

## Kant and War

<p><b>Iraq</b> Just War criteria</p>	<p><b>Categorical Imperative – Universalisability</b> The Just War criteria come from Natural Law thinking, but they can also be reached using the principle of Universalisability. A rational person would agree that wars should not be fought without a just cause, and must be declared by the appropriate authority. It makes sense to say that innocent people should not be targeted, as I would not want to be targeted myself. In fact, all of the Just War Criteria might be supported by a Kantian.</p>
<p><b>Child Soldiers</b> Congo, UK</p>	<p><b>Ends in themselves</b> Kant would disagree with mercenaries – people who fight for any country that pays. Such people are merely being used (or using themselves) as a means to an end. However, a soldier fighting for his own country may be treated as an end in himself if he benefits from the freedoms fought for, is well paid and looked after. In the case of child soldiers, proper care would mean education rather than front-line fighting, so Kant opposes child soldiers.</p>
<p><b>Geneva convention</b> Human Rights, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, Torture</p>	<p><b>Contradiction of the will</b> The Universal Declaration of Human Rights happened in 1948, so before then there were no human rights. It is logically possible to imagine a world where people are arrested without charge and tortured. However, any rational agent imagining themselves being arrested without charge would be against having such a rule – it is a contradiction of the will, because we would not want to be treated that way.</p>
<p><b>Recruitment – poor black people in America being exploited; forced conscription in WWI</b></p>	<p><b>Freedom</b> If there is such a thing as morality, we must have free will. Kant says ‘Ought implies can’, so it would be wrong to say I ought to do something if I am not free to choose. Critics of Bush say that poor black people in parts of America had no other option but to sign up. Kant is against forced conscription, as people are not freely choosing to become soldiers.</p>
<p><b>Pacifism - Conscientious Objectors, MLK - Vietnam</b></p>	<p><b>Good will</b> You might think that Kant would be a pacifist, as it makes perfect sense if everyone behave that way. However, we need to ask how Kant would have responded to Hitler’s attempts at world domination. One option is to allow such dictators to do what they choose – that doesn’t work well as a universal law. The good will does its duty, following the rational path. Many Kantians see this as requiring us to fight in self defence and defence of others.</p>
<p><b>Genocide - Sudan/Darfur, Rwanda</b></p>	<p><b>Law of Nature</b> All ethical theories condemn genocide, but in practice no-one stopped the Rwandan genocide, and 300,000 have already died in Darfur. Would we want a law of nature where people allowed genocide or fought it? If you imagine being a victim of genocide, we would clearly want someone to step in and help us. Kant’s theory would demand that the UN (Kant’s idea – a League of Nations) should act to prevent genocide.</p>
<p><b>Landmines - Cluster bombs, Napalm, Agent Orange</b></p>	<p><b>Synthetic A Priori</b> Kant believes we can work out moral rules by just sitting in a chair and thinking about it. Landmines may be used in a war and remain active for decades of peace that follow. This results in innocent children losing limbs or lives long after the conflict finishes. Any rational person can see that these sorts of indiscriminate weapons that kill innocent people are wrong.</p>
<p><b>Hiroshima – Dresden etc.</b></p>	<p><b>Self contradiction</b> In Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 220,000 innocent people were killed to bring an end to the war. What if we made this killing of innocents a universal law? We would all be targets, and there would be no-one left to fight. The man responsible for the explosions, Oppenheimer, famously said “I am become death, destroyer of worlds”. Kant would concur – by acting in this way, you have created a standard of behaviour that amounts to total annihilation.</p>

## Utilitarianism and War

<p><b>Iraq</b> Just War criteria</p>	<p><b>Singer – Preference Utilitarianism</b> Singer’s Utilitarianism focuses on fulfilling people’s preferences. Rather than requiring a Just Cause or Proper Authority, he would look at people’s interests. Singer is worried that we tend to be more concerned with our own interests than those of, say, the Iraqis. Having a Just Cause is not a reason to go to war. In all cases, you should do the things that are in everyone’s best interests.</p>
<p><b>Child Soldiers</b> Congo, UK</p>	<p><b>Mill - Higher/Lower pleasures</b> In the Congo, child soldiers are employed by militia, and made to do terrible, dehumanising things like raping enemy women. However, Britain allows children of 16 to sign up, and will send 17 year olds to fight. This makes use of their strength and youth, and increases the number of troops available. Mill would have a problem with this, though, as the alternative is to take them later, allowing them a better education and access to higher pleasures.</p>
<p><b>Geneva convention</b> Human Rights, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, Torture</p>	<p><b>Principle of Utility – greatest good for the greatest number</b> The Geneva Conventions set out how to treat prisoners of war, and do not allow the torture of prisoners. The UNHCR also rules out torture. However, the principle of utility allows that torturing an individual may lead to the greater good. This is no doubt the reasoning that justified Guantanamo Bay. Rule utilitarians may disagree, pointing to the horrors of Abu Ghraib as an example of the consequences of allowing the ill treatment of prisoners of war.</p>
<p><b>Recruitment – poor black people in America being exploited, conscription in WWI</b></p>	<p><b>“Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign”</b> Bentham, often seen as an Act Utilitarian, would support conscription in some cases, as it may be necessary to achieve the greater good. Mill defended individual liberty, making him more like a rule utilitarian. He would have resisted forced conscription, despite the fact that it might lead to the greater good. This aspect of Mill’s thinking appears contradictory, but could be justified from a rule utilitarian perspective.</p>
<p><b>Pacifism -</b> Conscientious Objectors, MLK - Vietnam</p>	<p><b>Teleological</b> Some pacifists disagree in principle with the idea of war. Utilitarianism is teleological, so will look at the consequences of going to war to see if it is right. Some utilitarians would also be pacifists if they believed that the consequences of war in the modern world will always be negative. Non-violence was effective for Ghandi and Martin Luther King, so a utilitarian may be attracted to non-violence because it works.</p>
<p><b>Genocide -</b> Sudan/Darfur, Rwanda</p>	<p><b>Hedonic Calculus</b> The more powerful nations may be able to prevent huge numbers of deaths in genocides, but a very careful calculation is needed. This includes the extent of the genocide (how many lives) as well as the number that might die in stopping the genocide, the certainty (how certain it is that these deaths will occur) as well as the likelihood of the success of any intervention. Singer believes any such interventions should go through the UN.</p>
<p><b>Landmines -</b> Cluster bombs, Napalm, Agent Orange</p>	<p><b>Act and Rule Utilitarianism</b> An Act Utilitarian will be open to using whichever weapons are most effective in any given confrontation, and this is most likely the thinking that led Israel to send cluster bombs into Lebanon. Rule Utilitarians would ask about whether a law restricting some types of weapons might lead to the greater good. If it was agreed that indiscriminate weapons should be banned, a rule utilitarian would be committed to not using such weapons.</p>
<p><b>Hiroshima –</b> Dresden etc.</p>	<p><b>“Everyone to count for one, and no-one to count for more than one”</b> The Utilitarian calculations need to treat all people equally, and enemy soldiers must not be seen as of less worth than our own. To justify Hiroshima and Nagasaki, where 220,000 died, there must have been a good chance that more people than this would have died if the bombs hadn’t been dropped. In fact, the US were ready to drop another 7 such bombs, as they were so convinced of the prolonged loss of life through war if they did not.</p>

## Utilitarianism and War

<p><b>Iraq</b> Just War criteria</p>	<p><b>Intellectual Virtues - Wisdom</b> Aristotle would have been happy that decisions of going to war be left to the wise, educated leaders of a country. Wisdom will lead to the Just War criteria. It makes sense that war should only ever be a last resort, and that you should only fight if it is possible to win. All of the criteria are reasonable, and there is a lot of support for the criteria from people of all backgrounds. The criteria can be reached at by a wise person using reason.</p>
<p><b>Child Soldiers</b> Congo, UK</p>	<p><b>Context</b> MacIntyre says that to understand people’s values, you have to understand the context. For example, in the UK you are treated as an adult from 18, so recruiting soldiers at 16 seems to not fit. In the Congo they recruit much younger, but a lot of children start work younger and don’t go to school. These facts should influence our understanding of the moral principles at work.</p>
<p><b>Geneva convention</b> Human Rights, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, Torture</p>	<p><b>Eudaimonia</b> Aristotle’s view of a good soldier was of a person whose character was so well-formed that their courageous nature would lead them into battle against corrupt dictators. The inhuman behaviour of soldiers in Abu Ghraib shows how far from Aristotle’s ideas we are. Eudaimonia involves development of all virtues, such as nobility, justice, courage, patience etc. This means having respect for all people’s human rights.</p>
<p><b>Recruitment</b> – poor black people in America being exploited, conscription in WWI</p>	<p><b>People who love honour</b> <b>Aristotle differentiated between</b> people who love <b>pleasure</b> (live for themselves), people who love <b>honour</b> (living for others) and people who love <b>contemplation</b> (living for knowledge). Soldiers should want to die honourably according to Aristotle. He said that “mercenaries prove cowards and when the danger is too great... they are the first to flee”. It is wrong to coax people to fight through pay. However, it should be noted that in Greek society warfare was an accepted duty of all men - an early form of conscription.</p>
<p><b>Pacifism -</b> Conscientious Objectors, MLK - Vietnam</p>	<p><b>Doctrine of the mean</b> Aristotle said “We make war that we may live in peace.” He would not have supported pacifism. E.g. Anger is one of the spheres of moral virtues, and the golden mean applies. This means being angry at the right time, not just to a specific degree. Excessive anger, or irascibility, means being easily angered. However, anger in the face of injustice, rape, murder etc. may be entirely appropriate. ‘Good temper’ doesn’t mean never getting angry.</p>
<p><b>Genocide -</b> Sudan/Darfur, Rwanda</p>	<p><b>Cardinal Virtues - Courage</b> Another example of a moral virtue is courage. Aristotle thought that tyranny was the worst form of government. He believed Courage was one of the cardinal virtues. He may have supported the conflict in Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein from power. He would have been far more likely to see the prevention of genocides in Darfur and Rwanda as courageous and noble.</p>
<p><b>Landmines -</b> Cluster bombs, Napalm, Agent Orange</p>	<p><b>Cardinal Virtues - Justice</b> Justice requires treating all people fairly. Any weapon that is indiscriminate will lead to civilian fatalities. Whilst innocent people die in every war, using weapons like landmines is similar to targeting individuals. Aristotle would see this as unjust.</p>
<p><b>Hiroshima –</b> Dresden etc.</p>	<p><b>The good for the community</b> Eudaimonia means happiness in the sense of ‘human flourishing’, and if this is achieved for a whole community, that is even better. It could be argued that the bombs dropped on Hiroshima were necessary for the international community to move forward and ‘flourish’. Many historians accept that the war would not have ended if the bombs had not been dropped. However, Hiroshima cannot really be said to have led to ‘human flourishing’.</p>

## Situation Ethics and War

<p><b>Iraq</b> Just War criteria</p>	<p><b><i>'The ruling norm of Christian decision is love: nothing else'</i></b> The Just War criteria, created by Augustine, Aquinas and the Catholic Bishops, lays down the necessary prerequisites for a war to be justified, all of which must be met. Situation Ethics rejects these rules. For example, Just Cause. A country must have done something to justify being attacked e.g. developing WMD, and it must be the Last Resort. For Situation Ethics, this is not required, as bringing about peace in an area may be the most loving thing.</p>
<p><b>Child Soldiers</b> Congo, UK</p>	<p><b><i>'Only one 'thing' is intrinsically good; namely, love: nothing else at all'</i></b> The Rights of a Child state that children should not be used as soldiers. These rights are seen by many as being intrinsically good. Situation Ethics rejects this – only love is intrinsically good. As such, a 15 year old child might give his life fighting for freedom in his country, and Situation Ethics would support this.</p>
<p><b>Geneva convention</b> Human Rights, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, Torture</p>	<p><b><i>'Love and justice are the same, for justice is love distributed, nothing else.'</i></b> After the horrors of WWII, it was decided that there should be standards for how prisoners of war are treated. For example, torture is never fair or just. Situation Ethics thinks that by making the world as good as we can, by helping as many people as we can, we make the world more just. This may mean sacrificing individual liberties in some cases, even torturing terrorists. Justice isn't treating everyone the same, it's helping as many people as possible.</p>
<p><b>Recruitment – poor black people in America being exploited</b></p>	<p><b>Pragmatism</b> Critics of George W Bush claim he exploited poor black communities where unemployment was high by offering young people a career in the army, then sending them to Iraq. Kant and Natural Law would support this claim. Situation Ethics is more pragmatic, recognising that you need to find a solution if there aren't enough soldiers. This system works, but many claim it is unfair.</p>
<p><b>Pacifism -</b> Conscientious Objectors, MLK - Vietnam</p>	<p><b>Personalism</b> Situation Ethics sees people as more important than rules. Pacifists use the Ten Commandments to argue that it's wrong to kill, but Situationists believe that killing to protect people may be right. Other Situationists may be pacifist, believing that it is more effective in achieving peace (MLK was very effective with non-violence), but a Situationist will not be <b>in principle</b> against war, they may just believe it doesn't work <b>in practice</b>.</p>
<p><b>Genocide -</b> Sudan/Darfur, Rwanda</p>	<p><b>Agape</b> This self-sacrificial love for all people would have driven Situationists to take action in Rwanda to prevent the genocide, and Situationists campaign for a military response in Darfur where 300,000 have died. They would not necessarily wait for UN backing. Agape demands that we love others as we love ourselves, and would lead Situationists to support fighting to save the lives of others.</p>
<p><b>Landmines -</b> Cluster bombs, Napalm, Agent Orange</p>	<p><b>Situationist</b> Princess Diana was one among many who claim that land mines are inhuman. Cluster bombs, with 40% left unexploded, were recently used by Israel. A situationist may have criticised Israel, but they would decide on which weapons to use on a case-by-case basis. Landmines aren't intrinsically wrong, it would depend on the individual circumstances.</p>
<p><b>Hiroshima –</b> Dresden etc.</p>	<p><b>Relativism</b> Terror bombing killed 60,000 in Dresden. The atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed 220,000 people. Kantians and Natural Law theorists see the targeting of innocent people as an absolute wrong. Situationists say that what is right or wrong is relative to the situation. In these cases, the killings may have ended a war that would otherwise have killed far more people.</p>

## Natural Law and War

<p><b>Iraq</b> Just War criteria (Poor Annie Just Couldn't Resist Ian Carmichael Jones' Latest Romantic Proposals Without Playing Jelly Marbles Poor Dear).</p>	<p><b>Reason</b> Aquinas contributed to the Just War theory. He believed that absolute moral principles governing when it is appropriate to use military force could be reached through the use of reason. The Just War criteria have been accepted by countries around the world, and have a firm rational basis. There are discussions about updating the principles in light of terrorist threats, but the theory itself hasn't been seriously challenged in hundreds of years.</p>
<p><b>Child Soldiers</b> Congo, UK</p>	<p><b>Secondary precepts</b> The primary precepts suggest humans should live in an ordered society that values education. This may lead to a secondary precept that children should not be sent to war. The UK recruits 16 year olds. This may be seen as contrary to human nature. Amnesty, and other human rights groups, consider this a violation of the absolute principles supported by the UNDHR and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (optional protocol from 2000).</p>
<p><b>Geneva convention</b> Human Rights, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, Torture</p>	<p><b>Interior and exterior acts</b> Many people argue that the torture of potential terrorists can be justified if it leads to the prevention of an attack. If the motivation is pure, Natural Law might describe this as a good interior act but a bad exterior act. In fact, the existence of torture can lead to bad interior acts such as in Abu Ghraib, where soldiers delighted in the suffering of prisoners of war. Natural Law would never see torture as a good exterior act.</p>
<p><b>Recruitment – poor black people in America being exploited</b></p>	<p><b>Efficient and final causes</b> In America, soldiers were recruited to go to Iraq from poor black neighbourhoods where they had no other choices. The money was an efficient cause that got them to Iraq. However, the final cause is different. What is the end or purpose of a soldier? There is a lot of disillusionment around Iraq, and many believe that the end or purpose of the war, to establish peace and democracy, has been lost or compromised.</p>
<p><b>Pacifism - Conscientious Objectors, MLK - Vietnam</b></p>	<p><b>Do good and avoid evil</b> Christian pacifism comes from the belief that it is wrong to kill. The early church was pacifist, and in WWI many soldiers conscientiously objected on religious grounds. Jesus taught his followers to turn the other cheek, and many believe that killing is an evil that we should not do.</p>
<p><b>Genocide - Sudan/Darfur, Rwanda</b></p>	<p><b>Protect and Preserve the innocent (D)</b> This primary precept is commonly used to establish secondary precepts to prevent life from being destroyed – eg, 'Do not abort', 'Do not commit euthanasia', and it may be used to support Jus in Bello ('don't target innocents'). However, it can also be used to require someone to act. For example, in the case of genocide, many think that the powerful nations have a duty to protect the people of Darfur, say, from being slaughtered in large numbers.</p>
<p><b>Landmines - Cluster bombs, Napalm, Agent Orange</b></p>	<p><b>Real and apparent goods</b> There are many different forms of indiscriminate weapons that are still being used today. Natural Law may describe these as apparent goods – they seem to be effective, helping one side to 'win the war'. However, they aren't actually good because they kill innocent people.</p>
<p><b>Hiroshima – Dresden etc.</b></p>	<p><b>Double effect</b> Natural Law cannot justify killing 140,000 people to end a war, even if this prevents millions from dying. However, if the intention was to destroy a military target in Hiroshima, and the civilian deaths were a byproduct of this, then the doctrine of double effect comes in. The civilian deaths are proportionate, as millions of deaths are being prevented. However, many commentators believe the intention was to kill innocent people, which would be evil.</p>