

Nonviolence and Just Peace Conference

Session 4 – Moving Beyond Unending War. Moderated by Sr. Ann Scholz, Leadership Conference of Women Religious

Sr. Ann Scholz: So how about a round of applause for Gerry?

[applause]

[inaudible] While our reflectors are getting settled, could I invite those of you who have a number 4, a roman numeral 4, on the back of your nametag to come up and join us in the first circle.

Thank you, thank you.

So where are we on this journey that we began many, many years ago, which we intensified yesterday and continue today. Our journey toward becoming God's beloved community, as Martin Luther king described it. You know we reflected in that first session on our own experiences of nonviolence. Then we took a deep look at Jesus of Nazareth who made his way Peace, and who made for us a way of nonviolence, in the midst of his historical moment, in the midst of structural violence. And then this morning we had beautiful examples of how to be in this world in concrete situations. What does it look like to make active nonviolence a way of life? What does it look like to stand before structures and individuals who are perpetrating violence and claim God's *shalom*? That brings us to session number four. Where we are going to take a close look at what it means to move beyond war. What will it take for us to reject violence and to establish *shalom*?

My name is Ann Scholz. I have the privilege of ministering at the Leadership Conference of Women Religious in Washington, D.C. in the United States where I am the director for Social Mission. And I'd like to briefly introduce to you our three reflectors who will seed our own dialogue this morning. And then I hope we can make time and space for as many of you as possible to contribute to our discussion to add to the dialogue. So first, if I could, I'll introduce Jean-Marie, from France. I understand you are a philosopher, would that true? A philosopher?

Jean-Marie Muller: Oui, oui.

Sr. Ann Scholz: And the internet tells me you're an expert on Gandhi.

Jean-Marie Muller: [speaks in French]

Sr. Ann Scholz: [repeats French] So glad you're here. And you're also the director of studies at the Institute for Research into Nonviolent Conflict. So welcome, we're glad to have you.

And to Jean-Marie's, left, Ogarit? Ogarit Younan from Lebanon. Ogarit is co-founder and president of the Academic University for Nonviolence and Human Rights in the Arab World and is also a founding member of 100 nonviolence, non-sectarian democratic houses throughout

Lebanon. In addition, if I read correctly, if this is true, you've helped to develop a curriculum in Lebanon and the region on solving conflicts nonviolently? That's wonderful, thank you so much.

And on your left is Lisa Cahill from the United States. Dr. Cahill is an American ethicist and a professor at Boston College. Her work focuses on an attempt to discuss the complexity of moral issues while lowering tensions about theological disagreements within the church and within the society. She's done work on gender as well as work on bioethics. So those are our panelists this morning. If I could please ask your indulgence, five minutes, five minutes. So if you could just after hearing where we've come these last two days, if you could just try to deepen that conversation and speak particularly to this notion of how we get out, how we break out of the cycle of unending war. OK?

So, we can begin. Jean-Marie? would you begin? Thank you.

Ogarit Younan: Le micro?

Sr. Ann Scholz: Oh, yes. Sorry.

Jean-Marie Muller: *Merci.* [Continues in French; English translation:] *Thank you. I would like to thank, very much, those that organized this meeting and thank them for this organization. I'm an old friend of nonviolence. I've been thinking about nonviolence for 50 years and I have to confess that I never hoped that a program like this that invites Christians and the church to break violent ideology and promote the philosophy of nonviolence. And I thank the organizers for talking the risk of inviting me and for taking the risk to let me speak.*

So, it's amazing to see that we're all in agreement to say that the testimony of Jesus is a testimony of nonviolence. And that the kingdom of Jesus that he wants to (unintelligible) ... that he asks us to xx is a kingdom of nonviolence. I already see that to simply say this and that be unified in saying it, is already an important point to create a new process in the Church and thus for society. So, being that the word "nonviolence" is a word hard enough in so much as that it's a negative word... Nonviolence. So to what does the word nonviolence say "no" to? You'll say, "to violence". But what do we mean by violence?

So first it's in effect the rejection of violence that kills. The basic principle of universal wisdom is "you will not kill". You will not kill. And the transcendence of man, in the end, is to fear more so killing someone than dying. Fear more so killing someone than dying. Meaning taking the risk of dying to avoid killing rather than taking the risk of killing to avoid dying. That's the theology of a just war, the ideology of legitimate violence is taking the risk of killing to avoid death. At the same time we can't content ourselves to define nonviolence as the refusal of violence... the refusal of violence. We need a positive definition of nonviolence. We can't keep on saying that there should be no war and that there should be peace. Condemning war has never reduced war. Making promises of peace never built peace. What we need is an alternative to violence to build peace.

This is where we need to prefer to Gandhi. There's pre and post Gandhi, when we talk of

violence. Gandhi was at the same time, a wise man who lived nonviolence - not only outside his society but in the heart of the conflicts in his society - and he first and foremost proposed a strategy, a strategy of resistance to free India from the oppression of colonial Britain. And he came up with methods. He tried to convince the Brits, to negotiate with the Brits. But it became impossible. It's why he finally started an act of civil disobedience by disobeying the law regarding salt. We have to be careful not to subscribe to an ideal idea of nonviolence by relying on dialogue and negotiation.

What characterizes justice is that, precisely, dialogue isn't possible. That negotiation isn't possible. When Jesus acted... ah, they're saying that I only have half hour left so I need shorten it a bit... When did Jesus act nonviolently? It's when he went to solve a problem in the temple... he refused the of sacrifice animals. He look the xx not to chase the merchants but to simply free the animals. He freed the animals from the temple. And he overturned the merchant's tables. He refused the temple's money. So her started the conflict.

We shouldn't have an idealistic vision of nonviolence as the refute of conflict. And I'm thrilled that in the text that the cardinal read yesterday, in the text of the pope, there's an apology the conflict, to face conflict. To not think that nonviolence is the absence of conflict. Conflict is necessary for creating peace. So, I only have half an hour, right? So, we must absolutely put ourselves in this perspective to create conflict. There are methods that aren't just dialogue... but we have to create the conditions that allow for dialogue. I'm going to conclude. There's an element that I would like to give. The problem not only of just peace but of just nuclear dissuasion. Being French citizens, we have nuclear weapons, a nuclear defense. And I think you have to be agnostic to understand that nuclear weapons aren't evangelical weapons. That it's not a Christian weapon. We must break the rush for nuclear weapons.

And not only for world disarmament. Everyone's for world disarmament. What we need are national disarmaments. Every local church should be able to refuse nuclear weapons. In France, unfortunately, bishops are silent. They're silent when it comes to nuclear weapons. They're for world disarmament but they're also for keeping nuclear weapons until the world disarms. So we have to have the courage to break... state by state, nation by nation, church by church, this problem... My conclusion... is that we have to absolutely want peace within justice. So we have sometimes the habit of thinking that we can be absent when conflicts arise. No! We must work within conflicts addressing the problem of nonviolence.

[applause]

Ogarit Younan: I will speak in French. [continues in French; English translation:] *Good morning to everyone. Thanks for the enriching experience that we had yesterday and today. People engaged in nonviolence are themselves models of nonviolence. The actions and the fights, the ideas and the research... I found this encounter... I thank the organizers for having invited me and my old friends at Pax Christi International who I'm happy to see again. I can add three ideas in a few minutes. I think I have more than five minutes to talk. I prepared something that takes 10 minutes so I'll do that half.*

Since 30 years I've made the personal decision to live militantly nonviolent. And that's what I do with my life. I work... I don't have other jobs, my job, my life, my fight... I decided not to find other jobs or look for money. I live modestly. I say this because it was a lifestyle choice. Nonviolence... the fight for nonviolence.

And it started during the civil war in Lebanon in 1982, since 1981 or 1982. So it's been years. together with my friend, my partner who is a nonviolent thinker... Walid Slaybi, Mr. Walid, together we started this fight during all these years. And so, we've tried combining our intellectual work with our fight on the ground. Both... the educating, pedagogical work, working with people.. going where they are. And together, fighting, but fighting for clearly defended goals. Because when we have concrete results... others' will like nonviolence. They'll see that nonviolence is useful and that it can change things, change things in society. I can't cite the extraordinary fights we fought, the powerful testimonies of people all over Lebanon. Our lives were threatened during the war because our work bothers the others...the deciders of war, the militias, etc. And even the religious people... the religions... in plural... almost all of them, except for certain actually people, Muslims and Christians, institutions generally don't like our work in nonviolence because it's a fight that will change ways of thinking and structures.

I propose at this conference these three ideas here to say that from this reflection that I lived in reality and from the pain that I also lived through... and I congratulate people that have lived through war and conflict and know exactly what this means. And I congratulate the Sister Nazek who presented this example ... I work in all the Arab region, not only in Lebanon and I consider myself a human being in this region.

The first thing is that we must absolutely stop using the term "just war". Not only because it's a term that we don't agree with but because I did some research on the terms used for war throughout history. And I found 20 terms for war. Each time, we go to war, we have to dress it up. The beautiful entry, useful, agreeable, acceptable... 20 terms, adjectives that we add a qualification to war so that this war becomes a necessary war, we love war, war is necessary, war is good... so we must stop using the term "just war" because it's one of the 20 terms that have been used... We use the word "peace" and we don't need to add a qualitative adjective to peace. Because peace is peace. And I propose that we don't look for an adjective for peace because peace is.. like xx ... the road to peace is just that. It translates itself. We could spend lots of time discussing amongst ourselves .. what should we add? Just or something else? etc... And it's important that the logic of violence pushes to react to "just war" by introducing "just peace". That's the first proposal.

We must certainly speak of justice. Of justice... because justice fundamental effects violence. We cannot talk about peace ... to not be superficial ... to not talk about results or individual things... We have talk of foundations and the foundations are economic and political. It's the big powers, the interests of all, including religious institutions. And to take just one more minute to say that we have to understand and the church has to understand ... I'll finish with this... even though I had other things to say... We're still in the legacy of "just war". And the Church too, is still in the

legacy of "just war". It's a legacy that's not only a legacy of the church and Christians but the thinkers, the Christian theologians gave a methodology to "just war". They came up with the five principles that are now the five principles of the international law... the international humanitarian law. Precisely in the x xx that ask if war is for peace, excuse me... if war is for peace, if war is being authorized by the right authority, if it has the chance of winning... reasonable hope, if it's proportional... And when we cite the theologians that invented these words and put these principles into a method to render "just war" into something well organized and if it's the last option.

So the five principles are the same and I invite... to conclude... I invite, the church obviously, to make a move, a decisive turn from history, an after, an after from the legacy of "just war". The legacy of the methodology of "just war" to accept it. Make an about face, a call for resolution and so that it rings out far, not discreet. But we also prepared a campaign to change a law that's been adopted in the highest international levels in the UN because it has become and international law.

The right for war exists in our world. That's what's scary and dangerous. Countries, the strongest countries have the right to war if it agrees with the five principles that have been placed into law internationally though out the world. So we must renounce war individually, as believers we must renounce war, as a church, the pope, renounce "just war". In cultural heritage... make cultural exchanges... but also with the law, with the international law, we must work so that war is never... is war, not a "just war".

[applause]

Sr. Ann Scholz: Thank you so much.

If I could, Dr. Cahill, just ask you to add your words of wisdom about how it is we get beyond where we are.

Dr. Lisa Sowle Cahill: OK, thank you. So, I am a theology professor and therefore I would like to address the theological and ethical framework that we might use going forward. And one of the key points is about rejecting Just War, which is a theme that's come up over and over again. And the only point I really want to make is that the popes, since Vatican II, have already rejected the idea of Just War. So the question is why has that not become part of the practice of Catholics around the world? That's the issue. If we go back as far back as John XXIII in *Pacem in Terris* he said, which was 1963 I think, he said, "It is hardly imaginable that in the modern world war could be an instrument of justice." We go to Paul VI in 1975 over 40 years ago, "The church cannot accept violence, especially the force of arms." Paul VI also said, "No more war, war never again." And John Paul II, Benedict the XVI, and Francis have repeated that using the very same phrases. So I don't think that the solution lies in having the Pope or the Vatican reject war, this has been done. This doesn't mean it wouldn't be a good thing to reiterate that again, but the real question is, what are the different incentives to war, and the motivations behind the continued use of Just War arguments in order to continue to perpetuate violence in

all of the social situations around the world. Of course I don't have a big answer to that question.

But, to go back to the Catholic Church's approach, something that was discussed in the first session today was the Just Peace paradigm, and I do think that that is a good example of a new approach, but again the primary point that I would like to make is that it has to go beyond a general appeal or abstract appeals. It's not enough actually to just say, "War never again, no more war." No, we have to have concrete strategies that are taken seriously as the Christian and Catholic vocation and that are really put on responsibility of all the bishops' conferences, but also of every clergy and religious and every diocese, and not leaving out every Catholic organization, every Catholic educational institution, and all of us as Catholic lay people. So, to look at the Pope, to look at the Vatican, or even to look at the bishops is not sufficient. It's the responsibility of all of us.

And I think that some of the merits of the Just Peace model are the following: First of all, it's a positive vision. I'm not even happy with the term "nonviolence," that's what we don't do, what we're getting away from. But what is the vision that's compelling us forward? It's to live out of the love and peace of Jesus Christ available to us in the power of the Holy Spirit. That is what we live out of, and that is what the Just Peace model I think captures. I also like the fact that it's a just peace, so something that we talked about in the English-language session just before this one is the interdependence, but also the difficulty, of justice, peace, and reconciliation. It's not, you know, we really can't say there has to be peace before justice or justice before peace, or reconciliation before justice. I think these are questions that vary a lot from particular situation to particular situation. I doubt that there is one model that everyone can adopt. I think the wisdom has to come from the local church, as well as from the Vatican or theologians, as to how to work this out, but the Just Peace paradigm does at least insist as Paul VI said, "If you want peace, work for justice." Or "Development is the new name for peace." I would emphasize an aspect that Jasmin brought up this morning which is Gender Justice, and the role of women. Around the world, women are the grassroots peacemakers and among those who are most active.

I would also say the Just Peace paradigm, besides linking all these values and engaging us in the process, gives us a lot of specifics. Many of the preparatory papers got into this, but we have principles, we have virtues, so the personal disposition to look for peace in every occasion that's available to us. And then a number of different practices, you could look at Rose Berger's paper and Maria Stephan's paper, she's spoken about this, again I won't get into them in detail, but there's lots of concrete things that can be done nonviolently that are effective and those are the responsibility of all of us.

And then the final thing that I want to say is to just reiterate that there's an interdependence between the global and the local. So the Catholic Church has a unique virtue or capacity of being an international institution with a central symbol of authority, which is the Vatican or the Pope, but also so many local congregations and organizations and base communities. And what

it looks like to embody justice, peace and reconciliation is different in the U.S. where we are trying to influence a federal government with great military power, or in Europe where they've recently been the victim of very, you know, several terrorist attacks. If you go to Africa and Kenya, dealing with post-election violence, that's different than what my responsibility is as an American, although we're connected. If you go to Congo, the DRC, you look at the problem of resource-extraction or battles over minerals. We've heard from Uganda and the LRA. If you go to Asia, there's huge inter-religious component with Christians as a minority, if you look at Mindanao in the Philippines as a Catholic country, again an inter-religious issue. So, there's so many different situations. So that we have to be in solidarity, yes, we need to look at the Pope, yes, we should have our international conversation and criteria that we share. But to me it's been so rich to learn from everyone here to appreciate the complexity, appreciate our shared challenge, but also to realize that listening and learning is just as important as coming up with a conclusion. So, on that I will be quiet and ready to listen.

Thank you.

[applause]

Sr. Ann Scholz: Thank you, all three, for your wisdom, and your honesty, for your own searching. Let's see if we can continue to deepen this conversation first by asking if any of you would like to respond to each other, ask a question, make a comment, stretch things out a bit.

Jean-Marie Muller [speaks in French; English translation:] *Yes. I see that in the church's recent declarations, especially from Francis, there's an ask for dialogue and negotiation. The problem is that what characterizes injustice is the impossibility of dialogue. We must create the conditions for dialogue from a rapport with force and fear.*

I want to say something here that I didn't have time to say earlier. It's an action by Martin Luther King. Martin Luther King tried to negotiate with whites to get justice. Dialogue wasn't possible, negotiation wasn't possible. And he went to Birmingham to perform civil disobedience. The notion of civil disobedience is central. Obedience to the state is the foundation of justice. He performed actions of civil disobedience and he was put in jail. And then there were religious representatives, four Protestants and one rabbi, who accused Martin Luther King of creating disorder. Well, when order is unjust then actions for justice appear like disorder. So Martin Luther King replied, from prison... the bishops wanted to negotiate, they didn't understand that what Martin Luther King did was create the conditions for dialogue, the conditions for negotiation. He said this... You ask why direct nonviolent actions in the streets? Why don't think negotiations are the best way? You're right to ask for negotiations. In fact, that's precisely the goal of direct action.

Direct nonviolent actions tries to foment enough tension so that the community, at first not willing to negotiate, finally accepts it as a solution. So we need to find ways to create conditions for dialogue. Dialogue isn't the solution to conflict. We must create the right conditions for dialogue to find solutions to conflict. That means we need opposing actions. Even Gandhi

couldn't dialogue with the Brits to obtain independence. He had to perform actions of civil disobedience. If had the goal to create a dialogue with the Brits but dialogue wasn't possible. So dialogue isn't the way to resolve conflicts. What resolves conflicts is opposition. Opposition to force.

Ogarit Younan [speaks in French; English translation:] *I have two things. I have a question for you. But first a... I'm going to continue with a thought to say that we're not... I'm guessing that we're not here to work on the ground, the biological ground. But rather on the foundations of these words that we use; "just peace", the foundations... foundations mean.. what is "just peace". If we're for peace, if we're for justice, if we're for the fight, the civil fight.*

So we agree... That's why, in my opinion, we have to deepen our point of view on the foundations that are behind these words and terminology. I'm not always tied to the word or term, only after I've established the foundations behind each of the terms. Also for nonviolence. Nonviolence for me, it's not an ideology, obviously. It's not a doctrine, it's not something that's frozen, that's closed. It's a no that ruptures violence. And violence and injustice are negative things in life. It's occupation... all what we can imagine as injustices. But I prefer using words like action and fight against xx. Because we are invited, we have the obligation and the responsibility to fight, by nonviolent means, to change structures, ways of thinking, education, the use of force in society. It's a fight. That's why I say if we're going to add something to the word "peace" we should add nonviolent fight. If we add something to the word war, we say no to war. It's not just "just war"... it's enough to stop there. We have to work at here levels and I'm going to ask the question at the end.

Working on the level of the individual... because a human being, sciences have proven this, is capable of being violent and nonviolent. Humans aren't born nonviolent and then turn violent. No, they have the both capacities. This has been proven in psychology and the sciences etc... And it's through education and environment... or we prepare them to use much less violence or more violence in their lives. So it depends on our work vis a vis the individual through education - and all instruction, not only at school. The media, the family, religions... all civil actions.

The second thing is that we need... that's why, personally, as a teacher, as someone who's researched pedagogic theories... I had the chance recently to start a university of nonviolence and to introduce nonviolent education in Lebanon, in the Arab countries for the last 30 years. I've found that education is a must, it's the essence of human life. It's the essence of life. Without it we wouldn't open up to change. And the means of nonviolence. Without it we would be left with authoritarianism, violence, in the acceptance of violence.

The second idea on which we have to work are the fights; each within their own country, in their own contexts. Obviously, there are no models. There are no models. Each country works on justice and peace etc... and we, in Lebanon, what did we do during the war? We came up with the slogan: Partial Fights to General Violence. We have global violence, economic, political, war,

religious war, civil war etc.. so we have to concretize partial fights to have results here and there, accumulated through the years, and this way we can present models of successful nonviolent fights. Because we need to look at nonviolence in such a way... not like nonviolence isn't useful, it's cute, it's fun... but it's not effective. We need to present nonviolent models that have the power to change.

The third thing is that we need to work to change laws. Because laws run the world. International laws? War is accepted. So it's why... and laws within each country. I agree with you all. It's not only the pope that will say he's against "just war", now that it's been said. But the whole Christian legacy; Saint Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Franceso di Victoria, Francesco Suarez... it's all these thinkers, theologians that founded the methodology of a "just war", inherited through many years. And I repeat that it's not just a Christian legacy. But with a clear methodology which was introduced in the UN in the international law documents. So we have to work to break from this legacy and say, "That's enough, that's the past. We don't want to take it up again, even in our religious teachings throughout all the parishes and societies."

The responsibility to change society starts with each one of us. It's the responsibility of each association, each movement, each person, each university, each school. Obviously, it's not the responsibility of the pope nor the Church. We don't wait for others to change, we start with ourselves. That's the reality. That's why I agree, it's not the pope's responsibility, it's really our own fight within us as far as we can go. And we have to talk of the nonviolent struggle. We must apply the nonviolent struggle throughout the whole world so that we are able to present these models of change.

And that's why I want to ask you... Do you agree that it's not enough that the pope says he's against war or "just war"? Do we need something more to really not retake the term "just war" because I've seen it in documents in certain Arab countries. So we're repeating it. In education, among the people. And then, if people go to war, well, they'll say that war is righteous, it's good, it's inevitable. So what is needed so that the pope doesn't just say "I'm against war"... that it becomes really ingrained among the people that adhere to different religions... I salute the pope, in parenthesis, for his strong position on the death penalty. I find that this is wonderful, it's very important. We started this fight in Lebanon 20 years ago. And I've found that he's made a huge call to abolish the death penalty.

Lisa Cahill: OK, that was a lot. Yeah. So, you're asking what would be an alternative to Just War that the pope or the Catholic Church could propose for everybody. I think, again, it has to be a positive vision, so one vocabulary and model that is been proposed here, not the only way to talk about it but it's an example, is the Just Peace model. And concretely, many people have talked about forms of nonviolent resistance to injustice that are effective. And you talk about "we" abolishing as a war as a legal measure, and so the question is, so, well, who will do this, is it the UN, is the UN Security Council going to do that, how will that happen? And sometimes I think it's better to speak in terms of more modest initiatives that might be more successful. For

example, giving international recognition and support, not necessarily by the whole international community, but, to nonviolent movements. Giving, Maria Stephan was saying in our last group, why wasn't there media attention to the nonviolent resisters in Syria before it got to a point that the U.S. and France were considering military intervention. So there are measures that could be taken by the international community, or some agents or networks in the international arena, not only under religious auspices, but coming back to the Catholic Church, you know some framework like Just Peace, but grounded in Gospel values and personal responsibility or virtue, but also in community responsibility, education, which you talked about a lot, and ministries.

Sr. Ann Scholz: Thank you. There's a whole lot of ideas on the floor. What are the preconditions for shalom, what are the strategies, how to we get the attention of those who are perpetrators of violence? Whose responsibility is it? I want to invite all of you into the conversation. We have only about 15 minutes until we need to move to small groups, where there will obviously be more conversation. So I'd ask you, I beg you, to keep your interventions short so that we can hear as many voices as possible. And you all are welcome to stay, you're also welcome to go.

Wiltrud Roesch-Metzler: Thank you. My name is Wiltrud, I'm from Germany, the Chairperson of Pax Christi Germany, and I'm also a member of the international Board of Pax Christi. Two things, I thank you very much Ogarit for making this link to the international [unclear] because it shows that it's really serious what we are debating today. It's not just a case of the Catholic Church, it has consequences when we decide to move on. So thank you very much for this point. And I want to ask, where is Lisa? OK. You know the German Catholic bishops, they issued their document on Just Peace in the year of 2000, and I want to ask you if the scholars around the world in the theology take up what was in their document, or is it not interesting for the United States, for example?

Lisa Sowle Cahill: I mean, I would just say that this is the problem -- we've got tons of documents everywhere, but how is it getting mediated down in to the life of the church and the life of the communities beyond the church? That's the real question that we're looking at. So it's really peace-building practices. I like the term peace-building myself, I, well, but it's really practices in the church and civil society and also with government and reaching out to many partners to stimulate action. And that's where I think the condemnations of war since the 1960s and 70s have not gone far enough. It's a prophetic announcement, but it doesn't have legs. So how can we improve that situation? That's the question. So, no, we are not discussing the German bishops' Just Peace document in the United States.

Dr. Gerald Schlabach: Gerald Schlabach, I teach at the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota. I'm one of the founders of a grassroots organization called Bridgefolk for ecumenical dialogue between Mennonites and Catholics. My deeper background is working in Central America in the 1980s. I'm a Christian pacifist. Jesus Christ has taken my life captive and I can go nowhere else. But I'm also uncomfortable with raw condemnations of Just War tradition. And I have to be

very brief, but three very quick reasons. Part of what has gotten us here historically, ecumenically, is collaboration between historic peace churches and people in the Just War tradition, but if we're trying to take it seriously as a tool for condemning particular wars. So working in coalitions at the grass roots is part of what's gotten us here. So I don't want to lose our allies. Those of us who are very convinced, as I am, about the power of active nonviolence. We want to keep building coalitions.

Secondly, one of the first things you learn if you study conflict transformation is: distinguish between positions and interests. Ok, if we want to move beyond the position of Just War, we need to pay attention to the interests that have made it appealing to people down through the centuries. To the needs that people felt it has met. To defend the innocent, to protect communities. Of course I agree entirely that it's very often, most often failed. But we're not going to convince people if we don't appeal to the deep interests that have made Just War tradition credible.

And so, third, we have to do, yes, this work of practices, giving models of alternatives, as many of you have said, but the examples we tend to give, that we tend to list, the great examples that ought to be in textbooks from the last 100 years of nonviolent victories, have, when you talk about nonviolent resistance, well, yes, most of the successes have been in surprisingly, powerfully, overcoming tyrants, oppressors from across the ideological spectrum, but then what happens? What happens on the next day? We've only barely begun. I appreciate Eli talking about civilian-based defense, for example. But we've barely begun to work on models of nonviolence for the process of governing, for the process of, say we want to outlaw war. Well, again, outlaw means we're going to depend on the rule of law, but that requires some kind of enforcement. How do we police nonviolence? We have to work on those things as well.

Nora Carmi: I think we are all here trying to convince the Catholic Church to go back to the roots of why it is a church, based on the teachings of our Lord, Jesus Christ. The Catholic Church is everywhere and it has different concerns everywhere. But the Catholic Church would not be here today without Jesus Christ being born in Palestine and teaching you all what it is that he wants you to do. So, I invite the Catholic Church, really to look at the root causes of the violence in the world, in the region, to be totally true to its beliefs. To see where nonviolence in Palestine for over 100 years is being responded by constant violence, extra-judicial killing, demolition and so on. The nonviolence movement exists in our country, in the heart of the Christian faith. And I invite you all, all, put the Catholic Church back where it should belong to get the support of its roots and to change what is happening in our area. Without peace in our region, you will not get peace anywhere in the world. Thank you.

Rev. Peter Mubunga Basaliza: I'm Fr. Peter from Uganda, I coordinate the Justice and Peace Commission in the diocese where I come from, the Diocese of Kasese. And I thank Ann for inviting me. I have to say that [unclear] say no to Just War in whatever condition. I was taught Just War in seminary, but I was wondering why and about putting to the bishops who are here, [unclear] this theory [unclear] in the seminaries, it has to be abolished because it can bring in

the mind of the students that Just War is good. So I come from an area where I have experienced war. I was ordained [unclear] for eight year in the region called ADF, Allied Democratic Forces. They would come, I would used to have supper at 3 p.m. in my parish, we leave that parish and go to another parish because if we stay there the rebels would come and kill us, they were killing men of the Christians. [Unclear] having supper every day at 3, by the time you go to sleep you are [unclear] hungry. But sometimes if you remain in the house the, the rebels would come and shoot in the room and you would die. So if you remain in the house, we would sleep in the corridor. So I'm saying no [unclear] ministry between religions because those Uganda ADF Allied Democratic Forces were Muslims and if we talk of no Just War, have also make sure that we dialogue with Muslims, because for us we can say no Just War for us and for them they have the Just War. So if we want to say for the Just War, no for everybody, we dialogue with them, we talk with them, and it is possible, dialogue is possible, it brings transformation. Thank you very much.

Jean Stokan: Jean Stokan and I work with the Sisters of Mercy in the Americas as the Justice Director, also I'm on the National Council for Pax Christi USA. And first I would just thank the Pontifical Commission for helping to co-sponsor this and Pax Christi international, just a deep bow for 70-plus years of linking nonviolence and peacemaking. And so just thank you for creating this Pentecost space for us.

I guess the two pieces that I would ask in terms that get elevated or documented in our discussion are the roles of the Church, one, to unmask the causes of war, the root causes of war and unmask the lies and the drivers of militarism. And secondly, to lift up the prophetic voice of the church. I think both, I would repeat, there's the elephant analogies have been used, but there's also an elephant in the room, those of us who know that analogy, that very big thing here that no one talks about and I would just say from U.S. policy. It is the U.S. policy that has caused or contributed to so much damage from the first bombs in Iraq, can you imagine if we never started, or to Palestine, how many children were killed in August 2014 alone in Gaza and the U.S. Congress is voting for more military aid. We wouldn't have the war on drugs or the war in Colombia. We talk about terrorism, what about Hiroshima and Nagasaki when the state does it. So you know I would also just think we have to confess our sin as a country. We have that burden and we need eyes from the outside to be able to name it. The whole pivot to Asia. So, again, I offer our apology, but I also think we as church need to say it, not just say we don't have reasons for the war in Iraq. It's because we have geo-political interests and we want oil.

So the second part of the prophetic voice of the church, I mean we have Francis who's not afraid to say it, who's not afraid to talk about the arms race, who's not afraid to talk about the economic roots, the Wall Streets, the unbridled capitalism driving so much of wars. And I'm spoiled, you know, I did lots of years of work in El Salvador and we had a prophetic bishop, Archbishop Romero, and while we all have the voice to be a peacemaker, there's a role for bishops. Even if we get an encyclical, which would be great, we have Laudato Si' and our U.S. bishops, there's very few that are really promoting it. But we still need it. You know someone

mentioned Honduras, the people are so vulnerable, I have just even one picture of the woman who was killed, the Jesuit next to her has gotten just as many death threats There's a Claretian priest getting just as many death threats because of his work on [unclear] mine, and they're asking for the voice of the church to really speak out and defend so, for both of them, the prophetic voice of the church as well as [unclear] the root causes of war.

[applause]

Sr. Ann Scholz: I just want everyone to be clear about where we are at this point. This conversation is very rich and very important. In five minutes, we are supposed to move to your small groups where more voices can be added and I want to honor that, so again, I beg you, be brief and we'll go for another five minutes and that's it.

Fr. Boniface Mendes: Thank you. I am Bonnie Mendes, diocesan priest from Pakistan. And ours is a nuclear power. And with India, the nuclear weapons is a big issue. And whether you like it or not, I'd like to add this dimension because this very real, how dangerous the place is. Although Pakistan is ten times smaller than India, its budget is very low, still we spend more on nuclear arms than India at this moment.

Secondly, the church cannot do much, and yet every year we still have in small groups and religious institutions the anniversary of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, we have prayers sessions and we continue to do that.

Thirdly, despite all the problems that we have, we still promote peace programs with India and Pakistan. The Caritas has [unclear] programs, the Justice and Peace have had programs together, the youth have had programs together, and we continue to promote some form of peace because Jesus came to give life, life to the full. Thank you.

[applause]

Giuliana Martirani [speaks in Italian; English translation:] *Just a brief speech to explain what we have achieved during the 90's: the conscientious objection not only to the military service, but at the same time the institution of civil service and women's civil service. And also the conscientious objection to military spending. This has been called tax objection, and here is Bishop Bettazzi, a tax objector, as well as another bishop, Don Tonino Bello. They made an objection to military spending and delivered the equivalent to works of peace.*

In a mafia context, a very significant action performed was the confiscation of mafia assets, because imprisonment is not enough: their assets should become peace assets. Moreover, 200 Salesian Sisters professed a vow of nonviolence in 2007, including attitudes as boycotting, disobedience. I conclude by saying that the Geneva Convention, which prohibits the refugee refusal, is imperative.

[applause]

Bishop Paride Taban: Thank you very much. I'm going to be only one second. I think instead of just speaking of Just War, we should speak of just service, just service. Pope John Paul said, don't bring people to the town, carry the town to the people. After deciding on the peace, now in South Sudan we have got nearly a million street children, men, women. Because no service in the countryside. Now the refugees in Uganda are going to Uganda, to Kenya, to Khartoum, [unclear] countryside because they have no services. All the UN, the church, all are in the towns. I'm in the countryside. A governor went to visit; they say who are you? He said, "I am the governor," they said, "What is a governor." They didn't know the meaning of governor. And they are asking why these people are fighting. And the governor say, "And who is this man," pointing at me. Said, "This is our governor. Without this man we didn't know that we are human beings." So, service to the people. [Inaudible]

[applause]

Sr. Ann Scholz: Thank you friends. Let's thank our three...