

## CHAPTER EIGHT “A” THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF WAR AMONG US

One of the most powerful quotations regarding war and the all-too-easy way it can be accepted as normative came from one of the most decorated heroes of the Second World War, General Omar N. Bradley. He shows how easily our culture trumps our faith; our religion is “America” before it is “Christian.” In a 1948 Armistice Day speech he declared: “*We have many men of science; too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount.*” As a result, he concluded, ours “is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace, more about killing than we know about living.”<sup>1</sup>

I grew up in Wisconsin during the Korean War. General Douglas MacArthur was a family hero. With General Bradley, he had been a leading general during the Second World War. Returning from Korea to the U.S. mainland in 1951, he spoke to Congress. In that speech he uttered a sentence that has become part of our lexicon: “Old soldiers never die, they just fade away.” Unfortunately, few of us have paid sufficient heed to another couple of sentences he said that day to the U.S. Congress: “I know war as few other men now living know it, and nothing to me is more revolting,” he stated. Then, he declared: “I have long advocated its complete abolition, as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes.”<sup>2</sup>

Whether disputes reflect dynamics at the micro or macro levels, all easily become macro when they are not resolved through conflict resolution and reconciliation. Consequently, at whatever level we discuss—divorces, strikes, walkouts, shutdowns, or lockouts—wars never occur in a vacuum. They happen as a result of power dynamics that have negated peoples’ belief that a conflict can be resolved or some damage done can be repaired. They represent a break in the relationship itself: the failure of any positive power to prevail. Negative power has had its day. Consequently, control can proceed with its destructive dynamics.

“Break-ups” are the consequence of “build ups” that lead to a “break-down,” a final straw. The consequent justification for arms will be defined as necessary and, many times, divinely supported. While it’s clear all wars reveal dynamics of control as “power over” others, they usually deal with issues of power (or control) itself, our property or possessions, and our image, reputation or prestige as individuals, groups and nations. Yet, as any amateur historian knows that, from the beginning of recorded history, battles over “turf” ultimately reveal ego and an individual’s, a group’s or a nation’s need to control.

If one would examine the source of killings between peoples in their homes, among neighbors and between nations, in one way or another, invariably such result from unresolved tensions of some sort or rage over some perceived injustice. A very clear example of this—at the domestic level—is evidenced when husbands and wives wage protracted and expensive “custody battles.” While the rationale explained regarding their effort to get “control” of their children invariably involve statements about care of the children, a deeper examination of the dynamics reveal the conflict to be a protracted way partners try to exercise continued dominance (another form of control) over each other. Indeed, even when they might be called “amicable” or “peaceful,” all divorces can have devastating effects on children.<sup>3</sup>

In the early days of writing this book, I watched on television a 2003 movie, *House of Sand and Fog*. It starred one of my favorite actors, Ben Kingsley. It tells the story of an abandoned wife, evicted from her house, which starts a tragic conflict with her home's new

owner, an emigrant Iranian couple (Kingsley and Shohreh Aghdashloo, who received an Academy Award nomination for her role as the wife). They have come to the United States in search of security. Just as they begin to find that security—dramatized in the purchase of their new house (which the previous owner believes has been unjustly seized from her)—tensions escalate between them and her. The conflict eventually leads to a full-scale war; it destroys all involved: emotionally, spiritually and, finally, mortally. The American dream, centered in brick and mortar, turned into a nightmare, destroying them all.

The United States--no stranger to wars within its boundaries and involvement in wars beyond its shores--has been conceived and constituted, created and acculturated to existing on a permanent war footing vis-à-vis its understanding of its rights related to property. In the 10<sup>th</sup> Federalist paper, James Madison argued that the main purpose of government was to arbitrate disputes arising from conflicts over property rights. A natural development of this thinking came in the notion of “manifest destiny” (i.e., a divinely directed dictate) that the white man was called to expand the nation’s boundaries from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This opened the doors to other territorial acquisitions and/or conquests. Advocates of Manifest Destiny believed in the ideology that such expansion was not only good, but inevitable (“manifest”) and ordained (“destiny”).

One a catch phrase of the 19th century, "Manifest Destiny" eventually became a synonym for U.S. expansionism beyond the nation’s boundaries. With James Monroe the notion involved extending the nation’s influence beyond our borders; this was the called the Monroe “Doctrine.”

This ideology continued into the third millennium. To ensure access to key resources deemed invaluable to the “national interest” or any threat to “our lifestyle,” the advisors and administration of George W. Bush promoted a policy justifying pre-emptive military strikes anywhere these interests and “our way of life” might be perceived to be jeopardized. At the same time a minority of the millions of U.S. Christians raised their voice in opposition with an appeal to understanding and conflict-resolution rather than pre-emption and first strikes. Why?

### **What Makes Us War-like?**

We become who we are, in great part, by the influence of that part of the world wherein we are located. Consequently, we are a “*mixtum compositum*” of nature and nurture. Given the all-pervasiveness in the U.S.A. of war and, if not all-out war, at least a militaristic approach toward life, one must naturally ask about the source of this form of violence in our perceptions and emotions, in our thinking and feelings (if not always expressed in our behavior) as individuals, groups and a nation itself. What makes us warring and so violence-prone?

Given what we said before about “manifest destiny,” we in the United States seem to have inherited a kind of godly overlay justifying our war-likeness. Somehow, if we are the ones divinely chosen to conquer evil, if this leads to war, such is the price of being faithful. The result of this sense of divine destiny not only leads to an attitude of war’s inevitability; it also results in our consequent need to be on perpetual war footing. To use the image of the philosopher and Jungian psychologist James Hillman, in his *A Terrible Love of War*, it even becomes our religious obligation, as the “savior of the world,” to engage in war when we decide (often independent of any other nation [“you are either with us or against us”]) that this is the only way conflicts can be resolved.

Noting that Ares was the Greek god of war, Hillman argues that, in a nation like the United States, Ares constitutes a critical part of our national identity; it’s the DNA of the U.S.A. If Peggy Noonan noted earlier that violence seems to be the waters in which we swim, he makes it clear that this water’s H<sub>2</sub>O reveals a DNA of toxic energy containing ingredients of a certain inevitability. He declares:

Wars could not happen unless there were those willing to let them happen. Conscripts, slaves, indentured soldiers, unwilling draftees to the contrary, there are always masses ready to answer the call to arms, to join up, get in the fight. There are always leaders rushing to take the plunge. Every nation has its hawks. Moreover, resisters, dissenters, pacifists, objectors, and deserters rarely are able to bring war to a halt. The saying, “Someday they’ll give a war and no one will come” remains a fond wish. War drives everything else off the front page.<sup>4</sup>

Unlike so many other “developed” nations, for some many of us in the United States, it almost seems that, when a potential conflict arises, our natural (national?) inclination is ordered to prepare for fight with winners and losers rather than immediately invite us to ask: how can we make this a win/win situation? This can even apply to real or potential conflicts within the nation as we—as evidenced in the example below.

A frightening and quite unbelievable example of this readiness to fight among ourselves came to me when I realized that Milwaukee, the city where I live, represents a clearly possible domestic war zone. Given the increasingly scarce supply of water, especially in the south, I was not that surprised to read comments from a key Republican from Texas, then House Majority Leader, Dick Arme of Texas. Noting that the Great Lakes provide so much water to states like ours, while Texas has so little, rather than suggesting the need for discussions around some kind of sharing, he declared: “I’m from Texas and down here we understand that whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over. If we get (control of it) in Washington, we’re not going to be buying it. We’ll e stealing it. You are going to have to protect your Great Lakes.”<sup>5</sup>

I find it fascinating (as well as frustrating regarding the success of our Church’s internal “evangelization”) how many U.S. Catholics supported the two Gulf Wars overseen by the Presidents Bush. They did this, even though the U.S. Bishops, as well as the Vatican and two Popes, did not. Again the “religion” of Americanism trumped their Catholicism. They were “Americans” first and foremost; their Catholicism was an adjunct to this dominant religion.

This reality leads me to recall an incident I had in Encino, California during the First Gulf War. I was giving a retreat in an affluent parish there. On the third night, I opened my talk by asking the participants if they had any thoughts or questions related to the material I had shared previously. At that a man in the front row raised his hand.

“Father, as I have listened to you,” he said, “I am beginning to think that you do not always support what our Holy Father says.”

“What makes you say that,” I responded?

“I don’t know for sure, but it just seems you are not 100% supportive of what the Pope says. And, if this is true, I’m not coming back.”

At that I realized the gauntlet had been thrown down. I also realized that everyone in the pews throughout the church was now truly listening!

“Well, let me ask you a question that might color what I’m going to say,” I responded. “Do you support everything the Pope says?”

“Yes I do, Father. And if you are a priest and do not support what the Pope says, I wonder how you can be considered a ‘good priest’ and whether I should be returning tomorrow to hear you.”

“Are you sure you support everything the Pope says,” I probed further?

“Yes, and you should too,” he replied, with wonderful sincerity.

“Well let’s examine the kind of things the Pope talks about,” I suggested.

At that (since I always use a writing instrument of some kind when I talk), I wrote on the board the words: “What the Pope says.” Beneath these words I made three columns. I explained that papal teaching covers three main areas: issues regarding power and authority in the church, sexual and reproductive issues, and social concerns. In the first column I wrote “ordination,” the role of “women” and “canon law.” In the second I jotted notions related to cohabitation, birth control, abortion and same-sex relationships. Under “social concerns” I wrote “poverty,” “human rights” and “war.”

As I wrote “war,” I said: “By the way, we have a war going on right now. And I am in Southern California. If I read the papers correctly, the vast majority of people in the United States support this war and, even more so, people in Southern California say we should be there. However, the Pope says this war is not justifiable. So,” I said, kind of winking at the man, “if you support the war, you are not agreeing with everything that the Pope says.”

At that, his face broke out in a big smile: “We’ll see you tomorrow night, Father,” he said. The rest of the church broke out laughing—maybe as much in relief that another conflict had been avoided as in my great insight!

As a follower of St. Francis, I have been intrigued for years by the way he responded to the violence that was *de rigueur* in his day. Regarding the culture of his day, a key biographer, Arnaldo Fortini (mayor of Assisi in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) wrote that the people of Francis’ day were immersed in violence and war. This reality created a war-like mentality. It captured the people (all Christians in that part of Italy) in such a way that they “could not even imagine a faith that was not sustained by military skill.”<sup>6</sup> As Francis experienced the ways of the people of Assisi in their various conflicts (Christianity vs. Islam, Pope vs. Emperor, Assisi vs. Perugia, nobles vs. merchants [and even Francis himself with his Father]), he intuited that the root of all the wars among all these combatants rested in issues related to power (feudalism), property (materialism) and pride (egoism [individual or collective]). Consequently, he invited his brothers to an alternative way of peace. He refused to be part of them. He said: “if we had any possessions, we would need arms to protect them because they cause many disputes and lawsuits. And possessions usually impede the love of God and neighbor. Therefore we do not want to possess anything in this world.”<sup>7</sup> He came to imagine faith itself in another form: the evangelical way rather than that defined by nationalism and militarism.

### **Why Do We Go to War?**

If violence can never be justified, it is irrational to think of a war as an apt means to vindicate violated rights,<sup>8</sup> especially when it can become nuclear war so easily. While our religious leaders have written about this, why do we still find ourselves continually preparing for and justifying our wars? While we regularly limit our “wars” to those that take place among states or groups within nations (i.e., civil wars) and ethnic communities, we know they also have their parallels among conflicted parties in labor disputes, between husbands and wives in deteriorating marriage and children with parents as well.

None of these wars occur within a power vacuum. Dynamics build up among conflicted entities. If unchecked, these only need a precipitating cause for the combatants to wage and remain at war.

From his analysis of the dynamics that created and sustained the two World Wars and the Korean War, the historian, Ralph K. White discovered all wars have a precipitating cause. This is preceded by underlying or attitudinal perceptions. For example, the First World War would not have occurred when it did simply because of the killing of the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria by a Serbian nationalist. Austria and Serbia had been saber rattling for a long time before this

incident. In a parallel vein, it is less likely there would have been the Second World War had the Treaty of Versailles not been imposed on the losers of the First World War, or by even by the invasion of Poland. The thought is always the parent of the action; the combatants involved must be buttressed ideologically by a war-like mentality before any real shots are fired.

White discovered that all parties in a conflict tend to justify their "cause" for going to and remaining at war by appealing to six attitudes. These attitudes become the ideological fodder that justifies the war that protects the interests of the combatants and their institutions. In our day, leading up to and during the two Iraqi wars, both sides viewed each other according to the six underlying attitudes listed below. By invoking them unconsciously, an ideology was created that justified war making on both sides.<sup>9</sup> Ideologically captive by these underlying attitudes, both the "evil" Baathists and the "enemy" Americans (and their "Coalition Forces") were viewed by each other as the cause of the conflict while they themselves were divinely blessed for trying to stop the evil represented in the other.

1. The first step in any conflict involves interpretations of one's opponent in terms of the *diabolical enemy-image*. The other is seen as diametrically opposed to the good that one represents. The enemy Vietnamese were "the gooks;" they could never be trusted. Even their eyes showed how slanted and shifty they were! The enemy Americans were "the running-dog imperialists;" their soldiers were the lackeys of the capitalists who were trying to take over the world.
2. The "*virile*" *self-image* provides the needed weapons for ultimate success. Whether these armaments be words or silence, missiles or guns, each side believes it has the resources to win. The Vietnamese outlasted the Japanese and French with guerrilla warfare; in the same way they would also beat the United States. The United States was the strongest nation on earth; it had never lost a war. It would bomb the Vietnamese into submission. Furthermore, if it lost Vietnam, all the other nations would fall like dominoes. To capitulate would be humiliation.
3. Buttressed by a *moral self-image*, both sides view themselves as peace loving and rational, orderly and just. In the U.S. we prayed to God in our churches to support us in promoting our democratic values so we could remain free of atheistic communism. The Vietnamese saw themselves as protecting their nation from yet another colonizer, like the French. Toward this goal they prayed to their Buddhist idols. But, while observing this, we knew that, with Cardinal Spellman blessing the troops and Billy Graham blessing our Commander-in-Chief, God had to be on our side.
4. *Selective inattention* focuses on the extremes; mitigating circumstances and significant historical background get short shrift. The Vietnamese refused to consider that their internal conflicts helped create a situation that resulted in many people calling for outside aid. Similarly, U.S. patriots refused to recall that, like the United States, Vietnam was going through its own revolutionary war. The founders were incensed when the Prussians helped the British colonizers try to squelch the fledgling independence movement; we could not empathize with them when the Viet Cong felt the same.
5. The *lack of empathy* means that both sides are unable to see matters from the other's view. Indeed, neither side really cares what the other thinks or feels. The Vietnamese were so controlled by their fear of the "Americans" as the

personification of evil, that they were blinded by their own demagoguery. The Americans, controlled by an ideology reflecting the white experience, never understood the Asian mind. What resulted from this insensitivity, coupled with the previous attitudes, led to the final step.

6. Each side developed a superiority complex based on a false or *irrational interpretation of reality*. Both sides were so controlled by their ideologies and subjective interpretations that it was simply impossible for them to think otherwise. Each side viewed itself as correct and justified in its position. Anyone within those nations who questioned the "party line" would be considered disloyal and traitorous. Thus Catholics in North Vietnam who wanted to worship freely were considered subversive. Those in the United States who questioned the morality of the war were suspect, if not actual communists.

When such ways of thinking are reinforced and cultivated by the media and educational processes, people develop a stance toward the other, the "enemy," as "evil" and themselves as "just" and "right;" these become the justifications for going to all-out war when a "last straw" is placed on the ideological haystack. Both sides have convinced themselves no alternative exists but to "go to war."

When we consider the "isms," or unequal power arrangements, within the various institutions, it quickly becomes clear that the resulting "wars" are not limited to nation states or tribal groups within states such as the Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda or the warring tribes in Kenya. The same pattern exists in Northern Ireland between the Catholics and Protestants or parts of Canada between the English-speaking and French-speaking. They can be found in our U.S. politics, when both "sides" justified their rightness (and righteousness) when it was being decided which presidential candidate had "won" the November, 2000 election. We also find it alive and well when in our lockouts and "strikes" at plants that get justified by both labor and management as necessary for survival. We find it in our church between "Vatican I" and "Vatican II" Catholics as well.

The result finds us in the midst of "wars" between labor and management, doctors and nurses, chauvinist priests and uppity nuns, etc. As long as the attitudes persist of "*they* always/never" or "why can't *they*" define the relationship in negativity, all that is needed, if they persist long enough, will be a precipitating cause. When this comes along, a war or break of some kind cannot be far behind.

Sad to say, in my own life, I found that Ralph White's discovery about the dynamics that lead nations to "go to war" can be easily replicated in "domestic" wars as well. I know, because I was one of the main combatants.

As I've outlined in another book,<sup>10</sup> unresolved tensions with a Brother with whom I lived as a Capuchin Franciscan led both of us to consider each other from the six perspectives noted above. All we needed was a precipitating cause to find us ready to "kill each other." Being the vowed Franciscans that we were, we did not resort to physical weapons; rather our conflict became psychological. It even became a kind of religious warfare because our core differences involved opposite understandings regarding spirituality itself. While, theoretically, we went to war over unresolved conflicts related to our differing spiritualities, practically, at its core, our conflict was basically about domination: one had to be right. This made the other wrong.

This experience convinces me that, unless we stop the "stinkin' thinking," as we learn in Twelve Step Programs, such attitudes will be toxic and can ultimately destroy not just otherwise

quite positive and healthy relationships, but our souls in the process. Until we find alternative ways of resolving our conflicts, we will remain at war. With God on our side(s).

### **Why Do We Remain at War—to Our Own Destruction?**

In my own wars, I find two main reasons why I will not lay down my arms vis-à-vis those with whom I am in conflict: selective inattention and pride. We noted above that, in the ways of thinking we cultivate in order to go to war, “selective inattention” is a key element. We concentrate on those characteristics and behaviors of our “enemy” that are negative. We refuse to give proper due, give equal play or balance to the positive. We dwell on notions and stances that support our righteousness, the other’s wrongs and filter those that would make us have a more nuanced stance to our position. Another reason why we remain at war involves pride. We can’t admit we might have been wrong; to do otherwise would mean capitulation. I can’t admit that I might have over-reacted or may have been too selective in my critique or in my stance. In the process of trying to put others down, I destroy a bit of myself.

We all know of seemingly once-intact families going to war—and remaining there forever—over inheritances. In the process all involved, even the innocent parties, get hurt and are bereft of the opportunity to benefit from the care of each other. I personally know of one such family where one person has become separated from siblings and cousins, children and grandchildren. All of this has undermined what once was a very close family dynamic.

What we do in our own relationships plays out in our institutions as well. Moving to dynamics in structures that keep us at war, we can ask: Why do some otherwise quite intelligent people become so accustomed to preparing for war that they are willing to destroy themselves in the process? According to the Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget, in 2004 the U.S. spent \$439 billion for its military (not including additional spending for Iraq and Afghanistan). This \$439 for our military budget was 35 times larger than the *combined* spending of those countries that have been continually listed as our most serious threats: Iran, North Korea, Syria, Cuba and Sudan. For every dollar paid in federal income taxes in the United States, 30 cents has gone to the military while 3 cents has been paid in veterans’ benefits. Of every tax dollar, 4 cents goes to education.<sup>11</sup> We are making ourselves feel secure on the backs of the next generation. No other nation in the world spends what we do to make ourselves “feel safe” and secure our “lifestyle,” yet we remain the “most fearful” of all “developed” nations. The debt we pay to be “secure” from our enemies undermines our very survival as a people.

This was made clear in testimony before a Joint Economic Committee of Congress in early 2008. Nobel Prize-winner (for economics) Joseph Stiglitz and Robert Hormats, Vice Chairman of Goldman Sachs International, talked about the huge opportunities for building up the nation because of military costs related to the Second Iraq War. Hormats argued that both Social Security and Medicare could have been put “on a more sustainable basis,” citing the Committee’s own calculations that showed that money spent on the war *each day* would be enough to enroll an additional 58,000 children in Head Start for a year, or make a year of college affordable for 160,000 low-income students, or pay the annual salaries of nearly 11,000 additional border guards of 14,000 more police officers.<sup>12</sup>

Why do nations like ours self-destruct in this way? Why has permanent “war-footing” become a way of life for some peoples, like us in the United States? Why are we the only nation with a national policy of being prepared to wage two full-scale wars at the same time? A key reason, I believe, has much to do with what Hillman calls “the religion of war.”

As with any religion, ours comes complete with its own powerful creed, its code and cult.<sup>13</sup> It has faithful and loyal worshippers; i.e., the citizenry ready to be mobilized

(manipulated) quite quickly and with little critique to support the war effort. In the case of the United States, our “religion of war” has had as one of its Lieutenant Generals, William G. “Jerry” Boykin who was unchallenged by his Commander in Chief (as far as I know, at least) after saying, in relation to a Muslim warlord in Somalia: “I knew my God was bigger than his. I knew that my God was a real God and his was an idol.” Why? For him it was quite simple: “because we’re a Christian nation, because our foundation and our roots are Judeo-Christian . . . and the enemy is a guy named Satan.”<sup>14</sup>

What we find about war itself has an even-deeper dimension when we ask why we seem more resigned to violence and killings than non-violent alternatives to them. This is especially true in the ideologically laden discussions regarding guns and our schools. Rather than address the gun culture that keeps many students afraid to go to school, we resign ourselves to get used to more. This became clear to me in the same week of 2008 wherein more students were killed at Northern Illinois University in De Kalb—because of a grudge—and a 15 year-old was gunned down by another boy a year younger—because the former acted effeminately. In response, the *Los Angeles Times* carried a page-one story: “Tragedy, Time and Again.” The subtitle explained: “A *Times* reporter who has interviewed school shooters and attended vigils finds only one answer to the violence: Prepare her children.”<sup>15</sup> “Prepare your children,” not to find alternatives to the violence, but for more.

As long as we (especially we Christians) consider the “other” as a real or potential enemy (*in + amicus*), like the people who lived at the time of Francis of Assisi, we simply cannot imagine another way of faith that will make us make ourselves into one family called humankind. This challenges us to stop thinking of such others as “evil” or our “enemy” and make them, if not friends, at least people toward whom we should extend the hand of peace. This is the attitude that must break down all contrary barriers that say why we are right and the other is wrong and, if taken to the extreme, can justifying killing in the name of such honor terms like “loyalty,” “fidelity” and “patriotism.”

In *Jesus and the Disinherited*, African American theologian, Howard Thurman wrote: “During times of war hatred becomes quite respectable, even though it has to masquerade often under the guise of patriotism.”<sup>16</sup> In other words, something about war can easily lead to hatred among those who end up fighting each other. If wars are prolonged enough or are terrible enough, a certain kind of brutality can easily result. A direct consequence of this will be hatred, as Thurman realized. And, again, because we Christians know “hating” is sinful, our disdain for the “other” has to be masked under the guise of grace and righteousness. Rather than making the enemy a friend, through honest be-friending, we resort to name-calling, scapegoating, projection and other forms of incivility. This leads us to the next chapter: a discussion of hate itself.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> General Omar N. Bradley, “An Armistice Day Address,” November 10, 1948 in *The Collected Writings of General Omar N. Bradley I*, (Washington: Library of Congress, 1967-1971), 588-589.

<sup>2</sup> General Douglas MacArthur, Speech to Congress, April 19, 1951 in Douglas MacArthur, *A Soldier Speaks: Public Papers and Speeches of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), 250.

<sup>3</sup> This is the result of a study by Elizabeth Marquardt, author of *Between Two Worlds*. For a summary of the results, see Tamar Lewin, “Poll Says Even Quiet Divorces Affect Children’s Paths,” *The New York Times*, November 5, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> James Hillman, *A Terrible Love of War* (New York: Penguin Press, 2004), 22.

<sup>5</sup> Dick Arney, 2000 in Traverse City, MI, in Tom Barrett, “Approve the Compact and Protect the Great Lakes,” *The*

---

*Milwaukee Journal*, January 27, 2008, Crossroads Section, 3J.

<sup>6</sup> Arnaldo Fortini, *Francis of Assisi*, trans. Helen Moak (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 244.

<sup>7</sup> Francis of Assisi, in “The Anonymous of Perugia,” 3.17, in Regis J. Armstrong, O.F.M.Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M.Conv., and William J. Short, O.F.M., *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents*, II (New York: New City Press, 2000), 41.

<sup>8</sup> See Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, 127, in Joseph Gremillion, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice: Catholic Social Teaching Since Pope John* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), 227.

<sup>9</sup> Ralph K. White, *Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1970).

<sup>10</sup> Michael H. Crosby, *Spirituality of the Beatitudes: Matthew’s Vision for the Church in an Unjust World*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005), 162-67.

<sup>11</sup> For more on such data, see Inter-Faith Peacemakers of Edina (MN). PO Box 24411, Edina, MN 55424.

<sup>12</sup> Robert Hormats, quoted in Bob Herbert, “The \$2 Trillion Nightmare,” *The New York Times*, March 4, 2008.

<sup>13</sup> Hillman, 178-191.

<sup>14</sup> William G. “Jerry” Boykin, quoted in Richard T. Cooper, “General Casts War in Religious Terms,” *The Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 2003.

<sup>15</sup> Stephanie Simon, Column One, “Tragedy, Time and Again” *Los Angeles Times*, February 16, 2008.

<sup>16</sup> Howard Thurman, *Jesus and the Disinherited* (Nashville and New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury Press, 1949), 77.