Introduction

Distinguished guests, it is certainly an honor to be with you tonight to present the inaugural Vann Lecture, ‘Hope in the Wound: Resurrection and Moral Injury’.

It is indeed a unique privilege as well to serve as the inaugural Vann fellow in Christianity and the Armed Forces, and to participate in a small way in the legacy of Bernard William Vann. By all accounts, he was a man with a multitude of talents and abilities – an athlete of considerable skill, he enjoyed a brief football career that saw him play for two different clubs in the English Football League. He was a scholar of no small ability, matriculating from Cambridge in 1910, after which he decided to follow a call to serve the Church of England as a priest.

Yet Bernard Vann's experience of the first war certainly reveals the distinctive nobility of his character. Joining the Army, he attempted to become a chaplain and serve his fellow soldiers in this capacity. Frustrated by what seem to be administrative delays, he instead joins the infantry and there, by every account, was of course a leader par excellence, brave and gallant, but particularly so, as in the Battle of St. Quentin Canal, when a significant number of lives depended on his unit charging into a situation of considerable danger.

It is no small part of his legacy, then, to note that he was a clergyman who was deeply involved in the midst of the affairs of the people. He was a man who
could have been whatever he chose – an athlete, teacher, scholar, and yet his choice, motivated certainly by his faith, was to become enmeshed in the harrowing moral difficulties of war and the lives of the people with whom he served.

The position of the Vann fellowship at Durham seeks to honour this legacy by examining the relationship between the Christian tradition and service in the armed forces. While I wouldn’t dare to claim an inheritance of Vann’s courage, bravery, or certainly football skill, as the first Vann fellow, I do seek to continue his legacy as a clergyperson and former officer whose project has been inspired by an experience of conflict and a deep sense of concern for my fellow veterans.

I served in the United States Air Force for eight years, from 1999-2007 as a weather officer. After 9/11, I was not content to sit behind a desk at a weather station, and so I volunteered for duty in Combat and Special Operations Weather Teams, which have just recently been redesignated as Special Reconnaissance by Air Force Special Ops Command. These “grey berets” train and embed with the US Army and DoD’s elite airborne and Special Forces units, and supply weather data from the sparse areas in which they normally operate. As so much of the “smart” technology in use on the modern battlefield is weather-sensitive, knowledge of the conditions in the immediate vicinity of their use is critical. In the capacity of one of these “grey berets,” I served with the 82nd Airborne Division in Iraq in 2004 and with the 3rd and 7th Special Forces Groups in Afghanistan in 2006. My final assignment was as the commander of a 22-man detachment of AFSOC weather operators out of Ft. Bragg, North Carolina.
What is remarkable is that over the almost two decades of relatively continuous deployment with elite American military units, to my knowledge, there have been zero combat casualties within the SOWT community. However, in the twelve years since I left the service, out of the personnel that had served in that Ft. Bragg unit alone, there have been 2 suicides, and the man who commanded the unit before me died defending his first sergeant at Lackland AFB, Texas, when an airman who had been deployed previously to Iraq entered his unit and began shooting. It is certainly impossible to know how, or even if, the experience of combat affected these particular cases, and it would disparage the memories of these men to claim so. Yet it would be equally disparaging not to recognize that their deaths are part of an alarming trend of suicides amongst American veterans. The US Department of Veteran’s affairs estimates that 22 veterans per day commit suicide across the US. These figures certainly reflect the struggle veterans face in returning into the civilian community, and testify to the presence of significant trauma resulting from combat. I should add that while aspects of trauma are certainly culturally conditioned, this is not simply an American problem. In the weeks leading up to Remembrance Day last year, the Sunday Times profiled six British soldiers who had taken their lives in a 5 day span that summer.

As a Christian theologian, my project is concerned with the role that spirituality, faith and the language of belief have to play in addressing aspects of combat trauma. While Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (commonly understood as PTSD) is often used as a catch-all phrase, researchers in the past few years have become adept at differentiating some forms of trauma from one another. PTSD is
accurately comprised of the physiological and psychological symptoms that often accompany repeated exposure to high-stress situations where a threat to life is imminent and considerable. The hyperarousal of the endocrine system and the mind returning over and over to a traumatic moment are common aspects of PTSD. In addition to the broad range of bodily and mental symptoms of PTSD, however, researchers are identifying the corrosive moral effects of combat on the psyche of those who participate in it. These fall more broadly under the category of Moral Injury, which is characterized by the presence of feelings of guilt and shame in veterans of the armed forces. PTSD is a medical and psychiatric condition, whereas Moral Injury is more complex – it is an ethical and spiritual problem. My contribution to the larger research world of moral injury, and the work I have done in the past few years, is to provide a theological account of combat trauma and moral injury. In a debate that could be dominated by psychologists, secular ethicists, and political theorists, I have joined a small cadre of religious scholars who have elucidated a debate about how classic religious language and theological symbols from the Christian tradition, all of which are deeply rooted in the human experience, may help us understand, talk about, and find ways of moving through these experiences of trauma and guilt.

**Vann Fellowship in the Past Year**

In light of the fact that the church has spent nearly two millennia thinking about what it means to be guilty – before God and each other, it is my argument in this larger project that the church has particular tools within the Christian system of
belief to build and articulate a moral universe in which those suffering from moral injury might find meaning. Moral injury, in other words, requires the attention of religious leaders as well as psychiatrists and psychologists, and my primary work in the fellowship has focused on illuminating the value of religious and theological language by exploring the resonances between theological doctrine and the veteran experience of guilt.

As the primary purpose of the fellowship is research, and as the first scholar in residence, I do believe it has been a productive year. In January, I published my first monograph, titled Full Darkness: Original Sin, Moral Injury and Wartime Violence. In it, I argue that an Augustinian understanding of original sin – an inherited distortion in our nature that makes us susceptible to fundamental corruptions of our sense of “good” is helpful in understanding guilt in combatants. As their agency is constricted by varying forces from cultural more to combat training, Augustine helps us to envision how we are simultaneously responsible for our choices and not able to escape the narrow bounds within which we make them. My hope is that it provides a path in which veterans may understand their feelings of guilt to be legitimate, but not exhaustive and suffocating, as there are more forces in the world responsible for their conduct than their own power of choice.

Additionally, I have written several pieces that have been accepted and will be published in the coming months. Among them is an article for the Scottish Journal of Theology on the writings of famed German theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer, titled “The Bonhoeffer Dilemma: Sanctification as the Increasing Awareness of Moral Chaos.” In this, I read the life of the Nazi resistor as an
experience of moral injury, noting that he understands “holiness” as an awareness that making “right” moral choices in situations of conflict is impossible. In this environment, Bohoeffer argues, to become holy is to embrace a willingness and responsibility to take actions counter to divine law at times, to take on the guilt of these actions for the sake of others.

I have also written a chapter for a forthcoming volume titled Moral Injury: A Guide for Understanding and Engagement. My chapter is simply titled “Moral Injury and Theology,” but argues for the unique value of religious language to give voice to the ethical dilemma that many veterans face. Here I talk about the early Christian idea that we were created in the image of God, and that this shared divine imprint united humanity in a common fabric. To kill another was to rend this fabric as it extinguished this image in another who bore it. My hope is that this theological language and insight will provide a way of understanding the seemingly inherent pain of taking life, at a deeper level than legal, ethical, and “just war” arguments. This chapter marks an important contribution to the debate as it stands amongst chapters written by many of the foremost psychologists, researchers and caregivers studying moral injury today.

I have been involved in the more particularly ecclesial sphere as well, publishing an article in the liturgical journal of the Presbyterian Church (USA) analyzing the problem with the notion of “dirty hands” and the idea of 4th century Church father Basil of Caesarea that soldiers should abstain from communion for 3 years upon return from war, because though he reckons that “homicide committed in war is not homicide,” soldiers hands, nonetheless are not clean. My intent in this
is to provoke dialogue within the church about its own practices of veteran care and to highlight the difficulty in a democratic society of asking soldiers to abstain from communion for being the instruments of policies that we all have the power to change.

Of course, the impact of any of this research depends greatly on both “getting the word out” about it, as well as bringing people together who are serious about fulfilling the “armed forces covenant” – civilians, churches, and voluntary organizations that are committed to supporting military members and veterans. In both of these respects, I am deeply proud of the work the Vann fellowship has accomplished in the past year. Herein lies an enormous part of the value of the networks and connections that many of you in this room have been building for the past few years, as they have allowed for some of this research to find the people who might make a real difference in the life of a service veteran.

On the front lines of identifying moral injury, are of course, chaplains as the spiritual caregivers most available and relatable to a combatant suffering from the trauma of combat. This year, I had the honor of offering a session on moral injury and its theological resonances with Chaplain General Clinton Langston and 40 other Army chaplains at the Anglican Chaplain’s conference in Durham in April. At the International Network for the Study of Religion and War in the Modern World annual meeting in July at the Armed Forces Chaplaincy Centre, Amport House, I presented a paper on the vitality of theological language in addressing combat trauma and had the opportunity to engage with chaplains like the Rev. Andrew Totten and US Army Colonel Timothy Mallard. Through the Robbins lecture at
Durham University and Sarum College, which I gave on Moral Injury and the problematic language of the “good” war, I met Alistair Nicholl, an RAF chaplain with whom I’ve worked to prepare a formal training event for RAF chaplains on moral injury that takes place tomorrow and Thursday at Amport House. Next summer, Mike Snape and I will be taking part in the International Military Apostolate Conference at St. Mary’s University, Twickenham, and I anticipate these connections will grow, strengthen, and produce more events that raise awareness of the particulars of moral injury and the theological resources available to chaplains and Christian caregivers.

In addition to chaplains, there are a great many members of the civilian clergy who are concerned about the toll of warfare on veterans and are working actively within their networks to find ways to help. As I’ve found in the first year of the fellowship, there are many organizations that have resources and are doing wonderful work with and for veterans. At a meeting at Lambeth Palace, I was able to present my research to the Christian Clergy Approaches to Disarmament and Defense group, comprised of ministers of different backgrounds that share a common interest in issues created by conflict. I have joined with another group of concerned clergy, the Community for Post-Traumatic Growth, which is focused on pioneering, creating, and sharing resources for churches on care for veterans with combat trauma and moral injury.

The fellowship stands in a perhaps unique position to connect many of these groups and through the chance meetings at different events, continue to build a network to enhance the impact of each. For example, at the Royal British Legion
Scotland founder’s day event in June, which commemorated the life of Douglas Haig, I had the pleasure of meeting Sir Alistair Irwin, Lady Raina Haig and several members of the Legion Scotland. A member of the Community for Post Traumatic Growth is an Army chaplain, Philip Patterson, who is building a program within several Scottish churches which is mindful of the nuances of combat trauma and moral injury. It is by chance that the two groups shared a link through the Vann fellowship, but now in contact with each other, there is an increased potential for further collaboration, and as the Legion is a primary point of reference and gathering for veterans, the Legion’s awareness of the veterans chaplain group could make a difference for those who clearly have spiritual needs in processing their experience.

In these ways, through these connections and this research, it is my sincerest hope that in the first year of the fellowship, we have done justice to the legacy of Bernard William Vann, who chose to become a priest, but spent his life instead in the midst of the struggles of those who fought in a deadly war alongside him.

**Current Research**

In the continuance of that hope, I’d like to turn, then, to talk about particulars of the research and theological developments that currently have my attention, and will into the next two years. I have titled the lecture

I have previously argued that one of the primary ways that theological language contributes to the treatment of moral injury is through its description of sin. In *Full Darkness*, I articulate a modified version of Augustine’s concept of
original sin in order to find a moral psychology that both takes that guilt seriously and contextualizes it within a world shaped and formed by a multitude of different forces and identities which compel our loyalty and allegiance. The particular value of Augustine’s psychology was that it says that each of us is guilty for our own participation in sin, but since the force of sin is so powerful in shaping our lives and trajectories, we should attend to the responsibility of larger forces in our midst as well. One of my principal aims in joining moral injury to this framework so was to provide a sense of moral order that resonated with the experience of the veteran and allowed them to conceive of a form of divine justice within the world that both took their guilt seriously and put it in a context in which they might bear it.

One of the landmark studies into the nature of moral injury, as I mentioned briefly earlier - published in 2009 in the *Clinical Psychology Review* – was written by a group of psychiatrists led by Brett Litz, and is titled “Moral Injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy.”¹ Among its arguments is an interesting note about the critical importance of viewing the world as fundamentally just. The authors note that one of the most corrosive effects of combat on one’s worldview is the loss of this belief and the subsequent expectation of injustice in response to wrongdoing. As you might imagine, or may have even have experience with – the commission of atrocities that go unpunished can undermine the belief that those who do wrong will ultimately be held to account by a legal system. The witnessing of mistreatment, rape, and killing of civilians and prisoners by personnel that do not experience consequences for their behavior can
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destroy the witness’s belief that there is a sense of justice in the world. The authors of this study link the loss of belief in a just world to poor self-care, alcohol and drug abuse, hopelessness and self-harm, and anti-social behaviors.

Conversely, the authors of the study note that those who have an unshakeable belief that the world is just, even while sustaining difficult life events, are significantly less prone to any of the behaviors above. They cite a study of Americans incarcerated in prison, in which they note that “prisoners with just world beliefs are more likely to feel that their punishment is justified and are less likely to act out and cause disciplinary problems. Moreover, prisoners with just world beliefs are more likely to view their future goals as attainable.” In other words, one of the beliefs that is key to understanding and conceiving a worthwhile future is that there is justice in the world.

This perhaps shows one of the tragedies of the interaction of veterans with moral injury and the society around them. A veteran who feels a distinct sense of guilt in a well-intentioned society that valorizes him may sink more deeply into a belief that the world is fundamentally unjust. So could a veteran who works up the courage to express his feeling of guilt and shame about participating in something, only to be met with discomfort and a desire to ameliorate his guilt with placid justifications like “it was war” or “it was done for a greater good.” Similarly, a veteran who sees someone decorated and recognized as a hero that has committed wartime atrocities can cause him to give up on any expectation that society will hold the guilty (perhaps including him or herself) to account. Military legal systems often

---
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have difficulty in holding war criminals to account – if you’ve followed the trial of American Navy Seal Edward Gallagher in the past few months, this would be a prime example. So how might religion help instill a belief in some sort of justice in the world and provide a path to moral solace that might serve as bulwark from the toxicity of abandoning the idea of justice in the world?

In the project that will be published as a book at the end of my time in the fellowship, I seek to explore the resonances between moral injury and theologies of resurrection and eschatology – particularly in the way in which they may involve the rebuilding of a contextual framework in which the morally injured can again find a sense of justice.

Tonight, I’d like to highlight three particular areas of resonance between the idea of resurrection and moral injury. I believe each of these has something meaningful to say about envisioning God’s justice and nuances the notion of forgiveness in key ways that elucidate how moral injury. In psychological terms, the Litz group understands forgiveness as a critical step in moral healing, encouraging those who are morally injured to participate in an imagined dialogue with a “moral authority,” often a religious figure about their own experience and complicity. They write further that “the hope is that faith, communion with, and empathy from others who share a faith, and messages based on “good” theology – centered on love and forgiveness – will help heal moral injuries over time.”

Before I list these areas, though, I would like to make two important qualifications about the way I talk about guilt. First – I presume that war itself
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involves morally difficult acts – killing and destruction. This is not a judgment on
their necessity, whether a war is just or unjust, or certainly military service as a
whole. Second, and related, I simply take at face value that many veterans feel
guilt and shame for their participation in conflict, and begin by taking this seriously. I
consider them the best council on their own actions.

With that said, the first area of resonance involves an attention to the
scriptural narrative of the first proclamation of the resurrection, made by Peter and
the disciples to the people of Jerusalem following Jesus’ ascension found in Acts 2.
This disciples in this passage first offer the promise of forgiveness to a crowd - not
to a group of relative innocents, or to people of marginal guilt, but to those who
were responsible for Jesus’ death directly. The crowd in this narrative presumably
contains a significant overlap with the crowd in the gospels that cried out for Jesus
to be crucified, and for Barabbas to be released to them in his stead. Peter, in
addressing the people of Jerusalem in Acts, names Jesus of Nazareth to them as “a
man attested to you by God with deeds of power, wonder, and signs...this man, you
crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the law.”4 After proclaiming the
resurrection of this same Jesus, Peter ends his speech with a pointed accusation as
well, saying “Therefore, let the entire house of Israel know with certainty that God
has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you killed.”5 Many of the
people to whom Peter speaks are then convicted with guilt, and ask him what they
might do? It is then that Peter tells them to repent and extends God’s justice to them
– not in the form of retribution, but forgiveness.

4 Acts 2.22,23.
5 Acts 2.36.
The guilt of the crowd – the first recipients of the offer of divine forgiveness – bear several distinct resonances with those who experience moral injury in conflict. Their guilt is that of perpetrators, who lent their loyalty to what they thought was a valued, and perhaps ultimate pursuit of good and participated in a killing in its defense. Those who demanded Jesus’ execution (according to the gospel narratives) participated in varying ways, but together demand the death and the crucifixion of Jesus. In this agitated state, as Jesus is naked, exposed and dying on the cross, some mock his suffering, others spit upon him and demean him. Listening to the accounts of veterans who experience moral injury, many of them experience the same moral anguish over the desecration of the suffering and the dead, the disregard for life displayed, and of course, their direct and indirect participation in killing. Recall that the Litz definition of “moral injurious events” includes “perpetrating, failing to prevent, or bearing witness to acts that transgress deeply held moral beliefs and expectations.” When confronted with what they have done, it seems safe to wonder if many in the Jerusalem crowd experienced guilt based on similar criteria – some guilty for what they feel they have done, others for going along with something they were conflicted about from the beginning – perhaps others for witnessing the horror of the scene. It is also notable that they took the actions and inactions that they did at the urging of their religious leaders - those they trusted for moral guidance. The leaders agitate their sense of divine holiness and piety – one of their most fundamental beliefs is in the otherness and awesomely unique nature of God. They accuse Jesus of blasphemy, of defiling the ultimate “good” in the universe.

---

by claiming God’s identity for oneself. We might find that this resonates with Shay’s notion of a betrayal by those in positions of power – of using their piety to their own institutional ends. Most certainly, their actions also resonate with the high-stakes situation of killing that is the source of much of the suffering of the morally injured. Given all this, it doesn’t seem like a stretch to envision the crowd, convicted by Peter, as suddenly reaping a whirlwind of guilt and shame for their participation in the crucifixion.

This highlights one of the major contributions that a “moral authority” based on a Christian theology may bring to the solace and healing of moral injury – that it takes veteran guilt and shame seriously. It doesn’t minimize it or attempt to ameliorate it, but takes it as it is as an experience of the wrongness and brokenness of the world, and from this recognition, takes seriously its quest for redemption and justice.

In light of the resurrection, then, it should be noted that while offering the crowd the forgiveness of Christ, justice is not abandoned. Forgiveness is not offered cheaply or by discarding the suffering of the victim. The guilt of the crowd is named, its victim is named, and the act is put into context and called out in the public square. In combat, the relative anarchy of a battlefield situation often means that morally heinous actions are never brought to the light of day, but hidden and kept secret. Those who are witnesses to it are often trapped in their own complicity and failure to stop it. This kind of exposure is something of a double-edged sword for those experiencing moral injury, as their own complicity stands to be exposed as well as those around them. Yet in light of this, it is worth noting that Litz and his
group distinguish between guilt as a generally positive emotion that motivates repentance and ultimately reconciliation, and shame, which is based on the expectation of judgment and scorn from others. So if a painful truth is brought to light, then it is necessary that it is carefully contextualized in a way that opens the avenue from guilt to reconciliation and hope rather than judgment, shame, isolation and self harm. In terms of Christian theology, a great deal revolves around God’s reception of our guilt – how does the Christian understanding of the resurrection tell us what to expect from divine justice?

This brings us to the second area of resonance – the transformative nature of the forgiveness offered by the resurrected Jesus. I would suggest that Rowan Williams in his seminal book *Resurrection: Interpreting the Easter Gospel* illuminates the figure of the risen Christ in a compelling way that opens a powerful path towards a transformative hope for the future. He argues that unlike all of us, who exist as victims to some and perpetrators to others, the resurrection of Christ is the resurrection of the “pure victim” who offered violence to none.\(^7\) The risen Jesus is the one who breaks the cycle of violence, having suffered greatly, but refusing to return or revisit it upon his perpetrators. In this way, Christ absorbs our violence, refusing to transmit it under the guise of necessity, purity, vengeance, justice, religious fervor or any of the other reasons that we find to do so to each other. The revelation of God’s disposition towards the guilty is made here – he offers forgiveness, a way to contemplate our own complicity, find our own voice of repentance in the presence of the pure victim who refuses to see justice as a matter

of punishment to be meted out, but the transformation of our very notion of justice itself.

Positioning the invitation to forgiveness in this way perhaps resonates with those who have created victims in war, and are victims of it themselves. The act of killing itself causes a high level of trauma in part because it is outside of our power to effectively walk it back – we cannot return the life we have taken. Here, Williams envisions Christ as standing in for all victims, and notes that ‘the saving presence of God is always to be sought and found with the victim. Conversion is always turning to my victim – even in circumstances where it is important to me to believe in the rightness of my cause.”

If the Litz group is right, and shame is a corrosive condition based on the fear of judgment, while guilt is an ultimately positive emotion because it motivates us to repentance, then perhaps what this vision of the risen Christ does is offer a path from shame to guilt. Litz envisions a critical step in moral healing as an imagined dialogue with a “moral authority,” often a religious figure. The vision of Christ presented by Williams presents a divine moral authority who has experienced extreme violence, and bears the marks of it on his own body, yet will not judge, who refuses to offer condemnation. Envisioning such a moral authority in a quest for healing offers a path to assuage the feeling of shame in light of one’s actions and allow the more natural expression of guilt to find an outworking in reconciliation (if possible) to our true and concrete victims, who cannot be forgotten in any meaningful notion of forgiveness.
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In keeping the focus of redemption where it must begin – with the victims of violence, Williams’ reading of the resurrection narrative perhaps resonates with the powerful call of justice for the victims – military and civilian – of wartime violence. For those who feel the guilt of killing, a sense of hope must begin with a sense of “good news” for the victims of violence as well.

This brings us to the third aspect of the resurrection that perhaps resonates with the experience of the morally injured – the hope of the renewal of life in the resurrection. Renowned German theologian Jurgen Moltmann is perhaps the world’s foremost living theologian today, and his theology draws deeply on experiences of war early in his life. He was a survivor of the allied firebombing of his hometown of Hamburg and served briefly in the German army after being conscripted and sent to the front.

For Moltmann, the resurrection of Christ marks the defeat of the forces of death and destruction that normally mark off the end of lives, movements, civilizations and groups of peoples. In the resurrection, Moltmann sees unique hope for these victims of war and violence. He writes that “the Spirit of eternal life is first of all a further space for living, in which life that has been cut short, or was impaired and destroyed will be able to develop freely.”9 In other words, in light of the resurrection of Jesus, foreshadowing a renewal of life for humanity, no life that has been ended in violence has eternally been ended, nor its potential lost, but simply temporarily set back. In other words, history literally “breaks open” with new possibilities for flourishing, as all historical events – death, destruction, violence and
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collapse - must be understood as “open and unfinished,” rife with new potentiality in the future of God.\textsuperscript{10}

While it is not an invitation to ignore the consequences of our actions in a cavalier way, this vision perhaps loosens some of the totalizing sense of guilt that many feel for the act of killing. It may serve as a reminder that as powerful as we envision that we are on the battlefield, we are not the ultimate arbiters of life and death in the world. God’s affirmation of life in the resurrection can provide a way of freeing oneself to imagine a hopeful future for those who have killed because it perhaps allows them to envision a future that focuses not simply on their restoration, but that of their victims.

Indeed, Moltmann’s vision of resurrection hope speaks to a renewal of life that offers hope to perpetrators and victims. While it may seem imaginative or even ethereal, the idea that the lives of the victims can be renewed, refreshed and continue on is a powerful one for the perpetrator. In this, he might be able to imagine a dialogue in which he is forgiven for killing his victim \textit{by} his victim. Drawing from the strength of this sense of solace within one’s own suffering psyche, it may enable the morally injured person to pursue concrete actions toward their real victims that would move toward meaningful reconciliation and peace. I say this, on a personal note, because Moltman’s view of the renewal of life of the victims of war has enabled me to find my own solace, and the work I do now is my own attempt to contribute to healing rather than increased strife.

In the next two years, I will be drawing on these areas of resonance, and hopefully many others that I find, in order to continue to discern and articulate, in conversation with brilliant researchers in psychology and psychiatry, and alongside chaplains and clergypersons, the role that theology may play in healing from moral injury. In this way, I hope to honor the legacy of Bernard William Vann, as a clergyperson who clearly saw the great value of a life of faith in service to others. I look forward to participating in this endeavor with all of you in the coming days, weeks, and months.