

Gifty it is likely for war to have

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



Gifty E. Codjoe Assignment 2 #1 on page 157 Describe how Cheney Ryan understands the pacifist's position. Ryan's understanding of the pacifist's position is that it's requiring respect for other human beings and to consider what brings us together as humans.

He opposes the killing of fellow human beings on the grounds of "logic of right." Cheney's position of a pacifist may bring about linking the act of violence as a result of our love for others. Importantly, when it is done out of love so why fault a man when it could be you in the same position to take action. Although an individual who goes beyond to commit violence should be monitored closely. As a pacifist Ryan rejects war, which brings about killing. Having victory over an enemy as a result of violence does not result in justification. #2 on page 155 what considerations does Wasserstrom think could justify war? Describe the limitations each. Wasserstrom says, how Ryan understands just when innocent people are killed despite love or natural human act.

That doesn't give a right to take actions, which is unfair to another, human. Wasserstrom believes that it is likely for war to have a moral justification. Even though war is immoral by its definition, murder and other acts which are normally prohibited is acceptable during war but not saying there is no backing of morality. Wasserstrom believes that very large number of innocent people are affected by war or that are killed is what could justify it. It raises a major argument or case whereby anyone may say this is not right. Although it is part of life, it is not good when it affects so many innocent people.

Wassserstrom assess this argument by first indicating the understanding of war being something that involves killing. Many will die yes but there is a Burden that rises to the surface to make a legitimate case against the killing innocent people, which is not moral. #2 on page 129 How do you think Scheffler will respond to someone who believes that one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter? In response to "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter". The definition for a "freedom fighter" may be someone who engages in struggle to achieve political freedom for either themselves or for others whereas the term "terrorist" may be defined as a person who uses terror or violence as a means of intimidation to attain a political goal. Scheffler sees the act of Terrorism as using violence by non-citizen person against noncombatants in order to attain a political goal.

He has a concern that there is something unique about some form of violence, which is suggestive that it is immoral for diverse reasons. But he is not saying that one act is better than another because these terms can easily be used confusingly. Scheffler tries to differentiate between terrorism and state terror by saying that people who participate in terrorism have different motives as compared to those who engage in state terror. Scheffler believes that even though terrorism will be done for political purposes, there are other terrorists who engage in terrorism for various reasons, which may include fame, and to gain attention from the public. He states that, Terrorists know what the subduing impact of fear has on people, therefore, they use it as a weapon against the people they terror and as a result are able to impart fear in people with the motive of weakening order in the society.

He mentions that terrorism evokes fear on people, and fear can be extremely harsh on an individual's overall welfare. Also, fear brings about ruin to a person's social life. In addition, fear makes people turn to the defense of a stable political society in order to avoid the impact fear has on their lives.