

TOWARD A CHANGE OF PARADIGM AND MORAL RESPONSE FOR PEACE IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS IN THE WORLD TODAY

CARLOS G. RONQUILLO

This paper situates Catholic social teaching on addressing social conflict and violence in the light of recent global events. Conflict, war and peace have been constant themes in the Church's policy and theological reflection, as exemplified in early canons about Christians' participation in military service, and Augustine's doctrine on the "just war". Changes in the situation of the modern world, especially after the Second World War, however, necessitates a reevaluation of Catholic perspectives on war and violence to better respond to technological and socio-political developments. The two established perspectives in Catholic social teaching – the theory of the "just war" and "pacifism" – emphasize key, though different, dimensions of the moral-theological tradition of the Catholic Church. This paper argues that, in the light of the increasingly complex and dangerous dimensions of modern warfare, the Catholic position on conflict and violence ought to emphasize the Christian tradition as a continuous impetus toward peacebuilding, and the increasing legitimacy of conscientious objection to war and Christian pacifism.

INTRODUCTION

Both in the fields of lived morality and ethical discourse there is a force brought about by the tension between historical reality and the Reign of God. Both the moral decision of a believer and the theological and moral discourse ought to make the Kingdom of God historically possible. In other words, the two must endeavor to transform human history in accordance with the values of the Kingdom.

In this reflection, the Kingdom of God is seen to be concretized in the evangelical value of peace, while human history

refers to responses to prevailing social conflicts among nations and in the world. This is the limitation that I wish to make to look into the question of the response to violence in the field of national and global relationships.

How can we bring about the integration of the Kingdom of God and human history in the face of social conflicts in the world today? Theoretically speaking, it is easy to know the evangelical ideal of peace, as well as actually-existing conflicts existing among nations. What is difficult to accomplish concerns the way we can articulate a praxis or discourse wherein the interaction of the two poles of the Kingdom and human history is maintained.

The argument I wish to forward in this paper is the necessity of changing paradigms to enable a theological and moral response to prevailing social conflicts, consequently shedding light to the value of peace for the present and future situation of humanity. By proposing this, I push for a re-thinking of the Catholic social teaching in the traditional propositions of approaches to social conflict: non-violent and violent.

In order to achieve this aim, I briefly analyze the history of Christian attitudes and praxis toward social conflicts. Then I will analyze at least three paradigms used from the Second World War to the present to think of the morality of the various responses to inter-state and world conflicts. Having done this, I outline the proposal for peacebuilding that transcends general fidelity to the just war tradition. By way of conclusion, I will point out some lacunae that peacebuilding in the Catholic social teaching must address.

PREVAILING CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE AND PRAXIS IN CONFRONTING SOCIAL CONFLICTS

Christian history has been conscious of the power and the need to make judgments and realize practices that will make the messianic and evangelical values of the Kingdom of God present in situations of social conflicts. However, a question crops under this dispensation: where can we find those discourses and to where do those practices refer themselves?

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), in their pastoral letter *The Challenge to Peace: God's Promise and Our Response* (1983), articulates the complex characteristic of the Christian tradition in responding to war and peace:

The Catholic tradition on war and peace is a long and complex one, reaching from the Sermon on the Mount to the statements of Pope John Paul II. Its development cannot be sketched in a straight line and it seldom gives a simple answer to complex questions. It speaks through many voices and has produced multiple forms of religious witness (no. 7).

If we are to scrutinize the many expressions of the Catholic tradition regarding war and peace, we can arrive at two traditional types. The first would conform to expressions that opt for pacifist strategies, and the latter would prefer strategies of rationalization or moralization of violence as a lesser evil in order that a greater evil in society may be addressed. What we shall do in the following section is to have a quick glance at history with aim of noting the simultaneous presence of the two different options, pacifist strategies and violent strategies in important periods of Christian history.

The attitudes and practices of early Christians were not only varied, but were also, at times, contradictory. Some Christians understood the Gospel as prohibiting any form of causing death, the use of arms and military service tending toward military actions. Many suffered martyrdom by refusing to comply with idolatrous demands or due to fear in spilling blood inherent in military service to the empire.

With the passage of Christianity from a persecuted sect to the official religion of the Roman Empire, there came a qualitative change in understanding and practice of confronting social violence. Christianity easily adapted to the military structures and institutions. Tertullian was the first Father of the Church who addressed the question of the presence of Christians in military service, giving it a positive appreciation. However, with

his conversion to Montanism, he took the opposite view relative to military service.

The Church, during the first three centuries, did not take any official stance in rejecting or accepting military service. The Church simply observed the progress faith was making among the Roman legions. The Council of Elvira in 305 AD never questioned military service. What it did was to recognize the positive presence of Christians in their various works in the military. It was the Council of Arles in 314 AD that made an official stance in favor of military service; it engaged Christians to render faithful service to the Empire, with threats of excommunication should they abandon their posts especially during times of peace.

During the Middle Ages, Christianity generally lived by social strategies of violence due to the bellicose nature of Germanic tribes. While it contributed justifications, orientations, and limits on wars, Christianity generally did not eliminate the reality of war. It was in that period that Thomas Aquinas consolidated the just war theory, which in turn gave a push to religious justification of religious wars, especially the Crusades. Likewise, big boost to military service during that era occurred. Military service was Christianized, professions connected to war were blessed, and religious military orders surfaced. All these contributed to the ideal of the “Christian soldier.”

There were also pacifist strategies. The same epoch witnessed evangelical pacifism echoing loudly and giving rise to practices in favor of peace. St. Francis is the prominent figure of non-violence during the Middle Ages. The Church used its power as international organization to limit new arms and the intensification of war conflicts. The Second Lateran Council in 1139 prohibited the use of crossbow against Christians but it did not oppose its use against Muslims (then called *infidels*). Likewise, during that period the *Peace of God* movement became popular. It applied spiritual sanctions to limit the violence of war. Coming with that movement was the *Truce of God*, which was an accord entered into by warring factions declaring cessation of hostilities during certain times of the year. Going the tide of non-violence, the Council of Charroux (989) gave official ranks in the Church

to those who would protect its properties and the agrarian economic base against the disasters of war.

The theoretical enrichment of the just war theology happened in the modern period through the theologians of Thomistic Enlightenment, the School of Salamanca (F. Vitorio), and the Jesuit theologians (F. Suarez and L. de Molina). However, there were also those who towed the pacifist line, for instance Luis Vives, Tomas Moro, and others. Erasmus was the defender of pacifism, as shown in his work *Querela pacis* (1517). Martin Luther, utilizing the insights of Tertullian, took an absolute pacifist line, affirming that Christians must not take arms against the Turks.

In the contemporary era, there are many known Christian stances regarding strategies of violence. This does not mean that those postures do not recognize or value pacifist strategies. In the recent past, we find many non-Christian personalities who witnessed to a pacifist stance, like Mahatma Gandhi. From the Protestant side, Martin Luther King cannot be forgotten. On the Catholic side, the resounding pacifist voice of Dom Helder Camara and other conciliar fathers during the Second Vatican Council were heard. It was also during the Council that the notion of the conscientious objector, that is, those who, in conscience, is opposed to war and military service, surfaced. In The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et spes*), we read:

Moreover, it seems right that laws make humane provisions for the case of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided, however, that they agree to serve the human community in some other way (no. 79).

Later, the conscientious objection movement would bend toward non-submission. This is the one that is charged with personal attitude and practice of pacifism.

While those non-violent attitudes and practices prevail, we cannot deny the many events of wars and violence in the recent past that spawned different reactions within the Catholic Church, particularly towards a bias for legitimate violence.

A COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE TWO TRADITIONS

It is necessary to point out that at the heart of the two traditions is the realization of peace. Both traditions affirm what John XXIII's *Pacem in terris* says: "Peace on Earth which man throughout the ages has so longed for and sought after" (PT 1). This is also the orientation of the different strategies which Christianity adopted in the course of its history.

By way of evaluation, one can say that the pacifist tradition is closer to the evangelical message of peace, and it expresses the demands of the Kingdom better. If one takes as referent the messianic peace, it is normal to oppose war. On the other hand, the tradition that supports the strategies of violent response to social conflicts is more sensible, given the laments of history. In understanding the strategies of violence in history, we take the presumption of the principle of legitimate defense. Legitimate defense has given rise to more functional and efficient strategies in history.

In sum, we can say that, first, pacifism looks more on the utopia of the Kingdom and legitimate defense focuses on the immediate reality of history. Second, one has an eschatological functionality that is long-term, and the other possesses a historical efficacy and is therefore short term. Third, one presents itself with charismatic features and therefore is sustained more by individual agents; the other offers itself as the more coherent solution to the ordinary human condition and, therefore, is sustained by collective subjects. A good assessment of the two traditions was done by *Challenge for Peace*:

While the just-war teaching has clearly been in possession for the past 1,500 years of Catholic thought, the "new moment" in which we find ourselves sees the just-war teaching and non-violence as distinct but interdependent methods of evaluating warfare. They diverge on some specific conclusions, but they share a common presumption against the use of force as a means of settling disputes. Both find their roots in the Christian theological tradition; each contributes to the full moral vision we need in pursuit of a

human peace. We believe the two perspectives support and complement one another, each preserving the other from distortion. Finally, in an age of technological warfare, analysis from the viewpoint of non-violence and analysis from the viewpoint of the just-war teaching often converge and agree in their opposition to methods of warfare which are in fact indistinguishable from total warfare (nos. 120-121).

As regards the present and future of the two strategies that are linked to the morality of violence, we can make these annotations. Without entering into the exposition of the ideological presuppositions of the attitude of the pacifist and active non-violent movement, we can maintain the constant validity of this alternative within the circle of social violence in general and war in particular. However, this validity must reckon with these conditions. It must be active, that is, it denounces, opposes, and struggles against structural violence. Also, it does not fall into a romantic attitude and movement or an illusory utopia, but rather it inserts itself in the possibility of what is real. In like manner, it acts not only with a personal-prophetic stance, but as social and historical movement; and lastly, it is capable of being translated into a serious program of strategies and tactics taking the path of winning over unjust violence.

The acceptance of pacifist and active non-violence strategies does not mean that they alone can reach or realize the good of peace in this world that is too complex and is surrounded by structures of power. We can understand the pacifist option as proper to “charismatic personalities” who can work for justice and peace utilizing non-violent means. In any case, I will refer in the succeeding discussions exclusively strategies linked with the use of violence to counter a greater violence.

MORAL PARADIGMS RESPONDING TO CONFLICTS AMONG NATIONS AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Catholic Church in its moral theology and in its magisterium has thought about, evaluated and oriented war using

different paradigms in history. We can name at least three of them: the just war theory; the legitimate defense; the humanitarian intervention; the preventive war. The just war moral theory marked by elements of the Christian tradition and with factors from the Greek philosophy and the Roman jurisprudence was started by Ambrose and Augustine. It was later systematized by Thomas Aquinas. During the modern era, it was applied to new situations of the modern sovereign states and to wars of colonization by the School of Salamanca (Francisco de Vitoria), the Jesuit School (F. Suarez and L. de Molina). It was repeatedly used but not deepened by Catholic moral theology until the time of Pius X.

The just war tradition has been the unique expression of the Christian attitude on war and violence for many centuries. It is an attitude that is hanging between an absolute no to all wars, consequently demanding for radical pacifism, and the consideration of war as a reality within the field of morality and, therefore, constitutes itself as a political question. At the heart of the just war theory are the conditions which can make a war just. The first set of these conditions refer to the decision to go war (*ius ad bellum*, or conditions for a just war) and this will require the following criteria to be met: legitimate authority, just cause, and right intention.

Legitimate authority means that evaluation of the condition for moral legitimacy of the war does not belong to individuals or to social associations or to a supra national authority; rather it belongs to the prudential judgment of those who have responsibility for the common good, that is, a duly constituted government. Just cause or just objective entails that war is declared against another nation to fight an injustice suffered by a nation and to restore justice between nations. A war is considered just when it is a question of self-defense. This means the collective of a people or nation, the defense of the common good. War can be just if it is an expression of retributive justice. Right intention refers to a subjective motivation. Just war has as its orientation the path to peace, a peace that is disrupted by injustice. War is not for its own sake; it is not simply to expand one's sphere of influence, conquer new territory, subjugate

peoples, or obtain wealth. War is launched so that people will find a more perfect peace than what they had before.

The second set of conditions deals with matters regarding the conduct of war (*ius in bello* or conditions for the conduct of war) and this requires these criteria to be fulfilled: discrimination, proportionality, last resort, and reasonable hope of success. Discrimination or non-combatant immunity essentially focuses on the protection of innocent lives. Here comes the needed distinction to be made between combatants and civilians, hence those who did not pose physical threat must not be injured. The mere fact that war has regrettably broken out does not mean that everything becomes licit between the warring parties.

Proportionality means that the use of arms must not produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated. This means that the overall destruction expected from the use of force must be outweighed by the good to be achieved. Proportionality considers that if a victory can be foreseen, the damage that is done by the war itself must be taken into account.

Last resort indicates that all other means of putting an end to the wrong must have been shown to be impractical or ineffective. This means that if there are other practical and effective means of stopping the aggressor, they must be used. Reasonable hope of success ensures that arms will not be used in a futile cause or in a case where disproportionate measures are required to achieve success.

But we must recognize that the just war theory has positive functions: it has served to limit wars and make more human the conduct of war. However, with similar honesty, it is also necessary to recognize the theoretical ambiguities and the practical dysfunctions of the theory. For example, it is not a minor matter in the theory when it is understood in the framework of conflict between individuals thus contributing to a closed understanding of sovereign states and retarding the creation of an international organ endowed with true authority.

Consideration of the horrendous experience of the Second World War and the awareness of the deeper value of peace has moved the Catholic Church to re-consider the just war

theory. The teaching of Pius XII,¹ John XXIII² and the Second Vatican Council³ push for the reexamination of the just war theory. With the first invasion of Iraq and the War on Terror that was launched after the bombing the World Trade Center in September 11, 2000, many reinterpretations were made that twisted the original meaning of the doctrine.

I will briefly cite here some of the questions regarding the call for the re-examination of the value of the just war theory. Crucial in the just war theory is the presumption against violence in general and war in particular. This presumption is where we can locate the similarity in sentiment of the just war theory with pacifism. In the teaching of Thomas Aquinas this presumption is premised on the fact that violence contradicts justice since violence contradicts reason. To remove violence or defend oneself or a nation is tantamount to restoring order and justice. In this regard, justice becomes an indirect path to peace. For Aquinas, the direct path to peace still remains – love. One example of the neglect in the presumption against violence is the first attack of the allied forces of Iraq popularly known as the Operation Desert Storm. In that event, the presumption against violence was never invoked; rather what dominated was the transgression of the distinction between war as an end and war as a means. Michael Novak gave justification to the attack in these words:

Warfare under this teaching [i.e.. classic Catholic just war thinking] is a morally appropriate political action and may be morally obligatory upon public

¹ “The theory of the war as an appropriate and proportionate means to solve international conflicts is already passé; there is no proportion between the good and the evil effects of war. War, therefore, ought to be forbidden.” See *Benignitas et humanitas* (1945). In *Gravi* (1949), Pius XII states: “A people threatened by or victim of an unjust aggression, if they want to think and act as Christians, cannot remain in passive indifference; with more reason the solidarity of family of all peoples forbids to the others behaving as mere spectators in attitude of passive neutrality.”

² “In this age which boast of an atomic power, it no longer makes sense to maintain that war is a fit instrument with which to repair the violation of justice” (*Pacem in Terris*, 112).

³ The document states: “War today must be evaluated with an entirely new attitude.” “The horror and perversity of war are immediately magnified by the addition of scientific weapons.” See GS nos. 79-80.

authorities when circumstances dictate that evil be stopped...In the view of St. Thomas, just war does not begin with a presumption against violence...[but with] the obligation of rightly constituted public authorities to defend security of those for whom they have assumed responsibility.⁴

The net effect of this position that defended the invasion of Iraq is the disregard for the question of proportionality. Proportionality as we said means that the use of arms must not produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated. Proportionality is based on presumption against war. With the presumption against war taken away, banalization of war's violent nature comes about. It is very obvious that with weapons of mass destruction used in Iraq, the proportion of the means to an end is beyond comprehension.

The other reinterpretation that is given has to do with the question of legitimate defense. Under this heading will fall the types of defense called for by the spirit of legitimate defense preventive or pre-emptive.

A preventive war is one aimed at preventing possible aggression in the future. The attack of the Israeli Air Force in 1981 against the nuclear built by Saddam Hussein with aid from the French government can be considered as a just preventive attack. Although the U.N. Security Council condemned the invasion, Israel perceived it as an act of self-defense.

When talking about pre-emptive war, we are dealing with response to obvious signs of threats of aggression, for example troop build-up, preparing missiles for launching, making biological weapons ready for use, and signaling to the potential victim an imminent strike of the aggressor. Generally, preemptive war can be justified if the danger is imminent. With the knowledge that Saddam Hussein had no weapons of mass destruction, the confusion comes about as to the nature of the

⁴ Michael Novak, "Asymmetrical Warfare & Just War," *National Review*, February 10, 2003, accessed January 10, 2015, <https://www.nationalreview.com/2003/02/asymmetrical-warfare-just-war-michael-novak/>.

attack. Ultimately, it was no longer preventive, but rather an unjustified preventive war.

When dealing with the criteria regarding the conduct of war, one problematic area in the just war theory is the principle of immunity of the non-combatants. Normally, this is expressed in the norm: "When it is necessary to win the war one has the right to kill innocents indirectly." Thus, we have the door opened to consider the deaths of non-combatants as collateral damage. While this may be justified because the killing is indirectly intended, the problem is that the indirect killing cannot be separate from the criterion of proportionality. And this is where the deeper problem lies since the understanding of the principle of proportionality is so varied.

If one will consider with realism all the wide and deep meaning of the present war realities, the doctrine of the just war has many defects to serve as an ethical scheme to discern the war morality of the option for war. There at least three fundamental reasons that we give in this regard. First, the actual meaning of war today has qualitatively changed due to scope and the destructive power of the modern weapons and the consequent potential extension of a war beyond the borders of the warring factions. Second, although the justice of a just war is still admissible, it is necessary to settle the question of universal public authority acknowledged by all, and with effective power to safeguard security, justice and rights in the settling of conflicts of sovereign nations. Third, the criterion of proportionality is no longer applicable between the evil to be tolerated (the war) and the good that is hoped to be achieved (the reestablishment of justice). In truth, war is no longer a lesser evil confronting the other greater evils; rather it has become the greater evil.

In spite of all the defects of the just war theory, it is hard to contest that in the course of human history, it has somehow mitigated excesses in war violence. While we can say that the just war tradition is a living tradition in the sense that it offers elements that help organize a moral reasoning concerning war, it cannot constitute a definitive tradition to organize the coherent responses between nations. It is therefore necessary to search for new approaches and solutions to violence cause by war.

The *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* did not reject the just war paradigm but neither does it use it to expound on the morality of a war of aggression. Citing the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (no. 2309), it only took the phrase “the traditional elements enumerated in what is called the ‘just war’ doctrine” (no. 500) to recall the conditions demanded for an armed defense against war of aggression may be moral.

The paradigm of legitimate defense took shape after the Second Vatican Council. The historical horizon of those years was marked by the Cold War and the consequently the political polarization between the two blocs: the United Soviet Socialist Republic and the West that was controlled by the United States. The nuclear war threatening the world was born out of the arms race. That imminent threat brought about the politics of nuclear deterrence.

Nuclear deterrence is a means employed to prevent the start of a nuclear war, by threatening to use nuclear weapons to respond to military actions considered aggressive. When the aggressor is threatened with nuclear attacks, what happens is that the latter would reconsider its military aggressions because of a disproportionate price it will have to pay for such actions politically and militarily. There is something paradoxical in nuclear deterrence in the sense that nations wage war in order to prevent war from being waged.

There are many theological reflections from the Magisterium regarding this issue. Episcopal conferences, particularly the United States and Germany in the 1980’s produced a corpus of interventions regarding the issue of peace and war.

The Second Vatican Council made an especially strong condemnation of total war and modern armaments race, wherein radical restriction to the application of the just war theory was made. It closes the door a little more to the possibility of just war in the context of nuclear weapons and arms race. In other words, while it recognized the right of a country to a legitimate defense, it did it in such a manner that such a defense was rendered inoperable. In *Gaudium et spes*, we read,

As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted (no. 79).

Within this passage is an indication that points toward an accepted and respected universal public authority that could safeguard security, justice, and rights. Without any competent international authority it is impossible for any war to be considered licit.

One of the prophetic intuitions of the Second Vatican Council is the affirmation of the new situation created by the increase in number of scientific arms. Again, in *Gaudium et spes*, we read,

The horror and perversity of war is immensely magnified by the addition of scientific weapons. For acts of war involving these weapons can inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction, thus going far beyond the bounds of legitimate defense. Indeed, if the kind of instruments which can now be found in the armories of the great nations were to be employed to their fullest, an almost total and altogether reciprocal slaughter of each side by the other would follow, not to mention the widespread devastation that would take place in the world and the deadly after effects that would be spawned by the use of weapons of this kind. All these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude. The men of our time must realize that they will have to give a somber reckoning of their deeds of war for the course of the future will depend greatly on the decisions they make today (no. 80).

Discernment and taking a stance, if they were to be authentically evangelical, would entail a fundamental change in the ethical attitude of Christians toward war. To realize this, a new religious conviction is demanded of Christians and a new ethical task. One can say the position of *Gaudium et spes* goes

beyond the proposals and the moral solutions offered by the just war theory.

Situated in the line of the just defense the period of the 1980s produced an ethical and theological summa with these affirmations: first, a nuclear war in any concept or form cannot be considered as a lesser evil. Second, conventional war is not a rational solution to settle disputes or to reestablish a violated right. This condemnation can be safely verified in offensive war or war of aggression and with strong probability in the defensive war in the face of the violation of rights on the part of another State. Third, to possess arms does not mean to use them or to have the intention to use them. But the possession of nuclear arms within the historical juncture of arms race and nuclear deterrence in itself fully enters the strategy of deterrence.

There had been many discussions on the concept, end, and efficacy of the nuclear deterrence. As regards its morality, it is good to cite the judgment of John Paul II during his talk before the U.N. General Assembly in 1982:

In current conditions "deterrence" based on balance, certainly not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable. Nonetheless in order to ensure peace, it is indispensable not to be satisfied with this minimum which is always susceptible to the real danger of explosion.⁵

The words of John Paul II did not constitute to be moral justification of deterrence but rather a proclamation of the moral urgency to get out of and move toward disarmament. What remained of the principle of legitimate defense? In great measure of reasons the principle became more and more political and bellicose.

⁵ *Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to the General Assembly of the United Nations*, June 7, 1982, accessed December 3, 2014, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1982/june/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19820607_disarmo-onu.html.

The loss of the applicability of the paradigm of legitimate defense can be assumed in John Paul II's position vis-à-vis war. In *Centesimus annus* he took a very radical move toward a pacifist position.⁶ This he also did in his discourse to the diplomatic corps to the Vatican in January 12, 1991 and January 16, 1993. One can assume that with John Paul II the tradition of the just war, including the paradigm of legitimate defense comes to an end. He changed the name of the rules of the game.

In spite of what has been said the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* still continues to formulate the principle of legitimate defense.⁷

THE UNILATERAL PARADIGM OF PREVENTIVE WAR

The terrorists' attacks in New York and Washington (2001), Madrid (2003), London (2005), Mumbai (2008), etc. and

⁶ I myself, on the occasion of the recent tragic war in the Persian Gulf, repeated the cry: "Never again war!" No, never again war, which destroys the lives of innocent people, teaches how to kill, throws into upheaval even the lives of those who do the killing and leaves behind a trail of resentment and hatred, thus making it all the more difficult to find a just solution of the very problems which provoked the war. Just as the time has finally come when in individual States a system of private vendetta and reprisal has given way to the rule of law, so too a similar step forward is now urgently needed in the international community. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that at the root of war there are usually real and serious grievances: injustices suffered, legitimate aspirations frustrated, poverty, and the exploitation of multitudes of desperate people who see no real possibility of improving their lot by peaceful means. For this reason, another name for peace is *development*. Just as there is a collective responsibility for avoiding war, so too there is a collective responsibility for promoting development.

⁷ A war of aggression is intrinsically immoral. In the tragic case where such a war breaks out, leaders of the State that has been attacked have the right and the duty to organize a defense even using the force of arms.[1049] To be licit, the use of force must correspond to certain strict conditions: "the damage inflicted by the aggressor on the nation or community of nations must be lasting, grave and certain; all other means of putting an end to it must have been shown to be impractical or ineffective; there must be serious prospects of success; the use of arms must not produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated. The power of modern means of destruction weighs very heavily in evaluating this condition. These are the traditional elements enumerated in what is called the 'just war' doctrine. The evaluation of these conditions for moral legitimacy belongs to the prudential judgment of those who have responsibility for the common good" (no. 500).

the on-going war in Afghanistan bring to the fore new ethical questions regarding international terrorism. While it is important to talk about terrorism per se, it is likewise important to deal with the moral response to it. Those who reflected and discussed the war on terror still hold on to the theory of the just war as the rallying center for moral evaluation. Generally, there was a very negative acceptance of the just war theory among many experts in their consideration of the responses to the terrorism according to the criteria set by it.

Evidently, there is the acceptance of the international law regarding the possibility of defending oneself against terrorist attacks. But the question is how? We respond to this question by showing how responses were done. We shall take two cases, the punitive response to Afghanistan in 2001 and the second attack in Ira which was bannered as preventive. The discussion will be brief for lack of space.

The Catholic moral response to the invasion of Afghanistan by the NATO forces was neither clear nor complete. The U.S. Catholic hierarchy sent a letter of solidarity to George Bush expressing their solidarity to respond militarily due to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In the letter the bishops affirmed their moral right and holy obligation as a nation to defend the common good against terrorist attacks. They added that any military action ought to respect the healthy moral principles. This they meant the protection of innocent civilians.

Without negating the validity of the concerns of the bishops and after many ambivalent interventions of the Vatican spokesperson Joaquin Navarro Valls, the posture taken by John Paul II tended more towards dialogue. This dialogical posture vis-à-vis terrorism was further demonstrated in his Angelus message in September 23, 2001, and during his trip to Kazakhstan and Armenia. Many observers saw the variance between John Paul II's position and the Roman Curia, in that the pope was more inclined to the comprehensive approach taken by the US bishops. The document that better reflects this option for dialogue was his Message during the World Day of Peace in January 1, 2002. He appealed to the need to forgive and ended with these words:

No peace without justice, no justice without forgiveness: this is what I wish to say to those responsible for the future of the human community, entreating them to be guided in their weighty and difficult decisions by the light of man's true good, always with a view to the common good.⁸

With regard to the war in Iraq (2003), there were no justifications that can be given to the invading nations. The reasons with which they tried to attract public opinion, the existence of weapons of mass destruction showed themselves later to be without any basis. The difficulties that they had pursued in the quick invasion would also show the impoverished foundation of the moral reasons in favor of war.

If we are to examine their justifications, there we can find that they are radically contrary and disqualifying both to a collective conscience as well to a rational discourse. There was an international mass demonstration against the war in Iraq with an estimated 110 million participants the world over in February 14, 2003. The US bishops made the decision of the Bush administration to invade Iraq as its object of ethical reflection. Not long after, the Catholic Church adopted an official position against the invasion of Iraq. Likewise, John Paul II in his interventions and his diplomatic actions was openly opposed to the attack. Catholic bishops in many countries, with evident international politic influence, were united with the Vatican opposition to the invasion and they created an ecclesial compact opposing the war in Iraq. The US bishops' declaration on November 13, 2002 explicitly said that "we continue to find it difficult to justify the resort to war against Iraq".⁹ The Bishops of England and Wales (October 15, 2002), and the German bishops towed the same line of opposition.

⁸ *Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II for the Celebration of the World Day of Peace*, January 1, 2002, accessed November 28, 2014, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/messages/peace/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_20011211_xxxv-world-day-for-peace.html.

⁹ US Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), "Statement on Iraq, 2002," Washington, DC, November 13, 2002, accessed October 17, 2014, <http://www.usccb.org/resources/statement-iraq-2002>.

All these ecclesial positions based on evangelical values took into account the U.N. Security Council's resolution no. 1441 in November 11, 2002, a resolution that closed the doors to the legitimization of the military intervention in Iraq.

PARADIGM SHIFT FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF A JUST NEW WORLD ORDER

The first decade of the twenty-first century is marked by spectacular changes in the world scene, especially in international conflicts. There is the constant search for global security of nations and the creation of a new just world order. Christianity has much to offer to orient the path of humanity toward this decisive moment. Limiting our consideration to the theological and moral discourse on the morality of response to the conflicts between nations and in the world, we need to reckon with the need to configure a new paradigm coming from Christianity to response to these conflicts. This proposition is born out of the historical responses we saw in the past and pushing us to move beyond.

The historical paradigms are incapable of giving adequate responses to the new conflicts in humanity. If the biblical passage directs us "to new wine a new wineskin," we follow the same suit embracing the challenge: "to a new conflict a new moral paradigm." This means to put into motion a new tradition in the morality of war or better a new ethic of conflict resolution. In this light, there is need for greater sensibility toward new imaginations and recovery of the eschatological and utopian charge of the Gospel. There is also a need to shift the moral orientation from understanding and evaluating war in the past to searching for adequate strategies to avoid the next and definitive war.

From these methodological options, we postulate the thinking of the solution to the conflicts between nations and in the world via a new paradigm: the construction and defense of a new just world order. There are several documents in the Church that tackle the questions of the just world order. The messages of the popes on the celebration of the World Day of Peace (January 1 of each year) compose a theological and ethical summary on

peace and on war. In those texts are found then necessary elements to build a new paradigm with the end of thinking about and realizing world peace. There are also aspects of teachings of episcopal conferences, in this case the *Challenge to Peace* from US bishops, from where significant proposals may be culled.

We shall present here three factors that can shape the new paradigm to think about and realize the world peace and, at the same time, to respond to the conflicts between nations and in the world. Recently, Catholic consciousness, both on the level of the official magisterium and theological reflection, gives much importance to the international institutions to solve conflicts and to promote peace. The interventions of Paul VI (1965) and the thirty years of John Paul II (1995) in the General Assembly of the United Nations are real signs of that appreciation. The discourse of John Paul II does not stop criticizing the United Nations in its real capacity for leadership in the movement for world peace.

This criticism that comes from John XXIII and is still valid until now points toward positive proposals:

1. The U.N. ought to situate itself into the new world order. As what John XXIII did in *Pacem in terris* no. 40, universal public authority is to be set up not to limit or substitute the responsibility of the States, but to tackle the fundamental problems of the nations which, by themselves and in spite of all the power they have, they cannot solve;
2. Linked to the strengthening of the international institutions, there must also be the support of regional and continental associations; the leadership of great powers when these would work for the common good; the role of the world civil society; and
3. An international authority must be created. The Second Vatican Council established the principle in this regard when it says that there is need for a universal public authority which all acknowledge and with effective power is able to guarantee and safeguard security, justice and rights (GS 82). In this regard, the intuition of John XIII in *Pacem in terris*

must be revisited when he called for the institution of a public authority in all the nations of the world.

Regarding the inevitable demands for international justice, there has been an increasing realization that there is war if there is no justice. It is therefore necessary to convert the economy of war into an inversion for peace. John Paul II, in his talk in Denver, expressed his call for an international community which must establish more effective structures to safeguard and promote justice and peace. This implies an elaboration of a concept of strategic interests based on the full development of peoples, eliminating power and providing dignified human existence, eliminating injustice and exploitation and providing greater respect for the human person and defense of universal rights. The strategies for peace are conditioned by these demands: full development of peoples and greater respect for human rights.

On these two fronts are summed up the demands for an authentic strategic plan for peace. As regards development of peoples it is only through the important changes in the economic world order that would stop the slipping away of the wealth of the poor to the rich. The indispensable condition for just and peaceful world order is the promotion of justice and defense of human rights.

One of the biggest threats to peace is linked to the violence that is ideological in character, especially national violence. This can include racial and ethnic violence, and also religion-based violence. From the genuine religious longing and the correct theological reflection it is necessary to unmask the false justifications of violence, religious or nationalistic. From the perspective of religions there is need for the purification of religious traditions in order to take away from them the spirit of violence. This means disarming religions of their internal structure of violence and to open up to dialogue with other faith traditions. In terms of ideological violence, there is need to explore wide avenues of dialogue and a revision of strategies and tactics of class struggle enriched by new science of knowledge and experience of spiral of violence that continuously plague the innocents.

In this light there is need for a new openness toward world ethic where the whole orientation is toward an option for peace and the rejection of bellicose violence. The importance of factoring on the concept of prophetic dialogue with religions is crucial here. John Paul II gives a good affirmation on this:

It is in this context also that we should consider the great challenge of *inter-religious dialogue* to which we shall still be committed in the new millennium, in fidelity to the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. In the years of preparation for the Great Jubilee the Church has sought to build, not least through a series of highly symbolic meetings, *a relationship of openness and dialogue with the followers of other religions*. This dialogue must continue. In the climate of increased cultural and religious pluralism which is expected to mark the society of the new millennium, it is obvious that this dialogue will be especially important in establishing a sure basis for peace and warding off the dread specter of those wars of religion which have so often bloodied human history. The name of the one God must become increasingly what it is: *a name of peace and a summons to peace* (NMI 55).¹⁰

However, bold and humble dialogue must also be pursued with those embracing secular ideologies.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The abovementioned trajectory will have to reckon with the lacunae in the current social teaching to address the question of building of peace in the world. Relative to the question of peace, one area lacking in the social teaching is the articulation regarding conflict. True, there is a very good optimism portrayed in John XXIII's *Pacem in terris* and the teaching of Paul VI

¹⁰ John Paul II, Apostolic Letter *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, To the Bishops, Clergy and Lay Faithful at the Close of the Great Jubilee Year 2000, January 6, 2001, accessed November 24, 2014, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/2001/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20010106_novo-millennio-ineunte.html.

regarding people of goodwill intervening in conflict resolution. Also affirmative is John Paul II's insights on the role of sinful social structures and the presence of evil in the violent conflicts the world experiences. There is, however, a need for further reflection on the complexities of social conflicts particularly with the kinds of warfare in the world and the bankruptcy of the traditional manner of making sense of violence via pacifism and the just-war theory. Complementing this is the critical articulation needed to define what properly must the role of the Church and the faithful to play in these types of conflict be.

These are, however, questions that are hard to respond and which the social teaching is silent: How can we define the morality of the types of intervention in light of sovereign states? What is the meaning of standing before those who perpetuate violence in the hope of solving the matter at hand? How do we reckon with protracted war or violence or low-grade intensity conflict? There still many questions that challenge the capacity of the social teaching of the Church respond. The questioning does not endeavor to replace the social teaching but are meant to expand its horizons or in more missiological terms to cross new frontiers of the realities in the world.

Another area that the current social teaching needs to update in its magisterium is in the development of a just order after the conflict. There is indeed a lacuna in this area. While the traditional just war theory clearly stipulates the conditions regarding the conditions for war and the just conduct of war, there is nothing in the Catholic tradition to address the post war realities.

Concretely, this means a sustainable peace after a conflict comes to an end. An evolution in the social teaching is needed to come to terms with post-conflict ethics expressed in terms of transitional justice, reparations, and construction of social and civic institutions to sustain a just peace. There is already something in the integral development which Paul VI's *Populorum progressio* started as basis for thinking about integral peace. One good area that calls for consideration is the transitional institutions that are needed on a long term basis to deal with post-war situations.

The third area that needs future articulation in Catholic social teaching refers to issues regarding the building of peace in the public sphere. Recent research in the field of peace studies has developed interesting insights concerning the creation of basic conditions for peacebuilding. One of the areas is the role of truth and reconciliation commissions. One area undeveloped in Catholic social teaching is a deeper look at grounds for forgiveness and reconciliation. While these terms are basically religious in origin, they are integrated into discourses in the secular sphere.

The fourth area which the world peace needs to look into is to respond to the call of those in the academe and policy circles is the rethinking of the relationship of religion to international relations. The current social teaching does not say much about this. In the world fast changes are happening as regards the understanding of state and statecraft. There are also changing configurations in politics and international relations. In light of these, a new thinking is called for in the relationship between the Church and the State and between the Church and the world. The present thinking of the social teaching as regards Church-State relation is the rights of the Church within the state; while this is still relevant there is need to move into the definition of the role of the Church as a transnational body that can really make significant dent in the building of a just and peaceful world.

Carlos G. Ronquillo