THEOLOGICAL Studies

Article

Just War, Pacifism, Just Peace, and Peacebuilding

Theological Studies
2019, Vol. 80(1) 169–185

DOI: 10.1177/0040563918819808
journals.sagepub.com/home/tsj
SAGE

Lisa Sowle Cahill
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, USA

Abstract
While Roman Catholic ethics of war and peace develops more restrictive criteria of just war and reprioritizes nonviolence, an important strand of Protestant theology defends war as a God-given instrument of government's multiple ends. A newer ethics of just peace and peacebuilding emerges from Christian initiatives to transform armed conflict at intra-state and cross-border levels. This essay assesses these approaches and pacifism, concluding with a perspective from the Global South.

Keywords
Christian just war tradition, humanitarian intervention, *jus post bellum*, just peace, nonviolence, pacifism, peacebuilding, presumption against war

The justice of war has concerned *Theological Studies* since the journal's inception, as James Keenan emphasizes in his essay for this issue.[1] Keenan discovers the formidable John C. Ford—already in 1941—sounding a keynote for subsequent Catholic just war tradition: the "horror of war" presses the question of "pacifism and Christianity," and forces recognition that "the application of our moral principles to modern war leaves so much to be desired."[2] Three years later, Ford's take-down of Allied rationalizations of "obliteration bombing," and of Catholic collusion via

1. Keenan, "Making Sense of Eighty Years of Theological Ethics," *Theological Studies* 80 (2019): 148–68.
2. Keenan, "Making Sense of Eighty Years," 150–51, citing John C. Ford, "Current Moral Theology and Canon Law," *Theological Studies* 2 (1941): 527–76.

Corresponding author:
Lisa Sowle Cahill, Theology Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA.
Email: cahilll@bc.edu

"double effect,"[3] made it crystal clear that intensified scrutiny of "just war" policy was demanded from moral theologians as well as individual consciences, and from the entire democratic citizenry whose officials wield weapons of "modern war."

The Changing Nature of War

In the decades since, war and theories of war have changed. The modern Western conception of war, consolidated in the era of the "World Wars," envisions armed combat between or among nation states, legitimating yet limiting violence with criteria evolved in a long tradition. Formulated variously, these criteria fall into two categories: *jus ad bellum* (justice in going to war) and *jus in bello* (justice in war). The first category includes three criteria derived from Augustine and Aquinas: just cause, legitimate authority, and right intention. The most important criterion of the second category is noncombatant immunity ("discrimination"), a post-World War II focus specified in the Geneva Convention.[4]

After the Cold War, this state-centric paradigm was challenged by the decline of inter-state and the rise of intra-state conflict, involving militants operating across borders, uninterested in just war criteria, and sustained by outside support. Ethnic and religious identities give violence momentum and duration, resisting political solutions. In the 1990s, genocide and mass atrocities in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda belied the effectiveness of just war analysis, international law, and intervention by the United Nations or coalitions of states. Similar scenarios have played out in multiple venues, including Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and Myanmar.[5] In 2017, the number of battle deaths was six times more than in 2011, the majority of casualties in war are now civilian, and the number of displaced people and refugees "is at an all-time high."[6]

This review article (focusing on contributions of the last three years)[7] will begin with energetic defenses of war, largely Protestant, as a necessary and God-given

3. John C. Ford, "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing," *Theological Studies* 5 (1944): 261–309, https://doi.org/10.1177/004056394400500301.
4. For overviews of this tradition by theologically informed authors, see James T. Johnson, "Just War," *Encyclopedia Britannica* online, 1998, revised 2005, https://www.britannica.com/topic/just-war; and Gregory F. Reichberg, "Historiography of Just War Theory," *Oxford Handbook of the Ethics of War*, ed. Seth Lazar and Helen Frowe, 2015, http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199943418.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199943418-e-18.
5. Christopher Browning, *International Security: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 47–50.
6. Sebastian von Einsiedel with Louise Bosetti, James Cockayne, Cale Salih, and Wilfred Wan, "Civil War Trends and the Changing Nature of Armed Conflict," Occasional Paper 10, United Nations University Centre for Policy Research, 2017. This paper is accessed through the UNU website and name of one of the authors: https://cpr.unu.edu/author/seinsiedel.
7. The recent theological literature on topics related to peace and war is immense. Even within the timespan 2015–18, it is necessary to give many works less consideration than they deserve and to omit others of worth.

instrument of national governance. A prominent example, Nigel Biggar, draws primarily on Augustine. Next are Thomistic reappropriations of just war theory, some of which, mediated through Roman Catholic social teaching, define the just war and just war criteria in highly "restrictive" or "stringent" terms. New ethical challenges presented by today's modes (e.g., humanitarian intervention, just revolution) and means (e.g., drones and nuclear weapons) of war will be noted.

Pacifist authors remain a clear minority, but their moral and political influence is considerable. Bearing affinities with pacifism but without necessarily excluding all use of armed force, is a new genre of Christian thought and action that can be called just peacemaking or peacebuilding. Its frame of reference is more subnational and transnational conflict than international wars. This approach stresses nonviolent conflict transformation, strategies of nonviolent resistance, the frequently disingenuous and excessive nature of even "just" uses of violence, and the ongoing processes required to attain just and sustainable peace.

In 2016, a conference on nonviolence and just peace, convened by the Roman Catholic Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace and Pax Christi International, coupled advocacy for nonviolence with a call for the church to abandon just war theory.[8] The latter move proved highly controversial and even divisive among Catholic thinkers, sparking debate about whether and how just war tradition and nonviolence can (or cannot) be interlinked and complementary. Though many leapt to the defense of just war theory, the ensuing controversy revealed a consensus about the priority of peace and nonviolence. Finally, an authentically "Christian" theory of war and peace must include the Global South, where theologians coalesce around practical peacebuilding initiatives. Here they are represented by Emmanuel Katongole, a Catholic from Uganda.

8. "Appeal to the Catholic Church to Re-Commit to the Centrality of Gospel Nonviolence," consensus statement of the Conference on Nonviolence and Just Peace, Rome, April, 2016, at Pax Christi International website, https://www.paxchristi.net/news/appeal-catholic-church-recommit-centrality-gospel-nonviolence/5855. Background papers may be accessed at the website of the Catholic Nonviolence Initiative, https://nonviolencejustpeace.net/framing-papers/. For conference history, documents and commentary, see Marie Dennis, ed., *Choosing Peace: The Catholic Church Returns to Gospel Nonviolenc*e (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 2018). A pacifist defense of the Appeal on biblical grounds is John Dear, "Death Knell for Just War: The Vatican's Historic Turn toward Nonviolence," *Plough Quarterly Magazine* 10 (2016), https://www.plough.com/en/topics/justice/nonviolence/death-knell-for-just-war. An excellent critical discussion. including Protestant and Catholic roots of the prioritization of nonviolence and questions for the Appeal regarding just war theory, is Anna Floerke Scheid, "Christian Peace Ethics: Trends in the International (Anglophone) Debate," *Jahrbuch für Christliche Sozialwissenschaften*, 59 (2018), 253–90. Important resources are three journal focus issues replying to the Rome Appeal and the debates it occasioned. These are the *Journal of Moral Theology* [*JMT*] 7 (2018), "Catholic Peacemaking"; *Horizons* 45 (2018), "Must Just Peace and Just War Be Mutually Exclusive?"; and *Expositions* 12 (2018), "Ethics in Focus: Special Issue on the Future of Just War Theory in Catholic Social Thought." The center of gravity of the *JMT* set is nonviolent conflict transformation, while that of *Horizons* is just war as a form of neighbor love. *Expositions* has longer, more developed articles, from a greater number of viewpoints (open access: https://expositions.journals.villanova.edu/). Subsequent citations from *Expositions* refer to this issue.

In Defense of War

In 2013, the Anglican theologian Nigel Biggar sparked a lively debate with *In Defense of War*, reasserting "the doctrine of justified war" against pacifism and every sort of "wishful thinking" on the "liberal-left," that believes patient reasoning can avert wickedness, so warranting "a strong presumption against war."[9] Invoking Augustine, Biggar insists on a serious doctrine of sin, takes a permissive view of war, views just war's primary purpose as punishment (not defense), sees behind just war a loving intention to restrain and reform aggressors, and justifies deliberately killing the innocent to preserve an overriding good.[10]

Biggar's advocacy stance for war resembles that of the historian of religion James Turner Johnson, who has long put the blame for a "broken" just war tradition on the Catholic bishops, as having moved far too close to "modern-war pacifism."[11] To the contrary, Johnson maintains, authorized by a responsible ruler, war can serve a "good society" and "just order," even when its goal is simply punishment, or ends other than self-defense.

2015 was a big year for debating this thesis. The British journal *Studies in Christian Ethics* (28/3) published a series of replies to Biggar that raised larger issues for the meaning and future of just war tradition; respondents received an answer from Biggar, who wrote a further article taking up "controversies" his book occasioned.[12] Monographs by Joseph Capizzi[13] and David Baer[14] continued the critique

9. Nigel Biggar, *In Defense of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 7–8. For some roots of the "presumption against war" idea (of which the author is critical), see Gabriel Palmer-Fernanadez, "Just War Moralities," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 45 (2017): 589–90, https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12191. Palmer-Fernandez provides a useful discussion of recent work on just war.
10. Biggar, *In Defense of War*, 11, 320, 191, 61 and 212, 98, respectively.
11. James Turner Johnson, "Getting It Right," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 43 (2015): 171 and 177, respectively, https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12090. See also James Turner Johnson, "Just War, As It Was and Is," *First Things*, January 2005, 1–2, https://www.firstthings.com/article/2005/01/just-war-as-it-was-and-is; and Johnson says of Christian just war doctrine that, "there is, simply put, no presumption against war in it at all," James Turner Johnson, "The Broken Tradition," *The National Interest*, September 1, 1996, 7–8, https://nationalinterest.org/bookreview/the-broken-tradition-921. Instead, "the core of the just-war tradition is based on opposition to injustice" (2). See J. Daryl Charles, "Presumption against War or Presumption against Injustice? The Just War Tradition Reconsidered," *Journal of Church and State* 47 (2005): 335–69, https://doi.org/10.1093/jcs/47.2.335. Johnson's 2015 essay replies to Kristopher Norris, "'Never Again War': Recent Shifts in the Roman Catholic Just War Tradition and the Question of 'Functional Pacifism'," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 42 (2014): 108–36, https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12046. Norris argues, against Johnson, that the Catholic popes and bishops are not "functional pacifists" ("Deliberating Just War: A Response to James Turner Johnson's 'Getting It Right'," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 43 (2015): 178–84, https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12091).
12. Nigel Biggar, "In Defence of Just War: Christian Tradition, Controversies and Cases," *De Ethica* 2 (2015): 5–17, https://doi.org/10.3384/de-ethica.2001–8819.15215.
13. Joseph E. Capizzi, *Politics, Justice and War: Christian Governance and the Ethics of Warfare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
14. H. David Baer, *Recovering Christian Realism: Just War Theory as a Political Ethic* (Lanham and Boulder: Lexington, 2015).

of the "presumption against war" while pursuing the larger view of politics just war presumes. Theodore Weber situates war as a necessary tool of government within a larger vision of God's reconciling work, yet stresses the work of the churches for peaceful arrangements of political power.[15] A set of largely Catholic authors contributed to *Can War Be Just in the Twenty-first Century?*[16] running on a different (and rarely intersecting) "restrictive" track of the just war discussion. The same year, another Catholic author, Anna Floerke Scheid, produced a restrained rationale for just revolution, highly conditional on strenuous peacemaking efforts.[17]

Among the questions posed to and by Biggar are the adequacy of defining war as primarily about punishment, what it means to say war must be "proportionate" to its aims, the status of the presumption against war, the more fundamental political vision implied by just war tradition, whether war can in fact be held to standards of justice, the ethical significance of moral injury to combatants, and the distinctively Christian contribution to just war thinking.

In Biggar's view, the distinctive contribution of the Christian, especially Augustinian,[18] just war tradition is that "it conceives of just war as basically punitive in form."[19] The advantage of this rationale, besides consistency with Augustine, is justification of war aims beyond national self-defense. Claus Kreß objects that international law authorizes the use of force only for defense and international peace, never simply to "inflict punishment on an aggressor state."[20] Yet Biggar stipulates that punishment is not simply inflicting commensurate harm. A just war necessarily "aims to rectify" a "grave injustice," to deter future injustices, and even to accomplish "eventual reconciliation."[21] Nevertheless, to portray war as "punishment," even so defined, contravenes international law and diminishes "the moral imperative to narrowly circumscribe the scope of military action," which invariably threatens "innocent human beings."[22]

Two related questions are what extremity of injustice makes armed response proportionate; and whether there is (or should be) a correspondingly strong presumption

15. Theodore R. Weber, *War, Peace and Reconciliation: A Theological Enquiry* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015).
16. Tobias Winright and Laurie Johnson, eds., *Can War Be Just in the 21st Century? Ethicists Engage the Tradition* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2015).
17. Anna Floerke Scheid, *Just Revolution: A Christian Ethic of Political Resistance and Social Transformation* (Lanham and Boulder: Lexington, 2015).
18. Biggar perceives a continuity between Augustine and Aquinas on this point. Yet while Aquinas cites Augustine's view that the aim of war is punishment, he does not elaborate this point in his own voice, but seems to shift the focus to the common good, inasmuch as he names "the common weal" (and not punishment) four times in describing the responsibility of the sovereign authority who declares war (*Summa Theologiae* 2–2, q. 40, a. 1). Hereafter cited as *ST.*
19. Biggar, "In Defence of Just War," 6.
20. Claus Kreß, "Revitalized Early Christian Just War Thinking and International Law: Some Observations on Nigel Biggar's *In Defense of War*," *Studies in Christian Ethics* (2015): 310–11, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565316.
21. Kreß, "Revitalized Early Christian Just War Thinking and International Law," 8. Similar if less-firm qualifications are offered in *In Defense of War*.
22. Kreß, "Revitalized Early Christian Just War Thinking and International Law," 8.

against it. Biggar not only does not endorse a presumption against war,[23] he thinks the criterion of proportionality is "elastic and permissive."[24] Opposing the presumption, both Joseph Capizzi and David Baer take up Johnson's argument that if the "forceful" and "providential" "exercise of political power" is to serve its rightful ends, war must be an available instrument in multiple arenas.[25] John Kelsay proposes to strengthen Biggar's hand by giving more weight to the wars of "the Old Testament."[26]

Esther Reed dissents on Augustinian grounds. Although Augustine sees government as inherently violent, he maintains "a high threshold of necessity" for war, and insists on peace oriented to the common good.[27] Clearly, Christian just war tradition in general shares Augustine's priority of peace as the commitment behind just war.[28] Few deny the multiple ends of government, politics, and power.[29] Yet the fact that sovereigns (and the democratic polities they may represent) may be obligated to use armed force after due deliberation does not mean that "any means whatsoever may be used to achieve a peace with justice."[30] A presumption against war survives—not as a repudiation of the many responsibilities of government nor of all coercive measures, but as essentially a bias against resort to arms before the criteria of just war have been met.[31]

Yet even if standards for resort to war are not as "elastic" as Biggar thinks, the presumption against war (or lack thereof), like the presumption in favor of international law, is a bias not a formula. Precisely because he believes that presumptions are too abstract to get very far in settling concrete cases, Kevin Carnahan recommends reliance on the virtue of prudence, and provides an extended reflection on this virtue's value in just war thinking.[32] Carnahan's counsel is well-taken; yet a preexisting reluctance or readiness to correct injustice violently will and surely should guide prudent discernment of the right means to the end sought: peace with justice. Taking his lead from Augustine, Richard Miller (who favors the presumption against war)[33] commends the virtues of "self-restraint,

23. Biggar, "Reply," 336.
24. Biggar, "In Defence of Just War," 11.
25. Capizzi, *Politics, Justice and War*, 32; Baer, *Recovering Christian Realism*, 1, 10, 12.
26. John Kelsay, "Biggar's Critique of Christian Pacifism, Extended," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 26 (2015): 259–65, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565301.
27. Esther Reed, "In Defence of the Laws of War," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28 (2015): 303, https://doi.org/10.1007/978–1-349–21707–6_9; citing *City of God*, ed. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), bk. 17, 945.
28. For example, Capizzi, *Politics, Justice and War*, 5–6.
29. For a similar Catholic social teaching view of "the purpose of politics," see Kenneth R. Himes, "Humanitarian Intervention and the Just War Tradition," in *Can War Be Just?*" 50–52.
30. Norris, "A Response," 182.
31. Cécile Fabre notes that the presumption against war depends more fundamentally on "a presumption against killing in general" ("Nigel Biggar's Just War: Reflections on the *jus ad bellum*," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28 [2015]: 296, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565313).
32. Kevin Carnahan, *From Presumption to Prudence in Just-War Rationality* (Oxford and New York: Routledge, 2017), 95–96.
33. Richard B. Miller, "Aquinas and the Presumption against Killing and War," *The Journal of Religion* 82 (2002): 173–204, https://doi.org/10.1086/491047.

self-analysis, and the willingness to deliberate publicly" to judiciously order the "practice of war" to "the ends of peace and justice."[34]

What is the distinctively Christian contribution to the ethics of war, if not to see war as divinely authorized punishment? Many Christian theorists follow Paul Ramsey in reinterpreting Augustine's loving intention in war as love for the innocent protected, rather than for the enemy killed.[35] Hugh Beach (who spent forty years in the British army, some in training officers) protests that Augustine's description of killing in war as a form of "tough love" is unrealistic, impractical, and untrue to military experience. A more apt biblical model for mutual soldierly respect is "the 'Golden Rule' (Matt 7:12)—to treat others as you would have them treat yourself"—given the conditions of war.[36] Biggar's proposal of forgiveness and reconciliation deserves wide agreement (granting this is not Augustine's view of "punishment").[37] But are love of neighbor, respect for the enemy, and forgiveness even possible given the real conditions of war? Christian proposals about the potential of justice, compassion, solidarity, and active nonviolence to transform conflict depend partly on humanity's essential moral goodness surviving the impact of sin. More importantly, they depend on a Christian eschatological vision in which renewal and reconciliation are historically incipient realities.

"Realism" and Eschatology

In a radical challenge to just war tradition in general, not a few doubt that just war criteria have any meaningful traction at all under real conditions of conflict. Eric Gregory makes a point with which many have agreed: Augustine's "wisest defenders admit there is no such thing as a 'just war,' even if resort to war can be justified."[38] Esther Reed worries that Biggar in fact "lacks a political realism robust enough to defend against leaving the laws of war in the hands of the most powerful nations."[39] An audit of events such as those of 1914–18 may expose in just war thinking "its inability to cope with war's inbuilt tendency to extremity, expansion and complexity, the drive toward Absolute War."[40] Paul Schulte invokes the French "*engranage*: the condition of being enmeshed … in a geared action–reaction system" that negates the reflective judgment on which just war judgments must rest.[41]

34. Richard B. Miller, *Friends and Other Strangers: Studies in Religion and Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 221.
35. See Capizzi, *Politics, Justice and War*, 64.
36. Hugh Beach, "Can a Soldier Love His Enemy?" *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28 (2015): 281, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565310.
37. Biggar, "Reply," 329–30; to James Turner Johnson, "'Harsh Love' and Forgiveness," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28 (2015): 266–72, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565304.
38. Eric Gregory, "What Do We Want from the Just War Tradition? New Challenges of Surveillance and the Security State," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 27 (2014): 58, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946813509337.
39. Esther Reed, "In Defence of the Laws of War," 298.
40. Schulte, "Probing the Biggar Line," 317, 321.
41. Schulte, "Probing the Biggar Line," 321.

A symptom of the injustice of war is moral injury to combatants, a danger to virtue not envisioned by Augustine when he exhorted warriors to maintain an inner intention of love even when engaged in outwardly violent acts. A career military officer, Robert Latiff, reminds academic just warriors that combatants' moral compasses become disoriented, requiring more not less prior reinforcement of the principles of just war.[42] Cian O'Driscoll suspects "a certain degree of callousness" may be necessary to execute the duties of war, even within the laws of war; and callousness may so numb soldiers to the suffering they cause as to risk "turning them into unfeeling brutes." The "inconvenient truth" is that all wars, even just wars, are necessarily "a mean business."[43]

Stephen Long's *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics*[44] encourages hope for a constructive Christian politics, one that can avoid and reduce, if not abolish, force of arms. For Long, contemporary "Augustinians" (reaching back to Reinhold Niebuhr and encompassing the "new Augustinians" Charles Mathews and Eric Gregory) provide theological warrants for the conviction that political conditions can be ameliorated by democratic action. Less sanguine "ecclesial" theologians (like Stanley Hauerwas) witness to the reconciling work of Christ in the world "by pointing to the disfigured body of Jesus" on the cross. Where they most differ is on whether the church's mission participates in "political formations" that "require taking up violence" or "requires renunciation of power and violence."[45] Another option would be political intervention with nonviolent power. A significant decider is eschatology. Does redemption from sin and renewal of creation make a difference politically? How far can the gospel be put into practice? Long rejects an apocalyptic "disjunction between the world as it appears and the world as it is and will be."[46] He favors the eschatological "inbreaking" of Christ's perfection, enabling a social and political (not only ecclesial) movement of repentance, reconciliation, forgiveness, and restoration "until everything is made just."[47]

Working from Catholic social teaching, Philip J. Rossi resonantly invokes an eschatological "horizon of hope" in which mutuality, solidarity, and action can "make a genuine difference to the trajectory and outcome of history." "The violence of war" is not "an inevitable feature of human life." It is possible to approximate "an effective order of peace."[48] Just peace and peacebuilding advocates assume an "eschatological imagination" in which the world in Christ is already open to a new world-engaging politics of just peace and nonviolence.

42. Robert H. Latiff, "Jumping into Combat without a Parachute—on Purpose?" *Expositions*, 72–79.
43. Cian O'Driscoll, "The Heart of the Matter? The Callousness of Just War," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 28 (2015): 274, https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946814565307. See Tobias Winright and E. Ann Jeschke, "Combat and Confession: Just War and Moral Injury," in *Can War Be Just?* 169–87.
44. D. Stephen Long, *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics: On Loving Enemies* (Lanham and Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018).
45. Long, *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics*, 227; apocalyptic is rejected on 155.
46. Long, *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics*, 244.
47. Long, *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics*, 155.
48. Long, *Augustinian and Ecclesial Ethics*, 237–40.

Thomist Directions in Just War Tradition

Thomas Aquinas adopts Augustine's three criteria for going to war, but emphasizes the "common weal" over punishment as the aim served by a sovereign who lawfully declares war.[49] Theologians—largely Catholic—who develop just war thinking Thomistically see their project as informed by the Gospel and, like many contemporary Protestants, understand just war to express love for the innocent neighbor. Yet they foreground justice and the common good in arguing the moral legitimacy of specific uses of armed force.

In a major work, *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace*, Gregory Reichberg makes the case that Aquinas in fact sees war as an expression of charity, contrary to what many have assumed from the title given Aquinas's main consideration of war in the *Summa Theologiae*, "Whether It Is Always Sinful to Wage War?" Reichberg's primary argument is that war is introduced under the virtue of charity because war secures the conditions of peace which unjust war destroys; and peace is an expression of charity[50]—though war is also related to justice, since temporal peace depends on the acquired virtues.[51] A problem for the "war expresses charity" picture is that Aquinas places his primary discussion "Of War" in a series of *vices against* charity, between discord and schism on one side, and sedition and strife on the other. It is clear that Aquinas wants to say that not all cases of war are unjust or sinful, on the three criteria adapted from Augustine. Yet though he raises several Gospel-based objections to the morality of war, he nowhere counters these in similar terms. Instead he moves to justice. For example, he averts "But I say to you not to resist evil" (Matt 5:39) with "it is necessary for a man to act otherwise for the common good."[52] As Reichberg notes, Aquinas thinks "every just war aims at peace."[53] He sees war as just when it does so, as specified by the common good (not the Gospel directly). This includes the authority to declare war;[54] "punishment" to remedy or deter injustice;[55] and "offensive war" in the sense of rectifying standing injustices not perpetrated by war against the intervening authority (similarly to humanitarian intervention).[56]

In a line of Thomistic just war thinking channeled through Catholic social tradition, the criteria justifying war become increasingly restrictive, and the values of peace and nonviolence correspondingly prominent in reinforcing a bias against armed force.[57] Gerard Powers sees the Catholic approach to war as "highly restrictive" and as "just

49. See Phillip J. Rossi, "Reframing Catholic Theories of Just War," *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 11 (2014): 239–40.
50. But Aquinas distinguishes temporal peace from the peace of charity, and does *not* say, in the text Reichberg cites (*ST* 2–2, q. 23, a. 3 ad 3.) that *all* peace is the fruit of charity.
51. Gregory M. Reichberg, *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 38–39.
52. *ST*, q. 40, a. 1, obj. 2 ad 2.
53. Reichberg, *Aquinas on War and Peace*, 41.
54. Reichberg, *Aquinas on War and Peace*, 131–34.
55. Reichberg, *Aquinas on War and Peace*, 144, 154.
56. Reichberg, *Aquinas on War and Peace*, 275–81.
57. See Norris, "Never Again War"; and a special issue of the *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 11 (2014) on "The Catholic Peace Tradition."

one, relatively marginal element of a much wider and more important project of strengthening peacebuilding."[58] Though defending just war tradition against the 2016 Rome "Appeal," Tobias Winright concurs with the Catholic priority of nonviolence. A just or "integral" peace must integrate "just peacemaking and peacebuilding practices, active nonviolence, and just use of unarmed and armed force."[59]

Anna Floerke Scheid references the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, a just cause that involved atrocities on both sides, yet yielded democracy and reconciliation efforts.[60] She argues that just war criteria both validate and restrain armed resistance, but must work simultaneously with nonviolent strategies,[61] to achieve sustainable and just peace. This is precisely the goal of Mark Allman's and Tobias Winright's *jus post bellum* criteria.[62] Building on existing just war criteria, *jus post bellum* addresses the dire effects of war on entire societies and populations, mandates diplomacy and other measures to avoid armed force, and urges warmakers to take advance measures against destruction of public goods such as food production, the economy, healthcare, education, and the environment. Similarly focused on civilian risk are renewed inquiries into the justice of means in war, including drones, torture, and cluster munitions. Nuclear weapons are receiving intensive scrutiny, regarding their inherent controllability, their danger in volatile political situations, and the morality of the policies that sustain them.[63]

58. Powers, "Our Vocation is Peacebuilding (*Construo pacem est nostra vocatione*)," *Expositions*, 126, 135–36.
59. Tobias Winright, "Why I Shall Continue to Use and Teach Just War Theory," *Expositions*, 142–61. See also Gerard Powers, "Toward an Integral Catholic Peacebuilding," in *Journal of Social Encounters* 1 (2017): 1–13, open access, https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=social_encounters.
60. Scheid, *Just Revolution*, xii–xiii.
61. Powers, "Toward an Integral Catholic Peacebuilding," 101–102.
62. Mark J. Allman and Tobias L. Winright, "Growing Edges of Just War Theory: *Jus ante bellum, jus post bellum*, and Imperfect Justice," in *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, 32/2 (2012): 173–91, https://doi.org/10.1353/sce.2012.0039. See also Allman and Winright's *After the Smoke Clears: The Just War Tradition and Post War Justice* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010). For an argument that forgiveness and reconciliation are mandatory criteria of *jus post bellum*, see Drew Christiansen, "Just War in the Twenty-First Century: Nonviolence, *Post Bellum* Justice and R2P," *Expositions*, 42–45.
63. Space prevents adequate consideration of this important literature. Contributions include Kenneth R. Himes, *Drones and the Ethics of Targeted Killing* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015); Nico Vorster, "Killing from a Distance: A Christian Ethical Evaluation of CIA Targeted Drone Killings," *Heythrop Journal* 56 (2015): 836–49, https://doi.org/10.1111/heyj.12262; Wojciech Morański, "Cyberwar in Catholic Ethics," *Horizons* 10 (2016): 69–84; David Decosimo, "Killing and the Wrongness of Torture," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 36 (2016): 181–98, https://doi.org/10.1353/sce.2016.0020; Nigel Biggar, "Imprudent Jurisprudence? Human Rights and Moral Contingency," *Journal of Law and Religion* 30 (2015), https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2015.23, arguing torture is not intrinsically wrong; Elias Omondi Opongo, "The Moral Question of Terrorism in Divided Societies," in Antonio Autiero and Laurenti Magesa, eds., *The Catholic Ethicist in the Local Church* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2018), 235–46; Gregory M. Reichberg, "The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence: A Reassessment," in Mathias Nebel and Gregory M. Reichberg,

Even within a very restrictive view of justified armed force, and recognizing that no use is ever perfectly just,[64] humanitarian intervention survives as the most readily defended validation of armed force. Popes after Vatican II, despite increasingly adamant insistence on the immorality and ineffectiveness of violence, and on Gospel nonviolence and peacemaking, have not definitively renounced either self-defense or humanitarian intervention.[65] The responsibility to protect (R2P) is an evolution of the concept of humanitarian intervention, referring the responsibility to the international community. A resolution on R2P was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2005. As Kenneth Himes points out, however, "the decision for armed intervention is fraught with difficult judgments." Among these are whether a proposed use of force will accomplish the desired goals, or will lead to escalation and further disarray. Moreover, ostensible humanitarian motives may provide cover for "more self-interested ambitions,"[66] making multilateral backing essential. Drew Christiansen sees just war criteria as "precautionary principles" for R2P, setting a high bar for intervention (large-scale loss of life or ethnic cleansing), and urging extreme caution about intervention by a single state.[67]

The downsides of humanitarian intervention are visible from regions where "humanitarian" interference in local bloodshed has failed to improve or has even exacerbated human suffering. Since the end of the Cold War, Africa has seen increases in internal conflicts, often transnational, and the fragmentation of "failed states."[68] Elias Omondi Opongo concedes that "in situations of gross violations of human rights, an international humanitarian military intervention could be justified," but prioritizes diplomacy, "soft power," sanctions, and action by regional governments. Outsiders often lack adequate

---

eds., *Nuclear Deterrence: An Ethical Perspective* (Chambésy, Switzerland: The Caritatis in Veritate Foundation, 2015), 9–26; Pope Francis, "Prospects for a World Free of Nuclear Weapons and for Integral Disarmament," November 10, 2017, https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2017/november/documents/papa-francesco_20171110_convegno-disarmointegrale.html; Michael C. Desch and Gerard Powers, "No More Nukes?" (a debate), *Commonweal*, February 9, 2018, https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/no-more-nukes; Drew Christiansen, "The Vatican and the Ban Treaty," *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 15 (2018): 89–108, https://doi.org/10.5840/jcathsoc20181515; and chapters in *Can War Be Just*, on drones and robots (Brian Stiltner), cluster munitions (Tobias Winright), torture and terror (Anna Floerke Scheid), nuclear testing (Rachel Hart Winters), and women in combat (Cristina Richie). See also Meghan J. Clark, "Military Sexual Assault as Political Violence," *Journal of Moral Theology* 8/2 (2018): 6–17.

64. Allman and Winright, "Growing Edges," 180–87.
65. See also, Kenneth R. Himes, "Humanitarian Intervention and Catholic Political Thought: Moral and Legal Perspectives," with responses by John Murphy and William Werpehowski, *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 15 (2018): 109–80, https://doi.org/10.5840/jcathsoc20181517.
66. Himes, "Humanitarian Intervention and the Just War Tradition," 60–61.
67. Christiansen, "Just War in the Twenty-First Century," 48–49. Roger Bergman even proposes a Catholic court of just war to guide Catholics, especially those with government or military responsibilities ("Preventing Unjust War: The Role of the Catholic Church," *Expositions*, 8–19).
68. Elias Omondi Opongo, "Just War and Its Implications for African Conflicts," in *Can War Be Just?* 142–43.

cultural and historical resources to settle conflicts successfully or establish lasting peace, especially with short-term interventions, given the deep-seated threats to human security posed by economic, health, educational, and employment deficits.[69]

Pacifism

Because no war is ever in practice just, and because violence contradicts Jesus's example and teaching,[70] current iterations of Christian just war tradition are still repudiated by pacifists.[71] For some, the Gospel demands fidelity to the cross at the expense of political effectiveness. For others, Christian peace practices can encourage social change.[72] Interventions by Stanley Hauerwas and William Cavanaugh, eloquent though brief, exemplify this difference. Hauerwas astutely questions whether just war "realists" are as realistic as pacifists, since "it is not at all clear that the conditions for the possibility of just war are compatible with realism." Hauerwas discerns that, however noble the cause, both the interested motives behind war, and its sacralization by Christian rhetoric of honor and sacrifice (amply illustrated by the Civil War), militate against "the capacity to keep war limited."[73] Against Ramsey, Baer, and Capizzi, Hauerwas maintains that, "realistically," war will never aim at a common good inclusive of the enemy. War can be countered only by "the reality of the church as an alternative to the world's reality."[74] Christians refuse the sword, seeking "not to survive but to live in the light of Christ's resurrection." Hauerwas repeats his famous line, "the church *is* a social ethic," and in this ethic, the "alternative to war is *worship*."[75]

William Cavanaugh has a similar view of the world's brokenness, but a different view of its possibilities—a different eschatology and ecclesiology. Eucharist is just as

69. Elias Omondi Opongo, "Insecurity & Violence and Impact on Human Security," in Michelle Becka, Felix Wilfred, and Mile Babic, eds., *Human Security* (London: SCM, Concilium Series, 2018), 83. See also John Kiess, "Civilian Vulnerability in Contemporary War: Lessons from the War in the Democratic Republic of Congo," *Can War Be Just?* 156–68.
70. Jeremy Gabrielson displays Jesus's nonviolence through the Gospel of Matthew and Paul (*Paul's Non-Violent Gospel: The Theological Politics of Peace in Paul's Life and Letters* (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke, 2014).
71. Terrence J. Rynne overviews evidence of Jesus's nonviolence, twentieth-century Christian pacifism, and pacifist interventions at the 2016 Rome conference ("Jesus and Nonviolence: Scriptural Evidence," in Dennis, ed., *Choosing Peace*, 79–103).
72. Among the more ambitious and hopeful expressions of this conviction is David Carroll Cochran's argument that, like chattel slavery, war can be abolished internationally. See "The Abolition of War: Why It's No Fantasy," *Commonweal*, January 4, 2016, https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/world-without-war; and *Catholic Realism, and the Abolition of War* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014).
73. Stanley Hauerwas, "The End of Just War: Why Christian Realism Requires Nonviolence," *ABC Religion and Ethics*, April 26, 2016, https://www.abc.net.au/religion/the-end-of-just-war-why-christian-realism-requires-nonviolence/10097052.
74. Hauerwas, "The End of Just War."
75. Stanley Hauerwas, "The Sacrifices of War and the Sacrifice of Christ," *ABC Religion and Ethics*, April 23, 2015, https://www.abc.net.au/religion/the-sacrifices-of-war-and-the-sacrifice-of-christ/10098368.

important in Cavanaugh's church. But Eucharist has political power, linked to peacemaking and commitment "to our world" (citing Benedict XVI). It "is not about creating internal unity by identifying and battling external enemies." It is about recognizing that all share in sin and redemption. The Eucharist incorporates believers, and potentially non-Christians, "into a much larger transnational body, the Body of Christ." Following Dorothy Day, Cavanaugh envisions a Eucharist in which "the distinction between friends and enemies is overcome." All must repent for the reality of war, and embrace nonviolent peacemaking.[76] David Martin calls on Christian liturgy, music, and literature to form Christians for the challenge.[77]

Just Peace

The Roman Catholic trajectory of the just peace and peacebuilding movement took new focus and momentum from the 2016 Rome conference on "Nonviolence and Just Peace." Its mission coalesced in Pope Francis's World Day of Peace Message, 2017, "Nonviolence: A Style of Politics for Peace." The pope addressed "all peoples," diagnosed "a horrifying world war fought piecemeal," and declared, "violence is not the cure for our broken world." Even "just" violence kills countless people, leads to "forced migrations and enormous suffering," and diverts resources from the majority.[78] Gospel nonviolence can be and has been effective. Francis mentions the Christian–Muslim women's peace movement in Liberia, Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan.[79]

Some take this message in a pacifist direction. Eli McCarthy, whose primary agenda is a virtue-based approach to just peace, sees all military action as a moral failure. He believes that "the church's role is to keep a just peace ethic front and center" (with which few just peace theorists, pacifist or not, would disagree). Moreover—another important yet neglected point—the just peace ethic addresses not only direct but also cultural and social violence, and promotes nonviolent resistance as a feasible and *effective* option.[80]

---

76. William T. Cavanaugh, "'An End to Every War': The Politics of the Eucharist and the Work of Peace," *ABC Religion and Ethics*, January 19, 2016, https://www.abc.net.au/religion/an-end-to-every-war-the-politics-of-the-eucharist-and-the-work-o/10097406.
77. David Martin, *Ruin and Restoration. On Violence, Liturgy and Reconciliation* (London: Routledge, 2016).
78. Francis, "Nonviolence: A Style of Politics for Peace," January 1, 2017, 1–2, https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/peace/documents/papa-francesco_20161208_messaggio-l-giornata-mondiale-pace-2017.html. Gerald Schlabach shows how this message implies strategic, transforming initiatives based on the Sermon on the Mount, in line with the just peacemaking theory of the late Glen Stassen. See "A 'Manual' for Escaping Our Vicious Cycles," *Journal of Moral Theology* 7 (2018): 86–91.
79. Francis, "Nonviolence," 6.
80. Eli S. McCarthy, "A Virtue-Based Just Peace Ethic," *Journal of Moral Theology* 7 (2018): 100–101. See also Eli McCarthy, ed., *A Just Peace Ethic* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2019). In "The Gospels Draw Us Further: A Just Peace Ethic," *Expositions*, 80–102, McCarthy develops the virtues and "transforming initiatives" required by just peace. For concrete evidence of how civil resistance can transform conflict, see Maria J.

Some just peace advocates fall into the "stringent" just war school, envisioning that truly just force includes goals such as restorative justice.[81] In the previously-referenced 2018 special issue of *Horizons* dedicated to a just war reply to the Appeal, Drew Christiansen, Tobias Winright, Laurie Johnston, and Mark Allman urge that the ancient Christian just war tradition not be abandoned, though this tradition has been moving toward an "increasingly stricter" formulation.[82] With McCarthy, they are committed first to nonviolent peacebuilding.

A leading exponent of just peace theory, Maryann Cusimano Love, sees Christian just war tradition as too often "top-down and state-centric," largely devised by people outside conflict zones, and overemphasized (albeit necessary to limit wars). The comprehensive approach to conflict is just peace: "Just peace is the mutually constitutive and interactive commitment to and pursuit of social cohesion and equity, in both orientation or aim and action." Just peace works to prevent or terminate violence and builds "lasting, sustainable, inclusive peace."[83] Just peace principles (which include related practices) are protecting human life, dignity, and the common good; right intention; inclusive political participation; restoration; right relationship; reconciliation; and sustainability.[84] Eli McCarthy adds the principle of reflexivity: (nonviolent) means should match (nonviolent) ends.[85] Just peace "harvests" the insights and approaches "of women and men working on the ground to build peace and restore communities."[86]

Stephan, "What Happens When You Replace a Just War with a Just Peace," *Foreign Policy*, May 18, 2016, https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/05/18/pope-francis-just-peace-catholic-vatican-africa-isis/; "Adopting a Movement Mindset to Address the challenge of Fragility," September 2016, United States Institute of Peace, https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/05/18/pope-francis-just-peace-catholic-vatican-africa-isis/; "Nonviolent Strategies to Address Terrorism and Violent Extremism," in Lisa Sowle Cahill, Diego Irarrazaval, and Jaõ Vila-Chã, Mercy (London: SPCK, 2017), 138–44; and, with Erika Chenoweth, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).

81. Restorative justice is treated in Floerke Scheid's *Just Revolution*; and in her "Christian Peace Ethics: Trends," 278–83. For an introduction to restorative justice, reconciliation, and related concepts, see Jennifer J. Llewellyn and Daniel Philpott, eds., *Restorative Justice, Reconciliation and Peacebuilding* (New York: Oxford, 2014), especially the editors' introduction and Stephen J. Pope, "The Role of Forgiveness in Reconciliation and Restorative Justice: A Christian Theological Perspective," 174–96; William R. O'Neill, "Must the 'Violent Bear It Away'? A Restorative Critique of Just War," *Expositions*, 103–25; and Kathleen Bonnette, "A Branch Regrafted: An Augustinian Approach to Restorative Justice," *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 15 (2018): 181–210, https://doi.org/10.5840/jcathsoc201815110.
82. "Must Just Peace and Just War Be Mutually Exclusive?," authors' joint "Conclusions," 127.
83. Mary Ann Cusimano Love, "Just Peace and Just War," *Expositions*, 59–61. See also May Ann Cusimano Love, *Just Peace in Practice* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019).
84. Cusimano, "Just Peace and Just War," 62.
85. Eli S. McCarthy, "The Gospels Draw Us Further," 83.
86. Cusimano Love, "Just Peace and Just War," 67.

Local agency is key to peacebuilding and its theologies; for example, traditional courts and reconciliation practices, church ministries to victims and perpetrators, initiatives to care for survivors.[87] An asset of Catholic peacebuilding is an international network of dioceses, religious congregations, universities, and nonprofit organizations, to support and connect communities and activists. The participation of women in peacebuilding, especially religious peacebuilding, is needed, present, and notable. Women are much more likely to respect and observe just peace principles than are state-centric approaches of governments, international bodies and the churches, which favor the leadership of men.[88]

Yet some Thomists share Augustinian worries about whether just peace advocacy is endangering just war as a "role incumbent upon statesmen."[89] Referencing European Catholic debates of the 1930s about whether international law supersedes or should rely on just war "doctrine," Reichberg argues that the former opinion (proposed in a 1932 declaration of French, Swiss, and German theologians) was that states no longer have an "unrestricted right of war," and must subordinate their interests to that of international society. He believes this view, by severely restricting legitimate defense and anticipating the displacement of just war by "international policing," detrimentally eroded traditional just war terminology in subsequent papal statements.[90] Yet, he agrees, papal teaching does encourage restraint of arms, and "the higher efficacy and moral superiority of nonviolence" (John Paul II).[91]

Peacebuilding in the Global South

Scholars writing on just war tradition are typically academics in the Global North. Their existential base point is the two World Wars, with subsequent application of derivative theories to "great power" intervention in injustices abroad (including humanitarian intervention). Pacifist scholars share a similar social location, though often with connections to activist organizations (like Pax Christi) and anti-war activists of the Vietnam

87. For accomplishments and challenges, see J. J. Carney, "A Generation after Genocide: Catholic reconciliation in Rwanda," *Theological Studies* 76 (2015), 785–812, https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563915605269; and Christine Schliesser, "Whose Justice? Which Democracy? Justice, Reconciliation and Democracy in Post-Genocide Rwanda—Challenges to Public Theology," *International Journal of Public Theology* 12 (2018): 24–37, https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320–12341521.
88. Maryann Cusimano Love, "Catholic Women Building Peace: Invisibility, Ideas, and Institutions Expand Participation," in Susan Hayward and Katherine Marshall, eds., *Women, Religion and Peacebuilding: Illuminating the Unseen* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2015), 55. This volume is a tremendous resource for the international and interreligious contributions of women peacebuilders.
89. Reichberg, *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace*, 264, 266.
90. Gregory M. Reichberg, "Reframing the Catholic Understanding of Just War: Two Contrasting Approaches in the Interwar Period," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 46 (2018): 570, 575–76, https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12232.
91. Reichberg, *Thomas Aquinas on War and Peace*, 275.

generation (like Dorothy Day and Daniel Berrigan) who prophetically denounced Western militarism, of the USA in particular. The just peace and peacebuilding scholars (including some stringent just war theorists and pacifists) are likely to have direct experience of conflicts in the Global South,[92] and write with conflict's cyclical and intransigent nature in mind, and its devastation of societies and populations. Inspired by desperation and hope, they foreground nonviolence and peacebuilding as both practical and morally mandatory.

A representative focus of literature from regions of ongoing conflict, with its immense scope and diversity,[93] is the recent work of Emmanuel Katongole. Katongole's powerful *Born from Lament*, using the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) as profound illustration, brings home the extremity, cruelty, and inhumanity of the violence suffered on the continent, violence that Katongole calls "pathological" in its inventive sadism. Katongole questions how "one was able to remain and sustain agency within such a painful space of anguish." Katongole narrates how faith activists, particularly women, transform deep "suffering and tragedy" into "energy, commitment, and nonviolent alternatives." But he does not move there too quickly.[94] Different from most North American peacebuilding literature and perhaps uniquely, Katongole plumbs biblical lament to confront an inadmissible possibility: God neither hears nor rescues supplicants. They go down to destruction alone. Katongole interprets Lamentations as a lament of a people in ruin and horror, destroyed by atrocities—bleak, bitter, and without hope.[95] It is a lament of standing and "turning" before a God who is contradictorily "liberating, abusing, silent and indifferent." Prayer that confronts this "harsh truth" can be consoling for those who struggle under its burden.[96] Though the Psalms of lament

92. See, for example, the website of the Catholic Peacebuilding Network, https://cpn.nd.edu/. Several participants at the Rome conference were from conflict zones, accounting in part for the Appeal's repudiation of just war theory, which many experienced as simply a rationalization of war.
93. For theological perspectives on "human security" and just peace from Europe, as well as Argentina, the Philippines, Colombia, Kenya, and Korea, see Becka, Wilfred, and Babic, eds., *Human Security*. See also Carney, "A Generation after Genocide"; Schliesser, "Whose Justice?"; Robert Vosloo, "Difficult Forgiveness? Engaging Paul Ricoeur on Public Forgiveness within the Context of Social Change in South Africa," *International Journal of Public Theology* 9 (2015): 360–78, https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320-12341406; Rudolf von Sinner and Euler Renato Westphal, "Lethal Violence, the Lack of Resonance and the Challenge of Forgiveness in Brazil," *International Journal of Public Theology* 12 (2018): 38–55, https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320-12341522; Victor Ezigbo, "Violent Christians, the Nigerian Public Square, and the Utility of Jesus' Forgiveness Sayings for Tackling Religious Violence," *International Journal of Public Theology* 12 (2018): 236–59, https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320-12341537.
94. Emmanuel Katongole, *Born from Lament: The Theology and Politics of Hope in Africa* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), xiii.
95. Katongole, *Born from Lament*, 47.
96. Katongole, *Born from Lament*, 58–59.

likewise risk exposing a God who is no longer "a God who saves," they offer a different "turning toward and around God," incorporating a note of confidence and praise.[97]

Incredible stories of survivors, healers, and reconcilers from the DRC, Rwanda, and Burundi bring home Katongole's ultimate affirmation that the "excess of love" with which God in Christ responds to evil and violence can lead to "a new place" and "a new politics." The church can be "a *sacrament* of God's ongoing work of social repair."[98] For Katongole, nonviolence is not just an ethics, or even a peacebuilding strategy; it is "the way God creates, rules, and governs the world," and thus a Christian "vocation" with ecclesial and political power.[99] In *The Journey of Reconciliation*, Katongole connects such narratives to interfaith peace efforts, and to Pope Francis's "Gospel of Mercy," confirming "the inherent political character of the Gospel."[100]

Social transformation in the wake or continuing presence of horrific violence is never smooth, easy, simple, or wholly just. It demands negotiation and compromise, not least of all with perpetrators whose reintegration requires uneasy bargains between political reconciliation and impunity. Nonviolence and human security are often at odds amidst the realities of transitional and restorative justice. Still, Christian war and peace ethics from the Global South presents multiple contextual strategies for and theologies of peacebuilding and just peace, while vindications of just war are rare.

Author Biography

Lisa Sowle Cahill is J. Donald Monan, SJ, Professor of Theology at Boston College. She is a past president of the Catholic Theological Society of America and the Society of Christian Ethics. Her research engages theology and gender, war and peace, and bioethics. Her most recent book is *Blessed Are the Peacemakers: Pacifism, Just War, and Peacebuilding* (Fortress, 2019).

97. Katongole, *Born from Lament*, 106, 111; 119 and 126 on "turning."
98. Katongole, *Born from Lament*, 162–64.
99. Katongole, *Born from Lament*, 176–77; Maria Stephan is cited, 176n32.
100. Emmanuel Katongole, *The Journey of Reconciliation: Groaning for a New Creation in Africa* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2017), 158.