

Good argumentative essay about ethics of the united nations

[Politics](#), [President](#)



The Just War Theory is a doctrine developed by Christians to determine whether the war is just. A number of criteria are used to determine whether the war is morally justifiable. The war is considered just if it satisfies a series of criteria. The Just War Theory has two parts which include: Jus ad bellum (conditions where war is justifiable) and Jus in Bello (conducting war in an ethical way). Jus ad bellum concerns whether it is moral to go to war while Jus in Bello concerns moral conduct expected in war (Jean, 2004). There is need to add a third part: Jus post bellum (handling the moral aspect of the aftermath of war as regards reconstruction and settlement).

The Just War Theory is based on attempts by Christians to reconcile three factors: killing a fellow human is wrong; countries have the responsibility of defending their citizens while making sure justice prevails; and the protection of human life while defending moral values may require the use of violence and force. This theory is not for Christians only, but for people of all faiths and those who are not religious. The Just War Theory acts as a guide towards decision making in situations of conflicts. This theory provides a framework for discussions among conflicting states (Jean, 2004). The Just War Theory tries to prevent nations from going to war by showing the bad side of war. Conflicting nations try to find other ways in which an impending war can be avoided. War is destructive and results in loss of human life as well as property. The aftermath of war is heavy losses the need to reconstruct. War should be a last resort if everything else has failed.

The war of the USA on Afghanistan has become the longest most unpopular American War. Immediately after the US was attacked on 9/11, a majority of Americans were supporting the idea of war (Jean, 2004). Twelve years down

the line has seen this support dwindle and most Americans wanting the war to end. The war has led to loss of lives, depletion of resources and an increased budget. Currently President Obama and the Afghanistan President Hamid Karzai have reached an agreement where President Obama wants to withdraw most of the US troops, but leave about 10, 000 American troops to strengthen the Afghanistan army. The interest of the US on this is to prevent threats from al-Qaeda. The Taliban officials are against the use of Afghanistan in threatening other countries. They support the peace process of Afghanistan. President Obama looks at this as a positive step which will lead to reconciliation. He says that the road will be bumpy, but the future looks bright. Taliban wants to cut ties with al-Qaeda as it does not support violence. The view is that war should be ethical and avoided if possible. War brings a lot of losses and should only be undertaken if everything else has failed.

I agree that war should be a last resort after attempts at discussion have failed. Avoiding a war can save a country from being subjected to heavy losses of both human lives and property. Negotiations can lead to agreements which can promote the well being of nations and even create friendship. It is more ethical to prevent war than creating it.

References

Jean B. E., (2004). Just War against Terror: The burden of American power in a violent world. New York: Basic Books.