REFLECTION ON THE CAUSES AND MORAL JUSTIFICATIONS OF WAR

Dotun OGUNKOYA•

Abstract

Today, our lives are constantly threatened because of technological advancement or sophistication in the art of war. As society evolved, war became better organized and consequently more destructive. We have developed the ability to destroy the entire planet at the push of a button. Thus, as we are compelled by certain reasons to wage war with use of modern and more sophisticated weapons, we realize that we are gradually opening a Pandora's Box of technological madness which is capable of wiping out human race. This has made human beings the most dangerous species on the planet. This paper attempts to reflect on the causes of war with the view to determining its moral justifications. By so-doing, the paper centers its discourse on two major aspects of the study of war. First, it examines, the existing causes of war; and second, it looks at the moral justifications for war among mankind.

Key Words: War, Moral Justifications.

Introduction

In history, the study of war began about 2,000 years ago with Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War (431-400 BC). Since then, many scholars have seen the need for the understanding of war as a step to managing wars and preventing or avoiding future outbreak of wars. Naturally, scholars' submissions vary in line with their schools of thought. What is discussed below in this paper is a reflection of how individuals saw some specific wars.

But is war necessary? How morally justified is war? These questions plunge us into the second aspect of our discourse – the moral justifications of war. The participation or involvement of different parties in war is a demonstration of power and supremacy and as a way of achieving justice. A soon as one of the potential warring parties is ready to go to war, the opponent is either ready to compromise its power and agree to terms or be ready to face its aggressor in self-defense. Thus, "most justifications for war began with some references to the principle of self defense", (Lackey, 1994: 197).

The Idea of War

War has many features, one of which is violence. According to Nicholson (1992:17) "the core of the concept of violence is that it is the deliberate use of physical force to injure or kill another human. War is an

---

• Ph.D., Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos.

extreme case of this, where the organized use of violence results in the death of some of the participants and bystanders, often in very large numbers. This indeed is the point of war".

We align with Nicholson's characterization of war as the highest level of crisis. A correlation is drawn by Mao Tse Tung (1972: 2), who sees war as "the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups, and it has existed ever since the emergence of private property and classes". According to Webster (1962:37), war is an "open armed conflict between countries or between factions within the same country". This definition explains what qualifies the Nigerian Civil War and other large-scale wars in human history to be rated as wars. Wright (1966) regards war as a violent contact of distinct but similar entities. Some scholars prefer to further qualify the status of these warring entities as "independent political units". In this case, war refers to an armed conflict between two independent political units by means of organized military forces. This definition is parochial in scope, for apart from the fact that the warring parties may not be independent (sovereign) political units, it is possible for more than two countries or political units to engage in the same war as found in the allied forces against Iraq.

*The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (*2002) gives a more elaborate description of war as an actual, intentional and widespread armed conflict between communities. It sees war as a phenomenon which occurs only between political communities, defined as those entities which either are states or intend to become states. By this definition, the mere conflict between individuals or groups cannot be described as war unless it involves armed struggle, is actual and is widespread. In the same light, the *International Relations Dictionary* defines war as:

> *Hostility between states or within a state or territory undertaken by means of armed forces. A state war exists in legal sense when two or more states declare officially that a condition of hostilities exists between them. Beyond this, international jurists disagree as to the kinds of conditions, intentions, or actions that constitute war by legal definition. De facto war exists, however, whenever one organized group undertakes the use of force against the other group* (Plano and Olton, 1969: 77).

But war itself has a variety of forms. Today, the term "war" is used in different ways. It embraces such terms as civil war, inter-state war, cold war, hot war, conventional war, unconventional war, guerrilla war, preventive war, political warfare, propaganda war, psychological warfare, nuclear war, and so on. Even in the communist enclave, we often come across terms such as "imperialist wars", "liberation wars" or "wars of national liberation", "revolutionary wars", and so on.

Even though it has been argued that crisis is inevitable in human life, (Ogunkoya, 2009), today we are desirous of a peaceful world because we feel the world is no longer safe. We have witnessed different wars and at different times and places. In fact, Palmer and Perkins (2002:187) recall that "no period of human history has been free (from war) whether tribe against tribe or nation against nation". We do not need documentation to prove its horror. For obvious reasons, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington DC have drawn the attention of the world to the fact that human society may suffer more horrendous rages due to violence, terrorism or war. Perhaps that explains why the legendary Carl von Clausewitz (1832/1996) defines war as a "continuation of politics by other means". He sees war as an act of violence intended to compel the opponent to fulfill the aggressor's will.

However, we must be careful in our qualification of war because not all forms of political crisis qualify as war. "Most scholars have agreed that war is a controlled use of force, undertaken by persons organized in a functioning chain of command", (Lackey, 1994: 201). Consequently, mere fisticuffs or feud between two communities such as Umuleri and Aguleri in Eastern Nigeria, the Niger Delta crisis in Nigeria, the Moslem Boko Haram crisis that started in Maiduguri in Borno state and spread to other parts of Nigeria recently, are not qualified as wars; but the Biafra versus Nigeria crisis between the mid and late 60s, and the recent America-Iraq crisis, are good examples of wars. In the same vein, we must note that our definition of war as a phenomenon involving the use of force for political purposes does not mean that war is restricted to only governments or states. On the contrary, war can be persecuted by the leaders of liberation movements, groups or revolutionaries even within the state. The Liberian civil war is example of such endeavour

undertaken by rebel leaders (Yorme Johnson, Charles Taylor against the government of Sergeant Samuel Doe).

However, in whatever guise it occurs, war is not human-friendly. It destroys and ruins lives without regard to status, age, gender, race, or creed. War renders normal existence impossible, and imposes heavy burden on humanity. It is indeed a 'curse' which the international community has to contend with or struggle to remove from the surface of the earth. Edward M. Earle (1946) calls it "the greatest unresolved riddle in politics". Nevertheless, to address this riddle we need to understand its roots. It is reasoned that the diagnosis of the causes of wars will enable policy makers to fashion out means of preventing their occurrence. Then what are the causes of war?

Accounts of the causes of war

War is a complex phenomenon. Different people, in different epochs have fought wars for different reasons, with different methods and tactics, and with different results. The 1914 German attack on Belgium, the 1939 German attack on Poland and France, the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, the Japanese attack on China, the Spanish Civil war, the Nazi conquests of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland, the Two World Wars, the Nigeria civil war, the American invasion of Iraq, and so on were carried out for different reasons, in different ways and with different results. Consequently, much of the thoughts and studies devoted to the causes of war have not really agreed as to what could be regarded as the common causes of this monstrous phenomenon in society. For example, Thucydides (1954: 49) argued that what made Peloponnesian War inevitable was the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused Sparta. But no matter how plausible Thucydides' thesis concerning the causes of war (particularly the Peloponnesian War) might sound, it does not explain the causes of wars.

In his study of the origins of the First World War, Fray (1929), identifies militarism, nationalism, economic imperialism and the press as the remote causes of the war, he nonetheless considers the system of secret alliances which developed after the Franco-Prussian War as the greatest single underlying cause of the War. Quincy Wright summarises what some writers have identified as the cause of the war thus:

> *Writers have declared the cause of World War I to have been the Russian or the German mobilization; the Austrian ultimatum; the Sarajevo assassination; the aims and ambitions of the Kaiser; Poincare, Izvolsky, Berchtold, or someone else; the desire of France to recover Alsac-Lorraine or of Austria to dominate the Balkans; the European system of alliances; the activities of the munitions makers; the lack of an adequate European political order; armament rivalries; colonial rivalries; commercial policies; the sentiment of nationality; the concept of sovereignty; the struggle for existence; the tendency of nations to expand; the unequal distribution of population, of resources, or of planes of living; the law of diminishing returns; the value of war as an instrument of national solidarity or as an instrument of national policy; ethnocentrism or group egoism; the failure of human spirit and many others* (Wright, 1942:727-728).

To the psychiatrist Storr (1964), one of the reasons for the continuous existence and popularity of war is comradeship. To him, war is a means of ensuring victory over enemies. This means that some people possess the desire to join other people in doing what is unusual, especially in the pursuit of a common course. For such individuals who love to fraternize with others to pursue a common course, armed conflict with common enemies is a welcome development. In the same way, Gray (1970) argues that many Americans regarded the World War II as an event that helped them to fulfill a desire of escaping from the monotonous civilian life (which they regarded as anemic and isolated) into a more dynamic one of having to unite with their fellow men in the military. By so doing, the war liberated them from continuous feeling of personal impotence and filled them with feelings of power and vitality.

According to Kagan (1995), war has been persistent because of mankind's failure to keep peace. Kagan supports his position by drawing an illustration from Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War (413-410 BC). He maintains that the war broke out between Athens and Sparta because of the failure of Athens, which was then the dominant city-state in Greece, to keep the peace that had been established by

virtue of its dominant status. Kagan feels that the preeminence of Athens had already established peace in Greece and this peace ought to have been preserved by Athens. Unfortunately, its failure to keep this peace created opportunity for war. Therefore, for Kagan the cause of the war was not Sparta's military aggression, as popularly held, but the failure of Athens to organize and plan for war in order to keep the peace. In the same vain, Kagan (1995:281) maintains that, "the Second World War emerged from the flaws of the previous peace and the failure of the victors to…vigilantly and vigorously defend the settlement they imposed".

Meanwhile, Kagan rejects pacifism and regards it as one of the causes of war. According to him, pacifism leads to war because it discourages militarism. Lack of military might leads to weakness, which leads to instability, which in turn can trigger war. Kagan is opposed to the doctrines of pacifists and liberals, which promote greater understanding, more generosity and patience as better ways to avoid war than by military deterrence. He insists that peace does not keep itself. Rather, it requires active effort, just as war does. Therefore, states which intend to preserve peace must maintain a strong military and the willingness to use it when necessary. However, we do not agree with Kagan that war can and should be kept by war, because war begets war and any form of peace attained by means of war is a "de-facto" peace, which is founded on the fear of punishment rather than respect for humanity and commitment to human progress. Such "peace by force" is bound to be short-lived.

Some scholars have argued that war is caused by the inbuilt aggression of man. Admittedly, the struggle for existence is a universal phenomenon among living things, especially human beings – it is a form of social Darwinism. Competition for dominance is natural with mankind. One of the results of such competition is the evolution or emergence of leadership. It has been argued that the emergence of leadership is enhanced by aggression, as it is the responsibility of the leader to enforce group solidarity, take strategic decisions and maintain discipline. Non-aggressive species and groups of individuals tend not to last long in the struggle for survival. Therefore, it is argued that war is a condition of group cohesion. The problem facing humanity today is how to channel aggression without destroying the world.

Stevens (1989) argues that war has served certain basic functions which have contributed to the survival of the species. He claims that war has in the past kept groups in balance with one another and with nature. War has also promoted peace and social organizations within groups. According to him, a group arrives at a profounder awareness of its own unity when it opposes other groups. Stevens claims that this is achieved by satisfying archetypal needs, which could otherwise destroy group cohesion. Thus, fighting within the group is dampened through fear of an external enemy, aggression being directed outwards against the common foe.

Davie (1929) describes how unordered population converts are turned into disciplined armies under a war leader. When peace is achieved the successful war chief or leader often retains his preeminence and in this way, dictatorships, monarchies and dynasties are founded. As human communities became larger and more complex, so the threat of war and organization for it became interestingly important instruments for social integration. Communities which failed to respond in this way, perished. Only if they developed and maintained military virtue could emerging societies hope to protect themselves from war-like neighbours. According to Davie, civilization depends for its existence on the institutionalization of war. Therefore, war has been inseparable from human history.

According to St. Thomas Aquinas (1952, Part II: 531), wars are waged as means of seeking peace. He declares:

> *Even those who seek war and dissension desire nothing but peace, which they do not consider themselves to have. There is no peace when a man agrees with another man counter to what he would prefer. Consequently, men seek peace by means of war to break this concord because it is a defective peace, in order that they may obtain a peace in which nothing is contrary to their will. Hence wars are waged that men may find a more perfect peace than that which they had before* (Aquinas, 1952, part II: 531).

In the research findings of the Social Science Research Committee of the University of Chicago in 1925, more than 250 causes of war were listed and discussed under four headings namely: political, economic, social and psychological. Wright (1935) summarizes these findings as follows: (1) a state of

opinion violently hostile to the existing state of affairs; (2) inadequacy of international organizations to deal with conflicts; (3) inadequate system of law; (4) unstable equilibrium of material forces. For Wright (1942:739) himself "War has politico-technological, juro-ideological, socio-religious, and psycho-economic causes". Turner, (1927) in his book titled, *The Causes of War and the New Revolution,* itemized forty-one causes of war under four headings, namely, economic, dynastic, religious and sentimental factors. Hodges (1932) listed twenty-one causes of war under four headings, namely, social, political, strategic, and economic (cf. Palmer and Perkins 2002). Rourke and Boyer (2002: chs. 3 & 10) classified the causes of war into three levels, namely, system-level analysis, state-level analysis, and individual-level analysis. Goldstein, (2008: Ch. 5) explains the causes of war from four levels, namely, the individual level, the domestic level, the interstate level and the global level.

Communist dialecticians distinguish between certain kinds of wars namely: imperialist wars, revolutionary wars and wars of national liberation. To them, the root of war is to be found in the inherent contradictions and condition of capitalism and imperialism. And according to Mao, the aim of war is to eliminate war. He writes:

> *War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society, and in the not too distant future too. But there is only one way to eliminate it and that is to oppose war with war, to oppose counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war, to oppose national counter-revolutionary war with national revolutionary war, and to oppose counter-revolutionary class war with revolutionary class war. History knows only two kinds of war, just and unjust. We support just wars and oppose unjust wars. All counter-revolutionary wars are unjust; all revolutionary wars are just* (Mao, 1972: 7).

Akinboye and Ottoh (2005: 139-147) distinguish between causes of international conflicts and wars. According to him, the causes of international conflicts are: national prestige, imperialism, acquisition, irredentism, diversionary strategy of national leaders, religious and ideological extremism, mutual distrust and suspicion, sociological and political conflicts, human aggressiveness. Whereas they identify the six causes of war as: regime type, interactive behaviour, lateral pressure, arms race, deterrence and other threats, war and ranking among nations.

Some sociologists have argued that people who kill with modern technology are exhibiting obedience; they are not exhibiting aggression (Denton 1995: 36-60). But the successful prosecution of war depends on the mobilization of the corporate aggression of the warrior. An essential aspect of military training is to encourage aggression. Military men are physically and psychologically equipped for aggression and military training is meant to release aggression and impulses from the control of super ego and bring them under the collective control of the military hierarchy. The aim is to bring to the fore the manipulation of this biological propensity inherent in man to subdue his enemies. By so doing, the soldiers or military recruits are stripped of their previous identity as civilians. Military trainers activate and channel biological imperatives to prepare the soldiers for any act of aggression. Thus, scholars have argued that the roots of war are traceable to the biological imperative in mankind to wage war. But with all these identified causes, are some wars ethically justifiable? When is war justifiable? To answer these questions we need to first consider the Ethics of War and Peace.

The Ethics of War and Peace

This is a philosophical aspect of war which deals with the ethics of human involvement in war. It is one important area in which philosophy demonstrates its foundation in International Relations and Peace Studies. It involves theories (Ethical theories) as means of evaluating the core of international relations – War and Peace. That explains the truth in Palmer's and Perkins', (2002) observations that:

> *Theory is closely allied to philosophy, and in international relations a philosophy is perhaps even more important than a theory. The subject (philosophy) deals with important aspects of human nature and conduct, with the behaviour and standards of groups, with the principles and forces underlying and motivating national and international actions, with*

values and value judgments and hypotheses. All of these and many related considerations are of deep concern to the social philosopher. Thus, a Philosophy of International Relations, as Feliks Gross has observed, may be an appropriate term for this area of ideology, vision, values, principles, future plans and solutions in the area of foreign politics (Palmer and Perkins, 2002: xvii).

It is this submission that forms the basis of the ethics of war and peace. Traditionally, there are three levels of thought in the ethics of war, namely, Just War Theory, Realism, and Pacifism. The proposition of the just war theory is that sometimes the politically independent communities can have justification for resorting into armed struggle or war at the international level. This means that war is sometimes morally right. In contrast, Realism holds the view that morality has no place in the pursuance of war. Rather, for the realist, it is power and national security which motivate the states or policy makers during the war time (see Morgenthau, 1985). Pacifism differs completely from the two previous perspectives in the sense that, it considers war as evil and wrong in its entirety. Having known the motive behind the realist's admission of war, and its rejection by the pacifist, we identify the just war theory as the most controversial among the three perspectives, for it sees war as sometimes just and sometimes unjust. It is therefore our task to determine when war is just and when war is unjust.

Meanwhile, Lackey (1994) sees just war as a morally justifiable war. This is inferred after justice, human rights, the common good, and all other relevant moral concepts have been consulted and weighed against the facts and against each other. But most wars involve the use of force, which is often destructive and which the pacifists abhor and regard as man's inhumanity to man. If this is to be admitted as the right attitude and the basis of human relation, what other options are there for us to organize the society peacefully without recourse to war? To address this question we need to make some clarifications of morality of war by examining the Just War theory.

Morality of War

The concept of morality of war is a complex one, especially when we consider the attitudes and feelings of people in different places and different eras toward the art of war. In human history, we have had some eminent philosophers and scholars who extolled the virtues of war. Just like Aristotle justified slavery, some philosophers and scholars of old also justified war as a necessary means of achieving human and societal development They saw war as a way of realizing the best qualities of a person, preventing economic distress, realizing and sustaining political and economic independence and so on. Indeed, some people believe that World War II was morally justified, but the main problem with this view is that it does not give any lending support to the pacifists who reject violence in war. This is an example of the puzzles which this section of the paper seeks to address under the philosophical concept of "Just War theory".

The Just war theory can be traced to Aristotle's *Politics*. It refers to a morally good war or a morally justifiable war. The justification is done using certain ethical concepts and standards to evaluate the war. According to Gonsalves (1985: 522), "War is the ultimate in human social failure. Unlike natural disasters, war is a wholly human affair, the result of greed, envy, hate, ambition and passion, and apparently useless and unnecessary". Gonsalves raises two fundamental questions: When, for one reason or the other, a nation attacks another nation, does it mean that the latter should suffer in silence? Or does the latter have the right to resistance or self-defense and redress?

Just war theory is based on the conviction that nonviolence is the norm (Hollenbach, 1983: 16-24). The theory tries to evaluate war and holds the thesis that the use of force can be morally justified under certain conditions. The theory insists on investigating the moral grounds for fighting at all and how the war should be fought in the eyes of morality. This explains the controversy concerning the just theory of war as against realism and pacifism.

According to St. Thomas Aquinas, for war to be just it must be seen to fulfill certain criteria, namely, it must be declared by competent authority; it must be for a just cause; and it must be fought with right intensions. Thus, the just theory of war purports to investigate the justice and injustice in opting of war in

order to seek redress as well as justice and injustice in the actual persecution of war. It also finds out which of the warring parties is just or unjust, a task which Lackey (1994: 201) puts in logical parlance that, "in just war theory the term "just" and "unjust" are logical contraries. It follows that in war one side at most can be the just side. But it is possible that both sides may be unjust, and it is fallacious to think that if one side is provably unjust, the other side must be provably just". Gonsalves (1985) has also observed that it is possible that a just war is fought unjustly and for unjust war to be fought strictly in accordance with customary and positive rules of battle. But to understand all these we need consider the three divisions of the theory. For the sake of convenience thethree parts of the just war theory are rendered in the literature in Latin. They are, (1) *jus ad bellum*, (2) *jus in bello*, and (3) *jus post bellum*. Here the term "bellum" is Latin word meaning war. These three parts of the just war theory explain the distinction between morally permissible or obligatory wars and morally impermissible wars.

(a) *Jus ad bellum*

This rule determines when it is permissible or obligatory to begin a war. This concerns the political leaders in the state (the Heads of state) because they are to device means of protecting the sovereignty of the state by organizing and commanding the armed forces. The state has the natural right to wage war when its existence is threatened by an aggressor. It is very reasonable to think therefore that if a state refuses to defend itself while allowing the enemies to destroy it, then it may loose its independence. It is political leaders that inaugurate wars and set their armed forces in motion to fight any battle. Therefore, they are accountable to *jus ad bellum* principles, in which case their actions will be examined under certain premises, among which are: whether the command to wage war is from a lawful authority; whether there is a just cause for the war; whether the intention for wagging the war is right or wrong; and whether the convention of war is strictly adhered to. If the political leaders fail in this regard, then they are said to have committed war crimes or crimes against peace. Thus, to commend a war as just the political leaders involve must fulfill six conditions as discussed below:

(i) Competent Authority and Public Declaration

Here, the legitimacy of command is determined. War is a political matter and it is expected that only a legally constituted authority is competent to declare war. As discussed earlier on, war involves the controlled use of force under competent persons who have the legitimate power as provided for in the constitution or any other instrument of power in the state, to control the armed forces and declare war. That is why it is morally and legally wrong for any person or persons to kill any other person without the authority of government. This aligns with St. Thomas Aquinas declarations that:

> In order for a war to be just, three things are necessary. First, the authority of the ruler, by whose command war is to be waged. For it is not the business of a private individual to declare war, because he can seek for redress of his right from the tribunal of his superior…And as care of the common weal is committed to those who are in authority, it is their business to watch over the common weal of the city, the kingdom or province subject to them. And just as it is lawful for them to have recourse to the sword in defending that common weal against internal disturbances, when they punish evildoers…so too it is their business to have recourse sword of war in defending the common weal against external enemies (St. Thomas Aquinas, 1988: 221).

Even with its constitutional right to declare war, the government of each state in the world is expected to regulate its will and power so as to prevent arbitrary encroachment on another country's sovereignty. This is one area in which international political organizations such as the United Nations, African Union, and so on, come into the affairs of the states. Thus, "Guerrilla warfare in the sense of raids unauthorized by any lawful government cannot justified, but guerrilla tactics may be employed in a war declared by legitimate authority, especially in regions occupied by enemies" (Gonsalves, 1985: 527).

(ii) Just Cause of going to war

This concerns the moral use of the armed forces or the military. It requires the state to wage war only for the right reason. According to Aristotle, (*Politics, 1333 A*) "we wage war, for the sake of peace. According

to John Stuart Mill (1867: 209), "as long as justice and injustice have not terminated their ever-renewing fight for ascendancy in the affair of mankind, human beings must be willing, when need is, to battle for one against the other". The struggle between justice and injustice amounts to uncontrollable conflict of interests between two politically independent communities culminating into war. When making his remarks on the second principle of Just war, St. Thomas Aquinas (1988: 222) also declares that, "…a just cause is required, namely that those who are attacked should be attacked because they deserve it on account of some fault". In the eye of just theory there must be other necessary conditions for war one of which is "right intention".

(iii) **Right Intention of going to war**

Right intention is a close ally of just cause. A state must use its military for right intention. It is agreed that the head of state has the prerogative to command the military to carry out any assignment appropriate to it. But the actual motivation for waging a war must be morally appropriate and justified; is it for self-defense? Or is it to defend the rights and lives of the citizen? Or is it to defend the sovereignty or independence? Or is it to expand the territorial boundaries of the state? All these must be spelt out and placed against the weight of moral principles in order to determine whether it is just or unjust. In accordance with St. Thomas Aquinas' third principle of just war theory, the war must be fought with right intensions Thus, he declares that:

> …it is necessary that the belligerents should have a rightful intention, so that they intend the advancement of good or the avoidance of evil. Hence Augustine says, "True religion looks upon as peaceful those wars that are waged not for motives of aggrandizement or cruelty but with the object of securing peace, of punishing evil-doers, and uplifting the good." For it may happen that war is declared by the legitimate authority, and for a just cause, and yet be rendered unlawful through a wicked intention. Hence Augustine says, " The passion for inflicting harm, the cruel thirst for vengeance, an unpacific and relentless spirit, the fever of revolt, the lust for power, and suchlike things, all these are rightly condemned in war" (St. Thomas Aquinas, 1988: 222)

However, Gonsalves' discussion of the "right intension" tries to defend the rights of the citizens including the soldiers who are drafted to war by the state or the political leader in the state. He writes:

> Conscientious objection is a painful problem in which the conscience of the individual clashes with that of the nation's leader. The ethical principle involved (states that) no country has the right to force a citizen to do what he or she is firmly convinced is morally wrong. One drafted to fight in what seems a certainly unjust war, whether he or she has this attitude toward all war or only toward this particular war, is morally obliged to refuse to fight. Whether the person's judgment is objectively right or wrong is not the question here… (Gonsalves, 1985: 529).

I do not still agree with Gonsalves' thesis of "conscientious objection" as he calls it. The thesis itself is against military ethics. Let me take it that what Gonsalves meant by the phrase "one drafted to fight" refers to the soldiers, which may include regular soldiers and those conscripted into the army during the time of emergencies. Once you are conscripted into the army, you are made to pledge your loyalty, obedience, devotion, respect, and support to the nation, nation's constitution and its leadership. Soldiers are made to obey. It will be unethical, therefore, for a soldier to refuse to take orders from his superior or the Head of State and the Commander –in – Chief of the armed forces.

One basic area which needs to be addressed is the competence of the leadership. Even though part of this will addressed earlier in this work, it is necessary to state here that the integrity of the commander or the head of state is very important both at the point of making him or her a leader and in his or her day – to – day running of the country. If a lunatic or a psychiatric patient or a criminal or a psychopath or an indecent person is made to rule over a country, most of his or her decisions will be on the wrong side. As a matter of fact, there are certain qualities a leader ought to possess and for which he or she ought to be chosen as a leader; he or she must be visionary, charismatic, educated, committed, endowed with instruments of right judgment, wisdom, etc. Plato puts it that he or she must a philosopher king who is above error because he must have being to the world of forms which is the abode of truth.

(iv) **Proportionality of Good over Evil**

Before the war, the involving state must weigh the general good expected to result from the war being conducted. If it is to the general well-being of the citizen, or if it is to defend the integrity and independence of the state, or to defend justice or self-defense, then the state is justified to go to war. In doing so the state must be sure that the proportion of the general good accruing to it from the war is reasonably high (the utilitarian principle of "the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people" may be employed to determine the value of the war proactively). For example a leader may choose to weigh the good in going to war by using Jeremy Bentham's Hedonistic Calculus to determine the amount of pleasure it will bring to the entire citizenry of the state. The hedonistic calculus contains guidelines for searching for and attaining pleasure. It is made up of seven criteria to determine our choice of pleasure; (a) Intensity – by which we should look for intense pleasure with less pain which the war will bring; (b) Duration – by which we should look for the pleasure that lasts longer and not the one that is short-lived; (c) Certainty – by which we should choose only pleasure that is certain; (d) Propinquity – teaches that we should favour the pleasure from the war which is immediate rather than the one that which is in near future; (e) Fecundity – we consider if the war will add more to our pleasure; (e) Purity – teaches that we must choose only pure pleasure but not of pain and pleasure; and (f) Extent – we need to be sure that the pleasure accruing from the war must be for the greatest number of people.

Bentham's calculus is very instructive to leaders to view their actions pro-actively in order to avoid afflicting more evils on their states. But not all of them can be applied in all situations of war.

(v) **War as the Last Resort**

Another condition for Just war is that it must be a last resort. It must be seen that war is the last option after all other available methods of resolving conflict (mediation, negotiation, diplomatic moves, economic measures, etc.) have failed. Under this condition, a state will have no choice but to prepare to defend its territory, citizens, property and independence against any aggressor. If a state is incapable of facing the enemy by virtue of its strength, it may request for assistance from the International Community. Otherwise, it should be ready to loose the battle and be humiliated.

A pacifist however does not see war as the last resort. Militarism and pacifism are two extreme perspectives in war. For the militarist, war is an inevitable means of settling disputes or seeking redress. Whereas, the pacifist abhors violence or forceful means of seeking redress or settling disputes. For the pacifist there is no moral justification for war. Gandhi in India was a practical representative of this philosophical movement. He believed that if people refuse to fight or battle, war is impossible.

(vi) **Probability of success in the war**

James F. Dunnigan and Austin Bay stated in their work, *A Quick & Dirty Guide to War*, (1991), that "No one can predict an outbreak of war by psychic magic or mathematical hocus-pocus. Intelligent Analysts, however, can estimate the likelihood of war or armed conflict in the same way meteorologists predict hurricane's path". Before going to war a state must be well prepared and foresee clearly that it will victorious. What is the use in sending men into the battle field when you are sure of failure? A head of state that does that has failed in his or her responsibilities and has committed war crimes. Therefore, it is expected that reasonable measure of preparedness be exhibited at all times. The army must have adequate strength and training before embarking on war. As a matter of fact, superiority of combat in war is measured, among other things, on the basis of the quantity and quality of the army, the available weapons of war, the skills of the soldiers, expertise knowledge of the army in military strategies, adequate understanding of the terrain of the battle field, correct estimate of the strength of the opponents and other necessary resources to persecute a war.

However, it must be noted that as necessary as these measures and preparations are, they do not guarantee success in war. There are times a mistake by a powerful army may lead to loss of battle. The situation becomes more compounded in a situation where a pacifist state is unwilling to face the wrath of an aggressor who do not give honour or regard to the spirit of such moral principle and decides to take it as opportunity of unleashing horrendous sufferings on its opponents.

(b) *Jus in bello*

This concerns justice in war and on the battle field. This is the responsibility of the military commander who is in charge of the formulation and implementation of the state war policies. He or she designs the strategies which will be adopted to persecute the war. Thus, it is under *jus in bello* that we question the moral character of the soldiers and their mode of fighting. There must be rules to follow in fighting the war which include: how and when a soldier may be killed in the battle field; who is morally justified to be killed during the war (soldiers of the opposite camp and their noncombatants); noncombatants should not be attacked except for some reasons; soldiers must use proportional force to the end they seek (weapons of mass destruction, for instance, are seen as too much for use in conventional war); soldiers may not use weapons or methods that will be injurious to themselves, and so on.

(c) *Jus post bellum*

This is justice at the final stage of war. This principle tries to regulate the end of war and its transition to peace. It is done with due consideration of five underlying principles, namely, just cause or reason for termination, right intention to terminate the war, issuance of adequate public declaration to terminate the war, concentration of punitive measures on the elites that are responsible for the aggression, and reasonable and appropriate punitive measures on the aggressor without making the citizens forfeit their rights.

Most times however some of these principles are not considered when decisions are made to terminate the war. For instance, it may be possible that citizens will begin to agitate for leniency after series of draconian measures have been used against them overtly or covertly by the legitimate authority concerned. That is why the principle of "jus post bellum" complements the other principles of Just theory of war.

CONCLUSION

War is a paradox – it sometimes has some usefulness, yet it is not a good thing to wish for any society. To a large extent, it is a matter of necessity. We are impelled to wage war by circumstances, some of which have been discussed earlier in this paper. Indeed, there are useful points in favour of war but the only problem we have with it is the evil aspects of it. For instance, in our world of today, there are a number of states that were born out of wars of liberation. The United States of America was a product of war - the American Revolution. There are necessary wars and there are unnecessary wars. However, this paper does not advocate war; rather, it discourages the situations which may culminate into it. When a crisis is well attended to and addressed as it looms by taking necessary steps to resolve it, much of the instances of future wars will be prevented. If this method breaks down and war inevitably the last resort, it must be waged with due consideration and strict adherence to the just theory of war.

REFERENCES

AQUINAS, T., (1952). "The Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas II" in R.M. Hutchins et. al. (eds.), *Great Books of The Western World*, Vol. 1 & 2, London: William Benton for Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

AQUINAS, T. (1988). "Summa Theologiae", II-II, in William Baumgarth and Richard Regan (ed.), *On Law, Morality and Politics*, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

ARISTOTLE, (1946). *Politics,* (Translated by Sir E. Barker), Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BARCALOW, E. (1994). *Moral Philosophy: Theory and Issues,* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

BENTHAM, J. (1967). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislat``ion*, (ed.) Harrison, W., Oxford: Blackwell.

CLAUSEWITZ, C. (1996). *On War*, (Edited & Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

CLAUSEWITZ, Car von 1832/1996, *On War*, (Edited and Trans. by Michael Howard and Peter Paret), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

CIOFFI-RAVILLA, C. (1996). "Origins and Evolution of War and Politics," *International Human Rights Quarterly*, 40: 1-22.

DAVIE, M.R. (1929). *The Evolution of War*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

DOYLE, M.W. (1997). *Ways of War and Peace*, New York: W.W. Norton.

DUNNIGAN, J.F. & BAY, A. (1991). *A Quick & Dirty Guide to War,* New York: Quill William Morrow.

EAGLETON, C. (1937). *Analysis of the Problem of War*, New York: The Ronald Press Company.

FRAY, S.B. (1929). *The Origins of the World War,* New York: The Macmillan Company.

GOLDTEIN, J. S. (2005). *International Relations* (6th Edition), New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.

GONSALVES, M. A. (1985). *Fagothey's RIGHT REASON: Ethics in Theory and Practice* , (9th edition), Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

GRAY, J. G. (1970). *The Warriors: Reflections on Men and Battle*, New York: Harper Colophon.

HODGES, C. (1932). *The Background of International Relations,* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

HOLLENBACH, D. S. J. (1983). *Nuclear Ethics: A Christian Moral Argument,* (New York, Paulist Press).

KAGAN, J. (1984). *A History of Warfare*, New York: Vintage.

KEGAN, D. (1995). *The Origins of War and Preservation of Peace,* New York: Anchor Books.

LACKEY D. P. (1994). "War and Violence" in Larry May and Shari Collins Sharratt (eds.), *Applied Ethics: A Multicultural Approach,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

LEVY, J. S. (1989). "The Causes of War: Review of Theories and Evidence", in P. Tetlock et al. (eds.), *Behavior, Society, and Nuclear War,* vol. 1 New York: Oxford University Press.

LEVY, J. S. (2002). "The Study of War" in W. Carlsnaes et al. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations,* London: Sage Publications.

MAO, T. (1972). *Six Essays On Military Affairs*, Peking: Foreign Language Press.

MILL, J. S. (1867). "The Contest in America" in John Stuart Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions,* Boston: William V. Spencer

MILL, J.S. (1947). *On Liberty*, edited by Alburey Castell, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc.

MORGENTHAU, H. J. (1985). *Politics Among Nations (The Struggle for Power and Peace),* New York San Francisco: McGraw-Hill

NICHOLSON, M. (1992). *Rationality and Analysis of international Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

O'BRIEN, W. V. (1995). "Just War Theory", in G. Percesepe (ed.), *Introduction to ETHICS: Personal and Social Responsibility in Diverse World,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

OTTAN, A. (2003). *Annual Report on Violent Conflict in Nigeria 2003*, Peace and Development Projects (PEDEP) and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES).

PALMER, N. D. & H.C. Perkins, (2002). *International Relations (The World Community in Transition) Third Revised Edition*, Delhi (India): Krishan Nagar.

PERCESEPE, G. (1995). *Introduction to ETHICS: Personal and Social Responsibility in Diverse World,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

RAY, J. L. (1995). *Democracy and International Conflict: An Evaluation of the Democratic Peace*, Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

ROURKE, J. I. & Boyer, M.A. (2002). *World Politics, International Politics on the World Stage, Brief,* 4th edition, Connecticut: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

STEVENS, A. (1989). *The Roots of War,* New York: Paragon House.

STORR, A. (1964). "Possible Substitutes for War" in J.D. Carthy and F.J. Ebling (eds.), *The History of Aggression*, London: Academic Press.

The Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. ix (1963), New York: American Corporation

THUCYDIDES (1954). *The Peloponnesian War*, (translated by Warner), London: Penguin Books.

TURNER T. A. (1927). *The Causes of War and the New* Revolution, Boston: Marshall Jones Co.

TYLOR, E. B. (1958). *Primitive Culture*, New York: Harper Torchbooks.

WASSERSTROM, R. (1975). "The Laws of War", in Richard Wasserstrom, (ed.), *Today's Moral Problems,* New York: Macmillan publishing Co., Inc.

WRIGHT, Q. (1942). *A Study of War*, 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.