

Catholic Peacemaking:
From *Pacem in terris* to *Centesimus annus*

A Talk Prepared for
The United States Institute of Peace

By Rev. Drew Christiansen, S.J
Woodstock Theological Center
and
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Washington, D.C.
February 5, 2001

Catholic Peacemaking:
From *Pacem in terris* to *Centesimus annus*

It is hard to identify the precise starting point of modern Catholic peacemaking.¹ Official reckoning assigns credit to Pope Benedict XV for his efforts to end the First World War. To Benedict, we owe the famous phrase, “Never again war, war never again”, made famous by Pope Paul VI’s 1965 address before the United Nations, and repeated by Pope John Paul II on several occasions.² But, Benedict’s overtures were dismissed by the great powers, partly because his proposals did not fit their interests, partly because they suspected his sympathies with Catholic Austria, and partly because the pope himself was still a prisoner of the Vatican with reduced political influence.³ Others would place the starting-point with Pope Pius XII. As a former diplomat, Pius took exceptional interest in international affairs, promoted Catholic internationalism, and played a significant role in Cold War politics.⁴

I cast my own vote for Pope John XXIII. Not only did he play an active and a positive role in perhaps the most dangerous of post-war confrontations, the Cuban Missile Crisis, Pope John also issued an encyclical letter on peace which for the first time elaborated Catholic teaching on the matter in a sustained way.⁵ *Pacem in terris* had significant influence on the Second Vatican Council’s approach to engagement in the world, it also provided the motivation for the most sustained Catholic contribution of the post-conciliar peacemaking, namely, the Church’s defense of human rights as the foundation of peace.⁶ A decade later when Salvador Allende was overthrown by a military coup in Chile John’s teaching on human rights would be the basis for the first major Catholic human rights office, originally called the Committee for Peace, and later as the Vicariat for Solidarity under the auspices of the Archdiocese of Santiago de Chile. In addition, *Pacem in terris*, published only months before John

XXIII's death, received an incredibly warm reception from the non-Catholic, secular world. The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, for example, celebrated the encyclical with quadrennial conferences by the same name for two decades.

During the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Kennedy White House was looking for back channels to communicate with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. After a request from the White House, Pope John sent a signal to Premier Khrushchev—which given the circumstances today sounds vague and convoluted—but Khrushchev welcomed the message, and began his movement back from the brink.⁷ Some days later, reflecting with his physician on the state of the world, Pope John shared his dream of writing an encyclical on peace. It was to be the last major act of his pontificate. Less than a year later he was dead of stomach cancer detected during the physical exam that November day.

The remainder of this paper will fall in two parts. The first is an exposition of the Catholic vision of peace. This quick tour d'horizon, I hope, will help define what is distinctive about Catholic peacemaking and point up at least one major weakness as well as its significant strengths. The second part will deal with official Catholic peacemaking understood as the peace work of the pope, the Vatican, episcopal conferences and individual bishops. I should also explain that my subtitle "From *Pacem in terris* to *Centesimus annus*" is a shorthand way to encompass the last forty years of Catholic social teaching and praxis. *Pacem in terris*, of course representing John XXIII's contribution to the teaching on peace and the praxis of human rights; *Centesimus annus* represents Pope John Paul II's extraordinary role in eastern Europe and his positive endorsement of non-violence in the encyclical of that name, one of the great kept secrets of contemporary Catholicism.

I. The Catholic Vision of Peace

I begin with Pope John XXIII and *Pacem in terris* because, as Catholic teaching insists, peace is not the mere absence of war, nor even the avoidance of war. Peace is the positive realization of the dignity of the whole human family. The Catholic vision of peace consists of several constructive components, the first of which is human rights. By contrast with some other religious traditions presented in this series, with their emphasis on conflict resolution and conflict transformation, the modern Catholic social tradition emphasizes the positive content of peace. While in the last thirty-five years since the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council, Catholic peacemaking has come to recognize the importance of non-violence, and indeed to formally adopt non-violence in significant ways, its own theory of conflict resolution and transformation remains relatively underdeveloped as compared to its positive teaching on peace. The paradoxical result of a strong positive doctrine of peace and a less articulated doctrine of conflict resolution is that even as church leaders are thrown into the role of national conciliators because of the credibility they have won on the basis of their work for peace in fields like human rights and development, they find themselves bereft of tools and support as they attempt to exercise their responsibilities in conflict resolution. I shall return to this paradox at the conclusion of my remarks when I speak about the role of bishops in conciliation and mediation.

Elements of the Catholic Vision

The Catholic vision of peace consists of four elements: (1) human rights, (2) development, (3) solidarity, and (4) world order.

Pacem in terris re-conceived the whole of Catholic political theology in terms of human rights. The common good was redefined as the “objective recognition, respect, safeguarding and promotion of

the rights of the human person.”⁸ The encyclical declared that upholding the common good so conceived was the goal of all public authority. In so doing, it prepared the way for notions of humanitarian intervention in what might be called Catholic cosmopolitanism, the view that in international affairs the rights of persons take priority over the rights of states.⁹ Above and beyond the good of individual political communities and international relations, *Pacem in terris* also identified “the universal common good” and called for transnational institutions to address global problems.¹⁰ Two years after the release of *Pacem in terris* the Vatican Council declared that the promotion of human rights was one of the three ways in which the Church served the world.¹¹

A second element of the Catholic understanding of peace is the value of integral or authentic development. Set forth in the Council’s *Gaudium et spes*, Pope Paul VI’s *Populorum progressio* (**Development of Peoples**), John Paul II’s *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (**On Social Concern**), and somewhat less extensively in *Centesimus annus* (n. 52), the idea of authentic development consists of three points: (1) the right of all people to the means for their full development as human beings, (2) the proposition that authentic human development consists of more than economic progress, and (3) the affirmation that the affluent nations of the world have an obligation to share the benefits of development with the poor, not just through aid, but also through structural economic changes such as equity in trade reform.¹² The notion that “development is the new name for peace” appears as a summary tag line in Pope Paul VI’s *Populorum progressio*.¹³ It is re-articulated in *Centesimus* where Pope John Paul II presents development as an alternative to war in two senses.¹⁴ First, development addresses some of the longstanding causes of war; secondly, church leaders hope that “a concerted worldwide campaign for development” is what William James called “a moral alternative to war”, a high cause that can be

widely shared and for which people will make considerable sacrifices.

The third component of the Catholic idea of peace is solidarity. In Catholic social theology, solidarity is a very rich and complex concept.¹⁵ Basically, it consists in active commitment to the belief that under God we belong to one human family.¹⁶ It has many applications in various contexts and for various classes of agents: for the poor, for workers, for affluent countries, between classes, between nations, and so on. Within the Church, solidarity has special reference to the ties which bind churches in one part of the world to churches and people in other regions and continents. Thus, the church in the United States exercises solidarity in the representations it makes to governments on behalf of the church in Congo, or Guatemala or Lebanon with respect to conflict resolution, re-development and other post-conflict policies. Solidarity is manifest in public life as well, undergirding, for example, citizens' pleas to governments for debt cancellation or for restructuring trade by the churches and civil society.

Furthermore, the Second Vatican Council declared that a second way in which the Church served humanity was in fostering the unity of the human community a task which is fundamental to the Church's own identity.¹⁷ Because of this commitment to the unity of the human family, Church documents were among the first to recognize the trends toward interdependence and globalization. The Church, to the consternation of some politically active American Catholics, has tended to be internationalist in its outlook, to support the United Nations system, and to search for new mechanisms to meet global problems.

The fourth element in the Catholic vision of peace consists in a teaching on world order.¹⁸ Due to limitation of time, let me for the moment just focus on issues of the breakdown of order. Over the last twenty years, the Church has condemned nuclear war-fighting and made the elimination of

nuclear weapons a goal for an ethical military policy. In a dramatic shift, moreover, the Church has moved from simply praising the practitioners of non-violence to espousing non-violence as the fundamental Christian response to conflict.¹⁹ Reflecting on the events of 1989 in eastern Europe, Pope John Paul II wrote:

I pray the example [of active non-violent resisters in eastern Europe] will prevail in other place and in other circumstances. May people learn to fight for justice without violence, renouncing class struggle in their international disputes, and war in international ones.²⁰

The Holy Father is clear that non-violent activists who accept their sufferings in imitation of Christ are “able to accomplish the miracle of peace and [are] in a position to discern the often narrow path between the cowardice which gives into evil and the violence which, under the illusion of fighting evil, only makes it worse.”²¹

The espousal of non-violence has meant a downplaying of just-war analysis in Vatican pronouncements, though it still utilizes the just-war criteria in criticism of acts of war the Holy See regards as immoral. In principle, however, the Church continues to admit of a limited just use of arms when non-violence fails.²² In practice, however, it appears to regard “humanitarian intervention” as the sole remaining “just cause”, and even then is quite reserved about the means to be utilized in defense of the innocent. Finally, because of their harmful effects on large civilian populations, as in Iraq and Cuba, the Church has been highly critical of the use of sanctions as a tool of coercive diplomacy and supposed alternative to war.

To sum up this portion of my talk, the Catholic vision of peace is primarily a positive one focusing on the promotion and defense of human rights, collaboration in authentic development, building

bonds of solidarity between people, and constructing the institutions of world peace. Its approach to the breakdown of peace is to foster non-violent practices and to permit the use of arms in humanitarian intervention only when whole populations are at risk.

II. The Catholic Practice of Peace

after Vatican II

The Second Vatican Council brought about two structural changes in Church organization which have shaped its ability to respond to questions of justice and peace for the past thirty-five years. The first was the establishment of bishops' conferences as forums for bishops to consult and coordinate on matters of pastoral and social strategy.²³ When bishops work in harmony, their conferences can be a steady force for peace even in very violent societies. Their pastoral letters and public statements are often catalysts in opening public debate or in galvanizing public opinion, even outside the church. Their coordinated social initiatives mean work for peace and justice, especially where there is a Catholic majority or a sizable Catholic population in a country, can spread wide and deep within society.

The second innovation was the institution of justice and peace commissions beginning with the creation of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace as part of the Vatican curia.²⁴ The Council carries out research and organizes programs in areas like the control of trade in small arms, the abolition of anti-personnel land mines, trade reform, and debt relief for poor nations. Officials of the Council also represent the Holy See in major international conferences. At the regional, national, diocesan and parish levels, justice and peace commissions, or sometimes human rights commissions, are the church organs that deal up close with local, national and regional problems. The networking of these commissions, moreover, provides international support for those working on the front lines for justice, peace and

human rights.

The Contribution of the Catholic Hierarchy to Peacemaking Today

(1) The Papacy and the Holy See. Whole books, huge books, have been written about Pope John Paul II. Several of his biographers and many political analysts regard him as the single most important figure in the collapse of communism in eastern Europe.²⁵ Pope John Paul has greatly increased the role of the papacy in international affairs, especially through his travels. Wherever he travels dictatorial regimes have fallen, most notably, in the Jaruzelksi government his native Poland, but also, the Duvalier regime in Haiti, and the Indonesian occupation of East Timor, just to name a few. His visit to Lebanon and his apostolic exhortation concluding the Synod for Lebanon were landmarks in the movement toward reconciliation in post-civil war Lebanon.²⁶ The Holy Father's three-cornered conversation with Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski, and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, one biographer believes, may have prevented military confrontation between the Soviet Union and its eastern European satellites as communist governments fell in 1989.²⁷

Under John Paul II, even Vatican diplomacy has also changed its approach to world affairs. Vatican Undersecretary of State for Relations with States, Monsignor Celestino Migliore, calls it "a diplomacy of conscience" because its primary concern is the good of the human family, in keeping the peace, in defending human rights, in protecting religious freedom.²⁸ Even the Church's agreements with states tend today to focus first on human rights, then on religious rights generally, and only last on the specific needs of the church. For example, both the 1993 Fundamental Agreement with Israel and the 2000 Basic Agreement with the Palestinian Liberation Organization follow this pattern.

(2) Episcopal Conferences. Some weeks ago I was privileged to participate in the International Mennonite Catholic dialogue near Karlsruhe, Germany. Among the papers addressed to the question, “What Is a Peace Church?” was one by a Mennonite pastor from Guatemala.²⁹ The church which he described as a peace church, to my astonishment and pleasure, however, was not the Mennonite Church in Guatemala, but the Catholic Church and especially its bishops’ conference. It was indeed a sweet moment.³⁰ For the bishops of Guatemala have been a steady force for peace in their society, promoting negotiations, defending human rights, providing accompaniment for refugees. Unlike some conferences in neighboring countries during some points over the past twenty years, the Guatemalan bishops have been both moderate and united, and this has contributed to the weight of their peacemaking in their country. Sadly, the quality of their commitment to peace was sealed two years ago with the blood of Bishop Juan Gerardi just after he had filed a report on human rights abuses during Guatemala’s civil war.

The bishops’ conference of the United States plays a unique role among episcopal conferences. After Brazil, it is the largest conference in the world, more than three hundred active members.³¹ Because the policies of the United States impact so much in the world, other conferences and individual bishops, sometimes at the suggestion of the Holy See, look to the U.S. bishops’ conference to help address their problems. Occasionally the U.S. government looks to the bishops to assist with its problems. President Clinton, reports one bishop, attributes his last minute dispatching of President Carter and General Powell to Haiti to negotiate with the Cedras government on the eve of the “invasion” on that island to have been inspired in part by a joint letter of the presidents of the U.S., Canadian and Latin American bishops’ conferences. Its most notable accomplishment, of course, was

the widely read and much studied 1983 pastoral letter on nuclear arms, **The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response**, which played a major role in forming public opinion in favor of halting the nuclear arms build-up.

The U.S. bishops address issues of peace in a number of ways: with pastoral letters and public statements, with visits of solidarity to churches in troubled areas of the world, with representations to U.S. and foreign governments, and with advocacy on executive and legislative policy proposals. The Office of International Justice and Peace and the Department of Social Development and World Peace also try to build a constituency for issues in the Catholic community, providing training for diocesan and parish social ministry workers, and programs for the social formation of the Catholic faithful.

(3) Bishop Conciliators and Mediators. I should not conclude a brief review of official Catholic peacemaking without some note of the difficult role individual bishops have played in peacemaking.³²

Frequently, an individual bishop is thrust into a distinctive leadership role. Such was the case with El Salvador's martyred Archbishop Romero or Congo's Archbishop Monswengo, for many year's Zaire's official conciliator. Others include Dom Samuel Ruiz from Chiapas, Mexico, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, Michel Sabbah, and the Nobel Laureate Bishop Carlos Felipe Ximenes Belo—Bishop Belo as he is known in the U.S.—from East Timor. In the early nineties, an estimated thirty-five bishops had served as national conciliators in their countries civil conflicts.³³

Bishop Samuel Ruiz, now the retired bishop of San Bartolomeo de las Casas represents an atypical success, not in resolving the hostilities in Chiapas but in assembling a remarkable set of resources for defending human rights and advancing the cause of peace. A defender of indigenous rights

in Mexico's Chiapas state, he was later named mediator between the government and the Zapatista rebels. Ruiz had a high profile outside of Mexico, a great deal of international support, including volunteer personnel, and a highly organized human rights and peace organization, including the Centro Bartolomeo de las Casas, a human rights monitoring group. Human rights work led inevitably to Ruiz's role as a peacemaker.

In Chiapas, where evangelicals and Catholics are frequently at odds, Ruiz was a father figure for all. His wide credibility by a reason of his defense of indigenous rights can be understood by recalling a simple incident. At one point, when his cathedral and residence were under siege by right-wing landowners, evangelical indians rushed down from the hills to protect him. "We have come," the evangelicals announced, "to protect *our* bishop."

Ruiz also had a natural talent for orchestrating his work. I have had direct experience of his gift for ceasing the initiative. On one visit, he dispatched a U.S. delegation to celebrate Mass in a parish where a U.S. priest had just been expelled, without explaining the Americans would be met by six thousand peasants demonstrating for the return of their deported pastor, an apolitical man excluded simply to put pressure on the Church. After dinner, on the delegation's return, Ruiz announced to his American visitors, "Now we are having a press conference. You," he told the delegation, "can go first." No wonder the Mexican government feared and respected him.

More typical is Bishop Belo, a lonely figure, with little immediate social support or infrastructure to sustain him, and with sympathetic but relatively weak support internationally.³⁴ In the years' prior to East Timor's 1999 independence vote, he walked a narrow line, defending human rights, espousing the cause of independence, all the while pleading for non-violence. Without support from the Indonesian

bishops' conference, under pressure from the papal nuncio and U.S. diplomats, criticized by Vatican curialists, only Pope John Paul II supported him. The destruction of his homeland following United-Nations- run elections in 1999 by marauding Indonesian militias broke his spirit. Not even a Nobel Peace Prize could compensate for the rape of his island and the dispossession of its people.

Somewhere in the middle as to the strength of his resources for witnessing to peace is Jerusalem's Latin or Roman Catholic Patriarch Michel Sabbah. A Palestinian, born near Nazareth, his appointment at the outbreak of the first *intifada* made him a natural leader for Christian Palestinians. He has overseen a diocesan synod, revitalizing and updating local church life. He has formed a justice and peace commission and a legal aid agency, the Society of Saint Yves. His most notable achievement has been overcoming centuries of rivalry among Jerusalem's historic Christian churches to form a common front with the two other patriarchs and ten other heads of churches on issues of justice, peace, and human rights.³⁵ A 1998 peace catechism from the Latin Patriarchate, drafted under his supervision, laid out in some detail a Palestinian Catholic perspective on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the relation of justice to peace, and the place of non-violence in the Palestinians' struggle for a homeland of their own.³⁶ He has also developed notable ties of solidarity with the U.S. Catholic bishops, the bishops of England and Wales, and other episcopal conferences in Europe, not to mention the Vatican. For all this, his support systems are still fragile and Patriarch Sabbah must rely very much on himself and his faith in God.

Patriarch Michel Sabbah, Bishop Belo, Congo's Archbishop Monswengo, to name another, illustrate the way in which the Church's teaching on human rights and human dignity has changed the role of bishop, thrusting them into conflict and conflict resolution, without a comparable change in training

and church organization, especially in sharply divided underdeveloped societies.³⁷ The bishop speaks out on human rights issues and as a result is thrust into a role as spokesman for his people without a trained cadre of people or institutions to assist him.

The Church's role in building peace has grown enormously in the last half-century. In the next decade, if I were to propose one thing, I would suggest that the larger Church (the Vatican, the major episcopal conferences, the major Catholic donor agencies like CRS) implement programs to provide the training, staffing, and infrastructure for bishops on the front lines to contribute more substantially to their peacemaking efforts. In 1994, the U.S. Catholic Conference in conjunction with CRS and Duquesne University sponsored a workshop for African bishops who had been peacemakers in their own countries.³⁸ Last summer, as Father Headley will tell you, CRS sponsored an African-Latin American dialogue on Catholic peacemaking. These conferences, I hope, mark the beginning of a process that needs to grow. The Catholic vision of peace as a way of life worthy of human dignity has put bishops on the front lines. They have shown generosity, great persistence and sometimes inventiveness in meeting their challenges with very few resources. The time has come to share resources for peacemaking with them.

The work of justice and peace is essential to the life of the Catholic Church today. Bishops bear a special responsibility for teaching the gospel as it relates to justice, peace and human rights. The work of transforming the world, however, belongs appropriately to lay people. Bishops, alone or together, are forced into leadership roles in divided societies for many reasons: the weakness of civil institutions, the autonomy and moral authority of the Church, credibility gained by the Church's service to the oppressed, the freedom offered by a celibate life. While necessary, such leadership is the exception.

Lay people should rightly take the lead. I would hope and pray that as Catholic social teaching becomes more widely known and appropriated, there will be many more Catholic lay leaders too involved in peacemaking.

Finally, I began by noting that Catholic teaching and practice of peacemaking was strong on peace building and weaker on conflict-related tasks. This is an area, I believe, where we can learn from others, like the Mennonites. If life in God is an exchange of gifts, then it is appropriate that just as Miguel Higuera has learned from the peace witness of the bishops' conference in Guatemala, so the Catholic Church in many places can learn techniques of active non-violence and conflict resolution from trainers in the Mennonite tradition. What a wonderful way to celebrate together the victory of the Lamb that was slain.

NOTES

-
1. For a history of Catholic attitudes toward peace, nonviolence, just war and peacemaking, see Ronald G. Musto, **The Catholic Peace Tradition** (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986). According to Musto, the low point in peacemaking within the Catholic Church came in the post-Reformation period and with the rise of the modern nation state (See Musto, pp. 153-56). The Catholic Middle Ages, by contrast, were alive with both popular and institutional peacemaking, including many initiatives by popes. (See especially pp. 76-134.)
 2. See John Paul II, **On the Hundredth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum: Centesimus Annus** (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1991), no. 52 and note 104.
 3. On Benedict XV, see Anthony D. Rhodes, **The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century: The Vatican in the Age of Liberal Democracies, 1970-1922** (New York: Franklin Watts, 1983) pp. 223-248.
 4. On Pius XII, see Anthony D. Rhodes, **The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators, 1922-1945** (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1974) and J. Derek Holmes, **The Papacy in the Modern World** (New York: Crossroads, 1981). In some ways, Pius laid out the framework for later Catholic

internationalism (See Musto, pp. 175-177, 184-186). In his lifetime and for a generation afterward, he was feted for his contribution to peace. Sadly, his reputation since then has been clouded by debate over the adequacy of his response to the Holocaust. That wrongly framed debate bases itself on anachronistic assumptions. Critics pose questions to a World War II-era papacy, just emerged from sixty years of political marginalization, expectating that the correct response would be modeled on 1960s style activism. Essentially, Pius XII's critics ask, "Could he have done more?" The proper question, in the context of the times, should be "Did any other world leader, religious or political, do more?"

5. For John XXIII's role in the Cuban Missile Crisis, see Giancarlo Zizola, **The Utopia of Pope John XXIII** (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1978).

6. See "Peace on Earth: *Pacem in terris*" in David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, eds. **Renewing the Earth: Catholic Documents on Peace, Justice and Liberation** (Garden City: Doubleday/ Image: 1977) pp. 117-170.

7. The generality of Pope John's diplomatic language is a quality he shared with Pius XII. Both had been Vatican diplomats of the old school. The indirectness of the language did not prevent Khrushchev from understanding the message and acting on it.

8. *Pacem in terris*, n. 139.

9. The predisposition to support what has come to be known as humanitarian intervention may be seen in the encyclical's affirmation that "civil authority, not to confine its people within the boundaries of their nation, but rather to protect, above all else, the common good of the entire human family." See *Pacem in terris*, n. 98.

10. *Pacem in terris*, n. 130-142.

11. "The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: *Gaudium et spes*" in **Renewing the Earth**, n. 41.

12. On trade reform, see Paul VI, *Populorum progressio*, n. 56-61 and *Centesimus annus*, n. 33, 58.

13. See *Populorum progressio*, n. 76.

14. See *Populorum progressio* in **Renewing the Earth**, n. 76. Pope John Paul II in *Centesimus* (n. 52) calls for giving the world's poor "realistic opportunities" to improve their economic condition through work. "Creating such conditions," he writes, "calls for a concerted worldwide effort to promote development, an effort which also involves sacrificing positions of income and of power

enjoyed by the more developed economies.”

15. The most extended treatments of solidarity in Catholic social teaching may be found in *Populorum progressio*, n. 43-54 and *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, n. 38-40.

16. The most quoted formulation of the idea of solidarity is found in *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, n. 38. There it is described as “*a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all.*” (Italics in the original.)

17. On the Church’s service to the world through the promotion of unity, see *Gaudium et spes*, n. 42. Vatican II defined the Church “as a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind, that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity.” See Dogmatic Constitution on the Church in Walter M. Abbott, S.J., general editor, **The Documents of Vatican II** with Notes and Comments by catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities, Introduction by Lawrence Cardinal Sheehan (New York: America Press/Association Press, 1966), n. 1.

18. Official Catholic treatment of political order can best be found in *Pacem in terris* and *Gaudium et spes*, n. 73-90.

19. The contrast is clearest in comparison of the 1983 US bishops’ peace pastoral **The Challenge of Peace** (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983), n. 71-79 with the bishops 1993 tenth anniversary pastoral statement **The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace** (pp. 317-319) in Gerard F. Powers, Drew Christiansen, S.J., and Robert T. Hennemeyer, **Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World** (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1994).

20. *Centesimus annus*, n. 23. Also see n. 25 and 52.

21. *Centesimus annus*, n. 23.

22. See the U.S. bishops **Harvest of Justice**, p. 317.

23. On the formation of episcopal conferences, see the Council’s “Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops’ in the Church”, n. 36-39 in **The Documents of Vatican II**.

24. The Commission *Justitia et Pax* was established in 1967 and re-organized as the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace in 1976.

25. See, for example, George Weigel, **The Final Revolution: The Resistance Church and the Collapse of Communism** (New York: Oxford, 1992).

-
26. On the Synod for Lebanon, see Carole W. Dagher, **Bring Down the Walls: Lebanon's Post-War Challenge**. Foreword by John Esposito (New York: Saint Martin's, 2000), esp. 91-122, 183-200.
27. See Tad Szulc **Pope John Paul II: The Biography** (New York: Scribner, 1995), pp. 338-416.
28. See Celestino Migliore, "The Nature and Methods of Vatican Diplomacy", **Origins** (Feb. 23, 00) 539 ff.
29. M. Higueros, "Justice, the Inseparable Companion of Peace", a paper prepared for the third International Mennonite Catholic Dialogue, Thomashof, Germany, November 24-30, 2000 [Unpublished Typescript].
30. The Higueros paper shows the complementarity of Catholic and Mennonite peacemaking approaches. In Guatemala, one Mennonite, at least, learned from the Catholic defense of human rights, just as Catholics in the Philippines and elsewhere are learning about active non-violence and conflict resolution from Mennonites. At the same time, the two communities present a case study in how social location and church history affect variations in approach to peacemaking.
31. In dealing with internal church matters, the bishops' conference is known as The National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The one exception is the issuing of a pastoral letter, which though it may deal with public policy, as a teaching document falls under the bishops' pastoral responsibilities. In addressing questions of public concern and social policy, including the preparation of pastoral letters and statements, the conference carries the title United States Catholic Conference. In July, 2001, these differences will be suppressed and the conference will carry the single title United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.
32. I do not mean to suggest that the role of peacemaker is restricted to bishops. It properly ought to be the office of lay people, as exemplified by the Community of San Egidio. My focus on bishops derives partly from my assignment which was to focus on the Vatican and episcopal conferences. It also results, however, from the facts of history, that bishops in our day have on numerous occasions been forced by circumstances into the role of peacemaker. This is due not only to the Church's commitment to the Catholic vision of peace which I outlined above, but often also to the undeveloped nature of civil society in many third world countries or to the discrediting of other institutions and leaders as the result of protracted civil conflict.
33. See **African Church as Peacemaker** (Washington, D.C.: Office of International Justice and Peace/United States Catholic Conference, 1994), a report on a workshop for African bishops who had been active in national mediation and conciliation efforts.
34. For an intimate study of Bishop Belo, see Arnold S. Kohen, **From the Place of the Dead: the Epic Struggle of Bishop Belo of East Timor** with an introduction by the Dalai Lama (New York:

Saint Martin's Press, 1999). Kohen is especially good at demonstrating the isolation of Belo as he tried at one and the same time to speak out for Timorese independence, to preserve the Timorese church, and to keep the student-led independence movement non-violent.

35. See my "Palestinian Christians: Status 2000" in Marshal Breger, ed. **The Vatican-Israel Accord: Meaning and Context** (forthcoming).

36. See **Recherche la paix et poursuis-la: Questions et Responses sur la Justice et la Paix en Notre Terre-Sainte** (Jerusalem: Latin Patriarchate, 1998).

37. Deep divisions in society can be replicated in bishops' conferences impeding their work on behalf of justice and peace or, at least, dividing the work among them. Such divisions sometimes account for the emergence of a single bishop as a peace advocate in the eyes of the world. Sometimes such divisions are simply reflective of clefts in the wider society and polity. At other times, they represent disparate sets of problems faced by bishops in different regions of the same country.

38. See n. 33 above.