

A “JUST WAR?”

What is “Just War” Theory?

Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life

Just War Tradition

The just war tradition, developed in the West over nearly two millennia, seeks to place moral restraints on warfare by establishing criteria for determining *when* and *how* to wage war justly. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the move toward war with Iraq, Americans have once again turned to the just war tradition for moral guidance.

Augustine of Hippo (354-430) is generally acknowledged as the first to offer a sustained treatment of war and justice in his masterpiece *The City of God*. While loathing the destruction and loss of life that attend war, Augustine nonetheless believed that a "just war" might be preferable to an unjust peace. Drawing on the apostle Paul's New Testament injunction to submit to governing authorities, "who do not bear the sword for nothing" (cf. Romans 13:1-7), Augustine recognized biblical mandates for individuals to love their neighbors (to the point of renouncing self-defense) even while defending government's duty to preserve civic peace and to secure justice. He maintained that use of force is necessary—though always regrettable—in a fallen world in order to restrain evil, but that its ultimate goal must be to restore peace.

St. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225-74) significantly contributed to the development of just war theory in his *Summa Theologica* in the 13th century. He formalized three criteria for a just war—*right authority* (a sovereign government, rather than individuals), *just cause* (to avenge wrongs or to restore what was unjustly seized) and *right intention* (the advancement of good or the avoidance of evil)—while also laying the groundwork for other criteria that would eventually be integrated into the tradition.

Protestant Reformers, as well as Catholic and Protestant natural law theorists, upheld the just war tradition. Some influential thinkers who significantly contributed to the development of just war theory include Francisco de Vitoria (1492-1546); Francisco Suarez (1548-1617); Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), often called the father of international law; and Emerich de Vattel (1714-67). In modern times, just war principles, frequently divorced from their religious origins, have been encoded in international laws governing armed conflict, such as the Geneva Conventions, as well as in American military doctrine and practice.

The result of 1600 years of evolving tradition is a fairly complex set of criteria that govern both moral justifications for waging war (*jus ad bellum*) and moral conduct once engaged in war (*jus in bello*). While just war proponents agree upon the criteria, there is often considerable variation in how the principles themselves are defined, not to mention how they are applied to particular cases. These principles may be roughly summarized as follows:

Jus ad bellum

· *Legitimate authority.* Private individuals and groups are not permitted to take up arms against others, however justified their cause may appear. Only governments—those who have been entrusted with the public good—may wage war, and they must do it openly and legally.

· *Just cause.* A government may wage war in self-defense, in defense of another nation, to protect innocents or to regain something wrongfully taken. The desire for personal glory or revenge, or to impose tyrannical rule, is never an acceptable cause for waging war.

· *Right intention.* The ultimate end of a government in waging war must be to establish peace, rather than to use a "just war" as a pretext for its own gain.

· *Last resort.* A governing authority must reasonably exhaust all other diplomatic and non-military options for securing peace before resorting to force.

· *Reasonable chance of success.* A government may not resort to war unless its prospects for success are good. In this way, lives will not be needlessly wasted in the pursuit of a hopeless cause.

· *Proportionality.* A government must respond to aggression with force only when the effects of its defensive actions do not exceed the damage done by the aggression itself.

Jus in bello

· *Noncombatant immunity.* An authority waging war is morally obligated to seek to discriminate between combatants and noncombatants. While civilians unfortunately may sometimes come in harm's way, a government may never deliberately target them.

· *Proportionate means.* This criterion pertains to specific tactics of warfare and seeks to restrict unnecessary use of force. It is intended to ensure that the military means used to achieve certain goals and goods are commensurate with their value, particularly when compared to the loss of life and destruction that could also occur.

While contemporary just war thinkers generally agree on these principles, changing political and military conditions often complicate their application. For instance, it's easy to say that war ought only to be waged in self-defense, but how does one know if or when it is morally permissible to defend oneself preemptively or preventatively? Moreover, what does the criterion of "last resort" really mean? As the just war theorist Michael Walzer has pointed out, "lastness" is a metaphysical concept that is never really achieved, because another effort to avert war can always be attempted. At what point, then, does a government determine that it has indeed exhausted all reasonable diplomatic solutions and must use force?

New military developments, advanced forms of weaponry as well as changing tactics of contemporary warfare also influence applications of just war thought. Precision-guided munitions like "smart bombs" ensure greater accuracy and enhanced ability to limit civilian casualties. However, even just war's effort to minimize use of force can be compromised and complicated by the decision to use "human shields," especially given the growth of real-time media coverage and broadcast of military actions.

These and other considerations render current debates about U.S. involvement in warfare

necessarily complex and morally ambiguous—even for those who agree, at least in theory, with the criteria established by just war thinkers.

For more articles on the “Just War” concept, go to <http://pewforum.org/issues/display.php?IssueID=11>

“Just War” in Iraq

Over the past few months, a number of Christian leaders—Protestant and Catholic—have questioned whether a war in Iraq can be justified. They have expressed many concerns, but three of the most important are these: (1) Can military action be morally legitimate if it is pre-emptive? (2) Is it morally permissible to use force to remove a tyrannical and aggressive regime from power, as opposed to merely disarming it? (3) May the United States legitimately lead a coalition against Saddam Hussein if the United Nations refuses, in the end, to authorize the use of force to remove or disarm his regime?

The religious leaders raising these questions are not pacifists. They do not suggest that the use of military force is never justifiable. Rather, they argue that a pre-emptive war in Iraq waged by the United States and its allies with the goal of removing Saddam from power does not satisfy the requirements of “just war theory.”

By Robert P. George, January 10, 2003

Institute on Religion and Democracy

<http://www.ird-renew.org/News/News.cfm?ID=548&c=4>

With God As Their Ally

As long as there have been battles, there have been warriors calling on God. So whose side is God on, really?

From a recent Gallup Poll, some American Christians would answer firmly, “Ours.” A February pre-war survey said practicing U.S. Christians were more likely than their non-practicing counterparts—Christian or not—to favor military action against Iraq. Sixty percent of those who said “religion is very important” favored going to war. The number increased to 70 percent among those who described themselves as members of the “religious right.”

“The question is not whether God is on your side,” said Maboud Ansari, William Paterson University sociology professor who has written extensively on Iranians in the United States. “In the Islamic perspective, you do things in order to please God. No matter what you do, you do it for the sake of God. When it comes to war, it becomes problematic. The only time you are certain God is on your side is when you are defending your religion. Otherwise, it is really a matter of political perspective.”

Discussing God’s loyalty to one side or another during battle is different from discussing a so-called just war, said Roger Berman, director of Creighton University’s justice and peace studies program.

“There is much biblical material—especially in the Book of Kings—based on legal material in the Book of Leviticus which explain the different levels of justification for the just and unjust wars,” said Rabbi Lewis E. Bogage of DePauw University.

Hartford Courant, March 25, 2003

www.ctnow.com/templates/misc/printstory.jsp?slug=hc%2Dgodlywar2Eartmar25

Vatican Peace Initiative

“One of the key principles of Catholic just war theory is that the good to be obtained from use of force has to be proportionate to the harm that is going to be done. I think the concern here is the harm—the humanitarian harm—could be enormous,” said John Allen, Fr., Vatican Correspondent for the National Catholic Reporter.

Religion & Ethics Newsweekly

April 4, 2003

<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week625/perspectives.html>

As U.S. Troops Reach Baghdad Rabbis Still Struggle with Position

As U.S. forces pushed to the outskirts of Baghdad this week, 350 Conservative rabbis were embroiled in a fierce Iraq conflict of their own. When the executive committee finally issued a resolution, it sent several messages. The rabbis supported the allied coalition's aims to "remove the threats posed by terrorism and weapons of mass destruction," expressed "maximum concern" for noncombatants, lauded U.S. troops, and underlined that Judaism holds peace as a "supreme value" but also allows defensive wars. Weeks into Operation Iraqi Freedom, it seems, the more liberal streams of American Judaism are more divided than ever about the war. The Orthodox community, in contrast, is standing firmly behind the war. For months, rabbis of all denominations have been sermonizing across the board on Iraq, finding Jewish reasons to rally behind the anti-war movement or wholeheartedly support the Bush administration.

United Jewish Communities, April 3, 2003

http://www.ujcna.org/content_display.html?ArticleID=75180

TV Debate Delineates Christian Divide on War

Mainline Churches Against; Evangelicals For

Talk show host Larry King raised a key questions to five Christian leaders debating the impending war with Iraq this week on CNN: “What would Jesus say?”

Most remarkable about the discussion was the ease with which each side supported its position with different aspects of Jesus’ Gospel teaching, the core of Christian faith. Opponents to the war quoted the Sermon on the Mount—‘blessed are the peacemakers’—to argue for continued diplomatic efforts. Supporters discounted such explicit messages of peace and stressed more obscure Gospel references to swords and battle as justification for going to war.

“According to Romans 13, the government and those in authority are really ministers appointed by heaven to protect and to punish,” best-selling author Max Lucado, pastor of Oak Hills Church of Christ in San Antonio, said. “I agree very much with the concept that we have to let war be the last resort. But somebody has to make that call.”

“God instituted government to carry a sword to protect innocent people and punish the evildoers,” Said John MacArthur, pastor of Grace Community church in Sun Valley, California, and a syndicated radio host. He bolstered his arguments by alluding to a passage in the Gospel of Luke in which Jesus warns of the dangers of being a Christian and tells his disciples to protect themselves by carrying a sword.... MacArthur also cited 1 Samuel, “God tells Israel to go to war against Amalek...and destroy the Amalekites because they were a blight on humanity.”

The Washington Post
March 15, 2003 Page B09
www.washingtonpost.com

Religious Anti-War Mobilization

Leaders of 24 Christian denominations and religious organizations marched to the White House this week. They said the march and candlelight vigil were part of what they call their own “faith-based initiative” against war with Iraq.

However, Diane Knippers of the Institute on Religion and Democracy said, “They don’t represent the people in the pews by any stretch of imagination. My suspicion is that if the president and our national leaders make the judgment that this is a necessary and just war, that the majority of American churchgoers will support that.”

Religion & Ethics Newsweekly
March 14, 2003
www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week621/news.html

Church Goers Support War with Iraq

A recent Gallup poll shows that church-going American are more likely to support war against Saddam Hussein than are Americans as a whole. According to Gallup, Americans who attend church at least once a week support war to depose the Iraqi dictator by an almost two to one margin. Americans who never attend church or say religion is not important to them are more evenly divided about the possibility of war.

The poll undermines the claims of anti-war church leaders who claim to speak for American Christians on Iraq.

The Institute on Religion and Democracy, March 18, 2003
www.ird-renew.org/News/New.cfm?ID=585&c=4

Catholics Debating: Back President or Pope on Iraq?

In religious journals, seminaries and informal discussions...the prospect of a pre-emptive attack in Iraq has set off an intense debate among people of faith over whether such a war would qualify as a “just war” in Christian teaching.

On the prospects of war with Iraq, [many Catholics] find themselves in a bind: as conservative Catholics, they follow the pope, but as conservative Americans, they support the president. They, like many other religious Americans, are more deeply indecisive and ambivalent than their religious leaders appear to be.

New York Times, March 6, 2003

War & Peace

President Gordon B Hinckley

April 6, 2003

I hope that the Lord’s people may be at peace one with another during times of trouble, regardless of what loyalties they may have to different governments or parties.

The question arises, “Where does the Church stand in all of this?”

First, let it be understood that we have no quarrel with the Muslim people or with those of any other faith. We recognize and teach that all the people of the earth are of the family of God. And as He is our Father, so are we brothers and sisters with family obligations one to another.

But as citizens we are all under the direction of our respective national leaders. They have access to greater political and military intelligence than do the people generally. Those in the armed services are under obligation to their respective governments to execute the will of the sovereign. When they joined the military service, they entered into a contract by which they are presently bound and to which they have dutifully responded.

One of our Articles of Faith, which represent an expression of our doctrine, states, “We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law” (Articles of Faith 1:12).

In a democracy we can renounce war and proclaim peace. There is opportunity for dissent. Many have been speaking out and doing so emphatically. That is their privilege. That is their right, so long as they do so legally.

.... there are times and circumstances when nations are justified, in fact have an obligation, to fight for family, for liberty, and against tyranny, threat, and oppression.

When all is said and done, we of this Church are people of peace. We are followers of our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, who was the Prince of Peace. But even He said, “Think

not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword”
(Matthew 10:34).

This places us in the position of those who long for peace, who teach peace, who work for peace, but who also are citizens of nations and are subject to the laws of our governments. Furthermore, we are a freedom-loving people, committed to the defense of liberty wherever it is in jeopardy. I believe that God will not hold men and women in uniform responsible as agents of their government in carrying forward that which they are legally obligated to do. It may even be that He will hold us responsible if we try to impede or hedge up the way of those who are involved in a contest with forces of evil and repression.

Now, there is much that we can and must do in these perilous times. We can give our opinions on the merits of the situation as we see it, but never let us become a party to words or works of evil concerning our brothers and sisters in various nations on one side or the other. Political differences never justify hatred or ill will. I hope that the Lord’s people may be at peace one with another during times of trouble, regardless of what loyalties they may have to different governments or parties.

<http://www.lds.org/conference/talk/display/0,5232,23-1-353-27,00.html>

New Scrutiny on Role of Religion in Bush’s Policies

President Bush has never been shy about injecting his faith into the public arena—his campaign remark that Jesus Christ was his “favorite political philosopher” was an early signal. But his rising use of religious language and imagery in recent months, especially with regard to the US role in the world, has stirred concern both at home and abroad.

No one presumes to know how another’s personal faith plays out in public life, and the president’s spokesman insists that Mr. Bush makes his decisions as a “secular leader.”

Not all evangelicals are pleased. Yet among those who share his evangelical Christianity, the satisfaction of having a born-again believer in the White House doesn’t necessarily preclude an uneasiness with some of his rhetoric and policies.

Others applaud Bush’s clarity in a time of national crisis. “He has reintroduced into the culture the language of morality and moral distinctions,” says Richard Mouw, president of Fuller Theological Seminary, in Pasadena, California.

The Christian Science Monitor

March 17, 2003

www.csmonitor.com/2003/0317/p01s01-uspo.html

Of God, and Man, in the Oval Office

The National Council of Churches, together with a number of peace organizations, recently ran an ad on CNN and Fox in which a bishop of the United Methodist Church, to which President Bush belongs, criticized the Bush administration’s relentless war

rhetoric. Going to war with Iraq “violates God’s law and the teaching of Jesus Christ,” said the bishop. “Unfortunately, I believe that the people in the Muslim world will see a war led by the [Christian] person from America as a Christian crusade...and it’s going to push the feeling of the people from the moderate to the more radical leaders in the Muslim world,” he said.

The Washington Post
March 6, 2003

“Irresponsible” Methodist Bishop Appears in Anti-War TV Commercial

The ecumenical officer for the United Methodist Church’s Council of Bishops is appearing in a television commercial asserting that a U.S.–led war to overthrow Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein “Violates God’s law.” Bishop Melvin Talbert is identified by the commercial as a spokesman for “President Bush’s church.” President Bush is a United Methodist. Talbert is a retired United Methodist bishop who represents United Methodist bishops at ecumenical meetings. The commercial is sponsored by the National Council of Churches.

“The commercial and Bishop Talbert’s participation in it are absurd and irresponsible on several levels,” said Mark Tooley, who directs the Institute on Religion and Democracy’s United Methodist committee. First, Tooley noted Talbert is not empowered to be a spokesman for the denomination. “Talbert...comes from the left-wing of our denomination. He is clearly unrepresentative and outside the mainstream.”

The Institute on Religion and Democracy, February 7, 2003
www.ird-renew.org/News/News.cfm?ID=565&c=3

Iraq War and Call for Jihad

In Egypt, a group of Islamic scholars at the prestigious Al Azar University this week said jihad -- meaning holy war -- becomes a duty for all Muslims if the U.S. attacks Iraq.

The scholars said such an attack would constitute a new "crusade" not only against Islamic territory but on Islam itself. Therefore, said the scholars, all Muslims are obligated to defend their land and their religion.

Religion & Ethics Newsweekly
March 14, 2003

www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week628/perspectives.html

Some Saudi Liberals Support U.S. Presence in Iraq

In Saudi Arabia, opposition to the U.S.-led war in Iraq remains high. But a small group of liberals believes the conflict could be beneficial for Saudi Arabia, saying American-imposed reforms on the Iraqi government might speed a democratic movement in their own country.

<http://discover.npr.org/rundowns/rundown.ihtml?prgId=3&prgDate=current>

Qur'an

2:190-195

Fight those in the way of God who fight you, but do not be aggressive: God does not like aggressors. And fight those (who fight you) wheresoever you find them, and expel them from the place they had turned you out from. Oppression is worse than killing.

Do not fight them by the Holy Mosque unless they fight you there. If they do, then slay them: such is the requital for unbelievers. But if they desist, God is forgiving and kind. Fight them till sedition comes to end, and the law of God (prevails).

If they desist, then cease to be hostile, except against those who oppress...

So if you are oppressed, oppress those who oppress you to the same degree, and fear God, and know that God is with those who are pious and follow the right path.

Spend in the way of God, and do not seek destruction at your own hands.

So do good; for God loves those who do good.

Hebrew Bible (or Christian Old Testament)

Hosea 1:7

But I will have pity on the house of Judah, and I will save them by the LORD their God; I will not save them by bow, or by sword, or by war, or by horses, or by horsemen.

Joel 3:9-13

Proclaim this among the nations: Prepare war, stir up the warriors. Let all the soldiers draw near, let them come up. 10 Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears; let the weakling say, "I am a warrior." 11 Come quickly, all you nations all around, gather yourselves there. Bring down your warriors, O LORD. 12 Let the nations rouse themselves, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there I will sit to judge all the neighboring nations.

New Testament

Matthew 5:7,9

Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy...

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

Hebrews 11:32-34

And what more should I say? For time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets-- 33 who through faith conquered kingdoms, administered justice, obtained promises, shut the mouths of lions, 34 quenched raging fire, escaped the edge of the sword, won strength out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to flight.

The Dalai Lama

"Responsibility does not only lie with the leaders of our countries or with those who have been appointed or elected to do a particular job. It lies with each of us individually.

Peace, for example, starts within each one of us. When we have inner peace, we can be at

peace with those around us. When our community is in a state of peace, it can share that peace with neighboring communities, and so on. When we feel love and kindness towards others, it not only makes others feel loved and cared for, but it helps us also to develop inner happiness and peace. And there are ways in which we can consciously work to develop feeling of love and kindness. For some of us, the most effective way to do so is through religious practice. For others it may be nonreligious practices. What is important is that we each make a sincere effort to take our responsibility for each other and for the natural environment we live in seriously.”

The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life has gathered position statements from a number of religious groups. You can view them at <http://pewforum.org/docs/print.php?DocID=21>

RELIGIOUS GROUPS ISSUE STATEMENTS ON WAR WITH IRAQ

Compiled by Religion News Service, March 19, 2003

African Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Adam J. Richardson, president of the Council of Bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, said in a March 12 interview that he was troubled by the support of possible war by some in Christianity's conservative wing. "I think that, from my perspective the right-wing faction of Christianity is doing Christ a disservice by attempting to back their jaundiced views with Scripture, trivializing the Bible in public view and making a mockery of the best traditions of biblical scholarship." He added his thoughts about the military: "I say emphatically that I am not against the military nor military personnel. I am an American. My passport says so. But I think the leadership is wrong. I'm praying for him (President Bush) and ... the people of the Middle East."

American Baptist Churches USA

The General Board of American Baptist Churches USA, meeting in November, issued a statement urging efforts toward peace and prayer for the United Nations, the Iraqi people, military personnel and others affected by the crisis. "Let us pray for the United Nations that it may continue to be a voice, a forum and instrument of peace in these days of terror and the prospect of war. We recommend that President Bush and Secretary of State Powell continue their efforts to work through the United Nations to resolve the issue of Iraqi disarmament through inspections and diplomacy," the statement reads.

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

The church's Common Global Ministries Board, a joint venture with the United Church of Christ, said in a Feb. 10 statement: "God continues to speak to us a word of peace. Our churches believe that the church is called to participate in God's message of reconciliation with all of creation. This calling is distinct from the pull of the world, but not removed from it. We are taught by Jesus, the Christ, that peace, harmony and justice are God's vision for humanity."

Church of England

Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams, in a joint Feb. 20 statement with Catholic Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor, reiterated his opposition to war. "The events of recent days show that doubts still persist about the moral legitimacy as well as the unpredictable humanitarian consequences of a war with Iraq."

Church of God in Christ

In a Jan. 23 letter to President Bush, Church of God in Christ Presiding Bishop Gilbert E. Patterson and the denomination's General Board expressed concern for the military -- noting its significant numbers of ethnic minorities -- and Iraqi civilians. They called for moral principles to be involved in determining the necessity for war. "Failure to satisfy

these criteria renders the war aims, strategies and tactics, at a minimum, morally suspect and perhaps morally unacceptable in the eyes of the church universal and under the gaze of a just and holy God," they wrote.

Conference of Major Superiors of Men (Catholic men's religious orders)

In a joint letter with other group to U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican Jim Nicholson, the men's orders flatly opposed the war. "There remain many avenues of peaceful, diplomatic alternatives that have not been explored. The international community does not support a planned war. A clear and imminent threat has not been proven."

Conservative Judaism

Rabbi Jerome Epstein, head of the United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism, said all Jews hope for peace, "history has also taught us that, at times, those who seek peace must fight for peace. Therefore, we hope that Iraq will use this period of time to comply with the world call for elimination of terrorism. If not, the responsibility of nations and the world to eliminate terrorism through whatever means necessary would be a tragic outcome."

Council on American-Islamic Relations

One of the country's most visible Muslim groups said war against Iraq would kill innocent civilians and destabilize the region. "Any American invasion and occupation of Iraq will fuel anti-American sentiment and would thereby harm our nation's image and interests in the Middle East and throughout the Muslim world."

Eastern Orthodox Bishops

The Standing Conference of the Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas urged "all leaders of governments to utilize every means available to seek a peaceful resolution to the present challenge to the security and happiness of all humankind, poses by the forces of terror and evil that threaten not only the civilized world, but the very survival of human existence" in a Feb. 11 statement.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson has called for prayer. "As weapons inspectors continue their work, the United Nations debates next steps, the Iraqi people suffer and our government moves closer to war, we must not abdicate our responsibility to both pray for peace and to engage in public conversation regarding what is a just response that might lead to peace," he wrote in a Feb. 13 letter to church leaders.

Episcopal Church

Presiding Bishop Frank Griswold, who has been critical of President Bush's war rhetoric, said on Jan. 30 that President Bush needs to "exhaust all diplomatic and multilateral initiatives as the alternatives to waging war" and to "act only in concert with the United Nations Security Council."

Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

In a March 3 statement on peace, the Rev. Gerald Kieschnick, president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod said: "Our president has been entrusted with the sword. He may have to use it. We pray for God's wisdom to guide him in the execution of his duty, that peace may prevail for us and for all people."

Lutheran World Federation

The LWF's executive committee, in a March 15 statement, denounced the Bush Administration for seeking war without United Nations approval. "The 'just war' criteria ... were designed to constrain – not justify – the resort to war. Indeed, they stand in clear opposition to a preemptive war for the purpose of 'regime change.'"

Mennonite Church USA

The church's executive board, in a Jan. 15 letter to President Bush, said "the victory this country needs, Mr. President, is the victory of peace, of a stable economy both here and in Iraq, of a democratic government that listens to the majority of its citizens who currently do not support war against Iraq."

Metropolitan Communities Churches

On Jan. 27, the church's board of elders said that "...war will only increase unrest and suffering in the world, deepen the distrust that already divides America and Britain from Iraq and its allies, and divert international attention ... from world poverty, a rapidly deteriorating ecological structure and oppression of too many of the world's peoples."

Muslim American Society

The Muslim American Society issued a March 10 statement, arguing that a war on Iraq would not be a "just war," would complicate the long-term foreign policy goals of our nation and could prompt increased terrorist attacks against America. "Therefore, based upon our Islamic religious beliefs and concern for our nation's prosperity and security and the innocent potential Iraqi victims, we call on our government and all peace-loving people and nations to do everything in their power to avoid war, and resolve all pending issues through peaceful means," the statement reads.

National Association of Evangelicals

Members of the National Association of Evangelicals, meeting on March 6, affirmed a call to prayer issued Feb. 24 by the World Evangelical Alliance. "We believe that war or violence is almost always the worst solution for resolving conflict. Insofar as it is possible, all paths to peace should be explored and all possible means should be used for resolving any conflict," the WEA statement said.

National Baptist Convention, USA

During its mid-winter board meeting, leaders of the National Baptist Convention, USA, adopted a resolution expressing opposition to a possible war with Iraq. "The president, officers, board of directors, auxiliaries, boards and commissions of NBCUSA, Inc. firmly believe that non-violent social change and international peacemaking are the most desired

methods to address any and all infractions of Iraq against the United Nations Resolutions passed relative to weapons of mass destruction in Iraq's possession," the resolution reads.

National Council of Churches

The NCC has sponsored anti-war delegations to Iraq, England, Germany, Italy, France and Russia, and is a sponsor of the "Win Without War" coalition. After the Feb. 5 meeting with German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, an NCC statement said "we deplore the fact that the most powerful nations of this world regard war as an acceptable instrument of foreign policy," and called a U.S.-led war "an inappropriate means to achieve disarmament of any Iraqi weapons of mass destruction."

Orthodox Judaism

Rabbi Tzvi Weinreb, executive vice president of the Orthodox Union, said he supports President Bush in this "just war" against Iraq. "We pray for a peaceful solution, but if the president and his advisers, who are the experts, determine that military action is required to eradicate this evil ... (the Orthodox Union stands by him) 100 percent."

Pope John Paul II

In a Jan. 13 address to diplomats, the pope said, "No to war! War is not always inevitable. It is always a defeat for humanity. International law, honest dialogue, solidarity between States, the noble exercise of diplomacy: these are methods worthy of individuals and nations in resolving their differences."

Presbyterian Church (USA)

In a Dec. 6, 2002, letter to President Bush, Stated Clerk Clifton Kirkpatrick urged caution. "We urge you to do everything in your power to encourage the United Nations inspection process. It is imperative for all that this be a successful effort."

Progressive National Baptist Convention

In a resolution passed in January, the Progressive National Baptist Convention said: "The Progressive National Baptist Convention calls on President George Bush, the Congress and the United Nations to seek peace and justice through diplomatic means in Iraq just as this administration is seeking better relations with North Korea through diplomacy and not preemptive strikes."

Reform Judaism

Rabbi Eric Yoffie, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said on Jan. 29, "We would prefer that this crisis be resolved by peaceful means, and if military action is necessary, we believe that multi-lateral action would be far preferable to unilateral action. Although we urge the President to pursue all diplomatic means with urgency and resolve, we know that the time for such efforts is limited."

Southern Baptist Convention

Richard Land, president of the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, has spoken in favor of the potential war with Iraq. In a statement issued after Secretary of State Colin Powell's Feb. 5 address to the United Nations

Security Council, Land said: "The case for using force to bring about disarmament and regime change in Iraq was clearly and convincingly made for anyone who has eyes to see and ears to hear. Our choice is to pay less now and deal with this problem or we can pay a lot more later and deal with a nuclear-armed Saddam."

Unitarian Universalist Association

UUA President William Sinkford has said he opposes the war and has asked for prayers for peace. In a pastoral letter last September, he said "The question in this difficult discussion must be more than simply, 'Do we go to war?' Raw power cannot heal those wounds hidden in the human heart that lead us to conflict."

United Church of Christ

In a Feb. 22 statement, regional church leaders urged more time for United Nations inspections. "The recourse to war, according to our Christian tradition, is an admission of human failure. By such action, we admit our lack of commitment to use other means to resolve human conflict. It is a resounding 'no' to God's eternal 'yes' to humanity."

United Methodist Church

Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher of southern Illinois, president of the Council of Bishops, wrote to President Bush on Feb. 6, saying that "we pray that every possible means to prevent war will be pursued in the coming days. This is not a moment for haste but rather for deep thoughtfulness and prayer. It is a moment to reflect upon the well-spoken concerns of our allies around the world. The welfare of our human family depends on it."

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

The bishops' president, Wilton Gregory, said on Feb. 26 that the bishops have not changed their minds since they spoke out against war last November. "To permit preemptive or preventive uses of military force to overthrow threatening or hostile regimes would create deeply troubling moral and legal precedents. Based on the facts that are known, it is difficult to justify resort to war against Iraq."

World Council of Churches

The WCC executive committee, in a Feb. 21 statement, said "war against Iraq would be immoral, unwise and in breach of the principles of the United Nations Charter." The WCC also lambasted "the fact that the most powerful nations of this world again regard war as an acceptable instrument of foreign policy."

The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life
<http://pewforum.org/docs/print.php?DocID=21>

FAITH, ENVIRONMENTAL & HEALTH ISSUES

Psalm 8 has been quoted to show that the earth was put at man's disposal to use:

- 5 For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.
- 6 Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet:
- 7 All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field;
- 8 The fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas.
- 9 O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!

Our Obligations to Nature

Philosophy Professor Holmes Rolston III, this year's winner of the Templeton Prize, says he has spent his life in a lover's quarrel between science and religion. Though most scientists and environmentalists would hesitate to plant trees for God, and most religious leaders would not call deforestation a sin, Rolston insists the two are undeniable connects. The earth, says Rolston, is the Promised Land of milk and honey referred to in the Bible, and man has a duty to protect it.

The Christian Science Monitor

March 20, 2003

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0320/p16s01-lire.html>

Evangelical Environmentalism Comes of Age

Environmental activism constitutes the "fastest-growing form of Christian ministry," according to Fred Krueger, director of the Christian Society of the Green Cross.

Incorporated in 1993, the Philadelphia-based Christian Society of the Green Cross (800/650-6600) is guided by the motto "Serving and Keeping Creation." Director Krueger says, "We noticed a severe disconnection between Christians' belief and behavior regarding environmental issues."

Christianity Today, November 11, 1996

For a brief survey of leaders in evangelical environmental ministry, go to:

<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/6td/6td084.html>

Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR)

For thirty years the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR) has been a leader of the corporate social responsibility movement. ICCR's membership is an association of 275 faith-based institutional investors, including national denominations, religious communities, pension funds, endowments, hospital corporations, economic

development funds and publishing companies. ICCR and its members press companies to be socially and environmentally responsible. Each year ICCR-member religious institutional investors sponsor over 100 shareholder resolutions on major social and environmental issues. The combined portfolio value of ICCR's member organizations is estimated to be \$110 billion.

Over the past 10 years, ICCR has been pressing energy-intensive companies to reduce emissions that contribute to global warming/climate change. Within the space of a single year, ICCR got a significant number of companies to withdraw from the Global Climate Coalition (GCC), an industry lobbying group.

http://www.iccr.org/issue_groups/environment/faq.htm

GM and Ford Hit with Global Warming-Related Resolutions from Shareholder Groups

A coalition of shareholders, including religious orders and other concerned investors, today unveiled global warming-related shareholder resolutions filed at General Motors Corporation and Ford Motor Company, the world's number 1 and 2 largest automakers. The resolutions ask that the companies measure and report to their shareholders on carbon dioxide—"greenhouse gas"—emission from their plants and products and commit to significantly reducing those emissions by 2012.

"We believe that Ford and GM face material and reputational risk in their current failure to address and reduce carbon dioxide emissions," said Patricia Daly, executive Director of the Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment, which represents more than 30 religious orders and Diocesan members. "The high greenhouse gas intensity of U.S. vehicle manufacturers undermines the competitive position of U.S. automakers both here and abroad as the world, including their competitors, moves forward to address climate change. This is not only about what is good for the environment. It is about what is good for GM and Ford shareholders."

www.iccr.org/new/press_releases/pr_ford_gm.htm

What Would Jesus Drive?

The first reaction by some to the question "What Would Jesus Drive?" is to laugh. However, we consider it one of the crucial questions of our day. Jesus cares about what we drive. Obeying Jesus in our transportation choices is one of the great Christian obligations and opportunities of the 21st century. Pollution from vehicles has a major impact on human health and the rest of God's creation. It contributes significantly to the threat of global warming. Our reliance on imported oil from unstable regions threatens peace and security.

<http://www.whatwouldjesusdrive.org/>

It's hard to decide whether to peg this "What Would Jesus Drive?" campaign as silly or offensive. It is the former for placing its absolute faith in Global Warming as the

ultimate Apocalypse. It is the latter for trivializing God and attempting to divert the Christian church away from its primary task—proclaiming the Gospel—to just one more left-wing cause du jour.

By Mark Tooley, December 4, 2002

<http://www.ird-renew.org/News/News.cfm?ID=514&c=4>

GLOBAL HEALTH: USAID's Core Initiative

Building on decades of experience and several years of detailed planning the U.S. Agency for International Development has established the Communities Responding to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic (CORE) Initiative to strengthen its partnerships with community- and faith-based organizations to meet needs associated with HIV/AIDS in developing countries. The initiative is also focusing change and activity where they are most urgently needed—at the community level, where people live, struggle and die as a consequence of HIV infection.

“While people of faith around the world hold differing views on how best to prevent HIV infection, all belief systems have compassionate care for the sick as a core value.

Additionally, faith-based institutions typically operate much of the developing country health care infrastructure—clinics, hospitals, and teaching facilities.

http://www.usaid.gov/pop_health/aids/TechAreas/community/corefactsheet.html

Shareholders Challenge Abbott to Treat AIDS Pandemic in Africa with Affordable Drugs

Calling the company's current AIDS treatment programs “meager”, religious and union shareholders are challenging Abbott Laboratories to make life-saving HIV/AIDS medicines accessible and affordable in African countries where AIDS is pandemic.

www.iccr.org/news/press_releases/pr_abbott.htm

HUMANITARIAN AID: THE ROLE OF FAITH-BASED GROUPS

What is the role of missionaries in delivering humanitarian aid? Should they also bring the messages of their faith or does doing so endanger aid workers?

President Bush Approves Faith-Based Office for USAID

President George W. Bush signed an executive order today that will lead to a center for faith-based initiatives at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). In keeping with the Bush Administration's commitment... the executive order makes it easier for faith-based organization to work with the federal Government.

December 12, 2002

www.usaid.gov/press/releases/2002/pr021212/html

Cover Story

Some agencies that traditionally receive U.S. grants for emergency relief projects have elected not to take government money for Iraq on moral grounds. Among them, Catholic Relief Services, the aid arm of the U.S. Catholic Bishops. "The position we have taken, the position the bishops have taken, that this is considered an unjust war, the conditions are not there that justify this war," said Nazare Albuquerque of Catholic Relief Services.

Nongovernmental organizations say their job is complicated because the U.S. government is overseeing all humanitarian operations inside Iraq through offices at the Pentagon and the U.S. Agency for International Development. Relief officials are urging that nongovernmental agencies have a greater role.

"With the U.S.-led coalition forces going in with one arm with bombs and the other arm, perhaps, with humanitarian aid to follow up, that gives us great pause and concern, because what you have is politicization of this humanitarian aid," said Kevin King (Mennonite Central Committee).

March 28, Religion & Ethics Newsweekly

www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week629/p-cover.html

Some Aid Comes With Strings To The Cross

Will proselytizing in Iraq offer comfort and hope to a nation that is 97 percent Muslim? Or will it reinforce the growing perception of Muslims worldwide that the war, no matter what President Bush says, is against Islam, not Saddam Hussein?

The largest American Protestant denomination, the Southern Baptist Convention, recently announced plans to send relief workers into Iraq to address both physical and spiritual needs. Samaritan's Purse, a relief organization headed by the Rev. Franklin Graham, has similar plans, as do other evangelical relief organizations.

Criticism was both swift and harsh. Other faith-based relief groups said that proselytizing would tarnish their own humanitarian efforts in Muslim countries. Several critics said that private relief groups are considered extensions of their governments in the Islamic world. Consequently, said Dan O'Neil, co-founder of Mercy Corps, based in Portland, Ore., "we have to pay the price of groups that don't play by the generally accepted rules of humanitarian engagement."

Some relief groups make proselytizing a firing offense." We try to open our hearts to others and see the full dimension of God in their experience," said Tom Getman, the Geneva-based director of humanitarian affairs and international relations for World Vision, a Christian group. "So we have a firm policy that we must never use a gift to persuade people to believe as we believe."

At its root, the proselytism issue is over religious values and interpretation of biblical passages. Evangelicals stress evangelism, as their name implies. They believe they have a duty to share the "good news" of the gospel, that Jesus came to save sinners so they can go to heaven and escape hell. They cite Jesus' last words to his followers, urging them to go forth and "make disciples of all nations." ... All the groups say they are taking no government money for their efforts and they will be sensitive, even subtle, in their approach. Receptivity to a religious message will never be a requirement to receive food, water, shelter or any other aid, they say. The image of Bible-toting missionaries marching into Iraq as Christian soldiers is inaccurate, they argue, because for the most part, the gospel will be shared only in private in response to queries from curious individuals.

Spokane Spokesman-Review

Saturday, April 5, 2003

Muslims: Franklin Graham's aid is unwelcome

A leading Muslim spokesman said Tuesday that evangelist Franklin Graham's Samaritan's Purse should stay out of Iraq, claiming the group's real aim is not to help people but to coerce them into accepting Christ.

"It's just a very deceitful practice," said Ibrahim Hooper of the Council on American-Islamic Relations in Washington. "There are enough legitimate organizations to handle these kinds of things. I think it's better that they not participate in relief work in Iraq."

The Charlotte Observer

April 2, 2003

http://www.charlotte.com/mld/charlotte/news/special_packages/iraq/5537822.htm

Aid Agencies Poised to Offer Relief

Not all of the relief organizations waiting to head into Iraq are evangelical. Many of the nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs, are Christian -- backed by Catholics, Lutherans, Baptists, Mennonites, Quakers, Orthodox and a variety of ecumenical movements. Some are resolutely multifaith or nonreligious: the Red Cross, Doctors Without Borders, the International Medical Corps. And a few -- the Red Crescent and the Islamic American Relief Agency -- are Muslim, like most of the population of Iraq.

"We always try to be clear about who we are. We always say, 'We are not missionaries.' We are a Christian NGO driven to help all people by our Christian ethos and spirituality," said Steve Matthews of World Vision International from his temporary headquarters in Jordan.

The Dallas Morning News

March 22, 2003

FAITH AND GLOBAL TRADE ISSUES

Interfaith Statement on International Trade and Investment

It is our belief, as members of diverse faith communities, that moral and spiritual principles can provide guidance in the search for practical measures to address the profound ethical issues raised by international trade and investment. In this spirit, we offer...five principles, each accompanied by our observations and visions for the future. We believe that adoption of these principles will assist people everywhere to shape international trade and investment so that they advance the goal of a more just, more sustainable, and more prosperous human society.

1. International trade and investment systems should respect and support the dignity of the human person, the integrity of creation, and our common humanity.
2. International trade and investment activities should advance the common good and be evaluated in the light of their impact on those who are most vulnerable.
3. International trade and investment policies and decisions should be transparent and should involve the meaningful participation of the most vulnerable stakeholders.
4. International trade and investment systems should respect the legitimate role of government, in collaboration with civil society, to set policies regarding the development and welfare of its people.
5. International trade and investment systems should safeguard the global commons and respect the right of local communities to protect and sustainably develop their natural resources.

www.networklobby.org/trade.htm

For a list of endorsers go to: <http://www.networklobby.org/trade.htm#group>

Landmark Study Shows Mexican Workers not Able to Meet Basic Needs on Sweatshop Wages

Workers in foreign-owned export assemble plants in Mexico are not able to meet a family's basic needs on sweatshop wages, according to a comprehensive study conducted in 15 Mexican cities. Over 3500 maquiladora factories (assembly plants located near the Mexican border) employ an estimated 1.2 million workers, manufacturing products for export to the United States.

"Companies tell us that they are paying above the minimum wage," said Rev. David Schilling, director of ICCR's Global Corporate Accountability Program, "but our data shows they are nowhere near paying a sustainable living wage. We call on all companies to publicly report what they pay their maquiladora workers and to close the gap between what they pay and what workers need." For twelve years, religious institutional investors, members of ICCR, have been pressing corporations to pay their Mexican employees a sustainable living wage.

www.iccr.org/news/press_releases/pr_maquila.htm

Equal Exchange Coffee in Your Cup

Already the second poorest country in the western hemisphere, Nicaragua and its coffee growers have been particularly hard hit by the collapse of coffee prices, which have fallen 70% in the last five years.

But in the last three years, a cooperative of small farmers and community organizers in Miraflores have found an unlikely partner in their struggle for economic survival—the Presbyterian Church (USA). On October 23, 2002, two Miraflores leaders visited the Presbyterian Center to tell their story and thank the PC(USA) for its participation in the revitalization of their community through the Presbyterian Coffee Project.

Launched at last year's General Assembly, the coffee project is part of the denomination's Enough for Everyone anti-hunger campaign. In partnership with Equal Exchange—a 15-year-old fair trade organization—the Presbyterian Coffee Project encourages congregations and other entities to purchase their coffee from farmers' cooperatives like Miraflores at a guaranteed price that is roughly three times the current world market price.

www.witherspoonsociety.org/coffee_project.htm

Microfinance

Catholic Relief Services' Microfinance program is rooted in the principles of Catholic social teaching. Guided by the call to end poverty and injustice, CRS has chosen to focus on the poorest clients, to recognize the dignity of their work, and to strengthen our partner organizations who serve them.

CRS' goal is to provide the self-employed poor, especially women, with access to reliable financial services. In response to client demand, CRS builds capacities and provides technical support to those partners who are committed to the goal of becoming specialized Microfinance institutions.

Olga's Bakery: Olga and her husband are raising two young children and running their small business. They started out as vegetable vendors in the central market. However, their true dream was to open a bakery. "Using the savings we had built up with our vegetable business along with a loan from the community bank [supported by Catholic Relief Services' Microfinance program], we were able to purchase a used refrigerator, an oven and our initial inventory. Thanks to our hard work and access to credit, we finally opened our door to our new business in June of 2002."

www.catholicrelief.org/what_we_do_overseas/microfinance

“Can We Be Citizens of a World Empire?”

By Robert Bellah

Sociologist of Religion

Professor emeritus

University of California, Berkeley

Author of *Habits of the Heart*

Power. We have enormous power, more than any nation has ever had before—probably more than it is good for any nation to have. But power in itself is not bad; we cannot live without it. The question is, what kind of power? Albert Borgmann has usefully contrasted regardless power with careful power. Regardless power is the great temptation of technology, military technology in particular—if we have it why not use it? But regardless power destroys what it touches, the environment, society, individual lives. Careful power is moderate and restrained, always thoughtful of consequences, always concerned that it nurture, not destroy. The Christian tradition is rooted in the idea that God in Christ is the very exemplum of careful power. All of the other great traditions say something similar in one way or another. Can we build an empire based on careful power and lay regardless power aside? That is the test that 9/11 and its aftermath lays on the shoulders of all American citizens.