

Counter terrorism course essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

What are the different perspectives concerning Just War? Can the war on terror be properly characterized as a just war? Under what circumstances would fighting terrorism cease to be just? Why? Just War is a terminology greatly utilized by the media and various groups in order to address a type of war which is occurring or has occurred.

Just war is said to have been caused by moral activities but is also a means to justify a hostile activity done by a group or an actor (Ramsey, 2002). From the theoretical perspective of Ramsey (2002), Just War is deemed as a type of war which could be easily justified due to the definition provided by the group who utilizes such methods. Furthermore, Ramsey (2002) stated that just war could also be used in order to promote a political agenda without directly implying it. Therefore, a just war could be very subjective or objective depending on the person discussing it (Ramsey, 2002). Judaism perspective is similar to the statement provided by Ramsey. In a panel hosted by the American Academy in 2001, Bryan Hehir and Roy Mottahedeh discussed just war from the Judeo-Christian and Islamic perspectives.

Hehir (2001) specifically stated that a just war must have the following aspects to clearly justify the actions of a just war: 1) “ proper authority; 2) last resort; 3) moral possibility of success; 4) and proportionality” (p. 3-4). With such statement, it is clear that a just war necessarily needs a just cause for it to be properly noted. Every single angle or the provisions stated must be followed and clearly seen in order to fully comprehend that the war taking place is a just war (Hehir, 2001) On the other hand, the war on terror could clearly be seen as unjustified. When the United States declared war on terror when they became a victim of terrorism last 2001, their cause was not

vividly vindicated for the reason that the years after the war against Afghanistan and Iraq, the expected results did not materialize. Therefore, fighting terror must only be done if all the provisions under the statement of Hehir and Mottahedeh are met.

2. Give your overall assessment of the USA PATRIOT ACT. Do you think it has contributed to the lack of terror attacks in the United States since 9/11? If you were in Congress, would you vote to renew the act as is? Would you change anything? Why or why not? The USA Patriotic Act was approved by the former President George W. Bush during the time of his reign as President of the United States. It became very controversial due to its contents and intent. Nevertheless, it appears to be one of the main contributors of the counter-attack against terrorism. Clearly, after the vicious attack of the so-called “terrorists” in the United States, the war on terror was immediately presented to the public.

Many were in agreement with the perspective of the United States to utilize the USA Patriotic Act, especially the people who witnessed the tragedies that 9/11 brought. The act includes various assumptions and beliefs with regard to those who have inflicted violence against the United States that may cause readers to be persuaded to think the same. In a study made by the Popular Mechanics magazine and website, the authors clearly stated that there is a clear conspiracy behind the September 9/11 attack. Although there are individuals who do not believe such conspiracy, the Popular Mechanics website presents all sorts of justifiable reason to think otherwise regarding the attacks made (“Debunking the Myths,” 2005). If I were in the United States congress, I would not agree to any of the statements provided by the <https://assignbuster.com/counter-terrorism-course-essay/>

act. First and foremost, I do think that using violence against violence will just create chaos not only towards the actors within the situation but also the allies of the United States.

Considering that the United States is the most powerful state in the international community, it must present that it can face and conquer any situation without the use of violent means. Therefore, I would not approve any of the statements provided in the Act for the reason that violence is not a way to solve huge atrocities. In addition, it is not the State who is affected by such, but the people and the family who lost their loved ones due to violence and selfishness. References Debunking the 9/11 Myths: Special Reports. (2005, March). Popular Mechanics.

Retrieved February 10, 2009 from http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military_law/1227842.html. Hehir, B. & Mottahedeh, R. (2001, December 10). A Just War? Judeo-Christian and Islamic Perspectives.

Panel Discussion. Cambridge, Massachusetts: American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Retrieved February 10, 2009 from <http://www.amacad.org/events/justwar.pdf> Ramsey, P. (2002). The Just War.

England: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. United States of America. (2001, October 26). The USA Patriotic Act. Retrieved February 10, 2009 from <http://web.archive.org/web/20070226113117/www.acluprocon.org/PDFdocs/PatriotActText.pdf>.