

Our Vocation Is Peacebuilding (*Construo pacem est nostra vocatione*)¹

GERARD F. POWERS

University of Notre Dame

“Our vocation is peacebuilding.” That would be a fitting theme for a new synod and apostolic exhortation. This synod could address the future of the just war tradition for the Catholic community, and do so in a way that situates the just war tradition where it should be: as just one, relatively marginal element of a much wider and more important project of strengthening peacebuilding. With the Sermon on the Mount at the center and drawing on a rich tradition of reflection on war and peace, the synod could offer a spiritual, theological, moral, and pastoral template for a Catholic community animated by a deep and abiding commitment to peacebuilding. As I envision it, the synod would insist that moving peacebuilding from the margins to the center of Catholic identity and practice is necessary for the Catholic community’s integrity as well as its capacity to work with other religious and secular actors in addressing the world’s most pressing challenges to peace.

A proposed synod on peacebuilding parallels Pax Christi’s call, following its 2016 conference on nonviolence with the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, for a synod on nonviolence and just peace. While an encyclical would be welcome, a synodal process, preferably including diocesan and national synods leading to an ordinary general assembly, would permit the wide consultations needed to address the varied and contingent dynamics of conflict and peace around the world. And the process itself would help achieve one of the goals of the synod: to broaden and deepen Catholic engagement in peacebuilding. Like Pax Christi’s proposed encyclical, the synod would take a “Just Peace approach [that] offers a vision and an ethic to build peace as well as to prevent, defuse, and to heal the damage of violent conflict.”² But the theme of the synod would be the vocation of peacebuilding: just peace is the vision and moral framework; peacebuilding is what we are called to do; and peacebuilders are what we are called to be if the world is to move toward a just peace. Peacebuilding reinforces the idea that a just peace is not a static end-goal achieved by implementing a set of principles or developing just structures. Rather, just peace is something that we must constantly build and rebuild, a dynamic process of contingent efforts to achieve

communities of right relations in many different places and at many different levels of society.³

Unlike Pax Christi's proposal, a primary purpose of this synod would not be to commit the Church "no longer [to] use or teach 'just war theory.'" The synod certainly would contribute to the increasing emphasis in the Church's teaching and practice on the importance and efficacy of nonviolence. But it would be clear that "Gospel nonviolence" is just one element of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding is not an alternative to the Church's restrictive approach to the just war tradition, but a necessary complement to it. The synod would highlight the need for both adherents of nonviolence and just war to enlarge the conversation by reflecting much more seriously and systematically than either have done to date on peacebuilding, an area where they should be able to find common ground.

In this essay, I will first argue that a synod is needed to address gaps that keep peacebuilding on the margins of the Church. I will then address four ways a synod could address those gaps in an effort to become more of a peacebuilding Church: (1) renewing a commitment to the vocation of peacebuilding, (2) further developing a peacebuilding ethic informed by practice, (3) understanding the distinctive contributions of Catholic peacebuilding as a basis for broader engagement with the world, and (4) clarifying the complementary relationship between peacebuilding, nonviolence, and the just war tradition.

Why a synod?

If Catholic social teaching is the Church's best kept secret, peacebuilding is Catholic social teaching's best kept secret. Much as *Laudato si'* did for the environment, a synod on peacebuilding would help address gaps in Catholic teaching and formation and help mainstream peacebuilding practices that, while impressive, are mostly marginal activities within the Church.

One gap is the literacy gap. From the Sermon on the Mount and official Catholic social teaching to spiritualities and sacraments, peace is a central theme. Yet, few Catholics, even clergy and laity with formal training in theology, know the Church's rich tradition of peace and understand how it might apply to today's world. How many graduates of Catholic universities have even a cursory understanding of this tradition? How many priests and bishops have taken a seminary course on the subject? An increasing number of Catholic universities have peace studies programs, but, as with other academic disciplines, engagement with the Catholic intellectual tradition and practice is often minimal and *ad hoc*. The relatively few Catholic dioceses and parishes that address issues

of war and peace usually do so during national debates about U.S. military intervention, a “teachable moment” that easily dissolves into political polarization, not enhanced understanding of the tradition.

A second gap is that, despite the Church’s rich tradition, important aspects of a peacebuilding ethic are underdeveloped. Just as just war norms are often racing to keep pace with new technology and new strategies of warfare, a peacebuilding ethic needs to catch up to the practice of peacebuilding.⁴ A synod could solidify, clarify, and deepen existing teaching by reflecting on the insights gained from a wealth of peacebuilding experience. Moreover, it could catalyze further reflection on today’s new challenges of peace, from the moral dilemmas involved in sustainable peace processes to issues of self-determination and nation-building, which are at the heart of some of the world’s most intractable conflicts.

Finally, perhaps the major gap is that the practice of Catholic peacebuilding is so rare. No doubt, the Catholic peacebuilding slate is hardly blank. Within the Catholic community, as with other faith communities and secular actors, peacebuilding has become a kind of cottage industry, with a proliferation of programs that seek to nurture, expand, and professionalize the kinds of peacebuilding activities in which the Church has long been involved. Sant’Egidio’s peacebuilding work in Mozambique and elsewhere is a notable example, as are endless kinds of peacebuilding activities by Church peace and justice entities, from parishes and religious orders to episcopal conferences and the Holy See. Less well known are the peacebuilding activities of Catholic Relief Services and other Caritas agencies, which have developed well-funded, long-term peacebuilding programs.⁵ As impressive as this work is, however, much of it consists of relatively modest, *ad hoc* initiatives run by a relatively small group of bishops, specialists, activists, and programs. For many Catholic faithful and institutions, peacebuilding is not considered integral to their Christian identity or mission and does not enjoy significant commitment of resources. The United States remains mired in Afghanistan and Iraq, the two longest wars in its history, yet, with a few exceptions—e.g., occasional statements by U.S. bishops and a few Catholic peace and human rights groups, and humanitarian aid and refugee resettlement programs—the Catholic community, like most Americans, acts as if the nation is at peace.

To help address these gaps, a synod could highlight four main topics: (1) the vocation of peacebuilding, (2) a practical theology of peacebuilding, (3) the distinctiveness of Catholic approaches, and (4) the complementarity of nonviolence, just war, and peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is our vocation

The central theme of the synod would be peacebuilding as vocation. No development of the tradition is needed for peacebuilding to be considered integral to an understanding of the Christian vocation and therefore central to the Church's mission. In his exhortation after the African Synod, Pope Benedict summarized the link between faith and peacebuilding as follows:

Christians will thus become peacemakers (cf. Mt 5:9) to the extent that, grounded in divine grace, they cooperate with their Maker in creating and fostering the gift of peace. As reconciled men and women, the faithful will also promote justice everywhere, especially in African societies divided and threatened by violence and war, yet hungering and thirsting for true justice [...]. Open to the prompting of the Holy Spirit who continues to awaken different charisms in the Church, Christians must pursue or undertake with determination the path of holiness, and thus increasingly become apostles of reconciliation, justice and peace.⁶

Robert Schreiter suggests three mutually reinforcing dimensions of the vocation of peacebuilding: (1) a spiritual vision of peace; (2) a set of tasks and practices of clergy and laity that correspond to the offices of teaching (e.g., education for peace), shepherding or governing (e.g., facilitating peace processes), and sanctifying (e.g., rituals of forgiveness); and (3) a set of spiritual disciplines (e.g., the sacraments, prayer, maintaining hope).⁷

Understanding the dynamics of conflict, training in conflict resolution skills, educating to change attitudes, and developing strategies of social change are essential. But understanding peacebuilding as vocation gives this work a depth and texture that are essential for effective, sustained peacebuilding, especially amidst seemingly hopeless, intractable conflicts. Understanding peacebuilding as vocation also enriches the Church's wider teachings and practices, from sacraments and systematics to human rights and development.

Drawing on its broad consultative process, the synod could highlight concrete examples of how the vocation of peacebuilding is being lived out around the world through a wide variety of charisms. It could highlight bishops and priests who engage in what secular experts would consider mediation or conflict transformation, but which the bishops and priests consider pastoral engagement or accompaniment. In Sudan, for example,

Church leaders did not consider themselves to be “peacebuilders.” They considered themselves pastors and shepherds, whose first obligation was to reflect Christ’s fidelity to the Church through their own fidelity to the people. As pastors, they created and sustained communities of faith that could absorb suffering, embody forgiveness and reconciliation, maintain hope, and advocate for justice. As shepherds, they gave voice to the voiceless and spoke truth to power.⁸

Unfortunately, this kind of pastoral engagement is too often the exception, especially in places where violent conflict is not a daily reality. That is the main reason it is necessary to revive peacebuilding as vocation. A synod could remind the clergy that too many priests and bishops are not responding to Pope Francis’ insistence that they escape the confines of their comfortable rectories and chanceries and get out into the streets.

The synod also could address challenges that arise when bishops and priests are out in the streets. Frequently, Catholic clergy and institutions are called to play leading roles in official truth and reconciliation or human rights commissions, constitutional reform initiatives, election monitoring, and negotiations between conflicting political parties or armed groups. Because these roles are inherently political, clergy sometimes decline to accept them. Especially in countries like Congo and South Sudan, however, where the Church is one of the only functioning and widely respected institutions and where there is a dearth of educated laity, clerics often reluctantly take up the mantle under the rationale that the extraordinary circumstances justify what is sometimes referred to as a “substitute political role.” When they do so, they must walk a tightrope between the religious and the political. This kind of direct political engagement by Church leaders can be necessary and effective in the short-term. But it always carries the risk of politicizing religion and clericalizing peacebuilding. A synod could mine the experience of the Church around the world in these situations and further elaborate ecclesiological and practical criteria for when it might be appropriate for the institutional Church or individual clerics to play this substitute political role and when to refrain from doing so.

By far the biggest challenge a synod could address is that revitalizing the peacebuilding vocation depends on revitalizing the lay vocation. Revitalizing the lay vocation, in turn, requires overcoming the strong tendency in the Church and the wider society to privatize religion, to create a sharp separation between what people pray on Sunday and what they do on Monday. Inculcating

peacebuilding as a vocation is possible only if Catholics can accept that social teaching and action are integral to their faith. Lay Catholics are meant to be the vanguard of a peacebuilding Church because, as “ambassadors of Christ” (2 Cor 5:20) in the public sphere, they have the principal responsibility for transforming the social order in light of the gospel through their work, family, and civic engagement.⁹ The synod could illustrate the lay vocation in action with concrete examples of the variety of ways in which lay people and lay organizations have embraced, nurtured, and lived out the peacebuilding vocation.

The synod also could acknowledge that too often the laity are missing-in-action when it comes to peacebuilding. It could cite the bishops of the Great Lakes Region of Africa, who have rightly identified the problem as one of evangelization. In a strategic plan approved by the six national and two regional episcopal conferences in the Great Lakes Region, they bemoaned the fact that “[w]e have not always done what we could in order to form the laity for life in society, to a Christian vision of politics and economics. A protracted absence of the lay faithful from this field has led them to believe that the faith has nothing to do with politics.”¹⁰ They concluded that action to promote peace and reconciliation requires finding “the language and methods which are necessary to form communities in an active faith which brings about a social and political revival.”¹¹

Just as the bishops of the Great Lakes Region committed to re-evangelize the laity regarding the lay vocation, a synod should commit the Church to a renewed Church-wide effort of formation. A synod could applaud the proliferation of peace and justice initiatives at all levels of the Church since *Gaudium et spes* called for undertaking “an evaluation of war with a new attitude,” strengthening programs to study peace, and renewing efforts to construct peace by international Catholic associations.¹² In the same spirit, it could call for a renewal of the Church’s *commitment to peacebuilding* with an entirely new attitude. Among other things, a synod could commit to new programs of priestly and episcopal formation to reinforce the centrality of peacebuilding in their ministry. It could call on Catholic institutions, from episcopal conferences, dioceses, and parishes to Caritas agencies, educational institutions, and religious orders, to do an audit of the role of peacebuilding in their work and to develop plans for making it more integral to that work. Moreover, it could encourage lay movements to do more to integrate peacebuilding into their work and could call for a proliferation of lay Catholic groups, such as Sant’Egidio and Pax Christi International, that have special competencies in peacebuilding.

A practical theology and ethic of peacebuilding

Revitalizing the vocation of peacebuilding is the critical foundation for becoming more of a peacebuilding Church, but further development of the tradition is needed to address new challenges. A synod could contribute to and call for further development of what Robert Schreiter calls a practical theology of peacebuilding, “an ongoing practice of reflection and action that keeps theory and informed practice in constant conversation with each other.”¹³ The synodal process of world-wide consultation would enable the Catholic community to undertake a systematic reading of the peacebuilding “signs of the times” that would deepen understanding of the nature of contemporary conflicts, contribute to mapping and analyzing the mostly unheralded peacebuilding work of the Catholic community, and identify ways in which existing teaching can be enriched by insights from practice and practice can be enriched by developments in teaching. While it is hard to predict in advance what issues would emerge from a synodal process, the Catholic Peacebuilding Network (CPN), a network of two dozen Catholic academic institutes, development agencies, lay organizations, and episcopal conferences, has identified several areas where further development of a practical theology of peacebuilding is needed.¹⁴

One area is the role of conflict resolution and dialogue. Kenneth Himes suggests that the presumption against war and the positive conception of peace found in Catholic teaching is not matched by “a comparable set of theological and ethical principles to guide conflict resolution.”¹⁵ According to Himes, Catholic communitarianism is overly optimistic about the efficacy of dialogue in overcoming deep-seated conflicts and, thus, remains underdeveloped in conflict resolution, despite its engagement in such efforts around the world.¹⁶ Catholic social teaching could benefit from more engagement with the fields of international relations and international law, as well as the newer disciplines of conflict resolution and conflict transformation, in developing more substantive norms for what is called “Track One” or government-to-government diplomacy, as well as the Church’s own rather impressive record of “Track Two” diplomacy, which involves non-state actors. Much has been written on the Sant’Egidio Community’s role in ending the Mozambique conflict.¹⁷ Also ripe for reflection are the ways in which theology, social teachings, rituals, and pastoral practices contribute to formal and informal peace processes in Colombia, the Philippines, Uganda, Congo, Sudan, and elsewhere.¹⁸ A synod could also address such recurring moral dilemmas as finding the right balance between justice (holding bad actors accountable so as to end a culture of impunity and break the cycle of violence) and peace (granting

amnesties and power sharing in order to achieve a peace agreement). Finding the right balance has to be done on a case-by-case basis, but these kinds of issues are a largely unexamined dimension of Catholic peacebuilding that warrant at least as much reflection as they are given in the secular literature.

A second issue that deserves fuller treatment is self-determination and nation-building. The religious-ethnic-nationalist conflicts since the end of the Cold War have generated a substantial literature on religion and violence, religion and ethnic-national identity, and the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention. But the issue that is at the heart of so many of these conflicts—disputes over self-determination and secession—has not been addressed to the same extent. The Church has been deeply engaged in debates over self-determination and secession in individual cases, but there is little in official Catholic teaching on the topic.¹⁹ A synod could lead to the development of a more consistent and coherent moral framework to guide the Church's engagement.

Nuclear disarmament is a third issue. The nuclear age has generated an abundance of Church statements and scholarly reflection on the ethics of nuclear weapons. Relying heavily on just war arguments, Pope Francis recently condemned not only the use, but also the possession of nuclear weapons.²⁰ This statement and the Holy See's ratification of a new treaty banning nuclear weapons are part of a long-standing strategy of the Holy See to delegitimize nuclear weapons. The continued success of this strategy will require the development of an ethics of nuclear disarmament that is as sophisticated as the ethics of nuclear use and deterrence. For example, more reflection is needed on what forms of deterrence would be morally acceptable to deter nuclear breakout in a world near or at zero nuclear weapons, as well as on the elements of an ethic of cooperative security that could make "global zero" feasible.²¹ More reflection is also needed on the pastoral implications, especially for Catholic policymakers and military personnel, of the Church's recent condemnations of both nuclear use and nuclear deterrence.

These and other issues marry political ethics, economic ethics, business ethics, environmental ethics, international law, and cultural norms, all of which must find expression in institutions. What is needed, therefore, is greater attention to an ethic of institutions that can translate norms into fair and effective structures and processes that are essential to building a just peace. This involves a multifaceted, building block approach to peacebuilding that a synod can model and encourage.

A distinctive Catholic peacebuilding

Since *Pacem in terris*, social encyclicals have been addressed to all people of good will, not just Catholics. In *Laudato si'*, Pope Francis not only addressed the whole world, but also quoted leaders of other faiths. Similarly, a new synodal process and apostolic exhortation could include religious leaders and reference texts of other faiths to highlight the importance of ecumenical and inter-religious peacebuilding, as well as the distinctive contributions of other faiths and secular specialists. At the same time, a synod could emphasize what is distinctive about Catholic approaches to peacebuilding.

Given the prevalence of conflicts with a religious dimension, a synod would have to reiterate the frequent denunciations of the new holy wars—religious violence and religious nationalism—by religious leaders. It would also have to address the prevailing secularist paradigm, which tends to view religion mainly as a source of conflict and division and thus seeks to remove it from the public square and marginalize and privatize it. The synod would make the case that strengthening religious peacebuilding is an obvious antidote to both contemporary holy warriors and the secularist paradigm. It could welcome scholars and policymakers who are enhancing their literacy on religion, conflict, and peace. It could make the case that marginalizing religion impoverishes peacebuilding because elements of peacebuilding, such as forgiveness, reconciliation, and solidarity, either are not prominent in secular policy discourse or become rather “thin” when separated from their religious and moral roots.²²

“Thick” religious contributions to peacebuilding require greater attention to single-identity peacebuilding. Developing common ground and common action on conflict and peacebuilding is essential, but the quality of ecumenical and interreligious peacebuilding is a function of the quality of intra-denominational and intra-religious peacebuilding. According to Scott Appleby, the Church relies on a “distinctive set of teachings, practices, sensibilities, and institutional resources” that might not be “exclusive” to Catholicism but that come together in a special way in Catholic peacebuilding.²³ The process of holding a world-wide synod would, itself, exemplify one distinctively Catholic dimension: the Church’s “ubiquitous presence.” As John Paul Lederach, a prominent Mennonite peacebuilder, points out, this presence gives the Church a “unique if not unprecedented presence in the landscape of the conflict.” Especially in majority Catholic countries like Colombia, he adds, few religious or secular institutions have the infrastructure or ecclesiology that “so neatly aligns with the multilevel and multifaceted demands of peacebuilding.”²⁴ A second

distinctive aspect of Catholic peacebuilding is the role of the Catholic social imaginary, including ritual, sacrament, and spirituality. Schreiter argues that a secular bias in peacebuilding has mostly ignored the role of ritual in conflict prevention, transformation, and reconciliation.²⁵ A synod could urge the Catholic community to revitalize and deepen its understanding of the distinctive role of sacraments in Catholicism and how they offer deep spiritual grounding for the Church's peacebuilding.

In addressing what is distinctive about Catholic peacebuilding, a synod would have to avoid any hint of triumphalism, exclusivity, or parochialism. But further plumbing of the spiritual, theological, and pastoral depths of Catholic peacebuilding is essential if the peacebuilding vocation is to be an animating feature of lived Catholicism and if the Church is to make her most authentic and fullest contribution to the world's wider peacebuilding project.

Peacebuilding, nonviolence and the just war tradition

Finally, as noted earlier, a synod need not dwell on the well-trod debate over just war and nonviolence, nor need it take a page out of the Mennonite Confession of Faith, discard the just war tradition, and embrace nonviolence as the sole Christian option. Instead, it could expand on and reinforce the growing importance of nonviolence in Catholic teaching, explicitly reject permissive approaches to the just war tradition in favor of a highly-restrictive one, and elaborate on the inherent complementarity of nonviolence, restrictive just war, and a broader theology and ethics of peacebuilding.

Since Vatican II and especially since the end of the Cold War, nonviolence has received greater emphasis and legitimacy in official Church teaching. Papal and other statements are replete with condemnations of the "savagery" and "scourge" of war, descriptions of war as "an adventure without return" and a "defeat for humanity," and hortatory appeals, such as "war never again" and "war is not the answer."²⁶ The experience of total war in the twentieth century, the threat of a nuclear holocaust, and the fact that civilians have increasingly been the main victims of war have led the Church to be deeply skeptical of the ability of modern war to meet just war criteria. At the same time, successful nonviolent change, from the demise of Marcos in the Philippines to the mostly peaceful dissolution of the Soviet bloc, has demonstrated the efficacy of nonviolence.²⁷ Nevertheless, nonviolence has been considered an option for individuals, not governments. A synod could call on the Catholic community to give much greater attention to nonviolence as a

core element of its identity. Without rejecting the just war tradition, a synod could call on governments to take their obligation to develop institutions, strategies, and means of nonviolent conflict resolution at least as seriously as they take their responsibility to develop their capacity to defend the common good through military means.²⁸ Such clarity about the obligation of governments to pursue nonviolent means of conflict resolution would significantly raise the threshold for the resort to force. It also would reinforce the Church's long-term vision of strengthening international law, international institutions, and means of conflict transformation to the point that war will become obsolete.

While highlighting nonviolence, a synod could at the same time emphasize that the Church's restrictive approach to just war is not an impediment to peacebuilding, but is an element of it.²⁹ A permissive approach to just war too readily justifies war and is prone to misuse, but the Church's restrictive just war approach, when followed, places severe constraints on the use of force. It helps delegitimize the holy war claims of religious terrorists or religious nationalists. It is a form of conflict prevention when *jus ad bellum* criteria are used to oppose military interventions, as was done by the Vatican, episcopal conferences, and pacifists, too, in opposing U.S. intervention in Iraq in 2003. Finally, *jus in bello* norms are elements of peacebuilding insofar as they seek to limit the civilian suffering that fuels cycles of violence and makes it much more difficult both to end conflicts and to promote post-conflict reconciliation.

Last but not least, a synod could elaborate on the ways in which nonviolence, restrictive just war, and a broader theology and ethics of peacebuilding complement each other. Neither nonviolence nor restrictive just war nor even a combination of the two is capacious enough to address the most difficult peacebuilding challenges. Theories of nonviolence and just war contribute little to post-conflict nation-building, trauma healing, and reconciliation in countries torn asunder by civil wars. Both nonviolence and just war can ground condemnations of religious violence and religious nationalism, but much more is needed to address the roots of terrorism, conflicting claims of self-determination, and deeply-rooted sectarianism. Moreover, theories of nonviolence and just war offer little guidance for understanding the relationship between the ethics of intervention and the ethics of exit. For example, while it may have been immoral for the U.S. to intervene in Iraq in 2003, it was not immoral for the U.S. to stay given the new obligations it incurred as the *de jure* and then *de facto* sovereign. In sum, the credibility and validity of both nonviolence and restrictive just war depend on whether they are tied to an ethics of peacebuilding

that can address these and other broader challenges of war and peace.

Conclusion

The Catholic community around the world is doing courageous work for peace in some of the world's most war-torn places, but this work tends to be unheralded, unknown, and under-analyzed—and mostly operates on the margins of Church life. A synod on the vocation of peacebuilding would bring new visibility to this peacebuilding and would seek to move peacebuilding from the margins to the center. A synod process with the vocation of peacebuilding as its animating principle, a practical theology of peacebuilding as its method, and a commitment to exploring the complementarity of nonviolence, restrictive just war, and an ethics of peacebuilding would contribute to what Scott Appleby calls “a conceptually coherent, theologically sophisticated and spiritually enlivening” approach to Catholic peacebuilding that can begin to match the sophistication of Catholic thinking on the ethics of war and peace.³⁰ A synod also would enable the Catholic community to move closer to becoming a peacebuilding Church in an authentically Catholic way.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this essay, “Peacebuilding Is My Vocation: 50 Years after *Pacem in Terris*,” was presented at the Anniversary of *Pacem in Terris* Conference, University of Notre Dame, March 24–26, 2011. This article also draws on Gerard Powers, “From an Ethics of War to an Ethics of Peacebuilding,” in *Just War to Modern Peace Ethics*, eds. Heinz-Gerhard Justenhoven and William A. Barbieri, Jr. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 275–312; and Gerard Powers, “Catholic Peacebuilding,” in *A Vision of Justice: Engaging Catholic Social Teaching on the College Campus*, eds. Susan Crawford Sullivan and Ron Pagnucco (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), 113–137.
2. Pax Christi International, “An Appeal to the Catholic Church to Re-Commit to the Centrality of Gospel Nonviolence,” <https://nonviolencejustpeace.net/final-statement-an-appeal-to-the-catholic-church-to-re-commit-to-the-centrality-of-gospel-nonviolence/>.

3. Kenneth Himes, “Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching,” in *Peacebuilding: Catholic Theology, Ethics and Praxis*, eds. Robert J. Schreiter, R. Scott Appleby, and Gerard F. Powers (New York: Orbis, 2010), 265–299, at 269. Peacebuilding is preferable to peacemaking because the latter is often defined narrowly as mediation or conflict resolution. While peacebuilding sometimes is defined narrowly as post-conflict reconciliation, I use a broader concept of strategic peacebuilding developed by Lederach and Appleby, which includes efforts at all levels, involving a broad range of actors and factors, to promote peace before, during, and after violent conflicts. See John Paul Lederach and R. Scott Appleby, “Strategic Peacebuilding: An Overview,” in *Strategies of Peace: Transforming Conflict in a Violent World*, eds. Daniel Philpott and Gerard Powers (New York: Oxford, 2010), 19–44.
4. To be sure, there is a growing literature on a theology and ethics of peace, but it is not nearly as well developed as the literature on just war and nonviolence. See, e.g., R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000); Mary Ann Cejka and Tomas Bamat, eds., *Artisans of Peace: Grassroots Peacemaking among Christian Communities* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003); Atalia Omer, R. Scott Appleby, and David Little, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Religion, Conflict, and Peacebuilding* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Glen Stassen, *Just Peacemaking* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); and Susan Thistlethwaite, ed., *A Just Peace Church* (New York: United Church Press, 1986).
5. For an overview of CRS peacebuilding, see William R. Headley and Reina C. Neufeldt, “Catholic Relief Services: Catholic Peacebuilding in Practice,” in *Peacebuilding*, 125–154.
6. Benedict XVI, *Africae munus*, 2011, §§170–171, http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20111119_africae-munus.html.
7. Robert Schreiter, C.P.P.S., “Peacebuilding as Vocation,” paper delivered at New Challenges for Catholic Peacebuilding Seminar, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Rome, May 29–30, 2012, 7–9.

8. John Ashworth, Hharuun Lual Ruun, Emmanuel LoWilla, and Maura Ryan, *The Voice of the Voiceless: The Role of the Church in the Sudanese Civil War, 1983–2005* (Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, 2014), 241.
9. Benedict XVI, *Africae munus*, §128.
10. Catholic Episcopate of the Great Lakes Region, Final Declaration: “God has entrusted us the ministry of reconciliation” (2 Cor 5:18) (Peace and Reconciliation Conference, King’s Conference Center, Bujumbura, Burundi, October 19–21, 2010), quoting African Synod of Bishops, 1994, §33, https://cpn.nd.edu/assets/228991/2010_burundi_final_declaration.pdf.
11. *Ibid.*, §6.
12. Pope Paul VI, *Gaudium et spes* (“Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World”), December 7, 1965, §80, §82, §90, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.
13. Schreiter, “A Practical Theology of Healing, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation,” in *Peacebuilding*, 366–397, at 366.
14. More information on CPN is available online at <http://cpn.nd.edu>.
15. Himes, “Peacebuilding and Catholic Social Teaching,” in *Peacebuilding*, 282.
16. *Ibid.*
17. See, e.g., Andrea Bartoli, “Mediating Peace in Mozambique: The Role of the Community of Sant’Egidio,” in *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World*, eds. Pamela Aall, Chester A. Crocker, and Fen Osler Hampson (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1999), 245–273.
18. See, e.g., John Paul Lederach, “The Long Journey Back to Humanity: Catholic Peacebuilding with Armed Actors,” in *Peacebuilding*, 23–55, at 29.

19. One of the few efforts in a Church document to define universally-applicable criteria for self-determination is found in the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace* (Washington, DC: USCCB Office of Publishing, 1993), 28–29.
20. Pope Francis, “Prospects for a World Free of Nuclear Weapons and for Integral Disarmament,” address to International Symposium, The Vatican, November 10, 2017, https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2017/november/documents/papa-francesco_20171110_convegno-disarmointegrale.html.
21. See Gerard Powers, “From Nuclear Deterrence to Disarmament: Evolving Catholic Perspectives,” *Arms Control Today* 45/4 (May 2015): 8–13, and Michael Desch and Gerard Powers, “No More Nukes?: An Exchange,” *Commonweal*, February 23, 2018, 12–17, <https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/no-more-nukes>.
22. See, e.g., Amitai Etzioni, *Security First: For a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 152; Monica Toft, Daniel Philpott, and Timothy Shah, *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011); Task Force on Religion and the Making of U.S. Foreign Policy, “Engaging Religious Communities Abroad: A New Imperative for U.S. Foreign Policy” (Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2010), http://keough.nd.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/engaging_religious_communities_abroad.pdf.
23. R. Scott Appleby, “Peacebuilding and Catholicism: Affinities, Convergences, Possibilities,” in *Peacebuilding*, 3–22, at 12; see also Schreiter, “Future Directions in Catholic Peacebuilding,” in *Peacebuilding*, 421–448, at 422–425.
24. Lederach, “The Long Journey Back to Humanity: Catholic Peacebuilding with Armed Actors,” in *Peacebuilding*, 50–51.
25. Robert Schreiter, “The Catholic Social Imaginary and Peacebuilding: Ritual, Sacrament, and Spirituality,” in *Peacebuilding*, 221–239.
26. Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington, DC: U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005), §497.

27. John Paul II, *Centesimus annus*, 1991, §23, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus.html. For John Paul's teaching on war, see Drew Christiansen, S.J., "Catholic Peacemaking, 1991–2005: The Legacy of Pope John Paul II," *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* 4/2 (Fall 2006), 21–28. On the efficacy of nonviolent resistance, see, e.g., Erica Chenoweth and Maria J. Stephan, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).
28. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace*, 5.
29. See Christiansen, "Catholic Peacemaking, 1991–2005," 24.
30. Appleby, "Catholic Peacebuilding," *America*, September 8, 2003, 12–15, at 12.