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Introduction

The United States has emerged from the half-century Cold War struggle as the sole remaining superpower. U.S. military and economic dominance, associated with the end of the Cold War and globalization, has intensified resentment and resistance in many parts of the world. The Middle East is the immediate flashpoint in this conflict. The so-called “war against terrorism” ignores this root cause of the violence that targets strategic American military and economic interests. The situation raises fundamental questions about human security, social justice, and the viability of present global structures and patterns of international relations.

It is crucial that U.S. citizens carefully consider the implications of these circumstances for our social engagement. How do our religious commitments relate to our responsibilities as citizens? How do we work at social justice and peacebuilding, both locally and globally, in ways that constructively engage and cooperate with our government while resisting its hegemonic practices? One needs to be discerning because even humanitarian practices, such as refugee resettlement, community development, and conflict mediation, can be used to serve imperialistic ends. Finally, how do we resist the real danger that our government’s increased focus on national security will gradually undermine our personal freedoms and democratic institutions?

John Howard Yoder’s social ethics are instructive. Yoder developed his notion of the “politics of Jesus” when the United States had just emerged as a superpower, put its stamp on a new global economic order, and became embroiled in the Cold War in the decades following World War II. He was involved in a debate between theologians Reinhold Niebuhr and Karl Barth about a faithful response to the emerging post-war international order. Yoder sought to guide appropriate social action informed by his interpretation of the social and political ethics of Jesus. Revisiting that discussion can offer insights
into appropriate social action today. Laying that aside for now, I begin with an assessment of the present post-Cold War geo-political order.

The Post-Cold War, Geo-Political Order

The beginning of the twenty-first century presents a fresh opportunity to reconsider and reformulate our understanding and practice of human security and global relations. Much of the past half-century has been dominated by the Cold War and the ideological struggle between capitalism and communism. The world order that emerged from that struggle is inherently unstable and unjust for the vast majority of the world’s people. It also puts unprecedented pressures on our natural resources and the entire ecosystem. It is imperative that we imagine and experiment with new models of local and global relations.

Habits of thought and action developed during the Cold War are no longer adequate, if they ever were. The realpolitik, or “realist” notions, developed during that era, imagined peace and stability as a balance of power in an archaic world of competing nation states. War and the continual preparation for war were seen as the prerogative and, indeed, the duty of each state in defense of its own interests. Accordingly, American foreign policy was premised on the containment of the threat of communism. Such a conception of the world had a certain operational saliency during the Cold War era. However, when the Soviet Union quickly disintegrated in 1989 most people, including professional diplomats and military planners, were caught by surprise. It was disconcerting because the assumed frame of two competing global power blocks and ideologies had disappeared almost overnight.

Politicians and strategic planners needed to reformulate how they had understood the world throughout their careers. The new situation posed different threats such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons from poorly secured Soviet stockpiles and the emergence of radical political and economic movements in various parts of the world. What has been especially troubling is that the most serious threat comes, not from other states, but from illusive non-state entities such as al-Qaida that are willing to use terror tactics to achieve their goals.

Given the degree of human suffering and disenfranchisement throughout the global South and in poor communities around the world, the emergence of many different resistance movements (including terrorist groups) is inevitable. It is a story that has been replicated in various forms throughout human history. Given the strategic position of the United States as the global hegemon, it should come as no surprise that the resistance would be directed against U.S. military and economic institutions that are believed to be responsible for the plight of poor
people. This is especially the case when the U.S. props up oppressive
governments in the Middle East and other parts of the world.

The basic challenge is to rethink and reconfigure our social and economic
structures to make them more responsive to the needs of our planet. The scope of
human suffering around the world is daunting and solutions within our existing
political and economic structures are illusive. For example, two billion people,
about one third of the world’s population, suffer from malnutrition and about
nine million people die each year from hunger-related diseases. Yet there is
enough food in the world to feed everybody, given more adequate distribution.5
This does not even consider other pressing needs such as healthcare, housing,
education, and environmental protection. We could do much better if we had the
vision and the political will to tackle such problems.

A fundamental problem is that, within the reigning political paradigm,
human security is thought of as national security. Consequently, an inordinate
and increasing amount of natural and human resources are committed to
military expenditures. During the Cold War, the U.S. government justified such
expenditures on the premise of containing communism. After the disintegration
of the Soviet Union there was a modest reallocation of resources from the
military sphere into the civilian economy. Then, at the end of the 1990s, military
spending started to slowly increase. Since the terrorist attack of 9/11, U.S.
military spending has increased from $348 billion in 2001 to $626 billion in 2007.6
The U.S. military budget is now roughly equivalent to the military expenditures
of the rest of the world combined.7 One also needs to consider that the United
States is running huge trade and budget deficits. The trade deficit exceeded $496
billion in 2003 and has been running at about $600 billion in the beginning of
2005.8

As of March 5, 2007 the total U.S. national debt stood at $8.8 trillion.9 While
annual budget deficits have decreased significantly from several years ago the
Congressional Budget Office still predicts a budget gap of $172 billion in 2007.10
Taken together, these figures indicate that the present level of military
expenditures, including the costs of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, are costing
billions of dollars to a nation with huge trade and budget deficits.11 Those
cumulative expenses are eroding the viability of the U.S. economy and are not
sustainable on the long term.

While one central aspect of U.S policy is national security, the other is free
trade in an era of globalization. Transnational corporations increasingly
circumvent national legal constraints in search of cheap labor, lax environmental
regulations, low taxes, and increased profits. As in any change of such scale,
there have been clear winners and losers. These are the causes of resistance
including act of “terrorism” that are generally overlooked or ignored in our national debate.¹²

More recently it has also become a political issue within the United States due to the outsourcing of American jobs and the economic squeeze of the poor and the middle class. Nevertheless, most Americans still have not connected massive military expenditures and economic globalization to poverty, homelessness, and crime in our neighborhoods. In frustration, we are tempted to embrace socially regressive solutions such as gated communities; budget cuts in welfare, healthcare, and education; and building prisons to incarcerate the poor.¹³ We still have not faced the reality that payments on the national debt and current military expenditures are consuming about half of our discretionary federal budget.¹⁴

The burning moral and strategic challenges at the beginning of this century include: (1) Creating a more just and sustainable global economic order; (2) reconfiguring human security in ways that reduce the inordinate amount of resources poured into military systems; (3) finding alternatives to the increasingly destructive and ineffective use of war as a tool of national foreign policy; (4) investing resources in basic human needs such as food, education, healthcare, shelter, and gainful employment; and (5) preserving natural resources and protecting our environment.

The Challenge for Religious Social Ethics

The challenge for religious social ethicists is to utilize the rich resources from our religious traditions to reconsider and reformulate our understanding and practice of global relations and human security. Because I am from a peace church tradition, I will engage the topic through that frame of reference. The Christian tradition, along with other major religious traditions, predates the modern nation-state and capitalist economic structures by many centuries; it has critically engaged many different forms of human society throughout its history. The life and teaching of Jesus is our touchstone for an authentic social ethic. The common belief that Jesus was an itinerant teacher of spiritual truths who’s primary mission was to give himself as a sacrifice for our sins undercuts Jesus’ relevance for social ethics because of the underlying assumption that he was apolitical.¹⁵

The Gospel narratives, however, demonstrate that Jesus was a nonviolent community organizer who taught and lived the reign of God in a way that stood against political and economic oppression in first century Palestinian society dominated by the Roman Empire. His healing ministry involved the inclusion of those marginalized by society into alternative communities characterized by
sharing and service, not exploitation and domination. That social stance forged
ew patterns of relationships for common people that became threatening to
social elites. It was not a mistake that the custodians of the old social order
cruelly executed him as a political subversive. These “politics of Jesus” are our
standard for right relationships within Christian communities and, by
correlation, for God’s redemptive purposes in the world.16

Jesus’ social ethics are instructive as we wrestle with the social problems in
our century, which are rooted in deeply ingrained ways of thinking about
ourselves and our world. Yoder’s groundbreaking research into the social and
political stance of Jesus changed the way many theologians and social ethicists
understand their work. In the following section, I will discuss how Yoder’s
European experience, immediately following World War II, shaped his social
ethics. Then, in the last section of my paper, I will develop my case for ways in
which some basic insights from the politics of Jesus can inform the current
American political situation.

Social Engagement in the Post-World War II Era

As a young college graduate in 1949, John Howard Yoder went to Europe on an
assignment with the Mennonite Central Committee. He was part of a cadre of
young men and women working at various relief and reconstruction projects
including the resettlement of refugees from Eastern Europe. Millions had lost
their lives when the war front swept through the region and many million more
had been uprooted as they fled before the advancing troops.17 That work gave
him a clear understanding of the horrific devastation of modern warfare and
framed his life-long passion to address social issues, especially the problem of
war. It also gave him a firsthand experience of the superpower standoff between
the United States and the Soviet Union.

A large Russian army remained positioned on the Eastern Front in a divided
Europe. American and allied troops faced them from Western Europe.
Americans tried to enlist European church leaders in the fight against
communism. Karl Barth, who had led in the German church struggle against the
Nazis, was not persuaded. Europeans resented their geo-political position of
being caught as pawns between the two superpowers and saw clear differences
between this emerging ideological standoff and the former struggle against the
Nazis.18

Yoder was doing his doctoral studies at the University of Basel and was soon
involved in discussions with various European academics and church leaders as
they struggled to find the most appropriate response to the war and the
emerging global order. Karl Barth and Oscar Cullmann, two of his teachers at Basel, were significant influences. Yoder also became involved in the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the World Council of Churches in Europe. Through those connections, he established life-long friendships with various European social activists and church leaders.19

After World War II, many Europeans simply wanted to return to where they had been in 1933 and pretend the intervening years had been a bad dream. Others, however, wanted to examine how European nationalism, with its coupling of state and church, had blinded the churches to the dangers of Nazism and made them ineffective in resisting the march toward war.20 They became Yoder’s mentors and interlocutors as he began formulating his personal response to such issues. It was an ecumenical conversation which the Europeans entered with passion because they knew that their churches had been swept along in the war fever that had engulfed the world.

The uneasy superpower standoff after the war created an added urgency to such questions. German churches now straddled the divide between East and West. Various European church leaders recognized the extent to which the church’s anti-communism had blinded them to Hitler’s true intentions in 1933. This now made them especially skeptical of the fervent anti-communism of many American church leaders.

Some of them believed that Germany must become solidly pacifist in order to finally break with past German militarism.21

The only hope for reunification and reconciliation lay in the search for what Karl Barth called a “third way.” He saw this as a middle ground between East and West and hoped that a dialogue between Christians in this altered European landscape would promote understanding between people living under opposing ideological systems.22 Others expressed deep frustration with the situation. One pastor, who had been part of the resistance against Hitler, wrote:

> We say that both parts [of Germany], as we have them today, are the occupied colonial lands of the respective victors. One must say that very clearly. We aren’t a sovereign state in the Federal Republic, but a colony of the Americans. Don’t be shocked. Just as the others are a colony within the entire Soviet empire….We are the spear’s end of the western superpowers against the East.23

It was difficult for Americans to appreciate or even understand such a point of view. They saw themselves as the liberators of Europe and the defenders of the free world. American theologian Reinhold Niebuhr was especially frustrated by Barth’s notion of finding a “third way” in the ideological and military divide
between East and West. There was ongoing tension, and occasionally outright hostility, between these two theologians from different continents. After the Russian army invaded Hungary to put down an anti-communist rebellion in 1956, Niebuhr wrote a scathing attack against Barth’s silence on the matter. He praised Barth for having led in the struggle against Nazism, but then challenged what he called Barth’s capricious conclusion that communism was not as bad as Nazism. He argued that Barth’s theology was not politically responsible. Furthermore, Barth’s political judgment was clouded by “his ill-disguised anti-Americanism and by what he regards as our ‘worship of the dollar.’”

More than a year later, Barth wrote an indirect response to Niebuhr in the form of a letter to a pastor from East Germany. He wrote that at that time he had not said a word because Niebuhr had not asked an honest question:

> It was not inspired by the real distress of a Christian seeking genuine conversation and fellowship with another, but it was addressed to me by a hard-boiled politician safe in his castle. He, as is customary with politicians who lead an opponent onto slippery ice, wished either to force me to profess his own brand of primitive anti-communism, or to expose me as a secret pro-Communist, and thus in one way or another discredit me as a theologian. What should I have said to that?”

Such European social and theological sensibilities were formative in the development of Yoder’s social ethics. He imbibed the profound European unease with the post-war economic and political order and the role of the Americans within it. The European belief that this was the raw politics of empire reinforced his inherited Mennonite distrust of such political powers. He developed a natural affinity to European scholars who shared such political views in comparison to Americans who did not.

Barth’s argument that the church is a community which transcends national ideological and military divides powerfully shaped Yoder’s understanding of the role of the church in the world. In 1954 he urged the World Council of Churches to take up the question of war because national rivalries which lead to war are a scandal within the church when they lead Christians to kill each other. Loyalty to a given nation-state too often trumped loyalty to the body of Christ. The faithful church is a global, transnational fellowship that rightfully transcends national ideological divides.

Yoder was especially concerned that American Christians were uncritically taking sides in the ideological and military struggle of the Cold War. Many believed that the Soviets would use any means possible as part of their grand, atheistic scheme of world domination. Francis Spellman, the very political
Catholic cardinal in New York, thought the nation was at war for its very soul against the brutal bludgeon of communism. The other side of this Cold War equation was that the endless demand for new markets propelled the United States on a course of global intervention. Dean Acheson, the secretary of state in the Truman administration argued, “We need markets—big markets—around the world to buy and sell....We’ve got to export three times as much as we exported just before the war if we want to keep our industry running somewhere near capacity.” Protecting those strategic interests motivated American military adventures throughout the Cold War years. The fight against communism became a rationale that conveniently hid such less altruistic motivations.

American political and economic clout in the post-war era brought new levels of prosperity and consumer spending for middleclass Americans. The average real income increased as much as it had in the previous half-century. Church membership in America was at an historical high and denominations were busy expanding programs and building projects that had been on hold for several decades because of the great depression and then the war. Yoder’s own Mennonite denomination participated in that prosperity and expansion of church programs. To many it felt like a golden era.

Yoder, however, raised awkward questions for his co-religionists. They were using their new-found prosperity to build their own congregational life and church institutions without even considering their relationships to American economic structures. In a letter to an American Mennonite church leader, he faulted the ease with which they had “taken sides in the Cold War” and “their unquestioning allegiance to the American economic system.” He complained about the parochialism of church leaders who had never left the American heartland and whose pastoral concerns, consequently, extended no further than their own backyards. They did not even understand the questions he was raising. He argued that such unthinking compliance to American social structures jeopardized their social witness and made their peace position little more than a sectarian hobby.

A Politics of Resistance and Engagement

Yoder’s social ethic is a politics of both resistance and engagement that can help guide our social involvement today. A central problem, which he addressed, is that the social and political ethics of Jesus are generally ignored or deemed to be irrelevant. He claims that this was not true in early Christian communities, but that a gradual shift took place as Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire. With rhetorical shorthand, he often referred to that development as the “Constantinian shift,” meaning the gradual identification of the church with the
dominant political structures of society. Rather than resisting hegemonic political powers the church now religiously sanctioned the actions of those powers.

The problem was further exacerbated by the Protestant Reformation. As a consequence of the Reformation, the medieval church was broken up into various national churches, tightening the fusion between church and state. The following wars of religion in Europe further linked each national church with its national government. That has been the fatal flaw of Protestant social ethics. The church was no longer the servant of all of humanity, but of a particular state or ruling class.

Furthermore, all nation-states are, to some extent, infused with nationalist mythologies which are generally racist and feed on ignorance about and fear of other cultures and societies. This is most evident when national leaders use patriotic and religious sentiments to help persuade their citizens to support a foreign war. That was evident in the recent buildup to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The buildup up to war created its own logic as powerful state propaganda was constantly repeated in the national media. Skeptical senators and other political leaders were afraid to stand in the way lest it ruin their political careers. Afterwards, even though the arguments put forward for going to war proved to be false, there was not enough political will to pursue the matter or to hold people accountable. It is as if the body politic had been infected by some strange virus. War correspondent Chris Hedges writes:

I learned early on that war forms its own culture. The rush of battle is a potent and often lethal addiction, for war is a drug....It is peddled by mythmakers—historians, war correspondents, filmmakers, novelists, and the state—all of whom endow it with qualities it often does possess: excitement, exoticism, power, chances to rise above our small stations in life, and a bizarre and fantastic universe that has a grotesque and dark beauty. It dominates culture, distorts memory, corrupts language and infects everything around it....

At such times, there is little that people with religious and moral scruples against the planned action can do. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we say “no” even though we cannot offer clear alternatives. The very act of saying no can open up the space for something new to emerge. That’s what conscientious objectors to war in the historic peace churches have consistently done when faced with participation in American wars.

Religious conscientious objectors have always struggled to balance resistance with social engagement; their example is not perfect. Nevertheless, a movement...
of service agencies grew out of the experience of refusing to participate in twentieth-century American wars. They now work around the world in many different humanitarian endeavors.37

That achievement is only one instance of resisting a destructive ideology and of practicing the politics of Jesus. Such an alternative politics, which Yoder called “body politics,” is rooted in the life of the church which has its own social structure with a crucial degree of autonomy from the nation-state. He argued that mainline Christian social ethics did not have enough distance from the all-pervasive nation-state to be authentically Christian. In contrast, his social ethic began with the social practices of the church. Those practices then model God’s purposes and the potential of all human relationships. The church becomes a witness to the way of Jesus in the larger society.

In his short book, Body Politics, Yoder developed the social implications of five different Christian practices. He insisted that the church’s internal life is also a political process. Accordingly, the issue of the church’s involvement in the wider society (education, economy, civil order) does not take a bi-polar shape involving the problem of moving from the realm of the church to the realm of politics. The church itself functions as a social organism—a polis.38

The social life of the church involves practices of moral discernment and reconciliation; of economic sharing; of breaking down human barriers such as ethnicity, gender, and social status; of valuing the gift of each member; and of a radically democratic decision making process of open conversation that respects minority positions. Each of these practices informs corresponding practices in the wider society.39

Such freedoms are fragile and need to be continuously developed and jealously guarded both within the church and in the wider society. A necessary task is to join with all people and groups who are defending the democratic institutions in our country. As America has taken on the trappings of empire, our democratic institutions have become ever more subservient to increasingly powerful economic and military forces.

In his recent book, Jesus and Empire, Richard Horsley does a groundbreaking historical and social analysis of Jesus’ resistance to Roman imperialism in first century Palestine. He relates Roman imperialism to imperialist forces within American society. There has always been a struggle between the forces of empire and our republican virtues. The so-called war against terrorism has strengthened the hand of national security ideologues within our country. Horsley writes:

The empire now belongs to global capitalism, with the U.S. government and its military as the enforcer. Of course, while increasingly decentered, global capital and its enabling instruments (such as the IMF and the World Bank)
are still heavily based in the United States and the culture it sells to the world is predominantly American. Those who selected the targets of the September 11, 2001, terror attacks had an acute sense of symbolism as well as of the real center of imperial power: the World Trade Center and the United States Pentagon.40

An especially troubling aspect of such American striving for global hegemony is the ways in which it undermines our democratic social institutions and weakens our economy. Chalmers Johnson, in his book The Sorrows of Empire, presents a sobering disclosure of the secrecy involved in the manipulation of military budgets and of the way the military has gradually infiltrated the multiple branches of the U.S. government. Consequently, the survival of our republican form of government is at stake. Johnson writes:

If present trends continue, four sorrows, it seems to me, are certain to be visited on the United States. Their cumulative impact guarantees that the United States will cease to bear any resemblance to the country once outlined in our constitution. First, there will be a state of perpetual war, leading to more terrorism against Americans wherever they may be and a growing reliance on weapons of mass destruction among smaller nations as they try to ward off the imperial juggernaut. Second, there will be a loss of democracy and constitutional rights as the presidency fully eclipses Congress and is itself transformed from an “executive branch” of government into something more like a Pentagonized presidency. Third, an already well-shredded principle of truthfulness will increasingly be replaced by a system of propaganda, disinformation, and glorification of war, power, and the military legions. Lastly, there will be bankruptcy, as we pour our economic resources into ever more grandiose military projects and shortchange the education, health, and safety of our fellow citizens.41

The challenge, once we are attuned to the possibility of such a scenario, is to critically discern our own situation and possible types of alternative politics and social actions. However, it is a mistake to think of it as a struggle that is confined to the national political arena or that it requires us to gain control of the levers of political power in order to be agents of change. Jesus’ kind of social action gives up the compulsion to be in control in order to make events come out right because such compulsion is itself a form of latent imperialism.42

Social action freed from that kind of compulsion focuses on the unmasking of destructive ideologies, on pioneering efforts in grassroots social transformation, and on victory as the transcendence of hope. It works at building networks and
strategic coalitions across various religious, ethnic, social, and national divides. It involves social analysis and developing strategies for action. It is a multifaceted, reflective practice with layers of tradition and continual development. It engages actors and forces at all social levels. It systematically creates and sustains transformative initiatives across a broad spectrum of human disciplines.

Such social action requires skills of engaging others, a deep patience in the midst of failures, and nonviolent strategies that respect the basic humanity and dignity of all people, including our enemies. It also requires a realistic assessment of our own capacities and a sober understanding of our limitations. It refuses to see the forces we are struggling against as monolithic or innately evil; instead, they seek out opportunities for transformative social engagement. One example of that kind of social action is the work of Vietnam Christian Service during the Vietnam War.

Vietnam Christian Service was an interdenominational church agency involved in supplying emergency relief aid and in providing skills training to refugees during the Vietnam War. It gradually became evident that such work was used by U.S. military planners as part of their twin objectives of destroying the Vietcong and winning the “hearts and minds” of the people. Vietnam Christian Service had a stark choice of either withdrawing in protest or continuing their work in an ambiguous situation. They decided to stay engaged, but began to shape their program in ways that made it more evident that they were not supporting the military efforts of any party in the conflict. As much as possible, they attempted to humanize all parties in the conflict and to minister to human need wherever it was found.

Accordingly, Vietnam Christian Service turned down an enticing opportunity to become a contractor for distributing relief aid under the U.S. Agency for International Development because it would have linked then more directly with the U.S. pacification strategy. They then began supplying relief aid to all parts of Vietnam, including civilian hospitals in the North. (Consequently, the U.S. embassy in Saigon warned them about breaking U.S. laws against aiding and abetting the enemy.) They also began to focus on humanitarian projects that carried a clear anti-war message such as clearing unexploded ordnance from rice fields. Near the end of the war, they facilitated interviews with common Vietnamese people for a visiting U.S. congressional delegation that was instrumental in cutting off funding for the war.

To reiterate, the challenge for religiously based initiatives in social justice and peacebuilding is to resist forces that are alien to their religious commitments while remaining engaged as broadly as possible. The act of resistance keeps us true to our core religious values. The act of engagement keeps us honest about our own strengths and weaknesses. We all live in imperfect communities, and it
can be humbling to learn lessons about our core values from others, even our enemies.

Jesus communicated and lived out his politics among marginalized Palestinian people in the Roman Empire, the most powerful imperial force in the ancient world. He resisted the Roman system of domination as carried out through client rulers such as the Herodians and the Jewish high-priestly rulers. He created a community of followers who instituted social practices such as reconciliation, economic sharing, equality, and nonviolence. As Yoder then demonstrated, in response to the challenges of the post-World War II era, the politics of Jesus continues to have saliency in a world of modern nation-states and economic structures.

The main reason we are inclined to ignore Jesus in our social and political ethics is because we think we need to ultimately resort to violence in order to socially relevant. We are now at a point in history where the fallacy of that approach has become increasingly evident. We have a new opportunity to practice the politics of Jesus in a world that is becoming more self-conscious of the disorder of a global economic and political order dominated by a single hegemon. Might it be that the politics of empire are finally playing themselves out and that the alternative politics of Jesus will again be taken seriously? My dream is that—on this basis—we can help to formulate a different kind of social order in the twenty-first century.

The change was so dramatic and disorienting to career foreign policy people that Francis Fukuyama could write of it as “the end of history” and be taken seriously. See Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, 1992). Now, a brief decade later, it has become obvious that the global political economy has entered a different era with equally formidable if not greater challenges and opportunities.
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