Active Peacebuilding as a Challenging Task of the Catholic Social Ethics

Inocent-Mária V. Szaniszló[1]

1 Pontifical University of Saint Thomas Aquinas

Abstract

The God's Fifth Commandment is one of those commandments that are negatively formulated. Its wording is unambiguous, and acclaims: Thou shalt not kill! Yet, the history of humankind on our Blue Planet is rather marked with breaks in military conflicts than longer periods of peace. Regardless of a high likelihood of constantly recurring military conflicts, and despite an intense involvement of Christian culture of Europe in lots of military solutions of such conflicts in the course of history, Christian theology has always been opposed to killing as a way of resolving problems. At the most, the Church admitted that in certain instances of conflict resolution killing cannot be avoided, and it frequently referred to a just or defensive war, and developed its theological justification. In the society of that time, it was not easy to take a completely negative position on killing as advocated by many pacifists, or a number of Christianity-oriented sects (such as Quakers in Pennsylvania in the U.S.A., and the like). Still, only since the Second Vatican Council there has been discussion on active peacebuilding and preconditions under which it could work.

Keywords: Catholic social teaching, pursuit of active peace, just war and its history, dialogue as a way of safeguarding peace, good coexistence of nations.

I got to realise the fact that Europe's history is filled with war conflicts during the course of my vicarship at the Leibstadt parish church in the Aargau canton in Switzerland. The town of Doggern, lying in the Black Forest (Schwarzwald) area on the other side of the Rhine River, i.e., in Germany, celebrated the 750th anniversary of its existence sometime in 2002. A local teacher approached this festivity quite whole-heartedly, staging a theatre performance on the history of Doggern that comprised 26 scenes, and featured approximately 300 supernumeraries. The history of this little town, unfolding before our eyes in quick succession, was shown to be in fact a history of brief breaks between conflicts of superpowers consisting of several states and/or potentates. After each conflict there was a period of peace, development and boom, which was, however, many times marked with pride, vanity and immoderation. It seemed that only at times of military hardships –rather than in periods of peace and thriving – were the peoples, following a sort of a spiral-like pattern, willing to become closer to each other and consider collaboration as an option. On this point professor Weber concludes that for centuries, any attempts to spread peace on an institutionalised basis to interstate areas have failed. In respect of the high

frequency of wars, the Church used to resort to an original sin in theological explanations. Neither did the Church lend its support to the pacifistic movement founded at some point of time at the beginning of 19th century.[1]

There have been military conflicts originating from the lack of natural resources and living space since time immemorial. This gave rise to many colonial wars – the records of which date back as early as to Old Greece and the Roman Empire.

Regardless of a high likelihood of constantly recurring military conflicts, and despite an intense involvement of Christian culture of Europe in many military solutions of such conflicts in the course of history, Christian theology has always been in opposition to killing as a way of resolving problems. At the maximum, the Church admitted that in resolving certain conflicts, killing cannot be avoided, and it frequently referred to a just or defensive war, developing theological arguments around it. It was not easy, given the society of that time, to take an entirely negative stance on killing, as proposed by many pacifists, or many Christianity-oriented sects (e.g., Quakers in Pennsylvania in the U.S.A., and the like).

From the theological point of view, it is not even possible to make a univocal decision for or against (i.e., for the possibility of leading a war, or for waiving this option completely).[2] On the other hand, there is a need for a clear ethics- and morality-based theological analysis of waging a war (even if it is just a defensive or just war, i.e. *bellum iustum*), as well as of peace enforcement. In the New Testament, Jesus Christ is depicted as a messenger and guarantor of peace for humanity, which is eschatological good, aiming to reconcile people. Traditionally, the Messianic Age is frequently denoted as a peaceful time.[3]

Peace as the Goal of Coexistence Among Nations

The Fifth Commandment imposes a ban on deliberate destruction of human life. Skoblík notes that the Church calls upon us to pray for the termination of wars. Each citizen and government official should contribute towards that end. Any offensive war is wrong.[4] This is also the reason why in the Catechism of the Catholic Church (abbreviated CCC) of 1993, this ethical category is discussed under the title of *Safeguarding Peace*. The word peace hints to amorality of murderous rage and hatred. Anger means desire for revenge. If someone wants to kill or severely hurt a neighbour, from the theological viewpoint it seriously contradicts love and involves a grave sin. Wilful hatred is in sharp opposition to love. If we knowingly and voluntarily wish ill or a great harm to our neighbour, there is a grave sin involved according to the Moral theology. At that, Pesch found the following resigned definition of peace in the work of German writer Karl Wilhelm Deutsch: peace is the absence of war.[5]

Professor Peschke adds that violation of peace constitutes an especially big sin in case of those who have an impact on mass media. It is because in order for human life to be respected and advanced, peace is required. However, such a condition is not only achieved through absence of war or a balance in armament, which is defined as negative peace by theology.[6] Rahner remarks that an active peace is about a relationship between security and welfare, along with health and even opposition to war.[7] The other attributes of peace indicate that peace cannot be attained without: safeguarding the goods of persons; free communication among men; respect for the dignity of persons and peoples and finally assiduous practice of paternity.

Permanent peace presupposes a just treatment of claims and expectations of all parties involved. In this context, dialogue stands out as particularly important. Pesch also underlines the interpretation of peace as the art of compromise.[8] On the contrary, adds Peschke, tolerance is harmed by extraordinarily dangerous ideologies.[9] Peace is *the tranquillity of order* (St. Augustine), *the work of justice* (according to Isaiah 32, 14, as quoted by St. Thomas Aquinas and Pius XII), and *the effect of charity* (the fruit of love which goes beyond what justice can provide – as quoted from *Gaudium et Spes*, abbreviated GS in the article 78). This is how a positive peace is defined (CCC 2304).[10] At a deeper level, such a peace is rooted in „tranquillity of just and dynamic order of freedom.“[11] Earthly peace is a reflection and fruit of tranquillity of Christ as a prince of Messianic peace.

Peace is therefore the work of order created by God, and it is furthered by men through their endeavours. This peace is not an ultimate possession, but remains to be a challenge. In order to ensure peace, we need institutions and legal systems though. All that notwithstanding, we also need moral attitudes and guidance in order to be able to make peace. In theological terms, earthly peace that comprises love of neighbours is brought by Christ, who has reconciled the world with God by his cross. In St. Paul's words, it is 'speaking the truth in love' (Ephesians 4, 15). Peschke points out that personal attitudes such as justice, consideration of others, doing away with prejudice, ability to make compromises and solidarity on the part of individuals through to small communities are prerequisites for peace at higher levels. A man must live in peace with themselves, in their heart and conscience. However, from a theological point of view, peace among people assumes they are in peace with God and recognise His will. That is why *prayers for peace* play such an important role in Christianity.[12]

Possibility of War as the Matter of Justice

A justified defence by an armed force always constituted a strong case in argumentation in Christianity. Concerned is so-called *just war* with a just objective, that is, the restoration of order among nations. Peschke writes that experts tend to forget that a preventive war against a sure threat of aggression can also be considered to be justified; nevertheless atrocities due to modern warfare put much more constraints on this right compared to the past.[13] Such atrocities made some renowned thinkers, such as Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, express ideas on it, like the following one: „in the technological epoch, global peace has become a necessary precondition for life.“[14] This is how the last popes, and especially Pope Francis, argue in all his international and interreligious activities.

Beneš reminds us that classic moral theology teaches that a war is only admissible under special preconditions: a harm inflicted by an offender upon a nation or nations must be grave, permanent and sure; all the other means of avoiding a conflict must be inefficient, or non-usable; there must be a solid prospect of success; the use of arms may not cause greater evil and disorder as the evil to be removed; the power of modern means of destruction matters a lot in this context; such a war must be announced by a competent authority, i.e. usually the current government.[15] From the point of view of the Moral theology, the most extreme acceptable degree of acting bound to result in killing innocent people, is terminating people's lives in a military conflict.

However, Schockenhoff emphatically reminds us of outstanding issues around the word „guilty". Killing in war should never be generally permitted, even if involving so-called „just" war, that is war focused on defending a homeland or preventing a systemic violation of human rights under the mandate of the Community of nations. Nevertheless, in certain cases killing is allowed: e.g., as long as enemy soldiers continue their military operations aimed at the attacked party's military targets, thus posing a potential threat to soldiers defending their homeland. Schockenhoff suggests that from a moral point of view, the fact that someone is a member of an adversary's unit does not by itself constitute grounds for the verdict of guilty. Such „enemies" life may therefore only be terminated on the grounds that they pose threat to one's own unit, or one's own civilian population (even though they are still not guilty in the true sense of the word, since they did not want the war and they are just discharging their military duties).[16]

Providing that the aforementioned preconditions are fulfilled, public authorities may impose certain obligations upon their citizens owing to the need of national defence. Serving one's homeland thus becomes a way of contributing towards common good and keeping peace.[17] Coercion is certainly not an essential element of law. Beneš observes that people could not live in a society unable to force its members to abide by law. Denial of *right to war* (for example by pacifists) could also lead to the disruption of the entire legal order. However, moral rules do apply to armed conflicts too – i.e., non-combatants, prisoners, and wounded soldiers must be respected and treated humanely.[18] On the other hand, Peschke recognises that quite frequently people have *completely differing ideas about justice*, and that too many wars have been waged in the name of justice.[19]

A Brief Excursion Into the History of Christian Views of a Just War

In the early Christianity period, service in the army had different implications for different people. Some served, others became martyrs.[20] The recognition of war as a necessary evil was slowly taking ground. St. Augustine, one of the first Church's theologians, elaborates on the just war criteria in two of his treatises, thereby setting the direction for the Church's treatment of this topic for many centuries ahead. So, a just war: must be commanded by a legitimate authority *(legitima potestas)*; must aim at a just cause *(iusta causa)*; must be a means of conflict resolution *(necessitas)*.[21]

Regardless of this positive position on certain wars, even in such cases it holds true that wars may only be led in order to establish peace. St. Thomas Aquinas was the first one to use the term *just war* in a systematic manner. He covers the topic of just war in two various parts of *Summa Theologiae*: *Of War* (II-II, Question 40) and *Of Peace* (II-II, Question 29).[22] As pointed out by Weber, both of those are closely linked to St. Thomas's treatise on charity *De Caritate*, which clearly expresses his view that a war is the violation of the commandment of love. His criteria of a just war are as follows: a lawful authority *(auctoritas principis)*; a just cause *(causa iusta)*; a rightful intention *(intentio recta)*.

In Römelt's opinion, the idea of *a just war* is the outcome of religious scepticism, which counts on human's incapability to keep an everlasting peace. Hand in hand with the hopes that God will bring eschatological peace, thus releasing men of their aggressiveness and violence, there was a prevailing conviction that it is necessary to fight against human sin, which necessitated military violence.[23]

Only late Spanish scholastics specified the topic of *a just war* with greater degree of discrimination. Jesuits such as Francisco de Vittoria, Luis de Molina, Robert Bellarmine, Francisco Suarez and Alberto Gentili write on the new circumstances of religious faith: the unity of Christians has been destroyed, and so even the Pope is unable to reach out, by virtue of his authority, to aristocrats who are believers of other denominations; political structures have changed thanks to the emergence of national states, which do not recognise any higher authority; and finally a progress of new military technology (artillery and handguns).

Seeking to substantiate *a just war*, Jesuits Vittoria and Suarez resorted to a natural moral law, and their argumentation marked the beginnings of a modern law of nations in place nowadays, which, being a positive law, aims to arrange matters so that natural moral law is applicable to relations among individual states too.[24] Conversely, thoughts by the philosopher Hobbes about a war of every man against every man resulted in simplification to the question of peace solely, scaling down the search for a just war. Likewise, the introduction of a compulsory military service leads to engagement of people who do not participate in wars for personal reasons, but must be motivated in some other way, for example by reassuring them of the just cause underlying their engagement.[25]

Nevertheless, this theory of *a just war*, which held true for centuries, has at least three weak points: definition of core concepts is not clear enough (such as *causa iusta*). Following the disintegration of the Western world in mediaeval times, there has been no authority in place there that would decide on required „just war" criteria); the entire theory can be considerably misused in practice, since both parties can use it to support their case; due to modern weapons of mass destruction, the coverage of which goes beyond a delineated territory under dispute, the legitimacy of such war becomes a main issue.

Condemnation of any wars by the popes of afterwar time

In his Christmas Message, Pope Pius XII condemns war for the first time, only allowing for a defensive war under special circumstances, providing that such war is „controllable". Finally, due to the emergence of weapons of mass destruction, Pope Pius XII himself appeals, in his Christmas Message of 1948, that the causes for war be suppressed at any cost, and depicts war as an outdated means of resolving interstate conflicts.[26] He does not repudiate a defensive war with good prospects though (along with the weapons of mass destruction, as many believed[27]): „if there are causes for it, and harm inflicted thereby is much greater than the wrong suffered."[28] Later on, Paul VI reformulated those ideas. In the meantime, John XXIII in encyclical *Pacem in Terris* (abbreviated as PiT) no longer mentions the right to defence; the Second Vatican Council, called by him, however adjusted for that in Article 79 (*De bello vitando*) of the pastoral constitution GS: „Certainly, war has not been rooted out of human affairs. As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defence once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted."[29] In her commentary, Putz adds that trust among nations must be built through a fully-scoped exercise of human rights in practice.[30] Perhaps it is worthwhile adding that both parties to a war conflict, and/or another (higher) authority recognised by the parties involved would have to agree on the interpretation of such rights. Additionally, Professor Tödt of Heidelberg claims, on quite a pacifist note, that what is missing in GS 79 is

the formulation of conservative „*presumptio juris*", that is the basic statement that in case of doubt concerning the justness of a certain war, a state authority must simply be obeyed. Later on, in „*De justitia in mundo*", the Synod of Bishops held in Rome in 1971 confirmed, without any limitations, „the strategy of non-violence" and „the recognition of conscientious objection against military service".[31]

As Peschke reminds us, amassing weapons is equally amoral. At the end of the day the arms race shall never secure peace, but will prevent needy from getting aid, and impede the development of nations. Peschke however underlines an old saying: If you want peace, get ready for war. He says that the risk of war expansion by one nation at the expense of another is greater where the adversary is weak. Of course, what is meant is armament proportional to the impending threat, which should not give rise to fears of aggression and thus cause further armament race.[32]

Weber concludes that Article 81 of GS does not address so much the question as to who is leading a just war. It rather tackles the question of „How can we free ourselves from the old slavish dependence on war?" and he notes:

a. military action indiscriminately aiming at extermination of entire cities and areas is considered as crime (in the eyes of God and people) and is damnable (*damnandum est*);
b. arms race is becoming questionable as a means of keeping peace in view of a growing responsibility for poor in the third world countries. All this notwithstanding, the Council does not banish this method completely;
c. the Council texts do not put an absolute ban on war, or weapons of mass destruction; nevertheless, one can find in them an idea of morally justified defence, once peaceful means of action have failed (GS 79), as well as the doctrine of a just war, although it is not expressly stated and emphasised;
d. big hopes are vested into a public authority accepted by all states to oversee the objectives of universal ban on war (GS 82). In Weber's view, the Council's statements are not satisfactory on each point, but they represent a potential compromise in the Church of that time.[33]

A period following the Second Vatican Council is marked by many ecclesiastical documents on the issue of peace, among other things also because the world of that time, typified by its bipolar vision, was getting involved in armament more and more.[34]

Notably American bishops sought to address the issue of *a just war* in their letters. In the pastoral letter entitled *Challenge of Peace – God's Promise and Our Response* (1983), they set out more stringent criteria of a just war (I.C. 3), and are in favour of a ban on the use of nuclear weapons (II. C. 2). A new document *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace* was published on the 10th anniversary of the earlier letter. In it, the bishops set as their goal a complete removal of nuclear weapons. The 15th anniversary of the publication of the letter was commemorated in 1998 by 75 *American Pax Christi bishops* through their letter *The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence*. It is noted therein that a policy of deterrence with the use of nuclear weapons is nowadays becoming institutionalised, and is no longer just a transitory policy, due to which superpowers tend to keep nuclear weapons for indeterminate time.[35]

Peschke underlined what Pope Paul VI wrote in *Populorum progressio*: that progress is a new name for peace, and what John Paul II added: that peace is the fruit of solidarity.[36] Tödt brings to attention his defiance of war as an attack against

the poor.[37] Many aspects of sustainable peace are in particular covered in the Pope's messages on the occasion of January 1, *the World Day of Peace* To him, nuclear war is a very serious problem, but initially he admitted it as a means of deterrence and prevention.[38] In his address to the UN Council on October 5, 1995 he emphatically condemned the stockpiling of nuclear arms though.[39]

After the fall of communism in Europe in 1989, many bishops' conferences have responded to an emerging situation by attempting a new perspective on peace doctrine. This is illustrated by a peace message of the Commission of the Bishops' Conferences of the European Community (ComECE) „*Truth, Memory and Solidarity. Keys to Reconciliation and Peace* "of 1999.

Trends in Treating the Concept of Active Peacebuilding Over the Last Decades

In 1980, Pope John Paul II expressed his views on the driving forces of war in writing, pointing to the connection between non-truth, disappointment and violence. The falsehood of refusing to believe in man's capacity for greatness and his need to be redeemed leads to an idea that all humanity is only able to achieve progress through violent struggle with the use of power and counter-power. Once we dig deep within man and his basic driving forces, we find that his real nature carries him towards mutual respect, brotherhood and peace. His message is directed towards the primacy of morality, for the man's good.[40]

Peace research institutes claim that free democracies do not wage wars with each other, giving up military means of conflict resolution. According to Senghaas, who is a researcher from Bremen, criteria for a stable, free democracy are as follows: [41]

1. a single-handed control over power (power concentrated in state hands);
2. a legal state (corresponding with the common law conception of „the rule of law ");
3. democratic participation (collective decision-making);
4. mutual interdependence/ emotions are kept under control;
5. social justice;
6. conflict resolution culture.

Weber proposes observance and protection of human and social rights, as well as the protection of natural conditions for life as a means for preventing conflicts (which according to Tödt arise from disappointment, fear and guilt[42]). In response to appeal by Pope St. Paul VI in the encyclical *Populorum progressio*, commissions such as Pontifical commission *Justitia et pax* have been formed to cover such topics.[43]

Equally important is the idea of *a transnational arbitration court* to oversee the observance of just war criteria in line with the just war. The establishment of the International Criminal Court in 1998 was a move in the right direction. War crimes may not be left unpunished. An important role on this point is also played by OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe). Likewise, GS 79 tackles the idea of a transnational authority, and Günthör even speaks about *a*

global government. In his opinion, it will be difficult to talk about a global peace, unless the Community of nations units in one global community to be governed by an authority equipped with sufficient power to settle potential disputes. In the opposite case he cannot see any other option but specialists in ethics continuing working on the defensive war criteria.[44] Also the question of executive authority (PiT) is at the same time a question of global authority that would provide for security, but also ensure proper execution of humanitarian interventions. An important role in resolution of conflicts among states is played by the United Nations Organisation, whose competencies must, without any doubt, be extended according to the Catholic social doctrine (but which is awaiting appropriate reform). Let us recall here the important fact that the creation of the European Union has managed to maintain peace in this political zone for more than 75 years, for the first time in modern European history, despite all the problems (not least the phenomenon of coronanationalism during the COVID-19 pandemic).

The Issue of Development of Nations on Heterogeneous Territories

Treatment of minorities is one of the important issues of social ethics. Pope St. John Paul II gave his opinion on this issue in his 1989 World Day of Peace Message.[45] Treatment of minorities played a very significant role in safeguarding active peace in any of the territories. Cardinal questions of how to become a member of a nation and how nations manage to co-exist on a shared (single) territory are equally relevant for social philosophy and the philosophy of law.

Pope explicates two fundamental principles relevant in terms of protection of minorities: *inalienable dignity of every human person* (anthropologic and social-philosophical principle) and *the fundamental unity of the human race* (creation-theological principle), which takes its origin from the one God, the Creator, who, in the language of Sacred Scripture, made from one every nation of men. They present the basic manifestation of Catholic social doctrine. A commitment of seeking diversity and protection of members of the family of humankind as the expression of strengthening of such unity is a task for both communities and individuals. This is one of the forms of constructive realisation of peace.[46] In situations of real injustice against minorities, the Pope also recommends the existence of *exile associations*, which may considerably facilitate the raising of awareness about the importance of resolving such conflicts.[47] He is also strongly inclined to be in favour of the right to self-determination of nations and, as part of striving for active peace, also of the development of the code of „rights of nations“, which would incorporate the rights of minorities in the quest for an optimum solution.[48]

Tödt remarks that in the eve of World War I, Great Powers believed that the emerging problems could be rationally resolved. What followed afterwards led many people, and still leads them until today, to considerable pessimism and scepticism.[49] However, those two should not triumph in our conduct. Contrariwise, hope and a realistic worldview along with a common quest for truth, are the values to be pursued by us. At the final analysis, the entire striving to establish peace is bound to result in, on the one hand, the accentuation of the great anthropological and social relevance of *questions of cultural and ethnic identity, traditions, history and culture of nations,* and on the other hand in *a need to take caution so that these values are not perceived in absolute terms*. The rights of communities and nations are constructed in the context of authentic human development of individuals and the common good of the community of nations. Only in this way an international peace order can be built based on the exercise of justice drawing upon fundamental human and

national rights.[50]

Final Considerations for an Active Peacebuilding

A right approach to war is not achieved through its refusal, but through humans positively striving for peace. The prospects of hopes for permanent peace in the future are the same as are the prospects of love and of overcoming sin. Besides more emphasis on human rights, peace is also facilitated by the support lent to affected states by international community and organisations. Moreover, several authors maintain that it is very difficult to search for answers to the question of rightfulness of a defensive war in the Sacred Scripture, since the Bible could not have even imagined our today's military potential.[51]

Peace plays a highly significant role in Christian ethics. Where hierarchies and institutions are in charge of peace among other things, each individual can contribute towards the peace. Individuals can help to prepare conditions for peaceful coexistence, as explained by Weber.[52] However, it may happen that without a peaceful mind-set some actions, pretending to be peace-making, will be such only formally. We have a rich experience with this phenomenon from totalitarian times, when there were posters promoting peace at every corner, whilst people were deprived of fundamental human rights and freedoms.[53] Nowadays people should never be appeased by the fact that wars always used to be and will always be. Contrariwise, as shown by the Second Vatican Council, it is important that they strive to do everything possible to maintain peace.[54] Günthör adds that rulers nowadays must free themselves from nationalistic egoism and from hegemonistic aspirations. They are under an obligation to lead a dialogue and mutual consultations, so as to enable the resolution of conflicts through consensus. Individual citizens can likewise do a lot for peace, if they themselves are pervaded by the spirit of love of tranquillity, willingness to arrive at a consensus, and not by nationalistic fanaticism, racial hatred and other toxic ideologies (GS 82). A special role in this respect is to be played by educators and opinion-makers in the society.[55]

Finally, Pesch observes that war has more to do with the Seventh Commandment than with the Fifth one. It is because this commandment originally did not refer to theft, but to robbing people. Where people are deprived of their property, freedom and development potential, there is war raging there. And the Seventh Commandment is to prevent it at any cost.[56] Pesch stresses that without a brand-new ethics that would be able to defeat a deeply rooted egoism in our every-day private, as well as public attitudes, we shall surely not be able to secure global peace.[57] Each follower of Christ has the calling to become a messenger of peace, a peace-builder, as underlined by Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. However, where salvation of people did not result in peace and tranquillity, there was a danger of loss of humaneness.[58] Let us add, from the theological point of view, that real theological virtue of faith defends the hope for peace.[59]

Footnotes

[1] Helmut Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie* (Graz: Styria Premium 1999), 252.

[2] Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 243-247.

3 Jiří Skoblík, *Přehled křesťanské etiky* (An Overview of Christian Ethics) (Prague: Karolínum, 1997), 194.

4 Skoblík, Přehled křesťanské etiky, 194

5 Cf. Otto-Hermann Pesch, *Christliche Lebenspraxis*, (Würzburg: Topos plus, Kevelaer, Echter 2003), 308.

6 Karl-Heinz Peschke, *Křesťanská etika* (Christian Ethics) (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1999), 516.

7 Karl Rahner, *Über den Dialog in der pluralistischen Gesellschaft*, in Josef Römelt, Christliche Ethik in moderner Gesellschaft, Volume 2, Lebensbereiche (Freiburg- Basel- Wien: Herder, 2009), 350.

8 Pesch, Christliche Lebenspraxis, 326.

9 Peschke Křesťanská etika, 518.

10 Peschke Křesťanská etika, 516.

11 Valentin Zsifkovits, *Friede*, in Neues Lexikon der christlichen Moral (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1990), 203.

12 Peschke Křesťanská etika, 516.

13 Peschke, *Křesťanská etika*, 523.

14 Heinz Eduard Tödt, *Frieden*, in Franz Böckle, Franz-Xaver Kaufmann, Karl Rahner, Bernhard Welte (eds.), Christlicher Glaube in moderner Gesellschaft, Volume 13 (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder 1981), 82.

15 Albert Beneš OP, *Morální teologie* (Moral Theology) (Prague: Krystal, 1994), 131.

16 Eberhard Schockenhoff, *Ethik des Lebens* (Freiburg i. Breisgau: Herder, 2013), 269.

17 Those, who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, are obliged to serve in another form, cf. CCC 2311.

18 Blind obedience does not suffice to excuse those who carry out actions deliberately contrary to the law of nations. Thus, the extermination of a people, nation, or ethnic minority must be condemned as a mortal sin. One is morally bound to resist orders that command genocide (CCC 2313). This is also the case of Blessed Franz Jägerstätter of Linz, cf. accessed June 10, 2021, https://www.dioezese-linz.at/site/jaegerstaetter/english/article/22514.html.

19 Peschke, *Křesťanská etika*, 516.

20 Skoblík, Přehled křesťanské etiky, 194.

21 See Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie*, 248, by St. Augustine, *City of Good*, book 19,7 and *Contra Faustum*, Book 22,74 (in line with the ideas by Cicero and Livy).

22 Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 249.

23 Römelt, Christliche Ethik in moderner Gesellschaft, Vol. 2 Lebensbereiche, 354.

24 de Vittoria and his concept of *„ius gentium"* concerning the relations among nations *(De Indis recenter inventis* III, 2), cf. Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie,* 250. Skoblík adds that de Vittoria denies that both of the warring parties could concurrently lead a just war, cf. Skoblík, *Přehled křesťanské etiky*, 194-5.

25 Skoblík, Přehled křesťanské etiky, 195.

26 Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie*, 252, according to A.-F. Utz / J.-F. Gröner (eds.), *Aufbau und Entfaltung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Soziale Summe Pius XII.* Volume III (Fribourg, Paulus Verlag, 1954-61), 3495 (UG).

27 See Gustav Gundlach, Die Lehre Pius XII. vom modernen Krieg. in Karl Forster (ed.), Kann der atomare Verteidigungskrieg ein gerechter Krieg sein? (Munich: Kath. Akademie Bayern, 1959), 107-133, cf. Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 253.

28 See Utz / Gröner (eds.), Aufbau und Entfaltung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Soziale Summe Pius XII. Volume III, UG 2366.

29 II Vatican Council, Pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world *Gaudium et spes*, accessed June 10, 2021, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html, 79.

30 Gertraud Putz, *Krieg*, in: Hans Rotter/Günter Virt: Neues Lexikon der christlichen Moral (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1990), 395-401.

31 Tödt, *Frieden*, 113.

32 Peschke, *Křesťanská etika*, 521.

33 Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 254.

34 As a result, a joint initiative of bishops of the U.S.A., the Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Ireland, Belgium, Hungary and Japan was formed in 1983, see: Sekretariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz (ed.), *Bischöfe zum Frieden.* (Bonn, 1983). As for the German side, the pastoral letter of the Bishops' Conference of Germany *„Gerechtigkeit schafft Frieden"* of 1983 is of great importance, see Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie*, 254.

35 Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 255.

36 Peschke, *Křesťanská* etika, 518.

37 Tödt, *Frieden*, 113.

38 Address of John Paul II in the UN in 1982, see Peschke, Křesťanská etika, 526.

39 Apostolic journey of His Holiness John Paul II to the United states of America the fiftieth General assembly of the United nations organisation address of His Holiness John Paul II, accessed June 10, 2021,

https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1995/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_05101995_address-to-uno.html.

40 John Paul II, *Truth, the Power of Peace*, 1980 World Day of Peace Message, 253, see: Tödt,*Frieden*, 114-5.

41 Dieter Senghaas, *Die OECD-Welt. Zonen des Friedens* in Volker Matthies (ed.), Der gelungene Frieden. Beispiele und Bedingungen erfolgreicher friedlicher Konfliktbearbeitung (Bonn 1997), 46-64 and Dieter Senghaas, *Hexagon-Variationen: Zivilisierte Konfliktbearbeitung trotz Fundamentalpolitisierung.* in Norbert Ropers- Tobias Debiel (eds.), Friedliche Konfliktbearbeitung in der Staaten- und Gesellschaftswelt (Bonn: SEF, 1995), 37-45, cf. Weber, *Spezielle Moraltheologie*, 257.

42 Tödt, *Frieden*, 102.

43 Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 258.

44 Günthör, Morálna teológia III/b, 264.

45 „*To build peace, respect minorities*." Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II for the celebration of the World Day of Peace on 1 January 1989, Vatican, Osservatore Romano, Nr. 52/53 of 22.12.1988, cf. Werner Freistetter, *Der Heilige Stuhl und die Minderheiten. Von den „Rechten der Minderheiten" zu den „Rechten der Nationen": eine friedensethische Herausforderung* (1999), in Werner Freistetter/Christian Wagnsonner: Friede und Militär aus christlicher Sicht I., (Wien: BWMLS, 2010), 7.

46 Freistetter, Der Heilige Stuhl und die Minderheiten. Von den „Rechten der Minderheiten" zu den „Rechten der Nationen": eine friedensethische Herausforderung, 9.

47 Article 11 of the same Message of St. John Paul II, cf. Freistetter, Der Heilige Stuhl und die Minderheiten. Von den „Rechten der Minderheiten" zu den „Rechten der Nationen": eine friedensethische Herausforderung, 11.

48 Address held by John Paul II at the UN General Assembly on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its foundation on 5 October 1995, see: Freistetter, *Der Heilige Stuhl und die Minderheiten. Von den „Rechten der Minderheiten" zu den „Rechten der Nationen": eine friedensethische Herausforderung*, 12.

49 Tödt, *Frieden*, 96.

50 Address by John Paul II at the UN in 1995, Article 8, see: Freistetter, Der Heilige Stuhl und die Minderheiten. Von den „Rechten der Minderheiten" zu den „Rechten der Nationen": eine friedensethische Herausforderung, 15.

51 Pesch, *Christliche Lebenspraxis*, 266. This is also confirmed by GS 80, see: Günthör,*Morálna teológia III/b*, 259.

52 Weber, Spezielle Moraltheologie, 260.

53 Skoblík, Přehled křesťanské etiky, 196.

54 Günthör, Morálna teológia III/b, 258.

[55] Günthör, Morálna teológia III/b, 282.

[56] Pesch, Christliche Lebenspraxis, 329-330.

[57] Pesch, Christliche Lebenspraxis, 327.

[58] Tödt, *Frieden*, 116.

[59] Römelt, Christliche Ethik in moderner Gesellschaft, Vol. 2 Lebensbereiche, 394.