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ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the profound change that occurred to the just war tradition during the Enlightenment, whereby just war changed from a religious set of principles to a secular theory. Just war theory in its most compact form attempts to establish a code for regulating the decision to enter war, *jus ad bellum*, and how to conduct war, *jus in bello*. The balance between the two principles is where justice can be found in war. How these principles were understood and incorporated into the decision making process, however, has changed drastically. One of the greatest transformations and one that has great consequence for modern warfare, occurred in the 18th century: the break from the religiously imbued theory from St. Thomas Aquinas of the 13th century. Following fatigue from the death and destruction occurring as a result of the reformation and counter-reformation, the theory took on a different role and understanding that was distinctly secular. This paper traces the origins of the just war tradition and then analyzes Aquinas’ theory and the impact he made. Following this section is a look at the Enlightenment and the changes that occurred to just war theory during this time. Finally, I take a look at the effect of this transformation of just war theory for the understanding of war in the modern age.
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PART I
CHAPTER ONE
Introduction: What is Just War Theory?

The unfortunate realities of war are known to all people of all societies, in all of time. As a universally understood component of human life, war is a common connection between people, and yet it is a continuously evolving, difficult to define, nuanced, and all around ambiguous concept. The warfare of the modern age has very few similarities with warfare in ancient Greece. The common thread that binds all war, however, is the desire to restrain war, to prevent it. The principles applied to war as a means of limiting its destruction have evolved nearly as much as war itself. Their intentions, however, never have. Understanding the evolution of war requires, in part, an understanding of these principles and their effect on war. Religion is one of the most prominent influences over the rules of war. Christianity, especially, has affected how war is conducted, for what reasons, and by whom. The history of Christianity has seen great times of war and has attempted to reconcile the unfortunate realities of war with the foundational tenets of the Christian faith. In the 13th century, a Catholic theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas, would compile and consolidate much of this long tradition in his seminal work, the Summa Theologica.

St. Thomas Aquinas, referring to these rules of war as the principles of just war, outlines the restrictions, as well as the prescriptions, necessary for a war to be just. Writing expressly on just war, he is among many to address the topic, but the first to address it as “just war.” In addition to giving a name to a set of principles long in existence, Aquinas also presented the most complete and clear set of principles for just war, which quickly became the authority on the matter up to, and to an extent, after, the Enlightenment. As a devout Catholic, he was significantly influenced by the teachings of the Church which is clearly evident in his arguments,
including just war theory. Constructing this argument, Aquinas appealed to natural law, a concept he developed, which explains the rules, principles, and facts of life, as deduced through reason. These are universally accepted because they are innate to human life and knowable by all. One such precept Aquinas ascribes to natural law is, “…that good is to be sought and done, evil to be avoided.”¹ Furthermore, “…natural-law commands extend to all doing or avoiding of things recognized by the practical reason of itself as being human goods.”² Essentially, humans should seek good and avoid evil, and this is known and accepted as a result of the rationality all humans are endowed with. In this sense, this one basic, and overarching, precept and all other rules and principles incorporated in natural law are binding on all people. Grounding his theory on just war in natural law, Aquinas built an argument that is universally applicable. While the Catholic influence in the writings of Aquinas is unmistakable, the reason-based argument on just war made the theory universally applicable, guaranteeing its staying power.

By the time of the Enlightenment, however, negative reactions against the ever-rising death toll from religious warfare, and the emergence of new thinking and ideals that sought to garner individual autonomy of thought and action and remove religious influences from the political sphere, placed Aquinas’ just war theory in a precarious position. “In working through this problem and rejecting religion as just cause for war, Western moral tradition on war implicitly rejected all such recourse to unverifiable truth claims,” notes Johnson.³ It was within this environment that just war theory underwent the greatest transformation since Aquinas in the 13th century. The works of Kant and other enlightenment thinkers significantly influenced the secularization of just war theory that occurred during this time. All of the religious influences

1 Aquinas, Summa Theologæ 81
2 Ibid. 81
3 Johnson, Can Modern War Be Just? 61
and justifications of just war theory, as presented by Aquinas, were rejected in favor of entirely secular justifications.

What occurred was a transformation, not in the actual tenets of the theory, but in the foundations of the theory. During this transformation, the religiously laden theory of Aquinas was not replaced by the new theory. Rather, just war theory split into two distinct theories. The concept of just war, as presented by Aquinas, which had enjoyed preeminence for five centuries maintained adherence and loyalty, especially within the Church. The secularized version also accrued a strong following. While the transformation may appear unsubstantial in light that the principles espoused do not change, the creation of a secular justification for just war principles greatly impacted the future trajectory of the just war tradition. While Aquinas’ theory is based on reason, very similar to the secular version, it uses a set of presumptions regarding the proper ends for human beings as its foundation. The just war principles he espouses are to be followed because it is in the best interest of the individual human. Conversely, the similarly reason-based secular theory of the Enlightenment reasonably deduces what is most beneficial to the maintenance and prosperity of the state. Again, the similarities between the two theories are greater in number than their differences, but the effect of the differences is great.

This impact is most clearly seen in the creation of nuclear weaponry. As warfare evolved and weapons became more advanced, and more deadly, there developed the question if modern war could ever be fought in a just manner? In answering this question, specifically with regards to if it is ever acceptable to use or threaten use of nuclear weapons, two differing opinions developed. These two camps were divided along the same line that divides the religious and secular just war theories. How just war theory is understood today is a direct result of the transformation that occurred during the Enlightenment.
The just war tradition has seen the evolution of a theory of principles meant to restrain and prevent the evils of war for the benefit of all. It has seen the introduction and the retraction of religious principles. Contributors from Plato in 400 BCE all the way to the present day have imparted their ideas and insights into the tradition. Understanding how just war theory is viewed in the modern context depends on understanding what happened to just war theory during the Enlightenment.

Before any of this can happen, however, a basic understanding of what comprises just war theory is necessary. Johnson summarizes the basics of the theory well, when he explains, “In the classic terminology, the component parts of just war theory are grouped under two headings, as follows:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jus ad bellum</strong></th>
<th><strong>Jus in bello</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(whether resort to force is justified)</td>
<td>(whether a particular form of the use of force is justified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just cause</td>
<td>Proportionality (in the sense of proximate good over evil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right authority</td>
<td>Discrimination, or noncombatant protection (Johnson 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality (in the sense of total good and evil anticipated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The end of peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last resort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this boils down to is that it is only justifiable to enter war, *jus ad bellum*, in defense or in pursuit of peace. Secondary aspects of this component of just war tradition deal with right authority, the idea that only the legitimate leader/ruler of a state can pursue war, and right intention, the concept that war be pursued as a means to an end of peace, rather than retribution or punishment. As St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, an important contributor to the just war tradition, and a major influence on Aquinas, argues, “Peace should be the object of your desire. War should be waged only as a necessity and waged only that through it God may deliver men from that necessity and preserve them in peace. For peace is not to be sought in order to kindle
war, but war is to be waged in order to obtain peace. Therefore even in the course of war you should cherish the spirit of a peace maker.”

Stemming from the prescription that war be waged with right intentions of peace, *jus in bello*, contains the restrictions on actions within war. One important restriction in the doctrine of *jus in bello* is discrimination, or the idea that noncombatants must be excluded from direct war actions. Writing in 1983, The National Conference of Catholic Bishops proffered that, “Just response to aggression must be discriminate; it must be directed against unjust aggressors, not against innocent people caught up in a war not for their own making.” Cicero, another contributor to the just war tradition, also argued for the importance of discrimination in war acts, although on different grounds. Roland Bainton writes that, “His greatest concern was with the treatment of the vanquished, because only a liberal peace was a sound basis for the building of an empire.”

As previously stated, just war theory stretches back to ancient Greece and continues to have implications for today. To understand how just war theory fits into the complicated reality of the modern globalized, technologically advanced world, and how the secularization process of the Enlightenment occurred, the most fitting place to start is at the beginning.

---

4 Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* 96
5 National Conference of Catholic Bishops 46-104
6 Bainton 41
CHAPTER TWO
Origins of the Just War Tradition

The just war tradition is ever evolving; the origins can be traced to a multitude of sources. Plato\(^7\) wrote emphatically on the importance of just rulers and ascribed to Socrates’ philosophy that it is better to suffer harm than to inflict it. While never addressing war explicitly, much of Plato’s philosophy on justice and the rightful actions of rulers can be seen to influence the manner in which Aquinas perceived of just war theory. Commenting on Plato’s philosophy as it relates to just war, Roland Bainton notes, “If all other means of adjusting a difference had failed and war ensued, then it should be waged with an eye to the restoration of peace. Such was the view of Plato who, without using the expression, first gave formulation to the code which came to be called that of the ‘just war’.\(^8\)

Plato’s arguments regarding the proper ruling of a state, namely Athens, and the interaction of the state with surrounding autonomous political bodies arose from a central precept of the importance of righteousness. Each individual citizen must act righteously in their dealings with their fellow citizens, as with the state; and more importantly the ruler of the state must be righteous and just in order to effectively control the state. Thus, Plato commanded restraint in war and limited destruction as it would be unrighteous to do harm to others without warrant. As always, many of his thoughts were directed by the ideal of not doing harm to others. In *The Republic*, Bainton notes that Plato argues that, “The conquered were not to be enslaved; by the same token they were not to be exterminated.”\(^9\) Even more specific, and derived from the experience of warfare among Greek nations, Plato outlines that, “The houses of the Greeks

---

\(^7\) Plato, living from 424/423 BCE – 348/347 BCE wrote prolifically on the concept of the state and its proper functioning. Plato’s *The Republic* is the most relevant to the questions over war and rules of war

\(^8\) Bainton 37

\(^9\) Ibid. 37
should not be burned. The land should not be scorched. Only the annual harvest might be confiscated. The sensibilities of the foe were not to be outraged by despoiling the dead of anything but weapons, nor by erecting trophies of victory in temples. Indiscriminate destruction would harm the innocent because in any conflict the whole population, consisting of men, women, and children should never be regarded as an enemy. Those really responsible for the quarrel would always be few.”

Plato was adamant in his understanding that warfare must be practiced in a limited fashion, regardless of the precipitating factors, since such harm was surely not righteous or just, and also potentially unsettling to Athens.

Much of what Plato conceived to be just on behalf of rulers was built on the premise of the autonomy of states, to which citizens are loyal and dependent. Bainton explains that, “The great growth of cosmopolitanism came partly as a result of the conquests and the program of Alexander the Great, who has been hailed in our own day as the first to essay the unification of mankind.”

The establishment of societal groups was not only important for Plato’s view on justice and politics but for his predecessors as well, including Cicero. “When the notion of the just war was taken over by the Romans certain modifications were introduced by reason of the altered circumstances. Cicero was to transform the just war into a code for conquerors – an ethic for empire,” writes Bainton. Furthermore, he explains that Cicero’s understanding of war centered on a basic principle that, “To be just, said he, a war must be conducted by the state. A soldier not inducted by oath could not legally serve.” This tenet would eventually find its way into Aquinas’ theory on just war, among other principles.

---

10 Bainton 38
11 Ibid. 34
12 Marcus Cicero (106 BC – 43 BC), a Roman philosopher and statesman
13 Ibid. 41
14 Ibid. 41
The works of St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo\textsuperscript{15} would have the most profound influence on Aquinas’ theory, however. As a Catholic, Augustine was the first to clearly define just war within a religious (Christian) framework independent of the biblical teachings on just war. Noting the reality that Augustine had accepted that peace in this life is not possible, Bainton writes that, “On our earthly pilgrimage we pant after peace, yet are involved in constant strife – with the pagan, with the heretic, with the bad Catholic, and even with the brother in the same household.”\textsuperscript{16} Nonetheless, Augustine believed strongly in the importance of striving for the ideal of peace and to seek out all possible resolutions before deferring to armed conflict. Similar to what Plato had put forward with regard to the principle that peace must be the objective of any conflict resolution, including war, Augustine wrote that, “Peace should be the object of your desire. War should be waged only as a necessity and waged only that through it God may deliver men from that necessity and preserve them in peace. For peace is not to be sought in order to kindle war, but war is to be waged in order to obtain peace. Therefore even in the course of war you should cherish the spirit of a peace maker.”\textsuperscript{17} In couching just war in Christian terms, Augustine explained that war was not necessarily incongruent with justice because the leading principle of Christianity is love which determines attitude, not action. He argues that it is possible to kill with an inward disposition of love. Bainton explains that, “The inwardness of Augustine’s ethic served to justify outward violence, because right and wrong were seen to reside not in acts but in attitudes.”\textsuperscript{18} Importantly, love acted as the necessary restraint in war that prevented further death and destruction. Augustine goes even further to argue that the evidence of warring parties showing mercy in victory to noncombatants and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} St. Augustine of Hippo (November 13, 354 – August 28, 430) was a Latin philosopher and theologian. His works significantly expanded the authority and power of the Catholic Church
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. 91
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid. 96
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid. 92
\end{flushleft}
property is a direct result of Christian conscience. “He was blind, said Augustine, who did not see that this was to be attributed to the name of Christ and to the Christian temper.”

Augustine marks an important evolution in the tradition of just war theory whereby the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, heavily influenced by Augustine, would culminate with the most complete and concise construction of just war theory. The course of history for the Catholic Church was changed due to the influence of Augustine and Aquinas, who instilled religious principles into many political theories and constructs, including the rules of war. “Augustine assigned to the Church a larger role in the fashioning of society, because the duration of that society was extended by the projection of the Lord’s return into an indefinite future… Augustine envisaged a partnership of Church and empire, but the leadership should lie with the Church.”

The Church inserted itself into the political role of the state, highly influencing and determining decisions of great concern for the state as an entity.

For Augustine, the importance of his contributions to the just war tradition are incorporated within the much greater impact he had on endowing the Catholic Church the power to dictate the terms of just war. Certainly, almost all societies faced the ethical questions of how to conduct war, and many even established codes by which to carry out war, but it wasn’t until Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, that just war theory would be developed into one religiously imbued theory that would eventually give rise to the most recognized theory on just war proffered by St. Thomas Aquinas. Bainton condensed Augustine’s thoughts on just war down to two primary points. “These elements, diverse in origin, were synthesized in a graded ethic. The distinctive points in Augustine’s theory were these: that love should be the motive in war, and

19 Ibid. 97
20 Ibid. 92
that justice should lie on one side only.”

These principles would face contention and evolve as the practices and realities of war, especially in the early modern era, questioned the possibility of justice lying on only one side in war.

In the sixteenth century, for example, Francisco de Vitoria in his work *On the Law of War* questioned Augustine’s presumption that in war only one side can be just. James T. Johnson explains Vitoria’s position that, “In war… one side may be in the right, while the other, by invincible ignorance, may believe itself in the right. Indeed, it is possible to conceive of war in which both belligerents are deceived by such ignorance into thinking that they each have a just cause, when in fact neither does… so, Vitoria concludes, in such cases both sides must consider themselves scrupulously bound by the limits of the *jus in bello*, the law of war.” Working also from Augustine’s and Aquinas’ compilations on just war, another early modern philosopher, Hugo Grotius made important clarifications and additions to the just war tradition. “But in the seventeenth century Grotius, by formalizing the criterion of just cause, opened the way for a transformation of the criterion of right authority into the acceptance of state sovereignty. The modern idea of *compétence de guerre* resulted, by which a prince, as a man without master, could initiate war against another for whatever reasons he might consider just,” explains Johnson. These two philosophers made important adjustments and enhancements to a theory that was now widely accepted as religious due to the works of Augustine of Hippo and St. Thomas Aquinas. That these philosophers were not working with just war within the Christian framework is important, especially as it relates to the transition marked during the Enlightenment.

---

21 Ibid. 98
22 Francisco de Vitoria (1492 – 12 August 1546) from Spain, was a philosopher and theologian, as well as a devout Roman Catholic
23 Johnson 20
24 Hugo Grotius (10 April 1583 – 28 August 1645), influenced by the work of de Vitoria, was a Dutch philosopher. His work would significantly impact the formation of international law
25 Ibid. 22
of the theory. The works of secular philosophers Grotius and de Vitoria in the 17th and the 16th century, respectively, foretold the transformation of the religiously based just war theory of Aquinas into a secular doctrine during the Enlightenment.
CHAPTER THREE
St. Thomas Aquinas and a Christian Just War Theory

The importance of Aquinas for the Catholic religion cannot be overstated. As a philosopher and a theologian, he established a framework for the Catholic argument and understanding of “…a very large range of topics including the existence and nature of God, the notion of creation, the nature and abilities of angels, human nature and its powers, the concept of human happiness, the characteristics of human action, the goal of human living, human virtues and vices, the life and work of Christ, and the meaning and significance of the Christian sacraments.” As a theologian, Aquinas was deeply influenced by the philosopher Aristotle; the importance of Aquinas in establishing Aristotle’s place in history is also important to note, however. Goyette writes that, “It has been said – by Pica dell Mirandola – that without Thomas, Aristotle would be mute. It is also true that without Aristotle Thomas would not have found his distinctive voice.” Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics explored the proper ends of humankind to which all strive. Ralph McInerny explains, “…a good man is one who performs well the peculiarly human function. But there is in fact such a function: it is rational activity. The perfection or virtue of rational activity is thus that which makes a good man good.” Aquinas used Aristotle’s framework regarding the ultimate end that is uniquely human and universal, and expanded it to include the ends that can be achieved in the afterlife, in addition to what can be achieved in this life - as Aristotle argued. Aquinas would, “subsume what Aristotle had to say of the good life into a richer version of the ultimate good that overcomes the vagaries and vicissitudes and contingencies of this life. Hence Thomas’s frequent use of the distinction

26 St. Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 7 March 1274)
27 Davies, Aquinas 4
28 Goyette, St. Thomas Aquinas and the Natural Law Tradition 36
29 Ibid. 31
between *beatitude imperfecta*, the happiness attainable in this life, and the *beatitude perfecta*, that which is promised us hereafter.”

Aquinas’ efforts were thus directed at using the reason-based thinking of Aristotle that had resulted in his eponymous philosophy on the natural, uniquely human end of all people to reform the ultimate end to include the afterlife in the presence of God. Aquinas was, after all, a devout Catholic who believed foundationally that, “...the most important reality is God the Creator, and the most important authority is Christ.”

Heavily influenced by the reason-based thinking espoused by Aristotle, Aquinas wrote prolifically on his understanding of the principle of natural law, a reason-based concept which underpinned most of his arguments. As discussed above, natural law established a universally applicable foundation of reasoning and argument that was knowable to all by the provenance of their rationality as a human being. “The precepts of natural law have to do precisely with the end. In its proper sense, a precept is a command to do that which will lead to the end, or a command not to do that which is destructive of the end,” explains McInerny.

The great value in natural law for Aquinas, and for all Catholic theologians thereafter, is that it forms a law binding on all, knowable by all, regardless of religious feeling. All things divine are supported by the reason of all things human, which all humans understand to be true – natural law. Reason provides the necessary foundation from which the divine can be accessed. McInerny writes, “Faith is not derived from reason, but reason is an indispensable presupposition of it.”

David Novak further explains that, “Natural law, then, can be seen as the precondition for divine grace, the greatest manifestation of which heretofore is the revelation of divine law. The humanly knowable world into which revelation can possibly enter must be a world in which natural law is

---

30 Ibid. 33
31 Davies 13
32 Goyette 34
33 Ibid. 36
discernible and respected.”

Divine law cannot exist without natural law. More importantly, though, for the future of the just war tradition during the Enlightenment, natural law exists independent of divine law.

Natural law as a doctrine can be summarized as those rules, principles, and facts of life that are deduced through reason and universally accepted because they are innate to human life. McInerny explains that, “Natural law consists of the first indisputable principles of practical reasoning… The natural law, as St. Paul remarks, is inscribed in our hearts… The universality of the first principles of practical reasoning is manifest in the ordinary remarks and disputes that human beings engage in with respect to good and evil.”

The use of natural law in underpinning Aquinas’ just war precepts allowed him to establish a religious doctrine that also had the binding force of law and could be understood by all people. In effect, Aquinas created a doctrine that was religiously driven, but also had the support of an entirely reason-based, humanly knowable theory. Bainton explains that for natural law, “Applied to war, the concept meant that this institution must be judged in a wide ethical context, in terms of a law which enjoyed at least the weight of universal usage, and was commonly believed to enjoy a religious or a cosmic sanction.”

Aquinas argued for a theory of natural law that was steeped in Catholic ideology and theology, but because his rationale relied on natural law, his argument could be understood and even entertained by non-Catholic thinkers, namely the philosophers of the Enlightenment.

The effect of Aquinas on the works of Kant and other Enlightenment thinkers was as profound as it was because his argument was not founded in religious or divine concepts, but human and reason-based ones. As John Goyette explains, “Aquinas seems to acknowledge, then,
that the natural law can be known apart from a demonstration of the existence of a creator God. Nonetheless, Aquinas would insist that the existence of a creator God can be known, at least in principle, apart from divine revelation and that this knowledge is ultimately necessary to defend the distinction between natural law and divine law. If the creation of the world can only be known by means of divine revelation, it becomes difficult to assert that what unaided human reason judges to be necessary for human happiness has the binding character of law.”

That Aquinas’ just war theory was transformed rather than abandoned altogether by enlightenment thinkers is a direct result of how Aquinas used natural law to defend just war principles. Natural law is knowable by all and binding on all, and therefore the principles of just war, derived from and defended by natural law, is also binding on all people.

In articulating his argument on the principles of just war, Aquinas answered the two facets of just war – *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. John Elford explains that Aquinas looked at, “First, under what circumstances, if any, is it ever justifiable for Christians to engage in war at all – the *jus ad bellum* (justifiable in going to war)? Second, if there are ever such, what means of war is it ever permissible to use – the *jus in bello* (justice within war)?”

In discussing these aspects of just war, Aquinas looked very specifically at four questions of consequence for all Christians. These were: 1) are some wars permissible? 2) may clerics engage in warfare? 3) may belligerents use subterfuge 4) may war be waged on feast days?

Addressing the first of these questions, Aquinas answered that yes, some wars are permissible. He laid out three requisites necessary for a war to be commenced.

---

37 Goyette 75  
38 Elford, *Christianity and War* 171  
39 Aquinas 81
Three things are required for any war to be just. The first is the authority of the sovereign on whose command war is waged. Now a private person has no business declaring war; he can seek redress by appealing to the judgment of his superiors. Nor can he summon together whole people, which has to be done to fight a war. Since the care of the commonweal is committed to those in authority they are the ones to watch over the public affairs of the city, kingdom or province in their jurisdiction. And just as they use the sword in lawful defence against domestic disturbance when they punish criminals, as Paul says, *He beareth not the sword in vain for he is God’s minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil*, so they lawfully use the sword to protect the commonweal from foreign attacks. Thus it is said to those in authority, *Rescue the weak and the needy, save them from the clutches of the wicked*. Hence Augustine writes, *The natural order conducive to human peace demands that the power to counsel and declare war belongs to those who hold the supreme authority.*

Despite the biblical citations, his requirement clearly traces its roots to the works of Cicero and Plato. Aquinas sought to restrict just wars to include only those conducted by authorities bestowed with a legitimate right to rule to prevent uprisings or other war actions conducted without regard for the interests of the state. To prevent anarchy, and to, as best as possible, avoid the disturbances of war, only wars conducted by the leaders of a state can be just. As Aquinas notes, “…the operations of war are totally upsetting; they seriously prevent the mind from contemplating divine things, praising God, and praying for people.” Aquinas also appeals to a religious source, St. Paul, to explain the importance of this restriction to establish an environment where faith and the Catholic religion can thrive.

Again building from the just war tradition, Aquinas argues that for a war to be permissible, not only must the right authority condone the war, but it can only be conducted in defense of a wrong committed. War cannot be used to achieve aggressive political goals, and most only be entered into as a last resort. “Secondly, a just cause is required, namely that those who are attacked are attacked because they deserve it on account of some wrong they have

---

40 Aquinas 81
41 Ibid. 87
done,” writes Aquinas.\textsuperscript{42} To be an aggressor is unjust within the framework laid out by Aquinas. However, if some transgression has occurred that cannot be rectified by other means, then the state has the authority and the just right to pursue the re-establishment of peace through war.

Augustine had argued that justice can lie on only side in a war, a theory Aquinas ascribed to. In the case of choosing to pursue war above other means, it is necessary to have a just cause, which is limited to defense against aggression from others. Aquinas quotes Augustine in this matter who explains that, “We usually describe war as one that avenges wrongs, that is, when a nation or state has to be punished either for refusing to make amends for outrages done by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized injuriously.”\textsuperscript{43}

The final requisite for Aquinas is one purely motivated by his religious inclinations, which requires not only that the actions be just according to the aforementioned principles, but the intentions and the demeanor in which the war is conducted be appropriate. He explains that more than just doing good, one must intend to do good and not evil. This holds especially true in war. Aquinas relies heavily on the teachings of Aristotle regarding the principle of right thought, right action in outlining this necessary aspect of just war. Articulating this argument, Aquinas writes:

Thirdly, the right intention of those waging war is required, that is, they must intend to promote the good and to avoid evil. Hence Augustine writes, *Among true worshippers of God those wars are looked on as peace-making which are waged neither from aggrandizement nor cruelty, but with the object of securing peace, of repressing the evil and supporting the good.* Now it can happen that even given a legitimate authority and a just cause for declaring war, it may yet be wrong because of a perverse intention. So again Augustine says, *The craving to hurt people, the cruel thirst for the lust to dominate, and suchlike – all these are rightly condemned in wars.*\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42} Aquinas 83
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. 83
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid. 83
Under this condition, war must only ever be conducted in the pursuit of peace. Most of Aquinas’ arguments regarding the principles incorporated within *jus in bello* are derived from this foundational notion that peace can only be achieved through war if it is the driving force for entering war.

Aquinas’ thoughts on appropriate conduct during war addressed, specifically, three questions pertaining to who can engage in warfare, if it can be conducted on holy days, and if deception is allowable. To answer the question if it is permissible for clerics to engage in warfare, Aquinas argues that, “We have said that every power, art or virtue directed towards an end has to prepare those elements useful for the achievement of that end. Now physical wars should be considered by Christian people as directed towards a divine spiritual good as their end, and to this end clerics are called. Accordingly they ought to prepare and urge others to fight in a just war. Clerics are forbidden to fight in war, not because it is a sin, but because it is unbecoming their persons.”45 While waging war can be necessary and even honorable, it is not allowable for clerics to engage in the acts of war. Although it is permissible, and even advisable that they offer their support and add to the cause, short of taking up arms.

With regard to the contentious topic of the use of subterfuge in war, Aquinas lays out his argument in his typical style whereby he lays out the argument against him so that he can then refute it. In this case he writes:

Moreover, subterfuge and deception, like lies, seem to stand against honesty. But since we must be honest with all men we cannot lie to anyone, as Augustine says. Since, then, *one is bound to be honest with one’s enemy*, it would seem wrong to use subterfuge against him.

In refutation of this argument, Aquinas argues that:

45 Ibid. 89
Subterfuge is used to fool the enemy. Now a man may be deceived by another’s actions or words in two ways. He may be told a falsehood or given a promise which is not kept. This is always unlawful, and no one should fool an enemy like that. As Ambrose says, rights of war and agreements with the enemy do exist and should be kept.

But a man may be fooled by our words or actions in another way, namely, when we do not display our intention or meaning to him. We are not always bound to do this, since even in the sacred teaching many things must be concealed, particularly from the disbelieving lest they ridicule them: *Do not give dogs what is holy.* All the more then should we hide from the enemy our plans against him. Indeed special insistence is laid on concealing operation orders against the enemy’s attempts to obtain them. Frontinus *On Strategy* makes that clear. Now this sort of concealment is the idea behind the subterfuge one may lawfully use in just wars. Properly speaking this is not deception, nor does it go against justice, nor against a well-regulated will. A man’s will would be undisciplined if he always wanted others to keep back nothing from him.46

The use of subterfuge is therefore allowable, when employed within the restrictions here laid out.

This facet of Aquinas’s just war theory has the greatest implications for modern day conflicts, second only to the principles of *jus ad bellum*.

Finally, the last question Aquinas sought to answer in his section on just war was whether or not it is lawful to fight on feast days. Related to the question if clerics could engage in warfare, Aquinas sought to reconcile the teachings of the Church with the concerns of his time. Using supporting scripture, Aquinas writes:

> The keeping of feast days is no barrier against those things aimed at saving men, even physically. Our Lord argued with the Jews on this point: *Why are you angry with me for making a man whole and complete on a Sabbath?* Thus doctors may tend their patients on feast days. But all the more reason exists for saving the body politic than the physical health of one man; after all, many more people are saved from slaughter and numberless temporal and spiritual evils are prevented. To act otherwise in the face of such peril would be to tempt God. But when the need is over, waging war on feast days would be unlawful for the reasons cited.47

All of these aspects of just war which comprise Aquinas’ understanding are grounded in

Christian principles and sought after in pursuit of the Christian ideals. Together, they constitute

46 Ibid. 91
47 Ibid. 93
a framework intended to moderate the actions of individuals regarding *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. It would not be for another five hundred years before this established framework would be questioned. It acted as a culmination of all of the works that preceded it and was used as the standard from which to work for all works that came after. In the tradition of just war theory, Aquinas is the most prominent, influential, and recognizable authority.

While Aquinas may be the most noted of the contributors to just war theory, he is still one among many who contributed to a tradition that has spanned over 2,000 years. As Johnson explains, “What is before us is not a doctrine, as it is often called, especially in religious circles, but a tradition with many individual doctrines from various sources within the culture and various periods of historical development and representing variations in content.”48 While the religiously based contributions of Augustine and Aquinas would dominate the interpretation and understanding of just war theory from the time of the publication of Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae* in the 13th century, the non-Christian contributors to the tradition, before and after must not be overlooked, for they laid the groundwork that would allow the tradition to evolve into a secular theory in the 18th century. Holistically, the tradition of just war theory can be viewed as “…above all a fund of practical moral wisdom, based not in abstract speculation or theorization but in reflection on actual problems encountered in war as they have presented themselves in different historical circumstances.”49 The events of the world had just as much impact on the evolution of the theory as did the abstract philosophical and religious constructs created over the centuries.
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PART III
CHAPTER FOUR
Enlightenment Ideals and Thinkers

In a world created by God, humankind is both his greatest creation and also the most imperfect. As an inherent part of every individual, sin is a reality of humankind that begets conflict, which oftentimes results in war. Just as sin is an inherent aspect of all people, war is an unavoidable event. As John Elford explains, “Though they were created in and still bear the image of God as an alien dignity, their propensity to sin manifests itself in all that they do… human beings are, however, the agents of God’s grace in the world, but at the same time they remain part of its essential problem.”\(^50\) The prominence of war after the time of Christ was significant, as religions lost and gained dominance and worked to secure their control over politics and money as well as faith. Religion was effectively used as a conduit through which to control people; it acted as one of the first bindings of what would develop into societies. The Christian faith which took an aggressive and proactive stance in the race to accumulate the most wealth and support purported a concept of the world that claimed that what is, is as it should be, and to revolt against it would be futile. It sustained the idea that all people must accept their realities as they are and trust that the divine will change their lives if that is what is meant to be. A consequence of this theorem was that war, violence, and suffering were acceptable and understood to be unchangeable. There were few to no movements to counteract these assumptions until around the 18\(^{th}\) century when enough death and destruction had eroded away the façade of the Christian concept of a world only God had the power to change and forced many to consider different frameworks of thought.

---
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The Enlightenment changed the course of humankind. One of the largest developments of the era was the rise of a strong opposition to the autonomous control of the Vatican over religion. Philosophers around Europe began to question not only the authority of the Catholic Church but also the validity of much of the foundational beliefs of religion in general. The academic works produced to answer these questions are responsible for the creation of a religion of reason. In this scientific age, religion no longer ruled, reason and rationality did. By the mid 18th century a battle cry was heard across Europe, especially in the circles of the intellectual elite. It called for the dethroning of the Catholic Church – Ecrasez l’infame “Crush the infamous thing.” This call was heralded by many of Europe’s prominent philosophers, critics, and poets, including France’s sharp witted Francois Marie Arouet, otherwise known as Voltaire. Part of the transition that occurred during the Enlightenment was the recognition of the ability of every person to think and reason for themselves without the need to be told what to believe or how to act. Building from this premise, religion was moved out of the institutions and into the minds and hearts of every person. Many believed and argued that what was needed was the elimination of the superstition and fanaticism that came with established religion.

Voltaire’s works, which epitomizes the ideals of the Enlightenment, shows a diverse range of opinions and illustrate his own development of thought during his life. One of his most acclaimed works, Candide, questions the pre-Enlightenment tendency to deny one’s ability to affect change in their lives. In this satire, Voltaire tracks the life story a young man who not only suffers greatly, but encounters many who have suffered even more than he has. The pre-Enlightenment world, highly influenced, and controlled, by the Christian Church perpetrated the notion that only God has the power to transform the lives of humans. Therefore, it is best to
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accept your reality and look only to God for change. Voltaire, however, begs the reader to think critically about this world and the place of mankind rather than blindly accepting that regardless of the atrocities perpetrated and suffered, all is as it should be. Voltaire does not discount God or even religion for that matter, but rather argues that humanity has a greater responsibility in forming the world into a place they desire to live. To simply defer to God’s will in all manners and accept that what has happened is what God has deemed necessary, is not only irrational but also begets greater suffering and pain. The novel *Candide* famously ends with the proclamation that “we must cultivate our garden.”\(^{52}\) It is a call to action, a call to take greater responsibility for the shape of the world, for the injustices that have occurred, and the peace that can be achieved if every man tends to his life and works to improve it. Voltaire, in this vein, writes that, “The little society, one and all, entered into this laudable scheme, and each began to exercise his talents. The little piece of ground yielded a plentiful crop.”\(^{53}\) In the novel, the title character, Candide, undergoes a transformation indicative of the change sweeping Europe in the Enlightenment. In the first half of the novel, many misfortunes befall Candide that he accepts, nearly to the point of fatalism, under the presumption that all is as it should be. As the novel progresses, however, he begins to question this notion. While he is still plagued by many unfortunate events, his choice to take responsibility for them and work to improve his situation, Candide becomes an entirely autonomous agent capable of affecting change. This message was a powerful call to upset the status quo. The Enlightenment upset this accepted reality and through the power of reason bestowed every individual with the ability to cultivate their own garden.

\(^{52}\) Voltaire, *Candide* 130  
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Voltaire was not alone in his call to elevate reason and individual autonomy above that of the established church and to rid society of the superstition and fanaticism that prevented forward progression of individuals and society. Immanuel Kant\(^54\), known for his work on metaphysics, sought to understand human reasoning and intelligibility – how humans know what they know. Kant’s ideas were formed against the backdrop of a changing society that began to resist against constant warfare and began to recognize the autonomy of individuals. Roland Bainton addresses this change in attitudes towards war, writing that, “One of the most important factors in the changed practice of war was political and consisted in the centralization of power in monarchy – this was the age of the enlightened despots – and, above all, in the stabilization of finance so that armies could be maintained without pillage.” These political factors certainly had great impacts on the relations between countries during this time, and so did the widespread reaction against warfare, and religious warfare in particular. Society was transforming during the eighteenth century due in great part to the peace that was established thanks to this change in the political sphere.

This transformation, constructed by the strong political regimes in Europe, allowed for the sciences to develop and for culture to flourish. The intellectual works that sprang from the Enlightenment reflected the ethos of the time which was formed in reaction against the human cost of religious war. While peace may have come about initially because of strong leadership, the peace was sustained because of a transformation in thought and understanding of warfare predicated on the works of some of the Enlightenment’s greatest thinkers, namely Immanuel Kant. Kant’s views on the limits of knowledge and importance of reason when applied to theology secularized many religious concepts.

\(^54\) Immanuel Kant (22 April 1724 – 12 February 1804) was a German philosopher and Enlightenment thinker
Kant’s ideas and understanding of the process by which humans acquire knowledge came on the heels of some of the most important Enlightenment period scientific discoveries and epitomized the change in thinking and understanding in Enlightenment. Kant’s views on religion and theology must therefore be viewed in relation to his work on reason and knowledge, which is a product of the Enlightenment. James C. Livingston writes that, “Between the 16th and 19th centuries a revolution occurred in our understanding of ourselves and our world that caused a sharp break with medieval civilization and ushered in the modern epoch.”55 The ‘modern epoch’ advocated individual autonomy and freedom of thought as had never been seen before. Livingston explains that, “More than anything else the Enlightenment marks a revolt against authoritarianism and the emergence of individual reason and conscience as the primary arbiters of truth and action.”56 As Livingston also explains, the Enlightenment was a reaction against dogmatism and mindless deference to authorities. As an enlightenment thinker, Kant was antagonistic towards political and religious hierarchical structures that controlled the knowledge and understanding of people. Allen W. Wood notes that, “[Kant] was deeply suspicious toward popular religious beliefs and practices, and hostile toward clerical power, both in politics and over people’s minds.”57 During this time, Kant’s own beliefs towards traditional religion, in combination with the upward trending philosophical entreaties for individual autonomy in all realms, was seen by many, and understandably so, as a threat to religion. Don Cupitt explains that, “There was sharp controversy about how far traditional theology would need to be revised (or even, as some hinted, abandoned altogether) in the new intellectual climate, which after all did not exactly encourage a reverent attitude to ancient supernatural mysteries that must be
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believed on authority.”\textsuperscript{58} On this point, a distinction between theology and religion is necessary, seeing as Kant rejected the constructs built around religious precepts (religion), not the precepts themselves (theology).

As already stated, Kant’s understanding of theology and the role of religion is best understood as an addendum to his work on reason and knowledge. It is therefore necessary to first broach that subject. Kant espouses that \textit{a priori} concepts allow the brain to make sense of experiences. Colin Brown writes that, “The ‘raw material’ of knowledge comes from outside us but the mind also plays a part in processing that material by means of its own built-in concepts and ways of thinking.”\textsuperscript{59} Thus, the acquisition of knowledge starts within oneself since the world is seen through the lens which our \textit{a priori} understanding places on it. Similarly, Kant suggests that all human beings are capable of reasonable thought. As such, we are all capable of knowing the laws of reason by which we should abide, but resulting from our independent wills, oftentimes do not. Brown explains that, “All imperatives are expressed by an “ought” and thereby indicate the relation of an objective law of reason to a will which is not in its subjective constitution necessarily determined by this law.”\textsuperscript{60} Kant applies this to both political and religious schemes. The laws of our society must originate from the laws of reason we ourselves know to obey and voluntarily agree to do. It is a bottom-up structure that does not rely upon the proclaimed authority of a few exalted individuals. Wood explains Kant’s argument writing that, “[Kant] also thinks that since morality’s concern is with the promotion of human perfection and happiness through voluntary conduct motivated by autonomous reason and duty, the proper standards to which to hold the coercive laws of the state are not moral standards, but rather
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standards proper to right, standards geared solely to safeguarding the external freedom of rational beings." If individual safeguards are secure then the laws of reason will competently restrain the individual from inflicting harm on others or the community. Only under such a social ordering can Kant foresee human progress. Not surprisingly then, his views on religion follow a very similar ordering.

Kant necessarily addressed religion in his works on human reason. Allen Wood succinctly explains Kant’s approach to religion:

It is an important tenet of Kantian doctrine that ethical duties are laid on each person autonomously by that person’s own reason, that the proper incentive for their fulfillment is the person’s own inner motive of duty, and that it is wrong and improper for others, or for society in general, to attempt to compel us to fulfill them (Wood, 171).

Again, religion here is a pursuit of the individual wherein superstitions and Church authority hold no sway. The works of Voltaire and Kant along with many of their intellectual counterparts were interpreted as anti-religious and even used as supporting texts for atheists. They were not, however, threats to religion per se, just to the traditional institutions that wielded authority through the provision of religion.

The Enlightenment saw the transition from authority held by the church to the monarchy. As Bainton notes, “The encroachment of the Church on the civil domain and the frequent confiscation by the civil power of the Church’s patrimony led to conflicts in which the empire was reduced to something more indeed than pageantry, but less than world dominion, and the Church to something short of a world power, though more indeed than a spiritual society” The movement away from this status quo was more significant than just a swing in authority but reoriented the entire society that changed the way people and societies interact and how they
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view the world. “Religious intolerance as a source of war was especially decried in this period, and the struggle for peace coincided with the struggle for freedom in religion,” explains Bainton. 63 Free from the strong hold of the church people began to look to sources outside of religion to explain the world around them. Where most turned during this period, was to the human mind. Cuppitt makes note of this transition explaining how, “The creative work of turning chaos into cosmos, ascribed in the past to God, is now seen as something that is necessarily done by human activity.” 64 It is through this lens that just war theory must be viewed during the Enlightenment. When previously the mandates of just war were derived from the will of God, they were now subsumed under a secular authority directed towards the improvement of humankind. The dictates were followed not because God and the church demanded so, but because the future of humankind required.

Ludwig Feuerbach came at the tail end of the enlightenment, but his works express a popular sentiment of the time and lend insight into the spiritual transformation that occurred. Now often thought of as the father of atheism, Feuerbach is known for postulating that God is a projection of a version of ourselves, of our most desired attributes onto a separate consciousness. He argues that organized religion had distorted humankind and robbed them of their best qualities. By reclaiming the qualities ascribed to God for themselves, Feuerbach argued humanity could be bettered and improve the world for all. This trend of taking responsibility for the reality of the world and working within human abilities to improve it was a new phenomenon of the time that arose out of the ethos of the Enlightenment.
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As a student of Hegel, Feuerbach was influenced by Hegel’s philosophy of religion and thought processes. In his critique of religion, however, Feuerbach inverts Hegel’s theory on the relation of the human being to God, arguing that, “Religion is not, as Hegel thought, the revelation of the Infinite in the finite; rather, it is the self-discovery by the finite of its own infinite nature.”65 Feuerbach’s basic argument is that every human, capable of conceptualizing themselves as an independent object of thought, projects his consciousness into a separate nature, which he then calls God. In defining religion, Feuerbach writes that, “Religion is the relation of man to his own nature, - therein lies its truth and its power of moral amelioration; - but his nature not recognized as his own, but regarded as another nature, separate, nay, contradistinguished from his own; herein lies its untruth, its limitation, its contradiction to reason and morality.”66

As it regards the truth about the relation of a person to their own nature, Feuerbach further explains that God is in fact the projected image of the greatest qualities humankind sees in themselves. “That which is the highest for man, from which he can make no further abstraction, which is the positive limit of his intellect, of his feeling, of his sentiment, that is to him God.”67 Thus, Feuerbach contends that God is the amalgamation of qualities and therefore cannot exist and does not exist independent of said qualities.

Of course, the consequence of this creation of God by man is the impoverishment of humanity, or so Feuerbach contends. Hans Küng writes that, “The more man becomes religious, the more he divests himself of his humanity… But because God and man are seen as two instead of one, the result of religion is the torn, disrupted, self-estranged, inwardly impoverished human
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being.”  It is for the purpose of reconciling each individual’s humanity that Feuerbach presents his theory on atheism. Karl Barth notes that, “Feuerbach would wish us only to perceive and acknowledge that the name of ‘God’, in which all man’s highest, worthiest and most beloved names are concentrated, actually first sprang from the human heart, and that religion is thus in the deepest sense concerned with man himself.”

Human beings were charged with improving themselves and the world around them. To do so they changed their approach to religion and their own characters. Livingston writes, “More than anything else the Enlightenment marks a revolt against authoritarianism and the emergence of individual reason and conscience as the primary arbiters of truth and action.” All of the standing policies that had been accepted without question came under a new and more discerning light. The new litmus test was not “is this what God desires?” but “is this beneficial to mankind independent from religion?” Thus was born the secular age. When before all areas of life came under the domain of religion, now man began to segregate and move certain aspects of life into religious and secular spheres. Just war was one that got caught in the middle. Originally a religious policy, its implications were still important in the modern, secular world.

---
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CHAPTER FIVE
Effect of the Enlightenment on Just War Theory

As a well-established construct of the Catholic Church, just war theory was closely connected with the institutional practices that the Enlightenment was revolting against. After the Enlightenment, The Catholic Church was removed from the political arena and limited to a smaller realm of influence that dealt only with religious concerns. Whereas before the choices of the Church, understood to be directed by God, determined political action and was thus imposed on all, now secular, reason-based thought processes determined action and even demonstrated control over the Church. Just war theory was also affected by the profound changes that occurred during the Enlightenment. In accordance with the thinking of the time and the emphasis on separate spheres for religion and politics, just war theory was cleaved in two. As a theory that has implications for the political realm, but is also grounded in religious principles (at least since the time of Aquinas), just war was pulled at from both sides. The new theory that evolved as a result of this contention was a secular theory that looked to human reason as a foundation.

The Enlightenment marks the dawning of an ethical age. The preservation of life was sought after not solely for religious purposes, but as an ideal for all mankind, a rational, humanist precept. With this concept in mind, just war theory was separated from the Church, and while highly influenced by Aquinas, was developed independent of his arguments. In establishing this new theory that used rationality knowable to all humans as its foundation, just war theory evolved into a set of political principles that could be used by secular bodies without consideration of religious implications. In essence, just war theory underwent a secularization
process. While not dissimilar to the original theory, there are important distinctions, the most notable of which is that differences in justification.

As a means of illustrating the transformation of just war theory into a secular policy during the Enlightenment, it is helpful to contrast the theory as laid out by St. Thomas Aquinas with the political arguments presented in Voltaire’s *Candide*. The novel, as previously introduced, epitomizes the message of the Enlightenment to move focus away from what God does to what man can do to improve life. It therefore offers the best paradigm in which to understand the changes made to just war theory during this time. The novel *Candide* is a satirical exaggeration intended to highlight widely accepted irrationalities. Voltaire’s motives in writing the story are as useful in understanding the changes in just war theory, as is the actual story.

Much of what drove the sweeping changes towards individualism in the Enlightenment, as noted, was a reaction against the stifling nature of established religion. It is certainly what drove Voltaire; explaining his motives, Livingston writes, “What drove Voltaire to such feverish polemics was his conviction that organized Christianity supported irrational superstitions whose vulnerability led only to fanaticism.” Moreover, the only means to truly eradicate fanaticism was to break the bonds, the puppet strings even, between the Church and the people. “The only way to reduce the evils of fanaticism was to unmask superstition, thus freeing men from the source of their spiritual malaise: ‘In a word, less superstition, less fanaticism; and the less fanaticism, less misery’,,” writes Livingston. The adventures of Candide express the change in society from accepting misery to productively working against it.
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In *Candide*, Voltaire offers the story of a young man whose life is tragically filled with great suffering and sorrow as are the lives of all those around him. And yet, Candide accepts without question the suffering he must endure because his teacher, his philosopher had explained to him the reality of the world. Voltaire explains:

Pangloss, the tutor, was the oracle of the family, and little Candide listened to his instructions with all the simplicity natural to his age and disposition.

Master Pangloss taught the metaphysico-theologo-cosmolonigology. He could prove admirably that there is no effect without a cause, and in this best of all possible works the baron’s castle was the most magnificent of all castles, and my lady the best of all possible baronesses.

“It is demonstrable,” said he, “that things cannot be otherwise than they are; for as all things have been created for some end, they must necessarily be created for the best end. Observe, for instance, the nose is formed for spectacles; therefore we wear spectacles. The legs are visibly designed for stockings; accordingly we wear stockings. Stones were made to be hewn and to construct castles; therefore my lord has a magnificent castle; for the greatest baron in the province ought to be the best lodged. Swine were intended to be eaten; therefore we eat pork all year round. And they who assert that everything is right, do not express themselves correctly; they should say that everything is best.”

Candide understands that he has no power to change his life and therefore does not work to improve it but rather moves from one tragic situation to the next. This indolent disposition towards the world, characteristic of the time, is what Voltaire fights against. He questions the assumption that humankind actually lives in the best possible world.

Questioning this concept, touted by Christian authorities, Voltaire mockingly writes:

Candide, amazed, terrified, confounded, astonished, all bloody and trembling from head to foot, said to himself: ‘If this is the best possible of all worlds, what are the others like? If I had only been whipped, I could have put up with it, as I did among the Bulgarians; but oh my dear Pangloss! my beloved master! thou greatest of philosophers! that ever I should live to see thee hanged, for no reason I can see! O my dear Anabaptist, thou best of me, that is should be your fate to be
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drowned in the harbor! O Miss Cunégonde, you mirror of young ladies! that it should be your fate to be ripped open!74

The realization that this world is hardly the most perfect world forced people to abandon their firmly, even fanatically held beliefs. In so doing, the Church lost much of its assertive force over their lies and an authoritative vacuum formed. To fill the void, Voltaire and his intellectual counterparts argued that every man, endowed with reason, should determine their own actions and beliefs. Questioning, analyzing, and acting as individual agents, the Enlightenment saw a great reduction in superstitions and religious fanaticism in favor of secular rationality. Humanism was the result. Seeking for ways to improve life, humanism offered a new perspective on based on rationality alone. The actual narrative of Candide offers even more insight into how the transformation in beliefs and how people think, which occurred during the Enlightenment, impacted just war theory.

As previously noted, Aquinas asked four important questions regarding just war: 1) are some wars permissible? 2) may clerics engage in warfare? 3) may belligerents use subterfuge 4) may war be waged on feast days?75 More generally, though, he worked to outline the principles of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. During the Enlightenment, many of Aquinas’ tenets would be changed, however. As it relates to *jus ad bellum*, much of what Aquinas espoused was held up, although it was advocated on different grounds. Conversely, as it relates to *jus in bello*, the concerns Aquinas addressed were largely disregarded by the people in the 18th century who differed considerably from those in the 13th. Specifically, the questions over clerics engaging in warfare and waging war on feast days were of no concern to those within the political realm of the 18th century who took orders only from their own human rationality, rather than God voiced
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through the Vatican. Therefore the questions that were of the most concern during the Enlightenment were what constituted a just cause for entering war and what actions are justifiable in war, including the question of subterfuge.

During the Enlightenment, the question of what constitutes a just reason for entering war was of grave importance. The people of the Enlightenment had witnessed great death and destruction resulting from wars that dragged on and served no great purpose. The fatigue and frustration of such warfare is illustrated by Voltaire in one of the many misadventures of Candide. In this particular instance, he finds himself a member of the Bulgarian army. From the viewpoint of the front lines of the Bulgarian army in war he offers an illustration of the reality of warfare, one that is highly destructive and entirely unproductive. It reads:

Never was anything so gallant, so well accoutered, so brilliant, and so finely disposed as the two armies. The trumpets, fifes, oboes, drums and cannon made such harmony as never was heard in hell itself. The entertainment began by a discharge of the cannon, which in the twinkling of an eye lay flat about 6,000 men on each side. The musket balls swept away, out of the best all possible worlds, nine or ten thousand scoundrels that infected its surface. The bayonet was nest the sufficient reason of the death of several thousands more. The whole might amount to 30,000 souls. Candide trembled like a philosopher, and concealed himself as well as he could during this heroic butchery.

At length, while the two kinds were causing “Te Deum” to be sung in each of their camps, Candide decided to go and reason somewhere else upon causes and effects. After passing over heaps of dead or dying men, the first place he came to was a neighbouring village in the Abarian territories which had been burnt to the ground by the Bulgarians, in accordance with the laws of war. Here lay a number of old men covered with wounds, who beheld their wives dying their throats cut, and hugging their children to their breasts, all stained with blood. There several young virgins whose bodies had been ripped open, after they had satisfied the natural necessities of the Bulgarian heroes, breathed their last; while others, half burnt in the flames, begged to be despatched out of the world. The ground about them was covered with the brains, arms and legs of dead men.76
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War is here described as a highly destructive pursuit that serves no purpose. It is conducted on its own behalf, as a game for warring princes. This expresses the general sentiment of the time that had greatly tired of the pains of war.

It was thus in this environment that just war theory was redefined. As it pertains to *jus ad bellum*, the arguments set forth by Aquinas were wholly adopted, but supported by different grounds. Recognizing that war is inevitable, the question faced during the Enlightenment was how to achieve peace through war. Aquinas stressed the importance of right authority and right intention – right thought dictates right action. These two precepts were accepted. However, they were redefined to exclude the Church and the Pope, the Prince of the Catholic faith, as constituting a right authority. This aversion towards the control exerted by the Vatican is seen clearly in *Candide*. Here, Voltaire mocks the suppression of knowledge under Church authority and the control enforced on the citizenry of independent states. In the encounter between Candide and Signor Pococuranté, a noble Venetian, Candide expresses his astonishment at the incredible art and literature owned by Pococuranté⁷⁷. The character of Candide represents the pre-Enlightenment man who defers to the Church in all manners and accepts whatever horrors he may face in life with the understanding that it is the will of God, whereas Signor Pococuranté represents a man of the Enlightenment who employs critical thinking and analytical skills to all aspects of life. In this particular encounter, Candide is exasperated to hear that Pococuranté sees little to no value in the works of all the artists Candide understood to be the greatest. It reads:

> Candide, who had been raised never to judge for himself, was astonished at what he heard.
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⁷⁷ Voltaire, Book XXV
I see a lot of plays,” said Candide, “in Italian, Spanish and French.” “Yes,” replied the Venetian; “there are I think three thousand, and not three dozen of them good for anything. As to those huge volumes of divinity, and those enormous collections of sermons, altogether they are not worth one single page of Seneca; and I’m sure you will readily believe that neither myself nor anyone else ever opens them.

It is noble to write as we think,” said Pococuranté; “it is the privilege of humanity. Throughout Italy we write only what we do not think; and the present inhabitants of the country of the Caesars and Antoninuses dare not acquire a single idea without the permission of a Father Dominican.  

This dialogue drives at the importance of not only thinking and judging for oneself but also daring to question the accepted status quo. Just war theory, while still requiring the approval of a valid authority to be just, established a secular authority, independent of religion as the legitimate authority. The result was that now, secular and political authorities were responsible for leading their polities through the treacherous waters of inter-dependent state relations that sometimes resulted in conflict. In so doing, they were responsible for using discretion and wisdom derived from human understanding and rationality, and not divine command, in determining if war is in fact necessary. Aquinas argues that a right authority with the ability to control the state and prevent killing is necessary to establish the community bonds that allow for Christianity to flourish and for the weak and the needy to be rescued. A reliable and safe environment is necessary for this to occur and thus a right authority to condone, but also prevent war, is necessary. While the Enlightenment would see the maintenance of this requisite, it understood the need for a right authority to derive from the need to prevent anarchy and political subversion, rather than fomenting Christian ideals.

This rationale is expressed in the story of Candide when, after having escaped the Bulgarians, he finds Cunégonde’s brother, who was presumed dead, and proceeds to celebrate
the reunion only to kill him moments later. Candide had no intention of killing the baron of Thunder-ten-tronckh (Cunégonde’s brother), or even harbored any ill-will towards him. It took only an instant, though, for that all to change. In the world in which Candide lives, the right to conduct warlike actions against others is afforded to all and restrained only by their own abilities and consciences. There is no right authority to effectively condemn or prevent such actions and therefore every individual is free to act as they see fit. Mocking this scenario, Voltaire writes:

The baron knew no end of embracing Candide; he called him his brother, his deliverer. “Perhaps,” said he, “my dear Candide, we shall be fortunate enough to enter the town sword in hand, and recover my sister Cunégonde.” “Ah! That is all I desire,” replied Candide, “for I intended to marry her; and I hope I shall still be able to.” “Insolent fellow!” replied the baron. “You! You have the impudence to marry my sister, who bears seventy-two quarterings! Really I think you are very presumptuous to dare so much as to mention such an audacious design to me.” Candide, thunderstruck at the oddness of this speech, answered: “Reverend father, all the quarterings in the world are of no significance. I have rescued your sister from a Jew and an Inquisitor; she is under many obligation to me, and she wants to marry me. My master Pangloss always told me that all people are by nature equal. Therefore, I will certainly marry your sister.” “We will see about that, villain!” said the Jesuit baron of Thunder-ten-tronckh, and struck him across the face with the flat side of his sword. Candide in an instant drew his rapier, and plunged it up to the hilt in the Jesuit’s body; but in pulling it out, reeking hot, he burst into tears. “Good God,” cried he, “I have killed my old master, my friend, my brother-in-law. I am the best man in the world, and yet I have already killed three men; and of these three two were priests.”

That Candide, “the best man in the world,” would have killed three people is a satiric warning of the negative consequences that can befall a society that lacks a right authority to suppress unwarranted killing and war. The need for a right authority is therefore to allow for a political entity to control the state and allow for the rule of law to develop. In establishing a predictable and stable environment, the energies of the collective citizenry can be directed towards the improvement of the state rather than the protection of their own persons. This is further evident in the discussion Candide has with a philosopher of types he finds in France. It reads:
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Then turning towards him: “Sir,” said he, “you are no doubt of the opinion that everything is for the best in the physical and moral world, and that nothing could be otherwise than it is?” “I, sir!” replied the man of letters; “think no such thing, I assure you; I find that everything goes wrong in our world. No one knows his place in society, his duty, nor what he does, nor what he should do; and except for our evenings, which are cheerful enough, the rest of our time is spent in idle disputes and quarrels: Jansenists against Molinists, the Parliament against the Church, and one armed body of men against another; courtier against courtier, husband against wife, and relations against relations. In short, this world is nothing but one continuous scene of civil war.”

Without a right authority to establish control to prevent the uncertainty and quarreling, characterized as a continuous civil war, a supreme and legitimate authority with the power to dictate compliance in society is needed.

A necessary complement to a right authority, in the context of war, is right intention. If war is to be conducted, it must be pursued for the purpose of peace. As seen earlier in the case of Candide when he was a Bulgarian soldier, war, when conducted for its own sake, becomes a deadly game that produces no greater effect than to spread death. Therefore, for the sake of maintaining a peaceful populace, right intention is a necessary complement to right authority. A third and necessary component of establishing peace is the avoidance of war if at all possible. Just as the purpose of war must be either for the establishment or re-establishment of peace, war must be pursued only when necessary, as in times of defense. The principles of jus ad bellum underwent one basic transformation during the Enlightenment. The tenets of Aquinas were upheld; the supporting foundation was swapped from a religious one to a political goal of maintaining authority and pursuing prosperity.

The changes to jus in bello underwent an entirely different kind of transformation. As religion was further sequestered into a religious sphere, separate from the political sphere, the
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concerns that Aquinas had addressed such as clerics engaged in warfare and battle on feast days were inconsequential. Jumping over these aspects of Aquinas’ just war theory, the question of subterfuge was of consequence. As Aquinas had defined it, subterfuge was essentially a question of deception. He had approached the question from a moralistic stance, if it is sometimes acceptable to deceive? The political authorities of the 18th century and onward, though, approached it from the perspective of how to establish enduring peace when uncertainty abounds. Commitment problems arise when there is uncertainty about the motives and intentions of the other side. Where deception is commonplace it can be quite difficult for parties to make commitments that will actually come to fruition. Therefore, the question is not so much is it morally acceptable to use deception, but is it politically effective? This question is one that the international community has fraught over since the introduction of subterfuge into war and continues to deal with today. Effectively, just war theory during the Enlightenment changed the questions asked of jus in bello practices, but provided few answers.

One clear tenet of jus in bello that did remain during the Enlightenment stems from right intention. Just as it is necessary for a war to be initiated with rightful intentions, the actions taken in war must be in congruence with that goal. Therefore, widespread destruction of property or wanton killing of noncombatants is not permissible in a just war that seeks peace since such actions are surely the antithesis of peace. While some of the particulars of jus in bello differ quite substantially from the 13th to the 18th century, the basic principle of limited and restrained war persists.
CHAPTER SIX
Just War Theory Duality

The differences between the just war theory espoused by St. Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century and the one that developed during the Enlightenment are foundational. The precepts espoused are very similar, in fact nearly identical, but the reasons for espousing them are quite different. Where Aquinas saw the principles of just war as derived from natural law, and imbued with the commands of God, the Enlightenment rejected the religious influence of Aquinas and established a separate, secular foundation. This foundation sought to justify the tenets of just war by proving that the maintenance and growth of strong political entities and societies required adherence to these principles.

The catalyst behind this split was the change in thinking during the Enlightenment, which sought to determine the boundaries of human knowledge. The capabilities of every human to know the world around them independent of teachings from God – the Church – took hold during the 18th century. Kant was at the forefront of this transition, speaking extensively on metaphysics. Religion and faith were not abandoned at this time, although they were understood differently. Allen Wood notes that, “Metaphysics as Kant knew it in the Leibnizian-Wolffian tradition consisted of three sciences: rational psychology, rational cosmology, and rational theology. They claimed to possess some a priori knowledge about the soul, the world, and God. In particular, they claimed to be able to demonstrate three crucial claims of moral-religious import: the immateriality and natural immortality of the human soul, freedom of will, and the existence of a supreme being.”

Kant, therefore, argued that belief in a supreme being is entirely rational, and even more importantly, is known to all humans through their own rational
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intelligence. Kant even goes further to claim that the questions around a supreme being that have forever interested humankind are rational and appropriate questions for each person to address. “He thought that the questions they were asking are inevitable ones for rational human beings to ask, and he thought the metaphysical propositions they wanted to defend represent genuine human concerns from the standpoint of morality,” writes Wood.82

Religion was not abandoned during the Enlightenment by the intellectual elite, and nor was it entirely excluded from just war theory. Rather, reason was elevated above all other sources of knowledge, most notably divine revelations. This resulted in a situation whereby God and religion came under the provenance of reason and therefore needed to be understood within the framework of human reason. St. Aquinas, as a philosopher, is very similar to Kant in that he appeals to reason as the foundation for his arguments as a means of universalizing his claims. The difference, however, is that Aquinas uses natural law, or reason-based arguments, as the foundation, or necessary link to divine law. What is rejected by Kant, and other Enlightenment thinkers, is divine law. It is reason and reason alone, that determines the boundaries of human intelligence and knowledge. As Allen, notes, “Kant regards “reason” as the “highest” or most encompassing of human faculties, the faculty through which we direct all our faculties (including reason itself) – which is why a critique directed to exploring the limits of reason must also be carried out by reason.”83 All that is known by humankind is known by the faculties of reason.

As a summary of Kant’s ideas on morality, espoused in his work the Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, Wood explains that, “Kant’s moral philosophy is grounded on several related values. Its primary idea is that of the rational agent as a self-governing being. This is
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closely related to the equal dignity of all rational beings as ends in themselves, deserving of respect in all rational actions.” The result of this philosophy is that God and faith are vital and necessary for humankind, but they do not supersede reason, and are in fact knowable only through reason. The just war theory that developed was not necessarily a rejection of the rationality of Aquinas or the principles he espoused, but rather an attempt to elevate reason above all other sources of knowledge, namely divine revelation. The theory that resulted is therefore very similar to Aquinas’ theory and exists, not as a replacement, but as an alternative. Where the just war tradition had heretofore existed as an ever evolving set of principles, at this point in the Enlightenment, the tradition split in two. The just war theory of Aquinas persisted, but the new theory, with different justification, also existed. The effect of the two just war theories, nearly identical in their prescriptions, while quite different in their foundations, on society is multifaceted and long-lasting.

Practically speaking, the differences in the two theories rest on the determination of who has the authority to implement and effectively control the prescriptions inscribed in just war theory. Effectively, the just war theory of the Enlightenment excluded the Church from the political processes of waging war, or conversely choosing not to enter war. The just war theory of Aquinas became entrenched on the side of religion and Christianity and the just war theory of the Enlightenment became the guiding principles of rational, political leaders interested in furthering the interests of their own states. The effect of this duality of just war theory on society played out in the years after the Enlightenment, and still has implications for today. The two theories, very similar in their content, are placed at odds with each other after the Enlightenment. Where the moral requirements of the Christian faith placed restrictions on the actions of political
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agents under the religiously influenced just war theory, the political leaders working with the
secularized just war theory of the Enlightenment are restrained only by those actions which are
not beneficial to the state. The actions taken by state leaders in the 19th and 20th centuries
illustrate this difference, and the response by Church authorities to such actions only reaffirmed
the separation between the two theories.
PART IV
CHAPTER SEVEN
Just War Theory after the Enlightenment

The 19th century was much different than any of the preceding centuries, an experiment for man in peace and international power struggles and politics. While much of the political control of the society had been moved from a religious sphere to a secular one, Christianity and religion retained much of their preeminence. Bainton notes that, “Christendom lived on, at least as a cultural entity, and for most statesmen also as a religious society.”85 Also commenting on the new dynamic established in Europe at the time, he writes, “The concept of Europe as a family of sovereign states imposed restraints, and when Bismarck had rounded out the confines of Germany, he refrained from Napoleonic adventures. Peace makes possible reform, and the nineteenth century was an age of reform in Europe and America. The abolition of the slave trade and of slavery, the ending of child labor, the reduction of hours and the increase of wage for adults, the repeal of the Corn Laws in England, the improvement of prisons, the reductions or abolition of the death penalty, the extension of the franchise, woman’s suffrage, the restraint of alcoholism, and social legislation.”86

If the nineteenth century saw great advancements in human equality, the twentieth century would see a great devolution in the conduct of war whereby, to a degree, just war theory principles were refuted, if not abandoned all together. The most poignant examples of this are the bombing of German cities by the British in World War II and the dropping of atomic bombs by the US on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These two cases represent a choice entirely outside the bounds of just war theory. The understanding of war itself changed so as to allow action that would otherwise be condemned. As Michael Walzer pointed out, US President Harry Truman
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noted that, “Let us not become so preoccupied with weapons that we lose sight of the fact war itself is the real villain.” War viewed in this manner loses the restrictions laid out in just war theory and becomes little more than an abhorrent, yet sometimes necessary means to an end.

The moral restraints were relaxed and utilitarian calculations triumphed over values of integrity. Walzer explains with regards to the choice to bomb Hiroshima, “…the sliding scale [was] being used to open the way for utilitarian calculations. The Japanese forfeited (some of) their rights, and so they cannot complain about Hiroshima so long as the destruction of the city actually does, or could reasonably be expected to, shorten the agony of war.” The choice to target noncombatants as a legitimate war tactic represents a clean break with a primary facet of just war theory. “Warfare in which combatants and noncombatants are perceived and treated as essentially alike is fundamentally against the major moral tradition of war in western culture,” notes Johnson. It is important to understand the role, or rather nonexistent role, of just war theory in these instances to know how the tradition is understood today.

While World War II saw the introduction of wartime actions incongruent with the principles of just war theory, the tradition was resurrected in the aftermath. To a degree it was even ardently sought to right the waywardness and bring morality back to war. Johnson explains how in the instances described, what occurred was that, “…the justice of the cause was allowed to override the justice of the particular means used to serve that cause; noncombatant protection in particular, and perhaps the idea of proportionality as well, thus lost their effectiveness as restraints on the destructiveness of war.” In the aftermath of the destruction caused by these tactics, there was a backlash against the utilitarian assessment of war. Walzer explains that, “It is
the acknowledgement of rights that puts a stop to such calculations and forces us to realize that the destruction of the innocent, whatever its purposes, is a kind of blasphemy against our deepest moral commitments.”

He also noted that more than preserving life, “There is much else that we might plausibly want to preserve: the quality of our lives, for example, our civilization and morality, our collective abhorrence of murder, even when it seems, as it always does, to serve some purpose.” At this time, just war theory made its reentry into politics, and established a more solid footing then it had ever experienced before. Additionally, the Catholic Church also used the religiously based concept of just war theory to support its condemnation of indiscriminate killing in war.

The reality was that after the Enlightenment, the one just war theory split and became two contra-distinguishable theories. The principles found in both theories became the foundation for international law restricting war. “In the twentieth century international law has attempted to recover the notion of just cause in war, thereby attempting to reassert the importance of the consideration known in the historical tradition by the name of *jus ad bellum*. Beginning with the League of Nations Covenant and the Pact of Paris, and continuing in articles 2 and 51 of the United Nations Charter the effort has been to outlaw aggressive war while accepting defense as a legitimate cause for going to war,” writes Johnson.

The just theory of Aquinas experienced a resurgence as the basis of support for the Catholic Church’s strong stance on the immorality of modern war tactics that did not discriminate between combatants and noncombatants. Gaudium et Spes, which was inspired by just war theory principles, was written during the Second Vatican Council in 1962. The conciliar document, which was effectively titled the Pastoral Constitution
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on the Church in the Modern World, primarily addressed peace and social justice. At the time that the council was convening, the world was experiencing a surge in technological advancements, many of which improved upon old weapons and created new ones all together. Stating the reality of the threat posed by the advancement in weaponry the document states, “Indeed, now that every kind of weapon produced by modern science is used in war, the fierce character of warfare threatens to lead the combatants to a savagery far surpassing that of the past. Furthermore, the complexity of the modern world and the intricacy of international relations allow guerrilla warfare to be drawn out by new methods of deceit and subversion. In many cases the use of terrorism is regarded as a new way to wage war.” 94 After the world experienced the remarkable destructive powers of nuclear weaponry with the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki an entirely new dynamic to war was introduced in the form of mutually assured destruction.

The Church addresses this new reality of warfare in Gaudium et Spes as a means of reiterating its own ideals in light of a transformed world. While not deferring to just war theory directly, the Council expresses its opinion on modern day warfare using language and concepts from the theory. The constitution states, “Certainly, war has not been rooted out of human affairs. As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defence once every other means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted. Government authorities and others who share public responsibility have the duty to conduct such grave matters soberly and to protect the welfare of the people entrusted to their care. But it is one thing to undertake military action for the just defence of the people, and something else again to seek
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the subjugation of other nations. Nor, by the same token, does the mere fact that war has unhappily begun mean that all is fair between the warring parties.”\textsuperscript{95} The right to justly conduct war when attacked by an aggressor is duly noted, just as Aquinas had promoted in just war theory. Moreover, this proclamation addresses not only \textit{jus ad bellum}, but also \textit{jus in bello} as well, when it notes that not all is fair between warring parties regardless of the tensions that resulted in war. Relying heavily on the principles of Aquinas, the Council earlier in the constitution made a concerted effort to emphasize the role of natural law stating that, Natural law… “In the depths of his conscience, man detects a law which he does not impose upon himself, but which holds him to obedience. Always summoning him to love good and avoid evil, the voice of conscience when necessary speaks to his heart; do this, shun that. For man has in his heart a law written by God; to obey it is the very dignity of man; according to it he will be judged.”\textsuperscript{96}

The Council in re-establishing these principles of war in the context of pursuing peace also ventured into the political. They very adamantly condemned unnecessary violence and destruction in war stating, “With these truths in mind, this most holy synod makes its own condemnations of total war already pronounced by recent popes, and issues the following declaration: Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation.”\textsuperscript{97} It was this statement that resonated most strongly because it unequivocally denounced, although thinly disguised, the actions of the United States regarding
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the use of nuclear weapons in war. In this manner, the bishops of the Second Vatican Council revived the traditional just war theory and applied the tenets to modern day concerns.
CHAPTER EIGHT
Conclusion: The Just War Tradition Today

Modern warfare, especially the use of nuclear weapons, has challenged the principles of just war theory in a way like never before. Throughout history, the limitations of weapons and abilities of fighting armies have restricted and limited destruction caused by war. The rise of the nuclear age, however, changed that. Now, there existed the potential to wipe out huge metropolitan centers with ease; war entered a new age and just war theory struggled to adapt. On the power of nuclear weapons, Walzer points out, “A new kind of war was born at Hiroshima, and what we were given was a first glimpse of its deadliness. Though fewer people were killed than in the fire-bombing of Tokyo, they were killed with monstrous ease. One plane, one bomb: with such a weapon the 350 planes that raided Tokyo would virtually have wiped out human life on the Japanese islands. Atomic war was death indeed, indiscriminate and total, and after Hiroshima, the first task of political leaders everywhere was to prevent its recurrence.”

In the attempt to understand this new age of war within the confines of just war principles, two differing patterns of thought emerged.

These two differing opinions arose over the question of the justifiable use of nuclear weapons, and the question over the justifiable threat of use of nuclear weapons. While the use of nuclear weapons is almost universally accepted as a tactic to be avoided, the threat of use is much more contentious. On one side stand proponents of nuclear deterrence who argue that it has prevented war which makes it justifiable. They further contend that there is a significant moral distinction between threatening the use of nuclear weapons and actually using them. “We threaten evil in order to not do it, and the doing of it would be so terrible that the threat seems in
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comparison to be morally defensible,” notes Walzer. Conversely, detractors of nuclear deterrence question if the threat itself is not immoral. Johnson speaks to this when he explains that for the modern age, “The moralist speaking in the public forum, then, bears the obligation to clarify what values of our culture are worth protecting at what cost, and he or she bears the equally heavy responsibility to seek to define what restraint or limitation may mean in the contemporary context.” After all, the reason nuclear deterrence works is because behind the threat of use is the legitimate ability and willingness to follow through. Nuclear weaponry has significantly impacted modern warfare and the principles surrounding the conduct of war have struggled to adapt.

The manner in which the principles of war have been applied to nuclear warfare has been highly influenced by the transformation of just war theory during the Enlightenment. The division over the justifiableness of nuclear deterrence aligns with the divisions between the just war theories, religious and secular, born in the 18th century. The secularized theory of just war developed and inspired by Enlightenment thinkers defended the principles of just war on the grounds that following these principles was necessary for domestic and international peace. Of course, no Enlightenment philosopher or politician ever fathomed the enormous and deadly power of nuclear weapons. Proponents of nuclear deterrence argue its effectiveness in deterring war justifies the use of threatening nuclear action. In this case, certain aspects of the just war doctrine are prioritized above others, particularly, peace over the potential mass killing of noncombatants. Johnson explains, “…the justice of the cause was allowed to override the justice of the particular means used to serve that cause; noncombatant protection in particular, and perhaps the idea of proportionality as well, thus lost their effectiveness as restraints on the
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Advocates of the religiously- or morally-bound just war theory of Aquinas, such as the Bishops from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of 1983, argued that even the threat of such condemnable actions, even if never acted upon, makes nuclear deterrence unjustifiable.

Walzer explains the position of the detractors of nuclear deterrence well. He writes, “No doubt, the threat of such slaughter, if it is believed, makes nuclear attack a radically undesirable policy. Doubled by a potential enemy, the threat produces a “balance of terror.” Both sides are so terrified that no further terrorism is necessary. But is the threat itself morally permissible?” They argue no, it is not permissible. To make noncombatants the target of attack, or to threaten such an attack, breaks the immunity of noncombatants, a primary facet of just war theory. As Johnson writes, “This has in fact been one of the overriding first principles of Western moral thought on war throughout its history. So far as the limitation of war once begun is concerned… the principal focus has been on the limitation of harm to noncombatants, though there have also been other themes.” Since secular just war theory defends just war principles, and restraint in war, on the premise of pursuing peace, safety, and stability for the state, it is much more adaptable. As the means of achieving this end change, the prescriptions of just war theory change as well. In this case, while the protection of noncombatants is still important, the establishment of peace trumps and the secular theory of just war can be adjusted to support that prioritization. Meanwhile, those who adhere to the just war theory of Aquinas cannot accept this prioritization of principles and thus reject the defense offered by nuclear deterrence advocates. Thus a division arose over whether or not nuclear deterrence, and to a lesser degree nuclear
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warfare, can fit into the parameters of just war. That the division broke along the same lines as the differences between the just war theory of Aquinas and the one that developed during the Enlightenment is no surprise.

The just war tradition has a long and storied history that can name some of the world’s greatest philosophers and theologians as contributors. A theory that began with the thoughts of Plato on the proper actions of rulers and the need for peace evolved into a coherent set of principles on just war to which many people contributed. Compiling and consolidating the works of the many contributions since Plato, St. Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century wrote what would become the most recognized and influential theory on just war. This religiously grounded theory on just war would not be challenged until the 18th century, when it was almost entirely forsaken. Instead of being replaced, however, the just war tradition branched into two; the just war theory of Aquinas remained, while a new just war theory, developed from Aquinas’ doctrine, also rose to prominence. This duality in just war theory greatly impacted the conduct of war and the reactions to war in the 19th and 20th centuries. Not the least of these impacts was the reaction to nuclear warfare. Today, the secularized and the religious versions of just war theory continue to compete for dominance. Just as the rationalist and individualistic ideals of the 18th century affected the understanding of just war at the time and today, the effect of nuclear weapons and other technological advancements are sure to impact just war theory in the future.
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