

Just War Theory by Loren Cahill, Rosati-Kain, 2010



One of the greatest empires in the world developed a doctrine of military ethics. Before entering any battle they would see if it was advantageous for them to compete and comply with this formula. It goes as follows:

1. A war can only be waged as a last resort; after all other options have been exhausted.
2. It also must be waged by a legitimate authority, meaning only the government, should be able to sanction action against others.
3. War must only be fought to readdress the wrong committed.
4. In addition a war can only be fought, if one has greater success in winning than one's opponent.
5. The force allotted should be adequate and match up to the country one is at war with.
6. Lastly, the goal of a just war is always to re-establish peace. This peace should be greater than the peace in the country had the war not been waged.

The great empire was Rome and now the same tactics are being used by the U.S.A the use of "total war" should never happen. Civilians are never one's aggressors, and one should only use military action against another, if they are in the way of a war's target.

It is my personal opinion that no war has ever followed these guidelines, and if the U.S. really believes in abiding by the "just war" theory, we should remove all troops from Afghanistan, immediately because we are miserably failing. For instance, many other measures could have been exhausted before we entered into the Middle East.

America's pride was simply hurt, because 9/11 made our national security look vulnerable to foreign attack, and more importantly, because of it our government made a rash decision. The right intention is still not there. It was and still is the belief that brute force is better than talking with one's enemies. While a legitimate authority allowed the war to happen, there was no wrong to be readdressed. I, at least have yet to hear anything about the finding of the weapons of mass destruction and I have also never figured out the goal of the mission that former President Bush swore to be accomplished. We as of yet have not captured Osama bin Laden, beat al-Qaeda or the conquered Taliban.

If we really have greater success in winning compared to our opponent than why do men like John McCain say "we'll be in the middle east for a hundred years." What is so disheartening about this fact is he probably has a lot of validity to his statement. While we have not gone over and bombed the Middle East enough to make it a sheet of glass we have not been exactly saints either. Everyday we hear about American casualties; and not to diminish them in anyway, those brave men and women who have fought valiantly for our country. However, not once have I ever heard the number of Iraqis or Afghanis casualties that have also laid down their lives because of this onslaught not just the

soldiers but innocent civilians. We tend to dehumanize our opponents in order to make the ills of war easier to deal with but they still deserve dignity.

Peace. I wonder if peace will ever come? I am assured that with our wrong intentions towards the war it will not be for a long time. The Roman Empire was the vastest and most powerful nation of its time but like all things rooted in evil it fell. I would hope that America would have a change of heart in how we treated others before our fate is the same.