STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

CHRISTIANITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO JUST WAR TRADITION

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID A. AHRENS
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

19990513 101

USAWC CLASS OF 1999

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

CHRISTIANITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO JUST WAR TRADITION

by

Lieutenant Colonel David A. Ahrens
United States Army

Chaplain (Colonel) John W. Brinsfield
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel David A. Ahrens

TITLE: Christianity's Contribution to Just War Tradition

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 30 March 1999 PAGES: 36 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Just war, the Western tradition of war, much like its people, is a product of a diverse cultural backdrop. While strong religious roots can be identified, it is not purely or uniquely a religious phenomenon. It cannot be reduced to a single source or interest of a particular class or institution or even to a particular time frame. Rather, a variety of ideas and institutions have played a role in shaping the Western approach to war. The donors include political, religious, legal, military, economic, philosophical and historical sources. While not discounting the broad variety of contributors, Christianity has played a major, if not the pivotal role, in the development of just war tradition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

CHRISTIANITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO JUST WAR TRADITION 1

JUST WAR DEFINED 1

THE ORIGINS OF JUST WAR TRADITION 2

The Hebrews 3

The Early Christians 4

Merger of Church and State 5

Classical Graeco-Roman Influence 6

The German Warrior Tradition 7

MEDIEVAL COALESCENCE OF JUST WAR TRADITION 8

Peace of God 9

Truce of God 9

Banning Weapons 10

Impact of the Crusades 11

Canonical Commentaries 13

JUST WAR TRADITION ENTERS THE MODERN PERIOD 15

The Metamorphosis of War 15

Natural and International Law 18

THE THEOLOGICAL RECOVERY OF JUST WAR TRADITION 22

ENDNOTES 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY 29

CHRISTIANITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO JUST WAR TRADITION

Just war, the Western tradition of war, much like its people, is a product of a diverse cultural backdrop. While strong religious roots can be identified, it is not purely or uniquely a religious phenomenon. It cannot be reduced to a single source or interest of a particular class or institution or even to a particular time frame. Rather, a variety of ideas and institutions have played a role in shaping the Western approach to war. The donors include political, religious, legal, military, economic, philosophical and historical sources.[1] While not discounting the broad variety of contributors, my purpose is to show that Christianity has played a major, if not the pivotal role, in the development of just war tradition.

JUST WAR DEFINED

When different individuals, often with varying perspectives, approach a subject as complex as war, one would expect to find a wide divergence of opinion concerning both its justification and its prosecution. This is certainly the case with the Western experience where viewpoints ranging from nonresistance and pacifism to the crusade and holy war have emerged over centuries of cultural evolution.[2] Yet over time, there has been sufficient agreement among theorists to declare the just war theory the

major normative Western viewpoint in regards to war, so much so that it can rightfully be labeled a tradition.[3]

The just war tradition is expressed in terms of the two foci of justification and limitation. *Jus ad bellum* encompasses matters affecting the right to make war such as just cause, right authority, right intentions, the achievement of more good than harm, a measure of last resort and that its purpose is to achieve peace.[4] *Jus in bello* or law of war is concerned with the restraint or limiting of war once begun.[5] Contemporarily, *jus in bello* is defined in terms of discrimination and proportionality. Historically, it is defined in terms of harm that might be done to noncombatants and legality of various weapons of war.[6] A historical survey of the evolution of the just war tradition will demonstrate the degree to which Christianity has contributed to this theory of war.

THE ORIGINS OF JUST WAR TRADITION

The deep roots of just war tradition are to be found in the customs, attitudes and practices of the cultures that have allowed it to germinate. These can be found in the Hebraic world, the world of classical antiquity and, later, in the Germanic societies of northern Europe.[7] Some have claimed that the ideas of justification and restraint are grounded in natural law and, in principle, knowable by all people everywhere.

The Hebrews

The Hebraic contribution is recorded primarily in the Old Testament in stories about the wars of the Israelites following their exodus from Egypt and ensuing conquest of Palestine, and also during the period under the reign of various kings, particularly Saul and David.[8] The Old Testament scriptures describe essentially three types of war.

The first was a type of holy war commanded by God and one in which he was directly involved. This type of war involved full participation by all Jewish males able to bear arms and generally called for complete destruction of the enemy in consecration to God. The second type of war was a defensive war involving some mitigation of destruction and one in which all males participated except for those possessing outstanding religious duties. The third type of war was an optional offensive war conducted at the discretion of the king and one in which participation was excused for a greater range of other obligations. Prosecution of this type of war was mitigated by considerations of noncombatancy and proportionality. Although some theologians subsequently used the example of the Israelite wars commanded by God to warrant their own justification of sending the Roman military into action, the just war tradition primarily took from the Hebraic culture those insights and practices aimed at mitigating the destructiveness of war.[9]

The Early Christians

Old Testament Israel was a theocratic state that acted largely in response to its relationship with God. In the teachings of Jesus found in the New Testament, the kingdom took on a different emphasis. It was no longer confined within the boundaries of a single state, but existed wherever Jesus was accepted as lord. This new covenant that Jesus proclaimed rendered many of the Old Testament war regulations obsolete.[10] While the New Testament broadened the early Christians' understanding of the kingdom, it had little to say about war. Early Christians had to draw principles from the scriptures rather than specific rules. While Jesus advocated nonviolence on the part of his followers, he accepted war as a part of the present world system. In Acts 10, a follower who was a soldier is neither commended nor condemned on account of his profession.[11] The New Testament also uses a number of military terms and metaphors to describe Christian spiritual conflict.

There was early Christian opposition to participation in war on grounds that military service involved idolatry (allegiance to the emperor as opposed to God), created ritual impurity through human bloodshed and took place within a context replete with moral temptations.[12] At the time, the Romans did not have universal conscription and there was no pressure for Christians to serve.[13] From the end of the New Testament period to the last

quarter of the second century, there is absolutely no evidence of Christians in the military.[14] Toward the end of the second century as both Christians and threats to the Roman Empire became more numerous, there was increasing pressure for the Christian minority to contribute to the defense of the state. Christian participation in war and theologians' apologetic acceptance of Christian military service ensued. This represented a shift in attitude on the part of Christians toward a positive acceptance of participation in the world system.[15] This shift and the ensuing two hundred years of Christian participation in war set the conditions for fourth and fifth century theologians such as Augustine and Ambrose to write on the justification and parameters of military service in support of the state.

Merger of Church and State

Much of the specific form of *jus ad bellum* owes its existence to Roman practice following the merger of the Church and state when Emperor Constantine made Christianity the official religion during the early fourth century. The Roman concept of justification of war was part of an overarching concept of statecraft in which war was an instrumentality of political sovereignty.[16]

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, is widely regarded as the father of the specifically Christian stream of just war tradition.

Writing in the fifth century, he recast Hebraic and Roman ideas into a Christian mold. This included the idea of just cause in terms of three conditions: defense, retaking something wrongly taken and punishment of evildoing as well as the requirements of last resort, proportionality of good to evil done and the goal of peace.[17] While the principle of discrimination and noncombatant immunity may be implicit in his writing, he never addressed *jus in bello* issues directly. Augustine's major creative contribution to the just war tradition is that in order for war to be justified, it was to be undertaken only out of the right intention.[18]

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, was the first theologian to argue that a Christian's obligation to loving his neighbor extended to protecting him from harm inflicted unjustly. He maintained that a Christian third party should intervene to protect the victim and that the use of force was justified should it become necessary. The force was to be limited, however, by the fact that Christ died for the assailant as well. This paradigm is foundational in Christian just war tradition because it counters arguments for pacifism that use Jesus' example rebuke of a disciple who came to his aid with a sword.[19]

Classical Graeco-Roman Influence

Plato, both in his *Republic* and in the *Laws*, urges limits on war, and insists that the only legitimate purpose of war is the

restoration of peace. Aristotle, likewise, argued that the nature of man calls for peace rather than violence.[20] Cicero developed this position at length when he wrote of his ideal of a state ruled by reason's laws.

> Nature has endowed man with a desire for peace and order and with the power of reason that makes possible an ordered society. True law is right reason in accordance with nature. It is unchanging and universal. It summons us to duty even to our enemies; it precludes treachery; it requires that even war be governed by moral law.[21]

Stable political environments allowed peoples of antiquity to experience the goods of society. Theologians were gradually converted by the obviously tangible benefits and, over time, their writings came to advocate the use of force to protect it. Additionally, Western attitudes toward justice and restraint were shaped by many of the concepts found in the laws and customs of classical cultures. On a broader scale, classical culture passed on the concepts of statecraft and the role of force on behalf of the state. These ideas were transmitted through legal, philosophical and theological texts to medieval and early modern thinkers.[22]

The German Warrior Tradition

Although often overlooked, the Germanic culture had an important impact on furthering the just war tradition in the Middle Ages. Ideas, customs and practices associated with the knightly class grew out of the German warrior tradition.

Knights, through the code of chivalry, shaped *jus in bello* more than any other force of the time. The idea of the separation of combatants and noncombatants correlated directly with the distinction between knights and non-knights. Knights taken prisoner instead of being killed could be exchanged for ransom; consequently, their lives were often spared.[23]

In summary, prior to the Middle Ages, influences as diverse as Christianity, Roman culture and the German warrior tradition were working on separate, but sometimes intersecting and sometimes parallel paths to bring about the rudiments of the just war tradition. It was not yet a tradition, however, because it still lacked the continuity and convergence of related ideas and associated practices characteristic of a tradition. In the context of medieval Christendom, these distinct cultural heritages merged into a single culture.

MEDIEVAL COALESCENCE OF JUST WAR TRADITION

Following the breakup of the Roman Empire and the influx of Germanic peoples, there was a period of general lawlessness by those who bore arms and a lack of political unity while the idea of chivalry had not yet taken root. A new warrior ethos consumed Europe and led the way into the Crusades. It was during this period, when the just war theory was all but forgotten, that the Church's effort at restraint took three major forms expressed in

canon law: Peace of God, Truce of God and attempts at banning weapons.[24]

Peace of God

In the tenth century amid a chaotic political environment, bishops from the Church in France stepped forward by declaring a "Peace of God." It was designed to protect noncombatant peasants and townspeople from the lawless undertakings of *milites*, who were essentially, hired mercenaries. French political and military leaders endorsed the declaration because it was in everyone's best interests to control the lawless activities of the *milites*.[25] Although the peace of God idea spread to other parts of Europe, it did not become universal. The most important contribution that Peace of God made to restraint was that it established the immunity in war of ecclesiastical persons and property.[26] It also represented a growing cultural consciousness in Europe along with provisions for noncombatant immunity.

Truce of God

The second major effort of the medieval Church to restrain war was the "Truce of God" movement that originated in Italy in the eleventh century. It forbade fighting on certain days of the week and during certain times of the year. The Truce of God cast a broader net than Peace of God because it applied not just to the activities of the lawless, but to those engaged in wars that could be considered just. Its scope broadened even further over

time by the addition of more restrictions on what and when particular acts of violence could be conducted.[27]

There is evidence of elements of the Peace of God and the Truce of God in the oath that was taken by Robert the Pious (996-1031):

> I will not infringe on the Church in any way. I will not hurt a cleric or a monk if unarmed. I will not steal an ox, cow, pig, sheep, goat, ass, or a mare with colt. I will not attack a vilain or vilainesse or servants or merchants for ransom. I will not take a mule or a horse male or female or a colt in pasture from any man from the calends of March to the feast of the All Saints unless to recover a debt. I will not burn houses or destroy them unless there is a knight inside. I will not root up vines. I will not attack noble ladies traveling without husband nor their maids, nor widows or nuns unless it is their fault. From the beginning of Lent to the end of Easter I will not attack an unarmed knight.[28]

Although it may have been important in its day, the Truce of God was to have little lasting effect on just war tradition, however, since interpretations of Gratian's forthcoming *Decretum* effectively nullified its contents.[29]

Banning Weapons

The third canonical effort to restrain war in the medieval period was by banning weapons, namely crossbows, bows and arrows and siege weapons. The weapons singled out were not the weapons used by knights, but were more typical of bands of mercenaries. The object of the weapons ban was to strengthen the hand of the authorities who were perceived to be the source of order, at the

expense of armed persons and groups that threatened their authority and power.[30]

The banning of weapons was largely ineffective for several reasons. First, the mercenaries with their specialized weapons were, in many cases, useful agents in the hands of the legitimate authorities in prosecution of their wars. Second, during the Crusades, the banned weapons were favorites of the Muslims and it was necessary for the Christian side to employ the same weapons to preclude being "outgunned." And last, during the Crusades, battles were fought on the enemy's territory and the Christian authorities had little concern for the defense of the local population against armed mercenaries.[31] Ironically, Medieval just war tradition was in practical terms a doctrine for Christendom alone. The Church's three major efforts to restrain war in Europe were not understood to apply to the Crusades, the Church's wars fought against the infidels. The Crusades did, however, have a major impact on the development of just war tradition.

Impact of the Crusades

Beginning late in the eleventh century and continuing into the fifteenth century, the Crusades were a manifestation of a fusion between the Germanic religion of war and the Christian religion of peace. What overpowered the early Christian teaching against violence was not a just war theory, but a total merger

of violence and holiness at all levels of Christian life. The completeness of this union can be seen from a participant in the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 as he described the conquest of the city:

> Entering the city our pilgrims pursued and killed Saracens up to the temple of Solomon, in which they had assembled and where they gave battle to us furiously for the whole day so that their blood flowed throughout the whole temple. Finally, having overcome the pagans, our knights seized a great number of men and women, and they killed whom they wished and whom they wished they let live… Soon the crusaders ran throughout the city, seizing gold, silver, horses, mules, and houses full of all kinds of goods. Then rejoicing and weeping from extreme joy our men went to worship at the sepulchre of our Savior Jesus and thus fulfilled their pledge to Him.[32]

Church liturgy was expanded to include the blessing of weapons and standards. Knights were consecrated in religious ceremonies, often containing the relics of pagan custom. Violence became sacred and enemies took on a diabolical character. Thus, Muslims became the enemy of God and it was considered wrong to show mercy to the enemies of God.[33]

> The code of the just war… was largely in abeyance in fighting the infidel. Crucifixion, ripping open those who had swallowed coins, mutilation—Bohemond of Antioch sent to the Greek Emperor a whole cargo of noses and thumbs sliced from the Saracens—such exploits the chronicles of the crusades recount without qualm. A favorite text was a verse in Jeremiah 'Cursed be he that keepeth back his hand from blood.'[34]

Canonical Commentaries

Although the code of the just war may have been in abeyance during the Crusades, just war theorists, primarily theologians at lower ecclesiastical levels, continued to seek a cultural consensus on the concepts of justification and limitation of war contained in just war theory. Gratian, a twelfth century monk, made an important contribution to the coalescent process by compiling canon law into a document known as the *Decretum*. Because of the lengthy hiatus in just war advocacy, he relied exclusively on works handed down from earlier Christian sources. He drew significantly from the writing of Augustine in compiling the *Decretum*, and it was this inclusion that secured Augustine's place in history as the father of Christian just war tradition.[35] The *Decretum* served two purposes in the development of just war tradition. First, it brought together and systematized significant statements on war and Christian morality from acknowledged authorities. Second, it focused just war theory to a narrower base by filtering out concepts that were inconsistent with Gratian's purpose in its composition. The *Decretum* provided the nucleus around which other medieval just war thought formed.[36]

Starting in 1265, Thomas Aquinas presented what is, perhaps, the greatest just war scholastic achievement in his *Summa Theologica*. Its notoriety was not based on new material because

Aquinas relied almost exclusively on Augustine's statements on just war.[37] Aquinas applied both natural law and the principle of love to in his arguments about government, war and military tactics. He produced a brief, orderly and reasoned résumé on just war theory up to his own day. In it, Aquinas defined the concept of just war in terms of three conditions: that only proper authority and not private individuals be allowed to wage it, that a just cause be present, and that the belligerents have a rightful intention.[38] The modern Roman Catholic Church still considers Aquinas' writings in *Summa Theologica* to be the normative text for just war theory.[39]

Additional canonical commentators followed Gratian and Aquinas during the Medieval Age. While these commentators added to the volume of writings on the just war tradition, the growth of the chivalric ideal and the emerging hero image in Europe rendered their efforts less influential on the actual conduct of war than they otherwise might have been.[40]

While none of the medieval Christian sources made explicit mention of all the elements of *jus ad bellum* (just cause, right authority, right intention, proportionality of ends, reasonable hope of success, last resort and aim of peace) and *jus in bello* (noncombatant immunity and proportionality of means), all these elements could be read in the ideas of the writers. What had been accomplished by late fourteenth or early fifteenth

centuries was a general consensus as to the elements embodied in the just war tradition. The core thoughts and ideas were in place, and by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, just war theorists presupposed these ideas as consensus.[41] It was also to be these same early modern theorists that stitched these ideas into a systematic whole during a time that was to challenge the just war tradition to the extreme.

JUST WAR TRADITION ENTERS THE MODERN PERIOD

The Metamorphosis of War

Up through the beginning of the Renaissance at the close of the fifteenth century, European culture clearly exhibited the characteristic behaviors, attitudes, thought patterns and social organizations of the Middle Ages. By the time the Thirty Years War ended a century and a half later with the Peace of Westphalia, Europe had transitioned to a new age, the modern era. The sweeping change that occurred in the intervening years left its mark on all facets of life to include the theory and practice of war and, in particular, its restraint. The moral and legal limits of war metamorphosed into new forms during this period of cultural transition. The various theories of war that had coalesced during the Middle Ages relied upon certain features of war that, to a large extent, no longer existed. New theories and practices of war mandated adjustments in the

mechanisms of restraint.[42] An understanding of some of the significant elements involved in this transition is key to understanding the consequent transition of just war tradition into the modern age.

Prior to the modern age, the Roman Catholic Church speaking through the papal hierarchy was the only recognized Christian authority. When Martin Luther ushered in the Reformation, there was a breakdown of unity within Christendom. This breakdown gave new impetus to the idea of ideological war. Ironically, it also gave rise to a just war theory based wholly in natural law, free from ideology.

During this time of transition, the New World was discovered, explored and colonized. This put Europeans in contact with indigenous peoples that had no knowledge of Christianity, the authority of the Church and traditions of European civilization. This stimulated theorists to develop a just war theory that relied on natural law to which even the most ignorant of natives could be held accountable.[43]

Europe saw the end of the period of knights and the establishment of dynastic monarchies from which the pattern of contemporary national states emerged. Armies of common, undisciplined men with no chivalric heritage were raised to defend the monarchies. A need arose to establish codes of

conduct that did not rely on the personal ethics and integrity of the warrior since these qualities were often lacking.

An additional demand for military discipline and order was created in response to the advent of firearms and other weapons of increased lethality. These weapons made it possible to easily void the principle of proportionality when facing a lesser-equipped foe.

A new style of naval warfare was developed. Distinctions between warships and civilian merchantmen were blurred. The traditional rules concerning noncombatancy were challenged.

New political patterns developed outside the relative orderliness of Europe. This created conditions whereby a condition of war might exist in the Americas, the Far East or on the high seas even though a formal state of war did not exist between the states. This, in turn, challenged the traditional consensus for the necessity to have the proper authority to wage war.[44]

The elements that contributed to a metamorphosis in the conduct of war also served as catalysts to a corresponding metamorphosis in just war tradition. Just war tradition was led away from a system of rules connected to the value system of Christianity and toward the secularized system of values and rules found in modern international law. While a host of religious and secular theorists took part in guiding just war

tradition through this transformation, two Christian theorists in particular, Vitoria and Grotius, are viewed as the benchmarks of change that had the most lasting impact leading into the modern age.[45]

Natural and International Law

A theological professor from Spain, Francisco de Vitoria, lectured and wrote during the first half of the sixteenth century. His writings focused on the moral implications of Spain's treatment of Indians during the conquest of Mexico. His *Conferences on the Indies and the Law of War* remains one of the most thorough and insightful treatises ever composed on the subject of the relations of Christianity to war.[46] Using Aquinas' conception of the perfection and autonomy of the natural, he maintained that while the Indians were ignorant of Christianity and shouldn't be held responsible for adhering to the authority of the Church, they could be held to observance of the truths knowable through natural law. He argued that among the contents of natural law were the values that generated the requirements of just war. In other words, just war limits were interpreted as applying to everyone, not just to Christians in their wars with one another.[47]

Vitoria contributed to further defining *jus ad bellum* when he stated that it was entirely possible for both sides in a conflict to be just in their reasons for pursuing war.[48]

Additionally, no matter how just a state's cause for going to war, the state was still bound by a principle of proportionality in making the final determination. Vitoria also placed a heavy burden on the individual by discarding Augustine's presumption that a soldier was to render unquestioning obedience to higher authority. Instead, it was the soldier's duty to listen to his conscience and if it told him that a particular war was unjust, it was the soldier's obligation to withdraw from the war.[49]

Likewise, he defined a strong position in *jus in bello* when he reiterated that there could never be extenuating circumstances sufficient to justify the intentional slaying of noncombatants. Although not a new idea, it reestablished a just war concept that had largely been ignored during the bloody holy wars of the Crusades.[50]

Overall, Vitoria made two important contributions. To his contemporaries, Vitoria's systematized the inherited just war concepts and to apply them to his own historical period. His most important contribution came in relation to adding to the normative base of just war tradition, by extending just war tradition into modern international law through his incorporation of natural law and rejection of religion as a prerequisite for just war applicability. The ideas that first surfaced in Vitoria's work became the core of normative moral and legal thought on war in the centuries that followed.[51]

Vitoria was a product of the Middle Ages who was able to look into the future and develop a doctrine suitable for the modern age. Grotius was a Dutchman trained in Calvinist theology who wrote at the end of the Thirty Years War having seen both the devastating effects of that war as well as the resulting new political structure of Europe. He had both feet planted firmly in the modern age.

Grotius formulated a conception of natural law and its relation to divine law that was quite different from Vitoria's. Grotius contended that the Christian doctrine on war represented a perfection of natural law. Christian morality was thus made over into a highly developed natural morality. This completed the secularization of just war theory that had been started by Vitoria.[52]

Grotius de-emphasized *jus ad bellum* by narrowing the definition in a way that limited the parties authorized to declare a just war. A just war was one that was formally declared including publication of the just causes for which it was fought, by a sovereign state. He agreed, however, with Vitoria's earlier statement that it was entirely legitimate for two states, each believing their cause to be just, to simultaneously declare war against each other.[53]

While downplaying *jus ad bellum*, Grotius added new energy to *jus in bello*. He emphasized the binding nature of the elements

of restraint in war. These provisions were not to be followed because they represented manifestations of supernatural morality, but rather elements of natural justice. This transformation of *jus in bello* to a wholly secular basis would lead to the subsequent development of the humanitarian law of war.[54]

The development of legal standards for the behavior of states was a principle carrier of the just war tradition from the seventeenth century to the present. Unfortunately, neither Vitoria nor Grotius could foresee all the effects of dethroning religion as a dominant factor in just cause tradition. Their work did have a moderating impact on the philosophical limits of war, but in practical terms, for the next two centuries, the same natural law arguments they had used to restrain war were used to broaden the acceptable conditions under which it was undertaken. War, in actuality, became more violent as nationalism fueled with massive armies and modern weapons proved to be too powerful for just war tradition in wars waged for causes held to be ultimate.[55] Speaking in the 1930s as war approached, President Franklin D. Roosevelt often used Biblical terms to describe mankind that was divided between good and evil. This same rhetoric was later used during World War II to justify an allied strategy that went far beyond the bounds of just war tradition and led ultimately to the demand for an

unconditional surrender of the axis powers.[56] The rebirth of the idea of total war threatened the very consensus upon which the just war tradition was founded.

THE THEOLOGICAL RECOVERY OF JUST WAR TRADITION

As the modern era progressed, the creative development of just war tradition was in the secular realm, not the theological. Only within the current century have Christian theologians reentered the debate over the moral justification and limitation of war. The two issues that have precipitated their return are the proliferation of nuclear weapons and American involvement in the Vietnam War.[57] *War and the Christian Conscience* written by Paul Ramsey in 1961, did more than any other modern book to stimulate the debate on just war as a source for Christian moral guidance relative to war.

This recent theological recovery has been characterized as a kind of Renaissance movement because the modern day just war theologians have reached back to the original sources in making their arguments. Ramsey has gone back to Augustine and Aquinas. Others, including Hauerwas and Yoder, have used the Bible extensively, particularly the New Testament. *The Challenge of Peace* by America's Roman Catholic bishops relied on the Bible as well as Church tradition.[58] In general, Protestant theorists have ignored the development that has taken place between the early

Church and the present, while Catholic theorists have relied on normative tradition established in Church doctrine.

What significance is the theological recovery of just war tradition? It is important because it restores the balance to the tradition as a whole, which despite its religious roots, has been dominated by international law. With the reintroduction of religious concerns, it is possible once again to examine the relation of individual moral behavior to the practice of war. This was simply not possible when the religious perspective was dormant. Religious differences have often been a cause or a pretext for war. Religion has also been a potent force in encouraging the peaceful avoidance or resolution of conflict. To look into the future of war without a consideration of the impact of religion on its justification and restraint, is indeed, a sign of blindness and a sure way to repeat the mistakes of the past.

> *Two species of blindness easily combine; of those who see not what is, and of those who see what is not.*
>
> Quintus Septimius Tertullianus
> Apologeticus IV, 20

WORD COUNT = 5,169

ENDNOTES

[1] James G. Williams, *The Bible, Violence and the Sacred: Liberation From the Myth of Sanctioned Violence* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), 4.

[2] Andrew Kirk, ed., *Handling Problems of Peace and War* (Basingstoke, UK: Marshall Pickering, 1988), 3.

[3] Paul Ramsey, *The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility* (Savage, MD: Littlefield Adams, 1984), 145.

[4] Francis Schaeffer, Vladimir Bukovsky, and James Hitchcock, *Who is for Peace* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983), 90.

[5] Richard B. Miller, "Casuistry, Pacifism, and the Just-War Tradition in the Post-Cold War Era," in *Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World*, eds. Gerard F. Powers, Drew Christiansen, and Robert T. Hennemeyer (Washington, D.C.: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1994), 203.

[6] William V. O'Brien, *The Conduct of Just and Limited War* (New York: Praeger, 1981), 37.

[7] Arthur F. Holmes, "The Just War," in *War: Four Christian Views*, ed. Robert G. Clouse (Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 121.

[8] John Kelsay and James Turner Johnson, eds., *Just War and Jihad* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991), 7.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Kirk, 58.

[11] Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 53.

[12] Charles E. Raven, *War and the Christian* (New York: Garland, 1972), 98.

[13] Donald A. Wells, *The War Myth* (New York: Pegasus, 1967), 142.

[14] Bainton, 67-68.

[15] Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., *War and Conscience in America* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1968), 22-23.

[16] Gerrit Jan Heering, *The Fall of Christianity: A Study of Christianity, the State, and War* (New York: Garland, 1972), 74-75.

[17] Long, 26.

[18] Kelsay, 10.

[19] Ibid., 9-10.

[20] Holmes, 125.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Kelsay, 11.

[23] Ibid., 11-12.

[24] James Turner Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 127-128.

[25] Kelsay, 12-13.

[26] Albert Marrin, ed., *War and the Christian Conscience: From Augustine to Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1971), 74-76.

[27] Johnson, 128.

[28] Bainton, 110.

[29] Johnson, 124-125.

[30] James Turner Johnson, *The Holy War Idea in Western and Islamic Traditions* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 108-109.

[31] Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War*, 128-130.

[32] J. B. Ross and M. M. McLaughlin, eds. "History of the First Crusade," in *The Portable Medieval Reader* (New York: Viking Press, 1963), 443; quoted in Robert G. Clouse, *War: Four*

Christian Views (Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 17.

[33] Robert G. Clouse, *War: Four Christian Views* (Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 18.

[34] Bainton, 112.

[35] Russell, 55-56.

[36] Kelsay, 14.

[37] Marrin, 68.

[38] Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 260-261.

[39] Marrin, 69.

[40] Kelsay, 15.

[41] Ibid., 16.

[42] Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War*, 172.

[43] Kelsay, 17.

[44] Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War*, 179-185.

[45] Ibid., 174.

[46] Marrin, 84.

[47] Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War*, 76-77.

[48] Kelsay, 18.

[49] Holmes, 128-129.

[50] Kelsay, 16-17.

[51] Ibid., 17-18.

[52] Bainton, 178.

[53] Johnson, *The Holy War Idea in Western and Islamic Traditions*, 14.

[54] Kelsay, 19.

[55] Wells, 39.

[56] Mario Rossi, "Behind the Unconditional Surrender Formula," *Army*, January 1999, 15.

[57] O'Brien, 7.

[58] Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, "The New Challenge of Peace," in *Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World*, eds. Gerard F. Powers, Drew Christiansen, and Robert T. Hennemeyer (Washington, D.C.: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1994), 17-18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bainton, Roland H. *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation.* New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Bernardin, Cardinal Joseph. "The New Challenge of Peace." In *Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World*, eds. Gerard F. Powers, Drew Christiansen, and Robert T. Hennemeyer, 17-26. Washington, D.C.: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1994.

Clouse, Robert G. *War: Four Christian Views*. Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

Heering, Gerrit Jan. *The Fall of Christianity: A Study of Christianity, the State, and War*, New York: Garland, 1972.

Holmes, Arthur F. "The Just War." In *War: Four Christian Views*, ed. Robert G. Clouse, 117-135. Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

Johnson, James Turner. *The Holy War Idea in Western and Islamic Traditions*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.

_____. *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Kelsay, John, and James Turner Johnson, eds., *Just War and Jihad*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Kirk, Andrew, ed. *Handling Problems of Peace and War*. Basingstoke, UK: Marshall Pickering, 1988.

Long, Edward LeRoy, Jr. *War and Conscience in America*. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1968.

Marrin, Albert, ed., *War and the Christian Conscience: From Augustine to Martin Luther King, Jr.*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1971.

Miller, Richard B. "Casuistry, Pacifism, and the Just-War Tradition in the Post-Cold War Era." In *Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World*, eds. Gerard F. Powers, Drew Christiansen, and Robert T. Hennemeyer, 199-

213. Washington, D.C.: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1994.

O'Brien, William V. *The Conduct of Just and Limited War*. New York: Praeger, 1981.

Ramsey, Paul. *The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility*. Savage, MD: Littlefield Adams, 1984.

Raven, Charles E. *War and the Christian*. New York: Garland, 1972.

Ross, J. B., and M. M. McLaughlin, eds. "History of the First Crusade," in *The Portable Medieval Reader*. New York: Viking Press, 1963, 443. Quoted in Robert G. Clouse, ed. 17. Downers Grove, NJ: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

Rossi, Mario. "Behind the Unconditional Surrender Formula," *Army*, January 1999, 15-16.

Russell, Frederick H. *The Just War in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Schaeffer, Francis, Vladimir Bukovsky, and James Hitchcock. *Who is for Peace*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983.

Wells, Donald A. *The War Myth*. New York: Pegasus, 1967.

Williams, James G. *The Bible, Violence and the Sacred: Liberation From the Myth of Sanctioned Violence*. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.