

**For Human Rights and Civic Freedom:
Movements for Democratic Change in the Arab World**

Acting from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)’s long commitments to democracy, religious freedom, and human rights, believing these to be rooted in God’s promised reign of justice for all people, and responding to the wave of democratic changes in the Arab world begun in 2011, the 220th General Assembly (2012):

1. Approve the following affirmations and directions for its mission and witness:

a. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), represented by its General Assembly, honors the courageous witness of millions of Tunisians, Egyptians, Libyans, Syrians, Yemenis, Bahrainis, Palestinians, and others who are seeking a major transition to democracy—sometimes despite violence and distortions—lifting up in particular commitment to peaceful change based in shared moral conviction and spiritual discipline. Movements for democratic change will continue to face obstacles (described below), reinforcing the need for wise international policies to encourage genuine self-determination, independence, and protection of minorities.

b. “As Christians we dare not be oblivious to the erosion of human freedom wherever or to whomever it occurs. Nor dare we feel detached from the courageous actions of fellow Christians who risk life, liberty and reputation in witnessing to truth and justice in their own societies. ‘If one suffers, all suffer.’” This affirmation from “Christian Social Witness in Repressive Societies and United States Responsibility,” of the 186th General Assembly (1974) of the PCUSA, pp 160, 598, continues to represent the commitment undergirding the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)’s support for the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (1948).

c. In mission and ecumenical partnerships with indigenous Christians, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) seeks to continue its educational, medical, religious, and justice work in ways that support the fulfillment of human aspirations and the freedom of all citizens to worship without discrimination, including ancient Christian communities and other religious minorities. In this service, the church will continue to differentiate its mission, even in humanitarian relief, from the work of the United States military and other governmental agencies.

d. As a Christian community based in the United States, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) affirms our heritage of separating government from religious control and yet allowing faith communities to witness for fair and wise public policies. In the Arab world, and the larger Muslim world, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) supports practices of mutual respect, tolerance, and understanding based on principles of international law and diplomacy. Aware of historic differences between Muslim and Christian understandings, the church sees these addressed best through dialogue, diplomacy, and respectful presence that recognize the importance of religion in societies. This approach is

to give religious leaders standing in public debate without making religion an instrument of the state, or vice versa.

e. Particularly in light of widespread resentment resulting from U.S. governmental support for undemocratic regimes, the church confirms its opposition to policies that support dictatorships, repress populations, and enable religious or ethnic discrimination. Such policies involve costly military aid (including security training and shared surveillance) that enables indefinite imprisonment without due process, torture of citizens and immigrants, and arrangements for military bases that exploit local weaknesses and compromise our country's values. This approach recognizes that privileged alliances with the militaries of other nations may weaken civilian democracy in those nations and here at home, and that one people's stability should never be sustained by another people's subjugation.

f. The significant role of women in movements for democratic change is notable, welcome, and appropriate. Given the abuse of women that has occurred in protests and the government crackdowns on demonstrators, the church should maintain vigilance and commitment to equal rights, social protections, and access to reproductive health treatment for women in the Middle East and elsewhere, recognizing that respect for human dignity can be expressed in a range of religious and cultural forms.

g. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) finds the refusal of the United States to accept jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court to be inconsistent with respect for law, detrimental to global leadership, and destructive of human rights standards. U.S. security and policy officials, as well as the military, covert, and contractor agents of those policies, should be subject to legal accountability for abusive or criminal activities in all countries where they serve, precisely to discourage unilateral uses of force that are both costly and counterproductive.

h. Grieving the last decade of war and distraction from economic and ecological realities, the General Assembly affirms the need for extensive public debate and greater transparency on decisions to use military force. The assembly affirms the national and international legal processes of the War Powers Act and the United Nations Security Council to ensure that military intervention of any kind is undertaken as a "last resort" and reflects a high consensus among democratic nations that it may serve a "just peace." The practices of undeclared war, including cyber attack, targeted killing by drone aircraft and other means, covert infiltration and "false flag" operations (that set up others for blame), expand government power, and threaten civil liberties as well as the national sovereignty of other nations. This recognizes that General Assemblies have supported humanitarian military intervention to prevent genocide (as in 1998), while favoring non-military intervention insofar as possible.

i. Threats of terrorism should be addressed primarily as matters of international policing and as part of the civilian criminal justice system, given the dangers of military overreaction, indefinite counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations,

and possible abuse of due process. The denial of due process to anyone, anywhere, makes everyone, everywhere, vulnerable to abuses in the name of national security.

j. In determining legitimate U.S. national interests amid changing regional alliances and shifts in power, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) affirms that human rights standards are vital to our national identity and purpose, as well as rooted in our Reformed awareness of sin and historical complexity. Support for democratic freedoms is of greater long-term value than guaranteeing access to cheap labor or resources by military alliances and bases. Greater security is likely from an environmentally proactive strategy to minimize global disruptions due to famine, extreme weather events, forced migrations, ethnic or religious cleansing, land seizures, and states with failed governance.

2. Based on the preceding affirmations, approve the following measures:

a. For study and action by members and congregations:

(1) Members and congregations of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) are encouraged to consider prayerfully the biblical message as it relates to the behavior of nations and the role of the church in influencing government policy, understanding that Reformed Christians have consistently sought to reform society as part of their witness to God's justice in the world. In their reflection on this resolution, members and congregations are encouraged to familiarize themselves further on the democratic and Islamist struggles across Northern Africa, the Middle East, and SW-Central Asia, and to consider appropriate forms of solidarity with Christian communities in these regions.

(2) Church councils (sessions) and presbyteries that develop partnerships with churches and ministries in other countries are encouraged to consult with Presbyterian World Mission personnel and to consider the justice implications of travel and other arrangements. Presbyterians are encouraged to consider travel in predominantly or partly Arab and Muslim countries, taking into account justice and security concerns, and connecting when possible with Christians in those nations. The World Mission ministry area is requested to provide appropriate regional travel guidance and advice on how not to jeopardize church partners.

(3) Members and congregations, and the church as a whole, are encouraged to consider what an "awakening" might mean for the United States, whether in counting the costs of recent wars, recognizing or memorializing all those dead and wounded in order to honor and learn from their sacrifices, or supporting social movements that deepen our own democratic processes and strengthen moral values.

b. In conjunction with the Peace Discernment process authorized by the 219th General Assembly (2010), and in relation to U.S. foreign and military experience and policy:

(1) Members and friends of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), particularly those with experience in Arab and/or Muslim countries, are encouraged to share their responses to this resolution and other reflections on their work or service. The Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy is directed to provide a suitable web posting of all respectful viewpoints (www.pcusa.org/acswp; a section of www.justiceUnbound.org may also be devoted to this discussion).

(2) Members, congregations, agencies, and ecumenical bodies are encouraged to consider new options in foreign policy and to support efforts of the United Nations Security Council and Department of Peace-Keeping Operations to implement alternative forms of peacebuilding, including unarmed civilian peacekeeping and nonviolent intervention, public initiatives of mutual forgiveness, and truth and reconciliation commissions, and to share their reflections on the work of these bodies and initiatives.

(3) Presbyterian elected officials, diplomats, and administrators in areas addressed in this resolution are invited to respond to the affirmations and background statement and to participate in briefings, seminars, and adult education programs. The General Assembly recognizes the moral pressure that concerns for human rights, security, self-determination, and political survival put upon all participants in the U.S. political process.

(4) Presbyterian military leaders and civilian defense officials are invited to consider and respond to the concerns of the church in light of their understanding of the complex and changing threats to the United States, its allies, and other nations. Chaplains and others teaching and supporting military or security personnel are encouraged to explore methods that work with conscience and trauma (including “soul repair”).¹ Such new approaches to reconciliation may prevent abuses of human rights (including women in the military itself) and spiritual damage to soldiers (whose addiction and suicide rates have been increasing).

c. For action by agencies of the General Assembly:

(1) The Office of the General Assembly is directed to support the reflection and action of members by making the text of this resolution available electronically and in a limited print run suitable for sharing with elected representatives, military leaders, and ecumenical partners in the United States and overseas.

(2) The Office of Public Witness, the Presbyterian Ministry at the United Nations, and other ministries of the Presbyterian Mission Agency/GAMC are directed to represent and advocate for policies consistent with the affirmations above, including measures to expand the role and funding of international diplomacy, peace-keeping, and peace-building; to encourage the protection of human rights and civil liberties, for all citizens and communities; to increase support for nuclear nonproliferation and a nuclear-

free Middle East; to advocate for treaties to strengthen international justice systems; to strengthen safeguards over government (and commercial) electronic surveillance and data collection; to develop public guidelines on the use of drone aircraft in targeted killings; to reduce the influence of private contractors on military procurement policy and operation of military bases; and to strengthen ethics, disclosure, and conflict of interest policies for agents of foreign governments and others lobbying and advocating on behalf of foreign interests and military engagement.

(3) The Presbyterian Ministry at the United Nations and other ministries of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) are encouraged to observe Interfaith Harmony Week in the first week of February and other measures to build understanding and minimize hostility among faiths, in accordance with the General Assembly's 1997 statement on Respectful Presence.² Appropriate PC(USA) bodies are encouraged to cooperate with the Fellowship of the Middle East Evangelical (Protestant) Churches and other partners in assessing such efforts and their implications for the life and witness of Middle Eastern Christians.

RATIONALE

Summary:

This is a U.S. Christian response to the outpouring of hope that has challenged dictatorships in the Middle East, Africa, and several Asian countries. Along with hope, there has also been rage at injustice, sometimes misdirected, and desire for better material life. Each country has its own particularities, and our partners within these countries differ by age and institutional perspective, with younger Arab Christians often expressing more optimism. Overall this movement has changed assumptions about Arab and Muslim religion and politics, and called into question foreign policies that have too often enabled authoritarian leaders or accommodated oligarchies. The church's traditional support for democracy and human rights is applied to this new context, with sensitivity to Christian-Muslim relations and advocacy for the rights of religious minorities—Christian in many cases. Military and political leaders have underestimated religious and ethnic dynamics, such as the assertion of Shia identity across many nations. One objective is to provide guidance to members and councils of the church that moves beyond the common image that Muslims-are-dangerous-and-undemocratic. Yet, we must acknowledge that public opinion of the U.S. in the Arab world is strongly negative³ and that some groups gaining power by democratic means may not be committed to religious freedom, equal rights for women, and other human rights.

This resolution thus encourages stronger U.S. support for democratic transitions and a recovery of a clearer respect for human rights. This means shifting diplomatic, aid, and military policies to back fundamental human aspirations and not sacrificing them to stability and access to oil. With the advance of their own healthy forms of democracy, and with more positive relationships between the Arab world and the Western powers, we can have realistic hope that war and terrorism will lessen and pressure on Christian and other religious minorities will diminish—though not overnight, or without risk of continued suffering. Because this calls for a significant transition in U.S. foreign policy, this background rationale summarizes some of the major recent policy debates about U.S. force projection in and beyond the Iraq and Afghan wars.

Historical Context:

The “Arab Awakening” of 2011 that has brought new leaders to power in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, and elsewhere has revealed a long-suppressed thirst for freedom and democracy across the Arab world and beyond. Despite the efforts of dictators and their security forces, much of the new social mobilization has been peaceful, nonviolent, and committed to freedom of press, assembly, and other forms of open communication. This widespread movement has altered power relations fundamentally even in states whose leaders remain in place and violence is used, such as Syria, and is affecting international alliances in an equally profound way. The 2011 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to three women, one from Yemen and two from Liberia, lifting up their work for democratic change in their countries and implicitly encouraging the further spread of peaceful methods. These women are Tawakkol Karman, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, and Leymah Gbowee.⁴ The role of a U.S. peace theorist, Gene Sharp, has been widely debated, based on the tactics and ethos of nonviolence used.⁵ Overall, we recognize God’s Spirit at work in the countless brave struggles by Muslims, Christians, those of other faiths, and those of no formal faith. We encourage wiser policies by our government to support fundamental human aspirations, free from the lingering yoke of colonialism or empire.

The last ten years of U.S. foreign policy have been deeply marked by two wars of questionable necessity and a growth of security concerns justified by a “war on terror.” The death of Osama Bin Laden and the tenth year anniversary of 9/11 have opened perspectives on new realities and attitudes. The NATO-led air war in support of insurgent forces in Libya underlined the need to shift policies in advance of popular movements; the legacies of long support for foreign militaries can be seen in Egypt as well as Bahrain, and Pakistan;⁶ new forms of “low level” warfare with CIA and drones are underway in Yemen and Somalia and elsewhere;⁷ reluctance within the U.S. military to end occupation was evident in Iraq even as that military-based effort at nation-building has produced limited democracy, much corruption, and an undercurrent of rage.⁸ (Afghanistan, while having some similar governance and counter-insurgency challenges, is a different case beyond this resolution’s focus.) That element of rage and resentment in Iraq assures a continued attraction to terrorism by some, in the absence of a more constructive project built on mutual respect. The emergence of a nation in Southern Sudan, despite massive ongoing tragedy, suggests the need for a stronger United Nations role in raising standards for governance, plebiscites, peace-keeping, and peace-building.⁹

Church and Interfaith Context:

Not all change is good change. We recognize how Egyptian, Syrian, and Lebanese Christians are threatened by new developments, especially in light of the score-settling and religious-cleansing that has occurred in Iraq. The U.S. is not responsible for inciting all interreligious violence in the area, but church representatives from the region have agreed that many U.S. policies have not been helpful, heightening vulnerability of indigenous Christians to popular movements and Muslim extremists (as happened already under Mubarak). Although they are not “Western,” Christians in the Arab World are sometimes perceived as proxies of the West and targeted for retaliation for Western foreign policy, particularly U.S. support for Israel’s occupation of Palestine.¹⁰ Through no fault of their own, this leaves Arab Christians in a no-man’s land, not at home in either East or West. In Iran, despite major international tensions,

Christians, Jews, and some other religious minorities in Iran have been relatively safe, though freedom to maintain church facilities has been restricted. Zoroastrians and Bahai`i experience significant danger, and the suppression of the “Green movement” in 2009 continues to affect public life.¹¹

The *Book of Order* affirms that “the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) at all levels seeks new opportunities for conversation and understanding with non-Christian religious entities. ... and common action with secular organizations and agencies where such approaches show promise of serving the mission of the Church in the world” (*Book of Order*, G-5.0102–.0103). General Assemblies provide practical and theological guidance for such efforts. The 209th General Assembly (1997) stated that:

In a world of many bitter divisions to which, sadly, religious differences often contribute, there is an urgent call to all people of faith to seek understanding and cooperation. In response to this vocation, Christians should be eager to seek fellowship with people of other religions, work together with them, and celebrate our common concerns and values, all the while being alert to the great sensitivity this practice requires. (*Minutes*, 1997, Part I, p. 435)

The 211th General Assembly (1999) affirmed that, “In the spirit of Jesus Christ, we are called to maintain a respectful presence with people of other faiths” (*Minutes*, 1999, Part I, p. 31). The 209th General Assembly (1997) defined respectful presence as “a way to follow Jesus of Nazareth, who met with people of many cultures and religions even as he fulfilled the nature and purpose of his God-given mission” (*Minutes*, 1997, Part I, p. 440). World Interfaith Harmony Week provides an opportunity to practice such respectful presence, which can include interfaith dialogues, shared meals, joint service projects, or praying for peace in the Middle East and around the world.

Implications in the Democratic Changes in the Arab World for the Church’s Hope for a More Just International Order:

As this paper is written, efforts at regime change and government resistance are threatening intensified violence in Syria. After the removal of Yemen’s ruler, and after elections in Egypt and Tunisia, there is a worldwide debate on how much power extreme Islamists will gain in open electoral processes. An early lesson has been that the much-demonized Muslim Brotherhood is not monolithic, whether among its seventy or so national affiliates or within nations, such as Egypt, where government forces and religious extremists have attacked Christian churches and peaceful protests. Clearly, the role of communications and media is crucial for the progressive and sometimes secular forces of change in any country—well understood by Syria’s Assad—but even the conservative groups know how important public moral acceptance has become. Regional public outrage against Syria’s crackdown has prompted the Arab League to take unprecedented steps to isolate that regime, but on the ground, Christian partners report violence from forces other than the Syrian government and real dangers to religious coexistence in an expanded civil war.

Democratic stirrings have not ended Shi'a/Sunni tensions in places like Bahrain, Iraq, and Pakistan (properly part of Southwestern Asia). Saudi Arabia helped the government of Bahrain—host to the U.S. Fifth Carrier Group—crush a movement of its majority population of Shi'ites who were out in mass, protesting for reforms.¹² King Abdullah of Jordan identifies with concern an “arc” of Iranian-Shi'ite interest across the region to Hezbollah in Lebanon.¹³ The memory of the Green Movement in Iran itself is not forgotten, even as the U.S. and Israel in particular exert force that some observers consider covert war, mysterious assassinations, explosions, and cyber warfare (the “stuxnet” virus, virtually claimed by the Israeli government).¹⁴ In early 2012, that cold war is getting hotter. Certainly some of the same people involved in advocating the Iraq war are now urging a more overt Iran war, undeterred by the same ambiguities about national intention and actual threat level.¹⁵ The need for unambiguous antinuclear proliferation on a region-wide basis makes concern for Iranian (and Pakistani) nuclear development selective; the lesson a military might draw from the Libyan revolution is to keep one's nuclear program to prevent intervention rather than give one up as Qaddafi did.

Since World War II, U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East has been chiefly driven by dependence on oil and concern for our ally, Israel. Both during the Cold War and after 1989, these priorities have put a premium on stability of governments that accept overall U.S. influence in the region, often at the expense of the freedom for the local people. (The U.S. support of the Shah of Iran is a good example.) President Carter's “doctrine,” that the United States had vital security interests in that access to oil, merely formalized a stance that has been confirmed in several wars and the construction of military bases throughout the Persian Gulf. The presence of U.S. forces itself increases tensions with nationalists and Muslim fundamentalists; the worsening situation of the Palestinians increases religious as well as political polarization. Religious extremists take out some of their hostilities on Christian minorities associated with the United States, which is inevitably linked to the policies of Israel's government.

The background statement to a brief resolution can only point to the larger changes in international affairs related to what the Egyptians and Tunisians call their “revolutions.” We have maintained here that the moral dimension in the popular movements is essential to recognize; we have not analyzed the economic desperation and population forces at work as well. Nor does this background statement treat the growing reality of interdependence that increasingly constrains unilateral action, involving Russia and China in Syria and India and other nations in relation to Iran. Turkey, rebuffed by Europe on the European Communities and now glad of it, has turned more of its attention to the Middle East and, with a somewhat more democratic and Islamist Egypt, is likely to play a growing role, with Kurdistan its only Achilles' heel. Along with Iran, Turkey now vies for regional dominance. One challenge is to see this interdependence and the mutual containments it involves as beneficial to peace.

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its ecumenical partners have strongly supported the concept of human rights, respect for international law, and the use of diplomacy rather than force in conflict situations. At the same time, the witness of the churches and others for “principle-driven” international relations has not prevented massive military build-up in the Middle East and nuclear proliferation in nearby Pakistan and India, as well as Israel. To understand the differences between “principle-driven” and realist perspectives on the Middle East and more

broadly, a debate between John Ikenberry and Stephen Walt, posted on Walt's blog site, may be illuminating.¹⁶ The legacies of the second Iraq war and ensuing occupation, and the Afghanistan engagement, have not built either confidence in U.S. judgment or respect for the morality of U.S. practice. Torture and Guantanamo Bay aside, the increases in drone warfare and covert action raise questions about official U.S. war aims. Cost factors are increasingly raised at home, but overall U.S. military expenditure—apart from money borrowed for the Iraq and Afghan wars—remains almost twice its pre-9/11 levels. It is estimated at 43 percent of world military expenditure.¹⁷ Hence the need for the churches and others to present an alternative vision of a U.S. role that moves “beyond empire,” or into a more multilateral and less military-based framework.

The 2008 paper “commended for study” by that year’s General Assembly, “To Repent, To Restore, To Rebuild, and To Reconcile,”¹⁸ supported the action of that assembly to urge an orderly end to the Iraq war and a morally-appropriate contribution to the reconstruction of that country. That paper also addressed matters of “empire,” an understanding of national purpose then current in the George W. Bush administration and among neo-conservative “hawks” in foreign policy. “Full-spectrum dominance” was another expression used to emphasize the unilateral capacity of the United States military to fight at least two major wars and to project force around the globe. “Empire,” understood as a more complex set of dominating relationships—economic, political, and military—was also presented in the 2004 Accra statement of the World Alliance (now, Communion) of Reformed Churches. Accra’s understanding of hegemony, inequality, and environmental unsustainability has been increasingly seen as prescient given the credit collapse of Fall 2008 and increasing criticism of unregulated globalization as an intensifier of economic inequality within and among countries.¹⁹

This resolution does not take a particular position on the question of “empire.” It does note the extensive pattern of wars, alliances, and bases—especially in the Middle East—that give rise to the discussion of empire. Two books by Asia scholar Chalmers Johnson, *Blowback* (2000) and *Sorrows of Empire* (2004), have helped popularize the phrase, “blowback,” which comes from military intelligence to refer to the public fallout, anger, and resentment of military action, particularly overseas. This points to perhaps the largest challenge for Presbyterians and other U.S. citizens: the need to understand how we are perceived by others around the world, especially by those from very different cultures and historical experiences. Certainly there are deep resentments, and many efforts to blame outsiders for internal problems. Yet in order to move forward and to face new economic and environmental dilemmas, new approaches are needed. This resolution is an effort to prepare Presbyterians for that new thinking, and to encourage our church to play a constructive role in an often contentious, but essential, public debate.

Beyond, but emphatically including reflection on the Arab democratic movements, is the larger question of the direction of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)’s peace witness overall. In 2010, the General Assembly approved a new process of discernment designed both to encourage members to encounter the nonviolent witness of Jesus in new ways, and to encourage “new thinking” in the church, thirty years after the landmark policy statement, *Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling*.²⁰ This resolution explicitly invites thinking about how peaceful reconciliation

and democratic social change can be combined, and what (very different) roles our church and our country can and should play. Commissioners are encouraged to discuss this resolution in the context of “peace discernment groups” in their congregations and presbyteries over the coming year. The discernment assignment helps commend study and action on this document in a dialogical and partly on-line way; readers may also find the invitation to the Peace Discernment process of considerable interest. [See the Interim Report of the Peace Discernment Steering Team to the 220th General Assembly (2012).]

Endnotes

1. <http://www.beaconbroadside.com/broadside/2011/11/how-do-we-repair-the-souls-of-those-returning-from-iraq-.html>.
2. The statement, “Respectful Presence: an Understanding of Interfaith Prayer and Celebration from a Reformed Christian Perspective” is available at <http://www.pcusa.org/resource/respectful-presence-document/>. The Interfaith Toolkit provides additional ideas and resources at <http://gamc.pcusa.org/ministries/interfaith/>. Find prayers for people of other faiths in the *Book of Common Worship* (pages 798 and 815). “Guidelines for Interfaith Celebration of Thanksgiving” in the *Book of Occasional Services* may also prove helpful. Background about World Interfaith Harmony week is available at <http://worldinterfaithharmonyweek.com/>. For our own Christian partners in the region, we relate through the Middle East council of churches and the Fellowship of Middle East Evangelical churches. <http://globalministries.org/news/mee/pdfs/FMEEC-final-communicu-Feb-2012.pdf>. This site provides a copy of the communique of the February 13–15, 2012, consultation on Evangelical and Christian Presence in the Middle East in light of the movements for democratic change, in which several PC(USA) members participated.
3. (<http://www.pewglobal.org/2011/05/17/arab-spring-fails-to-improve-us-image/>, <http://www.aaiusa.org/reports/arab-opinion-polls-u.s.-withdrawal-from-iraq-arab-political-concerns-and-so>, and http://aai.3cdn.net/7bd3659607410109f3_x2m6baq6q.pdf).
4. www.nobelprize.org.
5. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/17/world/middleeast/17sharp.html?pagewanted=all>.
6. http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/clinton-defends-us-stance-on-syria-bahrain/2011/11/07/gIQAsAJ9xM_story.html.
7. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704477904575586634028056268.html>.
8. <http://www.nationaljournal.com/u-s-troop-withdrawal-motivated-by-iraqi-insistence-not-u-s-choice-20111021>.
9. <http://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2011/04/20/the-u-s-role-in-building-peace-in-sudan/>.
10. http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/MK23Ak01.html.
11. <http://iranprimer.usip.org/>.
12. <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2058992,00.html>.
13. <http://www.resetdoc.org/story/00000000104>.

14. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/18/us-iran-methods-idUSTRE80H0NX20120118>.
15. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mj-rosenberg/it-makes-no-sense-and-yet-due-to-the-pressure-of-the-pro-war-lobby-it-is-diplomacy-that-is-barely-on-the-table-while-war-always-the-direst-option-is-front-and-center_b_1234762.html.
16. <http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/>.
17. <http://www.sipri.org/media/pressreleases/2011/milex>.
18. <http://www.pcusa.org/media/uploads/acswp/pdf/repent-restore-rebuild-reconcile.pdf>.
19. <http://www.pcusa.org/media/uploads/hunger/pdf/accra-confession.pdf>.
20. <http://www.pcusa.org/media/uploads/peacemaking/pdf/believers.pdf>.