

Week #6: Modern Interpretations of Just War
October 19, 2008

I. RECAP/INTRODUCTION

- ***Coercion is Necessary to Secure Justice***
 - o This is, and has been, the just war premise since Augustine
- In moving from the *presumption against violence* to its justification, both Augustine and Aquinas focused on *right intention* and *just cause*.
 - o *Augustine*:
 - Important to exclude motives of hatred and revenge from the “ordered loves” of the Christian
 - Placed even violent force within the purview of *love of God and neighbor*.
 - o *Aquinas*:
 - Reoriented Christian just war thinking toward natural justice rather than love
 - Most important criterion of just war for him was conduciveness to the *common good*.
 - Honed in also on the notion of *rightful authority*.
- The core of the just war doctrine remains the same, with occasional tweaks or more criteria added in order to be more explicit (e.g., discrimination, non-combatant immunity)
- 20th century, this trend of change continued
 - o World wars
 - o Advent of nuclear technology and nuclear weapons
- Concepts aligned with the historical just war tradition allow Christian thought to oppose war and renew its pacifist expression, especially in regard to nuclear weapons
 - o Is war in the nuclear age a qualitatively different prospect?

II. THE SOCIAL GOSPEL MOVEMENT (Late 19th Century to Early 20th Century)

- ***The message of the social gospel is the immediacy of the kingdom, and the mission of Christianity as loving social action in history.***
 - o Prompted by its authors’ sensitivity to the egregious injustice of surrounding social conditions
- Believed that the human response to Jesus’ kingdom preaching could lead to greater social equality, harmony, and a real initiation of the kingdom of God in history
- Violent coercion has no place in this renewed society (primarily a pacifist movement)
 - o Education and persuasion, rather than violent coercion, would bring about this better society (based on Christ’s kingdom preaching)

- **Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918)**
 - o “We must see the Kingdom of God as always coming, always pressing in on the present, always big with possibility and always inviting immediate action.” (*A Theology for the Social Gospel*)
 - o Deepest objections to war stemmed from his conviction that war causes immeasurable harm to the welfare of human beings (not based on imitation of Christ’s self-sacrifice)
 - *Thomistic concept with a different conclusion?*
 - o We are to take Christ at his word in the Beatitudes- the “radical sayings” of Jesus about nonresistance are not “unpractical or visionary.”

II. THE EFFECT OF TWO WORLD WARS ON JUST WAR DOCTRINE

A. Christian Realism:

- Espoused by **Reinhold Niebuhr** (1892-1971)
 - o Remains finely tuned to his social situation (both national and international) and addresses it from a Christian perspective
 - o The central feature of the social conditions at the time he writes is *war*.
 - Thus, he recognizes that not even Christian moral agency can be based exclusively on love.
 - Thus, he postulates the *love-justice* dialectic
- Social changes require adjustments in the balance of power, by force if necessary
 - o *Thus, different from the social gospel authors*
- War as an *inevitable necessity* to deal with international injustice; little hope that love can temper the harsh requirements for order
 - o *Augustinian?*
 - o *Hobbes?*
- Sees “love” as the “law of freedom” and the “end term” of any moral system, but asserts that because man is not completely free, and because he is corrupted by sin, “There is, therefore, no historic structure of justice which can either fulfill the law of love or rest content in its inability to do so.”
 - o *Augustinian, not Thomistic!*
 - o “*Corrupted by sin*” is not a term the social gospel proponents are likely to use
- Groups of people together, because of their sin and self-interest, cannot engage in mutual and self-sacrificial love on a systematic level (due to the “collective egoism”)
 - o Hence, “all social co-operation on a larger scale than the most intimate social group requires a measure of *coercion*.” (*Moral Man and Immoral Society*)
 - o “Conflict between the national units remains as a permanent rather than a passing characteristic of their relations to each other.” (*Moral Man*)

- **Attack on Pacifism:**
 - It is wrong simply to equate the Gospel with the “law of love.”
 - Instead, Christianity “measures the whole dimension of human conduct”- not only love, but also sin, a fact with which it deals “realistically.”
 - *The Biblical mandates to “love your enemy” and the Sermon on the Mount are critical ideals, but are a “very impossible possibility.”*
 - Neither individuals nor nations live by the law of love
 - The Church’s “appeals to moral will and this effort to support the moral will by desperate hopes are politically as unrealistic as they are religiously superficial.” (*An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*).

- **Realism:**
 - “Realism” means that no specific moral norm can be taken absolutely
 - A pragmatic approach- values must be weighed against each other to produce the pater of activity that will result in the most egalitarian and inclusive *social good*.
 - A utilitarian approach- though not without Christian sense of guilt at the price one has to pay
 - Describes “the whole moral ambiguity of warfare...It is not possible to engage in any act of collective oppression to collective guilt without involving the innocent with the guilty.” (*The Bombing of Germany*)
 - Not so much a high view of man, or of the incarnation, but strict utilitarianism
 - “The encounter between God and man...must be by faith and love and not by the discovery of some common essence of reason and nature underlying individuals and particulars.” (*Intellectual Autobiography*).
 - *Not very Aquinas sounding!*
 - War is a “**necessary evil**”
 - The issue is often not whether to resort to coercion, but how to find the least destructive form of doing so (*e.g., are economic sanctions always “easier” on the populace than some type of military action?*)
 - Even when justified, it violates humanity’s most essential nature
 - But at the same time, violence is a legitimate option to pursue order and justice
 - *A contradiction? If war is a “necessary” evil, isn’t it still an evil? Doesn’t that preclude a Christian from engaging in it?*
 - *What did Augustine say about war? What did Aquinas say?*

B. Pacifism:

- Espoused by **H. Richard Niebuhr** (1894-1962)
 - Author of *Christ and Culture* (Thesis: Christ is the “transformer of culture”)

- More than his brother Reinhold, H. Richard displays a deference to God’s sovereignty more in tune with the Reformed theological heritage.
 - At the same time, retains from the social gospel not the activist portion but the notion of the immediacy of the kingdom

- Endorses the pacifist witness to the kingdom present
- *Pacifism for H. Richard is a form of eschatological Christian witness, not of social responsibility or even particularly of compassion for one's fellow human beings.*
 - "Man's task is not that of building utopias, but that of eliminating weeds and tilling the soil so that the kingdom of God can grow. His method is not one of striving for perfection or of acting perfectly, but of clearing the road by repentance and forgiveness."
- There may be a certain grace in doing nothing in time of international conflict (*The Grace of Doing Nothing*)
- Human *inaction* is an occasionally appropriate testimony to the providential effect of divine *action*
- The kingdom of God comes through a life of "repentance and forgiveness," not from activity or inactivity.
- Later justifies military involvement in WWII, but his understanding of God's sovereign action in history remains unchanged
 - War is judgment as part of God's redemptive process
 - War is an imitation of Christ's vicarious suffering, and thus is transformative
 - War cannot be evaluated in terms of rightness of particular causes, an exercise that results only in self-righteous hubris both for pacifists and for war's advocates.
- For H. Richard, unlike Reinhold, the kingdom is vivid, absolute, and *temporally immediate*.
- The Jesus of the gospels is not the Jesus of the social gospel with his "anthropocentric morality," nor is he a pacifist in order to realize some social ideal.
 - And if one sees Jesus only in such a light, then he becomes irrelevant to the historical problem and is relegated to the margins.
- "Jesus knew what the social gospel forgot, that gladness and wisdom are gifts bestowed, not ends for engineers, and that they wait upon our willing obedience to the inevitable ways of a power not ourselves that makes for a glory which is not human glory." (*The Social Gospel and the Mind of Jesus*, 1933).

III. RECENT JUST WAR THOUGHT

A. Introduction

B. Paul Ramsey (1913-1988):

- Protestant theologian
- Lead just war thinker in 1950's and 1960's
- As did *Augustine*:
 - Sought to unit love to the just war tradition

- Thought of just war as an act of charity rather than justice
- His passion was to resituate theological ethics in general, and just war theory in particular, on biblical grounds, specifically the love command.
- Reacted to some extent against the dominance of Niebuhrian political realism
 - The political calculation of good ends is not a sufficient base for *Christian* ethics
 - Saw Protestant Christian ethics in post-WWII as floundering in the swamp of relativism.
 - Diagnosed theologians as having a “professional allergy to *rules*.”
 - Didn’t like Niebuhr’s proposal of an unspecified and tentative dialectic between *love and justice*
 - Ramsey instead wanted to permit love to transform and appropriate justice in a systematic and integral way.
- *Covenant Concept*:
 - Controlling concept of Christian ethics is that of *covenant*
 - God initiates a covenant with all people through Christ
 - The norm of that covenant is agape
 - *But* at the same time, reason and revelation can be *companion sources*, since God’s covenant is established with all persons in Christ.
- The first step to an understanding of the validity of Jesus’ strenuous teachings (e.g., the Beatitudes) must involve putting a *limitation* upon the area of their intended application.
 - The point of Jesus’ teachings were that we are to attend wholeheartedly to the neighbor *close at hand*.
 - But there must be a qualification beyond that because
 - “There is always more than one neighbor and indeed a whole cluster of claims and responsibilities to be considered.”
 - There may be a multiplication and eventual conflict of neighbor claims
 - Thus we must use the *love principle* in determining how to act towards our competing neighbors.
- Love has a critical role in forming the secular political doctrine of just or limited warfare
 - This doctrine is accomplished by a “love-transformed justice.”
- “The change-over to just-war doctrine and practice was not a ‘fall’ from the original purity of Christian ethics; but..a change of tactics only. The basic strategy remained the same: responsible love and service of one’s neighbors in the texture of the common life...Christians simply came to see that the service of the real needs of all the men for whom Christ died required more than personal, witnessing action. It also required them to be involved in maintaining the organized social and political life in which all men live. *Non-resisting love had sometimes to resist evil.*” (*War and the Christian Conscience*).
- It is love that places limits on the conduct of war in the Western political tradition.

- A special example of the work of love transforming justice is the principle of *double effect*.
 - o *Thomistic concept*

Nuclear Deterrence:

- As a nuclear power, the US is entitled to build, store, and position nuclear weapons in order to maintain its balance of power with the USSR
- Using nuclear weapons against civilians violates the just limitation of war.
 - o *However*, noncombatants cannot always be isolated from the military target
 - o Thus, while it is incumbent on the political leadership of the country to renounce the use of “morally repugnant means” (indiscriminate attacks) this does not preclude either a specifically military use of or the continued possession of nuclear weapons, which, because of the very ambiguity of their potential to be used against or to “indirectly” damage civilians, can be relied upon to produce the desired deterrent effect.

Ramsey: Conclusion:

- Ramsey’s theory is *Augustinian* when considered on the whole
 - o Acts of violence are legitimated primarily as requirements of *love*, and only secondarily as requirements of *justice* in pursuit of the common good
 - o At least two authors (Cahill and Richard Miller) have identified what they consider the danger in this approach
 - When war engaged to protect the innocent is presented as “an expression, not a compromise of agape, then qualifications become almost unnecessary.”
 - Tends to remove the thoroughly exceptional character of war, “to render war analogous with other moral acts, to domesticate war as it were.”
- Ramsey’s talk of the urgency of neighbor love derives not from realized eschatology (the radical presence of the kingdom in history) but from the so-called deontological imperative.

C. Evolving Roman Catholic Social Tradition

- Recent Roman Catholic social teaching is not like Niebuhr’s realism or Ramsey’s effort to make rules for the love mandate
- Instead, Roman Catholic pontiffs and their interpreters have taken a more *Thomistic* path
 - o Rooting a national right to self-defense in a reason-discerned *natural order* and in the mutual rights and duties that make for the *common good*
 - o “A will to peace, which, in the extremity, bears within itself a will to enforce the precept of peace by arms. But this will to arms is a moral will; for it is identically a will to justice.” (John Courtney Murray, *Theology and Modern War*)

Summary of RC View of Just War:

- In the Roman Catholic tradition, there may be a presumption against war, but it is considerably qualified by the expectation that there will be necessary and inevitable exceptions which reason demands, which are therefore clearly justified.
- Moreover, there is a strong assumption that Christian moral responsibility entails responsibility for the evolution of events in history toward the common good.
- Teaching on war and peace has become gradually more cautious about championing the unfettered sovereignty of individual states and more interested in joining nations together in the common cause of peace under the leadership of a world government
- Notion of the common good enlarged from the nation-state to that of the “world community” and the “universal common good”
- Thus the medieval allowing of violence to defend the political order from outside attack has been qualified
- More of seeing all cultures in terms of common humanity bound together by compassion as well as rational justice.
- Big issues that the Roman Catholic Church faces post WW-II are:
 - o The advent of nuclear weapons
 - o The growth of pacifism
- *Vatican II (1962):*
 - o Explicitly accepted pacifism as a legitimate Roman Catholic alternative
 - Made “humane provisions for the case of those who refuse to bear arms, provided however that they accept some other form of service to the human community.” (Vatican II documents)
 - o Move unequivocally to exclude nuclear attacks on civilians, while retaining a right to war in general.
 - “Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation.”
 - o Called for progressive disarmament under the supervision of an international authority
 - o But, like John XXIII, exhibits a catholic optimism about human nature in avowing that true peace “must be born of mutual trust among nations.”
- *Nuclear deterrence?*
 - o Pope Paul VII: “If you want to be brothers; let the weapons fall from your hands. You cannot love with weapons in your hands. Long before they mete out death and destruction, those terrible arms supplied by modern science foment bad feelings and cause nightmares, distrust, and dark designs. They call for enormous expenditures and hold up projects of human solidarity and great usefulness.”
(*Address to General Assembly of the United Nations, 1965*)
- *National Conference of Catholic Bishop’s Letter (The Challenge of Peace/May 1983):*
 - o Written by the U.S. bishops

- “Made an uneasy truce with mutual nuclear threat, while virtually ruling out any actual use of the weapons.” (Lisa Cahill, *Love Your Enemies*)
 - The central ambiguity in their letter is created by the fact that deterrence loses effectiveness to the extent that actual use of the weapon is disavowed.
 - Or conversely, deterrence policy is premised on an at least implicit threat to do that which it seeks to avoid as an irreducibly immoral violation of the immunity of noncombatants from direct attack.
- *Prevailing Roman Catholic Consensus?*
 - Both pacifist and just war approaches should be represented within the church in order to serve the pursuit of both peace and justice
 - No use of nuclear weapons is justified in any circumstances presently envisioned, and hence no planning for their actual use is justified
 - Concrete deterrence policies must be evaluated individually in light of their effect on the balance of power that staves off war and on the prospects of eventual disarmament.
- The pacifist challenge is met uneasily within the recent RC just war tradition
 - Many theologians question the consistency of the two attitudes toward war and peace
 - *Contra the Eastern Orthodox- remember this when we discuss their views of war and peace/ the warrior and the pacifist*
- At least one theologian (John Courtney Murray) opined that the pacifism of the papal encyclicals starting in the post WWII era sanctioned relative rather than absolute pacifism
 - Disallowing morally the option of war, not because killing is in principle always wrong, but because:
 - Nuclear war constitutes insufficiently limitable killing
 - The war experiences of the 20th century taught that violence and terror cannot build truly stable and humane international relationships.
 - Still based on an assessment of *justice* in relation to the *common good*, and is articulated in terms of *criteria* or *rules*.
 - I.e., pacifism in this mode still presupposes a natural law or justice-based approach to morality, and assumes that moral obligations can and should be best articulated in rules about permitted and excluded varieties of specific conduct.
- BUT: Pacifism cannot really be tied definitively to this mode of moral reasoning
 - The pacifist message may originate in a distinctive understanding of discipleship.
 - It is only incompletely appreciated by just war thinkers that genuine biblical pacifism does not revolve around the absolutization of any human *values* or *rules*, but around a converted life in Christ that subsumes and often changes every “natural” pattern of behavior.
- *Catholic Catechism (1992):*
 - Lays out the traditional criteria for, and explicitly adopts, the just war tradition.

- “The evaluation of the conditions for moral legitimacy belongs to the prudential judgment of those who have responsibility for the common good.”
 - *I.e., the lawful state authority, not the Church, is assigned the primary responsibility in the decision to go to war.*

D. Paradox of Nuclear Deterrence (*discussed above*)

- Can a state *threaten* a violation of noncombatant immunity in order to achieve a form of peace?
- Is a state allowed under just war to *threaten* to do that which, if it *did* do, would be a clear violation of just war (i.e., deploy nuclear missiles)?

IV. THE MODERN PACIFIST VOICE

A. Introduction

- Primary differences between just war and pacifist thinking lie in:
 - Interpretations of the presence or futurity of the Kingdom of God
 - Conversion-based vs. rule-based approach to violence as a moral problem
- In general, pacifists stress *Christian community* as the origin of the Christian life, and nonviolence as the expression of it.
 - They begin with the *way of life* formed in Christ, then search to carry out that formation toward practical details, *not via a code*.
- Just war thinking is also grounded in practice- the practice of the just and ordered political life.
 - But it is also *theory-oriented* toward defining and refining criteria by analysis and argument.
 - The theoretical and rule-oriented nature of just war thinking is evidenced by the fact that it is an “exception-making” enterprise.
 - Presumes a norm against violence and killing, then questions the application of that norm to specific cases.
- Genuine Christian pacifism, in contrast
 - Asks first not about the exceptional case, but about the quality of communal life grounded in Christ and in the kingdom of God
 - This life, for pacifists, makes violence incomprehensible.
- Christian pacifists focus so strongly on the original question of discipleship in the “kingdom present” that they exclude as a systematic and extended enterprise the development of criteria for living as though the kingdom had not yet arrived.

- The pacifist will avow that the whole thrust of the New Testament, as centered on the life and teaching of Jesus, militates against the idea that balance and compromise are what Christianity is about.
- Recall, though, the Sermon on the Mount has served as a moral compass for both pacifist and just war thinkers.
 - o Question for just war advocates is always *how* the New Testament ideal of love both of needy neighbors and of the enemy is to be applied in history, given conflicting duties to the guilty, the innocent, and the political order.

B. Roman Catholic Pacifist Tradition

- Roman Catholic tradition has in common with much Protestant pacifist thought a presentation of nonviolence as part of a total life of discipleship, growing out of a deep religious commitment and community rather than out of an ethical analysis of *values* and *norms*.
- Unwavering stand is not primarily a *rule*-governed activity, but a *conversion*-governed one.

1) Dorothy Day (1897-1980)

- Founder of the Catholic Worker movement, advocating social change in various areas
- Embodied many of the ideals of American social radicalism in the 1st half of the 20th century
- Stressed common humanity as a source of nonviolent attitudes, consistent with RC teaching on reason and natural law
- At same time, saw Jesus' teaching as central, particularly the Sermon on the Mount and the kingdom he inaugurated via his incarnation.
- Single-minded in her rejection of any form of violence, especially war.
 - o Claimed that she spoke instead "in terms of the Sermon on the Mount"- and sought to take it literally
- "Our side should be a side that follows the teachings of Jesus. We are Christians, which means we take our Lord's words and His examples as the most important message in the entire world."
- Though her religious language was often biblical and even eschatological, she also had a strong Catholic appeal to reason and humanity, as confirmed by the revelation in Christ and the tradition of the early church.
 - o Nonviolent resolutions are "more reasonable" and thus more in accord with human nature
 - o The Sermon on the Mount confirms and sanctions the non-violent procedure which is already sanctioned by reason.

- Day later in her life suggested that the practice of nonviolence grew integrally out of the movement's commitment to try to respond as Jesus would to the immediate situation.
 - o Not per se a matter of moral absolutes.
 - o "It is in our everyday lives that God judges us, not in the positions we take on issues."

2) *Thomas Merton (1915-1968)*

- Born in France, but spent his childhood living between Paris and New York with parents who were artists
- Became interested in Catholicism while in graduate school while studying Aquinas (and after having a bit of an Augustinian youth...)
- Trappist monk at Gethsemani Abbey in Kentucky (entered after Pearl Harbor)
- The spiritual dimension of pacifism (conversion-based, not rule-based) is particular evident in his writings
 - o Quasi-mystical identification of all human beings as part of one redeemed reality, a unity that he expresses in terms of compassion for fellow humanity.
- His interest in social issues grew with the cultural turbulence of the 1950s and 1960s
- Began to correspond with prominent Roman Catholic figures such as Dorothy Day
- His major focus in the 1960s was the problem of peace in a nuclear age
- He was impressed by the hegemony of the just war tradition and was reluctant to exclude completely the use of violence to repel injustice.
- *A bit of ambivalence:*
 - o "If a pacifist is one who believes that all war is always morally wrong and always has been wrong, then I am not a pacifist. Nevertheless, I see war as an *unavoidable tragedy*." (*Peace and Protest*, 1971).
- According to Cahill, it is possible to interpret Merton either as:
 - o A just war theorist who was rigorously faithful to the exclusions of violence implied by his criteria and to the presumption that violence is a sinful solution, or
 - o A pacifist at heart who felt accountable to the parameters outlined by his hard-won Catholic faith and who could allow a margin for violence at the theoretical level that he could never really envision in practice.

Merton's Christian View of Peace:

- Repeatedly stresses the kingdom made present and livable in Jesus Christ
- Ties Christian *love* to human compassion and to political action
- Eschatology- the immediacy of God's kingdom- is fundamental to Merton's thought
 - o The notion of "the Kingdom of God is among you"
- Merton invokes the example of Christ
 - o But insists that nonviolence does not preclude resistance to evil, possibly including force in limited situations.

- Strongly critical of “realistic” theologies (*e.g.*, *Niebuhr*) that reduce to “might makes right,” and of the tendency to “identify the God of the Bible and of the Church with the Angel of the West”- i.e., European-American civilization.
- Repeatedly criticizes the just war tradition for having contributed historically to rationalizations of violence on behalf of national self-interest.
- An important feature of his pacifism is his avoidance of any rule-based approach
 - o Rather, hinges on personal relationships
 - o The “Christian loves his brother” not because of any command to do so, but because the fellow human being is not an object, but “*is Christ.*”
- Seems to have accepted to some degree the adequacy of Augustine’s justification of war as an act of love
 - o But finds that the eventually developed set of refined criteria for adjudicating just cause and means in war yielded an illusory sense of moral precision and righteousness and led to egregious offenses
 - o Referred to Augustine as “the remote forefather of the Crusades and the Inquisition.”
- Violence depends on the premise that the enemy is not only different, but evil and deserving destruction.
 - o “There must be a new force, the power of love, the power of understanding and human compassion...*the will to live and to build, and the will to forgive. The will for reconciliation.*” (*Preface to Vietnamese Translation of No Man is an Island*).
 - o The capacity to love is the most distinctive quality of humanity, and it is grounded in our nature as ‘image of God.’
 - o The power to love is also linked to the Sermon on the Mount and the Christian’s vocation to redeem the world’s brokenness in very practical terms.

C. Protestant Pacifist Tradition

- Emphasis on community and on a realized eschatology are even more explicit in Protestant pacifism
- The vision of pacifism as humanity’s true fulfillment is muted, if not absent; accentuated instead are obedience and fidelity to God’s revealed will in Christ
- Love and sacrifice are construed in terms of *witness*, rather than of *social activism*

1) *John Howard Yoder (1927-1997)*

- Mennonite and theology professor at Notre Dame
- *Politics of Jesus*
 - o Focuses on the gospel of Luke
 - o Argues that Jesus expected his disciples to establish a new social order ruled by servanthood rather than power

- However, Yoder, unlike the Catholics and social gospel proponents, does not envision broad social transformation (however, later in life advocates more Christian social involvement)
- “The key to the obedience of God’s people is not their effectiveness but their patience.”
 - o Suffering is part of “the social reality of representing in an unwilling world the Order to come.”
- Yoder sees Jesus as having been confronted repeatedly by the temptation to rely upon violence to accomplish his messianic ends
 - o Jesus could have instigated the crowds to establish his own political rule
- The promise of a new humanity enabled by God “takes on flesh in the most original, the most authentic, the most frightening and scandalous, and therefore in the most evangelical way,” when it is embodied “with reference to enmity between peoples, the extension of neighbor-love to the enemy, *and the renunciation of violence even in the most righteous cause.*”
- Explicitly rejected the Niebuhrian dichotomy between pure Christian love and action for justice, refusing to concede that “this ethic of ‘obedience’ sacrifices ‘effectiveness.’”

2) *Stanley Hauerwas (b. 1940)*

- For many years described himself as a southern Methodist who often worships with Roman Catholics
 - o But now is a member of an Episcopal church in Chapel Hill, NC
- A colleague of John Howard Yoder at Notre Dame
- Has taught at Duke Divinity for about twenty years
- *Time* magazine in 2001 named him the country’s “Best Theologian” catapulting him to national attention
- Developed the communal emphasis in Christian social ethics in more philosophical terms
- Criticizes theologians such as Rauschenbusch, the Niebuhrs, and Ramsey for having compromised the authentically theological nature of Christian ethics in order to gain greater currency in the public and policy arenas.
- Although in many ways his position is similar to Yoder’s, he adds the notion of the way *community* functions theoretically as well as practically in Christian pacifism
 - o Very Thomistic in his emphasis on community

Hauerwas’ View of the Christian Community as the Fount of Nonviolence:

- “The calling for the Church to be the church is not a formula for a withdrawal ethic; nor is it a self-righteous attempt to flee from the world’s problems; rather it is a call for the church to be a community which tries to develop the resources to stand within the world witnessing to the peaceable kingdom and thus rightly understanding the world. *The gospel is a political gospel. Christians are engaged in politics, but it is a politics of the kingdom that reveals the insufficiency of all politics based on coercion and falsehood and*

finds the true source of power in servanthood rather than dominion.” (Peaceable Kingdom).

- Like Yoder, he sees biblical symbols, especially the cross and kingdom, as foundational
 - o However, “Scripture is not meant to be a problem solver” in the dilemma-ethics sense. “It rather describes the *process* whereby the community we call the church is initiated by certain texts into...biblical traditions.”
- Jesus’ story *is* a social ethic, because of the sort of community that it creates.
 - o Hauerwas, like other pacifists, begins from the premise that Jesus does not merely preach “impossible ethical ideals,” but “actually proclaims and embodies a way of life that God has made present here and now,” a life of “forgiveness and peace.” (*The Peaceable Kingdom*)
- The Christian fights injustice, but not with violent means- “any resort to violence betrays one’s relation to God.” (*Against the Nations*)
- In his view, the pacifist answer to the bomb requires simply an extension of the principle that violence of *any* sort is excluded.
 - o I.e., bomb doesn’t raise any new issue.
- Hauerwas does **not** deny that the just war theory begins with a presumption against violence and then tries to make the conduct of war a moral enterprise.
- However, he also makes the point that the just war tradition lives off the eschatology of Christian pacifism in the sense that it isolates some actions as never to be done, no matter what the consequences.
 - o This implies that the highest moral value is not, after all, survival.
- And for the pacifist, especially the Christian pacifist, the limit is the use of violence itself
 - o For even when it serves moral purpose, it is at the expense of a way of life and an interpretation of history of which nonviolence is an indispensable part.
 - o Hauerwas is critical of the notion that survival is to be our chief collective or individual aim, and of the sometimes unacknowledged- yet practiced by our “legitimized” violence- belief that we think we’re going to live forever.

VI. JUST WAR AND ASYMETRICAL WARFARE

Jus ad Bellum Challenges:

- Some of the just war criteria are still applied in the same way that these criteria are applied with nation-states as aggressors.
 - o Securing the peace
 - o Rightful intention
- But what about the just cause notion of “punishing evildoers”?
 - o Recall that both Augustine and Aquinas allowed this as one of the three justifications for the “just cause” prong

- Saint Augustine explained that a just war may be one that punishes another party for injuries “if some nation or state again whom one is waging war has neglected to punish a wrong committed by its own citizens.”
- Saint Aquinas added that the *state itself*, in refusing to punish its citizenry, was a legitimate object in this calculus.
- Another difficulty is with “last resort”:
 - When you are dealing with a slippery enemy who attacks then slips away into the populace, when have you reached the threshold of “last resort” so that you may then resort to war?
 - Do you look to the actions of the *harboring state*, in determining whether they have done all they can do to restrain their own residents?
 - When do you proclaim that the acts are not (or no longer) merely a *crime*, but are acts of *war*?
 - **Issue to Consider:**
 - Is it *war*, or is it a *crime*? What does calling it “warfare” versus “criminal activity” do to the enterprise?

Jus in Bello Considerations:

- Then, if *jus ad bellum* is met... What can you attack? What’s a legitimate target? (***jus in bello***)
- Big issues with proportionality, military necessity, discrimination/distinction
- Additional Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions provides the most widely-accepted definition (very in line with Augustine and Aquinas on the subject):
 - Parties to a conflict must take special care to ensure that their targets are military objects, not civilian objects.
 - Should doubt exist as to the nature of an object, the parties are to presume that it is civilian and are not to attack it.
 - Military objects are those “which by their nature, location, purpose or use make an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.”
- *How can we apply the doctrine of military necessity to those who purposefully use it against us and don’t “fight fair”?*