

International relations



Americas Wars in the Muslim world – the Morale of War The invasion of Iraq by the United States was proclaimed by Bush to be a war on terrorism for the sake of peace in the world. As Alia Brahimy outlines, the United States started the war on Iraq despite the disapproval of the UNO and the global society. Indeed, there is a difference between self-defense and aggression (p. 3). However, Bush did have a justification – the 9/11 attacks became a reason for starting a war. Furthermore, since innocent people suffered in the attacks, Bush justified the Iraq invasion by the statement that homeland security was being threatened. Bush found a just and highly moral cause for his war – protecting the nation against Muslim aggressors via disarming the enemy and bringing democracy and freedom into a dictatorial regime state. However, consider the pure definition of a just war. Brahimy does provide the features of a ‘just’ war. However, as for me, the whole concept of the ‘just’ war makes no sense. The reason is the fact that no matter what war it is, whether a nuclear, or a bacterial, or a financial, or whatever kind of war, war is never a just thing because while politicians and the elite argue around a piece of land with diamonds, for instance, the innocent die. On the other hand, according to Brahimy Concept of just war – war can’t be just. Both Bush and bin Laden see their wars as just – both are justifying violence. Similarly, a concept of preventive war does not make much sense either. Preventing against war? What people are doing these days, I think, is justifying their desires. I want to own that lake of oil, let’s say... Well, my nation, let’s kill our neighbors – their oil is what belongs to us. Nowadays, however, the war slogans and propaganda sound more sophisticated – the willing parties make people believe in the need for their actions. As an example, under the mask of self-defense the Americans exposed innocent Iraqi civilians to random

attacks of mass murdering (p. 40). That is not self-defense. When someone is defending oneself, one does not attack unrelated to the problem parties. As for the Muslims, their philosophy of Jihad initially does not involve killing civilians. At the same time, their religion is quite nationalistic and, consequently, teaches them to do everything possible for protecting their country and religion. However, in cases of terrorist attacks the Muslims misinterpret the tradition and attack innocent people. Alia Brahimmi mentions that the Muslims view terrorist attacks as just a tool to repel American invasion. Furthermore, according to Koran, Muslims are not to kill in anger (p. 10). Indeed, all the terrorist attacks are always well thought-over beforehand. Therefore, (again) the concept of a just war cannot be justified – the war can't be just. Both Bush and bin Laden see their wars as just – both are justifying violence. Similarly, a concept of preventive war does not make much sense either. Preventing against war? The war of Bush was a pre-emptive war, but it only seemed to be 'preventive'.