

Called to Holiness: Integrating the Virtue of Nonviolent Peacemaking

Eli S. McCarthy

Common contemporary assessments of nonviolence often describe it as primarily a rule against violence or as primarily a strategy. For instance, the rule-based assessment is often found in Catholic social teaching and faces important limits. In this article, I first describe the trajectory of Catholic social teaching on nonviolence. Second, I analyze Jesus as a model of nonviolent peacemaking with assistance from scholarship by Glen Stassen and John Donahue. Third, I draw on William Spohn's work on virtue and scripture to argue that Christian practices of nonviolent peacemaking are most adequately assessed through a virtue-based ethic, and that nonviolent peacemaking itself is a central virtue. Fourth, I develop a set of core practices and explain some initial implications of integrating this virtue into Catholic social teaching and U.S. policy.

Catholic social teaching (CST) is both a tradition of religious discourse and of translating such discourse into arguments for policy. Contemporary CST stands in a tradition of ethical discourse that has been moving toward integrating human rights and virtue. However, CST still maintains the tendency toward rule-based assessments of nonviolent peacemaking.¹ This tendency gets expressed in a rights-based approach to confronting conflicts, especially acute conflicts, and this approach offers some contributions but also some significant limits in correctly assessing, imagining, and sustaining nonviolent peacemaking.

In this article, I argue that CST ought to employ a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking even if supplemented by aspects of human rights theory.² This move would yield a more adequate way of

Eli S. McCarthy is an adjunct professor of Justice and Peace Studies, Georgetown University.

¹ Lisa Cahill, *Love Your Enemies: Discipleship, Pacifism, and Just War Theory* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1994), 6, 212, 237.

² I use "peacemaking" broadly to include peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding.

understanding and describing nonviolence in CST documents, and more readily bring to light as well as sustain us in a set of core practices.

Catholic Social Teaching on Nonviolence

In general, most of the earlier documents of Catholic social teaching from *Rerum Novarum* in 1891 through *Pacem in Terris* in 1963 primarily utilized a deontological model of ethics. Since 1963, this model continues to hold significant sway even as other models receive more attention.³ Charles Curran argues that the tendency to focus on structures and institutions has also contributed to inadequate attention to the person and development of virtues.⁴ In this context, Catholic social teaching often expresses a rule-based assessment of nonviolence. Lisa Sowle Cahill points to *Pacem in Terris* as an evolution in official Catholic thinking about pacifism, but still articulated in terms of rules. This version of pacifism coheres with “just” war theory as a caution about whether the “just” war criteria can be met in our nuclear age.⁵ Two years later at Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes* maintained this rule-emphasis by arguing that pacifism, like “just” war theory, aims at self-defense along with individual and communal rights. The difference resides simply in the means to these shared ends. Disagreement on the means is confined to individuals, such that war against aggression is a duty incumbent on those responsible for the common good.⁶ Cahill explains that most recent official “pacifist” manifestations really amount to a development of a rule-based “just” war theory in the modern context.⁷

In the 1983 document “Challenge of Peace,” written by the U.S. Bishops, Cahill suggests that as far as the U.S. Bishops “portray pacifism as aiming at defense of the common good and human rights, they tend to assimilate pacifism to the natural law just war model.”⁸ Richard Miller claims that the pacifist ethic remains hedged in by a theory of rights and justice. He argues that the U.S. Bishops maintain the basic teachings on the pacifist ethic as found in *Gaudium et Spes*.⁹

³ Curran, Charles E, *Catholic Social Teaching: 1891–Present: A Historical, Theological, and Ethical Analysis*, (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 81–82.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁵ Cahill, *Love Your Enemies*, 212.

⁶ Miller, Richard, *Interpretations of Conflict: Ethics, Pacifism, and the Just-War Tradition*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 82–84.

⁷ Cahill, *Love Your Enemies*, 237.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 6; see also U.S. Bishops, “Challenge of Peace,” par. 74.

⁹ Miller, *Interpretations of Conflict*, 84.

In turn, CST's rule-based assessment of nonviolence has often truncated the imagination of nonviolent practices, both for daily life and public policy, and gives inadequate attention to forming the persons and groups interpreting and applying the rules.¹⁰ A rule-based assessment also often gets played out in a tendency to blur the boundaries between nonresistance and nonviolent peacemaking on the one hand, and nonviolent peacemaking and "just war" theory on the other. This blurring often yields an understanding of nonviolence as the absence or reduction of conflict. Such a notion of conflict often creates an overemphasis on dialogue and a devaluing of nonviolent struggle, especially if the aim includes transforming structural violence. Further, CST primarily measures the success of nonviolent peacemaking practices by their protection of human rights, i.e. a set of rules. CST tends to argue that nonviolence is often unable to protect and promote certain human rights, such as the right to self-defense or the duty to defend the innocent. In turn, CST *has* held that nonviolent peacemaking was only or primarily for individuals. Thus, this rights-based ethic also reinforced an emphasis on "just war" theory and more recently on "humanitarian" intervention, more than nonviolent peacemaking practices, especially those that concern government or state actors. Other scholars have pointed out further significant limits of a general human rights-based approach.¹¹ It is at least partly for these reasons described above, I believe, that U.S. Catholic leadership often failed to challenge adequately U.S. political and military leadership on the use of war, e.g. the atomic bomb in WWII, Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, etc., and our preparations for war, e.g. our military budget that entails 45% of global military spending.

However, a gradual recognition of the importance of virtue has been increasing in CST, especially since Vatican II, but also more clearly since the U.S. Bishops 1993 document *Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*. The combination of drawing more readily on the Bible, especially the Christian Scriptures, with its' clearer resonance to virtue ethics, and the extending of the call to holiness to all persons has contributed to positions in CST that have increasingly questioned the possibility of a "just war" and increasingly valued the potential of nonviolent

¹⁰ Further limits articulated in Eli McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers: Virtue Ethic for Catholic Social Teaching and U.S. Policy* (Wipf and Stock, 2012), 14-22.

¹¹ Martha Nussbaum, *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach* (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 97. Johan Galtung and Anders Wirak, "On the Relationship Between Human Rights and Human Needs," paper, no. 71, 1978. <<http://www.transcend.org/galtung/papers/On%20the%20Relationship%20Between%20Human%20Rights%20and%20Human%20Needs.pdf>.

peacemaking practices for public policy. The particular practices of non-violent peacemaking illustrated by Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and the many successful nonviolent movements of the 1980's, especially the Solidarity movement in Poland, have also contributed to these positions arising in CST.

Pope John Paul II, who was a key contributor to the Solidarity labor movement in Poland and the largely nonviolent movements that toppled communism in Eastern Europe, taught that peace is the fruit of solidarity, which he also described as a key virtue.¹² He increasingly taught the priority of nonviolence and the need to end war, which Christianson argues was summarized in his statement “violence, which under the illusion of fighting evil, only makes it worse.”¹³ The Pope even went, as far as to say, “violence is evil. . .violence is a lie, for it goes against the truth of our faith, the truth of our humanity. Violence destroys what it claims to defend: the dignity, the life, the freedom of human beings.”¹⁴ Further, he exhorted persons not to follow leaders who

train you in the way of inflicting death. . .Give yourself to the service of life, not the work of death. Do not think that courage and strength are proved by killing and destruction. True courage lies in working for peace. . .Violence is the enemy of justice. Only peace can lead the way to true justice.¹⁵

In the *Challenge of Peace* document of 1983 by the U.S. Bishops, they offer some reflections on the value of nonviolent means of conflict resolution. Although a virtue-based ethic is not predominant in their document, the Bishops acknowledge that some Christians since the earliest days have “committed themselves to a nonviolent lifestyle.”¹⁶ They note that:

the objective is not only to avoid causing harm or injury to another creature, but, more positively, to seek the good of the other. Blunting the aggression of an

¹² Pope John Paul II, “Sollicitudo Rei Socialis: On Social Concern,” in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. by D. O’Brien and T. Shannon (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992), no. 39-40.

¹³ Drew Christianson, “Catholic Peacemaking, 1991-2005: The Legacy of Pope John Paul II,” in *The Review of Faith and International Affairs*, Fall 2006,” p. 23. For other statements on war see Pope John Paul II, “War, a Decline for Humanity,” in *Origins* 20, n. 33 (January 24, 1991), 527, 530.

¹⁴ Pope John Paul II, Homily at Drogheda, Ireland, Sept. 29, 1979, in *The Pope in Ireland: Speeches and Homilies*, (Dublin, Ireland: Veritas Publications, 2004), 18.

¹⁵ Pope John Paul II, Homily at Drogheda, 19-20.

¹⁶ U.S. Bishops, “Challenge of Peace: God’s Challenge and Our Response,” May 3, 1983, par. 111. <<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/TheChallengeofPeace.pdf>>.

adversary or oppressor would not be enough. The goal is winning the other over, *making the adversary a friend* (emphasis mine).¹⁷

—an emphasis consistent with viewing nonviolent peacemaking as a virtue.

In *Harvest of Justice* the U.S. Bishops orient the document by discussing the theology, spirituality and ethics of peacemaking.¹⁸ The Bishops argue that for Jesus' gift of peace to transform our world, it also requires "peaceable virtues, a practical vision for a peaceful world and an ethics to guide peacemakers in times of conflict."¹⁹ The list of virtues includes:

faith and hope to strengthen our spirits by placing our trust in God, rather than in ourselves; *courage and compassion* that move us to action; *humility and kindness* so that we can put the needs and interests of others ahead of our own; *patience and perseverance* to endure the long struggle for justice; and *civility and charity* so that we can treat others with respect and love.²⁰

The ethics to guide peacemakers in terms of conflict consists of the increasing importance of nonviolent peacemaking and the increasing questions about "just war" theory.²¹ On nonviolent peacemaking and public policy, they argue

Although nonviolence has often been regarded as simply a personal option or vocation, recent history suggests that in some circumstances it can be an effective public undertaking as well. . . One must ask. . . whether it also should have a place in the public order with the tradition of justified and limited war. . . Nonviolent strategies need greater attention in international affairs.²²

In the midst of the Bishops' increasing questioning of "just war" theory, they consider the importance of character and a properly formed conscience:

Moral reflection on the use of force calls for a spirit of moderation rare in contemporary political culture. The increasing violence of our society, its growing insensitivity to the sacredness of life and the glorification of the technology of destruction in popular culture could inevitably impair our society's ability to apply just-war criteria honestly and effectively in time of crisis. In the absence of a commitment of respect

¹⁷ Ibid. section 223.

¹⁸ U.S. Bishops, "Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace," Nov. 17, 1993, Introduction and section I. <<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/harvest.shtml>>.

¹⁹ Ibid. sect. I.

²⁰ Ibid. sect. I.A.1.

²¹ Ibid. sect. I.B.1.

²² Ibid. sect. I.B.1.

for life and a culture of restraint, it will not be easy to apply the just-war tradition. . . given the neglect of peaceable virtues. . . serious questions remain about whether modern war. . . can meet the hard tests set by the just war tradition.²³

This increasing emphasis on virtue, character, conscience and vision in CST strengthens CST's position that all persons, not just political leaders, are responsible for the common good. After describing an agenda for peacemaking,²⁴ the Bishops conclude with discourse congenial to virtue, such as conversion and imagination:

. . . today's call to peacemaking is a call to conversion, to change our hearts, to reject violence, to love our enemies. . . To believe we are condemned. . . only to what has been in the past. . . is to underestimate both our human potential for creative diplomacy and God's action in our midst which can open the way to changes we could barely imagine. . . For peacemakers, hope is the indispensable virtue.²⁵

Pope Benedict XVI has also indicated a way of thinking that supports the trajectory of further integrating virtue ethics into CST. He argues that the centrality of love can be commanded because God has first given love.²⁶ In other words, the central theme of Christian ethics is about a response to a gift, an attraction to a good before and more than assent to a command, duty, rule, or right. He attends to the interrelation of key virtues, such as charity.²⁷ In 2007, Pope Benedict spoke about the gospel text "love your enemies." He described nonviolence for Christians as

not mere tactical behavior but a person's *way of being*, the attitude of one who is convinced of God's love and power, who is not afraid to confront evil with the weapons of love and truth alone. Loving the enemy is the nucleus of the "Christian revolution," a revolution *not based on strategies of economic, political or media power* (emphasis mine).²⁸

When we combine his reflections on love, which prioritizes attraction to the good over command and rule, with his reflection on the centrality of love of enemies and particularly nonviolence as a way of being rather than mere tactic or strategy, he further opens the conceptual space

²³ Ibid. sect. I.B.2 and sect. I.C.

²⁴ Ibid. sect. II.

²⁵ Ibid. sect. III.B.

²⁶ Pope Benedict, *Deus Caritas Est*, (2005), par. 14. <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est_en.html>.

²⁷ Ibid., par. 39.

²⁸ Pope Benedict, Midday Angelus, 2007, <<http://www.catholicpeacefellowship.org/nextpage.asp?m=2308>>.

to understand nonviolent peacemaking as a virtue, which realizes the good of conciliatory love.

However, the movement toward integrating virtue ethics still has significant growing edges. I have noted how CST has previously relied primarily on a rules-based and more recently rights-based assessment of nonviolence. Even within the 1993 document, rights language has a significant, if not primary role. The term “virtue” is only used thirteen times, while the term “rights” is used over fifty times. In the vision of a peaceful world, the three components are each defined in terms of human rights. The “just war” tradition is understood in terms of a state’s right and duty to defend against aggression as a last resort, and as aiming at the kind of peace that ensures human rights. Humanitarian intervention, i.e. using lethal force, is permitted in exceptional cases as a right and duty. Securing human rights is one of the five components of their agenda for peacemaking. Seriously considering nonviolent alternatives by national leaders is described as a moral obligation, or what Christianson calls a “prima facie public obligation.”²⁹ Yet, in the ethics section, nonviolence is promoted as being an “effective public undertaking” under some circumstances, and thus, “nonviolent strategies” deserve more attention. In this instance, nonviolence gets portrayed primarily as a strategy or tactic, precisely in the context of arguing for its increased role in public discourse and policy.

In the 2004 Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church, the priority of rights is even more pronounced and there is no explicit mention of “nonviolence” or development of the “peaceable virtues.”³⁰ In this document they even use the misleading phrase “passive resistance” to refer to nonviolence.³¹ The document also refers to Pope John Paul’s quote that “violence is evil” and it “destroys our dignity,” which is the foundational principle of CST, but then suggests that armed force “should be” used at the service of peace.³² Do they also think armed force “can be” or simply in theory it “should be” if it were to ever be used? The relationship between peaceable virtues, nonviolence and

²⁹ Christianson, “Catholic Peacemaking,” 23.

³⁰ Pontifical Council on for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004). It does refer to peace as the fruit of justice and love, which are often described as virtues in the broader document. Rather than “nonviolence,” the compendium acknowledges the value of the “witness of unarmed prophets” but gives it little explication except to condition it on the defense of human rights. C.11, par. 203, 494, 496.

³¹ *Ibid.*, par. 401.

³² *Ibid.*, par. 496, 502.

human rights needs further clarification and development in CST, particularly for public discourse and policy.

Jesus in Scripture and Ethics

Therefore, in the spirit of Vatican II, I re-turn to Jesus as represented in Scripture. Some core nonviolent peacemaking practices of Jesus illustrated by the scriptures include: proclaiming and inviting present participation in the Reign or Kingdom of God, caring for the outcasts and prioritizing those in urgent need, loving and forgiving enemies, challenging the religious, political, economic, and military powers, healing persons and communities, praying, along with risking and offering his life on the cross to expose and transcend both injustice and violence.

Glen Stassen and David Gushee in their book *Kingdom Ethics* argue that the prophet Isaiah is the place to look for the background of Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom.³³ Further, they argue that each of the main teachings in the Sermon on the Mount is actually a pointer to the way of deliverance given to us when this Kingdom breaks into our midst. Thus, they hope to re-position the centrality of the Sermon on the Mount by arguing that Jesus taught us not hard sayings or high ideals, but *concrete practices* of how to participate in today and prepare for the full unfolding of God's Reign.³⁴ In the Sermon, the beatitudes relate closely to virtue because they refer to both dispositions and practices that cultivate the kind of persons expressive of God's blessing.³⁵ For instance, the meek refers to gentleness and humility. Aquinas describes meekness as a virtue, which moderates the passion of anger and calms the desire for revenge³⁶ or injury for injury.³⁷ As the Sermon

³³ Glen Stassen and David Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2003), 22.

³⁴ Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 29-31. Servais Pinckaers offers a similar argument against the "idealistic" interpretation as well as against four other common ways of interpreting the Sermon. See "The Sermon on the Mount," in *Sources of Christian Ethics* (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 1995), 136-139.

³⁵ Pinckaers, "The Sermon on the Mount," 148, 160. Drawing on Augustine, Pinckaers argues that the relation between the beatitudes and the gifts unites Matthew and Paul closely through Isaiah, 152-3, which supports Stassen's point about the significant role of Isaiah for Jesus' ethics. Another example: the poor in spirit refers to those who live with a sense of our interdependence with others, especially on God, and thus, without arrogance.

³⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (NY, NY: Benziger Bros., 1947-48), II.II, q. 157, a. 1, 2.

³⁷ Aquinas, *Summa*, I.II, q. 69, a.3.

continues, the practices get more specified in what Stassen and Gushee call transforming initiatives. They see a threefold structure rather than a twofold antithesis. The components are 1) traditional righteousness, 2) vicious cycle we often get trapped in, and 3) go, be reconciled, and make friends with the accuser or enemy. They discover fourteen triads in the Sermon.³⁸ For instance, Matthew 5.21-26 includes the three components in this way: 1) you shall not kill, 2) getting trapped in a cycle of being angry or insulting, and 3) go, be reconciled, and make friends with the accuser or enemy. In this case, the “transforming” initiative means the practice transforms the person into an active peacemaker, the relationship into a peacemaking process, and hopes to transform the enemy into a friend.³⁹

They argue that Matthew 5.38-42 offers this triadic pattern: 1) you have heard an eye for an eye, 2) cycle of retaliating revengefully or resisting violently,⁴⁰ and 3) turn the other cheek, give your cloak as well, go the second mile, and give to one who begs.⁴¹ The context of Matthew entailed an oppressive occupation by the Romans, particularly oppressive acts by the Roman military, and an audience of the oppressed and apparently powerless. In turn, Stassen explains how turning the other cheek was taught in order to surprise the oppressor or insulter by taking the initiative, communicating nonviolently that one has equal dignity, and thus, discovering one’s power. This practice of “turning the other cheek” exposes and then refuses to maintain the communication or logic of humiliation, i.e. psychological violence. Those engaging this practice take the initiative and opt out of the cycle of retaliation and violence, and thus, they “transform” the situation by offering humanity a “third way” of nonviolent love that justly restores a sense of shared human dignity. Thus, this practice confronts injustice and initiates the possibility of reconciliation.⁴² Often, the first step of social and political nonviolent revolution is the oppressed asserting their dignity and refusing to be humiliated.

Many examples of nonviolent peacemaking practices are also found in the other Gospels. In Mark they include healing and restoration, cultivating courage, and self-suffering. For instance, the conditions of discipleship (Mark 8:34-38) entail taking up our cross, following Jesus’ way,

³⁸ Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 142.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 135.

⁴⁰ Walter Wink, “Beyond Just War and Pacifism: Jesus’ Nonviolent Way,” *Review and Expositor* 89, no.2 (1992), 199.

⁴¹ Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 137.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 138-139.

and being willing to lose our life for Jesus. For Luke, Jesus is the Prince of Peace and Way of Peace.⁴³ This way of peace entails the practices of including outsiders and prioritizing the poor, which challenged the economic and political powers, practices of showing mercy by healing the enemy's wounds (Lk. 22.51), and being lambs in the midst of wolves. In the Johannine corpus, God is love. Laying down one's life for another in the way Jesus did is the ultimate expression of love of neighbor. Another key story is the woman caught in adultery. With the statement, "Whoever is without sin throw the first stone" (John 8), Jesus shifts the people's frame from blame and punishment to self-examination and character assessment, as well as from radical "othering" of the target to identification with her. This practice of peacemaking invites each person away from a perception of justice that seeks to inflict further wounds or rely on lethal force, and toward a truer or fuller justice that prioritizes healing, repentance, and character growth, i.e. a restorative justice.

Jesus' nonviolent peacemaking practices pose challenges to military use of violence, violent revolts, and holy wars. For instance, the teachings of Jesus to love our enemies, assert our equal dignity in a transforming nonviolent way, prioritize the poor and outcasts, and aim for reconciliation raise difficult questions for and even suggest a challenge to military methods that depend on domination, the violence of lethal force, and often on a corresponding structure of economic injustice. These challenges arise even more clearly when Stassen and Gushee explain more specifically how Jesus' way of peacemaking fulfills Isaiah's prophecy that the Reign of God, made present and accessible in Jesus, will usher in peace. Isaiah 2:4-5 describes this peace with the words: "Nation shall not lift sword against nation nor ever again be trained for war." Later in Isaiah, the author judges Israel for trusting in the ways of military strength for security rather than in the ways of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 31.1-5 and 32.15). Shifting to trust in God's Spirit yields a delivering justice that arises through God's suffering servant who does no violence (Is. 42.2 and 53.7-9).⁴⁴ The servant shall "not call out...in the open street" (Is. 42.1), which refers to the tradition of calling out the army for Yahweh war.⁴⁵ "He will not break a bruised reed, nor snuff out a smoldering wick...neither rebuke nor wound" (Is. 42:3-4).

⁴³ John Donahue, "Good News of Peace," in *The Way*, April 1982.

⁴⁴ Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 150-151.

⁴⁵ Haring, *The Healing Power of Peace and Nonviolence*, 41.

Stassen and Gushee support Richard Hays' argument that this trend of nonviolence represents a univocal testimony about Jesus in the New Testament.⁴⁶ They also agree with William Swartley's argument that this univocal testimony advocates proactive peacemaking, consisting of positive initiatives to overcome evil by employing peaceable means to make peace.⁴⁷ All the Gospels report that Jesus entered Jerusalem on a donkey at the time of Passover, which fulfills Zechariah's prophecy (Zech. 9.9-10) of a Messiah of peace who stops war and commands peace to the nations. The evangelists are unanimous in portraying Jesus as subverting expectations of armed victory over Israel's enemies by assuming the posture of exposing injustice and violence through humble suffering, even to the cross.⁴⁸ In contrast to Daniel Bell's portrayal of the cross in his claims about virtue and "just war," I would argue based on the examples in this essay that Jesus' cross and our subsequent call as disciples to carry our cross is not analogous to enduring any kind of discomfort or suffering in our lives, but rather is about voluntarily risking suffering in order to expose and transcend both injustice *and* violence.⁴⁹ The cross also points us to those suffering intensely from both direct and structural violence, i.e. to the "crucified peoples" of today.

All the Gospels also report the story of Jesus clearing the temple of sellers and buyers. Stassen and Gushee argue that this act represented a practice of inclusion toward Gentiles, and thus, a practice of love of enemies. They point out how the story in Matthew cites Isaiah 56, which describes the house of prayer Jesus calls for as being one "for all nations."⁵⁰ However, the story of clearing the temple also involved direct challenge to a systemic economic injustice and the religious sacrificial system of violence. The selling of sacrificial animals presented a disproportional hardship and at times even excluded the poor from participating in the rituals. Jesus' general prioritizing of the poor and outcasts presented a pattern of challenging systemic economic injustice, which generates and maintains such poverty. Further, Jesus calls people to exercise "mercy not sacrifice" (Mt. 9.9). Rene Girard supports the connection between the temple clearing and nonviolence when he

⁴⁶ Richard Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to Christian Ethics*, (NY, NY: Harper Collins, 1996).

⁴⁷ Williard Swartley, *Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), 46.

⁴⁸ Richard Hays, *Moral Vision*, 329.

⁴⁹ For a fuller analysis of Bell's argument, see McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers*, 58, 84, 86-88, 164.

⁵⁰ Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 157.

suggests that this story is paradigmatic of Jesus revealing the God who breaks the myth of redemptive violence. Stassen and Gushee point out that Jesus' assertiveness did not injure any people, thus it can hardly be extended to imply support of violence or lethal force.⁵¹

During his arrest in the Garden, Jesus rejects the disciple's use of the sword to protect or defend the innocent, i.e. himself. For example in John's Gospel, Peter draws a sword and strikes the enemy, i.e. the unjust aggressor. Is this not a "just" use of violence to protect the Innocent one? Is there anyone more innocent than Jesus? But what does Jesus say and do in this climatic revelatory moment. . . *'Put down your sword'* is the moment the Reign of God unhinges the logic of "justified" violence. In Luke's Gospel, his last free act before being arrested was to heal the ear of his enemy, who was struck by the violence of Jesus' disciple trying to defend the innocent (Lk. 22.51). He also rejects using legions of angels to fight a war (Mt. 26.51-54), which arguably would have been a "just war."

The shared stories about Jesus' clearing the temple, the Lord's Supper, the Garden, and the cross also indicate this overwhelming witness to nonviolent peacemaking. This kind of peacemaking is summed up in Jesus' new commandment to love as I have loved you (John 15:11-13), i.e. with nonviolent love of friends and enemies.

In a larger project I extend this analysis to Paul and the early Christian communities, as well as making some brief points about the Hebrew Scriptures.⁵² For instance, in Acts we find cooperative distribution of resources and examples of martyrs who forgave their enemies. Paul united formerly alienated peoples, exhorted reconciliation of those caught in divisive rivalry in the newfound congregations,⁵³ described how the peace and authority of Jesus confronts the peace and authority of the Roman Empire, transformed the weapons of war in Ephesians, and offered sets of virtues consistent with Jesus' way.

In Romans 12-13, Paul discusses how to resist or not conform to this world, such as how to respond to evil, and our conduct toward rulers. Responses to evil include letting our love be genuine, blessing those that persecute you, repaying no evil for evil, never avenging yourselves,

⁵¹ Ibid., 157. The Gentiles were only allowed as far as the Court of the Gentiles, which was where the market was located.

⁵² McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers*, 59-65.

⁵³ Swartley, *Covenant of Peace*, 161.

leaving room for God's power of accountability, making peace with all, conquering evil with good, and feeding your enemy if they are hungry in part to evoke their repentance.⁵⁴ Romans 13 is primarily about how a minority and oppressed group ought to relate toward rulers, particularly in the political context of Jews and Jewish Christians being expelled from Rome. N.T. Wright argues that Paul's underlying point is that social-political transformation is not won by the normal means of revolution or violence. By claiming that Caesar was answerable to God, Paul undermines pagan totalitarianism rather than reinforces it.⁵⁵ Richard Brown and Walter Pilgrim argue that Romans 13 is not a doctrine of the state, good for all occasions, nor is it a political theory of the nature of the state, particularly in light of John's critique of this state in Revelations 13.⁵⁶ Further, it may be more descriptive of the prevalent ruling authority than prescriptive of government practices, particularly since Christians did not yet hold official government positions. Paul does not directly address the question of unjust governments here, although he is clear that our true citizenship belongs in the Kingdom of God (Phil. 3:20). However, Paul's central message of Christ crucified would readily bring to mind the injustice of Roman authority.⁵⁷ Romans 13:8 immediately follows this section on ruling authority and indicates that the new contrasting form of life is based on love, specifically a resistance of embodied love consistent with Jesus, rather than through violence.

Virtue Ethics and Nonviolent Peacemaking

Where does this witness of Jesus lead us regarding ethical approaches to nonviolence? Before I elaborate on this question, I want to describe virtue ethics in brief. In general, virtue ethics is a teleological approach, which is based on the premise that all human action is directed toward an end. Virtue ethics also implies that the human person is oriented toward a human good, end, or *telos*. Most virtue ethicists offer a broad, complex, comprehensive, and inclusive understanding of the human good. Thus, not all but many forms of life and ways of embodying the virtues are compatible with the human *telos*.⁵⁸ Further, our

⁵⁴ Ibid., 214, 238.

⁵⁵ Wright, "Paul and Caesar."

⁵⁶ Richard Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, (NY, Doubleday, 1997), 572.

⁵⁷ Walter Pilgrim, *Uneasy Neighbors: Church and State in the New Testament*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 7-36.

⁵⁸ Joseph Kotva, *The Christian Case for Virtue Ethics* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1996), 22-23.

understanding of the human good or *telos* will change and develop during our journey.⁵⁹

The ends of human action are ordered such that human flourishing or excellence represents a life lived in accord with virtue and participation in virtuous relationships.⁶⁰ Being virtuous means having a set of related virtues that enable a person to live and act morally well, not simply to do a morally good action.⁶¹ I am using virtue to refer to a stable disposition to act, desire, and feel in characteristic ways that realize a specific aspect of human excellence or instance of human flourishing.⁶² Each virtue actualizes and cultivates itself in paradigmatic or core practices.

The virtues and their paradigmatic practices lead us toward and constitute the specific human goods that entail human flourishing, and thus, differ from a utilitarian understanding of virtue as merely a means or technique to an external end or good. Virtue ethics also differs from a deontological understanding of virtue as merely a disposition to follow the rules. Virtue ethics is focused on the character of persons, but includes concern for both acts and ends or consequences. In virtue ethics, the primary ethical question asked is “Who are we (am I) becoming?” before, “What is the rule?” or “What are the consequences?” James Keenan argues that the real discussion of ethics is not “What should I do?” but more “Whom should I become?” Another key difference is that rules or consequences-based approaches often give slight attention to friendships and emotions, while virtue ethics significantly values both.⁶³

The scriptural evidence, particularly the witness of Jesus, makes it difficult to argue that the pattern of nonviolent peacemaking or love of

⁵⁹ Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 219.

⁶⁰ Kotva, *The Christian Case for Virtue Ethics*, 32.

⁶¹ Jim Keenan, “Proposing Cardinal Virtues,” in *Theological Studies*, n. 56, (1995), 714.

⁶² William Spohn, *Go and Do Likewise: Jesus and Ethics*, (NY: NY, Continuum, 2003), 28.

⁶³ Friendships uplift our commitments and take us beyond treating others as a mere ‘duty.’ We can only develop virtue in the midst of friendships or community. Emotions are sensed as witnesses to our character and as help in directing actions. For instance, Alasdair MacIntyre claims that virtues are dispositions to both act and to feel in particular ways. Similarly, Simon Harak S.J. explains that Thomistic virtue entails expressing the passions in the right way, at the right time, to the right extent, and toward the right person. See *Virtuous Passions: The Formation of Christian Character* (Mahwah: Paulist Press 1993), 90. In turn, the province of virtue includes both acting in the right way and being moved in the right way.

friends and enemies would not be *at least* one of the paradigmatic actions that corresponds to one of the key Christian virtues; and thus, not merely a utilitarian strategy.⁶⁴ However, a Christian virtue entails key features that are also satisfied by the portrayal of nonviolent peacemaking in the scriptural witness. First, a virtue is a habit, disposition, or practice that realizes a specific good or instance of human flourishing. Fr. Bernard Haring was one of the most prominent scripture scholars in the 20th Century and was instrumental in the transformation of ethics toward scripture and more gradually toward virtue in official Roman Catholic teaching. He argues that the Christian virtue of nonviolence realizes the good of conciliatory love.⁶⁵ This virtue, which I am calling nonviolent peacemaking, would differ from the Thomistic virtue of charity but could fit as a sub-virtue that arises most fully from charity, as does the virtue of mercy. While charity aims at friendship with God, the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking aims particularly at transforming enemies into friends, and deals with conflict or acute conflict, which call forth a unique set of paradigmatic practices.⁶⁶ Second, Joseph Kotva explains that virtues are a means to and constituent elements of human flourishing, i.e. our human end or *telos*.⁶⁷ For Christians, Jesus is the way, i.e. the means, and the one who ushers in the present and coming-to-completion Reign of God, i.e. the *telos*. Thus, Jesus' pervasive and consistent practices of nonviolent peacemaking support the characterization of nonviolent peacemaking as a virtue, which constitutes our *telos*.

Third, William Spohn argues that "each virtue of the Christian moral life is shaped by the story of Jesus and preeminently by its conclusion, the cross and resurrection."⁶⁸ The instances of nonviolent peacemaking arise centrally in the narratives about Jesus, and the power of nonviolent peacemaking to realize conciliatory love is ultimately conveyed in the reconciling cross and resurrection. Fourth, a virtue entails the formation and transformation of character, rather than being primarily an external law or rule for us to obey by rote. Jesus' practice of nonviolent peacemaking aimed to disclose the conciliatory character of God, and to transform the character of his

⁶⁴ See Glen Stassen and David Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2003), 22, 26, 28-31, 134-142.

⁶⁵ Bernard Haring, *Virtues of an Authentic Life* (Liguori, MO: Liguori Publications, 1997), 129-131.

⁶⁶ The virtue of charity includes loving all that God loves, such as strangers and enemies.

⁶⁷ Kotva, *The Christian Case for Virtue Ethics*, 22.

⁶⁸ Spohn, *Go and Do Likewise: Jesus and Ethics*, 32.

disciples toward a conciliatory love, especially regarding the outcasts, poor, and enemies.⁶⁹

Fifth, a virtue consists in being a practice rather than being a mere technique or instrument that produces goods tangential to the activity. Spohn explains that practices are primarily “worthwhile and meaningful in themselves; the enhancement and satisfaction they bring comes from doing them well.” The primary intent of Christian nonviolent peacemaking entails a *satisfaction* found in expressing our love and gratitude for God’s love, rather than primarily as an instrument to gain political power or receive the reward of heaven. As far as nonviolent peacemaking cultivates the transformation of our character, nonviolent peacemaking entails an *enhancement* from the activity itself, which is a constitutive element of a practice. Further, Spohn argues that practices are activities that make up a way of life. Jesus, again often called the “way,” offered us a way of life, which entailed central practices such as those of nonviolent peacemaking.

Because the portrayal of nonviolent peacemaking in the scriptural witness satisfies these five key features of a Christian virtue, we ought to consider nonviolent peacemaking a distinct virtue rather than merely subsuming it in the paradigmatic practices of other virtues.

Integrating the Virtue of Nonviolent Peacemaking

A virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking supplemented by some aspects of human rights offers particular contributions toward developing CST. These contributions consist of both a more adequate way of understanding nonviolence, and a set of practices that arise more clearly and will more likely be sustained.

The shift in understanding consists in assessing nonviolent peacemaking as a virtue, which realizes the specific goods of a conciliatory love that turns enemies into friends, and truth, particularly the truths of our ultimate unity and equal dignity.⁷⁰ Recognizing this virtue qualifies key virtues, such as justice, courage, solidarity, and humility, and uplifts a certain set of related virtues to more prominence, such as hospitality, mercy, and empathy. For instance, the virtue of solidarity with its focus on the poor and oppressed would affect our analysis of

⁶⁹ Consider the Good Samaritan and the transforming initiatives noted by Stassen, *Kingdom Ethics*, 29-31, 135-142.

⁷⁰ Gandhi contributes the object of truth and its’ particular aspects as described.

preparing and directly engaging in war, our analysis of those who exercise lethal force, by emphasizing the question “what kind of persons are they becoming,” and our care for the environment.⁷¹ The virtue of justice would orient us to restorative more than retributive justice.⁷² Restorative justice focuses on the harm or wounds to relationships and how to heal those wounds in ways which persons are restored to participation in the community with a commitment to basic human rights. The virtue of nonviolent peacemaking would include this, but primarily entail drawing the enemy into friendship, which is a deeper more lasting transformation or good. The virtue of courage that prioritizes endurance over attack would now include the practice of suffering out of reverence for the dignity of others (and self) by risking, perhaps even giving one’s life without the distortion of our dignity created by relying on lethal force or by taking another’s life.

Further, particular aspects of human rights can supplement this virtue-based assessment, which presently has less moral traction in public discourse. The contributions of human rights theory in CST already include a strong presumption against war and a fuller range of human rights that includes socio-economic and political-civil rights.⁷³ These aspects enhance the priority of nonviolence, the challenge to the exorbitant and disproportionate U.S. military spending and selling, and even Gandhi’s insight about the constructive program being the main arm of nonviolence. Constructive program refers to “cooperation with the good” with a particular focus on caring for the poor and marginalized.

To take the approach outlined would set the stage for naming and elaborating a set of paradigmatic practices that correspond to the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking and its related set of virtues. I now turn to this set of practices as the second core contribution of a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking for CST.

Seven paradigmatic practices would include: 1) celebrating the nonviolent Eucharist, with secondary components of prayer, meditation, and

⁷¹ Attention to whom soldiers are becoming is particularly significant in light of the levels of PTSD, moral injury, suicide, murder, abuse of women and children, and homelessness. See Reuters News, “Mental Illness Common Among Returning US Soldiers,” Mar. 12, 2007. <<http://www.reuters.com/article/healthNews/idUSTON27935120070312>>.

⁷² For more on the difference between the virtue of justice and the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, see E. McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers*.

⁷³ For more on the integral relationship between virtue and human rights consider Martin Luther King and see William O’Neill, “The Violent Bear It Away: Just War and U.S. Military Policy in the Eyes of Catholic Teaching,” in *Journal of Religion and Society* no. 4, 2008, par. 31. <<http://moses.creighton.edu/JRS/2008/2008-31.html>>.

fasting; 2) training and education in nonviolent peacemaking, with the secondary component of forming nonviolent peacemaking communities; 3) attention to religious or spiritual factors, especially in public discourse, and learning about religion, particularly in the form of intra-religious or inter-religious dialogue; 4) a constructive program with its particular focus on the poor and marginalized; 5) conflict transformation and restorative justice, particularly in the form of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions; 6) third-party nonviolent intervention both in the form of international implementation and local peace teams; and 7) civilian-based defense.

Pope Benedict recognized the central role of the Eucharistic practice in drawing us into the “revolution” of nonviolent love.⁷⁴ Fr. Cantalamessa, the Preacher to the Papal Household in 2005, affirmed the growing attention to the Eucharist as the sacrament of nonviolence and God’s absolute no to violence.⁷⁵ Rev. Emmanuel McCarthy argues that the words “suffered and died” in the Eucharistic prayer are theologically correct, but pastorally insufficient. He suggests the Eucharistic prayer include something like the following:

On the night before He went forth to His eternally memorable and life-giving death, rejecting violence, loving His enemies, praying for His persecutors, He bestowed upon His disciples the gift of a New Commandment: “Love one another. As I have loved you so you also should love one another.”

...But, we remember also that he endured this humiliation with a love free of retaliation, revenge, and retribution. . .we recall also that He died loving enemies, praying for persecutors, forgiving, and being superabundantly merciful to those for whom [retributive] justice would have demanded [retributive] justice.⁷⁶

This practice of connecting the Eucharistic prayer with nonviolent peacemaking can be extended to the practice of prayer in general, but also to the practice of meditation. The virtue of nonviolent peacemaking not only foregrounds the significance of these practices, but also informs how and to what end(s) they should be practiced. For instance, prayer and meditation can function to re-connect us with the source of our lives and with the interconnectedness of all being. These practices often generate solidarity and patience, as well as a capacity to locate and focus on the deeper issues, desires, wounds, and needs. When situations of

⁷⁴ Pope Benedict, *Deus*, par. 13-14, 18. See Midday Angelus, 2007.

⁷⁵ Fr. Cantalamessa, 3rd Lenten Sermon, 2005. <http://centerforchristiannonviolence.org/downloads/Eucharist_Gods_No2Violence_03.pdf>.

⁷⁶ Rev. Emmanuel McCarthy, “*The Nonviolent Eucharistic Jesus: A Pastoral Approach*,” 4-5. <http://centerforchristiannonviolence.org/downloads/NV_Eucharist_PastoralApproach_01d.pdf>.

conflict become particularly trying and long-lasting, these practices nourish our energy and sustain us for the long haul.

Fasting has often accompanied prayer or meditation. Fasting can function as a way of discernment, along with cultivating a sense of solidarity with the poor, hungry, and vulnerable. Further, Gandhi illustrated how fasting can function to stir the hearts, especially of loved ones to transform their ways from violence toward nonviolent peacemaking. Policy makers who engaged in prayer, meditation, or fasting informed by the recognition and appreciation of the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking would likely become the kinds of people who can better see, imagine, and commit to policies oriented to nonviolent peacemaking.⁷⁷

The attention to formation that a virtue-based assessment offers raises a second core practice: training and education in nonviolent peacemaking. The U.S. Bishops have spoken generally about how our nation needs more research, education, and training in nonviolent means of resisting injustice. But the specifics can be clarified and the implementation can be enhanced by a virtue-based assessment.

Scott Appleby makes the argument that we need stronger religious education in nonviolent peacebuilding, and that spiritual-moral formation is the key internal condition for moving beyond violence.⁷⁸ John Paul Lederach suggests an emphasis on the moral imagination as a way to transcend violence, which resonates well with a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking.⁷⁹ Connecting the moral imagination to peacebuilding, he argues that such education should provide early and continual space for exploring questions of meaning and the journey such as: Who are we? What are we doing? Where are we going? What is our purpose? — all questions that get further emphasis with a virtue-based assessment.⁸⁰

Other examples of training and educating for nonviolent peacemaking include the development of Justice and Peace Studies programs and service-learning opportunities. A virtue-based assessment would

⁷⁷ For more explanation of how the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking arises in other traditions and is publicly accessible, see McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers*, 96-121, 138-161.

⁷⁸ Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), chapter 8.

⁷⁹ John Paul Lederach, *Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (NY, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 5.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 173-177.

uplift this need for more emphasis in our education on nonviolent peacemaking, and suggest relevant courses toward developing “deep nonviolence,” such as meditation or contemplation, and nonviolent communication.⁸¹ Training, courses and experiences in nonviolent civilian resistance, which is ten times more likely to lead to a durable democracy than violent revolution, would also be included.⁸² Other educational projects could include the movement to establish a Peace Academy,⁸³ analogous to the academies for the armed forces, or Just Peace Leadership Programs in colleges analogous to ROTC, a substantial increase in resources for the U.S. Institute of Peace, and the realization of a U.S. Department of Peacebuilding.

Closely related to the practice of training and education is the formation of communities committed to the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking. These communities provide a fertile and sustaining space to encounter nonviolent peacemaking, to grow in the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking and its related virtues, and to experiment with or imagine practices of nonviolent peacemaking. The Community of the Ark, the Catholic Worker Houses, and the Peace Community of San Jose de Apartado in Colombia offer good examples.⁸⁴ Gandhi illustrated this practice with his ashrams, understood as training for *Satyagrahis*. Catholic Dioceses and even public policy makers at various levels could also set up pilot-programs or experiment with the formation of nonviolent communities in the hope of drawing wisdom and practices eventually for the larger societies.

A third core practice arising more clearly in a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking is attention to 1) religious or spiritual factors, especially for public discourse, and to 2) learning about religion (s), particularly in the form of intra-religious or inter-religious dialogue. A virtue-based approach emphasizes conceptions of the good life, which persons in the major religious traditions have been reflecting on and enacting for thousands of years.

⁸¹ Marshall Rosenberg, *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life* (Encinitas, CA: Puddle Dancer Press, 2003).

⁸² Maria Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, *Why Civilian Resistance Works*, (Columbia Studies in Terrorism and Irregular Warfare, 2011), 213-214.

⁸³ National Peace Academy, <<http://www.nationalpeaceacademy.us/>>.

⁸⁴ Mark Shephard, *The Community of the Ark* (Simple Productions, Arcata, California, 1990). <<http://www.markshep.com/nonviolence/Ark.html>>. Elizabeth Lozano. “I am the Leader, You are the Leader: Nonviolent Resistance in the Peace Community of San Jose de Apartado, Colombia.” In *Peace Movements Worldwide: Peace Efforts That Work and Why*, edited by M. Pilisuk and M. Nagler, vol. 3, 93-109. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011.

Appleby and Douglas Johnston have both elaborated on numerous examples of how the religious factor and religious actors can and should become a richer resource for peacemaking and U.S. statecraft.⁸⁵ The U.S. government has recently developed a Civilian Response Network to provide civilian experts for deployment to regions at the risk of, in, or transitioning from violent conflict.⁸⁶ However, while they draw on various fields of expertise for this Network, they do not yet, but should include expertise in religion and religious peacemaking.

A fourth core practice highlighted by a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking is what Gandhi called constructive program or social uplift of one's own community. Martha Nussbaum's central capabilities theory, enhanced by Lisa Cahill, represents a policy framework for actualizing the focus on the poor and marginalized found in the constructive program.⁸⁷ The constructive program enhances with strengthens our commitment to the Millennium Development Goals particularly since progress toward most of these goals is still not on target.⁸⁸ The Human Development Index, grounded in capabilities theory, would also receive more prominence in a virtue-based assessment, particularly compared to GDP or economic development.⁸⁹ Further, since a constructive program would also aim to construct and sustain peaceful societies, we would take more seriously the policy implications of the Global Peace Index, which ranks the U.S. 99 out of 162 countries.⁹⁰ Finally, the fair trade movement would find stronger support with its emphasis on the poor and easily exploited.

A constructive program helps our understanding that nonviolence is in fact primarily a constructive endeavor. Stassen's cohort that developed the ten practices of just peacemaking theory is an example focusing attention on the practices that make for peace, rather than simply

⁸⁵ See Appleby, *Ambivalence*, Chapters 4, 5, 8. He argues this would inculcate forgiveness and compassion as political virtues and provide a stronger concept of reconciliation beyond the political realm. See Johnston, *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (NY, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994), 287-291.

⁸⁶ U.S. State Department Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization, <<http://www.stategov/j/cso/what/>>.

⁸⁷ Cahill offers Nussbaum suggestions on kinship and religion. See McCarthy, *Becoming Nonviolent Peacemakers.*, 172-173

⁸⁸ UN, Millennium Development Goals, <<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>>.

⁸⁹ UNDP, Human Development Reports, <<http://hdr.undp.org/en/>>.

⁹⁰ Vision of Humanity, Global Peace Index, 2013, <<http://www.visionofhumanity.org#page/indexes/global-peace-index/2013/USA/OVER>>.

on avoiding violence — or indeed justifying war.⁹¹ Just Peacemaking Theory resonates well with a virtue-based approach.

A fifth core practice corresponding to the virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking is conflict transformation, particularly in the form of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions. By conflict transformation I follow Lederach, who describes it as envisioning and responding to “the ebb and flow of social conflict as life-giving opportunities for creating constructive change processes that reduce violence, increase justice in direct interaction and social structures, and respond to real-life problems in human relationships.”⁹² Conflict is not held to be problematic, something merely to manage or resolve, but rather as a creative opportunity for personal, relational, structural, and cultural growth or transformation.⁹³ Thus, conflict transformation arises more clearly in a virtue-based approach, which is personal, relational and growth oriented.

The accent on reconciliation in conflict transformation resonates well with Pope John Paul’s addition of forgiveness to what Christianson calls the convoy concept of peace in CST,⁹⁴ and with the John Paul’s message of “no justice without forgiveness.”⁹⁵ Christianson argues “Catholic Social Theory needs a theory of conflict and principles of conflict transformation and reconciliation.”⁹⁶ Kenneth Himes acknowledges the underdevelopment in CST of alternative ways to achieve peace and particularly strategies for conflict resolution,⁹⁷ calling for CST to give more attention to the themes of reconciliation, truth-telling, restorative justice and forgiveness, as well as to develop an ethic for resolving conflict, that goes beyond the strategy of dialogue. Yet, when

⁹¹ *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War*, ed. by Glen Stassen (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2008).

⁹² Lederach, *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation* (Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2003), 390-397.

⁹³ Lederach, R. Neufeldt, H. Culbertson, *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring, and Learning Tool Kit*, (South Bend, IN: Kroc Institute University of Notre Dame, 2007), 18.

⁹⁴ Christianson, “Catholic Peacemaking,” 24.

⁹⁵ Pope John Paul II, “No Peace Without Justice, No Justice Without Forgiveness,” in celebration of the *World Day of Peace*, Jan. 1, 2002.

⁹⁶ Christianson, “Peacebuilding in Catholic Social Teaching,” response given at Catholic Peacebuilding Conference, (Notre Dame, IN, Apr. 15, 2008) session V, panel 1. Audio at <<http://cpn.nd.edu/2008CPNConference%20-%20Post-Program.shtml>>, 4.

⁹⁷ Kenneth Himes, “Peacebuilding as a Developing Norm in Catholic Social Teaching,” presented at Catholic Peacebuilding Conference, (Notre Dame, IN, Apr. 15, 2008) session V, panel 1. Audio at <<http://cpn.nd.edu/2008CPNConference%20-%20Post-Program.shtml>>.

Himes alludes to developing an ethic for resolving conflict, he primarily points to more rules in the form of *just post bellum* norms, rather than a virtue-based ethic with the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking. A virtue-based ethic would more adequately address the need to cultivate the character, which can imagine ways to achieve peace and respond to conflict, particularly enhancing the conflict transformation themes he mentions and sustaining the persons in their practice. William O'Neill and Dan Philpott have contributed to a deeper integration of virtue regarding the notion of reconciliation.⁹⁸

Conflict transformation and particularly Truth and Reconciliation Commissions could greatly enhance contemporary policy decisions. For instance, policy leaders even in the peacebuilding field sent a proposal to the new U.S. administration in late December 2008 but left out conflict transformation and reconciliation because they were and still are not “on the radar for many policy thinkers.”⁹⁹ A virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking would contribute to this disconnect by clarifying the meaning and value of conflict transformation in general, and Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in particular. These commissions could enhance U.S. policies regarding Iraq and Afghanistan, among other issues,¹⁰⁰ as well as U.N. policy for example as at least a complement to the International Criminal Court, if not an eventual substitute.

A sixth core practice that arises more clearly from a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking is unarmed civilian peacekeeping. This practice entails an outside party intervening in a conflict as a non-partisan, with compassion for all parties, without violence, with the aim of reducing violence, and of creating a space for reconciliation and peace building. The virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking cultivates the kinds of persons who can imagine, prepare for, and enact unarmed civilian peacekeeping, as well as highlights the themes of compassion for all, aiming toward reconciliation, and empowering all persons, including civilians. The Nonviolent Peaceforce,

⁹⁸ O'Neill, “What We Owe to Refugees and IDP’s: An Inquiry into the Rights of the Forcibly Displaced,” in *Refugee Rights*, ed. by David Hollenbach (Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2008), 32-39. Dan Philpott, “Lessons in Mercy: Justice and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Atrocities,” in *America*, May 4, 2009, 11-14.

⁹⁹ Lisa Schirch, “Building Bridges and Preventing Conflict: A Memo to the New Administration,” supported by 3D Security-Initiative, Alliance for Peacebuilding, and Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, Dec. 28, 2008. <<http://3dsec.sockhead.com/sites/3dsecurity.org/files/3D%20AfP%20and%20GPPAC%20Memo%20to%20Obama%20Admin%20December%2028%202008.pdf>>.

¹⁰⁰ TRC’s have also been proposed in the U.S. for issues like torture, racism and structural injustice, sexism and patriarchy, poverty and U.S. foreign policy in Central America.

which arose from reflecting on Gandhi's idea of *shanti sena* (peace army), is a prime example of the unarmed civilian peacekeeping practice.¹⁰¹ Other examples include Peace Brigades International, Christian Peacemaker Teams, the Meta Peace Team, and the recently formed Muslim Peacemaker Teams in Iraq.¹⁰²

The practice of unarmed civilian peacekeeping could contribute to CST and present public discourse and policies in the following ways. First, the UN Peacekeeping force is still based on military operations, although it has been expanding its repertoire.¹⁰³ The practice of unarmed civilian peacekeeping provides an alternative form of peacekeeping, which would change the debate on UN Peacekeeping, such as the use of private military contractors.¹⁰⁴ Unarmed civilian peacekeeping could potentially shift the ground of UN peacekeeping from military operations to civilian operations; shift the training from military virtues to the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking and its related set of virtues; offer the specific practices of nonviolent modeling and interposition; and more adequately integrate the aim of reconciliation rather than primarily keeping parties apart.

Second, although the US government has recently developed a Civilian Response Network, the implementation of the originating directive has faced bureaucratic roadblocks and taken a backseat to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.¹⁰⁵ Further, the emphasis of the Civilian Response Network is on mere stabilization with primary concern for U.S. national security interests. A virtue-based approach to nonviolent peacemaking could enhance the policy of developing and implementing a Civilian Response Network because it a) raises the value of civilian participation and intervention, b) clarifies unarmed civilian peacekeeping as well as the practice of conflict transformation and the particular form of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, c) indicates that the Civilian Response Network should also include experts in unarmed civilian peacekeeping, and d) calls us to human flourishing beyond mere national interests.

Third, unarmed civilian peacekeeping could offer some insights to the just policing model or to policing in general. One of these insights

¹⁰¹ Nonviolent Peaceforce, <www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org>.

¹⁰² Muslim Peacemaker Teams, <<http://www.mpt-iraq.org/>>.

¹⁰³ UN Peacekeeping, <<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/>>.

¹⁰⁴ Example of the debate: David Isenberg, "Contractors vs. Genocide," in *Middle East Times* Aug. 8, 2008. <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=9586>.

¹⁰⁵ N. Bensahel, O. Olikar, H. Peterson, "Improving Capacity for Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations," published by RAND Corporation, 2009. 46. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG852.pdf>.

is the creation of local peace teams as a supplement to and perhaps eventually a substitute for armed police. The Meta Peace Team, Cure Violence in Chicago, the DC Peace Team, and the Measure Y program in Oakland California, which entails training and deploying unarmed, non-police, street-smart persons to patrol high violence areas, are movements in this direction.¹⁰⁶

A seventh core practice that becomes clearer in a virtue-based and human rights approach is civilian-based defense. This practice entails using nonviolent resistance or force to defend against military invasion, occupation or *coups d'etat*. The resisters do not physically prevent invading troops from entering their territory. Everyone participates in the resistance, taking responsibility for their defense rather than delegating it to an elite group.¹⁰⁷ The power of this practice is in part grounded in the notions a) that one who refuses to submit cannot be ruled, and b) the distinction between resolutely acknowledging the humanity of persons, while resisting their unjust agenda.¹⁰⁸

A virtue-based assessment is particularly congenial to everyone's personal growth, such as the participation and taking fuller responsibility, which civilian-based defense emphasizes. Further, a virtue-based assessment would be especially helpful in drawing our attention to developing the courage and solidarity to engage this practice, the sustenance to maintain it in the face of ongoing repression, the imagination to find ways to non-cooperate, and the capacity to discriminate between the shared dignity of persons and their agenda. The recognition of shared dignity or humanity in civilian-based defense also entails relating to the other as potential friends, i.e. with the conciliatory love that the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking enacts and aims toward.

Taking different forms, civilian-based defense has been tried a number of times in the past century and has recently been incorporated into the defense planning of some governments.¹⁰⁹ Drawing on

¹⁰⁶ DC Peace Team, www.dpeaceatteam.wordpress.com. Kevin Grant, "Mayor's Street Outreach Program," part of Measure Y, (Oakland, CA, 2004). <<http://measurey.org/index.php?page=mayor-s-street-outreach>>.

¹⁰⁷ Michael Nagler, *The Search for a Nonviolent Future: Is There No Other Way?* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Hills Books, 2001), 252-253.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 135-136.

¹⁰⁹ Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers, 2005). George Lakey, "How to Develop Peace Teams: The Light Bulb Theory." <http://www.trainingforchange.org/light_bulb_theory>.

Adam Roberts four stages toward civilian-based defense policy,¹¹⁰ the UN, the U.S., and the Catholic Church, particularly Catholic schools, could all develop and emphasize policy on funding research and investigation into civilian-based defense (stage 1), as well as general public education in civilian-based defense with concentrated training and organizational preparations (stage 2).¹¹¹ If the U.S. would move toward a civilian-based defense policy, then this could help correct our excessive funding for military research in order to free up research funds for addressing root causes of violence, other social injustices, environmental harm, and human development.¹¹² Further, if Catholic schools of higher education were to give priority to the virtue of nonviolent peacemaking, and similarly to prioritize research into corresponding practices like civilian-based defense, then ROTC programs on campus would require serious reconstruction of their curriculum, or indeed should be given a diminished authority on campus, if not completely discontinued, as analogous just peace leadership programs are explored.

In sum, I have argued that a virtue-based assessment of nonviolent peacemaking contributes to CST by 1) offering a more adequate understanding than a rules-based approach, and 2) offering seven core practices that arise more clearly and more frequently in our imagination, and that will more likely be sustained. These practices further the integration of virtue, especially in CST, but also contribute to public discourse and policy. May we have the courage and the grace to live the adventure of our shared call to holiness.

¹¹⁰ Roberts, Adam, "Transarmament to Civilian Defence," in *The Strategy of Civilian Defence*, 292-3.

¹¹¹ Although the U.S. Bishops have mentioned "popular defense" and called for further research, little follow up has occurred on this topic.

¹¹² Franklin Zahn, *Alternative to the Pentagon: Nonviolent Methods of Defending a Nation* (Nyack, NY: Fellowship Publications, 1996), 1-14.