

By JOHN MECARTNEY

The bishops give considerable attention to non-violent means of conflict resolution.

The bishops reaffirm that diplomacy, negotiation, and compromise are forms of non-violent conflict resolution, but their primary focus here is upon non-violent resistance. They indicate that non-violent resistance can take many forms, but they are particularly concerned with the non-violent resistance that a government might organize as a means of helping its people to hinder an invading force or to prevent an oppressive government from successfully enacting its policies.

According to the bishops, if non-violent resistance is to prove viable the people will have to be united in their will and in their spirit of sacrifice. Indeed, as much sacrifice will be necessary as that required by the preparations for war.

In responding to those who would still dismiss non-violent resistance as impractical or unrealistic, the bishops suggest that the almost certain effects of a major war be considered. There could be a great loss of life from following the way of non-violent resistance, but the way of war will almost certainly require an extensive loss of life.

The bishops point to the principles of non-violent resistance as being compatible with and to some extent derived from Christian teaching in Scripture, tradition, the church Fathers, and the age of the martyrs. Regarding Christ they state: "Christ's own teachings and example provide a model way of life incorporating the truth and a refusal to return evil for evil."

In order to provide support for research into the various non-violent means of conflict resolution, the bishops make the suggestion that at least some percentage (even one-tenth of one per cent) of the funds currently budgeted for military purposes be redirected for this purpose. They also endorse the establishment of a U.S. Academy of Peace to support training in conflict resolution, non-violent resistance, and peace education.

ing an ability to survive attack. This confusion has led to public skepticism and even ridicule of the program and casts doubt on the credibility of the government. An independent commission of scientists, engineers and weapons experts is needed to examine if these or any other plans offer a realistic prospect of survival for the nation's population or its cherished values, which a nuclear war would presumably be fought to preserve.

5. Efforts to Develop Non-violent Means of Conflict Resolution

We affirm a nation's right to defend itself, its citizens and its values. Security is the right of all, but that right, like everything else, must be subject to divine law and the limits defined by that law. We must find means of defending peoples that do not depend upon the threat of annihilation. Immoral means can never be justified by the end sought; no objective, however worthy of good in itself, can justify sinful acts or policies. Though our primary concern through this statement is war and the nuclear threat, these principles apply as well to all forms of violence, including insurgency, counterinsurgency, "destabilization," and the like.

a. The Second Vatican Council praised "those who renounce the use of violence in the vindication of their rights and who resort to methods of defense which are otherwise available to weaker parties, provided that this can be done without injury to the rights and duties of others or of the community itself." (95) To make such renunciation effective and still defend what must be defended, the arts of diplomacy, negotiation and compromise must be developed and fully exercised. Non-violent means of resistance to evil deserve much more study and consideration than they have thus far received. There have been significant instances in which people have successfully resisted oppression without recourse to arms. (96) Non-violence is not the way of the weak, the cowardly or the impatient. Such movements have seldom gained headlines even though they have left their mark on history. The heroic Danes who would not turn Jews over to the Nazis and the Norwegians who would not teach Nazi propaganda in schools serve as inspiring examples in the history of non-violence.

Non-violent resistance, like war, can take many forms depending upon the demands of a given situation. There is, for instance, organized popular defense instituted by government as part of its contingency planning. Citizens would be trained in the techniques of peaceable non-compliance and non-cooperation as a means of hindering an invading force or non-democratic government from imposing its will. Effective non-violent resistance requires the united will of a people and may demand as much patience and sacrifice from those who practice it as is now demanded by war and preparation for war. It may not always succeed. Nevertheless, before the possibility is dismissed as impractical or unrealistic, we urge that it be measured against the almost certain effects of a major war.

b. Non-violent resistance offers a common ground of agreement for those individuals who choose the option of Christian pacifism even to the point of accepting the need to die rather than to kill, and those who choose the option of lethal force allowed by the theology of just war. Non-violent resistance makes clear that both are able to be committed to the same objective: defense of their country.

c. Popular defense would go beyond conflict resolution and compromise to a basic synthesis of beliefs and values. In its practice 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 adversary or oppressor would not be enough. The goal is winning the other over, making the adversary a friend.

It is useful to point out that these principles are thoroughly compatible with — and to some extent derived from — Christian teachings and must be part of any Christian theology of peace. Spiritual writers have helped trace the theory of non-violence to its roots in scripture and tradition and have illustrated its practice and success in their studies of the church fathers and the age of martyrs. Christ's own teachings and example provide a model way of life incorporating the truth, and a refusal to return evil for evil.

Non-violent popular defense does not insure that lives would not be lost. Nevertheless, once we recognize that the almost certain consequences of existing policies and strategies of war carry with them a very real threat to the future existence of humankind itself, practical reason as well as spiritual faith demand that it be given serious consideration as an alternative course of action.

d. Once again we declare that the only true defense for the world's population is the rejection of nuclear war and the con-

ventional wars which could escalate into nuclear war. With Pope John Paul II, we call upon educational and research institutes to take a lead in conducting peace studies: "Scientific studies on war, its nature, causes, means, objectives and risks have much to teach us on the conditions for peace." (97) To achieve this end, we urge that funds equivalent to a designated percentage (even one-tenth of 1 percent) of current budgetary allotments for military purposes be set aside to support such peace research.

In 1981 the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution recommended the establishment of the U.S. Academy of Peace, a recommendation nearly as old as this country's Constitution. The commission found that "peace is a legitimate field of learning that encompasses rigorous, interdisciplinary research, education and training directed toward peacemaking expertise." (98) We endorse the commission's recommendation and urge all citizens to support training in conflict resolution, non-violent resistance, and programs devoted to service to peace and education for peace. Such an academy would not only provide a center for peace studies and activities, but also be a tangible evidence of our nation's sincerity in its often professed commitment to international peace and the abolition of war. We urge universities, particularly Catholic universities in our country to develop programs for rigorous interdisciplinary research, education and training directed toward peacemaking expertise.

We, too, must be prepared to do our part to achieve these ends. We encourage churches and educational institutions, from primary schools to colleges and institutes of higher learning, to undertake similar programs at their own initiative. Every effort must be made to understand and evaluate the arms race, to encourage truly transnational perspectives on disarmament, and to explore new forms of international cooperation and exchange. No greater challenge or higher priority can be imagined than the development and perfection of a theology of peace suited to a civilization poised on the brink of self-destruction. It is our prayerful hope that this document will prove to be a starting point and inspiration for that endeavor.

6. The Role of Conscience

A dominant characteristic of the Second Vatican Council's evaluation of modern warfare was the stress it placed on the requirement for proper formation of conscience. Moral principles are effective restraints on power only when policies reflect them and individuals practice them. The relationship of the authority of the state and the conscience of the individual on matters of war and peace takes a new urgency in the face of the destructive nature of modern war.

a. In this connection we reiterate the position we took in 1980. Catholic teaching does not question the right in principle of a government to require military service of its citizens provided the government shows it is necessary. A citizen may not casually disregard his country's conscientious decision to call its citizens to acts of "legitimate defense." Moreover, the role of Christian citizens in the armed forces is a service to the common good and an exercise of the virtue of patriotism, so long as they fulfill this role within defined moral norms. (99)

b. At the same time, no state may demand blind obedience. Our 1980 statement urged the government to present convincing reasons for draft registration and opposed reinstatement of conscription itself except in the case of a national defense emergency. Moreover, it reiterated our support for conscientious objection in general and for selective conscientious objection to participation in a particular war, either because of the ends being pursued or the means being used. We called selective conscientious objection a moral conclusion which can be validly derived from the classical teaching of just-war principles. We continue to insist upon respect for the legislative protection of the rights of both classes of conscientious objectors. We also approve requiring alternative service to the community — not related to military needs — by such persons.

B. Shaping a Peaceful World

Preventing nuclear war is a moral imperative; but the avoidance of war, nuclear or conventional, is not a sufficient conception of international relations today. Nor does it exhaust the content of Catholic teaching. Both the political needs and the moral challenge of our time require a positive conception of peace, based on a vision of a first world order. Pope Paul VI summarized classical Catholic teaching in his encyclical, "The Development of Peoples:"

"Peace cannot be limited to a mere absence of war, the result of an ever precarious balance of forces. No, peace is something built up day after day, in the pursuit of an order intended by