in a variety of ways. Through worship, prayer, and Bible study, they point to the reality of God's peace-giving, nurture the spiritual life of their communities, and equip people to share the gospel message of peace throughout the world. Presbyterian peacemakers foster respectful communication using resources such as "Seeking to Be Faithful Together: Guidelines for Presbyterians During Times of Disagreement." They fight for affordable housing, better schools, and funding for social services through faith-based community organizing campaigns. They work to reduce gun violence in the United States. They join with ecumenical and interfaith partners in struggles for human rights and economic justice in countries around the world. Presbyterian peacemakers risk nonviolent accompaniment, walking alongside church leaders threatened with political violence in Colombia. They seek to make peace with the earth by living more sustainably themselves, and challenging legislators to resist the pressures of special interest lobbies and instead support forward-looking policies that reflect wise stewardship of the planet. Countless additional examples of faithful peacemaking could be cited. We have much good peacemaking work to celebrate in our church!

2. *Presbyterian Peacemaking Witness and Just Peace*

Since 1980, careful studies and prophetic statements have addressed the nuclear danger, particular military interventions and their rationale, and the relation of religion, violence, and terrorism. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), since 1988, has held a virtual "nuclear pacifist" position, opposing first use and retaliation and calling repeatedly for disarmament. That policy statement, *Christian Obedience in a Nuclear Age*, suggests that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is a kind of "just peace" church, with its images drawn primarily from the Old Testament:

The church in the nuclear age must shift its energies from considerations of just war to the urgent and primary task of defining and serving a just peace. A nuclear stalemate or even the elimination of all nuclear arms is still far from God's shalom. Shalom is the intended state of the entire human race. It involves the well-being of the whole person in all relationships, personal, social, and cosmic. Shalom means life in a community of compassionate order marked by social and economic justice. Peace without justice is no peace; that is why the Bible so often reflects God's special concern for the poor and powerless.

The great biblical visions of global peace—swords into plowshares, every family under its own vine and fig tree—are fundamental to thinking about just peace. Such a peace is ultimately God's gift; we need to avoid the proud illusion that we can create it by human effort alone. But Christian obedience demands that we move toward that peace in all possible ways: by extending the rule of law, advocating universal human rights, strengthening the organs of international order, working for common security and economic justice, converting industry to peaceful production, increasing understanding of and reconciliation with those we identify as enemies, developing peacemaking skills, constructing concrete manifestations of just peace across barriers of conflict and injustice, and other means. (*Minutes*, 1988, Part I, p. 450)

In 1998, the assembly approved a resolution on just peacemaking, which embodies the tension involved in endorsing military intervention as a method to prevent such things as genocide and seeks to move the church's thinking beyond the traditional categories of just war, crusade, and pacifism. Along with a realism that has been characteristic of much Reformed ethics (and some liberation theologies), that resolution affirms a preference for strong peacemaking initiatives, noting of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.):

- "It has called for greater emphases on the use of non-violent means for conflict resolution and social change, and for the promotion of training toward this goal.
- It has stressed the importance of human rights, religious liberty, and the importance of democracy as a foundation for just peace. ...
- It has called for the abolition of nuclear weapons, limitations on the development of weapons, and restrictions on the sale or transfer of instruments of destruction. It has supported these restrictions on the

understanding that traffic in arms raises the likelihood of conflict and raises the level of violence should conflict break out...

- It has recognized the critical importance of racial and gender justice in the achievement of social harmony and prosperity.
- It has called for independent and unilateral initiatives to reduce risks of conflict and to stimulate change. It has affirmed the importance of reconciliation even in the face of great risk...
- It has acknowledged the responsibility for international cooperation and leadership, and understands that the power and wealth of the United States require it to be part of international efforts to seek peace. At the same time it has recognized that the United States has and can abuse that power and wealth.
- It has supported international efforts, through the United Nations, at peacemaking and peacekeeping...

These church positions, together with background papers that support them, provide a complex legacy of important ideas. The Presbyterian church has not only made statements but has also encouraged participation in the ongoing tasks of peacemaking. Its peacemaking program has devised many strategies for helping to transform political and economic affairs in ways that promote just peace policies, whether in the domestic affairs of our own nation or in the world-at-large, whether through the use of civil authority or, if needed, resistance to it. ..." (*Minutes*, 1998, Part I, p. 463)

In keeping with these principles and policies, General Assemblies have also called for responsible withdrawals by the United States from Iraq (2004) and Afghanistan (2010); the 2004 General Assembly prophetically and controversially termed the Iraq war "unwise, illegal, and immoral." The resolution on "Religion, Violence, and Terrorism" (also 2004) endorsed a "policing" approach to terrorism and responds to the charge sometimes made that religion engenders violence. And in 2008, the General Assembly "commended for study" a careful ethical assessment of the Iraq war entitled "To Repent, To Restore, To Rebuild, and To Reconcile," which includes the concepts of public forgiveness and "honest patriotism" as developed by Donald Shriver.

One of the key questions wrestled with by Peace Discernment participants was whether the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) could consider becoming a "peace church" on the model of the Mennonites or Quakers, who have long held pacifism to be a key expression of Christian love and part of the nature of the church itself. A variant of this question was whether an individual congregation could declare itself a "peace church," going beyond the Commitment to Peacemaking. Some recent theological discussion has proposed nonviolence for the majority of Christians as well, deliberately challenging the compromises seen to accompany public responsibility.²

The wording of this first affirmation does not propose that nonviolence necessarily be an essential mark of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) as it is for the traditional peace churches. Rather, it proposes that we have: "a mission to present alternatives to violence and fear, unjustified force and misused power." The word "unjustified" signals the understanding of many Presbyterians that force may be justified; they would draw a line not between violence and nonviolence, but between justified and unjustified use or restraint of legitimate force. Edward Long, a leader in Presbyterian peace thinking, notes how today's pervasive acceptance of war's inevitability so often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.³ How does the church resist being transformed by that world of nations that is in constant overt and covert military struggle? This is where our peacemaking approach must go beyond words and engage in transformative worship and action, creating needed alternatives for our society as well as ourselves.

An updated Reformed approach was explored by a large number of congregations in the mid-1980s using the study guide, "Presbyterians & Peacemaking: Are We Now Called to Resistance?," written by Ronald Stone and Dana Wilbanks. That congregational process and a parallel conversation among scholars virtually unique among denominations generated some of the thinking about resisting violence that went into *Christian Obedience in a Nuclear Age*.⁴ In the case of the Peace Discernment participants, some held to fully nonviolent positions while a larger number argued that responding to injustice sometimes requires actions on the spectrum of force that includes physical violence. The overall consensus was to choose nonviolent alternatives whenever possible without making nonviolence an absolute position.

The Peace Discernment steering team (as noted below) thought it important to consider nonviolence in relation to the example of Jesus and the witness of much of the earliest, pre-Constantine church. This is not to deny our traditional Presbyterian appreciation of how justice and love, like Old Testament and New, must always go together. Biblical scholars Donald Gowan and Ulrich Mauser address this relationship of love and justice:

In view of the fact that Jewish thought and practice alike reserved the incorporation of all nations into God's world of peace for the world to come in which idolatry has ceased and one law of one God is universally acknowledged, there can hardly be any doubt that the Pauline mission... regarded the powers of the eschaton as driving forces which call forth historical realization. The prince of peace is in the Pauline mission not only the historically identifiable person Jesus of Nazareth, nor only the meta-historical redeemer, but also the continuous presence of God's ultimate peace in the stream of time.⁵

Given this rich history of peacemaking and the vital ongoing work of making peace, it seems only fitting that we re-affirm the centrality of peacemaking, and renew our dedication to this central calling as followers of Jesus Christ. At the same time, as an integral part of honest and authentic peacemaking, we must confess our complicity in the violence of our world.

B. *Affirmation #2. We confess our complicity in the world's violence even as we pray for the Spirit's courage to "unmask idolatries," to speak truth about war and oppression, and to stand with those who suffer.*

1. *Confessing Our Complicity in Violence*

Making peace means engaging the critical issues of our times. Yet, as those who are deeply immersed in peacemaking know so well, faithful peacemaking must be spiritually rooted and sustained by the Holy Spirit. The heart and mind of the peacemaker must be liberated from conformity to culture and renewed in the mind of Christ (Rom. 12). This transformation is itself peacemaking work. John Calvin reminds us that the human heart is "a factory of idols." Therefore, healing the violence in our lives—not only the violence we do and the violence that is done to us, but our sinful capacity to countenance violence and to accept it as normal—must be integrated into a holistic theology of peacemaking. The peacemaker must even confess the kind of complicity that comes from failing to avert violence even after great effort, a feeling shared by many who opposed the second Iraq war. Such awareness that we are all responsible for some measure of violence is an important admission of imperfection

In this section we move from an overview that looks at violence in our culture and its structures to a closer look at the factors at work in the Iraq and Afghan wars in particular. This gives violence an admittedly broad definition. A strict definition, for example, is suggested by Mark Douglas: "a forceful action that intends to cause unwanted injury to another."⁶ The adjective, "structural," modifies this definition to the operation of institutions and social structures that causes injury or deprivation to others.

The commitment to peace that stands at the heart of Christian obedience requires that Christians take an honest look at the extent to which they are complicit in the violence that characterizes the society of which they are a part. This complicity is present despite good intentions to avoid it and worthy efforts to live by the ideal of peace. Identifying and confessing this complicity is difficult and painful work—one that is often side-stepped or ignored. This complicity has not necessarily come about through deliberate malice, but inheres in the very course of living in an imperfect and fallen world, a world in which the human condition is marked by sin. No matter how much we as Americans can be proud of our ideals, if we fail to acknowledge our shortcomings we only increase the probability we will perpetuate them.

As the church engages in its discernment process, it must look honestly at our society and its history. It is hard to admit that violence has characterized much of our history and continues to dominate much of our current behavior. The land in which we live was frequently taken from native peoples by force. The independence we value so proudly was achieved by a violent revolutionary war. Our national wealth was advanced with the brutality of the slave system that was abolished only with a civil war. We have profited from violence used to subdue workers and to control access to natural resources.

We are addicted to violence for purposes of entertainment. Bullying is common in our schools, and violence in video games. The most popular sports often inflict injury, concussions, and trauma. More than 30,000 people are killed each year by guns, many of them suicides. In the U.S., one in every four women experience domestic violence during their lifetime. We have stationed armed forces throughout the world on a quasi-permanent basis and defend ourselves with weapons that are used in the places where others live—often striking the innocent in the effort to destroy the guilty. A large segment of our economy involves the production and sales of armaments. And for many in politics, to apologize is blasphemy or betrayal.

Much of the hurt that is experienced in our society is produced by what is termed "structural violence," what the second affirmation calls, oppression. Our social and economic systems seem to condemn a growing number of people to lives of poverty or fear—even when public investment and other measures could boost unemployment and raise wages. Concentration of ownership and regressive taxes have enabled 1 percent of Americans to reap almost a quarter of our nation's income every year and to control over 40 percent of our nation's wealth. Workers overseas are paid much less and often endure far worse conditions to keep our prices low and top salaries high. An economy dependent on the burning of carbon fuels threatens not only our future, but that of others. The purchasing of influence by corporate power undercuts our democratic system. Physical assaults may not be involved or necessary in these processes, but they are nevertheless forms of violence.

It is not this report's purpose to make a complete inventory of the extent to which we are complicit in violence. This is a task of ongoing prophetic scholarship, educational thoroughness, and moral inquiry to which the discernment being commended by this report must address itself. The task must be ongoing; subtle forms of coercion will always emerge, carried by "sanctioned ignorance," "false polarization," and the confusion of "virtual" reality with actuality.⁷ Most of all, as we know through our prayers of confession, this kind of disciplined self-searching requires the capacity of the church and its members to transcend our own confining self-interest. Yet it is an essential aspect of being redeemed, of being transformed by grace. Society tends to honor the team player, the person who with excitement and verve cheers on whatever is being done. When we affirm the need for confessing our complicity we may prompt denial and hostility. To counter that normal human tendency is a vocation to heroic and prophetic humility without which the culture around us

will never be healed.

It is not easy to unmask the powers. We all wear masks to some extent and therefore need others to help us take them off. Those who embrace idolatries usually believe they are defending the truth. They—and we—need to dialogue with those who differ from us—listening to them and hearing even the unspoken challenges to our views and unconscious ideologies. Discernment means prophetic criticism even of our so-called prophetic criticism. Yet confession and apology and repentance can unlock the enormous powers of truth and love.

With regard to that unconscious complicity, theologian Walter Wink believes we have embraced “the Myth of Redemptive Violence,” the widespread belief that violence saves, that war brings peace, that might makes right. “The belief that violence ‘saves’ is so successful because it doesn’t seem to be mythic in the least,” Wink writes. “Violence simply appears to be the nature of things. It’s what works. It seems inevitable, the last and, often, the first resort in conflicts. If a god is what you turn to when all else fails, violence certainly functions as a god. What people overlook, then, is the religious character of violence. ...”⁸

From this perspective, violence is an idol, a false god. Violence does not save us from evil, sin, and death. It only adds to evil, sin, and death. As the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. put it: “The ultimate weakness of violence is that it is a descending spiral, begetting the very thing it seeks to destroy. Instead of diminishing evil, it multiplies it. ... Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive our hate: only love can do that.”⁹

To the extent that we have put our faith in violence instead of God, we must repent of our idolatry, for we cannot serve two masters. As Christians we confess that Jesus is our Lord and Savior, no other. Our security does not rest in violence, but in God. On a deep level, anthropologist Rene Girard argues that the saving power of Jesus’ life comes from his unmasking the way that spirals of violence create and condemn victims who are in fact innocent.¹⁰ Our discipleship, instead, commits us to an upward spiral that weakens the powers of domination.

2. *Structural Violence*

The descending spiral of violence to which King referred often begins with “structural violence”—the social and economic structures that oppress and impoverish people, preventing them from meeting their basic human needs and realizing their full human potential. The structural violence of injustice and oppression can lead to the violence of revolt and rebellion that then leads to the retaliatory violence of government repression, which then only compounds the structural violence of injustice and oppression and leads to further revolt followed by yet more repression.¹¹ This is not to say that all violent crime in poor areas is a form of revolt, but to say that those neighborhoods themselves are a form of crime against their inhabitants.

While direct physical violence is more visible and attracts more media attention (“If it bleeds, it leads”), structural violence is far more widespread and arguably does much more harm over time. We see it manifest in hunger and homelessness, poverty and disease. The processes of oppression noted above include patterns of inequality and exclusion called the “isms” of racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and ethnocentrism. These patterns operate at interlocking levels — institutional (policies and practices), interpersonal (group and individual) and cultural (social norms and valuing). Most Americans know that the “isms” exist, but the common discourse in our country narrowly addresses discrimination that happens at the interpersonal level—when someone makes a blatantly derogatory comment or is accused of doing so. Most Americans are unfamiliar with how the isms operate on a more insidious social level and unaware of their exacting toll. Yet, those millions of “lives of quiet desperation” are reflections of coercive inequality. We dehumanize ourselves and degrade others by unconsciously supporting patterns that pin our opportunities for well-being on our neighbors’ marginalization. Structural violence militates against our Christian calling to be in authentic loving relationship with our neighbors, near and far.

3. *Violence Against the Earth*

We are also doing violence to the earth and its creatures. The globalized economy is built on the untrammled extraction of finite resources, the exploitation of cheap labor, and a no-limits-to-growth ideology, resulting in dangerously compounding climate change. We are destroying ecosystems, depleting precious natural resources, melting glaciers, raising sea levels, and causing a massive extinction of species as our waste products like greenhouse gases alter the ecology of the entire planet. Severe weather fluctuations are already causing tragic increases in hunger. In the book *Tropic of Chaos* (2011), Christian Parenti warns that climate change is creating desperate refugees and the potential for serious violence in many regions.

4. *The Global Context for the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars*

To confess our complicity in general without grieving for the two significant wars of the last thirteen years would be fairly painless. Yet to confess without addressing the underlying dynamics is too sentimental. Here we look briefly at the context for the Afghan and Iraq wars, which is partly international structural violence, and then address the somewhat differing tragedies they involve. We return to the issues of U.S. superpower status in discussion of the fifth affirmation.

From a global perspective, we who live in the U.S. are among the richest 20 percent of the world's population. (Consider that 40 percent of the world's people attempt to live on less than \$2 a day.) The world's income distribution resembles the shape of a champagne glass, with the top 20 percent of the world's people who live in the world's wealthiest countries receiving 83 percent of the world's income. The next 20 percent receive 10 percent of the world's income. The remaining 60 percent of the world's people share the 7 percent of world income that is left.¹²

Global economic inequality is nothing new. As far back as 1948, George Kennan, head of the U.S. State Department planning staff, wrote the following in a secret policy planning study:

We have about 50 percent of the world's wealth, but only 6.3 percent of its population. ... In this situation, we cannot fail to be the object of envy and resentment. Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity. ... To do so, we will have to dispense with all sentimentality and day-dreaming; and our attention will have to be concentrated everywhere on our immediate national objectives. ... We should cease to talk about vague and ... unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of living standards, and democratization. The day is not far off when we are going to have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealistic slogans, the better.¹³

How do we "maintain this position of disparity"? What does it mean to "deal in straight power concepts"? Thomas L. Friedman, the foreign affairs columnist for the *New York Times*, explains it this way: "The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist—McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps."¹⁴

Though there were multiple sources of our country's original wealth, our privileged economic position is preserved through U.S. military power, as well as through military aid and weapons sales to governments around the world. Even though it is a violation of U.S. law, the weapons we sell to foreign governments are sometimes used by their militaries against their own people in order to maintain a stable environment for corporate investments. Militarization makes corporate-led globalization possible. Whether militarization itself is finally profitable is one of the questions that Afghanistan and Iraq raise.

5. *The Iraq and Afghanistan Wars*

Since the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, involving four hijacked civilian airplanes and approximately 3,000 civilian casualties, the United States has been engaged in two significant wars and a limited intervention in Libya. The war in Afghanistan has been a joint operation with NATO member armies as was the military intervention in Libya. The war in Iraq was initiated without United Nations authorization and involved a "coalition of the willing," with Great Britain most notable among the U.S. allies. The General Assembly's calling the Iraq War "unwise, immoral, and illegal," was based on a clear rethinking of just war teaching: preemptive war was seen as antithetical to last resort; nonexistent weapons and regime change were not seen as just cause; unilateral action spurned the legitimate authority of the UN; and while military success was assured, democratization through military occupation was seen as a questionable way to achieve a just peace.

The Iraq and Afghanistan Wars have been extremely costly in both human and economic terms. The number of Afghans, Iraqis, and Pakistanis who have died in the fighting are estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Our repentance must include the long refusal of our occupation forces to count those deaths. Their survivors face many of the same issues that U.S. war veterans do, but without the medical and social support. War refugees and internally displaced persons number 7.8 million. More than 6,100 U.S. soldiers have been killed and more than 46,000 have been injured. Multiple deployments have put enormous stress on U.S. soldiers and their families, whose lives have been changed forever by the experience of war. Even after soldiers return home, war continues to take its toll through unemployment, domestic conflict, depression, alcohol and drug addiction, post-traumatic stress disorder, moral injury, and/or suicide.

The Iraq and Afghanistan Wars will cost the United States alone an estimated \$3–\$4 trillion when current and future veterans' costs are added up; the costs of reconstruction, rehabilitation, and military activity by other countries involved is estimated to be another \$3 trillion. Most Americans now question whether these military interventions have been worth the enormous cost in lives, national treasure, and reputation, particularly as it is not at all clear what they have achieved. This adds to an "increasing sense of the impotence of military might" (p. 11) and the belief that "the main problems of the world will not yield to military solutions," (p. 15) as *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling* (www.pcusa.org/resource/peacemaking/) put it.

A case can be made that disproportionate militarization is bankrupting the U.S. economy and creating additional structural violence or oppression. While weapons manufacturers continue to post record profits during a deep recession, our nation's cities and states are in a state of fiscal crisis, public services and welfare programs, especially for our more vulnerable citizens, are being slashed, and the federal debt due to war remains high.

The money we use each year to prosecute the war in Afghanistan could fund the Head Start program for the next fifteen years, but instead many children will grow up with an inferior education. With the money we spend in Afghanistan, we could provide health coverage to every American, thereby, according to a Harvard study, saving 45,000 American lives in

one year. The budgets for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan could fill the budget gaps in all the states, preventing deep cuts in programs to the poor, the sick, and the uneducated. Furthermore, by some reckonings, the number one source of our nation's debt, about which we hear so much these days, is military related—as Joshua Holland writes, "It's a tragic irony that so much of the discussion surrounding the public debt centers on "entitlements" like Social Security (which hasn't added a penny to the national debt) when we're still paying for Korea and Vietnam and Grenada and Panama and the first Gulf War and Somalia and the Balkans and on and on."¹⁵

Choices between the ability to kill militants and civilians on the other side of the globe and the ability to provide for the health and education of our children, choices to spend \$700 billion over the last decade on new weapons (which by the secretary of defense's own admission have been marginal in enhancing military capabilities) instead of spending that money on green energy or infrastructure—these are moral choices, and we are arguably making the wrong ones. The U.S. is in danger of what Paul Kennedy, author of *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, calls "imperial overstretch"—when a nation commits so many resources overseas to maintain its empire that the nation implodes from within.

In the 2010 General Assembly debate over the resolution to call for withdrawal from Afghanistan, six years after the church had called for an end to the Iraq war, it was claimed that the strategic goals for the 2001 invasion had been met with the dispersal or death of Al Qaeda leaders and downgraded military capacity of the Taliban. To stay longer was to accumulate enemies and support a corrupt government without adding much to regional or global security. Those judgments may be criticized, but they accepted a stronger initial justification for war than was the case in Iraq. Yet our moral accountability as a nation in both countries has to do not only with the invasion and occupation but the final cease fire and the future prospects for those nations. If Iraq is any indication, those prospects are not good. While our preeminent military role in the world does not make us accountable for all world problems, these two wars will be very hard to defend before the bar of history and history's judge.

To approve this affirmation is to acknowledge the interlocking web of violence in our lives, our society, and the world, and to call the church to confession. War and oppression are closely intertwined. Engaging violence in ourselves and in the structures of our society and our world is essential to the integrity of our faith, yet daunting, complex, even overwhelming. With a spirit of repentance, then, we turn back to the heart of our faith.

C. *Affirmation #3. We reclaim Jesus as Prince of Peace, Christ the Reconciler who proclaims God's reign, who inspires the prophetic church, forgiving, healing, and undoing violence, and who overcomes evil through the cross and resurrection.*

1. *The Life and Teachings of Jesus*

Since *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling* was adopted in 1980, there has been another kind of explosion: in historical scholarship about Jesus of Nazareth. While this scholarship is enormously varied, and involves a wide range of early Christian texts, it offers the church much rich reflection on the interaction of Jesus, the peasant population, the Jerusalem authorities, and the Roman army. Many of the participants in the discernment process were familiar with works by Marcus Borg, N.T. Wright, Walter Wink, Elizabeth Schlusser Fiorenza, Elaine Pagels, John Crossan, John Meier, Richard Horsley, to name some of the best known. Jewish and Muslim scholars have added their volumes to this mix. It is safe to say that most of the discernment participants—like our steering team members—see a clear predilection for nonviolence in the example and teaching of Jesus. Scholarly opinion is more divided, but even those who emphasize Jesus' engagement in confrontation and conflict rarely link him to violent revolution.

In this section we will look first at recent interpretations of Jesus, and then propose ways that new emphases and learnings may be considered in future Presbyterian peacemaking theology and formation.

Let us first heed Luke Timothy Johnson, however, who warns that our faith is not in the object of any scholar's historical-critical reconstruction.¹⁶ Johnson insists that for the church the canonical collection of literary texts called the New Testament is united in witnessing to the meaning of the Jesus story, and that meaning is found in a pattern consistent with the cross and resurrection. For him: "Jesus' existence as one of radical obedience toward God and self-disposing service toward others forms a pattern for all humanity that can be written in the heart by the Holy Spirit. It is this pattern that Paul designates as the *nomos Christou* ("the law of Christ," or, better, "pattern of the Messiah")."¹⁷ The first question, then, is whether peacemaking or nonviolence is part of that basic pattern.

Without attempting a survey, we choose very different scholarly positions from which to look at Jesus and violence, beginning with the work of Richard B. Hays in *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (1996):¹⁸

Our exegetical investigation of Matthew 5: 38–48 has led to the conclusion that the passage teaches a norm of nonviolent love of enemies. ... Do the other texts (than Matthew) in the canon reinforce the Sermon on the Mount's teaching on nonviolence, or do they provide other options that might allow or require Christians to take up the sword? When the question is posed this way, the immediate result—as Barth observed—is to underscore how impressively univocal is the testimony of the New Testament writers on this point. The evangelists are unanimous in portraying Jesus as a Messiah who subverts all prior expectations by assuming the vocation of suffering rather than conquering Israel's enemies. ...

When Hays turns to Paul, he lifts up Romans 12, noting “though the governing authority bears the sword to execute God’s wrath (13:4), that is not the role of believers.” As Paul’s military metaphors make clear, “the weapons of our warfare are not merely human” (2 Cor. 10:4). Hays carries through a review of the New Testament and considers Revelation as a counsel to endurance. He considers texts that are cited to allow for violent or military action, seeing in the Temple cleansing a prophetic confrontation, and the references to soldiers “dramatize the power of the Word of God to reach even the unlikely people” (like tax collectors). His summary: “from Matthew to Revelation we find a consistent witness against violence and a calling to the community to follow the example of Jesus in accepting suffering rather than inflicting it.” The challenge for Hays that he faces directly is the disjunction between this interpretation of nonviolence in the New Testament and the witness of the Old Testament, which he sees providing the only possible scriptural bases for the Just War and Holy War traditions.

For contrast, we turn to a biblical scholar with a sociological starting point, who sees Jesus more focused on achieving justice than peace, per se, and leading a social movement that challenged the social order as much as it sought to reform Israel’s religious life. Nonetheless, Richard Horsley states:

Jesus, while not necessarily a pacifist, actively opposed violence, both oppressive and repressive, both political-economic and spiritual. He consistently criticized and resisted the oppressive established political-economic-religious order of his own society. Moreover, he aggressively intervened to mitigate or undo the effects of institutionalized violence, whether in particular acts of forgiveness and exorcism or in the general opening of the kingdom of God to the poor.¹⁹

Analytically, Horsley considers injustice to be a form of structural violence and sees, particularly clearly in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus’ nonviolent resistance to a host of malevolent powers. He considers his own work, including *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* (1987) to provide a broader basis for nonviolence than selected quotations from Jesus and Paul, as he sees a first Century cultural context where religious and political allegiances are deeply entwined.²⁰ Horsley’s Jesus is primarily a prophet out to renew a religious and social covenant; his interpretation, like many recent readings of Jesus, does not emphasize eschatological or apocalyptic themes, but does stress the importance of the crucifixion.

Walter Wink sees in Jesus “a third way” that resists evil through nonviolent means, an approach that outflanks and subverts aggression, sometimes by choosing to suffer. From this perspective, turning the other cheek, offering more clothing than a coat, and going the second mile are examples of the “weaker” party taking the moral initiative and humanizing the opponent, “forcing” him or her to recognize one’s own humanity without resorting to violence. This is a strategy with social and cultural implications, potentially breaking cycles of subjugation and humiliation, exposing injustice in power dynamics, and neutralizing and undermining the threat of violence.²¹

Wink’s interpretation is a way of accounting for a prophetic and nonviolent life that posed a clear alternative to the domination systems of his time. It does not deny the violent imagery in some of Jesus’ parables, though Margaret Aymer has shown how deeply those images go.²² It presents a Jesus of inner power who, when a Samaritan village refused to host him, refuses his disciples’ idea “to command fire to come down from heaven and consume them.” Jesus rebukes them, saying, ‘You do not know what spirit you are of, for the Son of Man has not come to destroy the lives of human beings but to save them’ (Lk. 9:51–62). Similarly, images of Jesus’ exorcizing evil can also be seen as his engaging with violent forces, but in peace scholar Andrea Bartoli’s words, they are not so much nonviolent as “de-violencing.” That kind of healing can involve spiritual convulsion, as it undoes or disarms the violent spirits from those possessed. This suggests that Jesus may not fit a specific “nonviolent” definition, but maintains that his willingness to face conflict was never a choice for violence.

Of Jesus’ death on the cross, Martin Luther King Jr. said: “Jesus eloquently affirmed from the cross a higher law. He knew that the old eye-for-an-eye philosophy would leave everyone blind. He did not seek to overcome evil with evil. He overcame evil with good.”²³ “Those who want to save their life will lose it,” Jesus says, “and those who lose their life for my sake, and for the sake of the gospel, will save it” (Mk. 8:35). Following Christ involves sacrifice. It leads to the cross. But it also holds out the promise of resurrection and new life.

2. *The Example of the Early Church*

Following on from the life and example of Jesus Christ is the important realization that for the first three centuries, most Christians embraced a nonviolent witness. Early Christians in Rome refused to engage in any violence because they trusted that their love for fellow citizens would point people to the new day dawning in Jesus Christ. The first Christians lived according to a nonviolent code, with frequent martyrdom.

Early Christian theologians, reading the Hebrew Scriptures through the lens of Christian faith, took with utter seriousness the prophecies of Micah and Isaiah, asserting that the Messiah had indeed come, and that the time had come to enact their prophecies of beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. They did not interpret the violence in their Scriptures (our Old Testament) as giving them license to kill. Indeed, there is no affirmation of killing or war in the writings of the early Church, nor is there the idea that Christians making war would make the world a better or safer place.

The early writings are replete with prohibitions against killing of any sort, some of which even denied the Eucharist to persons who engaged in such acts. The early Christians would not watch killings, either by viewing legal executions or by attending gladiatorial games. There is scholarly debate over why the early Christians avoided violence, and some Christian soldiers in that period have been identified, but the general witness is clear.

In the fourth century, the church's relationship to the Roman Empire and to violence changed. The Roman emperor Constantine, converted to Christianity in 312 CE and began promoting the faith instead of persecuting it. By 380 CE, Christianity would become the state religion. During this period, Christians started to take up arms, sometimes with inducements of money or property. The change was such that while in 303 CE it was generally forbidden for Christians to serve in the military, by 416 CE only Christians were allowed to serve.

Christian reflection on the wars of the Roman Empire contributed to the creation of the just war doctrine, developed initially by Bishop Augustine of Hippo on ideas from Bishop Ambrose of Milan and Cicero. The just war theory established the ground rules under which a Christian might be understood to be acting morally—out of love and hence sorrowfully—even when killing other human beings. Ronald Stone sees Augustine's motivation to protect civilian populations in a time when the Roman Empire was falling into disorder as contributing to the tradition's emphasis on defensive war and on what is often lost, right intention. "Peace as the harmony among people is the theme of Augustine's great philosophy of history in the *City of God* . . .", and order more than power is what is desired from the Empire or its representatives.²⁴ Later just war theories, such as that of Thomas Aquinas, are based more on reason and justice concepts and, for good or ill, can function apart from Christian faith.

3. *Implications of Jesus and Early Christian Nonviolence*

It makes a difference whether one sees Jesus as nonviolent or not, but does not automatically imply that our discipleship should or could be the same as his calling, nor that we should seek martyrdom or withdrawal following a model from the earliest centuries of our faith. To approve the third affirmation is to say that it is important for faithful Christians to wrestle with or discern personally where they stand on nonviolence in relation to Jesus Christ. The witness of the first Christian centuries is important as well, both to help interpret Jesus Christ and illuminate our current context.

The Old Testament is the larger guide to our understanding Jesus and, indeed, to our reading human history. Drawing on hundreds of years of Hebraic experience with God, it develops a moral vision that shaped the Rabbi Jesus and many of the New Testament writers. For the Christians of post-Constantine centuries, the Old Testament's depiction of the exercise of power in families, tribes, nations, and empires lays the foundation for what philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff calls, "world-formative Christianity." For Reformed Christians, in fact, his early book, *Until Justice and Peace Embrace* (1983), has been seen as a counterpoint to John Howard Yoder's, *The Politics of Jesus* (1972), a ground-breaking Mennonite case for the relevance of a pacifist Jesus and a pacifist church to the world. The difference in focus and scope of argument illustrates the difference in approaches. In Wolterstorff's words:

If the Bible were to be a comprehensive guide for our social activities, it was essential that the Calvinist take the Old Testament seriously. Appeals to the Old Testament in Calvinism have a function similar to appeals to nature in Thomist Catholicism (and in Lutheranism). It is fascinating to observe, in his *Letters and Papers from Prison*, that as Bonhoeffer moves toward world-formative Christianity and away from a formative version of Christianity based on inwardness and religious practices, he also begins to emphasize the importance of the Old Testament. He saw, as did the Calvinists, that the New Testament in isolation gives insufficient guidance for the new praxis.²⁵

With the Old Testament comes the need to interpret the violence attributed to God and that attributed to human beings, and to do that in relation to newer views of Jesus. Those views, as we have seen, show him avoiding violence but not conflict, seeking reconciliation with justice, and resisting evil by yielding to God in such a way that Albert Curry Winn called him the original "reverse fighter."²⁶ The third affirmation proposes new thinking for the church, such as that done in Jerome F.D. Creach's *Violence in Scripture* (2013), which wrestles with the bloodiest texts about conquest, holy war, vengeance, hell, and judgment, and does so in response to portrayals of Jesus like that of Richard Hays' above.²⁷ The challenge for those of us influenced by Christian Realism is not to use the Old Testament only to confirm Reinhold Niebuhr's famous quip, "original sin is the only empirically verifiable doctrine of the Christian faith." This is untrue to the Old Testament, which gives us visions of shalom, rules to restrain evil, and prophets of a new covenant, and unfair to Niebuhr, whose senses of paradox and irony always helped him move "beyond tragedy."²⁸

Much of the traditional Reformed reading of pacifism was that it was impossibly perfectionist and entailed renunciation of power (as in priestly vows) or withdrawal from the world (whether in monasteries or in sectarian communities like those of the Anabaptists). It may have worked for the early church, so that thinking went, but they were not powerless and on the margins by choice. Jesus' teachings were sometimes considered impossible ideals, or to be a short-term ethic in anticipation of an imminent end of the world. This background section has suggested that better argued interpretations of Jesus' mission can help renew our peacemaking witness.

At the same time, it is clear that faithful resistance—as much of our General Assembly just peacemaking statements recognize—has a force to it, and thus that nonviolence itself can be a form of coercion. Daniel Ott states this explicitly in his argument for "A Realistic, Public, Christian Pacifism," arguing that "A realistic pacifism must be a pragmatic pacifism

that acknowledges that even physical coercion may in a few instances be necessary as a result of our 'responsibility to protect.'" Yet for Ott, even in policing, "nonviolent strategies are morally superior ... through the ability of nonviolence to engage in conflict while honoring the moral primacy of human life."²⁹ This is to anticipate the next affirmation and its supporting background rationale.

Two final observations may help us in reclaiming or renewing our understanding of Jesus the Peacemaker. The first has to do with the context for both most of the Old Testament and for the early church. That context was empire. The Hebrew people were first enslaved by and then liberated from the Egyptian Empire. The nation of Israel was conquered first by the Assyrian Empire, and later by the Babylonian Empire. Eventually, the Judeans living in exile in Babylon were allowed to return to Jerusalem as a result of the expansion of the Persian Empire. And the entire New Testament takes place in the context of a Roman Empire supported by conquest and slavery. Both John the Baptist, for us the last of the great Hebrew prophets, and Jesus of Nazareth, the One to whom he pointed, called for repentance, proclaiming the Reign of God. They spoke of the Reign of God as an alternative social order based on a rival set of values to those of the Roman Empire. Here is the choice put before the early Christians, imagined in contemporary preaching style:

For all its monumental cultural achievements, the Roman Empire was a system of domination; the Reign of God on the other hand, is a domination-free order. The Roman Empire was based on economic exploitation; the Reign of God is based on economic justice. The Roman Empire was based on violent pride; the Reign of God on nonviolent love. The Roman Empire projected a matrix of iron-fisted control; the Reign of God sings the songs of freedom. The Roman Empire was built on layers of oppression; the Reign of God is founded on the hope of liberation. The Roman Empire's brutality struck fear in its subjects; the Reign of God offers the balm of healing. The Roman Empire promised peace through victory; the Reign of God promises peace through justice.³⁰

The fact is, the Roman Empire continued in several forms after its "fall," and empire continued as a sometimes aspirational category in Europe even after the Treaty of Westphalia 1648 began to formalize nation-state sovereignty.³¹ More will be said about "empire" as a tendency or temptation in the final background section.

The second observation has to do with the social and cultural location of our church, the mainline Protestant church today. One word for where we are is "marginalization." Another might be, "dis-establishment." Our numbers are smaller and secularization consigns religious institutions to the private sphere of values. Thus the church's public voice is taken less seriously, and is distinctly unwelcome in some quarters, including much of the academy. This is not to argue that religion or Christianity is without influence in what is still a fairly religious country, but it suggests that we are in a pluralistic situation closer that of the early Christians.

While our minority situation may well be cause for lament and deep concern, it may, paradoxically, free the church from the burden of straddling two worlds and serving two masters. From this standpoint, for centuries the church has spoken in a "Constantinian dialect," that is, speaking both as followers of Jesus Christ grounded in his message and values and as "good citizens" of the social order caring for the interests of the nation or empire. This is not a full picture of our loyalties of citizenship and love of country, but it is a more prophetic position from which to resist pressures that would make the church a junior partner to nationalism. In fact, the mainline churches have been influential in insisting that patriotism does not mean automatic approval of military ventures, and in those debates the charge that ecumenical Protestantism is "irrelevant" often reflects an effort to weaken its voice.

D. *Affirmation #4. We seek to understand the nonviolent revolutions and armed struggles of our time through the Gospel of Peace, by drawing on the traditions of just war, just peacemaking and active nonviolence, and by cultivating moral imagination through prayer, study, and engagement with friends and enemies.*

Along with new insights from Jesus scholarship, Reformed Christian thinking about peacemaking for today must take into account the series of substantially peaceful transitions that have occurred since the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. These include other transitions in Eastern Europe and the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, a cessation of terrorism alongside power sharing in Northern Ireland, the massive demonstrations that led to the end of the Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines (after the killing of Benigno Aquino), the still-surprising end of apartheid in South Africa, including the Truth and Reconciliation process, and the initial successes of the Arab Awakening in Tunisia and Egypt, where dictatorships collapsed with great speed. As continuing developments in Egypt underline, in no case does justice or democracy simply fall from heaven. Yet these notable cases are part of a larger picture presented by scholars in which nonviolent regime change is approximately twice as successful as violent government overthrow.

The counterexamples of Syria, and weakened or collapsed states such as Somalia, Mali, and parts of Congo, speak to the combined powers of disorder, sheer repression, climate change impacts (all around the Sahara desert) and cross-border extremism, sometimes funded by neighbors more interested in proxy wars than collective security. Certainly the pictures of tortured bodies and videos of beheadings show the depth of evil and dehumanization. The continued violence in Iraq and Afghanistan reflects, in part, the failure of military intervention to ensure either democratic institutions or equitable development. As this is written, the wisdom of the United States and other Western powers holding off from airstrikes on Syria in exchange for chemical weapons disposal and peace talks is being claimed both as a triumph of threatened intervention and of multilateral negotiation. It points to the interplay of diplomacy, foreign aid, including military aid, United Nations structures, and geopolitical alignments. In relation to Iran, both a target of covert computer viruses and

assassinations of scientists and a backer of resistance to Sunni extremists in Syria and elsewhere, an undeveloped capacity to build nuclear weapons prompts sanctions, including by nuclear states which themselves refuse to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Agreement.

The point of these illustrations is that international relations are complex and that the churches, to offer credible witness, need to have capacity for analysis as well as passion for peacemaking. In this section we present first emerging nonviolent strategies that are clearly preferable to continued dictatorships protected by short-sighted alliances, commercial interests, and massive weapons sales. We note the contributions made by Just War and Just Peacemaking categories, and their limitations. (See Appendix A for brief listings of Just War, Just Peacemaking and nonviolence principles.) This section concludes with the claim that the church's capacity to "nourish(es) the moral life of the nation" (to quote *The Believers' Calling*) depends on its own capacity to nurture a moral imagination to envision new relationships and take risks for peace.

1. *Nonviolent Direct Action and Nonviolent Ethos*

Nonviolent direct action, best known from the work of Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., has proven to be a powerful means of wielding power in a variety of conflicts. This is the source behind the earlier examples: the nonviolent "people power" that freed the Philippines, the pro-democracy movements in Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia that ousted communist regimes in 1989, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, supported by international economic pressure, that brought an end to white minority rule. With them are lesser known cases, such as the nonviolent student movement in Serbia that ousted a weakened Slobodan Milosevic in the year 2000, or the peace achieved in Mozambique with the explicit assistance of Roman Catholic mediators.³² Christians participated in these movements for social change, using methods of nonviolent action reminiscent of the civil rights movement that changed the United States.

Nonviolent direct action—the use of protest marches, strikes, boycotts, sit-ins, and more—is a means of wielding power, a technique for waging conflict, just as guerrilla warfare, conventional warfare, and terrorism are also means of waging conflict. Nonviolent direct action is distinct from some methods of conflict resolution in that it seeks to surface, escalate, or intensify, conflict. It does not require its practitioners to be committed to a philosophy or ethic of nonviolence, so long as they follow the methods and stay united. Indeed, people often choose nonviolent action for pragmatic reasons rather than religious, moral, or ethical ones.

Nonviolent people power movements have shown themselves capable of overthrowing dictators, thwarting coups d'état, defending against invasions and occupations, challenging unjust systems, promoting human rights, and resisting genocide. A recent study, "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict," by Maria J. Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, compared the effectiveness of violent and nonviolent resistance campaigns in conflicts between non-state and state actors between 1900 and 2006.³³ The study found that "major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns." Jesus' third way of nonviolent action may not work in all circumstances, but the historical record shows that its contemporary analogues are a powerful means of engaging in conflict and can be used successfully in struggles for justice, human rights, and self-determination.

The work of nonviolence theorist, Gene Sharp, *From Dictatorship to Democracy*, was widely used as a manual during Arab Awakening. Widely translated and reprinted, it contains practical guidance for assessing the weak points of repressive governments and building movements, along with a list of 198 nonviolent methods.³⁴ Sharp's strategy would suggest, for example, that though the Syrian protesters were right to try nonviolent means at first, they had not prepared enough of the population for the regime's response and the influx of extremists pursuing a proxy war. Though Sharp (himself a minister's son) stresses the pragmatic applicability of the strategies to struggles anywhere, as Christians we are particularly interested in relating them to our "world-transformative" ethos and motivating hope.

Nonviolence may be thought of as both an end and a means. It is an end in that it refers to the future world we long for—a world free from violence and war, free from hunger and poverty, free from injustice and oppression, and full of God's love, justice, and healing. We may understand it as Jesus' 'kingdom of God'; Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'beloved community,' or Walter Wink's 'domination-free order.' Leo Tolstoy's reading of Jesus in the Gospels influenced Gandhi in finding the *satyagraha* or truthforce in his religious tradition. Henry David Thoreau's civil disobedience would be an example of nonviolence as an ethic or applied philosophy of life. As an ethic it has often be disparaged as a form of withdrawal or an attempt to escape complicity in life's power struggles. Certainly parts of the Mennonite tradition reflect that withdrawal, while Quakers often represent deep and tenacious engagement, even with powers they oppose. Yet the paradigmatic Mennonite story of Dirk Willems, escaping imprisonment for his faith, yet turning back to rescue a persecutor from drowning, and then burnt at stake, is not about withdrawal. It is about being willing to suffer out of love.³⁵

These alternative visions and actions can contribute to the church's embodied witness by helping it be a "contrast model" to more violent, hierarchical, or competitive social relations. Nor is nonviolence or pacifism based solely on a personal ethic of imitating Jesus. A communal ecclesiology can involve clear beliefs about everyone sharing in the gifts of the Spirit and about God's interaction within human nature and within dedicated, worshiping communities. Personal and collective forms of nonviolent action are described later in the report under the heading of "things that make for peace," but they are ideally rooted in the life of the church.

Thus we wonder and ask the church to wonder with us: what would it look like if the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) reoriented more of its common life around the Prince of Peace and reemphasized the nonviolent example of his life and witness in our preaching and teaching, our spiritual formation and worship, and our public witness in our violent world?

Many Presbyterians have rarely given serious attention and reflection to questions of violence and nonviolence, war and peace. They have not heard these subjects addressed in sermons, nor have they talked about them in Christian education classes. We heard from many participants that the Peace Discernment process was their first introduction to the ideas of Christian nonviolence. At the same time, many were also unfamiliar with the actual content of the Just War and Just Peacemaking approaches. As a denomination, we need to do a much better job of teaching peace to people in the pews.

2. *Just War Principles and Just Peacemaking Initiatives*

These background sections have mentioned the just war tradition at various points, starting with the quote from Chaplain Kermit Johnson, who applied its categories of ethical decision to nuclear war. He concluded that even various “tactical” nuclear war scenarios could not be justified.³⁶ In light of Augustine’s insistence on right intention, Ron Stone argued that the threat of “mutually assured destruction” could not be justified, even though the Roman Catholic bishops’ pastoral letter, “The Challenge of Peace,” accepted deterrence conditionally, saying it was not “adequate as a long term basis for peace.” That was in 1983. The General Assembly’s opposition to nuclear war in *Christian Obedience in a Nuclear Age* (1988) is also based partly on just war criteria, as was its stand on the Iraq war (2004). The clear implication of the church’s stand against the Iraq “war of choice” is to rule out the purported doctrine of preemptive war practiced by the second Bush administration in absence of a real or imminent threat. Indeed, if the discernment discussions revealed any consensus on a specific policy, it was to oppose preemptive war.

The just war tradition is intended to serve as a constraint on the use of military force—to minimize the violence used in achieving a particular objective. *All* of the criteria must be satisfied if military action (*jus ad bello*) is to be considered morally justifiable: just cause, right intention, proper authority, last resort, reasonable hope of success. Once a nation has committed to military action, that conduct (*jus in bello*) must adhere to two additional criteria—proportionality and discrimination (avoiding noncombatants).

Though we have seen the utility of just war criteria as a means of assessment, their flexibility is often exploited by those seeking war or defending the necessity of certain war practices. Critics question the practical value of just war criteria if they do not give clear direction to decision makers about which course of action is more moral. Some in the Christian Realist camp challenge the “natural law” bases of just war (such as the right to self-defense) and doubt that war can ever be a fully rule-governed activity.

A case in point: World War II, the so-called “Good War,” is widely considered to have been a “just war.” However, it did not meet all of the criteria of a just war. U.S. involvement in the war was certainly prompted by just causes—responding to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and countering the aggression of Nazi Germany in Europe. But the conduct of the war devolved into “total war” with both sides bombing cities indiscriminately, killing hundreds of thousands of noncombatants, culminating in the U.S. atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in pursuit of unconditional surrender and possibly to signal Russia. The 158th General Assembly (1946) responded: “Christians know that war is evil. The use of the atomic bomb means that war reaches a degree of destruction which multiplies this evil beyond human concept.” They went on to call for “... immediate cessation of the manufacture of atomic bombs.”³⁷

Despite the elasticity of just war criteria, as long as U.S. military actions are presented as morally justifiable based on those criteria (whether or not there is a declaration of war), it is important that Presbyterians be well-versed in this tradition so that they can participate intelligently in the public debate and not be deceived by national leaders bent on using military force. The 1988 *Christian Obedience in a Nuclear Age* statement recognized that most acceptance of war is based not on just war thinking, but on often unthinking obedience to the state and political forces; hence various means of resistance were seen as consistent with Reformed teaching.

The most important baseline approach to the just war tradition that has evolved in post-World War II ethical thinking is to underline the presupposition or grounded preference for nonviolence to be used with just war criteria. This understanding is augmented in the just peacemaking preventive measures that build on the principle that war is a last resort. Resort to violence in war, as many in the military know as well as civilian victims, is inevitably tragic and frequently means suspending moral criteria in the name of survival. Christopher Hedges, a former war correspondent, has also illuminated the virtually addictive thrill of combat violence.³⁸

The ten Just Peacemaking practices were put together by an ecumenical team of ethicists coordinated by Professor Glen Stassen of Fuller Theological Seminary.³⁹ Based on many lessons from peacemaking involvements and perceived limits of Just War thinking, these practices focus most on how conflicts can be avoided—not least by taking what are called independent initiatives to reduce tensions and thus avoid overt hostilities. (See Appendix C.) An interfaith application of the principles has been published as well.⁴⁰ The just peacemaking practices do not presume a pacifist basis, and hence are not an alternative to just war principles, even though they seek to “abolish war.” They underline how much war often results from specific failures of leadership and diplomacy, and from predictable weaknesses of international institutions—including a United Nations hamstrung by Security Council members with individual nation veto power and low standards

of member behavior. The international justice system to protect human rights is also kept weak, partly by a United States that refuses jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and stands outside of basic treaties.

Just peacemaking, like active nonviolence, thus illuminates how much the just war approach is tied to nation states and their sovereignty. Citizenship in nation states is a basis for grounding much human rights law, but human rights law also points beyond and within states, many of which mistreat their people. A searching critique of the just peacemaking construct by one of its ethicist participants points both to its antecedents, in the "Six Pillars of Peace" of the Federal Council of Churches, and the limitations of putting too much weight on alternatives to national policies: "Until just peacemaking incorporates more attention to power, national definitions of purpose, diplomacy, and biblical realism derived from the prophets, it will remain too idealistic."⁴¹

What just peacemaking does well is to introduce a whole new body of practical measures for conflict resolution and reconciliation forged in some very difficult circumstances, often with strong Christian inspiration. We look more at "the things that make for peace" in the next section, but simply to look at just peacemaking practice 4: "Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness." This partly reflects Donald W. Shriver's *An Ethic for Enemies* (1995), which applied forgiveness in political and social situations. Among the groups explicitly focusing on forgiveness are Fr. Leonel Narvaez's Schools of Forgiveness and Reconciliation in Colombia and elsewhere in Latin America, seeking to help heal the effects of "dirty wars," and the work of Donna Hicks on ways to restore dignity to victims of violence and humiliation.⁴²

What the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and other U.S. Christian bodies have not done fully or effectively is to provide a moral analysis of certain major developments in war-making. These would include what is close to the abdication by Congress of its power to declare war; the movement of many combat functions to private contractors and voluntary enlistees which has the effect of making it more and more a profit making enterprise (often financed by borrowed money); and the development of incredibly sophisticated weaponry in robotics, nanotechnology, drones, and more. (The 2014 ACSWP resolution on drones and surveillance addresses some of this.)

3. *The Church and the Military*

As long as Presbyterians continue to serve in the U.S. military, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has a responsibility to care for active duty soldiers, veterans, and their families. Our denomination does this by providing chaplains to the military through the Presbyterians Caring for Chaplains and Military Personnel (PCCMP).⁴³ The mission of these ministers is "to provide military personnel with a visible reminder of the HOLY in the midst of combat and chaos." Chaplains serve as noncombatants; they are prohibited from carrying firearms. They offer worship, prayer, and Bible study, and spend much of their time providing pastoral care and counseling to the soldiers in their units. Chaplains also may serve as a moral voice on the battlefield, where life and death decisions are being made on a daily basis. Chaplains are often the only ones in the chain of command who can hear and hold the terror of young soldiers facing death, and hear and hold the remorse in taking the life of another human being. Chaplains themselves carry a large burden in being present in war as enemies also made in the image of God are objectified and killing becomes routinized. Indeed, military training is designed to break down the innate reluctance to take the lives of our fellow human beings, to make killing normal, normative, and necessary. Furthermore, war doesn't end when the deployment is over; its lingering effects continue long after veterans return home.

Our congregations also have a role to play in supporting military families while their loved ones are deployed overseas and after they return home. Multiple deployments put enormous stress on soldiers and on the spouses and children they leave behind. Even when soldiers return physically unscathed, parts of the soul can remain on the battlefield. This can mean depression, suicidal thoughts, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, sometimes augmented by serious doubts or lack of support for the wars. Veterans need the love and care of congregations who will welcome them home and listen to them with wisdom. The church has a special responsibility to help heal the moral and spiritual wounds of its sons and daughters who have been scarred by war. For instance, in the Greek Orthodox tradition there is a ritual cleansing from the spiritual defilement of violence. A new approach to the "moral injury" of war has been pioneered by Rita Nakashima Brock and Gabriella Lettini, working with retired Army Chaplain Herman Keizer.⁴⁴

The PC(USA) also has a responsibility to our youth and young adults to help them examine their own moral consciences and to work through the ethical arguments for serving in the military versus declaring oneself a conscientious objector to war. Young people are presented with these important decisions early in their lives. We fail them if we do not equip them to make these decisions faithfully and wisely. The 1969 General Assembly report on *War, Peace, & Conscience* is still relevant here, even though there is no current military conscription. The major report, *Ministry to Persons in the Armed Forces*, adopted by the General Assembly in 1975, contains much valuable analysis of both chaplaincy work and short term programs like the Emergency Ministry on Conscience and War of the late 1960s.⁴⁵

4. *Inviting in the Moral Imagination*

In our peace discernment process, we were inspired by the writings and the grassroots peacemaking work of John Paul Lederach, a Mennonite veteran of "peace-building" who has mediated conflicts for the last thirty years. Others, like Andrea Bartoli in the Roman Catholic tradition, and the emerging "forgiveness" school, also introduce imagination in cultivated

ways. Lederach identifies the moral imagination as the capacity to imagine and design processes within the real-life challenges of violence without being caught up in destructive patterns. Lederach maintains:

If we are to survive as a global community, we must understand the imperative nature of giving birth and space to the moral imagination in human affairs. We must face the fact that much of our current system for responding to deadly local and international conflict is incapable of overcoming cycles of violent patterns because our imagination has been corralled and shackled by the very parameters and sources that create and perpetuate violence.⁴⁶

The moral imagination is activated when "politics as usual" fails to deliver. The moral imagination requires the capacity to risk a new world. This risk is embedded in three related capacities: to imagine ourselves in a web of relationships in which all parties are knit together, to embrace the complexity of every conflict, and to act creatively, especially given the risks it takes to imagine peace. Peace-building requires that people be able to envision their interconnectedness and mutuality. Daniel Ott, in his adaptation of Christian Realism, emphasizes how much peacemakers have to see that real change is possible and not be stuck in fatalism or determinism. Without the inner strength of hope, Christians would not have led in the struggles to abolish slavery, honor women's equality, pay workers fairly, protect the rights of children, or fight global warming today.

Moral imagination also involves the capacity to rise above polarities of "us and them" and divisions of "with us or against us," and reach beyond accepted meanings. "Paradoxical curiosity" is the gift of respecting complexity, seeking something beyond what is visible, and discovering unexpected potentialities. To take a risk is to step into the unknown without any guarantee of success or safety. For many people caught in conflict, violence is known, and peace is a mystery. Because peace-building typically requires people to move toward a new, mysterious, and unexpected future, it is a difficult journey. And yet, Christ clearly calls us to join him in risking peace and transforming conflicts by boldly practicing the things that make for peace.

E. *Affirmation #5: As disciples of Jesus Christ, we commit ourselves to work first for nonviolent change in our personal and communal lives, to risk calling our nation back from the practices of empire to the highest ideals of our heritage, and to practice boldly the things that make for peace.*

As followers of Jesus Christ, we are called to seek first the kingdom of God. Peacemaking is part of our seeking that reign or commonwealth where God's will is done on earth as it is in heaven. Until that day, prophetic discipleship involves risk, and in this section we realize our proposal may challenge many. We propose it, not so much that our country's national security be at risk, but for our church to challenge the way our nation has extended its understanding of national security into the world.

It is clear, after more than twelve years of war, that a majority of Presbyterians are deeply concerned about the enormous human and economic costs of war—the hundreds of thousands killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, the millions of people displaced by the violence, the thousands of U.S. soldiers killed or injured, the trillions of dollars spent and the damage done to our economy. This report has noted that a majority of Presbyterians are also deeply worried about the pervasive violence in U.S. culture—in gun violence, sports, entertainment, and our tolerance for hunger, poverty, abuse, and neglect. Just as we seek to be just and loving in our own lives and in our congregations, so as Reformed Christians we believe the church is called to invite the nations of the world into new understandings of how to respond to violence in our time. To many, the church is called by the scriptures to be a counter-cultural community, as it was in its first three centuries of growth, pointing the world to God's coming reign in Jesus Christ. The times cry out for the church to bring forward the Spirit's healing and transformational gifts in new ways.

In this section we look at the sometimes controversial concept of empire, understanding that the U.S. is not the only empire, and that empires come in several kinds. Under that heading we address the purposes of power and propose that our peacemaking calling means helping our nation change its orientation to the world, from superpower to something less grandiose. We do not see the U.S. losing its military preeminence any time soon, but it would be good to be number one again in some other measures of national achievement. Attacks on "empire" are nothing new: Christians have been comparing their governments to Rome from the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment through to our day. And yet, the word still names with power the misuse of power, the use of other people and nations for our benefit more than theirs.

Thus this affirmation lifts up a vision of God's Reign of justice and peace as an alternative standard to power relations predicated *primarily* on force. The United States is not unique in the inevitable competition among nations seeking their own interests. China, Russia, and other major powers maintain empires through trade, alliances, and force. Ethnically different sections of some countries may be controlled by majorities and even internally colonized. Our role remains dominant, however, despite the tragedies of Iraq and Afghanistan, and the interests for which we sustain our massive military presence around the world remain largely unquestioned. On one level, it is honest patriotism to challenge U.S. foreign and military policies that seek to dominate the rest of the world in order to maintain our "American Way of Life" at the expense of others, especially "the least of these." But it is also a matter of Christian discipleship, and this requires us always to be clear who "we" are: Christians and citizens who do not confuse the cross with the flag.

To say we seek nonviolent change first is to acknowledge that for many Presbyterians as individuals and as citizens there may be a last resort to violence. Yet our first goal or presupposition is peace, with justice, and our dispositions and our

disciplines can be much strengthened in this direction. Our confirmation and adult education classes can teach forgiveness, reconciliation, and conflict resolution as practical strategies, and our public witness can look more wisely and critically at the national interests we are called to fund or defend. To support this recommendation is not only to seek to be nonviolent in our own lives, but to seek to reorient our society away from the lure of empire and its structures of domination toward the promotion of a sustainable global community in which everyone's basic human needs are met and security assured.

1. *Colonialism, Empire, and Post-Colonial Empire*

The church stood in opposition to the Roman Empire until the fourth century, when it arguably began a long symbiotic relationship. As subsequent European empires expanded, they did so often with the blessing of the Church. Explorers and conquistadors conquered lands and peoples with Christian missionaries at their side. This was true of the Spanish, the Portuguese, the French, and the British, as they all came to the New World in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. Elsewhere in the world, powerful nations exercised their power to control the land and resources of others in a variety of ways, often settling regions, dispossessing native inhabitants, imposing new languages, cultures, and religions. For some one-time colonies, even after independence, relationships of dependency remained with the former colonizers.

In the case of the United States, original hopes of being a New Israel took new forms on the frontier and manifest destiny led to wars of conquest, however rationalized. Pax Romana became Pax Americana. In the 20th century the U.S. has controlled countries by supporting military dictators, such as Marcos in the Philippines, the Somozas in Nicaragua, and the Shah in Iran. We extend our influence and leverage by providing governments with military and economic aid, and with military equipment comes training and enduring relationships with foreign militaries, whatever their human rights records. Where there has been resistance to U.S. hegemony, whether it be the Cuban Revolution, or the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua, the Iranian Revolution in some respects, the U.S. has reacted with military and economic force.

As Christians living in the U.S. today, difficult as it may be, it is incumbent upon us to recognize that we live in what is perceived to be the heart of empire. Even in our own faith community, the World Alliance (now Communion) of Reformed Churches, issued a declaration containing a sophisticated concept of empire that still delivers mail to our address. The Accra Assembly (2004) defined the term: "In using the term "empire" we mean the coming together of economic, cultural, political and military power that constitutes a system of domination led by powerful nations to protect and defend their own interests."⁴⁷ That declaration criticized the unregulated or "neoliberal" market system in ways that were prophetic in light of the credit crash of 2008, but its larger claim was that economic globalization was strengthening inequality among and within nations, to the benefit of those at the top of a hegemonic order. We may not think easily about "hegemony," but that's part of the point. As Americans, we don't think twice about the U.S. maintaining approximately 750 overseas military bases in 130 countries. But imagine some other country wanting to operate a military base on U.S. soil!

Given the freedom and prosperity most Presbyterians experience inside the U.S., we don't often challenge the status quo, except perhaps on domestic surveillance. If we raise our voices in opposition to U.S. empire, we may not speak very loudly. But like Jesus, John the Baptist, and the Hebrew prophets before them, the Church today has a prophetic calling. As the Body of Christ, the Church continues the work of Christ in the world. We have a responsibility to speak truth to power, to challenge the status quo, to be a voice of conscience to our nation and to the world.

2. *Aspects of "Empire" in U.S. Policy Today*

Three crucial developments in U.S. foreign and military policy have arisen since 1980: the Carter Doctrine, the Powell Doctrine, and the Bush Doctrine. The Carter Doctrine says that the U.S. government reserves the right to use military power to guarantee access to Middle East oil. The Powell Doctrine expressed the U.S. aspiration to "full spectrum dominance," that is, the ability of the U.S. military to bring dominating military force to bear on any situation anywhere on the planet. The Bush Doctrine of "preventive war" claims that the U.S. government has the right to "defend" itself against putative or imagined threats by striking adversaries preemptively. All three of these foreign policy strategies rely on a military role and can be termed, "militarism," though the Obama administration has criticized the Bush doctrine and not stated a doctrine for its own increasing reliance on drones and special operations forces.

For most of our history, the size of the U.S. military mirrored the immediate threat or task to which it was directed. After the end of the Cold War, the size and capability of our military seemed to take on a life of its own, independent of any specific threats. Americans had grown to see it as their right and responsibility to police the world, and powerful interests benefited. Then the tragedy of 9/11 occurred, prompting a virtual doubling of military and surveillance expenditure even independent of the two wars, which were funded by debt.

Today our nation's ability to project armed force beyond our borders is second to none. We have the best trained and equipped armed forces in the world, and we spend more on our military than do the countries with the next ten highest military budgets combined. The United States is by far the largest arms dealer in the world. U.S. weapons sales tripled in 2011 to a record high of \$66.3 billion, accounting for more than three-quarters of the global arms market. The U.S. military budget is larger than all other federal programs except Social Security. The U.S. retains a web of military bases around the world from which to project force, carry on surveillance, and protect oil and other resources. U.S. military intervention had become relatively normal since the end of the Cold War—in Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, the Persian Gulf, and then Afghanistan and Iraq II opened new horizons, including Pakistan, Yemen, and various military assistance

operations in the Western Hemisphere. Hardly a year or two has passed without a significant military action. Living in a state of war has become the rule rather than the exception.⁴⁸

National security has become the overarching interest with which the United States approaches the world. Since “the war on terror” began, covert operations, surveillance, and drone missiles have taken on a central role. The growth in the U.S. intelligence community has been staggering. According to a July 2011 series in *The Washington Post*, some 1,271 government organizations and 1,931 private companies then worked on programs related to counterterrorism, homeland security, and intelligence, with an estimated 854,000 people holding top-secret security clearances. The threat of terror is not to be dismissed, but that label may conceal the way that globalization creates cross-border networks of grievance and covert operations kept secret to us (such as providing arms, training, surveillance data) de-stabilize traditional societies.⁴⁹

Perhaps more importantly, the entire spectrum of our nation’s engagement with the world is becoming more militarized. U.S. military forces are increasingly being used to do things that have not usually been considered part of their job—things like nation building, which had been handled by the State Department and through international diplomacy. The extent to which our nation’s priorities have been skewed toward the military is illustrated by the resources we invest in it compared to what we spend on diplomacy and development. The base funding of the Department of Defense is more than ten times that of the State Department and USAID. Rather than a once hoped for “peace dividend,” our military planning is still guided by the goal of “full spectrum dominance,” and remains predicated on maintaining overwhelming superiority.

There are voices for change within the military itself. One of the more comprehensive comes from Captain Wayne Porter, USN, and Colonel Mark Mykleby, USMC, whose proposal for a new “National Strategic Narrative” was endorsed and summarized by Anne-Marie Slaughter, a professor of international affairs and briefly director of Policy Planning in the State Department. Their proposal is for five shifts in approach:

1. from a dominant position of control to credible influence in a more open geopolitical system;
2. from containment to sustainment,” based on domestic redevelopment and better modeling of the behavior we seek in other nations;
3. from deterrence and defense to civilian engagement and competition,” which would reemphasize trade and diplomacy, while still modernizing “a security complex that includes all domestic and foreign policy assets”;
4. from zero sum to positive sum global politics/economics,” preferring interdependence and universal values to isolation and exclusion of other nations;
5. from national security to national prosperity and security,” a shift that would involve a new National Prosperity and Security Act to replace the 1947 National Security Act.

In Slaughter’s summary, she sees the officers adjusting the balance between exceptionalism and universalism toward the latter value, still seeking to be “leader of the free world,” but in a healthier and actually less military way.⁵⁰

3. *Economic Drivers or National Purposes*

President Eisenhower’s prophetic warning about the unwarranted influence of the military-industrial complex from 1961 has become more relevant than ever.⁵¹ More accurately called the military-industrial-congressional complex, or “the iron triangle,” it is an interlocking system of mutually reinforcing interests with very little outside oversight. Supported by “political engineering” that distributes military contracts across many congressional districts, the complex creates and sustains its own bureaucratic momentum. The question is simply how much private interests are dictating national interests, and whether we have come to confuse such interests with national purposes? Nonviolence seeks to put a moral bottom line under foreign policy, while peacemaking works more broadly to see that our purposes remain larger than our interests.⁵²

The United States’ vast military and intelligence establishments go far beyond the intent or imagination of our nation’s Founders, whose views could loosely be called isolationist, opposed to “foreign entanglements” in John Adams’s words. George Washington himself counseled against a significant standing army: “Overgrown military establishments are under any form of government inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican liberty” (Farewell Address, September 17, 1796). And James Madison wrote: “Of all enemies to public liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few.”

By contrasting the practices of empire with “the highest ideals of our heritage,” we affirm that our country should have a significant role in the world and one of benefit to all. It is a key role of the church to help inspire our culture to see new possibilities, and it is not isolationist to be opposed to much military intervention. At times the use of power is justified and may serve those high ideals of democracy and world community; the danger is both the momentum of our enormous arsenal calling to be used, and the mindset that may confuse power and responsibility.

4. *Challenges in Pulling the United States Back from “Empire” Practices*

Professor Andrew Bacevich, a career military officer now a professor of political science and incisive commentator on American military policy, analyzes a phenomenon he terms “Washington rules.” These rules consist of the “American credo,” which is the assumption that the United States is “exceptional” or “indispensable”—that it alone has the duty and the calling to “lead, save, liberate, and ultimately transform the world.” Complementing the belief in American exceptionalism is a consensus across the spectrum of the American political elite regardless of political party. This consensus insists that international peace and order require the U.S. to project military power anywhere across the globe and that the U.S. follow a policy of global interventionism. The twin pillars of “Washington rules”—American exceptionalism and the global police role—have a strangle-hold on American foreign and military policy, according to Bacevich. Voices that question this consensus, as the church has done on numerous occasions, are ruled out as outliers, too radical, or naïve and unrealistic. The result is a self-reinforcing system of decision-making that discounts the calls for moral restraint or efforts to see the other nation’s point of view.

Therefore, the church must be realistic about the nature of its influence. In light of the Iron Triangle noted above, three main factors influence military spending: (1) powerful multi-national corporations have a vested interest in perpetuating the machinery of war and seeing it as a necessity. Weapons must be used and new orders placed for profits to be maintained over time; (2) political careers must be continued and economic benefits from the military-industrial complex deliver the goods to constituencies back home, even if other forms of public investment would create more jobs; and (3) the dramatic rise in the power of the Pentagon and the massive “defense” establishment over the past seventy years has created a huge and dominant sector of government with ever-increasing demands. These three extremely powerful factors in the decision-making process regarding war form a political “micro-climate” largely impervious to outside influence. In fact, the phrase “micro-climate” is deceptive, for it is an enormous part of our country’s life, too often underestimated by churches and other reforming groups.

It is true that the Reformed tradition has long affirmed that the state can indeed be an instrument of God’s purposes in history (Romans 13). But it is also true that the Word of God warns us that the state can also be an instrument of the Beast (Revelations 13). These texts pose the basic question of whether the United States functions more as an empire pursuing its own interests than as a faithful instrument of God’s will. In these historical circumstances, nonviolence represents a counter-logic, a sharper contrast, and a counterweight to the machinery of permanent war and seemingly perpetual cycles of violence. The Reformed tradition makes careful provision for responsible resistance to government overreach, based on its covenantal vision of national purposes, and this more constructive vision is the core of the alternatives to misused power that the church seeks to present. That covenantal vision, in fact, was expressed in Puritan John Winthrop’s first use of Jesus’s metaphor of a “city set on a hill” for the new settlement they were building. Nowadays we are clearer, perhaps, than Winthrop was, that human rights and respect for international law are essential building blocks in any such construction, but he was clear enough that for the community to last “we must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities for the supply of others’ necessities.”³

5. *The Things That Make for Peace*

We Presbyterians are looking for direction and guidance about how we, as individuals and congregations, can take faithful and effective action to reduce violence and war, to further justice and peace. In this vein, there is broad interest in learning concrete peacemaking skills that we can use in our daily lives. Indeed, if we are to be effective peacemakers, able to actually reduce violence and injustice in our various contexts, we need to receive education and training in the “things that make for peace.” We need to study and practice nonviolent means of conflict resolution (such as nonviolent communication, negotiation, and mediation) and nonviolent methods for social change (such as faith-based community organizing and nonviolent direct action) to help bring about a more just and peaceful world. (See Appendix C for brief descriptions of these approaches.) We also need to become more familiar with just peacemaking initiatives, which can help prevent war, and just war principles, which are intended to limit war, so that we can be more effective advocates for justice and peace in the public square. Jesus’ own statement, “would that you knew this day the things that make for peace,” was addressed to the whole of Jerusalem, and was followed shortly by his “cleansing of the Temple”(Lk. 19:42–46).⁴

6. *Interfaith Understanding*

Among the most important peacemaking approaches for Christians today are practices of interreligious understanding that build mutual respect and the ability to hear what is most important to the other, without vetoes or mischaracterization. Religions are often blamed for being the cause of conflict and violence in the world. Religious identity is impossible to separate from other dimensions of personal identity, yet those who blame religion isolate it as the primary causal factor. In reality, political, ethnic, and economic factors bear much more responsibility for creating the underlying conditions that lead to violent conflict. Nonetheless, religions have within them a storehouse of resources to promote peace and reconciliation and Presbyterians should be quite familiar with the Christian basics—starting with the Golden Rule—“Do to others as you would have them do to you” (Lk. 6:31)—found in some form in all of the world’s major religions. In many cases cited in *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*, edited by David Little, public dialogue between religious leaders from opposing groups can help create breakthroughs for reconciliation.⁵

Little also sees religious peacemakers playing key roles in “enforcement, peacekeeping, institution-and-capacity building, and agreement-making.”⁶ The work is less in the first area, which can involve coercion to end violence (as in Bosnia and

Kosovo), and the second, which can be diplomatic language for outside military monitoring or stabilization forces. But the third and fourth, sometimes considered part of "Track Two," unofficial or citizen diplomacy, frequently involve religious peacemakers in developing organizations and even rituals for social harmony and then creating positive contexts for Track One, or formal peace negotiations. Such efforts built empathic understanding in South Sudan and Northern Ireland, for example, although the relationships built can remain fragile.

7. *Truth and Reconciliation Commissions*

Under the fourth affirmation we noted ways that public forgiveness and apology were included within the just peacemaking framework. Truth and reconciliation commissions are also ways of bringing perpetrators to acknowledge, if not actually confess, the truth of their actions before their victims or the survivors of their victims. Allan Boesak has pointed out the danger that a collective evil, like apartheid, can be reduced to the actions of individuals who are then blamed on the group's behalf, but he has also pointed to the way that victims can regain their voices and dignity through publicly recognized and respected grief. Naturally, the work of truth and reconciliation commissions must follow the actual achievement of ceasefires and the presence of outside observers (like a Jimmy Carter) and religious leaders (like a Desmond Tutu) can be extremely helpful. The key thing, though, is that such commissions are moral inventions and they can lead to more healing and more creativity. We need more arenas where longer term hostilities can be defused and young people inspired and new leaders born. Could we even address structural violence this way, and recognize more veterans of social conflict who carry moral injuries?

8. *Accompaniment and Nonviolent Third-Party Intervention*

Nonviolent direct action is usually engaged in by the "weaker" party in a conflict. In the past few decades, however, there has been growing experience with third parties, who are not part of a conflict, intervening nonviolently in the hopes of deterring violent attacks and human rights violations. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has played a part in this through its Colombia Accompaniment Program, which has brought more than ninety trained accompaniers to stand in solidarity with the Iglesia Presbiteriana de Colombia whose leaders had been killed and members intimidated. The World Council of Churches has cosponsored an accompaniment program in Palestine to protect Palestinian school children and others from settler and Israeli army violence. The goal in such efforts is "to see and be seen." At a less-intense level, court watchers and election monitors do variants of this work.

9. *Teaching Peace in the Church; Being Peace in the World*

The more personal dimensions and disciplines of active nonviolence and peacemaking are already being practiced in many churches where strangers are welcomed, prisoners are visited, veterans brought in, and perhaps "international peacemakers" hosted and interfaith dialogues sponsored. Some mission trips also seek to cross once-hostile boundaries, or to help build new friendships. Suspicion of "the Russians" still exists, racism still poisons our cities, Islamophobia is manipulated to prevent empathic understanding: all are addressed in some congregations. Some also teach children nonviolence and ways to prevent bullying, and increasing numbers are speaking up about the constant menace of gun violence. We believe these life-giving practices are of God and offer life to the church and witness to the world.

Peacemaking is a faith commitment; it is a calling rather than a conclusion. It constitutes the lens by which reality is brought into focus; the value system by which the meaning and significance of threats are determined. With humility, we recognize that just as the nationalistic exceptionalism of empire distorts, so a concern for universal human rights may not be the full key to the healing of the nations. IF the U.S. were to reduce its footprint, would benign forces take the place of our military? Would the churches push for constructive multilateral ways to fill power vacuums and help create order through collective security—or are we simply weary of war? We have spoken of citizen diplomacy; could we see ourselves assisting others with citizen-based defense? At the core of all these risks in seeking peace is the choice to resist violence, and it is not just a personal choice.

The word, "making," in peacemaking, is *poesis* in Greek. The Gospel of Peace is Christ, who is our peace, who gives to us ministries of reconciliation, who makes us ambassadors of God's commonwealth and reign. But perhaps God also calls us to be poets of peace, composers, crafters, creators, hearers and doers of peace.⁵⁷ We end with three true stories.

Three Examples of Risking Peace

- The French village of Le Chambon risked peace in sheltering 5,000 Jews fleeing the Nazis during World War II. The driving force behind the rescue effort was Andre Trocme, the Huguenot (French Reformed) pastor of the village. Deeply committed to Christian nonviolence, on Sunday mornings he would preach the Sermon on the Mount, love of God and love of neighbor, reverence for life, and the necessity of resisting evil with good. The people of Le Chambon hid Jews in their homes and farmhouses and arranged for them to reach the safe haven of neutral Switzerland. In doing so, they risked their lives. Occasionally, the Gestapo raided the town. Leaders were arrested and imprisoned, and some were later killed. But despite the repression, the resistance in Le Chambon continued to the end of the war.

In the last months of German occupation, the Tartar Legion commanded by SS Colonel Metzger was poised to destroy the village and its inhabitants. But a second German officer, Major Schmebling, commandant of the German Army post in Le Puy, dissuaded Metzger from attacking. Years after the war, Schmebling told Trocme of the fateful conversation: "Colonel

Metzger was a hard one, and he kept insisting that we move in on Le Chambon. But I kept telling him to wait ... I told Metzger that this kind of resistance has nothing to do with violence, nothing to do with anything we could destroy with violence. With all my personal and military power I opposed sending his legion into Le Chambon.”⁵⁸

- More recently, on August 20, 2013, a school bookkeeper, Antoinette Tuff, risked peace when a gunman walked into her school. Twenty-year-old Michael Brandon Hill entered the Ronald E. McNair Discovery Learning Academy near Atlanta with an AK-47 and 500 rounds of ammunition intending to shoot and kill as many people as he could. Ms. Tuff was scared but remained calm. She had received training in how to respond to dangerous situations like this one. And she found courage and strength in her Christian faith. She recalled her pastor’s teachings about “anchoring and how you anchor yourself in the Lord.” She was able to talk Hill down and convince him to surrender to police, thereby averting another mass shooting. “It was all God,” she said. “I was just praying.”
- The U.S. risked peace in September 2013, when it opted not to launch air strikes against Syria in response to an August 21 chemical weapons attack against civilians, but instead negotiated an international agreement to disarm the Syrian government of all of its chemical weapons. President Obama had threatened a military response as a consequence for violating international norms. Military intervention seemed imminent. Then U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry made an off-the-cuff remark that air strikes could be averted if Syria turned over all its chemical weapons to the international community within a week, but Syria “isn’t about to do it and it can’t be done.” This rhetorical suggestion was taken up as a serious proposal by Russia and received a positive response from Syria. Where once military intervention was being touted as the only option for responding to the use of chemical weapons in Syria, the U.S. stumbled into a diplomatic alternative that had not been seriously considered. Whether the countries involved in that proxy war have encouraged a serious peace process since is another question.

God is always doing a new thing. It is the nature of God to gather up all the occasions of the past, and with immense healing power, weave transforming possibilities into the emerging moment. The future is constantly arriving, a future whose radical and redemptive newness it owes to the creative work of the Poet of the World, the Lover of Souls, the Lord of the Church, who declares, “Behold I make all things new.” Let us welcome the new thing that God is doing, risk peace and transform conflict by boldly practicing the things that make for peace.

APPENDIX A

Brief Summary of Christian and Presbyterian Approaches Prior to 1980

There is no question but that the centrality of peace as a distinctive feature of Christian fidelity goes back to the Bible, to the idea of shalom in the Hebraic tradition and to the idea of being peacemakers in the teachings and pattern of Jesus’ own fidelity to God. But translating this concept into policies that further human well-being has challenged Christian thinking ever since the church ceased to be bands of dedicated believers existing as outsiders within Greco-Roman culture.

Two main traditions developed within the Christian movement that were dedicated to the goal of peace, but understood responsibility for achieving it in different ways. The first, claiming a strong grounding in the New Testament and the practices of the early church, is Christian pacifism; the other, the just war tradition, grows out of the realization that when Christians become holders of authority and exercise office in a political world they may be called upon to use violence for the protective love of neighbor and for the maintenance of justice and order. Both of these moral stances need to be seen as very different from the views that religion may use violent means to advance its own interests—the premises of an ethic of the crusade, or that nationalisms or ideologies may claim de facto religious sanction for dominating others—the major causes of war for more than two centuries, particularly in Europe and countries colonized by European empires.

During the Protestant Reformation some groups, from which the “peace churches” emerged, understood Christian discipleship to require the repudiation of violence in the manner of the earliest church. Other groups, from which most mainline Reformed bodies emerged, understood Christian discipleship to allow for the restrained, and hence legitimate, use of the sword to preserve justice and order. Presbyterian Confessions generally contain just war positions in relation to the role of the magistrate, or civil government. These two main Christian approaches to war and violence retained theological coherence as Christians sought to apply them through revolutions and wars of conquest, liberation, defense, and humanitarian intervention. American Presbyterians participated in and justified the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, but have been less and less of one mind on smaller wars like Vietnam, the Nicaragua/Contra war, the two Iraq wars, and Afghanistan.

Back in 1936 and 1938, when pacifist sentiment was strong in American Social Christianity, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. sent the presbyteries proposals to remove just war language from the Westminster Confession, which was then the church’s only confessional standard. While a majority of the presbyteries voted to remove or amend the language, in neither case did the outcome reach the supermajority of presbyteries required to accomplish that result.

During WWII, which had the overwhelming support of most Americans following Pearl Harbor, two important developments took place. First, some individual Presbyterians felt called to be conscientious objectors and were generally supported in taking this position (or at least benignly tolerated) by the church. That support made it amply clear that a

pacifist conviction was a legitimate form of Christian discipleship. (The influence of the votes in the 1930s may be seen here). The second development found the Presbyterian church in cooperation with many other denominations giving extensive thought to what would constitute a just and durable peace. Studies were undertaken both in the denominations and in ecumenical bodies which explored such concerns and were staffed with competent specialists. That work contributed to support for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations and was likely to have helped the postwar settlement avoid the vindictive features of the armistice that settled WWI.

The development of the Cold War and its tendency to divide the world into two polarized positions eventually brought increasing questions about the wisdom and adequacy of military and particularly nuclear means for establishing peace and justice on a worldwide scale. Many Christian ethicists at the time argued that the draft laws should recognize the validity of conscientious objection on just war grounds as well as on fully pacifist grounds, and the General Assembly of 1967 emphatically reaffirmed the right of Presbyterians to be conscientious objectors. (See *Conscience, Conscriptio, and the Church*.) This action highlighted the legitimacy of conscientious differences about participation in war by individuals, and made individual integrity a foundational reference point for moral reflection. That action did not overcome the differences between pacifist and just war commitments in the church's corporate stand, but it clearly undercut any presumption that just war thinking inevitably means subservience to the policies of the state or that pacifism is unacceptable because it is unpatriotic.

Thus the recent history of our church is marked by a persistent belief in the importance of peace but also by continuing good faith disagreements as to what kinds of policies and commitments most faithfully translate that central belief into prudent and responsible action. Some of these disagreements have challenged the Peacemaking Program, the primary agency through which *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling* and other social witness policies were to be implemented. Some have been impressed with what the church has done in the last quarter century, particularly the extent to which it has managed to be critical of the prevailing trends in the society of which it is an integral part. Others feel that the program has been insufficient in its vigor and lacking in prophetic intensity and are disturbed by the fact that at the same time the church has been engaged in this program the country has become more and more involved in the use of military ways of meeting the threat of terrorism and other international crises, and has landed on what amounts to a permanent war footing.

APPENDIX B

DEFINITIONS

A very succinct summary of just war principles: Those applying to the decision whether or not to go to war (*jus ad bellum*).

1. There must be just cause.
2. There must be right intention.
3. The action must be undertaken by the proper authority.
4. The action must be taken as a last resort.
5. There must be a reasonable hope of success (to defend, protect, or otherwise gain a just peace).

Those applying to the conduct of war (*jus in bello*).

1. The force or violence used must be proportional to the result intended.
2. Noncombatants are not to be directly attacked.

See Edward LeRoy Long, Jr. *War and Conscience in America* (Westminster Press, 1968) 22–33.

Ten Principles of Just Peacemaking

1. Support nonviolent direct action.
2. Take independent initiatives to reduce threats.
3. Use cooperative conflict resolution.
4. Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness.
5. Advance democracy, human rights, and religious liberty.
6. Foster just and sustainable economic development.
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.

See Glen Stassen, ed. *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Pilgrim Press, 1998)

Six Elements of Nonviolent Strategy (More from a faith perspective)

1. Nonviolence is for the strong rather than the weak. It is a difficult discipline that eschews cowardice. It is not nonresistance but a particular method of resistance.
2. Nonviolence does not seek to “defeat or humiliate” the opponent, but to win them over. It is not employed for the purpose of scoring points but as a means of creating “the beloved community.”
3. Nonviolence directs itself “against the forces of evil rather than against persons who happen to be doing evil.” One may despise a particular form of evil, but one may not despise the doer of the evil.
4. Without making suffering into something to be sought, nonviolence can bring home the truth that “unearned suffering is redemptive.” It can be creatively enacted in ways that transform evil into a potential for good.
5. The attitude of nonviolence must be within the heart of the individual as well as his outer actions. “The nonviolent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him.”
6. Nonviolence “is based on the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice.” The practitioner can believe that she is not going against the grain of what is ultimate, but seeks rather to exemplify what is ultimate: redemptive suffering love.

These six come from Martin Luther King, Jr.’s *Stride Toward Freedom* (NY: Harper & Row, 1958), summarized by Robert McAfee Brown in *Religion and Violence* (Phila.: Westminster, 1973). King learned from Mohandas K. Gandhi, who in turn learned from Leo Tolstoy on the spiritual ground and orientation of nonviolence.

APPENDIX C

SEVERAL EXAMPLES OF METHODS OF VIOLENCE REDUCTION:

Nonviolent Communication

Too often the words we use, especially in conflictual situations, escalate tensions rather than reducing them. We use words as weapons to blame, judge, criticize, or dominate others. At the same time, we don’t listen well. What we hear is distorted by our own prejudices and misconceptions.

Nonviolent communication is a process developed by Marshall Rosenberg that helps people to exchange the information necessary to resolve conflicts and differences peacefully. When using nonviolent communication, people listen deeply to themselves and others and articulate their observations, feelings, needs, and requests, honestly and respectfully with empathy and compassion. Nonviolent communication can help bring healing and reconciliation to interpersonal relationships in a variety of settings. More information is available from the Center for Nonviolent Communication (<http://www.cnvc.org>).

Interreligious Understanding

Religions are often blamed for being the cause of conflict and violence in the world. Religious identity is impossible to separate from other dimensions of personal identity, yet those who blame religion isolate it as the primary causal factor. In reality, political, ethnic, and economic factors bear much more responsibility for creating the underlying conditions that lead to violent conflict. Nonetheless, religions have within them a storehouse of resources to prevent violence and promote peace and reconciliation. For example, the Golden Rule—“Do to others as you would have them do to you” (Lk. 6:31)—is found in some form in all of the world’s major religions. Increasing inter-religious understanding through interfaith dialogue is critical to peacemaking in the 21st century. Some Presbyterian teaching elders and congregations have been involved in interfaith dialogue in their local communities, particularly between Christians and Jews. These conversations are important and to be encouraged. At the same time, efforts to promote interreligious understanding and reconciliation must expand to include Muslims and other faith traditions. Strengthening these bonds of mutual respect and understanding between the religious traditions has a stabilizing effect in society.

Training and educational resources are available from a number of organizations, including the Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding (<https://www.tanenbaum.org>), the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace & World Affairs (<http://berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu>), the Religion and Peacemaking Program of the U.S. Institute of Peace

(<http://www.usip.org/religionpeace>), the Program on Religion and Reconciliation at the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies (<http://kroc.nd.edu/research/religion-conflict-peacebuilding/program-religion-reconciliation>), the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions (<http://www.parliamentofreligions.org>), and Religions for Peace (<http://www.religionsforpeace.org>)

Conflict Resolution Skills

Methods of conflict resolution such as negotiation and mediation seek to settle disputes peacefully through mutual agreement. We encounter conflict regularly in our day-to-day lives—at home, at work, in school, and in our congregations. Knowing how to manage and resolve these conflicts well is essential to the well-being of ourselves and others. But few people ever receive training in conflict resolution.

Many community mediation centers offer training in conflict resolution skills. For church leaders who want to learn the skills needed to address conflict in church settings, the Lombard Mennonite Peace Center (<http://www.lmpeacecenter.org>) offers a Mediation Skills Training Institute for Church Leaders. Excellent educational resources are also available through the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School (<http://www.pon.harvard.edu>).

Faith-Based Community Organizing

Congregations have joined together in faith-based community organizations to work for social and economic justice in their communities. By building relationships with one another they discover their shared self-interest. By organizing their people and money, they build the power they need to influence key decision makers in government and business to act in the community's interests. Working across lines of religion, race, and class, these interfaith community organizations have fought for affordable housing, better schools, funding for social services, and a host of other issues. These are efforts that address causes of structural violence, and hence contribute to less violence in families and communities.

Training in faith-based community organizing is available through four national organizing networks: the Industrial Areas Foundation (<http://www.industrialareasfoundation.org>), the Gamaliel Foundation (www.gamaliel.org), the PICO National Network (<http://www.piconetwork.org>), and the Direct Action and Research Training Center (DART) (<http://www.thedartcenter.org/>).

Nonviolent Third-Party Intervention

Most nonviolent direct action has been used by one or more parties directly engaged in a conflict. However, in the past few decades there has been growing experience with third parties, who are not part of a conflict, intervening nonviolently in the hopes of deterring violent attacks and human rights violations. Organizations such as Peace Brigades International (<http://www.peacebrigades.org/>), Witness for Peace (<http://www.witnessforpeace.org/>), Christian Peacemaker Teams (<http://www.cpt.org/>), Nonviolent Peaceforce (<http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/>), and the Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and Israel (<http://www.eappi.org/>), recruit, train, and deploy volunteers who provide an international nonviolent presence in areas of violent conflict.

The Presbyterian Church (USA) has played a part in this through its Colombia Accompaniment Program (<http://www.presbypeacefellowship.org/colombia/accompaniment>), which began in 2004 at the request of the Presbyterian Church of Colombia (IPC). Colombia church leaders who had spoken out against human rights violations and who had supported families displaced by decades of war were facing threats of political violence. They asked the PC(USA) to send international accompaniers to stand with them and provide a measure of safety for them as they carry out their prophetic ministry. In response to their request, the Presbyterian Peace Fellowship has worked with PC(USA) World Mission and the IPC to train over 130 volunteers, of whom 90 have been deployed as short-term mission workers to Colombia. Accompaniers practice a ministry of presence with the IPC and with the displaced communities and human rights leaders with whom they work. The primary goal is to be a nonviolent presence of Christian support and solidarity with our church partners in the IPC, to "see and be seen," and to share the story with churches and communities in the U.S. through prayer, education, and advocacy efforts.

Endnotes

1 Johnson, Kermit D. "Just War and Nuclear Deterrence," in Ronald H. Stone and Dana W. Wilbanks, Eds., *The Peacemaking Struggle: Militarism & Resistance* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985), p. 197. Johnson went on to determine that even various "tactical" nuclear war options then being advocated would not fit the criteria of Just War.

2 Much recent mainline pacifist discussion has been prompted by the writings of John Howard Yoder, Stanley Hauerwas, and a number of Roman Catholic priests (whose vows forswear violence).

3 Edward L. Long "The Mandate to Seek a Just Peace," in Stone & Wilbanks, op. cit., pp. 29–41.

4 Presbyterians may be proud to know of the serious theological and ethical discussion of war and peace issues by Presbyterian scholars represented in several collections of essays, in particular: Ronald H. Stone and Dana Wilbanks, eds., *The Peacemaking Struggle: Militarism & Resistance* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985) and Ronald H. Stone and Robert L. Stivers, eds., *Resistance and Theological Ethics* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004). With some writing

more than once, thirty-six scholars participated in this work, representing most Presbyterian seminaries and a number of colleges and universities.

5 Donald E. Gowan & Ulrich W. Mauser, "Shalom and Eirene," in Stone & Wilbanks, op. cit., p. 132–33.

6 Joel B. Green, Jacqueline Lapsley, Rebekah Miles, and Allen Verhey, eds. *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

7 Kathryn Poethig points to the fundamental asymmetry involved in structural violence and to key analysts Gayatri Spivak ("sanctioned" or non-innocent ignorance), Catherine Lutz on misleading names and language, Slavoj Zizek on the distancing and falsifying impact of "virtualization," and Sturken on the distortions of fear magnifying insecurity. See Spivak, Gayatri (2003). A conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: politics and the imagination, interview by Jenny Sharpe, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(2): 609–24

8 Wink, Walter, "The Myth of Redemptive Violence," <http://www2.goshen.edu/~joannab/women/wink99.pdf>.

9 Martin Luther King Jr. *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community*. 1967. (Boston: Beacon Press, 2010), p. 62.

¹⁰ Rene Girard's work gives depth to the concept of unmasking and has been part of Presbyterian ethicists' discussions of the persistence of violence. An example of his view: "Christ does not achieve this victory through violence. He obtains it through a renunciation of violence so complete that violence can rage to its heart's content without realizing that by so doing, it reveals what it must conceal ... because it will be recorded and represented with exactness in the Passion narratives." Girard, Rene, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2001), p. 140.

¹¹ Robert McAfee Brown notes Brazilian Bishop Dom Helder Camara's version of this in, *The Spiral of Violence* (Dimension Books, 1971); Brown's own *Religion and Violence* (Westminster, 1973) presents a pioneering assessment of structural violence.

¹² Isabel Ortiz & Matthew Cummins, "Global Inequality: Beyond the Bottom Billion," UNICEF Social and Economic Policy Working Paper, April 2011, p. 12. http://www.unicef.org/socialpolicy/files/Global_Inequality.pdf.

¹³ Written February 28, 1948, Declassified June 17, 1974. Kennan, George, "Review of Current Trends, U.S. Foreign Policy, Policy Planning Staff, PPS No. 23. Top Secret. Included in the U.S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, volume 1, part 2 (Washington DC Government Printing Office, 1976), 524-525. <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/cgi-bin/FRUS/FRUS-idx?type=goto&id=FRUS.FRUS1948v01p2&isize=M&submit=Go+to+page&page=524>. Kennan is best known for the strategy of containment that guided much U.S. policy during the Cold War. Raised Presbyterian, his realism contained clearer moral components later in his published essays.

¹⁴ Thomas L. Friedman, "A Manifesto for the Fast World," *New York Times*, March 28, 1999. <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/03/28/magazine/a-manifesto-for-the-fast-world.html/>.

¹⁵ The cost comparisons in this section are distilled from The National Priorities Project: <http://nationalpriorities.org/analysis/2011/us-security-spending-since-911/>. The 2007 Harvard study referred to: <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2009/09/new-study-finds-45000-deaths-annually-linked-to-lack-of-health-coverage/>. The role of military expenditure in creating debt is summarized by Joshua Holland based on a study by economist Robert Higgs: <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=1941/>. Holland's article: http://www.alternet.org/story/151119/five_eye-opening_facts_about_our_bloated_post-9_11_%27defense%27_spending?page=0%2C1/.

¹⁶ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (SF: Harper Collins, 1996).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 149. Historical, literary, and other criticism can illuminate ways that texts and traditions developed, but Johnson, a biblical scholar himself, questions especially the use of Gnostic texts without passion narratives, as he relates "narrativity" to materiality.

¹⁸ While appreciating Hays' respect for the scriptural canon, Luke Timothy Johnson takes issue with him on his methodology for making ethical applications. For reviews by Johnson and four others: <http://www.westmont.edu/~fisk/articles/mvntreviews.htm>.

¹⁹ Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 319.

²⁰ See Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Powers* (Mpls: Fortress, 2011) for a recent synthesis of his work. Horsley sees Jesus as a prophet in the covenantal tradition and movement leader, rather than an apocalyptic visionary, wisdom teacher,

or self-proclaiming messiah. As a transforming public martyrdom, the crucifixion amplifies Jesus' message and carries great power not only for occupied Israel but for all on the margins seeking hope.

²¹ Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 175–93.

²² Margaret Aymer presented a critique of violent biblical imagery to the Peace Discernment consultation for Presbyterian universities and colleges in January, 2013, at Montreat, N.C.

²³ Martin Luther King Jr., *Strength to Love*. 1963. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), p. 39.

²⁴ Ronald Stone & Dana Wilbanks, op. cit. at 4, p. 187. A non-Realist reading of Augustine is presented by Eugene TeSelle in *Living in Two Cities* (Scranton: University of Scranton, 1998, following an earlier debate in Richard John Neuhaus, editor. *Augustine Today*. Encounter Series, 16. Grand Rapids, Mi.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993).

²⁵ Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Until Justice and Peace Embrace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), p. 18.

²⁶ Albert Curry Winn, *Ain't Gonna Study War No More* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), p. 99, cited in Daniel J. Ott, "Toward A Realistic, Public, Christian Pacifism."

²⁷ Jerome F. D. Creach, *Violence in Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2013).

²⁸ Readers of Niebuhr will recognize references here to *The Irony of American History* and *Beyond Tragedy* as illustrations of his application of biblical resources.

²⁹ Daniel J. Ott, "Toward a Realistic, Public, Christian Pacifism," [American Journal of Theology & Philosophy Volume 33, Number 3, September 2012](#), pp. 245–57.

³⁰ This paragraph is from the Reverends Mark Davidson and Roger Powers, both pastors on the Peace Discernment steering team, putting recent scholarship into admittedly simplified antitheses.

³¹ For the Treaty of Westphalia's implications: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sovereignty/> But perhaps the most fundamental and controversial account of what the church lost in the rise of empire in the West is Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Parker's *Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love of this World for Crucifixion and Empire* (Boston: Beacon, 2008). Acceptance of violence is a big part of this fall into empire. For a positive if questioning review: <http://www.psr.edu/saving-paradisehow-christianity-traded-love-world-crucifixion-and-empire-review-tat-siong-benny-liew>.

³² The role of the transnational Roman Catholic community of Sant'Egidio in Mozambique is described by Andrea Bartoli, one of its members: "Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Mozambique Peace Process," in Helmick, Raymond, S.J. and Rodney L. Petersen, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (Phila. & London: Templeton Foundation Press, 2001), pp. 361ff.

³³ Maria Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict" *International Security* 33:1, pp. 7–44. <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2008.33.1.7>.

³⁴ Further information about the techniques for nonviolent direct action is available from The Albert Einstein Institution (<http://www.aeinstein.org>) and the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict (<http://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/>). See also Roger Powers, ____, forthcoming, for further Christian analysis of Sharp's methods. (Sharp himself, a minister's son, does not emphasize particular religious motivation but encourages widest applicability.)

³⁵ This story can be found at: http://deedsofgod.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=181.

³⁶ See Johnson, Kermit and Ronald H. Stone essays, op. cit. at endnote 1.

³⁷ Quoted in Introduction, "The Promise of Peace," *Church & Society*, Sept/Oct 1983, p. 4. That issue of *Church & Society* journal (available online through the American Theological Library Association) was edited by Robert F. Smylie, longtime director of the Presbyterian United Nations Office (now the Presbyterian Ministry at the United Nations). Perhaps the best treatment of Presbyterian thinking on peace leading up to 1980 is Smylie's "A Presbyterian Witness on War and Peace: An Historical Interpretation" *Journal of Presbyterian History*, Winter, 1981, 59:4.

³⁸ Chris Hedges, *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning* (N.Y.: Public Affairs, 2002).

³⁹ Glen Stassen, ed. *Just Peacemaking: Ten Principles to Abolish War* (Pilgrim Press, 1998).

⁴⁰ Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, ed. *Interfaith Just Peacemaking* (N.Y.: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012).

⁴¹ Ronald H. Stone, *Prophetic Realism: Beyond Militarism and Pacifism in an Age of Terror* (London/N.Y.: T&T Clark, 2005),

p. 119.

⁴² Leonel Narvaez, *Political Culture of Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (Bogota: Fundacion Para La Reconciliation, 2009 (original Spanish) and 2010 (English). Includes essays by Narvaez and Hicks.

⁴³ The PCCMP was formerly the Presbyterian Council for Chaplains and Military Personnel: <http://pccmp.org/who-we-are/history/>. An influential essay by a current chaplain, Captain Mel Baars, discusses her ministry in Afghanistan as of September 11, 2012: <http://www.faithandleadership.com/content/mel-baars-war-and-the-dimensions-love>).

⁴⁴ See <http://www.brite.edu/academics/programs/soul-repair/regional-programs/history-of-the-soul-repair-center/>.

⁴⁵ 187th General Assembly (1975), pp.474–79; full report printed separately.

⁴⁶ John Paul Lederach, *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 14).

⁴⁷ For a downloadable version of Accra Declaration: <https://www.pcusa.org/resource/accra-confession-covenant-justice-economy-and-eart/>.

⁴⁸ For the State Department's annual report on Foreign Military Sales: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/209508.pdf>. Current: <http://www.ibtimes.com/global-defense-budget-seen-climbing-2014-first-total-increase-2009-russia-surpasses-britain-saudi>).

⁴⁹ Mary Kaldor ("new wars") and John Arquilla (network wars, or "netwars") see globalization eroding state sovereignty so that non-state militants function in states that fail to provide protection and face social/demographic crises.

⁵⁰ See online: <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/A%20National%20Strategic%20Narrative.pdf>

⁵¹ Eisenhower's words are worth remembering: This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together. (Eisenhower's Farewell Address, January 17, 1961).

⁵² See Ronald H. Stone, *Prophetic Realism*, op. cit. at xxx, Chapter 6, "On Power and Purpose," pp. 72–83, for influence on this section.

⁵³ John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity" See http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/519465.John_Winthrop.

⁵⁴ The placement of this text in Luke is another argument against the exchange with the money-changers being a violent one. This passage was one featured in the 2012 Season of Peace Bible Study leading up to the Peacemaking Offering: <http://www.presbyterianmission.org/ministries/seasonofpeace/biblestudy/>.

⁵⁵ David Little, ed. *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution* (N.Y.: Cambridge University Press/Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding, 2007).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 442–47.

⁵⁷ Andrea Bartoli suggested this understanding of peacemaking as an art in his talk at the Consultation on Peace Discernment for Presbyterian-related colleges and universities, January 19, 2013.

⁵⁸ Philip Hallie, *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed: The story of the village of Le Chambon and how goodness happened there* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), p. 245.