

Approved by the 210th General Assembly (1998) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

III. Reports and Resolutions

A. *Resolution on Just Peacemaking and the Call for International Intervention for Humanitarian Rescue*

Precis

This resolution seeks to address the growing assumption and acceptance of the idea that conflicts in the post-cold war era involving either a major violation of basic human rights or a massive degree of human suffering require the response of the international community. Amplified by the immediate nature of television broadcasting, the intensity of such crises as Bosnia, Burma, Haiti, Rwanda, and Somalia call for a Christian response to help alleviate internal upheavals and to undertake humanitarian rescue to relieve suffering and rescue dying human beings.

This resolution explores the challenges posed by such contemporary situations and brings to those challenges the rich resources of the biblical and theological heritage of the Reformed traditions for moral guidance. These resources include a long history of Presbyterian teaching about peace, war, and international responsibilities. And, it brings to bear a well-developed set of principles and policy positions that translate the mandate for peacemaking into specific policy guidelines. Throughout, the resolution reaffirms the theological convictions at the heart of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)'s peacemaking commitment, especially *Peace-making: The Believers' Calling* convictions that rest upon trust in the sovereignty of God in world affairs.

At its core, Just Peacemaking is about taking transforming initiatives; political, economic, and humanitarian initiatives designed to foster peace and justice. Indeed, the emphasis on initiatives is intended to preclude the circumstances which deteriorate into genocidal, civil, or international conflict. Efforts in this arena stand in relation to, not isolation from, the other facets of Just Peacemaking.

Just Peacemaking recognizes, however, that there are human disasters that call for an emergency response. Sometimes these disasters are of such magnitude that the extraordinary use of military capability may be required for humanitarian purposes or for peacekeeping, peace building, and peace enforcing. This resolution seeks to develop criteria for evaluating military intervention for humanitarian reasons in the context of Just Peacemaking. It is understood that efforts to apply these criteria need to be in the context of ongoing diplomatic efforts with all parties involved in the resolution of the outstanding problems. The criteria state the following:

- Intervention must respond to a real and genuine need that cannot be met by other means.
- It must have a reasonable chance of alleviating the conditions it seeks to overcome.
- It must constitute humanitarian rescue and not cloak the pursuit of the economic or narrow security interests of the intervening powers.
- Intervention, whenever, possible, should have international auspices in order to achieve the greatest presumption of legitimacy.

- It should advance the general welfare of all the inhabitants of the region in question and not become a tool by which powerful elites further cement their power.
- Intervention should involve the minimum degree of coercion necessary to achieve the purposes of the action.
- Intervention in the forms of punitive sanctions should be targeted against those in authority rather than against broad population groups.

This resolution emphasizes that there is much need for continued discussion both within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and with its ecumenical and interfaith partners, and views the resolution as a contribution to that ongoing conversation.

1. *Resolution*

Whereas, our Lord Jesus Christ said, “Blessed are the peacemakers” (Matt. 5:9, NRSV); and

Whereas, biblical faith requires us to seek peace and pursue it as long as injustice and suffering prevent the realization of a just peace; and

Whereas, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in the document *Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling* has declared that:

1. The church is faithful to Christ when it is engaged in peacemaking. . . .
2. The church is obedient to Christ when it nurtures and equips God’s people as peacemakers. . . .
3. The church bears witness to Christ when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace in our world. . . . (*Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling*, pp. 5–6); and

Whereas,

The church’s faithful obedience to its calling means active participation in the formation of the values and beliefs of our society. It means seeking peace in the personal and social relationships of our culture and exercising our citizenship in the body politic to shape foreign policy. It is of strategic importance for us to nurture changes in public attitude and to raise public consciousness. (*Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling*, p. 6); and

Whereas,

By God’s grace we are members of a world community and can bring our global insights and peacemaking to our particular settings. By God’s grace we are freed to work with all people who strive for peace and justice and to serve as signposts for God’s love in our broken world. To deny our calling is a disservice to the church and the world. To affirm our calling is to act in “faith, hope and love.” The love of Christ constrains us. The choices may be difficult, but there is no substitute for acting as a church on the specific foreign policy problems affecting peace in our world today. Our “strength is in [our] confidence that God’s purpose rather than [human] schemes will finally prevail.” (*Confession of 1967* (9.25)) (*Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling*, pp. 6–7.); and

Whereas,

Peace and justice are yoked in the very nature of things. There can be no enduring relationships between persons if exploitation, unchecked and arbitrary exercise of authority, or excessive disproportions of access to the fruits of the created order are prevalent. (*Peacemaking: The*

Believers' Calling, p. 25); and

Whereas, the United Nations was created to maintain international peace and security, and to that end take collective measures to remove threats to peace, and to settle international disputes by peaceful means; and

Whereas, it is incumbent on all nations, individually and collectively, to protect human rights, and to solve problems of an economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character in order to enhance human dignity; and

Whereas, relationships among nations and peoples in the post-cold war era have undergone momentous transformations marked by ethnic conflict, clashes across cultural and religious lines, extreme malnutrition, and a growing gap between the rich and the poor; and

Whereas, the historic positions regarding the morality of war are being modified by the development of principles of just peace with a growing emphasis on international cooperation and partnership; and

Whereas, "Distributive justice is essential to our faith. It is the ethical process of apportioning benefits and burdens to ensure that all parties with stakes in an outcome receive their due or proper share" (*Hope for a Global Future: Toward Just and Sustainable Human Development*, p. 78); and

Whereas, the magnitude and intensity of some international crises are so great that short-term responses have employed military forces to effect humanitarian assistance and protect basic human rights; and

Whereas, just peace is closely linked to sustainable development for improving the lot of the least of these; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy (ACSWP) recommends the resolution "Just Peacemaking and the Call for International Intervention for Humanitarian Rescue" to the 210th General Assembly (1998) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and calls on the assembly to do the following:

a. Reaffirm the theological convictions at the heart of its peacemaking commitment, especially as they are set forth in the document *Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling*, adopted by the 192nd General Assembly (1980) of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. These convictions rest upon trust in the sovereignty of God in world affairs and that Jesus Christ is central to all peacemaking activities.

b. Renew its commitment to the following previously established principles that provide the warrants and mandates for peacemaking:

(1) the promotion and preferential use of nonviolent means for conflict

resolution and social change;

(2) the importance of human rights, religious liberty, and democratic principles as foundational for just peace;

(3) the necessity for sustainable economic development in the achievement of just societies and the protection of the environment;

(4) the abolition of nuclear weapons, limitations on the development of new weapons, restrictions on the sale and transfer of instruments of destruction;

(5) the strengthening of international cooperation through the United Nations, including its peacemaking and peacekeeping roles;

(6) the promotion of racial and gender justice in the achievement of social harmony and prosperity;

(7) the use of unilateral initiatives to reduce risks of conflict; and

(8) the importance of self-examination and repentance in international relations as steps in the healing of conflict and the promotion of reconciliation.

c. Affirm the following criteria as guidance in just peace decision making concerning military intervention for humanitarian purposes in situations of massive suffering and/or major violations of human rights:

(1) Intervention must respond to a real and genuine need that cannot be met by other means.

(2) Intervention must have a reasonable chance of alleviating the conditions it seeks to overcome.

(3) Intervention must constitute humanitarian rescue and not cloak the pursuit of the economic or narrow security interests of the intervening powers.

(4) Intervention, whenever possible, should have international auspices in order to achieve the greatest presumption of legitimacy.

(5) Intervention should advance the general welfare of the inhabitants of the region in question and not become a means by which powerful elites further cement their power.

(6) Intervention should involve the minimum degree of coercion necessary to achieve the purposes of the action.

(7) Intervention in the forms of punitive sanctions should be targeted against those in authority rather than against broad population groups.

d. Direct the General Assembly Council, its related ministries divisions and agencies, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy, to do the following:

(1) encourage, on all levels of church life, ongoing examination, discussion, and prayerful reflection of just peacemaking through

(a) developing a study guide for this resolution and distributing the resolution, background paper, and study guide to middle governing bodies and every congregation in the denomination with a letter from the Stated Clerk;

(b) organizing an ecumenical consultation on these topics to be held in conjunction with the 211th General Assembly (1999), preferably as the pre-assembly conference;

(c) giving special attention in General Assembly Council-related publications concerning the church's role and action in just peace and responding to humanitarian crises;

(d) creating tailored resources to inform congregations of the church's responses to crisis situations and to aid congregations in their reflection as military intervention is being considered by this nation, other nations, or by the international community;

(e) urging congregations and middle governing bodies to give regular attention in its communication and special attention in its study life including

(i) continued study of *Hope for a Global Future: Toward Just and Sustainable Human Development*, approved by the 208th General Assembly (1996), to understand the relationship between economic justice and political conflict;

(ii) in-depth examination and discussion through such material as recommended in the bibliography;

(iii) keeping apprised of the church's concern about critical international issues that raise the possible need for involvement for humanitarian assistance or protection of basic human rights through use of the *Human Rights Update*, the *Stewardship of Public Life* resources, "Peacenotes," *World Updates*, *Mission Yearbook of Prayer and Study*, and "Highlights of Worldwide Ministries";

(f) urging the colleges and theological seminaries of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) to include in their curricula study of just peacemaking;

(g) encouraging the Presbyterian Publishing Corporation to consider these concerns in their planning of future publications.

(2) increase direct involvement and support of peacemaking efforts by the church in its mission programs and encourage mobilization of resources into early intervention where sustainable development may prevent the need for more extreme peacemaking efforts through

(a) acknowledging with respect, supporting with prayers as well as materially, and accompanying by our physical presence the local peacemaking efforts of nationals in their own countries, as they are the ones on the front lines bearing the brunt of terror, repression, military violence, and civil strife, risking their lives while standing for peace in their community;

(b) providing resources, in conjunction with national partner churches as well as regional ecumenical entities, to train local peacemakers in negotiation, conflict resolution, and peacemaking skills, concentrating resources in places where the church's presence might be critical in preventing or abating tension and violence;

(c) making just peacemaking a continuing and increasingly important priority in strategic decisions around use of resources, promotion of mission giving, and response to witnessing opportunities internationally and in the United States;

(d) encouraging congregations and individuals to provide financial support for special giving opportunities focusing on sustainable development and peacemaking in emerging countries.

(3) Communicate policy with nongovernmental agencies, engage in interfaith dialogue, and encourage joint action with ecumenical partners on issues of just peacemaking, through

(a) communicating in all appropriate ecumenical and interdenominational forums in which the General Assembly Council is represented, our policy and concerns for just peacemaking and responding to humanitarian crises and encouraging the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and World Council of Churches to increase policy formation and direct intervention for just peacemaking;

(b) communicating in all appropriate forums of interfaith discussion in the United States where the General Assembly Council is represented, our policy and concerns for just peacemaking and responding to humanitarian crises and encouraging further dialogue on these topics to understand the ethical views of other religious communities and to develop potential bases for just peacemaking cooperation;

(c) notifying related nongovernmental organizations through Inter-Action and United Nations forums, of the criteria developed in this paper for guidance in military intervention for humanitarian purposes;

(d) requesting the review and response to this resolution by selected partner churches of the Reformed tradition.

(4) Encourage, in 2002, a denomination-wide, ecumenical, and international recognition of pursuits for a “Just and Durable Peace,” recognizing sixty years of guidance that provided the “Six Pillars of Peace,” through

(a) recommending to all related agencies of the PC(USA), and encouraging all middle governing bodies, congregations, and members to highlight the period from the 213th General Assembly (2001) to the 214th General Assembly (2002) as a time to give special attention to prayers and actions for peace;

(b) encouraging the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in reconsideration of the “Six Pillars of Peace,” and the development of related study material for the purpose of this celebration.

e. Calls upon the United States government to do the following:

(1) Pay in full the arrears that have accumulated for both regular United Nations assessments and peacekeeping obligations, and to meet future financial responsibilities on time and in full through appropriate authorization and appropriations legislation.

(2) Recognize the jurisdiction of international bodies of adjudication, such as the agencies of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, and other protocols and agreements duly arrived at.

(3) Take further steps to enhance the democratic political and just and sustainable economic development in emerging states and to refine its capability to respond to humanitarian crises, and including, as a last resort, with military capability, and to these ends

(a) exercise peacekeeping functions in and through the United Nations, and provide the monetary and logistical support for expanded roles in this area;

(b) establish specially designated units that are specifically trained and equipped for peacekeeping functions and keep them on standby for use in United Nations’ approved peacekeeping operations;

(c) ensure a regular review and update of all political, economic, and military plans to assure they remain relevant and functional in relationship to

peacemaking purposes and establish a civilian crisis intervention corps, specifically trained and fully equipped for humanitarian crisis relief;

(d) strengthen the work of the Peace Corps and continue the reform of USAID toward enhancing democratic, political, and just and sustainable economic development in emerging states;

(e) create a permanent advisory committee on the United States' role in humanitarian crises to advise the secretary of state.

f. Calls upon the United Nations to do the following:

(1) Enhance its instruments/capacities for nonviolent conflict resolution through negotiation, mediation, and arbitration.

(2) Develop a publicly identified set of norms and standards for decision making in situations that might require intervention.

(3) Strengthen the ability of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs, United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees, United Nations Children's Fund, and other United Nations bodies to cope with those situations of massive human suffering and need resulting from conflict.

(4) Encourage its member states to contribute to its reserve fund for peacekeeping operations, and to make available, on a standby basis, units that are trained and disciplined for peacemaking and peacekeeping operations.

(5) Review regularly how embargoes and sanctions are used so that the suffering and dislocation that necessarily results from such action is not counterproductive and puts the burden on those actually responsible for the conditions being addressed.

(6) Address the voting power and procedures of the United Nations Security Council in order to ensure that it is able to function in ways that ensure equitable response to all international issues and to ensure that all voices are heard.

(7) Establish an International Criminal Court with sufficient independence and authority to bring to justice those who are accused of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity.

g. Directs the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to do the following:

(1) Send this report to selected partner churches of the Reformed tradition for review and response.

(2) Communicate background and the text of this resolution to the

president of the United States, the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, the secretary of commerce, to every member of Congress, the secretary general of the United Nations, every United Nations mission, the United States ambassador to the United Nations, and the general secretaries of the World Council of Churches, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

2. *Background*

Somalia: Humanitarian Relief in the Midst of Anarchy

In the early 1990s, Somalia descended into anarchy following years of clan violence and the collapse of the presidency of Siad Barre . . . 50,000 killed in factional fighting . . . 300,000 died of starvation . . . horrific TV images beamed around the world . . . impossible for relief organizations to distribute food in the war-ravaged state. In December 1992, U.S. Marines landed in Mogadishu to support the UN peacekeeping force to restore order . . . relief agencies resumed food distribution and hunger eased. International efforts bogged down as mission objectives shifted from humanitarian relief to a failed effort to capture a powerful clan leader, Mohammad Farah Aidid, to rebuilding a government. Efforts hampered by inadequate cooperation and communications . . . clashes between UN troops and Somali clans escalated . . . 30 American soldiers killed and 175 wounded. US forces withdrew in 1994 relinquishing the field to other UN troops . . . these UN forces withdrew in 1995 . . . 300,000 lives saved from famine by the relief effort . . . mission creep entered the vocabulary of humanitarian intervention forces . . . a stable government has yet to emerge. ("Somalia," Microsoft(R) Encarta(R) 98 /Encyclopedia. © 1993–1997 Microsoft Corporation)

Rwanda: Genocide and the Failure of International Response

Following the April 1994 shoot down of the aircraft carrying the Presidents of Burundi and Rwanda, a wave of ethnic violence swept across Rwanda . . . the modest pre-existing UN mission sought to mediate between warring Hutus and Tutsis, but lacking a mandate to protect civilians they abandoned Kigali, the capital, at the height of the violence . . . over 500,000 Rwandans brutally slaughtered in organized genocide rivers flowed into Uganda and Tanzania clogged with bodies. Fleeing advancing forces over one million refugees poured across the borders into Tanzania and Zaire . . . enormous refugee camps sprang up around Goma. Responding international military forces struggled to create orderly conditions for the deliver of aid by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and a network of relief organizations . . . 20,000 more died in a cholera epidemic in the camps. Former President Carter sponsored a summit on Rwandan refugees in November 1995 . . . thousands returned and yet thousands remained in camps in eastern Zaire . . . the UN mission ended in 1996. Official reports suggest the international community failed to respond to the early warning signs . . . part of that failure stemmed from the inadequate response of UN member states to respond to pleas from the UN Secretariat and its humanitarian arms . . . adequate political action may have averted the massacres and the refugee crisis . . . the media shared the blame for treating the massacres as spasmodic tribal conflict rather than calculated, systematic genocide. ("Rwanda," by Randall Arlin Fegley. Microsoft(R) Encarta(R) 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993--1997 Microsoft Corporation)

Haiti: Building Democracy After Dictatorship

Following the exodus in 1986 of Haiti's ironman, Michele Duvalier, the ruling military junta tolerated and participated in mass violence. Efforts to transition to an elected government under UN supervision led in time to the landslide victory in 1990 of Father Jean-Bertrand Aristide, a Roman Catholic priest. Ousted by a military coup in 1991 and went into exile in the United States . . . conditions in Haiti further deteriorated . . . thousands fled by sea to the U.S. . . . thousands returned to Haiti by the Coast Guard. The OAS imposed sanctions on the regime . . . the UN imposed sanctions on the regime . . . Sanctions proved ineffective as they were not uniformly implemented. More than 20,000 additional refugees attempted to reach the US in 1994 . . . a UN resolution authorized member states to use all necessary means to facilitate the return of President Aristide. In September 1994, a US plan to invade Haiti was side-stepped with an agreement to allow General Raoul Cedras and others to enter exile. American forces followed by a

multinational UN peacekeeping contingent served to create a more secure environment for aid agencies and non-governmental organizations to attempt to promote economic and democratic reform. Great nation building challenges remain. ("Haiti," by Robert J. Tata. Microsoft(R) Encarta(R) 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993–1997 Microsoft Corporation)

For nearly half a century the church's teaching about peace and justice for international relations has been shaped by the memory of World War II and by the subsequent cold war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. With the end of the cold war many aspects of the world situation have changed, but the thinking and teaching of the churches about issues of peace, war, and international relations has not responded explicitly to the kinds of issues that are now presented by these changes.

a. *The Challenge*

The forty-five-year struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States has left a world with still dangerous stockpiles of war materials (including nuclear, biological, and chemical weaponry), impoverished economies, uprooted refugees, an enormous number of antipersonnel land mines, and expenditures for war materiel that far exceed the defense needs of most nations. The new context of international affairs is characterized by extreme malnutrition in many geographical areas, a growing gap between the rich and the poor, and by ethnic, cultural, and religious conflict often between groups within single states rather than between sovereign nations. The parties to conflicts in this new situation are defined by special needs or special desires rather than by national identities.

Many of these tensions and conflicts stem, not from the breakdown of what were previously workable societies, but from the very efforts of many peoples to outgrow past conditions of subjugation, poverty, and injustice. Many countries in the developing world have suffered over the years from interventions and exploitations visited upon them by dominant nations. Their struggles for social, political, and economic liberation do not bring forth quick and effortless transformations. They must wrestle with the task of providing adequate resources for the persons living within their borders, overcoming the dislocations that attend economic exploitation, and creating structures of justice and attitudes of responsible public concern that will help them enter into full and equal participation in the international community.

Today, television brings vivid experiences of human misery into our homes, creating what is sometimes called the "CNN effect" where coverage is immediate, intense, short-lived, and globally broadcast. As television has shown us more and more stories of suffering in ever widening parts of the world, it is understandable that public sympathy has been raised. It can also lead to compassion fatigue. In addition, television accounts can overlook, even obscure, more fundamental problems. If new accounts concentrate on human suffering, they can ignore the political corruptions that exacerbate inequalities, the adverse economic position weaker countries experience in international trade, or the way in which during the cold war overseas aid was dispensed more for the purpose of strengthening military allies than helping impoverished nations achieve economic justice and well-being. The result can be a well-intentioned impulse to offer humanitarian relief without a corresponding realization of the need for correcting social injustices

and inequities.

In this situation, the dominance of the post-cold war world by one superpower and the prevalence of its democratic forms of government and its version of a market economy, although reducing the threat of overt hostilities, raises new issues. The massive influence of the United States in models of government, in business organization, in control of resources, in communications, in decisive military capacity, and in massive cultural influence, has both a positive potential and incipient dangers. The temptation to manage others for the interest of the United States through the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and international trade, calls for special sensitivity and restraint. There is no reason, particularly for Christians who share an ecumenical perspective, to assume that the dominance of one superpower will necessarily benefit all other groups. Christianity, which encourages lives of service to humanity, and modesty in the receipt and utilization of resources, will question trends that exacerbate inequalities and intensify the growing contrast between super affluence and degrading poverty. The end of the cold war does not translate automatically into just peace.

This new world situation is full of problems that present the world community with new choices. Governments sometimes prove incompetent to maintain order within their own jurisdictions. Many places in the world lack the economic resources and social infrastructure to provide an adequate level of sustenance for their people. Ethnic rivalries, religious differences, and political corruption often produce disorder, massive killing, and practices such as ethnic cleansing and genocide. Hunger and malnutrition exact enormous tolls. Such horrendous spectacles prompt efforts to help alleviate internal upheavals and also to undertake humanitarian actions to relieve suffering and even rescue dying human beings. Such actions frequently involve the use of military forces in new kinds of assignments, assignments designed to provide food and temporary shelter, to protect besieged populations from wanton violence, or to assure refugees safe evacuations and at least minimally humane conditions while in exile.

The United States has been involved, under the auspices of the United Nations, in such actions in Bosnia, Haiti, and Somalia—where it sent a military presence to relieve suffering and help to establish order. The armed forces designate such actions “Operations Other than War.” An emerging vocabulary, much of it originating from the United Nations, helps us think about many different kind of actions that are grouped together by the military term “Operations Other than War.” That term covers both the uses of military power to alleviate human suffering (popularly designated humanitarian intervention), and interventions that seek to influence political outcomes without escalating into full scale combat.

The sovereign state system continues to provide the primary context for responses to the new developments. But it is also challenged by what is taking place. Most of the conflicts that have arisen in the last two or three decades, and which threaten to continue into the twenty-first century, are internal to individual autonomous states. The traditional norm against intervention in the internal affairs of other nations would, strictly speaking, simply rule out any uninvited effort to alleviate crises or to stabilize situations.

There is a growing assumption and acceptance of the idea that conflicts that involve either

a major violation of basic human rights or a massive degree of human suffering require the response of the international community. This is the case whether or not the conflicts adversely affect other nations. The United Nations has responded to more than twenty-five such crises, and the United States has furnished moral and logistical support for many of these. Some of these actions have settled difficulties quickly, but others have encountered conditions that have smoldered for months and years and seem to defy solutions. These actions fall into four categories explicated by United Nations Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in *An Agenda for Peace* (adopted by the United Nations Security Council on January 31, 1992): preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace building.

Preventive diplomacy seeks to prevent disputes from arising or escalating into military conflicts, and involves arbitration, mediation, and negotiation. These, in turn, rely upon credibility, access to information, and the right to monitor the activities of the parties to the dispute.

Peacemaking (should preventive diplomacy not be successful) means helping parties that have become involved in conflict to reach settlements. Greater degrees of pressure are involved than in the case of preventive diplomacy, such as sanctions and possible military presence.

Peacekeeping follows successful peacemaking. It means providing an international presence (military and/or civilian) in a region to monitor agreements that have been reached and/or to provide a buffer between contending but no longer warring parties.

Peace-building recognizes the necessity to create stability after the settlement of conflict in order to prevent its recurrence. This may involve help in the establishment of new governments, monitoring elections, disarming warring factions, and addressing the concerns that originally led to the initial conflict.

The concept of peace enforcement was subsequently added to include responses to conflicts not resolved by the other methods, but which by virtue of the intensity of the conflict, the humanitarian consequences, and/or the threat to neighboring countries, cannot be ignored by the world community. Peace enforcement may entail the most direct form of intervention in what are normally considered the internal affairs of nation states, and it presents the most serious challenges to the idea of traditional national autonomy.

b. Theological and Moral Resources for Facing the Challenge

To date, the churches have done very little to examine the moral issues such operations raise and to revise their thinking about war, peace, and international affairs, but they do have a long history of reflection on the morality of war and the importance of peacemaking that can be utilized to examine the moral challenges of this new situation.

(1) *Presbyterian Teaching*

The long history of Presbyterian teaching about war, peace, and international responsibility provides possible resources for dealing with the complex issues of a changing world situation. Early in the history of this nation, the heritage of Calvinism operated to prompt the search for a

new form of government in which freedom and justice operate in creative balance. The impulse to seek a just ordering of human life appeared again in the faith of the Presbyterian layman President Woodrow Wilson who led in the struggle to achieve these values on a worldwide basis through self-determination, international law, and international organization. Wilson's vision was largely unfulfilled during the period immediately following the first world war. Just peace principles were enunciated again with the help of Presbyterian leadership in the Federal Council of Churches during the 1940s, when the second world war prompted the need to create a world in which justice and cooperation were achieved. This time the consequences were more fruitful. Now again, in a newly emerging post-cold war world, this thinking about peacemaking needs to provide moral guidance.

Although many baptized Christians feel duty bound to obey the directives of their national governments when called upon to go to war, the Christian tradition has developed a considerable body of thinking concerning the legitimate or illegitimate uses of military power. This thinking emerged during times when most conflicts took the form of violent combat between sovereign political states or groups of states. Traditional Christian pacifism, basing its stance on biblical admonitions to love without stint, has considered all military action to be contrary to the command of Christ. The ethic of the Crusade, dominant in the Middle Ages but also operative in a more secular form in patriotic jingoism, has blessed the use of military power to advance religiously approved objectives as well as the interest of nation states. Just war teaching has occupied something of a middle position, endorsing the use of military power, but only in conditions of dire necessity and calling for the limitation of such use to modest parameters under the controls of authorized officials. A fourth position, not usually treated as another option, agrees with the pacifists that war is contrary to God's will for humanity and cannot ever find war to be morally just. However, it simply realizes that there are times when the powers and structures of human life are so threatened by the policies or actions of an international outlaw that there is no other course of action to take but, in great agony and without a sense of righteousness, to restrain an evil threat by military means.

Peace thinking, in contrast, focuses on what is required to create conditions of peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers," has sounded an activist note from its first century Greco-Roman context. Presbyterian spirituality, rather than shunning concern for political and economic matters, has affirmed the importance of responsible peacemaking action. The Confession of 1967 caught this hopeful, forward-moving character of Presbyterian ethics with this passage:

God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ is the ground of 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 peculiarly urgent as countries develop nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, diverting their manpower and resources from constructive uses and risking the annihilation of 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. (The Book of Confessions, 9.45)

During the thirty years that have followed that declaration of faith the Presbyterian church has attempted to live out its vision of peacemaking with various degrees of energy and success. The 192nd General Assembly (1980) declared peacemaking to be a priority of the denomination. Affirming peacemaking as the responsibility of the church it said:

1. The church is faithful to Christ when it is engaged in peacemaking. God wills shalom—justice and peace on earth. . . .
2. The church is obedient to Christ when it nurtures and equips God’s people as peacemakers. . . .
3. The church bears witness to Christ when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace in our world. (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1980, Part I, pp. 202–3)

The 200th General Assembly (1988) elaborated the implications of the agenda for peacemaking in a document entitled *Christian Obedience in a Nuclear Age*. This document grounded its arguments in the love commandments of Deut. 6:4, Mark 12:29; Lev. 19:18, and Mark 12:31. Summarizing the implications of the biblical mandate for peace, the General Assembly committed the church to these propositions:

- a. We are called to be faithful to Jesus Christ and the biblical vision of peace and justice and to work for its manifestation in every possible way.
- b. We are called to work through established social and governmental structures for just peace which requires order and equal justice for all citizens.
- c. We are called to expose and oppose every violation of the spirit of God’s rule of peace, righteousness and justice. This means that our “Yes” to God’s will for peace may require a “No” to civil authority, resulting in noncooperation or civil disobedience if the policies of the civil authority fundamentally contravene God’s purpose of peace for the world. (*Minutes*, 1988, Part I, p. 447)

Furthermore, in the same document, the General Assembly specifically commended to the church the search for a just peace.

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)

Not only has the Presbyterian church highlighted the need for peacemaking in general terms, it has enunciated a number of principles and policy positions that translate the mandate for peacemaking into specific policy guidelines:

- It has called for greater emphases on the use of nonviolent 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 sustainable economic development for the achievement of a just society at home and abroad and the protection of the environment.
- 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 consistently called for the strengthening of international cooperation through the United Nations.
- 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 pointed out the need to identify national actions that have harmed or brought undue suffering upon peoples, whether within a country or on its neighbors, the necessity to acknowledge responsibility for whatever actions of ours that have contributed to such consequences, the need for open efforts to seek and enable reconciliation with countries that have been treated as enemies.
- 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.
- It has played an active role as a nongovernmental organization in the realms of political life and humanitarian endeavors, recognizing the role and responsibilities of Christians as citizens and the church as an institution with important roles to play in civil society.

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. The new conditions in the world will be helpfully addressed by utilizing the main premises of the teaching that has been cited, by relating this body of teaching to new and changing needs and circumstances, and also by engaging in a widespread educational and reflective process that carefully considers the nature of Christian responsibility in these new times.

(2) Ecumenical Reflection

This Presbyterian teaching has been informed by and interactive with similar reflections by other churches. As the nations approached the end of the second world war, a group of Christians set to work formulating an ethic for what they called a just and durable peace. This process was undertaken by a Commission on a Just and Durable Peace set up by the Federal Council of Churches and headed by a Presbyterian elder, John Foster Dulles. The commission set itself to defining war aims, as did many theologians and journals of Christian commentary at the time. The commission also considered what would be necessary to establish a peaceful international order once the war neutralized the threat of totalitarian evil. The work of this commission was not conducted without debate nor was it exempt from criticism. It was attacked for its legalism and for the imperialism implicit in its statements. It was decried for its moral simplicity and for the possibility its principles could cloak national self-righteousness. It was seen by some as the platform for its most prominent member, John Foster Dulles. Even so, the work of the commission was a prominent aspect of the church's witness.

In 1942, the commission published a "Statement of Guiding Principles" in which the influence of Dulles is dominant. This statement assumed the existence of a moral order and contended that the sickness of society (of which the war was seen to be one result) stems from a violation of that order. It upheld repentance as a politically important stance, urging that international anarchy, revenge and retaliation be avoided in setting up an international order to serve the world following World War II. The work of this commission heightened the awareness of issues in ways that made the churches active partners in the formation of the policies that mark the settlement of the war. The churches helped in the large scale educational and lobbying efforts that led to the creation of the United Nations. Seldom has the ecumenical church exerted as much influence on foreign policy as it did under the work of this commission.

This effort probably helped to keep the United States from returning to certain forms of isolationism. It probably did much to shape peace settlements after World War II in ways that furthered reconciliation and international good will rather than vindictiveness and revenge. It probably helped to create the public acceptance of new international organizations being proposed to deal with economic, social, and humanitarian agendas on a worldwide scale. It probably helped to reinforce a growing public support for human rights, including the rights of work, worship, speech, assembly, etc. It emphasized that churches have special responsibilities for supporting these aims. These principles were translated into "Six Pillars of Peace," which are representative of the approach that has had an important place in church thinking for many years. The Six Pillars of Peace were as follows:

I

The peace must provide the political framework for a continuing collaboration of

the United Nations and, in due course, of neutral and enemy nations.

II

The peace must make provision for bringing within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of national governments which have widespread international repercussions.

III

The peace must make provision for an organization to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing underlying conditions.

IV

The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.

V

The peace must establish the procedures for controlling military establishments everywhere.

VI

The peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty. (Minutes, PCUSA, 1943, Part I, p. 200.)

The world has still a long way to go to make these principles truly operative. To a great degree they stem from a view of international possibilities that may not be characteristic of the real world. The end of the second world war corresponded with the beginning of the nuclear age. The two major powers which were allies for victory in that war found themselves at loggerheads with one another. The resulting titanic standoff shook confidence in liberal perspectives. Even Dulles, when serving as secretary of state, became a cold war antagonist.

For several decades, subsequent ecumenical commissions and study conferences focused on the morality and use of nuclear weapons, the peaceful uses of outer space, the achievement of peace, and the conditions necessary for dealing with rapid social change. However, the thinking of many theologians shifted away from creating peace toward dealing with the moral issues of conflict, particularly the possible moral dilemmas of nuclear war. For a number of years most of this thinking was done primarily by individuals rather than by ecumenically sponsored groups. The literature dealing with just war theory grew in contrast to antiwar literature. On one side, much of this thinking drew heavily from a so-called realist understanding of international affairs that focused more on the reality of power than on the ideal of political cooperation. On the other side, much was influenced by a pacifist morality.

The cold war was intensely real, but it also encouraged many illusions and unproductive antagonisms. The contest between the United States and the Soviet Union did not produce a world war, but it forced other countries to choose sides rather than deal with real and pressing internal problems. Wars in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Latin Americas all became subordinate to episodes of the larger confrontation. Greeks, Koreans, Vietnamese, Afghans, Iranians, Salvadorans, Nicaraguans, Indonesians, Guatemalans, Angolans, Ethiopians, Cubans, and countless others were drawn into the larger conflict. U.S. foreign aid, which under initial programs

like Point Four was directed to establishing viable economic well-being in places of enormous need, came to be an instrument of pressure designed to strengthen those on our side in the cold war. The world has paid the economic price, for many nations that were not aligned with the United States in the cold war often remained in or slipped into economic impoverishment. As these processes unfolded through the decades, fear in the industrial world of nuclear war far outweighed concerns for economic justice and the building of international instruments for a just and peaceful order.

In recent years, however, significant studies by several individual church groups have appeared to help overcome this general dearth of moral thinking about international affairs. Roman Catholics sought to deepen their theology of peace in the document *The Challenge of Peace*, issued by the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1983. The bishops of the United Methodist Church produced a somewhat similar document, entitled *In Defense of Creation*, three years later. Although these groups looked at the world situation broadly, both of these documents enunciated a moral judgment concerning the moral illegitimacy of nuclear weaponry. The media picked up on that aspect of these works more than the portions of those documents that focused on the mandate to make peace, so in a certain sense the result was to continue to focus more on the morality of warfare than on the mandate for peacemaking. The deliberations of the United Church of Christ, reported in *A Just Peace Church*, have probably attracted the attention more of scholars than of the general public since their primary thrust was to recast that denominational group as a just peace church. In 1985 the Presbyterians, in a document edited by Dana H. Wilbanks and Ronald H. Stone entitled *Presbyterians and Peacemaking: Are We Now Called to Resistance?*, studied the possibility of active Christian resistance to national policies depending upon the overt threat to use nuclear weapons and the extension of militarism into the formation of all levels of national policies.

Although there was much informal interaction between the groups that drew up these statements by individual denominations, no official ecumenical study group was ever formed to replicate the work of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace sponsored by the National Council of Churches in the 1940's. The main reflection done during this period was sponsored by the World Council of Churches on the theme: Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation. The impact of this study was possibly diminished by the fact that ecumenical groups were steadily losing their visibility in the public realm and many of the denominations came to be preoccupied with problems affecting their own internal life.

In the absence of major official studies and pronouncements by the major ecumenical bodies, other religious groups have been addressing issues concerning intervention for humanitarian purposes and the warrant for peacekeeping. For example, in 1994 a task force of the Program for Humanitarian Assistance of the World Conference on Religion and Peace published a pamphlet entitled "The Mohonk Criteria for Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies." This document strongly asserts the right of nations or groups to request and receive humanitarian aid and declares that "Humanitarian agencies have the right to offer and deliver that humanitarian aid where needed, consistent with universal principles embodied in international and human rights law."¹

The thrust of this document is to emphasize the truly compassionate nature of humanitarian assistance and to keep it as untainted as possible from the political and military agendas of nation states. It emphatically repudiates the traditional premise that national sovereignty can be used to permit nation states to refuse to open their borders to humanitarian aid when there has been a breakdown in life-sustaining conditions. Although the primary thrust of this document is to insure openness for humanitarian organizations to render aid where and when needed, it does not ignore the place of political and military actions by nation states and international organizations intended for peacekeeping and peace enforcement activities. It calls for coordination between agencies rendering humanitarian aid and those involved in diplomatic and military actions to achieve and/or maintain peace. It urges that any use of military force for peacekeeping activities fully respect the work of agencies rendering humanitarian aid and seeks to insure that such agencies are provided freedom and protection to carry on their work. It calls for the development of appropriate rules of engagement for peacekeeping activities to assure that international norms regarding human rights are observed. The premise of this document seems to be that humanitarian aid ought to be rendered primarily (if not entirely) by nongovernmental agencies solely to meet human needs. While it does not explicitly exclude the rendering of humanitarian need through the use of military forces, it does very little to suggest specific guidelines for determining when (or if) such activity is appropriate and the safeguards that should be observed if such activity occurs.

It is clear that one problem related to official or state sponsored aid or humanitarian assistance is the difficulty of separating such aid from the broadly strategic, political and economic agendas that governments invariably have. While this concern should not suggest a foreclosure of state aid, it does suggest that official aid is apt to be more acceptable if carried on under United Nations auspices or its related bodies, or where feasible by international recognized voluntary agencies. This also means that official aid be held up for constant scrutiny in order to avoid its use for the political ends of particular parties or governments.

Another group has been working outside of normal ecumenical channels to address the somewhat broader issues of peacemaking. It came together in the early 1990s under the prodding of Professor Glen Stassen, now of Fuller Theological Seminary. A number of the Christian ethicists who had been active in developing the study documents of several different denominations or who had authored a book dealing with peacemaking, were brought together to think further about the moral imperatives in this area. This group has developed ten suggestions for peacemaking with the title *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices to Abolish War* (to be published by Pilgrim Press in 1998).

This unofficial ecumenical study provides suggestive insights into the task of peace thinking in the new world situation. It proposes ten ideas or recommendations (or, as some prefer to call them, practice norms) for seeking a just peace. In order to build just peace, it is necessary to do the following:

(a) Recognize the growing importance of cooperative forces in the international system and a call to work with such forces to facilitate cooperative interaction between the various parts of the world. Such cooperative forces may be governmental or nongovernmental. Many of them have arisen as economic interchange between various parts of the

world has grown and as expanding means of communication have leaped the traditional boundaries of nation states.

(b) Strengthen the United Nations and other international efforts for cooperation and peace and support their efforts to intervene in places of turmoil and difficulty. Efforts to do this may involve an abridgment of absolute national sovereignty.

(c) Support the attempts to advance human rights, religious liberty, and democratic freedoms that generally contribute to peace.

(d) Foster just and sustainable economic development. Degraded environments and declining economic opportunities lead to refugee problems, conflicts over the allocations of resources, and civil contention that escalate into violence.

(e) Reduce the international traffic in armaments. The encouragement of massive arms trafficking, by the United States as well as other countries, only intensifies the likelihood that different nations or other groups will look to war as a means of adjudicating their grievances.

(f) Increase attention and give moral credence to the usefulness of nonviolent means of achieving social change and redressing evils. Such means of achieving social change have been successful under leaders, such as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., and in places like South Africa and Eastern Europe. Nonviolent direct action normally does less harm than violence, though embargoes and boycotts may on occasion cause great suffering.

(g) Encourage independent initiatives in order to reduce hostilities. Such initiatives, which should be undertaken openly and with a clear indication they are aimed at lowering the sense of threat, can encourage reciprocal responses.

(h) Utilize cooperative methods of conflict resolution. Awareness of the possibilities in such methods is crucial and training in its techniques should be expanded.

(i) Acknowledge responsibility for creating conditions that lead to conflict. Repentance and confession of wrongdoing are often crucial to reconciliation, whether between individuals or between groups, even within and between nations.

(j) Recognize and enhance the significant roles played by a vast array of citizen groups (voluntary associations) that are active in the international arena. The work of such groups often has staying power beyond that of particular administrations and not infrequently furnishes an avenue for the powerless to find a voice and to exert influence.

These principles are not new, though they collect into one place ideas that have been previously expressed in a variety of contexts. Some of them extend or sharpen the categories which Presbyterians have affirmed, not least in the document on just and sustainable human development adopted by the 208th General Assembly (1996) under the title *Hope for a Global Future: Toward Just and Sustainable Human Development*, which underscores the close

connection between economic and political factors in the development of a peaceful world order. Nor are these principles necessarily a complete statement of all that will be involved in just peacemaking. For instance, there is a need to place more emphasis on the importance of gender and racial equality in all aspects of international life. Ways must be found to recognize the importance of ethnic, religious, language, class, and cultural diversity in moving into a new world order. *Hope for a Global Future* already has pointed the direction for pursuing this discussion. Nevertheless, the ideas enunciated by this unofficial ecumenical group help us to think about criteria that need to be developed for thinking about the moral status of various peace-related actions and the use of military forces for humanitarian purposes. These principles or action guides provide a helpful instance of just peace thinking as distinct from thinking about the morality of war.

(3) On Sovereignty and Sin

Reformed theology has always stressed the sovereignty of God. As the very word “international” implies, relations between the peoples of this planet are most often (for the past five hundred years) thought to be encased in the assumption that a real “nation” is “sovereign” over its own affairs. In these days other claims to sovereignty have arisen from religious, cultural, and ethnic communities. The result is a world “order” of disorder, i.e. a world of clashing sovereignties.

Our theology cuts across this concept by asserting God’s sovereignty over the world, which, at minimum, relativizes all other claims to human sovereignty. This theological turn of mind should equip Christians in every nation, including the U.S.A., to question the political dogma—often voiced by national politicians—of national “self-determination.” Ironically enough, the major contemporary practical challenge to the feasibility of national sovereignty comes from globalizing economics. Cooperation, competition, and conflicts between interests now crisscross political borders, leaving governments with less power to control global economic forces. This development, of course, has good and bad consequences for various of the world’s peoples. Advocates of the Reformed tradition may discern in this economic phenomenon a sign of the work of a Sovereign who means to reconcile the whole of the human world.

Ours may be a time, therefore, when Christians, while being grateful for the services of national governments to human welfare, must sharpen their awareness of the circumstances in which cries of national autonomy hinder rather than promote the pursuit of justice and peace in the world. At stake here are new questions about the uses of power, multinational responsibilities, and authority that citizens feel bound to recognize: Should the United States consent to the jurisdiction of a World Court? Should soldiers in our military forces be asked to obey non-American officers? Should threats and the beginnings of genocide in any nation be permitted to continue when its government claims the right to “take care of our own affairs?”

Christians have intellectual and spiritual resources for thinking about these new questions. Reformed theology compels us to try to discern what it means concretely and contemporaneously to subject ourselves to the authority of God rather than to the authority of the individual self or some collective institution. We must try to discern what it means for nations (1) to be under God;

(2) to show due responsibility towards each other's interest; (3) to respect each other's right to determine some of their affairs; but also (4) to seek the justice and peace that are only possible when the nations defer to their common good and therefore—in our Christian view—defer more truly to the sovereignty of God.

The interactions of nation states exhibit group pride and greed to a very high degree. In the pursuit of national security and national economic success they override the lives and aspirations of other people. The human sin stemming from such claims is expressed with particular strength in international politics. The claim of any group to an absolute sovereignty for itself can be seen as a rebellion against the sovereignty of God. Nations have cried “peace, peace” while seeking only their own gain. Interventions can be hypocritically defended as for the good of humanity while designed to serve mostly national self-interest.

While recognizing that international interventions may disguise a multitude of sins, nevertheless, still there are exceptional cases that require international intervention to save significant numbers of human lives. Recognizing the history of Christian peace seeking, the reality of God's sovereignty and the presence of sin, this paper seeks to surround our considerations of international interventions with moral criteria, constraining its exercise with the refinement of appropriate norms.

c. Developing Criteria for Military Intervention for Humanitarian Reasons in the Context of Just Peacemaking

The idea of just peacemaking will involve a shift from all the traditional views that have developed about the morality of armed conflict. To propose criteria for creating conditions of justice and mutual trust between international groups is an even more challenging task than dealing with the dilemmas posed for a Christian ethic of love by the presence of armed conflict between sovereign nations. However, some moral insights from each of the four positions that have characterized Christian attitudes toward war may be potentially useful; others will need to be significantly transformed, if not altogether abandoned. Although the terminology seems to establish a more or less direct connection from “just war” to “just peace,” a just peace ethic will not be a simple recasting of just war theory, but a new kind of thinking that draws its inspiration from all of the serious moral thinking that has been present in a diverse Christian heritage. It may help to address this matter under two rubrics: (a) military intervention for humanitarian purposes; and, (b) the use of military force in peacekeeping actions. Both of these new developments reconfigure the moral issues in slightly different yet equally important ways.

(1) Regarding Intervention for Humanitarian Purposes

Just peacemaking recognizes that there are human disasters that call for emergency responses. The time is passing when any single nation, citing sovereign autonomy, can allow its citizens to suffer privation or chaos without calling forth responses from other members of the community of nations. This means that members of the world community will not always stand aside while serious hunger, momentous refugee migration, or violations of basic human rights go on. In a response somewhat like that of the agonized participant, people may come to recognize that the human misery in a particular situation is so momentous that it simply has to be dealt with

by whatever just and appropriate means are at hand for the purpose, even when that involves breaching the sovereignty of some nation or group.

Humanitarian aid must often be started as quickly as possible. There are private and quasi-public agencies, known as nongovernmental agencies, that can be rather quickly deployed to meet humanitarian needs. But there are disasters of such magnitude as to call for extraordinary responses. As the television screen portrays such suffering it is quite natural for the public to accept the use of military forces to bring relief to places where the need is very great. Such uses of the military appeal because they can be quick and presumably effective and because, in some instances, there are enormous resources with which to work. They also raise issues, not least because the dangers and temptations of strong nations to misuse massive power are very great. Nations can rationalize the need for intervention on humanitarian grounds when indeed they are mainly preserving some vital self-interest.

In looking at these issues, it is well worth noting the efforts of our own nation's National Security Council to develop criteria that it should utilize for judging whether or not the United States should intervene in situations of need and crisis in the new world situation. A major policy document entitled, "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," was published by the White House in May 1997. In this document the government of the United States outlined the circumstances when the United States military may provide "appropriate and necessary humanitarian assistance," possibly even on its own. These circumstances include:

- "Natural or manmade disasters" that dwarfs the ability of the normal relief agencies to respond (The White House, "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," May 1997, pp. 11–12). A distinct example of this type of intervention was the deployment of logistics personnel to Eastern Zaire in 1995, in response to the flood of Rwandan refugees, which at first, overwhelmed the ability of relief agencies to cope with the tide of uprooted human beings.

- A situation in which "the need for relief is urgent and the military has a unique ability to respond quickly" (The White House, "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," May 1997, pp. 11–12). With its inherent rapid response capability, the U.S. military is often the world's only agency that can provide urgent, large-scale aerial transport, sea lift, communications, and information support in response to a rapidly developing crisis.

- "The U.S. mission is to be narrowly defined with minimal risk to American lives" (The White House, "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," May 1997, pp. 11–12). The National Security Council has developed this criterion to avoid the use of military forces in mainly political circumstances and to avoid the slow expansion of the mission from humanitarian assistance to an internal police function, referred to as "mission creep." The phrase "minimal risk to American lives," remains as a vestige of the Vietnam Syndrome and the provision that technological rather than personal resources be expended remains as an aftermath of the public mood during Persian Gulf War.

- "The United States may intervene when the costs and risks are commensurate with the stakes involved and when there is reason to believe that our action can make a real difference"

(The White House, “A National Security Strategy for a New Century,” May 1997, pp. 11–12). This careful phrasing leaves open the need for a case-by-case analysis of each crisis and a careful weighing of the possible consequences by senior decision makers.

· “Such efforts by the United States and the international community will be limited in duration and designed to give the affected country the opportunity to put its house in order” (The White House, “A National Security Strategy for a New Century,” May 1997, pp. 11–12). This qualification reflects a recognition that the affected nations must bear the responsibility for addressing the root causes of the crisis that brings on the temporary intervention.

· “The United States cannot long sustain a commitment without the support of the public, and close consultations with Congress are important in this effort.”²

Other writings on United States military intervention for humanitarian purposes address the “acceptability,” “feasibility,” and “suitability” of a contemplated operation. Acceptability refers to the support that is likely from Congress, the media, and the American people. It also implies international or coalition support—important in any case and crucial if the operation involves other nations. Highly variable factors will affect prudential judgments about acceptability, such as: Is it an election year? Is the operation likely to succeed quickly? Determining feasibility means reaching a judgment as to whether the operation is “doable” with existing military forces. Will the proposed use of military force promote the desired outcome? Suitability addresses whether or not the United States has sufficient credibility for the action. Does it have a “history” of actions in a particular situation that would prejudice the chance for success? Would United States forces be the target for direct attacks because of anti-U.S. feelings in a particular region?³

These criteria, of course, are drawn up from the perspective of one country—a country with the necessary military strength to take initiatives most other nations cannot even contemplate. They do not reflect a sufficiently international perspective to be adequate for the world scene as a whole. But they do embody many of the prudential elements that can be discerned in just war teaching and apply them to a new set of circumstances and a new kind of military undertaking.

However, the conditions under which the use of military capability for humanitarian intervention is warranted must be truly extraordinary. The use of the military for humanitarian interventions must not preempt the role and significance of the nongovernmental groups that are dedicated to such purposes. Such interventions must not have any punitive dimensions and should be as free as possible from the use of violence or coercion. They must be conducted in fully public ways and have strong support from the community of nations. They must be available to all groups in extraordinary circumstances and not be a tool of diplomatic pressure. Such actions must not be undertaken to provide the armed forces of any country which are trained primarily to fight wars merely with alternative missions during peacetime.

(2) Regarding Peacekeeping and Even Peace Building and Peace Enforcing Uses of Military Power

As we have noted above, the United Nations has been engaged in a slowly evolving pattern of intervening by military means in various trouble spots around the world for the purpose of maintaining peace agreements that have been established by diplomatic means and even for using a military presence to nudge diplomatic processes toward desired consummations. Basically such activities are proactive, or at least more proactive than traditional uses of military force for self-defense or to resist aggression. These actions call for a somewhat more thoughtful and qualified judgment than the use of military forces for humanitarian purposes (which may be legitimized by appealing to little more than mere goodwill).

Peacekeeping may involve more than maintaining a military presence. Peace building and peace enforcement involve an exercise of pressure but still something different from the conduct of warfare aimed at coercing recalcitrant groups into submission against their will. All these engagements seek to eliminate violence as much as possible, not to maximize violence in order to win victories. Thus, while they share with both the ethic of the just war and agonized participation a willingness to accept the use of military means, they also incorporate a thrust to minimize (ideally, to avoid) the use of violence as a means for solving international disputes. In this they have affinities with Christian pacifist alternatives. Such engagements do not entail the deliberate arms buildups that are associated with uses of military power to deter possible aggressors. They are efforts of an organized world community to respond collectively to crises rather than efforts of individual states to deter potential enemies or to serve national interests by the use of force. They at least permit, and perhaps even encourage, searches for alternative solutions to conflict even after they are undertaken.

Some of the principles that have been developed in just war teaching in the effort to establish moral judgments about the use of force may offer suggestive guidance for thinking about the legitimacy of peace-related uses of military power, but only with considerable reconceptualizing. For instance, just peace thinking prompts the taking of transforming initiatives, which means that the criterion of the just war tradition that speaks about last resort is not adequate to the situation. Initiatives may need to be taken before a situation deteriorates into genocidal, civil, or international conflict.

Initiatives ranging from preventive diplomacy to establishing an international presence in a world trouble spot can be taken to pursue peace. It makes little sense to think of activities designed to achieve peace as valid only as last resorts. The literature about peace-seeking activities talks about taking initiatives, not necessarily holding back. Many actions designed to further peace should be seen as first priorities not as last resorts. Humanitarian intervention may be far more sensible as early action to stave off a calamity than as a response to horrors that have become extreme.

Although this is the case morally, the logistical reality is that many of the things done to preserve peace have been last-ditch actions, dragging nations reluctantly into joint actions with humanitarian purposes. Misery has to be massive before the nations respond; the breakdown of civil order almost calamitous to call various forms of peace-related strategies into play. There is probably no immediate likelihood that the responses to conditions of misery and disorder that threaten various parts of the world will be dealt with too quickly rather than not quickly enough.

Intervention is tricky business. Overzealousness can violate the integrity and autonomy of other groups. It can raise resentments, even if an intervention is intended to aid rather than destroy a particular party. Efforts to help others can be premature as well as too late. Timing becomes morally significant, which means the appropriateness of intervention may depend upon facing a particular situation with sensitivity rather than going through a check list of conditions. That sensitivity will flow from a statecraft that is aware of the dynamic and contingent fortunes of nations and peoples.

The just war tradition has also specified that war can be morally acceptable only for just causes, that it must be undertaken with the right intentions, that it must be instigated by a legitimate authority, and that it must have a reasonable chance of success.

These various measures, which may establish some justice regarding the cause and conduct of war, have counterparts in conditions that may help to determine the nature of just peace. Clearly peace requires justice. Attention must increasingly be given to establishing conditions in the world that insure the fair treatment of people. This means that peace is closely connected with economic policies that foster just and sustainable human development. Peace also requires respect for human rights; efforts to establish peace that put down violence by curtailing human rights would be unacceptable.

Similarly, war can be just only if undertaken for the right intentions (or right attitudes). In the case of the just war tradition this precludes using war merely to settle grudges. It also precludes going to war for national prestige or for economic advantage. Although peace-related actions are less likely to be started from such malintentions, it is important to consider the attitudes that should be associated with them. These include compassionate concern for the welfare of all peoples in the world and a professionalism that ensures disciplined behavior in peacekeeping forces.

The stipulation that international war can be just only if declared by legitimate authority has traditionally meant it must be undertaken only by the national sovereign, whether king or parliament, president or congress. In the case of peace-seeking activities, there is every reason to enlarge this concept of legitimate authority to involve the sanction of an international organization, of which the United Nations is the most visible present instance.

At the United Nations, the power and authority for intervention are vested with the Security Council with its fifteen member states. That body represents in clear terms where global power rests, but therein lies the issue of its own legitimacy. Created at the end of World War II, the five principle wartime allies, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, France, and China, were given status as permanent members with veto power over any Security Council action. The Security Council is now composed of fifteen members, the permanent five, plus ten countries serving in groups of five, two-year, staggered terms. Each set of five tends to be chosen from regional groups.

This very situation raises, for many, questions about its legitimate authority. The voting is not democratic or truly representative. Not only can one of five prevent any action, those five

singly or in concert are frequently in position to influence the votes of the other states. For instance, many argued that the United States was able to use its economic weight to secure support for the role of the Persian Gulf War coalition.

Consequently, the structure and membership of the Security Council are under review: some calling for eliminating or restructuring the veto power; others call for increasing the number of permanent members with or without veto power, while increasing the number of rotating members by five or seven.

Thus, the decision making of the UN to intervene in its multiple forms is controlled by a Security Council whose own role is challenged. The challenge for the future of the United Nations includes, therefore, some equitable adjustment of the Security Council, strengthening the role of the General Assembly, operating with openness in critical decisions, and strengthening checks and balances to prevent abuse of power.

Chapter seven of the charter of the United Nations restricts its powers to meeting “threats to peace” in order to maintain or restore international security and peace, but also recognizes the right of regional groups to act to protect peace and security. Obviously, these rights of intervention and defense are utilized with some latitude, and perhaps that latitude is broadening in some respects and narrowing in others as the United Nations engages in military intervention under the provisions of chapter seven. To date the United Nations has drawn its peacekeeping forces from the armed services of member nations. Some people suggest the UN should have its own standing military units, ready for deployment immediately. But others feel that the present system has a unique credibility because it makes peacekeeping a function of the world community, which must concur in sponsoring the action. An alternative to standing military units of the United Nations would be for individual countries to provide standby military units specially trained for peacekeeping missions, on immediate call.

Just war teaching has also offered criteria by which certain operations within war can be judged acceptable or unacceptable. Military actions, particularly destructive ones, must meet a test of proportionality, that is the benefits must be sufficient to justify the destruction required to achieve them. Every intervention is costly, both to those who do the intervening and to those whose affairs are affected. Applying the test of proportionality in the case of peace-seeking actions will involve taking stock, not only of degrees of destruction, but of social and human disruptions. Although every humanitarian deed that alleviates suffering is momentarily valuable as a moral action, considerations of cost in relationship to benefits are bound to govern decisions made by political authorities.

Just war teaching also insists that the parties to a conflict must respect the immunity of noncombatants. This has been a traditional teaching, though since warfare has come to include bombing of cities, it is a point honored more in theory than in practice. Ideally, in peace-related actions all parties are noncombatants. Since the aim is to reduce violence rather than subjugate wrongdoers, respect for noncombatants would seem to be a central aspect of most peace-seeking efforts. However, serious moral questions about the use of embargoes and sanctions arise under this principle. While these are usually viewed as preferable to violent combat (and are sometimes

used for peace-related purposes) it is the case that they inflict huge costs on populations rather than on the rulers who are being pressured to change their policies. Embargoes and sanctions in peacekeeping can raise the same kind of issues with respect to noncombatant immunity as does widespread use of aerial bombing in warfare. Those who are not significantly involved in threatening peace should not be made pawns in the process of exerting pressure on those who are.

Christian reflection on issues of this sort may involve several levels of reflection and commitment. It can appeal directly to biblical patterns, as when it cites the love commandment and the example of the early church. Another level Christian reflection is more prudential and rational. This does not mean that such reflection is simply secular, for it expresses a profound concern to be faithful and responsible in dealing with the world, with the stuff of politics and with social interactions about which God cares profoundly. After all, the Bible teaches us that God is concerned about what takes place in these realms, and that God works through the likes of kings and princes who handle practical affairs to accomplish morally meaningful outcomes. Although not necessarily couched in biblical language, teaching about just peace thinking will be faithful to the Bible's understanding of human responsibility for historical affairs. It will draw upon political and prudential wisdom to judge what is appropriate and possible in the exercise of the God-given responsibility to be members of a human community. To be sure, it will not settle for a minimally demanding vision of political life, nor will it subsume all considerations under rational and prudential tests, but it does not have to be narrowly scriptural or explicitly theological to have a claim on the church's loyalty.

Clearly the search for peace requires a dedication comparable in scope and intensity to the sacrifices associated with war. Attention must be given to establishing conditions in the world that insure the fair treatment of people regardless of their social standing or economic clout. It also means that various methods of resolving conflicts that have been successfully used by aggrieved groups to secure themselves greater justice—such as nonviolent direct action—need to be explored as possible ways of exerting pressure. It means being suspicious of the hegemony of powerful nations without requiring them to simply abdicate all responsibility for acting for peace and justice in the world.

All of the foregoing ideas, which do not arrange themselves into a neat new theory, provide a framework within which this task force has drawn up its recommendations. This paper, together with those recommendations, offers something more like a report of work in progress than a significant new set of guiding principles. The result is a call for a continuing process rather than a moral stand with fixed ideas, but that call points to the directions in which any ongoing thinking should move.

The recommendations that accompany this paper presuppose the strengthening of a commitment to an international rather than a national framework. Only when factors of time or logistics prevent the sometimes lengthy process of soliciting international support for peace related activities are unilateral decisions by single nations defensible. Every effort should be made to enhance the international community's decision and response time in order to eliminate the unilateral option. International discussion is a necessary check on unilateral motive and method. We must welcome, not resent, the check that international discussion can offer to our own

perceptions of what is required.

The recommendations we make also call attention to the various forms of injustice—economic, class, racial, and gender. Unlike just war teaching, which has too often tended to focus too narrowly on the specific moral issue of using violent means to achieve political aims, just peace thinking must be taken as a holistic concern. Hence, it involves a shifting from a reactive stance (which considers whether or not a particular kind of action is legitimate once it has arisen) to a proactive stance (which thinks ahead as to what can be done to prevent the rise of a moral problem).

Although this background paper suggests that the use of military units for humanitarian intervention and for peacekeeping purposes can be morally warranted in appropriate cases more readily than combat roles for the military, we acknowledge the fact that some individuals will differ from this conclusion on the grounds that any use of military force is immoral. We believe that the church's support for conscientious objection to military service should in no way be eroded by the changes occurring in the use of military units for peace-related and humanitarian purposes.

d. Concluding Observations

Although many new understandings as to the moral standings of intervention for humanitarian purposes will probably emerge from the experience that accrues from its exercise, no thoughtful analysis will come merely from raw experience itself. Only as that experience is thoughtfully scrutinized in light of the moral understandings that are part of the social, political, and religious heritage of the world, will our judgments be sobered and our understandings enriched.

Though Christian just war theory emerged from a Western cultural context and applied mainly to Western political theorizing, the development of just peace theory is broader in scope, inclusive of insights presented from across the globe.

What contribution, then, can the Christian heritage make to thinking about the new world order and the responsibilities it demands?

First, the prophetic heritage of which we are heirs requires that all human actions be subject to moral analysis and judgment. Although intervention for humanitarian purposes probably has a presumption of legitimacy that intervention for other reasons (such as aggression) does not have, it cannot be automatically declared legitimate.

- Intervention must respond to a real and genuine need that cannot be met by other means.

- It must have a reasonable chance of alleviating the conditions it seeks to overcome.

- It must constitute humanitarian rescue and not cloak the pursuit of the economic or

narrow security interests of the intervening powers.

- Intervention, whenever possible, should have international auspices in order to achieve the greatest presumption of legitimacy;

- It should advance the general welfare of all the inhabitants of the region in question and not become a tool by which powerful elites further cement their power.

Intervention should involve the minimum degree of coercion necessary to achieve the purposes of the action;

Intervention in the forms of punitive sanctions should be targeted against those in authority rather than against broad population groups.

Second, we must recognize that it is difficult to discern all the consequences of massive political and military ventures. This makes careful discernment imperative, and willingness to revise policies in light of experience necessary. While resolve is crucial, as it is in all moral action, so is humility. Caution about the use of military force is always in order, yet the impulse of much political life is to stress the need for resolute action and determined resolve in ways that go against the very moral questioning that is crucial to the prophetic function. Single nations that undertake military intervention for humanitarian purposes probably run a greater risk of throwing moral caution to the wind than do forces that are deployed at the behest of the United Nations. But even international groups can get so carried away by the sense of purpose as to become blind to the moral problematic involved or be manipulated by powerful members for narrow economic or political purposes.

There is bound to be something of a tension between the need to keep all peacekeeping activities under moral scrutiny and the need to endure the complexities and agonies involved with resolution. Moral scrutiny of a given venture may seem to undercut the impulse to carry through with that same venture regardless of troublesome adversities. Churches can help to nurture the political maturity that can live creatively with such a tension, avoiding both a proud tenacity that hangs on despite all difficulties and a superficial commitment that evaporates at the first serious obstacles. We may not have all the insights and practice to do what is needed, but it is well to recognize the need to cultivate further the sophistication that will be required. Traditional just war teaching makes a point of entering conflict with the right intentions. That has generally been understood to rule out vindictiveness or self-aggrandizement. The pursuit of just peace enlarges the concerns beyond just war teaching. Not only must vindictiveness be avoided; wise discernment and enormous patience will be called for.

Third, it has long been understood that war requires sacrifices and has high costs. It is tempting to think that peacemaking activities will be less costly and bring about results more quickly. For example, it has been the tendency of administrations that undertake peacemaking or peacekeeping roles, whether unilaterally or in conjunction with the United Nations, to set in advance time schedules for withdrawal. Such time limits, which surely would never be appropriate in normal military operations, may not be appropriate for peacekeeping ones. They can tempt

troublemaking parties to wait out the intervention and regroup for emergence when the announced time limit is up. The public tends to condone peacekeeping ventures until some loss of life is entailed, in which case the temptation to cease and desist may arise far more readily than it would in the case of traditional military operations. There are no quick fixes in peace anymore than there are costless wars.

Finally, it is important to affirm confidence in the existence of a cosmic intentionality for human well-being. Peacemaking presupposes that God wills human well-being, that the divine sovereignty supports efforts to improve human conditions and human relationships. Peacemaking and peacekeeping (with all the military, political, social, and spiritual resources that are entailed) can only thrive on a conviction, through God's providential sovereignty, that as humans struggle for justice the world will move toward greater international harmony and profounder experiences of a beneficial well-being than it has known in the past. Such advances will be marked by a justice in which freedom and equity are the touchstones and by a social order that is an instrument of liberation and community.

Appendix

- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Long, Edward L, Jr. *Peace Thinking in a Warring World*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1983.
- Shriver, Donald W., Jr. *An Ethic for Enemies: Forgiveness in Politics*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Stassen, Glen. *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices to Abolish War*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1998.
- Stone, Ronald. *Christian Realism and U.S. Peacemaking: Issues in Foreign Policy*. Nashville: Abington Press, 1988.
- Thistlethwaite, Susan, editor. *A Just Peace Church: The Peace Theory Development Team*. New York: United Church of Christ Press, 1986.
- The United Methodist Council of Bishops. *In Defense of Creation*. Nashville: Graded Press, 1988.