FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Fuller Theological Seminary
Digital Commons @ Fuller

Theology News & Notes | Fuller Seminary Publications

Spring 2009

Theology, News and Notes - Vol. 56, No. 01

Fuller Theological Seminary

Glen Stassen

Kent Davis Sensenig

Cameron Lee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/tnn

Part of the Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons

Recommended Citation

Fuller Theological Seminary; Stassen, Glen; Sensenig, Kent Davis; and Lee, Cameron, "Theology, News and Notes - Vol. 56, No. 01" (2009). *Theology News & Notes*. 165.
https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/tnn/165

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Fuller Seminary Publications at Digital Commons @ Fuller. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theology News & Notes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact archives@fuller.edu.

Fuller Theological Seminary

Fuller Theological Seminary
Spring 2009

THEOLOGY NEWS & NOTES

The Long Reach toward Just Peacemaking

About This Issue: Applying the Practices of Just Peacemaking GLEN STASSEN 2
An Abrahamic Paradigm for Just Peacemaking KENT DAVIS SENSENIG 4
Making Peace in Our Families CAMERON LEE 7
Working with the Poor with a Bias toward Peace BRYANT L. MYERS 10
Talk It Out, Reduce Nukes: How Following Jesus Relates to International Cooperation PAUL ALEXANDER 13
Just Peacemaking Opens Catholic Eyes Too JAMES B. BURKE 15
Evangelical-Muslim Peacemaking: Drink Lots of Cups of Tea EVELYNE A. REISACHER 18
Just Peacemaking and the Sanctity of Life DAVID P. GUSHEE 22

GLEN STASSEN

Applying the Practices of Just Peacemaking

In the early 1980s, several years before the end of the Cold War, the U.S. Catholic bishops, the Methodist General Assembly, the United Church of Christ, and the Presbyterian Church (and more recently the Christian Reformed Church and the Protestant Church of Germany) issued major 100-page statements arguing that while we still need pacifism and just war theory to restrain the excesses of war, we need a new theology of peacemaking to guide us in taking the steps that actually prevent war.

But those early statements did not develop the new ethical paradigm of peacemaking that they called for, so I wrote *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Westminster John Knox Press, 1992). In it, I propose seven specific practices of the new just peacemaking paradigm, based on the Sermon on the Mount and Paul's Letter to the Romans as well as on what political science demonstrates actually is working to prevent wars. Then twenty-three Christian ethicists and experts in international relations and peacemaking worked together for five years to produce *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War* (Pilgrim Press, 1998, 2004, 2008). It develops the paradigm further, with ten rather than seven practices.

The book is in its third edition, sixty or more articles and book chapters have been published about it, and "just peacemaking" is becoming a globally familiar phrase. Fuller Theological Seminary has received a $1 million grant to work with Muslim scholars to see if they can develop a parallel Qur'an-based just peacemaking ethic, since Muslims, like Christians, need to get specific about the concrete peacemaking practices they support and practice. As Evelyne Reisacher tells in this magazine, that project has produced results. Now three further grants and projects have followed. One applies just peacemaking to the conflict with North Korea and Iran over their nuclear enrichment programs, and to the newly developing hope that we might abolish nuclear weapons, step by step, by international agreements (see the article by Paul Alexander, also herein, and www.Matthew5project.org). The other two, supported by the U.S. Institute of Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation, have achieved unanimous agreement from leading Jewish, Muslim, and Christian scholars to develop the new paradigm of just peacemaking based on their own Scriptures and practices that actually lead to peace. All agreed to work to develop the just peacemaking ethic, as the ethic we all need, each mining their own Scriptures. (For more, see www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr214.html.)

Fuller can be proud that our seminary is taking national leadership for making the practical implications of Jesus' teaching on peacemaking clear to so many. We have raised half the funds to begin an Institute for Biblical Peacemaking at Fuller—most of which will go to scholarships for PhD students studying subjects related to peacemaking. See the article on Fuller's grad, Paulus Widjaja, doing remarkable peacemaking teaching in Indonesia (see http://documents.fuller.edu/news/pubs/fullerfocus/2008_Winter/mission-4.asp).

We believe that each Christian church should teach its members the three paradigms for the ethics of peace and war—just war, pacifism, and just peacemaking. If they don't know Christian ethics, members have no Christian guidance when debates about peace and war arise. They are undefended against ideologies that blow back and forth through our nations and our churches (Eph. 4:14). When churches teach all three, you don't force them into one ethic: their members can decide, prayerfully, which ethic seems right to them. A summary of all three is in chapter 7 of *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (D. Gushee and G. Stassen, InterVarsity Press, 2003). Following are the ten practices of just peacemaking:

1. Support nonviolent direct action. Based on Jesus's way of transforming initiatives (Matt. 5:38–42). See James Burke's article herein.
2. Take independent initiatives (also Matt. 5:38-42). This is how George Bush Sr. and Mikhail Gorbachev disposed of half the nuclear weapons of America and Russia.
3. Use cooperative conflict resolution (Matt. 5:21–26). This is how American President Jimmy Carter achieved peace in the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel. See Paul Alexander's article and www.matthew5project.org.
4. Acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness. (Matt. 7:1–5). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa lanced festering historical injustices in this way.
5. Advance human rights, religious liberty, and democracy. During the twentieth century, democracies with human rights fought no wars against one another.
6. Foster just and sustainable economic development. See Bryant Myers's article herein.
7. Work with cooperative forces in the international system. Empirically, the more nations are involved in international organizations, communication, travel, missions, and international trade, the less they make war.
8. Strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights. Empirically, nations more engaged in the UN avoid war more often. Unilateral policies cause more wars.
9. Reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade (Matt. 26:52). This makes war less likely.
10. Encourage grassroots peacemaking groups. Every Church a Peace Church (www.ecapc.org) has links to church peace fellowships.

For too long, people have interpreted Jesus's teachings of peacemaking practices as Platonic ideals, high and beautiful, but impractical. Yet when Jesus taught leaders in Jerusalem that they needed to practice peacemaking or the temple would be destroyed, he was talking realistically about a real threat and about the practical way to avoid the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem—which happened in 70 A.D. The ten practices in the new ethic of just peacemaking work, empirically, realistically, to avoid the destruction of war.

For too long, people have treated Jesus' teachings of peacemaking practices as if they were general principles. This diverts us from actually *doing* Jesus' words. Our ten just peacemaking practices are *concrete practices* that are working in real history to prevent numerous wars.

For too long, people have been influenced by a Platonic tradition that sees God or "the Good" as an "ideal" outside the cave where we live. But Jesus was no Platonic idealist; he was a Jewish realist. We have fashioned just peacemaking beginning with Jesus' teachings of peacemaking practices—as the way of realism. We believe God is Lord of life: if we live against God's will, it leads to destruction. But if we live our lives faithful to God's will, it leads to peace. ■

Glen Stassen (PhD) is Lewis B. Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics. He is author of *Living the Sermon on the Mount* (Jossey-Bass), *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Westminster/John Knox, 2004), and *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context*, with David Gushee (InterVarsity Press, 2003), which won the *Christianity Today* award for Best Book of 2004 in theology or ethics.

THEOLOGY NEWS & NOTES

Vol. 56, No. 1
President:
Richard J. Mouw, PhD
Editorial Board:
James H. Morrison, ThM, Chair
David Bundy, ThM
D. Scott Cormode, PhD
Edmund Gibbs, DMin
Ronald J. Kernaghan, PhD
C. Douglas McConnell, PhD
Robert P. Meye, DTheol
William E. Pannell, DD
Richard V. Peace, PhD
Cecil M. Robeck Jr., PhD
Clayton J. Schmit, PhD
Linda M. Wagener, PhD
Manager/Designer: Randall Cole
Editor: Lauralee Farrer
Mechanical Editor/ Proofreader: Susan Carlson Wood
Circulation: Dottie Yelsik

Send change of address to:
Fuller Theological Seminary
Office of Publications
135 N. Oakland Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91182

Internet address:
www.fuller.edu/news/pubs/tnn

Cover art by Karen Swenholt

Theology, News & Notes (ISSN 1529-899X) is published for the alumni/ae and friends of Fuller Theological Seminary. It is published three times a year, in Winter, Spring, and Fall.

The editorial content of *Theology, News & Notes* reflects the opinions of the various authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the views of Fuller Theological Seminary. ©2009 by Fuller Theological Seminary. Produced in limited quantities for alumni/ae and friends.

THE MINISTRY OF FULLER
Fuller Theological Seminary, embracing the Schools of Theology, Psychology, and Intercultural Studies, is an evangelical, multidenominational, international, and multiethnic community dedicated to the preparation of men and women for the manifold ministries of Christ and his Church. Under the authority of Scripture it seeks to fulfill its commitment to ministry through graduate education, professional development, and spiritual formation. In all of its activities, including instruction, nurture, worship, service, research, and publication, Fuller Theological Seminary strives for excellence in the service of Jesus Christ, under the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, to the glory of the Father.

KENT DAVIS SENSENIG

An Abrahamic Paradigm for Just Peacemaking

For Jews, Christians, and Muslims alike, Abraham is the founding father of monotheistic faith.[1] Both the Bible and the Qur'an feature this prophet of the One God. In an era characterized as a "clash of civilizations" between estranged siblings of the Abrahamic family, could the moral authority of Abraham provide a peacemaking paradigm for contemporary conversations, cooperation, and commitments between Muslims, Christians, and Jews?

Writing as a confessing Christian—and addressing North American evangelicals who have a unique relationship to the Zionist state currently dominating Israel/Palestine—I hope to provide a persuasively peaceable reading of this foundational part of God's story. The peacemaking paradigm of Abraham may serve specifically as a counterweight to the problematic policy of Joshua, a descendant of Abraham's who waged a holy war in the same land centuries later. Abraham's sojourning can also prefigure the conflict-transforming (and similarly itinerant) career of another of Abraham's descendants (and yet another Joshua, or Yeshua), Jesus of Nazareth.

SYNOPSIS

Sensenig describes Abraham as an early practioner of just peacemaking. He argues that the rise and fall of peace in the lives of Abraham's descendants is linked directly to their faithfulness to his command to keep the way of the Lord and do what is just and right.

Abraham's pursuit of harmonious relationships with other ethnic-religious groups, the land itself, and the One God, offers a concrete model for all his children. Abraham was ready to risk all—his life, status, family, possessions, and home—in order to keep faith with his Creator. He left his hometown, broke with the polytheistic practices of his ancestors, and sojourned in a new place, trusting God to provide for his family's future (Gen. 12:1–5). Later he was even willing to sacrifice his son, the very sign of God's promise for that future, if God desired it (Gen. 22:1–14).

Though he ultimately acquired great wealth, Abraham maintained the social-spiritual stance of a "resident alien" (or sojourner, or immigrant) throughout his life. He traveled the length and breadth of Canaan, encountering many other cultures. He was always willing to share the bounty of the land with those who already lived there, and did not seek to dominate any other group. The patriarchs of Genesis had a free relationship with God, encountering the Divine in various places throughout the land and setting up markers to honor their meetings. They did not strive to centralize God in one place, in order to control divine power for self-centered ends, as was typical of pagan worship.

This mobile God promised that Abraham would father many nations and commanded that those descendants be a blessing to all nations (Gen. 12:2–3). Abraham's relations with other groups were therefore predicated on the practice of *hospitality*. (Middle Easterners have become rightly famous for this trait ever since!) For example, Abraham was blessed by God for his willingness to feed three strangers in his tent, who turned out to be messengers from God (Gen. 18:1–15). In his compassionate spirit Abraham even sought to save Sodom and Gomorrah from God's wrath. The residents of these cities had committed great sins of violent *inhospitality*, yet Abraham prayed they be spared for the sake of even a few righteous among them (Gen. 18:22–33). Abraham practiced the proverb that "hospitality begins at home": when their respective flocks began to compete for limited pastures, even though he was the clan patriarch and thus had "pride of place," Abraham willingly conceded to his younger nephew, Lot, the first choice of land, in order to keep peace in his family (Gen. 13:2–12). (Abe got the better deal in the end, as Lot's choice to settle in the area of Sodom proved ill-fated! God works in mysterious ways for those who humble themselves for the sake of peace.)

Abraham also pursued a peaceable "foreign policy" of cooperative diplomacy. He entered into covenants with various Canaanite kings, negotiating mutually beneficial power-sharing arrangements for trade, security, mutual aid, and land use (Gen. 21:22–34). One such king was Melchizedek. Abraham honored this local ruler by giving him one-tenth of his wealth and refusing to accept any of the spoils of their shared military victory (Gen. 14:17–24).

Abraham's generosity toward others was richly reciprocated. Abimelech, king of the Philistines (who later became archenemies of Israel), freely invited Abraham to "live where he willed" and graze his animals as he needed. He was willing to share the resources of the land with this new immigrant in his territory, even after Abraham tried to deceive him. Abraham, in turn, prayed for Abimelech's people, bringing healing to their diseases and an increase in their numbers (Gen. 20:8–18). Already Abraham was fulfilling his God-given mandate to be a blessing to other nations.

Abimelech was so impressed by the prosperity and integrity of Abraham's enterprises that he had his military commander make a treaty with Abraham, saying "Swear to me here before God that you will not deal falsely with me or my children or my descendants. Show to me, and the country where you are living as an alien, the same kindness I have shown to you" (Gen. 21:23).[2] This agreement also served as the basis for resolving a potentially explosive dispute between their respective animal herders over the ownership of a water well—a resource as important for ancient nomadic peoples as oil is to modern-day industrial economies (Gen. 21:25–31). Abraham's son Isaac learned this lesson too, using similar conflict resolution tactics to defuse an escalating feud with Canaanites in the next generation (Gen. 26).

Abraham received hospitality from other foreign kings. Early in his travels, he went down to Egypt. Because he was afraid of the mighty Pharaoh, he pretended that his wife was his sister. After discovering his deception, Pharaoh still treated Abraham and his wife with honor. Given later developments in which the Hebrew children were enslaved in Egypt, ironically it was an ancient Pharaoh who forgave this "wandering Aramaean" and provided the first seed-money of Abraham's wealth. A potential diplomatic disaster was averted, as Abraham was able to make friends wherever he went (Gen. 12:10–13:1).

Also ironically, the only ownership of the land of Canaan Abraham achieved in his lifetime was a burial cave for his wife, Sarah. Even this he gained not through military might or manipulative dealings, but through legal negotiations with the local land-owner, a Hittite king. Abraham and the Hittite competed with each other to give the best price for the land, with the king offering Abraham the cave for free but Abraham insisting on paying a full and fair price (Gen. 23).

Abraham took a "big tent" approach to clan politics: he was willing to include many ethnicities within his extended family. Abraham not only brought his own sons—first Ishmael (by his Egyptian wife, Hagar) then Isaac (by Sarah, an Aramaean)—into the covenant of circumcision; he also invited indigenous Canaanites who joined his household into this ancient ceremony of belonging (Gen. 17:22–27). The progeny of Abraham's family became many nations: Ishmael is father to the Arabs; Isaac is father to two nations, Jacob/Israel and Esau/Edom; Abraham's union with Keturah (as well as his nephew Lot's offspring) produced the Asshurites, Letushites, Leummites, Ammonites, and Moabites (Gen. 19 and 25); he even gave blessings to the sons of his concubines, sending them off to their own lands (Gen. 25:6).

Abraham's Descendants in Conflict

All of Abraham's descendants were instructed to "*keep the way of Lord, doing what is right and just*" (Gen. 18:19) by sharing land, water, and wealth with others. Only by living in this hospitable way will the promise of God's gift of good land be fulfilled. No justice leads inexorably to no peace, no blessing, and exile from the land of God's promise, as the rest of the Hebrew Bible sorrowfully narrates. The violent seeds of conquest sown by Joshua's "scorched earth" crusade in this Promised Land ultimately bore the bitter fruit of a flawed and failed mini-empire, the Davidic monarchy.

This stark future reality of God's judgment against Israel via exile from the land is warned of already in the "Blessing of Jacob" (Gen. 49). While Jacob's sons are promised an allotment of the land of Canaan, Levi and Simeon are chastised by their father for their rash act of vengeance against the people of Shechem. The Shechemites, like King Abimelech of the Philistines, desired to trade freely, share the land, enter into a peaceful covenant, and even intermarry with Jacob's sons. They were even willing to undergo collective circumcision to do so! Yet as they are recovering from this painful procedure, Levi and Simeon launch a preemptive strike and slaughter them. Such aggression is roundly condemned by Jacob because it puts the very promises of God in grave jeopardy.

The Genesis saga as a whole can be read as a story of estranged siblings (Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, Joseph and his brothers). As the story progresses, these conflicted siblings find ways to move towards reconciliation after years of rivalry, envy, mistrust, competition, deception, violence, deep wounds, pride, and fears (even if Jacob and Esau amicably go their separate ways after their rapprochement). After his all-night wrestling with God, Jacob even declares that he glimpsed something of the very face of God in the face of his too-long-estranged brother Esau. In the twists and turns of these family dramas, sometimes one brother has the advantage, sometimes the other does. In the end, Esau—and later Joseph—takes "transforming initiatives" to forgive and

Kent Davis Sensenig is finishing his dissertation at Fuller on Free Church political ethics. As a research assistant for Fuller's Conflict Transformation Project, he published an essay in *Resources for Peacemaking in Muslim-Christian Relations*, and teaches on Creation Care and Sabbath Economics at Fuller.

even provide for the brother(s) who had wronged them, when they could have punished or destroyed them instead.[3] By choosing reconciliation instead of retaliation, and forgiveness over force, they save the futures of their families, and God can perform divine purposes through them rather than against them.

Can contemporary Christians, Muslims, and Jews learn anything from this Abrahamic paradigm? Can they discern any parallels between these ancient stories and the contentious history that has grown up between their historically related families of faith, a history in which sometimes one group has had power advantage and sometimes the other, and both sides have plenty of grounds for mistrust, fear, competition, and even violence?

Just Peacemaking in the Ways of Abraham

Our survey of Genesis reveals that reading the Bible through the eyes of just peacemaking helps us notice peacemaking practices that our arguments about war had caused us to miss. For example, Abraham could be said to have engaged in "nonviolent direct action" (JP practice #1) by confronting/pleading with God to spare the people of Sodom, despite the violations committed by the majority of its inhabitants against his own family.

Abraham takes an "independent initiative to reduce threat" (JP practice #2) by offering his nephew Lot the first choice of land for his cattle, once their growing flocks begin to compete over limited resources. Lot sets up camp in the Jordan Valley, Abraham moves to the Hebron area, and a potential family feud is avoided.

Abraham also negotiates an amicable resolution to a dangerous conflict over ownership of wells, on the basis of a treaty he had made with King Abimelech of the Philistines. He is thus able to succeed where Israelite kings Saul and David would later fail—making peace with the Philistines and not resorting to war. This was only one of several treaties Abraham made with different Canaanite kings (treaty-making being a crucial method of conflict resolution, JP practice #3).

Abraham "takes responsibility for conflict, acknowledges mistakes, and asks for forgiveness" (JP practice #4)—first to Pharaoh and later Abimelech—when he admits to his deceptions about the status of his wife.

Abraham promotes a proto-human rights/democratic/religious liberty ethic when he commands all of his descendants to "do what is just and right" if they desire to live sustainably in the land with their (diverse) neighbors. (Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, also supports the just rule of law when he condemns his own sons for their vicious attack against the Shechemites.)

Abraham "fosters just and sustainable economic development" (JP practice #6) via his willingness to share the land and water of Canaan (and even his own wealth) with both his kin *and* other ethnic groups he encounters, an act that is generously reciprocated by many of the local Canaanite leaders (such as Melchizedek and Abimelech and a Hittite who sells Abraham his only property).

Although "working with emerging global networks" and "strengthening the United Nations" (JP practices #7 and #8) obviously would have been impossible for ancient Abraham, as a seemingly multilingual sojourner, this father of monotheistic faith possessed a remarkable ability to make trade, security, and resource-sharing treaties—with a diverse array of peoples.

And while Abraham was not what we moderns would call a pacifist, he steered clear of the battles for conquest between Canaanite kings, only entering the fray to rescue the household of his nephew Lot (Gen. 14). Abraham was clearly more devoted to increasing his herds and multi-ethnic children than his weapons! ("reducing weapons" being JP practice #9.)

Lastly, Abraham did not simply "encourage grass-roots peacemaking groups" (JP practice #10), he founded them through his families and followers, whom today we call Jews, Christians, and Muslims (within which, we know, there are many diverse sects and sometimes conflicting cousins, all in great need of the peacemaking lessons their father Abraham might teach them!)

Tragically, the followers of Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad have too often neglected, ignored, or transgressed these practices of hospitality and conflict resolution in seeking their own interests and security apart from trust in God's salvation. May all those who claim Abraham as a faith-father remember and imitate the peacemaking practices of this prophet, applying them creatively to our globalized, post-9/11, "clash of civilizations" context in obedience to the desire for unity-within-diversity of the One God. This God calls all humans to "do what is just and good" (Gen. 18:19) by making peace-*shalom-salaam* with aliens/foreigners as well as neighbors/estranged siblings, as Abraham commanded all his children to do. May it be so with us! ■

ENDNOTES

1. This essay grows out of three years as a research associate with Fuller's Muslim-Christian Conflict Transformation Grant.
2. It would be edifying for all the children of Abraham living in this land today to remember this ancient oath taken by Abraham in the name of his descendants.
3. The term "transforming initiatives" is taken from Glen Stassen's *Living the Sermon on the Mount* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

CAMERON LEE

Making Peace in Our Families

Beloved comedian and actor Bill Cosby once tried to explain to a nine-year-old boy named Peter what Jesus meant in the Sermon on the Mount by turning the other cheek. "If somebody hits you, you don't hit him back," Cosby said.

A visibly confused Peter replied, "Jesus said be a wimp?"

"No, not a wimp, a lover of peace."

Peter was resolute. "It don't sound too smart. Why don't the guy who hits me love peace *first*?"

Cosby tried again. He explained that Jesus was trying to teach his followers to "be bigger than the other person." After pondering this for a moment, Peter gave a logical conclusion: "If you're bigger, you should definitely hit back."[1]

Where did Peter learn such values? The family environment is one obvious candidate. Unsurprisingly, youth are more likely to believe that it is permissible to hit back if they think their parents also believe this.[2] This applies to all families, Christian or not. Psychologist Louis Cozolino, for example, points to the importance of the family environment in the development of childhood aggression:

> [C]hildren who suffer early abuse may enter their schoolage years agitated, aggressive, and destructive, engaging in fights, property damage, and even animal torture. In the absence of a memory of his or her trauma, the child's behavior is not experienced as a reaction to a negative event but as a natural part of the self, an indication of his or her essential "badness." This feeling is usually reinforced by an array of critical adults and feelings of shame that consolidate into a negative self-image.[3]

This is the nature of implicit social memory. Early emotional experiences in our families leave unconscious traces by the way they shape our brain chemistry. Even if we cannot remember such experiences, they may prime us to respond more aggressively to situations later in life.

Seen through an ethical lens, the quote portrays the compounding of social injustice: from the failure of parental stewardship to the inappropriate blaming of the child that stems from an overly individualistic understanding of character. Who knows how far back the injustice stretches? Were the parents themselves the unwilling recipients of a legacy of abuse? Nor do we know how far the legacy will stretch into the future, across the generations, as the child in question grows to have children of his or her own.

This is not to advocate an exaggerated stance of victimhood that absolves the child of any responsibility for aggression and destructiveness. It does, however, recognize a vicious cycle in need of transformation—one that should be of particular interest to those who value what Jesus taught and demonstrated about an ethic of nonviolence. Yet as Richard Hays has lamented, "One reason that the world finds the New Testament's message of peacemaking and love of enemies incredible is that the church is so massively faithless."[4] There are, however, signs of hope, witnessed in part by the momentum of the just peacemaking paradigm.

SYNOPSIS

Lee argues convincingly that the Christian social ethic that serves as the basis of just peacemaking should transform not only public policy and international diplomacy, but the patterns of life in that most formative of social settings—the family.

As Lisa Sowle Cahill has argued,

> The ideal to which Christian faith calls families is a new existence in which marital and kin bonds are the basis for affectionate, mutual, just, and generous internal family relations and for compassionate and sacrificial outreach to those beyond one's own family, especially to those who are socially peripheral or powerless.[5]

Here, Cahill looks in two directions: to the quality and character of the relationships between family members, and to the larger social consciousness and behavior these relationships engender. So it is with just peacemaking. A

Cameron Lee (PhD) is professor of Marriage and Family Studies at Fuller. He speaks as a Family Wellness Instructor and Trainer and a Certified Family Life Educator. He also teaches and preaches regularly in church settings. He has been published in a variety of journals, including *Family Process*, *Family Relations*, and the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. His recent books are *Why Psychology Needs Theology: A Radical-Reformation Perspective* (2005), coedited with Al Dueck, *Unexpected Blessing: Living the Countercultural Reality of the Beatitudes* (2004), and *Beyond Family Values: A Call to Christian Virtue* (1998). Lee is a member of the National Council on Family Relations.

Christian social ethic should transform not only public policy and international diplomacy, but the patterns of life in that most formative of social settings, the family.

The Beatitudes as a Source of Just Peacemaking

Rather than begin with the practices of just peacemaking, however, I will return to their source: the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, and in particular, the Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3-12).[6] Christians are sometimes too eager to get to the application of moral practices, without a corresponding and prior transformation of moral vision. As Hays has suggested, the moral teaching of the New Testament is not limited to rules, practices, and paradigmatic examples. At the most far-reaching level, texts like the Beatitudes provide a *symbolic world* "through which we interpret reality."[7] A full exploration of the Beatitudes is beyond the scope of this article.[8] It will suffice to put Jesus' statement "Blessed are the peacemakers" (Matt. 5:9) in context, before turning to a discussion of how just peacemaking might apply to families.

I was not raised in a Christian family. My first real encounter with Bible reading was as a child, with a pocket-sized King James New Testament my grandmother had given me. It had been collecting dust on a shelf, until a vague curiosity compelled me to read it. Not knowing where else to begin, I opened to the gospel of Matthew. The antiquated language, together with the unpronounceable names of the genealogies, almost made me give up. But I pressed on. The familiarity of the Christmas story, at least, was comforting.

I came to rest in the Sermon on the Mount. Some of the sermon made sense, though I struggled with it as generations of Christians have—aren't these impossibly high standards for mere mortals? They certainly seemed beyond the reach of a preadolescent boy with no background in theology.

The Beatitudes, however, especially the first four and the one about rejoicing in persecution, simply seemed odd. What did it mean that those who were poor in spirit, mourning, meek, and hungering and thirsting could be *blessed* by God? I did not have any knowledge of the Old Testament or the prophets. I could not hear the text as a post-exilic Jew might, with the words of Isaiah echoing in the background.

Yet this is how we must hear the text if we are to understand the nature of the kingdom Jesus inaugurated, the theological and social context in which we practice peacemaking. To say that God blesses the poor in spirit and the meek (Matt. 5:3, 5) is to say that God is a champion of the downtrodden, who otherwise have no hope and no expectation of blessing. To say that God blesses those who mourn (Matt. 5:4) compels us, like the exiles, to recognize and repent of our own sins, while grieving the injustice of a sin-stained world. To say that God blesses those who hunger and thirst for righteousness (Matt. 5:6) follows from the others. If we know our dependence on God's mercy, and how broken we are, then what we will long for is God's grace-filled justice—righteousness, not merely in the sense of personal conduct, but in the larger, global sense of God putting things right.

The hunger to see God restore justice to a broken world is the basis for the corresponding outward expression of the second half of the Beatitudes: a life of compassionate mercy (Matt. 5:7), purity of devotion (Matt. 5:8), and, of course, peacemaking. Here, peace means more than the avoidance or absence of conflict. It points to the deep and rich concept of *shalom*, or in the felicitous phrase of Cornelius Plantinga, "the way things ought to be."[9] Peacemakers, in other words, are agents of God's *shalom*.[10]

In my own teaching and preaching on the Beatitudes, I have likened *shalom* to the intrinsic goodness of God's creation before the Fall. As those attempting to live according to the reality of God's reign, we take seriously the call to participate in his ongoing work of redemption. We labor with God to restore what sin has spoiled. As Donald Kraybill notes, "*Shalom* comes when there are right relationships among people in all realms of life."[11] Thus, here's the challenge I put to families, especially in situations of conflict and distress: What would it mean, right here and right now, in the context of this relationship, to be an agent of God's restorative and redemptive *shalom*? What would it take for God to look upon this relationship and to repeat the blessing of the creation story—"and God saw that it was good"?

Transforming Initiatives for Peace in Families

Realistic responses to such questions point us in the direction of what Stassen has called the "transforming initiatives" needed to promote peacemaking in the family.[12] In the Sermon on the Mount, for example, Jesus did not establish new laws, but promoted transforming initiatives to break the vicious cycles of injustice perpetuated by sinful attitudes and conduct.[13] Drawing upon the teaching of Jesus and Paul, Stassen identifies the following eight practices of peacemaking,[14] which may be applied fruitfully and pastorally to family relationships:

1. Acknowledge your alienation and God's grace realistically.
2. Go, talk, welcome one another, and seek to be reconciled.
3. Don't resist revengefully, but take transforming initiatives.
4. Invest in delivering justice.
5. Love your enemies with actions; affirm their valid interests.
6. Pray for your enemies and bless them; persevere in prayer.
7. Don't judge, but repent and forgive.
8. Do peacemaking in a church or a group of disciples.

Clear echoes of the Beatitudes and the transforming initiatives of the Sermon on the Mount can be heard in these practices. Our imaginations need to be reshaped to understand ourselves as participants in God's reign. Thus, peacemaking in the family begins with an honest acknowledgement of our own sinfulness and need for grace (practice 1), and a corresponding repentance that takes us out of the judging role that so often characterizes interpersonal conflict (practice 7). Without such internal transformation of our attitudes, our motives will continue to be dominated by a desire to get back at the person who hurt us (practice 3). As suggested earlier, it is the attitudes of poverty of spirit, meekness, and mourning that undergird the desire to see God's justice done (practice 4), whether in the world at large or in our families.

Peacemaking in the family expresses itself pragmatically in the pursuit of reconciliation: someone has to take the initiative to swallow injured pride and seek out the other for a healing conversation (practices 2 and 3). This may require learning appropriate communication skills, which unfortunately do not come as naturally as they should. Empathic listening helps us to bracket our own concerns temporarily, long enough to understand the other person's point of view and legitimate needs (practice 5). In this way, we can express love through action, even when it is difficult to feel loving or affectionate toward other family members.

And how can we follow Jesus' command to pray for our enemies (practice 6) unless we have taken the time to understand them? Listening deeply and well provides the platform for knowing how and what to pray for family members. Perseverance in prayer may include continuing to pray even when our own feelings of resentment for past offenses threaten to reassert themselves. Here, we might follow the lead of the man who brought his son to Jesus for healing: "Lord, I believe; help my unbelief" (Mark 9:24). The internal transformation needed to bless our enemies may be incomplete, but we can trust in the sanctifying role of obedient prayer.

The final practice is key. To borrow from Stanley Hauerwas, peacemaking must be done within a community whose identity has been formed by the story of the nonviolent, *shalom*-inaugurating Jesus.[15] It is too difficult for families to sustain this moral vision on their own. They need to be immersed in the kind of Christian community that continually holds up the transforming initiatives of the New Testament, against the background of worship that tells and retells the story of Jesus and God's reign.[16] Such a view, taken seriously, moves family ministry away from a model of special-interest service-delivery to one grounded in a vision of discipleship for the entire congregation.

I cannot do justice to the possibilities of the peacemaking paradigm for families. The reality of our own stubborn sinfulness warns us not to expect simple panaceas for the lack of *shalom* in our families. We are shaped by our emotional histories, and resist habits of thought and behavior that encourage us to neighbor-love of those who feel like enemies. As Cahill writes, "the process of trying to live as Christian families makes us all too acutely aware of sin and failure in our own lives and in those of persons whom we love."[17]

But if we seek God's kingdom and righteousness above all else (Matt. 6:33), we must also take with utter seriousness the call to peace. *Shalom* begins at home. May we work toward the day when God in his mercy may look upon our families and pronounce them blessed: "and God saw that it was good." ■

ENDNOTES

1. Bill Cosby, *Kids Say the Darndest Things* (New York: Bantam Books, 1998), 21.
2. See, e.g., Barry S. Solomon, Catherine P. Bradshaw, Joseph Wright, and Tina L. Cheng, "Youth and Parental Attitudes toward Fighting," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23 (2008): 544–60.
3. Louis Cozolino, *The Neuroscience of Human Relationships* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), 130.
4. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 343.
5. Lisa Sowle Cahill, *Family: A Christian Social Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 46.
6. See, e.g., Glen H. Stassen, *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992); Glen H. Stassen and David P. Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003).
7. Hays, *Moral Vision*, 209.
8. For further study see, e.g., Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, chapter 2, or my book *Unexpected Blessing: Living the Countercultural Reality of the Beatitudes* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004).
9. Cornelius Plantinga Jr., *Not the Way It's Supposed to Be: A Breviary of Sin* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 10.
10. Lee, *Unexpected Blessing*, 164.
11. Donald B. Kraybill, The Upside-Down Kingdom, rev. ed. (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1990), 200.
12. Stassen, *Just Peacemaking*; see especially chapter 3.
13. Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, chapter 6.
14. Stassen, *Just Peacemaking*, 56–87.
15. See, e.g., Stanley Hauerwas, *A Community of Character* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981).
16. Cf. the late Robert Webber's contention that worship "does God's story": see Webber, *Ancient-Future Worship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008), chapter 1.
17. Cahill, *Family*, 136.

BRYANT L. MYERS

Working with the Poor with a Bias toward Peace

SYNOPSIS

Myers brings his considerable experience to an exploration of how preventive peace-building can be influenced by a biblical understanding of the theory and practice of transformational development and humanitarianism.

One of the ten practices of just peacemaking is to foster just and sustainable development.[1] Secular development conversation is also relating development and peace-building.[2] My purpose is to explore some of the ways that a biblical understanding of the theory and practice of transformational development and humanitarian response may concretely contribute to reconciliation and peace-building in a preventive sense. I will provide a biblical frame for understanding and responding to poverty, and then describe how a bias toward peace can be built into relief and development programming.

Peace in the absence of justice is hard to imagine. When human flourishing is limited to some and not to others, an unhelpful dynamic becomes imbedded in social life. When some have opportunities that others can never have, resentment and a sense of privilege tend to follow. Regardless of the cause—poverty, racial discrimination, marginalization, the desire to dominate or control—the result is a festering sense of unfairness. This can be exploited to foster violence by ideologues, warlords, power-hungry men, and zealots who claim to know the way to a more just world.

"Development is the new name for peace" was the unexpected claim of Paul VI in *Populorum Progressio* (*On the Development of Peoples*),[3] an encyclical written in response to the widespread hunger, disease, and poverty of which the world was then becoming aware. Challenging the underlying assumption of the time, Paul VI argued that development was more than economics. Human beings were created to know and love their creator and to be productive stewards, concerned with the good of all as well as themselves.

A biblical understanding of poverty goes deeper than just being hungry, or sick, or powerless without a voice, or being labeled as an inferior "other." Human beings are made in the image of a relational God, who is also a creator of good things. Human beings are, then, relational beings who are most fully themselves, most fully human, when they are rightly related to their creator, to their community, to those they call "Other," and to God's creation. Human beings are most fully human when they are emulating their creator and improving the world in which they live.

The Fall destroyed the harmony of these relationships, and the causes of human poverty emerged as a result. Separated from God, we worship ourselves and other gods, and our communities become divided by self-interest. As some take advantage of their gifts to extend power over others, poverty and oppression arise. Between those we call "Other" and our community or tribe, claims of superiority, racism, and violence become the norm. Our relationship with the environment becomes hostile and exploitative.

The implication is clear: all are in need of restored relationships, of reconciliation. Some may have more stuff, some may have more power, some may have more followers, but, in this larger sense, *all are poor*. At the end of the day, we all end up in the same place—dead and alone.

Development must be more than more things, more knowledge, or more access to opportunities or services. Humanitarian action must go beyond saving lives. From a biblical perspective, God's view of the best of human futures includes redemption, reconciliation, and restoration. Human beings need a restored relationship with God, just and peaceful relationships within their communities, enriching relationships with those who are "Other," and a nurturing relationship to the environment.[4]

So the reason for relating peace-building and development is driven by our understanding of the Bible, poverty, and God's view of what constitutes human flourishing.

Bryant L. Myers (PhD) is professor of transformational development in the School of Intercultural Studies. Myers worked for over 30 years in senior management roles at World Vision International. Myers's most recent books include *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practice of Transformational Development* (1999), and *Working with the Poor: Insights and Learnings from Development Practitioners* (1999). Myers was one of the editors of a four-volume series of holistic ministry case studies from around the world. Myers's courses at Fuller include "Poverty and Development," "Globalization and the Poor," "Relief, Refugees and Conflict," and "Advocacy for Social Justice."

Transformational Development and Peace-Building

World Vision International, led by Bill Lowrey, a Presbyterian pastor with years of experience in peace work in Southern Sudan, has worked systematically to integrate a bias for peace into their development programming.

Development takes place in a social, economic, and political context. Ignoring the context and connections to the local setting can often lead to harm and even sustain or exacerbate local violence. Recognizing the need to understand the context in which local programming was taking place, World Vision developed a tool for on-the-run macro analysis: Making Sense in Turbulent Contexts (MSTC).

The MSTC allows local people[5] to construct a macro-level analysis as a backdrop and informant for their planning and thinking at the local level. A simple set of tools allows local staff to do rapid historical analysis, description of the symptoms of instability, analysis of actors whose actions affect the local situation, simple analysis of local political economy, and mapping of intergroup relationships. The resulting distillation of local knowledge results in shared understanding of three of the critical questions in transformational development process:

- Who's who in the zoo?
- Who's doing what to whom?
- Where's the money going?

Answering these questions allows for local programming to avoid contributing to ongoing conflict dynamics and to see how to protect the community from those who take advantage of their development or even those who resist their development.

At the local level, a framework for integrating peace-building and development (iPAD)[6] was created to assist development program planners in integrating five peace-related strategic desires into program planning:[7]

- Contributing to a culture of good governance
- Transformation of persons
- Developing coalitions that work beyond commonly recognized boundaries
- Enhancing community capacities that generate hope
- Developing sustainable livelihoods with just distribution of resources

These programming biases for peace can lead to interesting places. They led to interethnic peace-building processes; that was the original intent. But they also led to interfaith peace-building processes. Christian development agencies do not see themselves as being in the interfaith dialogue business, and so were quite surprised, and more than a little ill-equipped, when development programming in Kosovo and Indonesia was confronted with the need to address Christian/Muslim relations. Furthermore, what does a Christian relief and development agency do when other faith-based, but not Christian, institutions share our vision for working for the well-being of a local community? From a peace-building perspective, this is obviously desirable, but what does one say to Christian donors on the other side of the world who have trouble understanding why they are being asked to support a cooperative Christian/Muslim development program?

Furthermore, any meaningful understanding of empowerment in the development process places the ownership of development and its planning, implementation, and ultimate assessment with the poor themselves. Yet the power relations between the poor and the agency that desires to help are very unequal. How do the poor find their voice? What can be done so that the poor themselves describe, diagnose, and then program a response to their situation? The current answer is to make use of participative methodologies that reverse the teacher/learner, outsider/insider roles. Such methodologies can be powerful tools of peace-building.

Siobhan O'Reilly (now Calthrop), of World Vision UK, completed research in two Area Development Programs of World Vision in Ethiopia and India in 1998.[8] She proposed the hypothesis that if participative methodologies include all groups in the community—men, women, children, castes, tribes, etc.—then the very fact of participation in a shared process of community development might promote peace-building attitudes and behaviors. Her research confirmed this hypothesis in a program where the potential for possible peace-building had been recognized and planned from the beginning. More interestingly, she found evidence of emerging peace-building capacity and skills derived from participative processes in another development program in which the potential for this was not part of the program design.

Humanitarianism and Peace-Building

The most significant characteristic of humanitarian relief in the 1990s and beyond is that most relief work takes place in violent contexts. Rwanda became the poster child of a new kind of relief setting. A new phrase, "complex humanitarian emergencies," was coined for places where there were widespread famine, large numbers of displaced people due to violence, a failed economy, and no functioning state.

Mary Anderson, of the Collaborative for Development Action in Boston, carried out research on the Rwanda refugee crisis that convinced the relief world that humanitarian aid is a two-edged sword: Depending on how it is done, relief can both save lives and do harm by feeding the vio-

lence. Feeding Hutu refugees in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo both saved hungry women and children, and fed and sustained Hutu military in exile that had perpetrated the genocide and was still fighting a guerilla war directed from the refugee camps in Goma.

Anderson further observed that outsiders had been unable to make or keep the peace. Therefore, she argued that we needed to find ways for victims to create their own systems for achieving peace and resolving internal dissensions. She provided practical insights as to how an agency can "figure out how to do the good they mean to do without inadvertently undermining local strengths, promoting dependency, and allowing aid resources to be misused in the pursuit of war."[9] Anderson developed a simple analytical tool for identifying "connectors" and "dividers" in a conflict setting in order to help the responding agency do relief in a way that reinforces "connectors" and avoids aggravating "dividers."

For example, a Christian relief agency was asked to rebuild the water system of a small Bosnian town. The three local ethnic groups asked for three separate water systems, reasoning that this would safeguard the water supply if they ever started fighting again. While a true practice of participatory processes agrees with their proposal, the Christian agency refused. Acceding to their request was like planning for future violence. Furthermore, being a Christian agency required acting as an agent of reconciliation. The agency refused to begin work on a water system until the three groups agreed to work together to design and maintain a new common water system. This is a bias toward peace.

Doing relief in the midst of conflict raises issues of cooperating with peacekeeping military forces. In Bosnia, Somalia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Cambodia in the 1990s, NGOs had to cooperate with troops intent on keeping the peace, or on imposing the will of external powers. To further confuse, the bitter experience of Rwanda, Somalia, and Bosnia has led to military forces requesting humanitarian NGOs to help develop new military doctrine. Militaries are learning to do the same kinds of things on the ground that humanitarians do. This is confusing to the victims, to the agencies, and often to the military. This long-term trend shows no sign of going away and is becoming more ethically challenging as humanitarian agencies are being described as "force multipliers" in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. The day is not far off when "military operations other than war" may become the centerpiece of some militaries.

The sword of humanitarianism is double-edged. The lessons of Rwanda suggest that timely external military intervention can save lives. Civilian deaths continue to be a consequence of conflict, and in some situations, military protection for the uprooted will be essential. At the same time, NGOs are keenly aware that military forces are designed to kill and destroy. Further, and more problematic, militaries are instruments of some country's foreign policy, so humanitarian action can itself be a mask for geopolitical objectives.

Christians and Christian agencies are conflicted by these developments. The traditional view of war (pacifism versus just war without attention to just peacemaking practices)) makes this hard to work through. Our tendency to see militaries only as institutions that break things is no longer valid. We need theological help to rethink things.

Conclusion

For Christians doing relief or development in the context of conflict, issues of peacemaking and reconciliation are inescapable. A biblical approach to development in both theory and practice can and must contribute to peace-building. Thus a Christian understanding of development and humanitarian response is a necessary tool of just peacemaking. ■

ENDNOTES

1. Stassen, Glen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998).
2. For example, "Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy," *World Bank Policy Research Report* (Washington, DC: Oxford University Press and the World Bank, 2003); Jonathan Goodhand, *Aiding Peace: The Role of NGOs in Armed Conflict* (Bourton on Dunsmore, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications, 2006); Michael Brown and Richard Rosecrance, eds., *The Costs of Conflict: Prevention and Cure in the Global Arena* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999); Karen Ballentine and Jake Sherman, *The Political Economy of Armed Confict: Beyond Greed and Grievance* (London, Reinner, 2003).
3. Pope Paul VI, "Populorum Progressio (On the Development of Peoples)," in *Catholic Social Thought* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003), paragraphs 76–80.
4. Stephen Jackson, with Siobhan Calthrop, *Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts* (Monrovia, CA: World Vision International, 2003).
5. The MSTC exercise privileges the view of local staff over those of outsiders since only local folks have the details and specifics at hand most of the time. Doing an MTSC exercise with outsiders present is an excellent way to get outside experts to stop long enough to really listen and learn from local folks. This in itself is a contribution to peacemaking within the agency.
6. Bill Lowrey, Abikök Riak, Herminegilda Carrillo, and Andreas Sihtoang, *Integrating Peacebuilding and Development* (Monrovia, CA: World Vision International, 2003).
7. Michelle Garred, ed., *A Shared Future: Local Capacities for Peace in Community Development* (Federal Way, WA: World Vision, Inc., 2006), 11.
8. Siobhan O'Reilly, "The Contribution of Community Development to Peacebuilding," in *Working with the Poor: New Insights and Learnings from Development Practitioners*, ed. Bryant Myers (Colorado Springs, CO: Authentic, 1999).
9. Mary B. Anderson, *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner, 1999), 2.

PAUL ALEXANDER

Talk It Out, Reduce Nukes: How Following Jesus Relates to International Cooperation

My father, a long-time deacon in a Pentecostal church, has always encouraged me to "seek Jesus." As a minister and teacher, I try to follow his advice even when it is challenging. But how widely can my father's counsel be applied? Is Jesus's way relevant to international relations and the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons? The authors and endorsers of the Matthew 5 Project think so. We argue biblically, theologically, and empirically for cooperative conflict resolution, international cooperation, and reduction of nuclear weapons—three practices of just peacemaking.

In Matthew 5:21–26, Jesus commands that if we are about to give a gift to God at the altar but become aware of anger between us and another, we are to go at once and make peace first. And if an adversary or enemy is taking us to court, make peace with that enemy quickly while there is still time. These are imperatives from Jesus that apply to relations with a brother, *adelpho*, which likely means a fellow believer; as well as relations with an adversary, *antidiko*, which means enemy or opponent in general.[1] In Matthew 5:41, "if someone forces you to go one mile," Jesus is referring to Roman soldiers who compelled Jews to carry a pack one mile. In Matthew 5:43–45, "Love your enemies," Jesus was interpreting Leviticus 19:17–18, "love your neighbor as yourself," and answering the question, "Who is to be included in the community of neighbors?" His answer: Everyone to whom God gives sunshine and rain. All are included by God.

Seeking Out Adversaries to Make Peace

"For the Health of the Nation," a statement unanimously adopted by the National Association of Evangelicals, declares: "The peaceful settling of disputes is a gift of common grace. We urge governments to pursue thoroughly nonviolent paths to peace before resorting to military force. . . . We urge followers of Jesus to engage in practical peacemaking locally, nationally, and internationally. As followers of Jesus, we should, in our civic capacity, work to reduce conflict by promoting international understanding and engaging in nonviolent conflict resolution."[2] Cooperative Conflict Resolution is a key practice of just peacemaking. *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy* declares: "A key test of the seriousness of governments' claims to be seeking peace is whether they initiate negotiations or refuse them and whether they develop imaginative solutions that show they understand their adversary's perspectives and needs."[3]

We encourage a principled commitment to following Jesus in seeking out adversaries to make peace: to understand what motivates our adversary and be willing to talk about reasons for antagonism, instead of avoiding all conversation or diplomacy. Talk may be blunt, but should always be based on listening, understanding motivations, and never treating anyone as beyond the reach of the Holy Spirit to bring conviction, change, and redemption. Even the apostle Paul, who formerly terrorized Christians, was radically changed when he encountered Jesus on the road to Damascus (Acts 9).

SYNOPSIS

Alexander believes that Jesus Christ is Lord over international relations and nuclear nonproliferation and reduction. The command to make peace with our adversaries requires international cooperation in order to overcome nuclear threats.

Decreasing Nuclear Threats by Talking

Overcoming the nuclear threat requires international cooperation. In a July 2006 interview with *Religion and Ethics Newsweekly*, evangelist Franklin Graham stated, "I want to encourage the president, I want to encourage this administration, those in Congress—we need to talk to the North Koreans face to face, period. Eyeball to eyeball. And there is a lot that can be accomplished if we simply just do that."[4] Saddleback Pastor Rick Warren said of North Korean missile tests: "I know that in any conflict—whether in a marriage, in business or between nations—as long as the parties keep talking, there is hope. My plea to everyone involved in this diplo-

Paul Alexander (PhD) is the author of *Peace to War: Shifting Allegiances in the Assemblies of God* (Cascadia, 2009) and *Signs and Wonders: Why Pentecostalism is the World's Fastest Growing Faith* (Jossey-Bass, 2009), editor of the *Pentecostals, Peacemaking, and Social Justice* series (Wipf & Stock), and founder of Pentecostals & Charismatics for Peace & Justice. He has delivered keynote speeches in The Hague on religions and human rights, at a United Nations conference in India, and to audiences as large as six thousand. Alexander, who serves as professor of theology and ethics at Azusa Pacific University (Azusa, CA), is one of the framers of the mission of the Matthew 5 Project.

matic process is to please, keep talking."[5]

The validity of Jesus's way of talking directly to make peace was recently demonstrated by the effort to persuade North Korea not to develop nuclear weapons. Initially, neither the Clinton nor the Bush administration agreed to talk with North Korea. Instead, both relied on threats. North Korea responded by building "a nuclear deterrent against possible U.S. attack." Refusing to talk was not working, so U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill and North Korean negotiators met, and solutions were quickly worked out. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and President Bush affirmed the result, North Korea's Yongbyon reactor closed down, and international inspectors monitor it. Talking worked better than merely threatening and refusing to talk.

Ever since the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, there have been many successes in persuading nations not to develop nuclear weapons, with only India and Pakistan as exceptions. Sixteen nations that began to, reversed course. The keys to those decisions were direct talks, international nonproliferation agreements, consensus against nuclear proliferation, and awareness that nuclear weapons are not useful. Conversely, there is not a single case where nations avoided going nuclear because the U.S. refused talks. The reverse was true—other nations hosted talks, made clear the penalties of nuclear weapon development, and guaranteed support in exchanges for staying with international cooperation.

Since the Iranian hostage crisis during the Carter administration, the U.S. government has refused to talk with the Iranian government. In 2006, the Bush administration wisely decided to conduct conditional talks with Iran. "Mr. Bush's search for a new option was driven . . . by concern that the path he was on . . . would inevitably force one of two potentially disastrous outcomes: an Iranian bomb, or an American attack on Iran's facilities."[7] Secretary of State Rice announced that the U.S. would join multilateral talks with Iran "once Iran suspends disputed nuclear activities. Kazem Jalali, spokesman for the Iranian parliament's Foreign Policy and National Security Committee, said the U.S. move might be viewed positively in Tehran if preconditions were dropped."[6]

To give in to the demand of suspension of enrichment of uranium even before talks began was difficult for a culture that values honor. It would mean giving up the right to enrich uranium for generating electricity—a right universally recognized for other nations. David Isenberg writes in *Defense News*: "nearly 30 years after the 1979 revolution, we need to consider what the policy of no official U.S. dialogue with Iran has achieved in terms of influencing Iranian behavior. In a word: nothing."[9] Howard Baker, Secretary of State in the first Bush administration, pointed out that the U.S. and the Soviet Union talked directly many times, helping avoid nuclear war and achieving a peaceful end to the Cold War. Former U.S. foreign policy officials—Republican and Democratic—support direct U.S.-Iranian unconditional negotiations. The United States has crucial disagreements with Iran, but Jesus does not say talks should be refused until we approve of the conduct of the adversary.

Preventing War the Jesus Way

Our parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents saw the devastating destruction of World War II. When they returned from that war, many dedicated themselves to creating international networks to enhance national security. Those war-preventing networks include practices of conflict resolution, trade relationships, organizations like NATO, the European Union, and the United Nations—all imperfect, but serving as partial checks and balances against rash action by imperfect national governments. These, along with international law, have worked to prevent nuclear war. Political scientists report that nations cooperating actively in this web of security have experienced fewer wars than other nations.[10]

By intention, by accident, or by escalation of war, nuclear weapons could kill millions or even billions of human beings created in the image of God. The U.S. and the Soviet Union have thousands of nuclear weapons. England, France, China, India, and Pakistan have fewer—but enough for destruction of sacred human lives. The threat of terrorism puts us in even greater danger. Nuclear weapons are also a moral threat. Possessing them means military are trained in the routines to fire them. In this way, nations are nudged toward the belief that it would be right to kill millions or billions of people for whom Christ died. Even such preparation, given the sin that nuclear weapon use would be, is tantamount to a discipline toward sinfulness, the inverse of sanctification.

Influential editorials in *The Wall Street Journal* (January 4 and 13, 2007) by seventeen conservative U.S. former national security policymakers, including George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, James Goodby, and Sam Nunn, declare that the existence of nuclear weapons in the world that threatens to destroy untold numbers of humankind actually *decreases* U.S. security. The problem is not deterring the Soviet Union, but preventing nuclear weapons in dangerous hands. Cold-War reliance on nuclear weapons is a grave danger to U.S. as well as world security.

These conservative national security experts advocate specific steps: agree with Russia to move away from plans for massive nuclear attacks based on short warning times, ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, halt production of

continued on page 17

JAMES B. BURKE

Just Peacemaking Opens Catholic Eyes Too

As friends carried bread, wine and gifts for the poor to Christ's table one recent Sunday, the presider exhorted, "lift up your hearts." I was filled with thanksgiving that Catholic peace-teaching since Vatican II and the just peacemaking project were causing seismic, Spirit-driven shifts in Christian war-peace ethics. Lewis University in Chicago, Illinois, where I teach, was planning a peacebuilding symposium, and I wondered: would the symposium exist without the preceeding U.S. bishops' peace pastoral of 1983 and the just peacemaking theory of 1998?

The symposium, "Called to Live Justly: Shaping a Just Peacebuilding Agenda," acknowledged indebtedness to both peace teachings and attemped to commemorate the pastoral's twenty-fifth anniversary by fostering dialogue among 6,000 students, faculty, and staff. Symposium planning was driven by three elements—the pastoral entitled *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, a tenth-anniversary reflection called *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace*, and Glen Stassen's book *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War*. They inspired eight global priorities, which we invited nearly 1,100 participants to rank—once for the new U.S. president and again for individual just-peacebuilding pledges. The symposium's fundamental inquiry became realist: How ought the United States use its power, wealth, and influence to build just peace globally?

Catholic teaching integrates nonviolent conflict, just war theory, and pacifism coherently into a renewed just war framework, but stops at crossing that threshold. Sidestepping just-warrior/pacifist polarization, just peacemaking theory brilliantly directs interdisciplinary and interfaith leaders to effective just peace praxis as a source for constructing realist just peace theologies and ethics for this century. Brief sketches of Catholic peace teaching since Vatican II and the just peacemaking project will illuminate their achievements as well as a common blind spot.

Catholic Peace Teaching

Vatican II's plea for reevaluating teaching on war and peace (1965) ignited justice and peace experiments among Catholics. Taking root in that praxis, Catholic peace teaching developments spread through Paul VI's establishment of annual New Year's World Day of Peace messages (1968-), matured in the U.S. bishops' peace pastoral (1983) and tenth anniversary statement (1993), and flowered throughout John Paul II's global ministry and twenty-seven peace day messages (1978–2005). A new, dynamic dialectic on just-peace teaching also emerged between the U.S. bishops and John Paul. In 1979, the U.S. bishops began to morally evaluate the nuclear weapons crisis. On May 3, 1983, they issued a 103-page peace pastoral. Reviving just-war reasoning, the pastoral condemns first strikes, accepts deterrence under strict conditions, and calls for mutual disarmament. It honors pacifism and nonviolence as individual conscientious options. The bishops dreamed beyond just war to employ a just peace theology prioritizing peace actions.

SYNOPSIS

By exploring the strengths and weaknesses of both Catholic post-Vatican II peace teaching and just peackmaking practices, Burke argues that understanding nonviolent conflict praxis is the key to just peace theology's fruition among reconciling Christians.

The demise of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union (1989 and 1991) initiated Catholic teaching surprises. In his 1991 encyclical, John Paul praised popular nonviolent struggles for helping end the Cold War. In *Harvest of Justice*, the bishops reversed the pastoral's teaching to make nonviolent conflict an obligatory first resort. Without precedent in official ecclesial documents, *Harvest* also defines and critiques just war theory, and proposes a post-Cold War peacemaking agenda. The 17-page peacemaking agenda proposes six global concerns with applications: strengthening global institutions; assuring sustainable and equitable development; securing human rights; restraining nationalism and eliminating religious violence; building cooperative security; and shaping responsible U.S. leadership. In later peace day messages, John Paul urged the building of

James B. Burke is assistant professor of theology at Lewis University, a Catholic and Lasallian institution outside Chicago. Holding a Master of Arts (University of Chicago) and doctorate in Christian Ethics (Loyola University, Chicago), he directs Lewis University's Center for Ministry and Spirituality. His research includes nonviolent conflict, Catholic social teaching, and interfaith justice-spiritualities.

a new realist just-peace synthesis, emphasizing international law and nonviolent conflict while neither abrogating just war nor excluding just pacifism. Though John Paul and the U.S. bishops differed in moral assessments of the Gulf War and Afghanistan invasion, Rome and the bishops resisted Bush administration pressures to expand just war criteria to include preventive war, and thereby to justify the Iraq war.

Catholic peace ethics mark three achievements. First, Catholicism preserves *and adapts* just war teaching. The pastoral's strong just war analysis of arcane nuclear strategy reveals that just war reasoning's resilience resides in its capacity for renewal through evaluating new uses of force. In *Harvest of Justice*, the bishops are so confident about just war theory's value that they discuss its limits. (Our symposium chose just *peacebuilding* rather than *peacemaking* to acknowledge this Catholic difference with just peacemaking.) Second, Catholic teaching envisions an eventual just-peace theology to be multi-paradigmatic—integrating within a renewed just war framework strategic nonviolent conflict (nonpacifist nonviolence), delimited just war theory, and in-principled pacifism. Third, the church's public consultation on social teaching informs reasoned dialogue and respectfully forms consciences in a pluralist society. Such consultation can mobilize pluralist coalitions to speak truth to power.

Weaknesses exist in Catholic peace teaching. Papal and episcopal teaching push toward integration of just war, nonviolent conflict, and pacifism, but do not decide which ethic begins the peace teaching. Popes prefer principle over application. Prevented by pacifist/just war polarizations in the American church, the bishops failed to apply their new assessment of nonviolent conflict in their peacemaking agenda. (As corrective, the symposium added "experimenting with nonviolent conflict" to its 2008 global agenda.) Even after seeing nonviolent conflict wield force, Catholic teaching tends to conflate it with in-principled pacifism. Hence it does not perceive nonviolent conflict strategy clearly enough as a positive, effective means of waging conflict successfully, rather than merely a way of avoiding violence.

Just Peacemaking Practices

Recognizing weariness over Christian just war-*versus*-pacifism debates, twenty-three Christian theologians, international relations scholars, peace activists, and conflict resolution practitioners wisely set aside ecclesial polemics and focused five years of dialogues on empirically verified peacemaking practices. They developed "a road map for actions that actually participates in effective forces that are turning major parts of our world from war to peace."[1] They dubbed the map "just peacemaking theory" and outlined it in *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (1998), edited by Glen Stassen. They articulate the theory under three categories (peacemaking initiatives, justice, and community) and ten practices: support nonviolent direct action; take independent initiatives to reduce threat; use cooperative conflict resolution; acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness; advance democracy, human rights, and religious liberty; foster just and sustainable economic development; work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system; strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights; reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade; and encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations. These practices are also moral guides calling "persons of good will to lend their shoulders" to just peacemaking. In its first decade, the project's leaders have successively invited interfaith examination of just peacemaking,[2] mostly recently among Abrahamic religions.

Just peacemaking theory's achievements are strikingly significant. First, the scholars explore the mammoth and complex positive dimensions of making, keeping, and building just peace. They skillfully do not confront regnant just war or ascendant pacifist paradigms. They reclaim Reinhold Niebuhr's realism without alienating idealists' prophetic energies. Second, they emphasize just peace praxis, rather than principles. This strategy evokes liberation theology's turn to just action in gospel light, or Maurice Blondell's notion that Christian tradition develops first in the "ascetic dimension," where believers struggle to live gospel in history. Third, they devise a phenomenal process which reaches ecumenical, interfaith, and interdisciplinary consensus over just war/pacifist divides without demanding unanimity.

Two weaknesses tarnish just peacemaking's strengths. In under-appreciating just war tradition as simply one side of a debate "whether or not to make war," just peacemaking theory serves only amoral realists' current efforts to undermine the tradition.[3] Even though just peacemaking gives pride-of-place to nonviolent direct action in explicating its ten normative practices and declares supporting nonviolent direct action to be an "obligatory norm," just peacemaking does not grasp what internationalists Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler find in praxis. Though just peacemaking cites Gene Sharp, the dean of nonviolent-struggle theorists, it mistakes nonviolent direct action for a conflict strategy that "produces healing," rather than a powerful social-political force for fighting wielded by millions in twentieth century campaigns.[4] Instead nonviolent conflict begins with the collective withdrawal of political consent, and is the means of waging mass conflict against an organized and armed state-opponent. The accent is on *conflict* as much as *nonviolent*. And the accent is on the now historically demonstrated effectiveness of this strategy for waging conflict.

This common blind spot in Catholic peace teaching since Vatican II, and the just peacemaking theory on nonviolent conflict as effective practice, might not be consequential if it were not indicative of pervasive American cultural blindness. The attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, signifies the age-old resort to political violence, according to Jonathan Schell.[5] The peoples' bringing down of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989, signals, as Schell puts it, "that forms of nonviolent action can serve effectively in the place of violence at every level of political affairs." Many Americans have been unable to read these global signs because of the conflation of nonviolence with pacifism fostered and sustained in public imagination by this ecumenical blind spot in Christian ethics. In face of the just-peace agenda before us, we must understand nonviolent conflict in actual praxis. For example, the latest research confirms Schell's insight: Between 1900 and 2006, "major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns."[6]

Ecumenical Christian ethics must rapidly do three things to enable our contemporaries to read these signs of the times. First, we must differentiate nonviolent conflict from pacifism in just peace ethics. Second, we should integrate strategic nonviolent conflict into the just war framework by morally evaluating with just war reasoning cases using this new kind of powerful nonviolent force. This stretching of just war thinking will concomitantly change just war theory. Third, the theological community in public consultation ought to continue to shape a coherent multi-paradigmatic just peace theology unifying-in-tension nonviolent conflict, just war theory, the other just peacemaking practices, and pacifism. In this we certainly will have cause to lift up our hearts. ■

ENDNOTES

1. Glen Stassen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998), 2.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 4.
4. Ibid., 31. See also G. Sharp and J. Paulson, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Boston: Extending Horizon Books, 2005); P. Ackerman and C. Kruegler, *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the Twentieth Century* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993); and P. Ackerman and J. DuVall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Palgrave, 2000).
5. Jonathan Schell, *The Unconquerable World: Power, Nonviolence and the Will of the People* (New York: Henry Holt, 2003), 8.
6. Maria J. Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, "Why Civilian Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict," *International Security* 33, no. 1 (Summer 2008): 7.

Alexander, continued from page 14

nuclear fissile materials for weapons and develop an international system providing reliable supplies of nuclear fuel for electricity (so nations like Iran have no incentive to unilaterally enrich uranium), and agree to further reductions in international nuclear weapons. The more worldwide reductions in nuclear weapons are achieved, the safer we all are.

To safeguard life, liberty, community, and security for its own citizens and for the world, the U.S. must demonstrate moral leadership in strengthening the rule of law in the international community and seeking diplomatic negotiations with allies and enemies alike. As Christians, we must express citizenship in ways that prioritize faithfulness to Jesus and to biblical standards of justice, rather than political decisions driven by prejudice or narrow nationalism. We call for obedience to the Lordship of Christ in all that we do. When we experience conflict with a brother, sister, or adversary—we will go talk and seek to make peace, as Jesus calls us to do. ■

ENDNOTES

1. For more information on the Matthew 5 Project statement, visit http://www.matthew5project.org.
2. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 73.
3. "For the Health of the Nation: An Evangelical Call to Civic Responsibility," 11, http://www.nae.net/images/civic_responsibility2.pdf.
4. Ronald J. Sider and Diane Knippers, eds., *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 303. In the ethic of just peacemaking, this is called "cooperative conflict resolution." See *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War*, 3rd ed. (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2008), chapter 3.
5. "Franklin Graham on North Korea," *Religion and Ethics*, July 14, 2006, episode 946, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week946/newsfeature.html.
6. "Rick Warren's Trip to North Korea Delayed," *Christianity Today*, July 16, 2006, http://www.christiantoday.com/article/rick.warrens.trip.to.north.korea.delayed/6943.htm.
7. Kurt Campbell, Robert Einhorn, and Mitchell Reiss, eds., *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), 329–30; Mitchell Reiss, *Without the Bomb: The Politics of Nuclear Nonproliferation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 263–68.
8. Helene Cooper and David E. Sanger, "With a Talk over Lunch, a Shift in Bush's Iran Policy Took Root," *New York Times*, June 4, 2006.
9. David Isenberg, "Talk is Win-Win," *Defense News*, July 17, 2006, 76.
10. Ibid.
11. Glen Stassen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998, 2004, 2008), chapters 5 and 7.

EVELYNE A. REISACHER

Evangelical-Muslim Peacemaking: Drink Lots of Cups of Tea

SYNOPSIS

Reisacher believes that relations between Muslims and Christians can be vastly improved, in spite of theological differences, by engaging in dialogue and life-sharing experiences.

LAST SUMMER, IN PÉCS, Hungary,[1] I visited the former Gazi Kasim Pasha Mosque, built in the 16th century. Now a Catholic church, it has a symbol on its roof combining the Christian cross and a Muslim half-moon, and, inside, another unusual blend of Christian-Muslim symbols: a human-sized crucifix right above a *mihrāb* with the Muslim creed.[2] It made me wonder, "How close can Muslims and Christians draw to each other despite their differences?"

The crucifix expresses the narrative of Christ's redemptive work, and the Muslim creed implicitly contains the narrative of Jesus as an important prophet to Islam[3] while negating his death on the cross. Combining the two symbols, then, may be confusing. Religious communities often overprotect their symbols because they summarize their most sacred beliefs. As an evangelical, I cherish the symbol of the cross, even though it was an instrument of torture, because it reminds me of Christ's work. I understand Muslim feelings when symbols of their faith are distorted. Riots over Danish cartoons of Muḥammad show vividly that neighborliness is threatened when one faith does not respect the symbols of another.

During the 2007 Fuller School of Intercultural Studies (SIS) Missiology Lectures,[4] Joseph L. Cumming spoke of the negative impact of the Crusades under the symbol of the cross: "For the Muslims and the Jews of the world, what does the symbol of the cross now signify? 'Christians hate you enough to kill you'."[5] Since the Crusades distorted the message of the cross for Muslims, Cumming continued, Christians should make sure Muslims understand the cross as "God loved you enough to lay down his life for you. I love you enough that I would lay down my life for you."[6] In every contemporary Muslim-Christian conflict the risk exists that Christians will misrepresent the cross through attitudes, behaviors, and socio-political choices.

Mistreating symbols can also lead to the escalation of devastating conflicts. On November 9, 1938, several hundred synagogues were destroyed in Germany. Recently, Naim Terrnava, Mufti of Kosovo, showed me pictures of over 200 mosques damaged or demolished during the recent conflict there. It is heartbreaking that the worldwide community failed to address the hatred that resulted in the destruction of symbols and lives, sanctuaries and sacred spaces.[7] I am devastated when Christians lightheartedly use derogatory and hateful language about Islam and Muslims. The history of interreligious conflict shows this can lead to events such as those in Germany and Kosovo. How can Christians participate in preventing religious conflicts?

During the SIS lectures, Ida Glaser used Francis of Assisi as a model of Muslim-Christian peacemaking. For Francis, the cross was the heart of a mission of powerlessness, love, and suffering. Glaser called for a "missiology of grace" in interactions with Muslims.[8] The juxtaposed symbols of Pécs may make us theologically uneasy, but they are also a reminder of a much-needed "missiology of grace"—one that does not request that we give up our convictions, but rather avoid calling "fire down from heaven to destroy" those who refuse Christ, as Jesus's disciples wanted to do (Luke 9:51–56).

Songs and Peacemaking

In 2008, Roberta R. King, associate professor of communication and ethnomusicology, Fuller student Matthew Krabill, and I attended the 14th Fes Festival of World Sacred Music, created after the first Gulf war as an attempt to promote peace, cross-cultural understanding, and the dialogue of religions. Festival President Mohammed Kabbaj describes Fes as "a place of tolerance, opening to the other, and peaceful coexistence."[9] Participants in the ten-day festival left more open to positive interaction with people of other faiths.[10]

Shared joy, attachment theorists say, strengthens the formation of bonds. When Jessye Norman sang "He Holds the Whole World in His Hands," accompanied by the Regional Lyric Orchestra of Avignon Provence, Muslims and Christians danced and cheered in the grandiose palace courtyard of Bab el Makina. If people danced together more often, would there be fewer wars? Interfaith dialogue should not limit itself to religious experts engaging in lengthy polemical discussions in stuffy hotel ballrooms. Why should theological differences prevent us from celebrating together? The "Shining Face of God" is my mission paradigm for interfaith relations and dialogue.[11] God "lets his face shine upon people and is gracious to them" (Numbers 4:25–26). If we want to follow God's model, we should bless others rather than turn our faces away from them. "The Lord is compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, abounding in love" (Psalm 103:8). In *Exclusion and Embrace*, Miroslav Volf addresses this same attitude of embrace.[12]

King writes, "In song and music we often come to learn of issues deep within the hearts of people."[13] During night concerts, the non-Muslim audience discovered the reverence Muslims have for the Qur'ānic Jesus by the many references Sufi singers made to him in their songs.[14] Muslims learned about Christianity, for example, in a concert featuring the Ysaÿe Quartet playing Haydn's "The 7 Last Words of Christ." Although concerts had many positive outcomes in peacemaking, some participants were uncomfortable engaging in this multisensory interfaith dialogue, preferring logical arguments to music. This clash between explicit and implicit information processing can be stressful—some people found themselves moving nonconsciously with the rhythms of the music, while consciously resisting the concepts it contained.[15]

One evening, Craig Adams and the Voices of New Orleans shared the stage with Pakistani singer Faiz Ali Faiz. Both performed with their ensembles, engaging in a dialogue of song and dance between Sufi and Christian songs.[16] Similarly the Muslim Al-Kindi Ensemble with Sheikh Hamza Shakour, from the Great Mosque of Damascus, shared the stage with the Athens Tropos Byzantine Choir, blending Muslim and Christian music in homage to Mary. This type of dialogue is a challenge—I withdrew at times when the music was "leading me to bliss" that did not match the worship I wanted to offer to God. Nevertheless, I saw how music can create new spaces for encounter: Fes, even with its challenges, shaped another style of encounter to learn from.

Muslim-Christian Conflict Transformation

In the weeks following September 11, 2001, Fuller engaged in conflict transformation. Classes such as "Introduction to Islam" or "Current Trends in Islam,"[17] taught by J. Dudley Woodberry, were advertised in the community and saw a significant increase in attendance. Students evaluated their prejudices and fears. In 2003, Fuller received a federal grant for developing and organizing conflict transformation projects between evangelical Christians and Muslims. Two years later the Salam Institute for Peace and Justice became a copartner in this project.[18] We discovered there were many misunderstandings between evangelicals and Muslims.[19] One recurring question from Muslims was, "Who are the evangelicals?" They had not had much exposure to evangelicals, and formed opinions from hostile misstatements by some thought of as evangelical spokespersons.

We found that evangelicals accuse Muslims of closing churches, jailing or killing Christians, while Muslims accuse Christians of supporting unjust wars and using unethical methods to evangelize and destabilize Muslim societies. These issues needed to be addressed in our conversations, and we wanted to strengthen our theological discussions with just peacemaking practices. Platforms for deep conversations about each others' assumptions, practices, and interfaith implications were provided (later compiled in a book[20]).

Both faith traditions have more conflict transformation resources than we anticipated. A number of participants shared their long experience working in this area, although the current evangelical-Muslim conflicts were new fields for them.[21] Research assistants and fellows from the Muslim side provided material for the Salam Institute's First Annual Muslim peace-building, Justice and Interfaith Dialogue conference in 2006. On the Christian side, Fuller students gathered Muslim-Christian conflict transformation resources that were compiled in books and published in journals.[22]

The challenge of this kind of project is to move the model of respectful encounters between scholars into local communities. Glen Stassen regularly reminded us that academic discourses must give birth to just peacemaking practices. Although we have not yet developed a model similar to Stassen's book *Just Peacemaking*, adapted to the evangelical-Muslim context, we continue to move in this direction.[23] I strongly believe that as evangelicals we should be known for the love we have for people more than for the hate we instill between communities. As a first outcome, the conflict transformation project designed a training manual and organized several training seminars offering key resources and guidance for the questions that "communities raise when they discover that they have not worked to overcome walls of misunderstanding and suspicion that block the ability to live as neighbors and fellow community members."[24]

Evangelicals and Muslims acknowledged theological differences but were able to meet on respectful terms, and Fuller did not abdicate its commitment to share the love of Christ to the world. We created a new style of dialogue in which Muslims and evangelicals shared similarities, acknowledged differences, built healthy relationships, voiced griev-

Evelyne A. Reisacher (PhD) is assistant professor of Islamic studies and intercultural relations at Fuller with expertise in gender issues in Islam, Muslim-Christian relations, world religions, and right brain-to-right brain resonance, as well as studying intercultural attachment using Allan Schore's developmental attachment theory. Reisacher has visited Muslim and Christian populations around the globe to facilitate development of teaching tools for Christians sharing the gospel cross-culturally.

ances, and engaged in peacemaking. During the missiology lectures, John Azumah reminded us that in some parts of the world there is no alternative to peacemaking. "When we talk about Muslims in Africa we are not talking about immigrants, we are not talking about aliens . . . we are talking about fully fledged citizens . . . people who are not just neighbors but relations, family members, cousins. So Islam and Christianity in Africa are two women married to one husband. They bicker, they quarrel sometimes, and they fight, but they just have to learn to live together. They can't afford to see each other as enemies."[25]

To those not calling Muslims neighbors but enemies, David Augsburger gave this advice, "Can I enter my enemies' eyes, which is part of what loving my enemies means . . . [and] see that their point of view makes sense and love them for having that point of view when I radically disagree with it?"[26] Joseph Cumming added, "If the Christian faith is primarily a tribal identity . . . it takes us to the belief that 'We must fight to defend the survival of Christian civilization . . . We must pray that our God gives us victory over their 'Allah-god'." Cumming gave two choices for Christians: "self-preservation" or "self-giving for the gospel." He said, "if the Christian faith is primarily costly discipleship to Jesus the Crucified, then we must gladly lay down our lives in love for Muslims and share with them the precious Good News of Jesus, so that they may come to know his gospel of salvation."[27] This is conflict transformation at its best.

A Common Word between Us and You

In October 2007, 138 Muslim scholars, clerics, and intellectuals endorsed "A Common Word between Us and You"—a letter addressed to all Christians, declaring love of God and love of neighbor as common ground for dialogue and understanding between Christianity and Islam. Scholars from Yale Divinity School headed by Miroslav Volf and Joseph L. Cumming wrote a response entitled, "Loving God and Neighbor Together: A Christian Response to 'A Common Word between Us and You.'" Over 300 Christian leaders endorsed it,[28] and a number of evangelicals criticized it.[29] Let me explain why I believe this is an important endeavor.[30]

First, why shouldn't evangelicals accept an open invitation? As Martin Accad said, we should consider the communal culture from which the invitation emerges: "You don't accept an invitation by insulting your host, you go, and then you sit, and then you drink coffee, you have a meal and then you talk."[31] There are too many misunderstandings between evangelicals and Muslims to refuse a warm invitation.

Second, the letter is an effort by Muslims to reach out to Christians and build bridges. For that, they have to be commended. They have chosen a common ground—Jesus's summary of the law. Endorsing the Yale response by no means required that I believe Muslims understand God's love the same way Christians understand God's love fully expressed in Jesus Christ and recorded in the Bible. But their invitation to find a common ground allowed for fruitful discussions afterwards. I spent one week with a number of Muslim and Christian signatories at Yale. I listened to scores of presentations on love for God and love for the neighbor from both Muslim and Christian speakers. I must admit that it is not possible to talk about love without being deeply convicted of the *lack of love* that sometimes characterizes our lives.

Third, the Common Word provides opportunities for evangelicals to meet face-to-face with significant religious leaders from all over the Muslim world. Nothing meaningful can be accomplished without such encounters. These encounters allowed evangelicals and Muslim leaders to have ample time to build relationships and learn about how the other faith understands the love of God and love of neighbor. We did not agree on everything, but this framework represents a paradigm shift for evangelical-Muslim encounters. I wish more evangelicals had been present and more reports had appeared in the secular press. This conference was a breath of fresh air as evangelicals and Muslims peacefully sat together to share their deepest concerns and aspirations. The Yale webpage reads, "Muslims and Christians together make up well over half of the world's population. . . . If we can achieve religious peace between these two religious communities, peace in the world will clearly be easier to attain. It is therefore no exaggeration to say, as you have in 'A Common Word between Us and You,' that 'the future of the world depends on peace between Muslims and Christians.'" Fourthly, the Common Word motivates us to do more theologizing. Workshops and conferences deepened our understanding of love of God and love for the neighbors as both faiths understand them. As Martin Accad reminded us at the missiology lectures, "Muslims have a Muslim theology of Christianity but Christians do not have a Christian theology of Islam." These encounters may allow us to define one.

Finally, did evangelical participants give up sharing God's love in Christ who died for our sins, rose again, and will return? Did they forget the churches in the Muslim world, often persecuted for their faith? No. This makes these encounters unique. In the Conflict Transformation project, we continued to listen to struggles of both Muslims and Christians, and to work toward greater advocacy.

Conclusion

Many Fuller graduates are engaged in sharing the love of Christ with Muslims throughout the world, and Fuller is engaged in supporting Christian minorities or individuals when life and ministry are threatened in Muslim contexts. What can we learn through the encounters at Pécs, Fes, Fuller, and Yale Divinity School? I believe we can improve relationships in many areas even with our theological differences. We can foster humanness and cordiality. We should also not be afraid to voice our grievances. In all the examples discussed above, Muslims took great initiatives reaching out to evangelicals—a willingness that we should acknowledge. One of the greatest lessons from these events is that evangelicals can be involved in dialogue and peacemaking and continue to share the love of Christ to the world.

As Christians, we must constantly ask what motivates us and what guides our attitudes and behaviors as we encounter Muslims. A number of theologians and Christian Islamicists have challenged us to be more Christ-like in our encounters with Muslims. We should always return to the true meaning of the cross in our encounters. Some of these projects involved risk: we have found new friends, but lost some in our own community of faith. As we know from cooperative conflict resolution, "Those who seek to resolve conflict cooperatively take risks in order to find common ground. They are willing to make themselves vulnerable, in order to create safe spaces for resolution and in order to encourage others to do the same."[32] At the Common Word Conference at Yale Divinity School, David W. Shenk told of a relationship between a Muslim and a Christian who started as enemies, and became friends. When Shenk asked the Christian how this happened, he replied: "By drinking lots of cups of tea." I was so moved by Shenk's story that I borrowed his advice for the title of this article. Our world needs encouragement from peacemakers like him and many others.[33] ■

ENDNOTES

1. At the International Association of Mission Studies conference on the theme of "Human Identity and the Gospel of Reconciliation: Agenda for Mission Studies and Praxis in the 21st Century."
2. The Muslim declaration of faith is "*Lā ilāha illa 'llāh wa-Muḥammadun rasūl Allāh*" (There is no god but God [Allah] and Muḥammad is the messenger of God).
3. Unfortunately, symbols can narrow dialogue compared to narratives. It is a common belief that all Muslims interpret Sura al-Nisā' (4) 156–157 as a denial of Jesus' crucifixion; however, Joseph L. Cumming shows significant Qur'anic commentators have listed among their interpretations the possibility that Jesus may have died on the cross. See Joseph L. Cumming, "Did Jesus Die on the Cross? Reflections in Muslim Commentaries," *Muslim and Christian Reflections on Peace: Divine and Human Dimensions* ed. J. Dudley Woodberry, Osman Zümrüt, and Mustafa Köylü (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005) 32–50.
4. In 2007, the theme of the SIS missiology lectures was "Toward Cordial Witness among Muslims." We chose this because we wanted to show how in the midst of conflict we can love Muslims and reach out to them without abandoning convictions about Christ. The lectures featured four speakers addressing Muslim-Christian relations in the U.S., Europe, Africa, and the Middle East.
5. Joseph L. Cumming's presentation is included in "Toward Respectful Witness," in *From Seed to Fruit: Global Trends, Fruitful Practices, and Emerging Issues among Muslims*, ed. J. Dudley Woodberry (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2008), 311–24. The passage quoted is from pp. 322–23.
6. Ibid., 322–23.
7. The word "sacred" here means "set apart for religious worship." See the parallel between the idea of "sanctuary" and "safe space." J. Cartwright and S. Thistlethwaite, "Support Nonviolent Direct Action," in *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War*, ed. Glen Stassen (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998), 43.
8. Ida Glaser, "Toward Respectful Witness among Muslims: A British Perspective," presentation given at the 2007 SIS Missiology Lectures, November 2007. For more on Francis of Assisi's interactions with Muslims, read C. A. Mallouhi, *Waging Peace on Islam* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002).
9. FÈS: La Fondation Esprit de Fès, http://www.fesfestival.com/2008/en/fes.php?id_rub=35&type=2.
10. For more on the festival see Nathalie Calmé, ed., *L'Esprit de Fès* (Paris: Éditions du Rocher, 2004); Patrice van Eersel, *Tisseurs de paix* (Gordes, France: Les Éditions du Relié, 2005); Nathalie Calmé, ed., *Les Chemins de l'Espoir: Une âme pour la mondialisation*, Actes du Forum de Fès 2005 (Paris: Éditions du Rocher, 2006).
11. Evelyne A. Reisacher, "The Processes of Attachment Between the Algerians and French Within the Christian Community in France," PhD dissertation, 2001, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
12. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996).
13. Roberta R. King, "Variations on a Theme of Appropriate Contextualization: Music Lessons from Africa," *Appropriate Christianity*, ed. Charles H. Kraft (Pasadena, CA: William Carey, 2005), 309.
14. For Sufis one role of music is the remembrance of God or *dikr* as expressed in the following assertion: "Your heart, you will purify it with the water of *dikr*/and from every vice you will cleanse it." The Fes Festival website gives a brief presentation of each group, including a short description of their music. According to this website this quote is from a Muslim theologian, Mohamed al Harraq, explaining the role of music as remembrance of God.
15. For more on explicit and implicit affect resonance, see Daniel J. Siegel, *The Developing Mind* (New York: Guilford Press, 2001); and Allan N. Schore, *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self: The Neurobiology of Emotional Development* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999).
16. http://faiz_ali_faiz.mondomix.com/en/video4414.htm.
17. Adding to its Masters of Arts in Cross-Cultural and Intercultural studies with an Islamic concentration, Fuller will start offering in Fall 2009 a Master of Arts in Islamic Studies uniquely designed for those students planning to undertake research in the various disciplines of Islam.
18. Salam Institute for Peace and Justice, http://www.salaminstitute.org/.
19. We learned this painfully—a number of evangelicals thought Fuller had given up the call to share the gospel when we first engaged in this project. We had to assure them it is definitely not the case.
20. Mohammed Abu-Nimer and David Augsburger, eds. *Peace-Building By, Between, and Beyond Muslims and Evangelical Christians*, (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009).
21. Two books I highly recommend from this project: Glen Stassen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998); and Mohammed Abu-Nimer, *Nonviolence and Peacebuilding in Islam: Theory and Practice* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003).
22. *Resources for Peacemaking in Muslim-Christian Relations: Contributions from the Conflict Transformation Project*, ed. J. Dudley Woodberry and

continued on **page 23**

DAVID P. GUSHEE

Just Peacemaking and the Sanctity of Life

When just peacemaking theory under Glen Stassen's leadership emerged, Christian ethical arguments about the morality of war were stalemated—pacifists argued it was never permissible for Christians to participate in wars, and just war theorists argued it was sometimes *permissible* and sometimes *obligatory*. The arguments had become entirely predictable.

The stalemate fixed attention on the morality of fighting wars, while neither side focused on how to prevent them. No one paid adequate attention to how Christians might become the peacemakers Jesus calls us to be (Matt. 5:9). The pacifism/just war debate became a distraction from the praxis-focused demand for disciples of Jesus to make peace.

Why should Christians make peace? Why is this obligation such an important dimension of the life of discipleship? War destroys human beings, body and soul. It literally deconstructs the works of human civilization, laboriously crafted over many generations. It destroys the ecosystems on which we and others of God's creatures depend. War is un-creation. Those who heed the creational call to steward the earth (Gen. 1:26–28) see war as a negation of an awesome human responsibility.

SYNOPSIS

Gushee suggests that one way to ground Christian peacemaking and resistance to war is with an understanding of the sanctity of human life—a biblically grounded vision of the immeasurable value of every human being.

A robust vision of the sanctity of human life, and secondarily of all created life, gives us a deeper grasp of why the un-creation caused by war is such a sacrilege. The sanctity of life is the conviction that all human beings, at any and every stage of life, in any and every state of consciousness or self-awareness, of any and every race, color, ethnicity, level of intelligence, religion, language, nationality, gender, character, behavior, physical ability/disability, potential, class, social status, etc., of any and every particular quality of relationship to the viewing subject, are to be perceived as sacred, as persons of equal and immeasurable worth and of inviolable dignity. Therefore, they must be treated with the reverence and respect commensurate with this moral status, committed to the preservation, protection, and flourishing of their lives.

Here I will use my own distillation of the *universality* of life as sacred, and the *centrality* of preserving human life:

> The long, blood-stained journey of humanity has involved the constant negation and yet occasional affirmation of the preciousness of every human being. Most people readily acknowledge the value of those closest to them, beginning with their families. It is harder to extend that high valuation of human life to strangers, aliens, and especially enemies. We value those we know, those we love, and those who benefit rather than threaten us. But the sacredness of each and every human life pushes us far beyond valuing kin, friends, and loved ones. It demands that we look at every person as we look at our most beloved friend—as immeasurably valuable.

For those we most value we seek a hierarchy of goods, including "the preservation, protection, and flourishing of their lives." Survival comes first because all other goods depend on it, but for those we love we want a sense of security, and conditions of life in which they can flourish. We are not merely to avoid threatening or harming others, but to perceive them as of exalted worth, treating them with the respect commensurate with such worth.

A belief in the sanctity of each and every human life requires us to learn how to care about the preservation, protection, and flourishing of the lives not just of loved ones but of strangers, aliens, and enemies. Our tender care for *our* people needs to extend to those well beyond our immediate circle. We are to perceive them as immeasurably valuable and treat them with commensurate respect.

A variety of religious traditions, ethical systems, and worldviews articulate some version of this moral conviction. Christians are called to show how a belief in every life's immeasurable value fits with our own faith. Here is my brisk summary of some of the sources for such a view:

> The belief that human life is sacred flows from biblical faith. In particular, life is sacred because, according to Scripture, God created humans in his image, declared them precious, ascribed to them a unique status in creation, blessed them with unique, god-like capacities, made them for eternal life, governs them under his sovereign lordship, commands in his moral law that they be treated with reverence and respect—and forever elevates their dignity by his decision to take human form in Jesus Christ and to give up that human life at the Cross.

This definition sees ingredients for belief in life's sacredness across every part of the canon and in every major doctrinal category. Human life is sacred as an implication of a theology of creation and the image of God. We see sacredness in the way divinely inspired moral law protects human beings, with special attention to those most vulnerable to harm. These moral demands were reinforced by the prophets—including Jesus, as he taught in the prophetic tradition. The significance of Jesus, of course, goes beyond his ministry and teachings to include his incarnation, death, and resurrection. Through his words and loving deeds he demonstrated the immeasurable value to God of every human being. In emptying himself and taking on human form, he displayed obedience to the Father and love for humanity, even unto death on a cross on behalf of strangers, aliens, and enemies. The Father vindicated the Son's obedience by raising him from the dead and exalting him as Lord (cf. Phil. 2:1–11). Followers of Jesus Christ are called to embrace the sanctity of every human life. We are called to *see* people the way Jesus did, to *love* people the way Jesus did, and to *act on behalf of* people in delivering love the way Jesus did.

One way of grounding just peacemaking theory theologically is in this vision of the sanctity of human life. It is because we view human beings with exalted and immeasurable value that we recoil from their destruction in war. We cannot be cavalier about the effects of war either on ourselves or on our enemies, for God loves enemies and values them just the same as we are valued. Christians ought to recoil not just from the physical effects of war but also from the way war systematically unleashes cultural currents that dehumanize and degrade ourselves and our enemies. War teaches us to diminish the worth of our adversaries and to care little for their preservation or flourishing, so that we might kill them with good conscience.

To all of this, just peacemaking says a resolute *no*. It thrusts Christ's disciples toward concrete practices to prevent war and make peace: nonviolent direct action, independent initiatives, conflict resolution, acknowledgment of responsibility, and so on. Just peacemaking theory demonstrates respect for life's sanctity not just in its goals but in its means. The practices of just peacemaking demonstrate respect for the legitimate interests, basic humanity, and God-given value of those with whom we currently stand in adversarial relations. As we attempt creative peacemaking initiatives toward the adversary, take the first step to talk with them, search together for win-win solutions, acknowledge things we have done that have harmed them, and strain to avoid war, we demonstrate respect for our adversaries that is an indispensable ingredient of just and peaceful relationships.

Just peacemaking obeys Christ's peacemaking mandate. It also reflects and advances the exalted vision of life's immeasurable value that lies at the heart of Christian faith. Just peacemaking is more than an ethical theory; it is a crucial aspect of a Christian theological vision. ■

David P. Gushee (PhD) is the Distinguished University Professor of Christian Ethics at McAfee School of Theology at Mercer University, in Georgia. He is a prolific writer, with eleven books to his credit, most recently *The Future of Faith in American Politics* (Baylor University Press, 2008) and *The Scholarly Vocation and the Baptist Academy* (Mercer University Press, 2008). He is the president of Evangelicals for Human Rights, a columnist for Associated Baptist Press, and a contributing editor for *Christianity Today*.

Reisacher, continued from page 21

Robin Basselin (Pasadena, CA: Fuller Seminary Press, 2006); K. S. Reimer, A. C. Dueck, J. P. Morgan, and D. E. Kessel, "A Peaceable Common: Gathered Wisdom from Exemplar Muslim and Christian Peacemakers," in *Religion and the Individual: Belief, Practice, Identity*, ed. Abby Day (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate: 2008).

23. See Susan Thistlethwaite and Glen Stassen, "Abrahamic Alternatives to War: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Perspectives on Just Peacemaking," United States Institute of Peace Special Report 214 (October 2008), http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr214.html.
24. David Augsburger, "Final Report of Conflict Transformation Project," 2006.
25. John Azumah, "Toward Cordial Witness among Muslims: An African Perspective," School of Intercultural Studies Missiology Lectures, November 2007 (CD recording).
26. Augsburger's remarks were made at the 2007 School of Intercultural Studies' Missiology Lectures "Toward Cordial Witness among Muslims."
27. Joseph L. Cumming, "Toward Respectful Witness among Muslims: A North American perspective," School of Intercultural Studies Missiology Lectures, November 2007 (CD recording).
28. A Common Word website: http://www.acommonword.com/.
29. Sam Solomon and Elyias Al Maqdisi, *The Truth about A Common Word* (Pilcrow Press: 2008), http://www.pilcrowpress.com. Another critic of the Common Word is John Piper; see "John Piper Responds to 'A Common Word between Us and You'" at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rTY-9FY13kw.
30. For more, visit Yale Center for Faith and Culture's "'A Common Word' at Yale Frequently Asked Questions": http://www.yale.edu/faith/about/abou-commonword-faq.htm.
31. Martin Accad, "Toward Respectful Witness among Muslims: A Middle Eastern Perspective," School of Intercultural Studies Missiology Lectures, November 2007 (CD recording).
32. Glen Stassen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2004), 53
33. For more, see David W. Shenk, "The Gospel of Reconciliation within the Wrath of Nations," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, January 1, 2008.

Fuller Theological Seminary
135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena, California 91182

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 69
Mendota, Illinois

FACES OF FULLER

Erin Dufault-Hunter

Erin Dufault-Hunter remembers bomb drills in third grade, where even at eight years of age she wondered whether God was powerful enough to make a difference in a broken world. Some of the questions she pondered while under her school desk still occupy her as an adult: "I never questioned whether God exists. I wanted to know if God *matters*." Christian ethics, she says, "is an active trust that Christ redeems even the darkest places of my personal life and of my world. It invites us to receive and embody this salvation of God."

Erin Dufault-Hunter is assistant professor of Christian ethics in Fuller's School of Theology and part of the launch of a new master of arts degree in theology, Christian ethics. For more information visit fuller.edu/sot/christianethics