Ethics of Intervention for Humanitarian Rescue

Our sources for ethical consideration of humanitarian rescue involving armed force and international intervention are scarce. Scripture has reference to Cyrus as the anointed one defeating the Babylonians and freeing Israel, but that is really a case of imperial conquest. Similarly though exodus is an escape from oppression the intervening power is God rather than another nation. The history of the Crusades though originally, perhaps, preached to secure the safety of pilgrimages became a religious war, and then imperial war and perhaps a commercial war in some cases. John Wesley's movement to abolish slavery recognizes humanitarian goals of freedom, but neither it nor his objections to imperialism are analogous cases.

The United Methodist resolutions on intervention are ambiguous enough to leave room for development on the issue and so I think we can say new work on church policy is needed here in the face of the post-cold war situation. The United Methodist resolutions have urged the Organization of African Unity to disarm the warring parties in Liberia and supported sanctions against South Africa's apartheid. Support for comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa and Namibia has been resolved. Support for the "front line" countries against South Africa was urged. Likewise support for United Nations peace-keeping efforts has been resolved. The United Methodist Church has requested the President and Congress of the U. S. to refuse to use embargoes of food or medicine (without exception). Also a very strong statement against unilateral intervention was passed in 1988. While upholding diplomatic moves by the U.N. for peacekeeping, this comprehensive resolution "In Support of Self-Determination and Nonintervention" does not give explicit support to the use of military forces in intervening for rescue. Almost all other means to achieve fundamental human rights are mentioned. Given the activism of United Methodist Church thinking and action the question still remains as to how we
should think and act in the case of massive denial of human rights and life. Is military intervention for humanitarian rescue morally justifiable and if so, must it always be under the authority of the United Nations?

Adequate contextualism of the issue is necessary. The paper proposes two contexts:

1. A United States perspective on the changed international scene in the post-cold war situation;
2. New developments by an ecumenical group on the theory of just peace. These reflections though only partially will permit a restatement of just war criteria as applicable for our question of military intervention for humanitarian rescue. The precedents for just peacemaking theory as the moral framework for this discussion are dependent upon the inclusion of six criteria of just peacemaking in 1996 *Book of Resolutions* and in the recommendation *In Defense of Creation* (1986) of a provisional list of such principles with an invitation "to reflection, amendment, and enrichment."
The post-cold war context presents the Church a new situation of need and a new opportunity for emerging forms of peacemaking. The new context includes a world containing extreme malnutrition, a growing gap between the rich and the poor, new conflicts and wars involving tribal, ethnic, cultural, and religious differences. The 45 year world wide struggle between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. leaves a world of stockpiles of war material, broken economies, refugees, economies geared to military expenditures and in places the ongoing, outdated conflicts of the cold war. The survival of only one superpower and the prevalence of its democratic forms and market economies reduce the dangers of world war while it increases the temptations to the U.S.A. of the arrogance of pride and dominance. In such a situation of temptation the U.S.A. will have to respond to criticism, practice humility, develop habits of patience and peacemaking to avoid becoming an "evil empire."

U.S.A. superior potential in government, business organization, control of world resources, communications, military capacity, and mass cultural products over other countries encourages it in its pursuit of economic interest to exploit others. The temptation is to manage others for U.S.A. interests through I.M.F., World Bank, and international trade patterns. there is no reason for Christians to assume that one super-power dominance will benefit those subject to
its dominance. In fact U.S.A. power abroad exports jobs from the U.S.A. as well as produces
others here, its power-minded culture tolerates and encourages guns and drugs which destroy the
less powerful in its own culture and corrupt societies and governments abroad. Christianity,
which encourages lives of service to humanity with no one receiving too much or too little in the
way of the material foundations of life, can exist only uneasily in a culture producing super
affluence for many and degrading poverty for more. The punishment for lack of economic
success in the U.S.A. is too high for Christian conscience and the increasing demands for success
are far too high. All of these trends are encouraged by the rampant competitiveness of American
citizens encouraged by the victory of market economy and its competitive, individualistic
tendencies.

Christian thought about peace correlates with world developments. On the one hand it
has its own history rooted in scripture, theology and church actions, but on the other it relates to
its own time and the world situation. Our major church policies
on peacemaking (The Peacemaking, 1986) were set in the cold war
context. Now new thought and new times make it appropriate to develop the policies of the past
for the present post cold-war context.
Aristotle criticized Plato's vision of The Republic for ignoring interstate relations. It was a fair criticism then and now. Any ethic which does not incorporate, today, an ethic of international relations is deficient. Social orders reflecting particular ethics are partially integrated into a world system. Ethical recommendations for a particular society which cause it to self-destruct in its encounters with international reality are truly naive. The prescriptive ethic of this argument originated in a particular community as the expression of God's will. It was that community's grasp of ultimate wisdom and imperative. Through Jesus that imperative was broadened to universal dimensions though still reflecting its particular communal roots and the new community recognizing Jesus as ultimate.

Through the prophetic traditions the imperatives summarized in Jesus' imperative were broadened and specifically applied to the nations. Matthew judges the nations by their actions of provision and visitation of Jesus' little disciples. This reinforces Amos' standards of justice by which he portrays God judging the nations and Isaiah's regarding the council of nations as the context for the revelation of the servant who suffers to bear the light to the nations.

This ethic of double love, community, justice, ten commandments and contemporary principles is applied through church, society and nation to the arena of international politics. However it also reaches out directly in its power to shape the global ethic of the growing ecumenical movement and in forming the United Nations, associated bodies, and declarations.
and policies of human rights to further influence the nation's role in international politics.

As the nations closed out WWII, a group of Christians were formulating an ethic for international relations. They called it just and durable peace. It did not last as a concept, but before it disappeared it helped the victorious allies to see their way clear to found the United Nations and to impose peace settlements upon the defeated nations that were less vindictive than the political slogan "unconditional surrender" threatened. In fact the leading figure of the just and durable peace concept, John Foster Dulles, a Presbyterian elder, was the lead negotiator for the peace treaty with Japan. He was a remarkable person and the protestant-church peace movements have not seen his equal since his death as Secretary of State for President Dwight Eisenhower.

In the 1930s John Foster Dulles, grandson of Presbyterian missionaries and of a Secretary of State became enthused about the ecumenical Christian contribution to peace making. The liberal-activist theology of his father, a theologian, merged with the worldly wise ways of his mother's family to equip him to lead the international relations thinking of the Federal Council of Churches. His favorite uncle had been Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State and when the uncle, the boy John Foster Dulles, and his grandfather, another former Secretary of State, went sailing on Lake Erie, there were as many Secretaries of State in a small boat as the country ever saw. With his law firm severing its relations with Germany in the late 1930s, he wrote his first and best book on foreign policy War, Peace and Change. The influence of the French philosopher, Henri Bergson, was evident in the book in the emphasis upon the dynamics of history. The vision of peace came both from his American context and the Christian faith. War was the imminent reality to be fended off with realism, change, and vision.
by the Republican, internationalist establishment) at every opportunity. Except for his brother's unfortunate intervention by the CIA in Guatemala which led to almost half a century of warfare with resultant disastrous consequences, he kept the U. S. out of open warfare from 1952 to his death in 1959. Forgotten as a peacemaker, he was decried for risky brinkmanship, for him as a lawyer and a partially secularized Calvinist the two were not in opposition. Communism and the cold war changed him and the U. S. policy. Given the cold war, his earlier philosophy of peace had no space in which to grow. Now with the cold war eclipsed, the thought may be revisited and examined for the concept of just peace in his Commission's work.

In 1942, the Commission published a "Statement of Guiding Principles" in which the hand work of Dulles is dominant. Beyond Dulles, however, they represent a typical, liberal, progressive Protestant perspective on just peace. First they assume a moral order and that the sickness of society is a violation of that order. Penitence is required. International anarchy, revenge and retaliation must be replaced with international order through agencies. Economics must be reordered for the general interest of all nations. Military establishments, colonial relationships, and treaty arrangements all need to be ordered by international organization. The human rights of work, worship, speech, assembly, etc. were demanded. The United States could not return to isolation but must act responsibly for the general interest. The last three principles affirmed the special responsibilities of the church, active Christian citizenship to change the nation, and finally that the author of the moral law on which all depend was "God revealed in Christ." Later these principles were translated into the more politically relevant "Six Pillars of Peace." More importantly here, the commitment to energize the U. S. commitment to a yet unknown international organization was found. The church authorities speaking at the Delaware
Conference in March of 1942, emphasized realism and hope. They knew of the need to weave international structure around nations. They also knew the nations were not ready. So they and the church leadership forswore utopianism and worked doggedly for the best they could get in the United Nations Organization.

In these thirteen principles of fifty years ago and in their translation through politics into the preamble and structure of the UN, we have already an incarnated theory of just peace. Corresponding commitments to work at foreign policy through the UN for the general interest of humanity might provide what we are looking for when we search for a theory of a just peace.

The fury of the cold war hardened Christian judgment in the U.S. Dulles is only one example. Just war theory was elaborated by Paul Ramsey and many others while peace theory withered. The war while encouraging many illusions and myths was real. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. contested their respective systems through surrogate wars in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Only seldom did the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. directly conflict but Greeks, Koreans, Vietnamese, Afghans, Iranians, Salvadorians, Nicaraguans, Indonesians, Guatemalans, Angolans, Ethiopians, Cubans, and countless others fought the war. The world paid the economic price. Only near the end of the war did the theory of just peace reemerge in a central way in Christian discourse.

Talk of just peacemaking emerged as Roman Catholics sought to deepen their theology of peace. In the United Methodist Church criteria of a just peace were suggested in a policy on nuclear weapons, deterrence and disarmament. In the United Church of Christ it was part of the recasting of the church as a just peace church. Among Presbyterians it appeared as part of a study process of the possibilities of Christian resistance to nuclear weapons and the militarism of

Christian ethicists commented on these converging trends in modern Christian thought. Glen Stassen, however, took the lead in theorizing about just peacemaking. He related just peacemaking to the Sermon on the Mount on the one hand and to practical politics of the nations on the other. His study \textit{Just Peacemaking}\footnote{Glen Stassen, Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp. 209-230.} became a primer for many Christians who joined in the search for the development of the concept of just peacemaking. Furthermore he took the lead in asking Christian ethicists to think together about just peace first at a meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics and then at a working conference on the subject at The Abbey Center in Trappist, Kentucky, in 1994. Further work in 1995 led to the conference at the Carter Conference Center in Atlanta in 1996 which achieved a synthesis of scholarship and agreed on essays to further the results of the collaborative effort.\footnote{Glen Stassen, ed. "Just Peacemaking Theory: Papers for Working Conference at the Carter Center October 11-13, 1996" (Louisville: n.p., 1996).}

Though this new work is not a direct continuation of the pre-cold war peace efforts or the cold war debates continuity across generations is represented in Stassen. His father, Harold Stassen, Governor of Minnesota, candidate for President, and indefatigable worker for disarmament in President Eisenhower's cabinet had as a younger man drafted the Preamble to the United Nations Charter. The elder Stassen argued for deepening the peacemaking work even at the time that Dulles as Secretary of
State was discouraging disarmament strategies with his cold war belligerency.

The post-cold war era presents a new situation. The debates about the morality of nuclear deterrence struggled to address a time of neither peace nor war but of great danger. So today neither the categories of pacifism nor just war seem adequate and we seek a moral paradigm to compliment these age old moral frameworks. Neither pacifism nor just war theory are rejected. Pacifism is seen as a vocational decision for those who cannot morally support any armed conflict even humanitarian or peacekeeping interventions or a just defensive war. Just war theory is a group of principles implied by the commandment not to murder which distinguishes just wars from unjustifiable warfare or murder. The Christian ethics of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) is particularly compatible with both justifiable war and just peacemaking theories. Pacifists, too, can affirm just peacemaking theory as a further explication of their position of refusing war. Just peacemaking is an approach to create conditions under which the debates between pacifists and just war advocates would become fewer. Just war theory recognizes that war is a last resort. In most of our interstate conflicts just peacemaking work would precede and in many cases prevent states from ever getting to the last resort situation.

As just war theory is a set of principles for evaluating a proposed national policy of initiating war so just peacemaking theory is a set of principles for evaluating a government's initiating of peacemaking practices. At the present stage of development the principles are considered for official church adoption. They are proposed as principled initiatives to be followed by Christians in developing state policies and hopefully to be adopted and advocated as a set of principles by the churches. The advocates of just peace theory ground these principles
differently. Some derive them from revelation in scripture. Others see them as a product of
discernment of moral law of human history. Others see them as the fruit of human moral
discourse or the findings of social science. Most base them on some combination from different
sources. This inquiry sees them as a development of moral reasoning grounded in the discourse
of Christians in the 20th century which reflects critical Christian thought about war and peace
ultimately rooted in the justice and peacemaking imperatives of scripture. They are a
contemporary elaboration of the commandment to "Love your neighbor as yourself." Finally
they are an affirmation by human spirit that: this I will do to resist the evil in our human nature
that leads us to murder in war. Consistent with the blessing of Jesus for active peace work,
"Blessed are the peacemakers, they shall be called the children of God," they are congruent with
the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

This initiating quality to the just peacemaking principles is very important. The policy
makers, organizations, and citizens need to act for peace rather than wait for war. In a state of
modified human anarchy, like our interstate-corporate world, initiatives must be taken to
overcome the tendencies to warfare. War must be regarded as usually outside the moral limits of
human action. The determination that war is morally repugnant is important, but working on the
prerequisites for peace has the priority here. As the group has chosen to formulate them, they
are not negative prohibitions, but expressions of moral imperative formulated as action
guidelines. They have the active formula of "Love your neighbor", rather than the negative
prohibition of "Thou shall not murder."

The group of ethicists and political scientists referred to their initiatives alternatively as
practice-norms or principles. Principled initiatives is the formulation for

Wide
consensus was achieved around ten practice norms or principles. The group knew its finitude and limits as it was predominantly (75%), though not, totally white and male and North American.

_"The question for you is whether to regard the practices as useful initiatives to encourage."_ Christian realism assumes the ongoing season of wars and rumors of war while trying to avoid all wars that are possible to responsibly avoid. Many, probably most, of these wars will be civil wars as the utility of international war in a market economy of trading states dominated by interacting democracies is very low. In this anarchic society the intentional prizes are to be won by business and not by intentional war. Still rational choice is only one of the modes of decision making exercised by nations and racism, mental illness, paranoic irrational fears, fanaticism, greed, and false pride all have their role in influencing and sometimes determining national policies in the international system. The great realist theorists Thucydides, Augustine Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Morgenthau all lived in times of international terror. We, living in a less terrible time, are able to stress the cooperative forces and morally we must. However, the times of terror are here for vast populations and they may again be immediately upon us. Meanwhile, in the time given to us, out of loyalty to God we for the welfare of the neighbor can use these just peacemaking initiatives. 4

**Commenting on 11 Principles**

1. Recognize the emerging Cooperative Forces in the International System, and work with them.

---

4Steven Brion-Meisels, *The Carter Center Chart Papers* (October 14, 1996). The eleventh is a new addition for Presbyterian policy expressive of concern for ethnic diversity and gender equality.
Paul Schroeder found four trends in the present which moved him to emphasize the need for wisdom in cooperating with forces in the international system which promoted peace. In the late 20th century these factors were (1) The utility of warfare was declining, (2) The role of trade in the development of successful nationstates, (3) The increase of international communications, and (4) The increasing dominance of liberal representative democracy and market capitalism. His analysis critical of neorealism while sympathetic to classical realism affirmed the need to develop and cooperative with voluntary international organizations. Peace has possibilities and no guarantees but he saw referring to Reinhold Niebuhr how institutions of international cooperation can be gradually developed. He took his stand with the problem solvers that William Fox used to call the "pragmatic meliorists."

The danger in this principled initiative is that while these trends support the ideology and interests of the United States they may oppose the self-understandings of some other nations. The world trends probably are running in the directions he avows, but resistance to them on the part of some countries may be fierce and particularly so to the supremacy of democracy and market-capitalism. This is a particularly apt principle for the United States and requires much more listening to the needs and aspirations of others in voluntary associations than U.S. diplomacy often grants. The Presbyterian Church accepts the principle while balancing it with all the others and its own commitments to the sustainability of the earth and the welfare of the poor as developed in Hope for a Global Future by the 208th General Assembly (1996). The U.S. needs to have its own aspirations remolded and limited somewhat by international associations rather than simply coopting all international organizations.

Michael Joseph Smith's paper argued that peacemaking requires armed intervention in conflicts to restore peace. National sovereignty may be abridged by multilateral intervention sanctioned by the United Nations for a variety of just causes. Like Schroeder his analysis of the international system revealed trends supporting some abridgement of sovereignty, peacemaking forces and emerging possibilities for collective security. Some of Kant's prerequisites for peace are increasingly realized: the cost of war, the lure of commerce, and increased public participation in affairs of state. Human rights overrule nations state sovereignty in legal precedent and moral weight according to Smith. He concludes by calling for a strengthened U.N. with a "standing volunteer military force" to enforce human rights and the capacity to promote peace.

This development is highly desirable in the post-cold war world with its diffused power. However collective security and international organizations have been overrun in the 20th century by fanatical nationalism and militarism. This too like Schroeder's recommendations will be incrementally achieved, if at all. At the present time the political will for such developments is lacking in the U.S., Russia, China, Great Britain, France and Germany. Some humanitarian interventions under the U.N. will be possible and if they are successful, they will contribute to the argument for the practicality of this initiative. At present the record of the United Nations in the former Yugoslavia shows the moral ambiguity of the initiative. This principle affirming policies of intervention in international conflicts for humanitarian objectives receives further treatment in the concluding section of the paper.

Buoyed by the advances of democracy and the mounting evidence that international relations between democracies are more peaceful than the relations between other politics John Langan and Bruce Russett collaborated to argue for the peacemaking gains of advancing human rights and democracy. Protection of liberties of religious conscience and fundamental human rights are a requirement of democracies. To the extent that countries fail to achieve these the democracy is regarded as immature (e.g., the United States before the achievement of universal suffrage). The struggles for religious liberty and rights promotes democracy and the achievement of democracy insures these rights. The lack of war among democratic states tends to confirm Kant's vision that democratic polity is a prerequisite of peace. With the achievement of democratic government by a slight majority of the world's states and the wide spread appeal of democracy a process toward just peacemaking may be evolving. These three values and systems are, of course, goods in their own right, but the evidence for peacemaking tendencies between democracies is a valuable insight for international relations. Unfortunately powerful democracies have tendencies to wreak havoc on smaller autocratic societies and to find themselves at war with totalitarian societies. The great democracies of France, Britain, United States, and India scarcely have histories free from war in the 19th and 20th century. Struggles for religious liberty and human rights may encourage civil wars (England in the 17th century, United States in the 19th century) and the pushes for them must be subject to political prudence as must the campaigns for democracy. The literature of American foreign policy is filled with crusade mentality, and forces promotive of just peacemaking ought not to become teleological goals for self-righteous wars.
4. Foster Just and Sustainable Economic Development

Degraded environments and declining economic opportunities lead to refugee problems, immigration problems, conflicts over resources, civil war and international war. Rodger Payne, David Lumsdaine, and David Bronkema joined in advocating policies of sustainable economic development as part of just peacemaking. The economic development they advocated needed to be ecologically sustainable, focused on the poor, built around enduring relationships, and account for human frailty, sin and ignorance. The authors advocated a perspective that treated development as a wholistic issue including political and spiritual factors as well as economic. Their explicit Christian advocacy on behalf of the poor reflected recent emphases in theological thinking. For church reflection the principle is better expressed as fostering just and sustainable human development as in Presbyterian policy of Hope for a Global Future (208th General Assembly).

5. Reduce Offensive Weapons and Weapons Trade.

Barbara Green and Glen Stassen wrote about U.S. government and commercial policies to increase armaments in the world. The encouragement of massive arms trafficking by U.S. business and governmental policies is one of the most difficult hurdles for the realization of just peacemaking policies. The United States is usually the leader in selling and giving arms away while other countries like Russia, China, France, Britain, and Germany, Israel, Italy, and the Czech Republic compete also for their share of this rich market. The fear of war drives nations to arm themselves and the presence of arms encourages their use. Throughout the poor world wars are fought with weapons sold or given to them by the rich nations. On this issue the democracies seem no better than the totalitarian states. In fact it now appears that the
democracies with market economies are now the more able to subsidize the increase in arms trafficking.

While many nations share guilt in the current arms races, the United States is the largest player in this dangerous game. U.S. arms subsidies fuel regional arms races, strengthen unjust dictatorial regimes, and arm potential enemies, e.g., Somalia, Iraq and Iran. Armaments will remain part of human history, but a surfeit of arms is dangerous and economically counterproductive. The money given away and spent for arms purchases denies the resources for needed human projects in food, education, housing, health. Political decisions to deny resources to the poor in the U.S. are related to the arms manufacturers' contributions to U.S. political parties and massive subsidies to these companies and their stockholders. The fading of the recognition that arming evil rulers is itself an evil during the cold war was a moral loss. The resurgence of the moral recognition of arms build ups as usually an evil must be developed. The end of the world-wide cold war provides an opportunity to demand thorough decreases in these armament policies and profits.


Susan Thistlethwaite, John Cartwright and Gary Gunderson advocated the recognition of nonviolent means of social change as having a moral priority over violent means. A variety of nonviolent means have been successful in the Gandhi and King campaigns. Recent successes in South Africa and Eastern Europe have demonstrated the practicality of nonviolent means of social change. The moral priority should be given to nonviolent means as they normally do less harm. Care must be taken with boycotts or embargoes for they may hurt the vulnerable parts of the population rather than the decision makers who exercise control. The authors explained and
evaluated the use of boycotts, marches, civil disobedience, public disclosure, accompaniment, safe spaces or sanctuary, and strikes. Moral philosophy must recognize the moral division between the use of violent and non-violent means. This line should not be obscured in moral thinking. The criticisms of non-violent means usually occur as they shade over into the use of violence. The drawing of the line does not deny the possibility of justifying violent means under criteria of just war considerations or an appeal to self or communal defense. But the recognition of the difference encourages the use of non-violent means for the sake of justice and peacemaking before violent means are needed.

7. Take Independent Initiatives to Reduce Hostility.

Glen Stassen provided the contemporary interpretation of independent initiatives which influenced the whole conception of just peacemaking. As both Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. recognized the original source is Jesus, and Stassen's utilization of the Sermon on the Mount was fundamental to the work. The basic idea of the independent initiative is to take clearly interpreted peaceful action in a manner that encourages your opponent to a similar positive step. The initiatives can reduce the perception of threat by visible action not dependent on negotiation. Negotiations need to follow, but negotiation proceeds much better following progressive action. Initiatives should be a series of acts that increase the security of the other while not weakening the initiator. Initiatives are best announced in advance and then carried out and given clear explanations of the intent to de-escalate tension. Much of the disengagement of the cold war was achieved by independent initiatives on both the part of the Soviet Union and the United States, and Stassen's book Just Peacemaking provides the story.

8. Use Cooperative Conflict Resolution and Prevention Processes.
Steven Brian-Meisels, David Steele, Gary Gunderson and Edward L. Long, Jr. formed a team to write about the use of cooperative conflict resolution. Before conflicts over security or interests develop into war there are many practices to utilize for the securing of cooperation and peace. The thrust of the essay is for an activist partnership in threatening situations. The Carter negotiations in Haiti persisting even while invasion planes were airborne is symptomatic of the use of conflict resolution to avoid war. The processes of conflict resolution are a theory with proven results in themselves and are recommended here but not detailed. Steven Brian-Meisels shared his expertise from school based conflict resolution. Gary Gunderson showed the Carter Center's experience with alternative methods to war. David Steele reflected his active involvement in mediation and peacemaking in the former Yugoslavia. Edward Long showed all of these known strategies related to the transforming ways of just peacemaking. These strategies fit both the just peacemaking values and the older justifiable war theory which confined any justifiable resort to war to a last resort implying that imaginative peacemaking had already been exhausted. The large collection of strategies within the conflict resolution options deepen the human possibilities of avoiding conflicts turning into wars.


This principle developed in essay form by Alan Geyer drew the most criticism from the assembled group. Like the Tenth Commandment of Moses, "Thou shall not covet," it moves toward the interior realms of humanity and has worldly consequences. There was more agreement around "Acknowledge responsibility for conflict" than for "Seek repentance and forgiveness." Historical knowledge in depth was regarded as vital to peacemaking and this
requires acknowledgement of a nation's contribution to conflicts. In fact conflict resolution strategies require the discovery and sharing of such knowledge. There was more doubt about the practicality of urging nations to repent and for their asking of forgiveness. This seemed too theological to some of the group for the purposes of just peacemaking principles. It also seemed to characterize prophetic utterance rather than more rational principles for nations. There were many calls for repentance of the nations in the Old Testament and few examples of it as national policy (Jonah at Nineveh comes to mind as a case of repentance and there even Jonah was surprised). The debates revealed some of the tensions in the group between the realists who tended to use just peacemaking theory within the world we have and the more idealistic thinkers who were more bold in expecting transformation of this world and saw the theory as aiding in that transformation. Repentance and forgiveness are relevant to international politics and that there are some examples of it in practice that Donald Shiver documents in *An Ethic for Enemies: Forgiveness in Politics*, but it is not a normal expectation of national behavior. After all the classical realists observed history and they saw little of it and peace can be achieved without it. Most statespeople are not free to express their self-transcendence of their assigned roles nor to confess their own nation's sin in their diplomatic roles. In conclusion the principle is directly correspondent to the 1967 Confessions emphasis upon practicing reconciliation, and Christians should lead in practicing these virtues, and promoting them for national policy as they are able.

10. Encourage Grassroots Peacemaking and Other Voluntary Associations

Duane K. Friesen provided the commentary for the affirmation of peace and justice oriented voluntary associations. International politics is not just about nation states. Below the level of the state and beyond the limits of the state exist a vast array of citizen organizations.
These organizations assemble the activists and leaders of the "We the people" of the United Nations Charter. The associations provide community for the work of peacemaking and give the work a chance of succeeding.

Non-governmental associations are growing in power and influence and they were vital in freeing Eastern Europe and in ending the cold war. Capacities for receiving information and transcending national interest are enriched by transnational associations. Peoples organizations including the churches have capacities for staying with issues beyond particular political administrations. The powerless can find voice in these associations. Mediation possibilities can be nurtured in voluntary associations. Groups outside of government can conceive and foster independent initiatives for nations to adopt. Associations preserve issues and concerns beyond short range expectations of short term governmental policy makers. Groups can resist governments when they act against peacemaking. Religious associations when committed and active in peacemaking can nurture transformed souls to work for peacemaking. As Jesus called his followers to organize so the work of peacemaking calls for organization in community. 5

11. Move expediently toward gender and racial equality in all issues of international policy and utilize the ethnic diversity within each country in the formation and execution of foreign policy.

The Presbyterian task force on sustainable development and U.S. foreign policy learned how important women's perspectives on justice and peace are at every level of the peacemaking-development process. The socialization processes of men and women remain so different that

dreams of peacemaking without the full inclusion of women's perspectives are an illusion. Men are more warlike and women reflect the perspectives of all victims including children more adequately than do men trained and socialized toward war.

Foreign policy has for too long been the prerogative of ruling elites of national establishments. Much broader representations from ethnic, religious, language, class, and cultural groups is needed for the conduct of diplomacy. This was not a principle from the just peace group, but it is a required perspective within Christian church thinking.

Just Peacemaking and Ethics of Military Intervention for Humanitarian Reasons

God, give us grace to accept with serenity the things that cannot be changed, courage to change the things that should be changed, and the wisdom to distinguish the one from the other. Reinhold Niebuhr, 1943.

The early (1992) post-cold war enthusiasm for the use of military force to intervene across national borders for humanitarian reasons has started to fade. The results of intervention in Bosnia, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Rwanda, and Somalia seem ambiguous. The old norms of nonintervention and almost absolute state sovereignty of the Westphalian system (1648) are crumbling. However, the way forward toward an international order which could intervene to save states from failing or to prevent genocide (Bosnia and Rwanda) remains unclear. In the cold-war the super powers intervened almost at will to further their perceived national interests of security or economic advantage. Today's world of one world power and four centers of regional power and almost 200 other nations needs ordering, but without policies resembling
imperialism. Everyone has a stake in contributing to the evolving world system. Ethicists and religious communities contribute to the process particularly by suggesting what the order ought to look like and what means are ethically applicable for working for that system. Goals and means are, in part, the subject matter of ethics.

Military intervention for humanitarian reasons is often called Humanitarian Intervention. This paper rejects that title as overly moralistic. Caution about the use of military force is always in order, and the church intervenes all the time with other forms of Christian intervention. The subject of the paper is not the ministries of preaching, healing, feeding, and educating that the church lives for, but the subject of when can the Christian ethics of the church support military intervention.

Christian thinking about war and peace presupposes that war is evil and can be justified only by the meeting of strict criteria which in certain cases make exceptions for justifiable war. The law of nations permitted a right of war, but the U.N. charter restricts that to meeting "threats of peace" to restore international security and peace under chapter 7 of the charter. The provision of armed forces to the U.N. under chapter 7 is still in development. Rights of regional organizations to act to protect peace and security are recognized and the right of unilateral or collective self-defense is recognized. These rights of intervention and defense can be given some latitude. But the requirements that use of armed force meet the criteria of justifiable war remains in force in Christian thought. Furthermore as the use of armed force is an exception and normally a means of "last resort" such use must be considered within the newly emerging teachings of just peacemaking. Though both intervention for humanitarian reasons and just peacemaking have ancient precedents, fortuitously in the post-cold war period both are emerging
with fresh vigor and intersecting each other in academic and public discourse.

Prophetic insight permits the recognition of humanitarian impulses or even divine support for some interventions. The invasion of the neo-Babylonian empire by the Persians for example freed the Jews from captivity and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the prophet could discern this truth (Isaiah 44:28-45:1). But our powers of discernment of the ways of nations are weak and we must be careful. Even the provision of food for humanitarian reasons to refugee camps may serve the ends of war lords in the camps and nurture the next war.

National sovereignty defers to humanitarian rescue when the purposes of the nation to protect its people is not served. National sovereignty is not an absolute, but it is normally a necessary limit. Normally nations may not intervene militarily in another nation. Exceptional cases like Bosnia, Iraq, Liberia, Rwanda are exceptions and the violations of human life must be flagrant for another nation or nations to intervene. The overriding of national sovereignty requires a just cause of great magnitude.

The overriding of national sovereignty requires appropriate authority and normally this is the authority of the united Nations Security Council. In some cases regional organizations may intervene prior to formal U.N. approval, but they should soon take their case to the Security Council for guidance. In some rare cases a nation may intervene unilaterally under emergency conditions, but even then it must seek U.N. approval at the earliest possible moment or desist. Even in a day of declining sovereign rights, the need for proper authority of an international body is needed to override national sovereignty.

The international authorizing body must be convinced of the real need for military intervention and the grounds are really for humanitarian rescue and not to serve economic or
national security interests of the intervening peoples. This will require prudence as motivations are mixed. The covering of material gains in the cloak of humanitarian rescue promotes cynicism whereas moral realism is needed.

The intervening nations must have the capacity and will to succeed. Humanitarian rescue requires success for the use of military force as does justifiable war theory.

Humanitarian rescue efforts are not necessarily the last resort but the full means of justifiable peacemaking must be utilized before and with intervention. The threat of invasion assisted Carter’s conflict resolution in Haiti, and his conflict resolution made the intervention non-violent at the last moment as the planes were approaching Haiti.

The intervention must honor the principles of proportionality, the good to be achieved must outweigh the foreseen damage in consideration of an intervention.

Also the non-belligerent civilians must be excluded from ill effects of armed intervention. The principles of justifiable war provide the moral context and criteria for considering armed intervention for humanitarian rescue. Though this paper has described criteria for military intervention there are many forms of intervention that may precede the use of armed force.
the social realm. Well in international politics we have to deal with powers that are so rapacious and evil as they were in Wesley's day. Still we believe and I believe that God will be able to abolish and while it still exists its power as a world-wide economic force has been broken. As we become more of a united world, sometimes even with the ambiguous forces, at our disposal we can move toward order and justice. However, under the UN and regional associations we must sometimes use the tools of the military in a way other than even very carefully, to save human lives. If God gives us the power, we may ever years strong, institutions of international order, and we may, guided by the spirit, use them well.

E. My colleague and friend, Edward I. Long, Dr. Professor Emeritus of Drew University, has improved my guarded hopes more boldly in a rewrite of my paper for the United Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) task force on the Ethics of Human Rescue, 1997. "Place matching and reconstruction
(with all the military, political, social, and spiritual resources that are entailed) can only thrive on a conviction, central to what theologians call eschatology, that the world is destined to move to greater international harmony and profane experience of a benighted well-being than it has known in the past or may experience in the future, p. 24 of unpublished paper.
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