Peace-makers are blessed with insight that is both divine and historical. It is a divine insight, for as children of God peace-makers are beginning to inherit the riches of God’s wisdom. This insight is historical, for history, both written and unwritten, attests to the recurrent desire that the human joy-of-victory in competition be balanced with the human dignity of vanquished competitors. When joy and dignity are affirmed in the very act of competing, people learn to love their enemies.

Human competition differs from competition between beasts. A human being is superior to a jungle carnivore. The survival of the carnivore depends on its predatory power: its prey is its nourishment. Human survival requires organic interdependence, for no man is an island; he needs the wisdom to outgrow the predatory habits of a lower level. Any competition here requires the ability to achieve communal survival even in conflict situations. If competition, while challenging competitors to do their best, also increases the probability of counter-productive conflicts, still it must (and can) include skills in conflict resolution, or at least in conflict management, and thus preserve the historical gains achieved in the act of competing.

History narrates situations of conflicts within both the religious and the secular spheres and between these two spheres. If conflict management has not always been successful in these situations, still the trial-and-error efforts show a general perception of needs and potentials for the super-life (implied in the term “sur-vival”) dimly sought by both sides.

The present inquiry is concerned with two sets of efforts, each distinct from the other, and yet vitally interrelated. There is the ecumenical set of efforts to manage conflicts between religious beliefs and institutions. There is also the secular set of efforts to manage conflicts that arise from societal, political, economic and military dynamisms. It can be shown that the relation between
these two sets forms a complex network of recurrent schemes. One operation is to identify "the enemy." This is a military precept, but its meaning is implicit in all forms of human competition, whether secular or religious, where individuals or groups all take a stance different from that of other individuals or groups identified as "the enemy."

Identifying the enemy always falls short of its aim whenever the enemy within is ignored or underestimated. For every human being is his own enemy, whether consciously or unconsciously. If this internal enmity is rooted in subjective "bias," it follows that discovering the biases is a necessary phase of conflict management, and eventually of conflict resolution.

Can bias be discovered? If so, what is the best procedure? To answer such questions, it may be helpful to examine three efforts at conflict management presently being carried out in different fields: (1) the field of Christianity as related to other World Religions, (2) the field of macroeconomics in the context of indebtedness, and (3) the field of guerrilla warfare in urban and rural regions of the Philippines. The possibility that these three fields overlap will also be examined.

FUNDAMENTALIST CONFLICTS

It would be difficult to analyze the differences between World Religions unless there is a previous analysis of the differences within each of them. There are dialectically opposed positions within Christianity, within Islam, within Buddhism, within Hinduism, within Taoism, within each and every religious group all lumped together under the label of Animism. The value of written texts, the Bible, Koran, Vedas, Sanskrit, teachings of elders, patristic pastorals, etc., is emphasized in one position. An opposite position, while respecting texts, also goes beyond the divergent meanings attributed to these texts by those desirous to live by them. (For lack of a better alternative, the term "fundamentalism" might here be used if the danger of erroneous nuances could be avoided.1)

1. The word "fundamentalism" originally referred to biblical inerrancy about certain beliefs, whether religious or scientific. Later, the New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: McGraw-Hill 1967, Vol. 6, p. 224) has an article entitled "Fundamentalism, Biblical," implicitly acknowledging a non-biblical context of the word: for example, newspapers refer to Ayatollah Khomeini as a Muslim fundamentalist. Still later, jour-
It is helpful to adopt Lonergan's distinction between beliefs (plural) and faith (singular), i.e., between religious symbols and a religious attitude toward particular symbols. The word "symbol" is here used in its most general sense as any carrier of meaning, and includes intersubjectivity, art, language, or even the silent communion wherein heart speaks to heart. For example, a graven image is a work of art that carries many different meanings, and one's involvement with this carrier and its possible meanings may or may not be dialectically differentiated as intending either idolatry or authentic worship culturally associated with the artistic work.

That involvement with graven images as necessarily limited to idolatry is the long-standing tradition of some fundamentalist groups. This tradition is based on their chosen interpretation of texts from the Old Testament. Having made their choice, they further elevate its importance as a necessary element for anyone to be "born again." From this they deduce that anyone who bows before a graven image "cannot see the kingdom of God," and "cannot enter the kingdom of God" and may not "have eternal life." From this position there follow iconoclastic conflicts with groups holding an opposite position which they now identify as a counter-position: they have identified "the enemy."

Many such groups exist. For example, Filipino devotees of the Blessed Virgin Mary tend to band together in sodalities, legions and confraternities that they find to be helpful in fomenting their devotion. They like to gather together before an image of Mary, repeatedly reciting the angelical salutation richly adorned by culturally-conditioned spontaneity. They are firm in their hope and belief that this practice leads them into spiritual rebirth, helps them enter into the kingdom of God, and wins for them eternal life. This position is opposed to the counter-position identified with "the enemy."

---

3. Ibid. 57-73.
4. E.g., Ex 20:4, Dt 5:8.
5. Jn 3:3.
With these two positions in mind, the immediate task is not to prove a position nor to refute counter-positions, but primarily to manage conflict by exhibiting the diversity and uncovering its fundamentalist roots. Many are these roots and these are entangled together in a very complex way. One root is the insufficient attention paid to the enemy within that bedims the remembrance of the precept to love one’s enemies, the beatitude of peacemaking, Mary’s animated proclamation of “the greatness of the Lord,” and the salvific influences of conscious and unconscious traditions that cannot all be contained in a world of written books. Such insufficiency of attention generates the roots of biases, obscures understanding, and intensifies the difficulties of conflict management. To manage this particular conflict within Christianity, the peacemaking effort obligatory on Christians, though often neglected, must include a “turn to the subject,” a sincere examination of the subject’s conscience. For the conflict is not between objects but between subjects who have not yet fully understood their own objectives because they are not yet completely aware of their own biases.

Conflicts within Christianity are paralleled by similar conflicts within other World Religions. For example, the bloody conflicts in the Middle East, while involving competition for real estate and for petro-dollars, are sometimes seen as rooted in religious conflicts between Muslim fundamentalists. In the more distant past and on a higher scale, there have been bloody conflicts between the World Religions themselves. However, in later decades, these have been considerably mitigated. The defense of “the true faith” no longer leads to military mobilization. Ways of discussing religious differences are becoming more civilized and more amenable to constructive dialogue.

INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

In the past few years, a number of interreligious consultations have been conducted, not so much to iron out differences, but to discover how these differences actually include and clarify areas of agreement that can be broadened. One consultation was held in

7. Mt 5:9, 44; Lk 1:46; Jn 21:25.
Singapore in July 1987. One participant, Dr. Peter K. H. Lee later published an article about the Four Little Dragons of Asia (Singapore, Hongkong, Taiwan and South Korea).\(^{10}\) Lee sees significant relations between religious factors and the rapid rise of technology in these regions and the consequent need for the "epistemological shift" advocated by Felix Wilfred at the consultation.\(^{11}\) It appears that interreligious conflicts in Asia are being managed in situations when World Religions are beginning to band together against the onslaughts of the secularist technology of North America and Western Europe. It appears further that a dialectic is emerging in Asia between religious and secularist tendencies.

If Christianity has not enjoyed a central role among Asian religions, this is probably because it came into Asia mainly through European and American colonizers. Christian teaching could have inspired these Christian colonizers with the meekness and poverty of Christ, but except for some saintly martyrs and missionaries, the Asian image of Christianity was one of political, economic and military domination: historically the Christian image was more secularist than religious.

If this perception contains some truth, interreligious dialogue might fare better if it is handed over to the initiative of the non-Christian majority, with Christians playing a supportive role, sharing the fruits of their discernment, and clearly acknowledging their non-central position. Having recognized the need for an "epistemological shift," the Asian dialogists who are more at home in Asian wholistic epistemology should now lead the way to authentic dialogue, thus replacing the present dialogue that is seen by Felix Wilfred as now "gasp for breath."

Sensitively concerned about these dying gasps of interreligious dialogue, Dr. Lee suggests in a low key that religionists in the "Four Little Dragons of Asia," because of their technocratic superiority over the rest of Asia, may culturally be in a good position of leadership in the dialogue, but later admits that the Little Dragons' policy of cordial coexistence of their various religions is superficial: this cordial coexistence is cheaper than Middle East belligerence.

---

This perception is confirmed by the perception\textsuperscript{12} of the military intelligence of the Reagan government that Japan, Taiwan and South Korea have adopted the BAIR model, so dear to the heart of American technocracy: this "Bureaucratic, Authoritarian and Industrializing Regimentation" of Asian peoples is part and parcel of a geopolitical and military strategy that subordinates all religions to its objectives. Like the Christian colonizers from the West, the proponents of the BAIR model subordinates religious values to secular values.

Admitting the need for an epistemological shift but without immediately aiming at Wilfred's shift from a technological to a theological epistemology, we must first consider an epistemology that includes and integrates both; for our present aim is not to resolve the conflict but to steer it towards eventual resolution by seeking an effective method of conflict management. Lonergan describes such a method in his \textit{Method in Theology}.\textsuperscript{13}

To integrate a subject's religious values and scientific values is one aim of Lonergan's epistemology. Such an integration was not possible in the Scholastic age when science was still infantile and scientists were often labelled as "adversaries." Science has since matured and begotten a modern technology that now refuses to be subordinated to a theological epistemology that ignores the need for a common epistemology. Lonergan's focus is on a method for the knowing subject to decide priorities of values. In dialogues between subjects whose priorities differ, dialectic\textsuperscript{14} is still operative and must first be understood before any foundational theology can begin to enter into the dialogue. To impose a theological epistemology on the dialogue in its beginnings is to mismanage a conflict, and the gasps we now hear may become terminal.

Here again, this "turn to the subject" becomes an examination of the subject's conscience in an effort to discover bias. In turn, this discovery will lead to a collaborative search for a common epistemology acceptable to conflicting parties as neutral ground for managing conflict.

\textsuperscript{12} "The origins and development of the Northwest Asian political economy" by Bruce Cummings in \textit{International Organization} 13, no. 1 (Winter 1984) 26-35.
\textsuperscript{13} Lonergan, \textit{Method}, 129 et passim.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
CONFLICT OF MACROECONOMIC INTERESTS

The reference above to geopolitical and military strategies in the context of interreligious dialogue suggests that religious factors can be manipulated by parties conflicting in the secular sphere. This conflict may be viewed as an on-going global war in which political and military strategies are dictated by economic advantages, and warring blocs do not scruple to use religious differences as instruments of psychological warfare at the service of economic blocs.

If this view is plausible, it will be helpful to consider the call in Sollicitudo Rei Socialis for a “careful analysis” of the conflict. To this call, Lonergan’s insights into macroeconomics are proposed as one response.

(These have been discussed in previous issues of this journal. Briefly, they show how Lonergan selects a norm as an Ignatian “first principle and foundation” according to which an economic decision can be judged to be functional or dysfunctional: the chosen norm is the emergent standard of living of world populations. The choice of this norm is proposed as a position. In the counter-position, the chosen norm is the maximization of investors’ income. One consequence of this counter-position is the present debt problem that continues to aggravate the conflict between creditor and debtor nations.)

To manage this conflict, Lonergan mathematically quantifies economic decisions according to the Ignatian tantum-quantum principle: the aggregate of quantities involved in economic decisions are optimal when their aggregate amounts, no more and no less, promote an emergent standard of living for the populations of the world. In the debt problem, the counter-position ignores the crucial distinction between optimal and maximal returns on investment loans. The optimal solution intends the common good. The maximal solution may or may not include the common good. Furthermore, maximization is made to depend on market forces of the “caveat emptor” type, where caveats are influenced by military units policing the trading routes of the world with expensive

armaments and military bases, and where emptors are systematically maneuvered into mendicancy and endless borrowing. Thus indebtedness is never liquidated but only perpetuated. Thus global conflict becomes essentially a "beggar thy neighbor" competition. The victorious competitor succeeds only in inflicting indignity on the vanquished and degenerates into a welfare agency doling out alms, humiliating sovereign peoples, and stoking the fires of a larger conflagration. There is no more taste of joy-in-victory but only the taste of ashes.

Is conflict management still possible? Yes, because conflict management is necessary for human survival. But conflict will not be managed by more financial power. Only by further enlightening the poorly enlightened self-interest of the competing powers, or in other words, by a "turn to the subject," can such global conflict be managed.

The subject may wish to perform the following thought-experiment. I imagine that I am totally victorious, and I follow up my total victory to its most logical conclusion: the taste of ashes. I discover this as counter-productive. Still, I am convinced of the value of "perfect competition," i.e., one in which price control is not a seller's monopoly. How do I respond to the dialectic between perfect and imperfect competition? One response is to seek consensus among all the macroeconomic sectors about some dynamism, specific yet flexible, whose parameters are always accessible to fine-tuning by all the competing sectors. This is the direction of growth of the "economic democracy" emerging in the collective consciousness of mankind and conceptually anticipated in Loner gan's heuristic method. Within the existing structures of the macroeconomy, this can lead to the discovery of a practical form of conflict management.

ARME D CONBAT

Fine-tuning a mechanism of perfect competition adopted by consensus among competitors leads to a general formula applicable to economic conflicts. In armed combat, is it possible to construct a similar formula? Yes, if the combatants can think of their combat as a "just war."

Combat management begins by assuming that the term "just" has at least an abstract meaning for those who risk human lives,
their enemies’ and their own, for a “just cause.” It continues in
the process of working out concrete meanings from the abstract
meaning. It progresses when the opposed sets of concrete mean-
ings are found to overlap or even to coincide in essentials. It
declines when no concrete meanings emerge. It breaks down when
one or both sides decide on a total destruction of “the enemy.”
The five moments of the process outlined here may be seen as five
schemes of recurrence forming a series of conditions for armed
combat to be either managed towards resolution or mismanaged
towards mutual destruction.

Filipino society is presently composed of a combatant minority
and a non-combatant majority, and the combatants are either for
or against the government insofar as its policies are perceived
either to represent or fail to represent the interests of the non-
combatant majority. That government policies should repre-
sent the interests of the majority constitutes the “just cause”
perceived by opposed combatants as the motive for going into
combat. If the purpose of the combat is the improvement of
non-combatants’ lives, to endanger non-combatants’ lives is to
contradict the original purpose. To eliminate this contradiction
is the first concrete meaning to be realized by each and every sub-
ject sincerely desiring to struggle for a “just cause.”

Combatants may prefer that non-combatants volunteer to join
their respective factions, but non-combatants have probably learned
from their EDSA “people-power” experience to appreciate the
potentials of passive resistance and so have chosen to remain non-
combatants. As a further development, more and more of them
are now attempting to resolve, or at least to manage, the armed
conflict between combatants.

This latter development has been going on and is today becom-
ing increasingly systematic. In December 1988, a week-long dia-
logue on conflict resolution was held in the Ateneo campus, at-
tended by various groups both local and foreign. Some of the pro-
posals presented the possibility of “zones of peace,” the adoption
of norms similar to those being tried in East Asian and Latin
American battle regions, including those suggested in the Geneva
Protocol II of 1977. These include codes of combat behavior like
the treatment of prisoners and hostages, danger to civilian popula-
tions, hamletting, trials, terrorism, torture, pillage and many other
such matters. The details analyzed in the discussion papers indi-
cate a strong determination to make this undertaking more system- 
tematic and more interdisciplinary, drawing as it does upon in-
tsights from psychology, sociology, economics and cultural anthro-
pology.17

Some of Lonergan’s insights into epistemology can be particu-
larly helpful. However, these are not meant for the combatants 
but only for the non-combatants. The concern of combatants is 
limited to short-term objectives of armed combat. In contrast, 
conflict management by the non-combatants transcends these 
short-term objectives, for its essential premise is that violence 
begets more violence and that modern weaponry makes everyone 
a sure loser.

Lonergan’s epistemology prescribes a “turn to the subject.” How 
is this precept to be applied? One way is for the peacemakers 
to ask themselves whether they are sincerely concerned with the 
long-term objectives of improving the lives of the non-combatant 
majority, especially the poor majority among these, and whether 
their own lives give credible witness to this concern. Many other 
questions related to this will further be asked. The answers to 
these questions will in turn raise further questions. The total 
series of questions and answers will eventually lead to decisions. 
Many decisions will probably fail. A few may succeed. This pro-
cess of trial-and-error, the only process humanly available, will also 
be a test of a subject’s sincerity.

If this epistemological “turn to the subject” is by-passed as in-
consequential, conflict management will falter when difficulties 
arisef. Difficulties can be expected to cluster around the principal 
difficulty of including and heightening the short-term viewpoint 
within the long-term vision. On this will depend the success or fail-
ure of conflict management.

THREE OVERLAPPING FIELDS OF CONFLICT

These three fields of conflict, religious, economic and military,

17. Unpublished papers on “Conflict Resolution in the Philippines: An International 
Conference,” 12-16 Dec. 1988, John Pollock Center, Ateneo de Manila University, Que-
zon City.
overlap in four distinct areas in terms of distinct objectives. (See diagram:)

Our epistemological tool of conflict management prescribes a turn to the subject and this attends mainly to the subject in conflict with himself. It remains that conflicts between different objectives are more easily managed by prioritizing them. Hence, in view of a broader preference for non-violent means, first to be managed is armed combat: even those who engage in armed combat claim this to be only a last resort. Armed combat is less likely to occur in a situation of religious unity and of equality of economic opportunities.

Of the two remaining fields, economic and religious, which has priority? This can only be answered by each subject asking himself whether he subordinates his economic values to his religious values or vice-versa. He may find it difficult to give an honest answer.

On the one hand, a religious precept may inspire him to choose an economy wherein a preferential option for the poor is built into its basic structure. On the other hand, he may see such an option as attainable only through bankruptcy and therefore equivalent to becoming poor himself. This dialectic can be clarified only if a tantum-quantum principle is accepted, for here the concept of "poverty" involves quantitative analysis. To accept this principle is to subordinate economic values to religious values. An inverse subordination can occur when the subject restricts the ultimate objective to the maximization of an investor's income and decides that this objective can conveniently be attained by fomenting conflict among the other sectors, in the dubious hope that the conflicts could be kept at low intensity — low enough to safeguard the investor's income and high enough to impede perfect competi-
tion between all the sectors. A subject biased with such restrictions on intelligent inquiry would ignore our inquiry into peace-making.

It appears then that the proper agency of conflict management is a community of peace-makers sharing with armed combatants a communal and authentic perception of perfect competition. For life is like "the good fight" enjoyed by the sports-loving Corinthians.\textsuperscript{18} St. Paul's advice to them suggests the joy and dignity of civilized competition.

18. 1 Cor 9:24.