

JPIC supplement to candidacy formation
by Andrew Conradi, ofs (JPIC National Animator), 2016
Some ideas/points that could be included at the discretion of the formator

CANDIDACY

Chapter 27 “Bearers of Peace”

The Franciscan Journey (Updated version 2010) by Lester Bach, OFM Cap.

Note: *Understanding JPIC (UJPIC)* can be found here:

<http://www.franciscanvoicecanada.com/> Click on “Understanding JPIC” at the foot of the page. [It is best to get it from this source as it will post the amendments quickly after they are made so you will get the latest updated version here]

1.

From *FJ* p 287: “Peace is the work of justice ...”

Comment: Peace is a major topic for Franciscans. *FJ* concentrates more on the personal aspects while *JPIC* concentrates more on the nation to nation aspects which take up 10 pages in *UJPIC*. These aspects include: *Pacem in terris* / Peace on Earth (St John XXIII, 1963); Peace & War; Responsibility to Protect (R2P) & the Just War doctrine; UN Peacekeeping; Peace operations with or without the UN e.g. Iraq 2003 & 2014.

Obviously too many pages to be reproduced here in full. Following are some excerpts.

From *UJPIC*:

3.2.38. The day of writing this paragraph was the 50th anniversary of John XXIII’s *Pacem in terris* which had a momentous impact on the Catholic Church’s view of the world. It recognized the growing rights of workers, the advancement of women, the spread of democracy and an affirmation that war was not the way to obtain justice. It was the first encyclical addressed, not just to Catholics, but “to all people of good will,” and laid the foundations for the attainment of a just and lasting peace.

3.2.40. The building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 by the East Germans had raised tensions enough, but the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962, brought the superpowers to the brink of a third world war, and terrified people around the world with the spread and threat of nuclear weapons.

3.2.40.a. After the fall of the USSR the world learned that Soviet submarine flotilla Commander Vasili Alexandrovich Arkhipov is credited with saving the world from the catastrophe of nuclear war in 1962 by refusing to fire a nuclear torpedo at US Navy vessels trying to force his submarine nearing Cuba to surface. The USN was using non-lethal depth charges but the Soviet submariners did not know that. Another close and potentially dangerous confrontation occurred in 1983. On 26 September 1983 Lieutenant Colonel Stanislav Petrov of the Soviet Air Defence Forces correctly identified an incoming missile threat as false, due to a system malfunction. If he had not had the courage and confidence to do that, a retaliatory strike would have been launched with the expected mutually catastrophic consequences known as MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction). This was the backdrop to NATO Exercise Able Archer (early November 1983) which simulated a NATO vs Warsaw Pact confrontation resulting in nuclear war. The Soviets thought this might be a cover for an actual nuclear strike and the danger was they would launch a pre-emptive strike. This was averted by information provided by

Colonel Oleg Gordievsky of the Soviet KGB who was secretly working for the British Secret Intelligence Service. His information lead NATO to scale down the exercise and allay Soviet fears.

3.2.40.b. Let us not forget that most wars are actually started or continued due to wrong assumptions or miscalculations of how opponents will react to a given course of action by a proponent and often has produced very different political outcomes to those originally intended in spite of von Clausewitz' view of war as a means for achieving political ends. This is the law of unintended consequences.

3.2. 42. The encyclical starts out on the building blocks of human dignity and human relationships. From these core values, it explains how each country has the right to existence, to self-development, and the means to achieve their development. Minority groups should be protected and be allowed to live in association with the other peoples within a state.

3.2.44. The encyclical supported the objectives of the UN, as it promotes peace and protects human rights.^[SEP] *Pacem in Terris* paved the way for strong involvement of the Catholic Church and faith-based organizations in the promotion of human rights, justice, peace-building and peaceful resolution of conflicts. In the years that followed its release, Bishops' conferences created many human rights centres, and Catholic peace movements sprang up all over the world.

3.2.45. *Pacem in terris* ends with an exhortation to uphold the *four pillars of peace – truth, justice, love and freedom* - virtues that need to be pursued and concretized. As a living document, how do we keep the message of *Pacem in Terris* alive?

Peace & War

3.2.49. There has always been tension between the right of self-defence and a strict interpretation of turning the other cheek (Sermon on the Mount); between the concept of a Just War and non-violent resistance. It is only since John Paul II and his experience of the Polish Trade Union *Solidarność* (Solidarity) and its resistance to the Communist Government that non-violent resistance has become a core teaching of the Catholic Church. For a short article on Just War click on

<http://www.catholicpeacefellowship.org/nextpage.asp?m=2198>

3.2.49.a. We should not forget that St Joan of Arc had Franciscan connections and influences. Although the evidence is not clear she is thought to have been a Franciscan Corderbearer and she definitely believed that her cause called for a just war. She is the Patron Saint of Women Soldiers.

3.2.49.a.1. St Martin of Tours is the patron of Canadian Military Chaplains but San Giovanni da Capestrano, OFM (St John Capistrano) is the patron of military chaplains in the USA. About 30 of the first *Franciscains-Récollets* (Recollets, a reformed branch of the Franciscans) in what is now Canada were *aumôniers militaires* (military chaplains) with the troops and forts in New France. (Bacon, 2013, no page number)

3.2.50.b. The Vatican's role in promoting peace is a relatively recent one in the history of the papacy. Until the loss of the Papal States in 1870, when the Holy See ceased to be a territorial power, far from tirelessly advocating for negotiation and dialogue, popes often justified war and even waged it themselves. Medieval popes called nine Crusades over 200 years against Muslims in the Holy Land and elsewhere, four within the lifetime of Francis. Francis himself was on the Fifth Crusade (1217-1221), and was appalled by the

conduct of Christian soldiers. This was the background to his encounter with Sultan Malek el-Kamil in Damietta, Egypt in 1219. Crusades were called against heretics elsewhere e.g. the Albigensian Crusade (1209–1229) against the Cathars in France. Until the late 19th century, the papacy had its own army. Pope Julius II (reigned 1503-1513), in armour, led his troops in battles against rival Italian rulers and France. It was only in the 20th century that the Pope emerged as a reliable voice against war as a way of resolving international disputes. That change certainly reflects the increase in destructive power of conventional, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, which has made the conditions set by Catholic Social Doctrine for waging a *Just War* almost impossible to meet.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) & the Just War doctrine

3.2.50.d. The Canadian Government established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in September 2000 to answer the question of when intervention was permissible. In February 2001, at the third round table meeting of the ICISS in London, Michael Ignatieff and two others suggested the phrase "responsibility to protect" as a way to avoid the "right to intervene" or "obligation to intervene" doctrines and yet keep a degree of duty to act to resolve humanitarian crises. The African Union in 2002 adopted the right "to intervene in a Member State pursuant to a decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity."

3.2.50.e. The ICISS argued that any form of military intervention should be guided by the following six criteria to be justified as an extraordinary measure of intervention:

1. Just cause – Is the threat a "serious and irreparable harm occurring to human beings"?
2. Right intention – Is the main intention of the military action to prevent human suffering or are there other motives?
3. Final resort – Has every other measure besides military invention been taken into account? (This does not mean that every measure has to be applied and failed, but that there are reasonable grounds to believe that only military action would work in that situation)
4. Legitimate authority
5. Proportional means – Are the minimum necessary military means applied to secure human protection?
6. Reasonable prospect [of success] – Is it likely that military action will protect human life, and are the consequences of this action sure not to be worse than no action at all?

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Responsibility_to_protect)

3.2.50.f. These closely echo the criteria for fulfilling the requirements of a *Just War* in Catholic doctrine (see CCC, 1994, n. 2302-2317; CSDC, 2005, n. 497-520)

3.2.50.g. The *Responsibility to Protect* principle, sometimes referred to as R2P, was adopted unanimously by the UN in 2005. It holds that sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable catastrophe, but that when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states.

3.2.50.h. After the international community failed to prevent the mass murders in Somalia (1993), Rwanda (1994) and Srebrenica, Bosnia (1995) and in light of the successful NATO Kosovo intervention justified as a "humanitarian war" (1998-9, which however did not gain UN Security Council approval for political reasons), the UN

adopted this principle. Libya (2011) was the first case where the UN Security Council authorized a military intervention citing the R2P.

3.2.50.i. R2P is open to double standards and abuse in implementation due to political & ideological favouritism as the use of Security Council vetos shows.

3.2.50.j. Without mentioning R2P, The Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church (2005) states: “The international community as a whole has the moral obligation to intervene on behalf of those groups whose very survival is threatened or whose basic human rights are seriously violated. ... The principle of national sovereignty cannot be claimed as a motive for preventing an intervention in defence of innocent victims.” (506).

Fr Raymond de Souza: “In 2008, during the last papal visit to the United Nations, Pope Benedict XVI organized his remarks around the responsibility to protect doctrine — the diplomatic and moral principle that when atrocities are being committed, an obligation falls upon the international community to intervene to protect the civilian population, before matters descend to a humanitarian crisis of refugees. “It is indifference or failure to intervene that do the real damage,” Benedict XVI said. (National Post, 22 Sep 2015)

3.2.50.s. Patriarch Louis Raphael Sako, the Chaldean Archbishop of Kirkuk, was less ambiguous. He condemned the foul fruits of Western intervention in the Middle East: “Intervention by the West in the region did not solve the problems of those countries, but on the contrary, produced more chaos and conflict. Honestly, 1,400 years of Islam could not uproot us from our land and our churches, while the policies of the West have scattered us and distributed us all around the world.”

(<http://bellarmineforum.org/2014/05/07/from-under-the-rubble-catholics-war-and-unintended-consequences/>)

3.2.50.t. Patriarch Sako has changed his tune, or has he? On 7 August 2014 because of the attacks by the Islamic State on about one hundred thousand Christians in villages on the plain of Nineveh, the Chaldean Patriarch of Babylon, Louis Raphael Sako, President of the Assembly of the Catholic Bishops of Iraq wrote: “There is need of international support and a professional, well equipped army” to defend Christians and others (e.g. Turkmens, Yazidis, Shite Muslims). But who will provide that army?

Question for Reflection: 1. If the key to “solving” the present exodus of Syrian and Iraqi refugees to Europe and other places is to restore peace in Syria & Iraq, should force be used and who should use it?