Just War Theory: A Guide For States To Act In A Potential Conflict Situations

When Looking at wars there are a lot of different aspects of it some argue that war is good and others believe that it is not good. The aim of Just War Theory is to provide a guide to the right way for states to act in potential conflict situations. This only applies to states, and not to individuals with that being said, an individual can use the theory to help them decide whether it is morally right to take part in a particular war. As this have been used before where an individual this can be leaders of state can use this theory as an act of aggression to start or go to war with another state. The theory of Just War provides a useful framework for individuals and political groups to use for their discussion of a possible war or a war that is rising. However the theory is not intended to justify wars but to prevent them from happening. As most states know going to war is not good for them but showing that going to war except in certain limited circumstances is wrong. This motivates states to find other ways of resolving conflicts, the doctrine of Just War can deceive a person into thinking that because a war is just, can mean it's actually a good thing. According to BBC " behind contemporary war theory lies the idea that war is always bad, and that a Just war is permissible because it's a lesser evil, but it's still evil.

Hugo Grotius was a 16th-century jurist who according to some stated the practice of international law in earnest. His work the Rights of War and Peace details with what proper action is among states and sovereigns. Grotius can be understood as providing a foundation for contemporary traditional just war theories, the Nature of War. Grotius then make some distinction among various kinds of conflict he then first starts off by distinguishing between private and public wars. Private war is which is carried on by a private person without authorization from the state. Public waes as those carried on by the person holding the sovereign power this is typically thought of in the vernacular sense of warring states. Although both of these wars are to be considered so far are pure that is entirely of one kind either private or public. Grotius believes that for a war to be a formal public war the sovereign power must declare war first, this can either come from the sovereign themselves. There are principles of Just War as Grotius offer several requirements for a war to be considered. He includes his basic point, a series of interpretations, and clarifications for application to a wide variety of potential applications. "The status of voluntary slaves when ambassadors are fair targets, the justification of spies, and ect these subjects distract from the basic outline of what becomes the foundation for contemporary Just War theories. The aim of Just War Theory is to provide a guide to the right way for states to act in potential conflict situations. This only applies to states and not to individuals although they can use the theory to help them decide whether it is morally right to take part in a particular war.

Historical motivations range from individual states and different time periods as well. These could be seen differently to where Imperial Rome would not have the same motivations for Jus War as to the Trenches in Germany during the war that was supposed to end all wars or future wars. There have been multiple conclusions that have been developed by different theorists saying that state the Just War theory is a pivotal subject to examine because it can guide the way in which war is conducted. Many already know that war as it is can be a violent and cataclysmic event but with the right sets of moral guidelines, war can be conducted on a more humanitarian scale. Even the idea of war can be devastating but Jus War theory ensures that all

aspects of the war are examined and this helps the civilians and others who are not participating in the war to be somewhat safe with these sets of rules. When a state wants to go to war there are aspects that have to be meant for the right reason to the more important subject of how to conduct war so that not all civilian life is led to mass and brutal deaths.

Jus Ad Bellum can be described in many ways but it is the right to go to war or the right way to go to war. There are six principles of Jus Ad Bellum, and I will be covering all six of them. The first one is Just Cause there must be a just and proper reason for going to war. This can include self-defense, protecting the innocent, preventing genocide, restoring human rights wrongly denied and assisting an ally in their self-defense. The second one is the proportionate cause which means the good of going to war must outweigh the destruction and death that is caused by the war. The right Intention that is our reasons and motives for engaging in warfare must noble and in line with ethnic of Christian love. A great example of this is going to war to right a wrong or restore a just peace but not to restore national pride or seek revenge against an enemy. The right Authority war can only be authorized by a legitimate governing authority. This means that the proper governing authority has actual sovereign authorization to engage in war. Reasonable chance of success, the initiation of warfare brings violence, pain, and suffering. This can be seen as the cost is only worth paying if it will, as noted before outweigh the destruction and death will be caused by warfare. With no reasonable chance of success in warfare there can be no reasonable chance of using warfare to restore a just peace. Last, but not least Last resort engaging in warfare must be the last reasonable and workable option for addressing problems. With any peaceful alternatives such as diplomacy or non-violent political pressure must first be exhausted before going to war. Before going to war all of these criteria must be met before a nation can be justified in going to war.

These are the six rising elements of Jus Ad Bellum that lead up to the right way to fight a war or to go into a war. Grotius characterized as state's right of self-defense to include the right to forestall an attack forbilly, and we would see this with the Germans and France in World War 2. There have been multiple wars regarding this a preemptive war is a war that is commenced in an attempt to repel or defeat a perceived imminent offensive or invasion. As we saw in World War 2 when Germany led by Hitler invade a lot of places and France was one of them in May of 1940. When the Germans' attack came through the Ardennes, they caught the French and their allies by surprise because the French had believed it was impassable to tanks. There are other great Preemptive wars such as World War 1 when Austro-Hungarian Chief of the general staff Franz Von Hotzendorf argue for a preemptive war against Serbia in 1913. For a while now Serbia had the image of aggressive and expansionist power and was seen as a threat to Austria-Hungary in Bosnia. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914 was then used as an excuse for Austria to attack Serbia which lead to the start of World War 1.

Jus In Bello is the right way to conduct yourself in war. The rules of Jus in Bello serve as guidelines for fighting well once war has begun. Others have argued that morality does not exist in warfare, and others are willing to do whatever necessary to ensure victory. There are four principles that applies to this which are military need. The use of military is when nothing is being solved, so then use the military makes the decision not a politician. Spare noncombatants this one is really huge and everyone had agreed to this. Proportion when in war having rules on the battlefield. Last but not least immoral weapons such as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons not being used due to previous wars. An account of Jus in Bello proportionality must satisfy two apparently conflicting demands. Such account must explain how we rationally compare civilian losses with military advantages. Jus in bello also requires that the agents of

war be held responsible for their actions and this is a really important rules in the International law. Say if a soldier attack noncombatants or to pursue their enemy beyond what is reasonable or violates other rules of fair conduct they commit not acts of war, but an act of murder. International law suggests that every individual regardless of their rank or government status, they are responsible for any war crimes that they committed. Now there are restraints on the extent of harm, if any that can be done to noncombatants as well as restraints on the weapons of war. These restraints are aim to limit war once it has begun. The principles of humanitarian law are thought to apply in conflict and to regulate the conduct of military forces. There was a lot of thoughts being put into this when these rules were created within the International laws, the rules of warfare aim to safeguard human life and some other fundamental human rights. War crimes tribunals were meant to address such crimes, just because there is a war going on does not mean that there aren't rules.

The principle of proportionality deals with what kind of force is morally permissible in warfare. This suggests that the injury caused should proportional to the objective desired, and that the extent and violence of warfare must be tempered to minimize destruction and casualties. All of these restrictions are meant to protect all involved from unnecessary suffering to safeguard human rights as well as to restrict the amount of damage likely to be long term extending beyond the period of hostilities. With that being said Central to proportionality is the notion that parties should oppose force with similar force an example of this can be one may not kill the opponent if it is possible to achieve the desired end by only injuring him. In addition to this " the evil produced by the war must not be greater than the good or the evil averted by it" the costs must not outweigh benefits. With Jus Ad bellum the principle of right intention suggests that wars must be fought for limited objectives, and that there must be restraints with regard to the quantity and quality of weapons used during warfare. Weapons that do not discriminate between combatants and noncombatants cannot be used, the use of asphyxiating or poisonous gases, the starvation of civilians as a method of warfare, and the destruction of objects that are indispensable to the civilian population are prohibited. Weapons that also cause long-term environmental damage are prohibited as well. Another important law is the law of armed conflict forbids acts that go beyond the purpose of defeating the enemy party cause unnecessary injury. I feel like this law is really good in setting the rules of what can be damaged or not or unnecessary injury as it mentioned.

Historical arguments today include a wide variety of past conflicts and many other aspects. The most notably the third Reich and their egregious crimes during World War 2. The argument that arise from that historical event is that it shows how bad the severity of a situation can escalate when there is no protection for innocent civilian lives. However people tend to always think that the Germans were the only one, and that is not true the Japanese and the Russians also failed to recognize Jus in Bello in regards to topic of prisoners of war. There have been other events similar to World War 2 such as the Cold War which involved human rights this was big for the German people some being kept inside and not allowed their freedom. Proponents of Jus war theory argues that in our modern-day we must move as a collective to eradicate any examples of human rights abuse in the world. Doing this would require the actual implementation of Jus War theory and this had never been used on such a large scale before the argument is standing with no development. Johnson (2017).

Modern adaptations of the Just War theory are widely popular today since there is much substance. The world as of today has progressed thoroughly after the end of the Cold War and there are still tension that continually rise on the daily in today's world. A great author name

John Lango argues that for states with competing interests both nationally and politically should look to comply with universal moral principles in coordination with Just War theory Lango (2014). This signifies how today's emerging powerful states should examine Just war theory and recognize that the alternative to a justifiable war would be to just live in co-existent. This involved war theory by trying to neglect the use of it in a sense of waging war, and therefore Just War theory should be examined but only to solidify the fact that war is not worth it henceforth it should be waged. In the United States, a lot of terror had happened and since the attacks on the world trade center in 2001 the war on terror has sparked new modern adaptations as to whether or not the U.S. was within Just war theory during the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan. Till this day this modern-day question has yet to be answered as the ramifications of these events are still active in Afghanistan today. With the development of Just War theory there are still abhorrent war crimes still being committed around the world. There are parts of the world in which action should be taken to aid in humanitarian crisis, but whichever country chooses to pursue the previously mentioned humanitarian crisis will still be viewed in relation to Jus ad Bellum and Jus in Bello. 0.

Just War theory has evolved throughout centuries with new theorists contributing to the work that has been done before them so on and so far. There are new interpretations constantly being developed, and Just War theory has seen new modern adaptations rise as new global challenges arise as well. As we all know that Just War theory does not have all the answers as to whether a war is justifiable or not, with that being said the true importance is the most optimal doctrine available for understanding if wars should or should not be waged. Looking back at Just war theory we do know that it provides some guidelines and in a way that helps the way a war is being fought that can be seen as a positive thing because as we all know war is not good, but it matters how it is being fought. There have been many theorists that argue different interpretations for Just War theory and I believe that success for the theory is context. With technology and many others things we are able to look back and try to improve for the future of wars to come and ways to handle them differently. There is still no clear guidelines for what would justify the use of nuclear weapons Just War theory is not perfect as there are many injustices that have occured that never bothered to examine the moral ramifications of waging a war. We all know that this theory is very old and this means that it can constantly evolve to meet new situations that arise. Just War theory is not flawless by any means but it is a better alternative to just outright waging a violent war that disregards human life, and I believe that we should continue to use this theory and work on it to be even better for the future.