

# Final exam



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Final Exam What is your moral responsibility, if any, as a citizen of an affluent nation toward alleviating severe poverty in the world?

In extreme poverty, individuals from affluent nations have the ability to save people in situations that are life threatening due to absolute poverty. By donating fifteen cents, they can help a child in extreme poverty get oral rehydration salts that could save its life while a twenty-five cent donation could purchase antibiotics for respiratory infections. Individuals from affluent nations have the lifestyle that gives them the capacity to give much more than these fifteen or twenty five dollars. Just as, one is obligated morally to save a child from drowning, the capacity to help people from impoverished countries also leads to a moral obligation to do the same (Winfried & Pogge 33). Affluent individuals can now also engage in a new relationship with strangers across the world that involves a larger community and stronger connections. Via new technologies at the work place, increased mobility, and international trade, people are now more interconnected than before. In addition to this economic interconnection, there is also environmental interconnection. We partake of the same natural resources; water and air, with people from less affluent countries.

Because of this environmental and economic interconnection, the actions that we take are directly impactful on people in less affluent countries (Winfried & Pogge 34). Consumption on our side, as a global consumer of resources, affects the environment of those far and near. The actions we take have a consequence for others living in countries far from ours and we are responsible, causally, for the consequences, without regard of the place that they take place. Because our actions can bring environmental and economic harm to those living in less affluent countries and we remain

unmoved by the suffering and pain inflicted on them, therefore; this is a brutish behavior (Winfried & Pogge 34). To act in a virtuous manner, however, would be showing compassion for them in a manner in which our close neighbors are not harmed. As people from affluent countries possess the capacity to be of aid, are members of a globalized community where actions affect those in less affluent countries and the fact that failure to act would be an act of moral viciousness, we must act in order to alleviate severe poverty.

Apply the just-war theory to the war on terrorism. Can the hybrid war-law model be justified under just-law theory?

While terrorism is an old practice, the war on the same is a new concept. The war on terror challenges prior conceptions on conflict, especially the theory of a just-war (Smit 23). While the question regarding whether the war on terror is just still remains unanswerable, it can be concluded that the theory of just-war is not fittingly applicable to the war on terror. The evolution of a better understanding of contemporary terrorism and the threat it causes has brought into doubt, the accuracy and value of utilizing a war metaphor to attempt a definition of the global response. The willingness of the perpetrators of terrorism to use blatant force on civilians shows that terrorism is not within the boundaries of international armed conflict laws. Responding to terrorism, with war-like measures poses the risk of damaging social bonds that made for a resilient, inclusive, peaceful, and cohesive society (Smit 23).

The model of WAR assumes that war is a conflict involving groups controlled by political authorities, especially governments, nations, and countries (Kaufman 44). One side has the ability to negotiate, with the other side, to

establish peace and end the conflict. The theory of just war postulates that peace is the overall goal in war. However, the US government does not recognize an authority with whom they are at war, and thus, there is no authority to negotiate peace. While the US claim the right of killing and defending, our safety is the only recognized goal. The war on terror does not have any finality, so suspending human rights acts as a permanent rights suspension. However, just war theory does not give any justification for this (Kaufman 44).

#### Works Cited

Kaufman, Whitley. *Justified killing : the paradox of self-defense*. Lanham : Lexington Books, 2011. Print.

Smit, Wim. *Just war and terrorism : the end of the just war concept?* Leuven : Peeters, 2010. Print.

Winfried, Thomas. & Pogge, Menko. *World poverty and human rights*. Cambridge : Polity, 2008. Print.