

Just war theory and christian peace

Religion



Just war theory and Christian peace

The Just War tradition provides a moral calculus or moral criteria that may be used to determine whether an action or actions can be morally justifiable. In this case, looking at the responses that Christians are offering, it can be acknowledged that the foremost responses were under the following studies: just cause, right intention, right authority, proportionality, reasonable hope of success, and lastly the last resort. This paper will be focusing on each response and make an analysis on the legitimacy in which Christians took up in the war against terrorism.

Under the just cause argument, just cause may be defined in terms of a response to the crime of aggression, the unlawful violation of the principle of nonintervention. If aggression is being viewed as a crime in accordance to the international law, then states have a right to respond to aggression with force, given that there is no world government or world police force to espouse international law. Most importantly, the moral rationalization for intervening in the affairs of such States would be based upon considerable, clear, irrefutable evidence of their support for terrorists, which is very intricate at best to bring into being, for instance, the lack of tangible evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and Iraq's support for terrorism.

Right authority was a different intervention that has also been used to respond to the issue on terrorism. Most significantly, right authority required an official declaration of war, which includes a bill of particulars that clearly articulates the moral justification and aims of the war.

The other measure that the Christians undertook was to use reasonable hope

<https://assignbuster.com/just-war-theory-and-christian-peace/>

of success. This criterion entailed calculation that using force would re-establish peace. This stipulation represents an attempt to protect the citizens, nonmilitary and military alike, from the imprudence and/or immoral ambitions of their leaders.

The most important and very precious means were the Last Resort. This last criterion mandated that the use of force shall be the last resort, and that adequate nonviolent attempts to resolve the conflict is made and have failed. If all attempts at nonviolent conflict resolution were being reasonably made and while the conflict or threat persisted, then the criterion of last resort would have been met. Even though, the judgment that last resort can never be known with absolute certainty, a considerable effort must be made to resolve the conflict diplomatically in spite of imminent threat. Crucially, the principle of last resort is consistent with the overarching goal of a just peace and exerts a tough moral restraint on war.

Conclusion

In conclusion, while there may be morally acceptable fundamentals in security response by Bush Doctrine, from the standpoint of the Just War tradition the doctrine' connection with a power-hungry, hegemonic foreign policy strategy undermined the moral credibility of the doctrine, and as a result, the moral credibility of the United States. This means that the Christian interventions were a way to retaliate in the abolishment of acts of terror considering just war thinking.