Intentions And Motive In Augustine's Just War Teaching

Petrus Farneubun
Program Studi Hubungan Internasional Universitas Cendrawasih
E-mail : farneubun_petrus@yahoo.com

Abstract: Augustine, one of the greatest christian thinkers, tries to reconcile the love of neighbors and justification of wars. He develops a radically different biblical interpretation than those of early Church Fathers who believe in incompatibility of Jesus's central teaching of loving neighbour and Christian participation in warfare. Augustine repudiates such incompatibility. This paper investigates the teaching of Augustine's just war teaching formulated in his masterpiece The City of God. In the light of this tradition, this paper specifically adresses the intentions and the primary motive of the just war. This paper argues that both the intentions and motive have to be distinctive. Accordingly, war is justified if it meets two distinctive conditions. First, the goal of the war is to bring peace, restore justice, and and punish wrong doers. Second, the war should be based on Christian charity or love of neighbours. This paper begins by introducing the core issue of Christian understanding of its position on warfare, followed by brief profile of Augustine. Then, it addresses Augustine's interpretation of Jesus' teaching and finally it analyses Augustine's just war teaching by focusing on intentions and motive. Two cases, NATO Interventions in Kosovo 1999 and Libya 2011, are also included to illustrate the principle of Right Intention and Motive. It argues that NATO interventions meet the conditions of Right Intention but fail in the principle of Right Motive.

Key Words: Augustine, Just War, Love, Justice, Intentions, Motive

Abstrak: Sebagai salah seorang pemikir Kristen terbesar, Agustinus mencoba merekonsiliasi cinta sesama dengan justifikasi keterlibatan orang Kristen dalam perang. Agustinus mengembangkan suatu interpretasi terhadap kitab suci yang berbeda dengan interpretasi bapa-bapa gereja perdana sebelumnya yang percaya akan inkompatibilitas antara pengajaran Jesus tentang 'cinta sesama" dan partisipasi dalam perang. Agustinus menolak inkompatibilitas tersebut. Tulisan ini mencoba menganalisa pengajaran "Perang Adil" Agustinus yang diformulasikan dalam karya besarnya "City of God." Dalam kerangka tradisi ini, artikel ini secara khusus berfokus pada "Tujuan dan Motif" dalam perang yang adil. Argumen utama dalam tulisan ini adalah baik tujuan dan motif harus memiliki karakteristik yang sangat khusus agar menjadikan perang itu adil. Pertama, tujuan utama dalam perang adalah membawa damai, menegakan keadilan, dan menghukum pelaku kejahatan. Kedua, keterlibatan orang kristen dalam perang harus didasarkan pada kasih atau cinta terhadap sesama. Tulisan ini dimulai dengan memperkenalkan perdebatan sikap orang kristen terkait perang dilanjutkan dengan profil singkat Agustinus dan interpretasinya terhadap pengajaran Jesus. Selanjutnya, analisis tentang pengajaran Agustinus tentang 'perang adil' dalam konteks tujuan dan motif. Dua kasus intervensi NATO di Kosovo 1999 dan Libya 2011 di masukan untuk memberikan gambaran pemenuhan prinsip maksud yang benar (*right intention*) dan *motive*. Tulisan ini berargumen bahwa kedua intervensi tersebut memenuhi prinsip *Right Intention* namun tidak untuk prinsip *Motive* yang benar.

Kata Kunci: Augustine, Perang Adil, Cinta, Keadilan, Tujuan, Motif

Introduction

The issue of the attitude and positions of christians towards war has raised endless debates. As the conduct of warfare evolves in relations to asymmetric wars, rights of combatants and non-combatants; and duty of states and external parties, christians start to frame different interpretations and subsequently add more criteria to the doctrine of warfare conduct. In one hand, this indicates an act of consciousness of christians as a part of responsible human community responding to the war facing them everyday. On the other hand, it signifies a tremendous change on the attitude towards war. This represents a surge of interests on warfare and development of

war ethics not only under christian's traditions but also secular traditions.

Specifically, within just war tradition, the culmination of the debates took place during the 17th century under great just war thinkers Hugo Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf.[179] Accordingly, numerous additional criteria and interpretations have been introduced from the time of Augustine to the present time. Bellamy puts it, " the tradition is fragmented, comprising many different sub-traditions . . . none of which permanently prevail."[180] Further, Brough, Lango, and Linden assert that there have been many just war theories—for example, those of Augustine, Aquinas, Vitoria, and Grotius—theories that have various commonalities and differences.[181]

Such diversity derives from moral consideration of potential human destruction caused by specific acts. Therefore, early, medieval and modern Christians ask normative questions: Should Christians participate in a warfare? Does the participation violate the central teaching of Jesus to love one's neighbors? Normative questions, according to Frost, 'require us to make judgement about what *ought* to be done.'[182] Christians understand that direct involvement in war can lead to human destruction.

Therefore, in making good judgments, two ethical references are used. First, Christians refer to holy scripture. They often ask "What does the scripture say"? Among Christians scripture plays a very distinctive role as moral authority and source of ethics of war. The problem is that there is no universal interpretation in regard to war and the position of Christians. The problem arises because Jesus does not explicitly condemn nor approve whether Christians should participate in war. Second, as there is no definitive answer found in the scripture, Christians refer the teaching of early church fathers. However, problem occurs again as the positions of church fathers are not unified.

In addition, how to reconcile between the love of neighbors and taking up arms is another troubling issue. One might easily argue that they are simply not compatible. Love and war, by definition, can not be reconciled. In the bible particularly in the New Testament Jesus teaches two greatest commandments 'Love God and love neighbor as you love yourself.'[183] Augustine also points out that God, our master, teaches two chief precepts, love of God and love of neighbor, and in them man finds three objects for his love: God, himself and his neighbor.[184]

Two traditions emerge from interpreting the same message. Pacifism understands that taking up arm is against the

---

[179] Larry May, 2007. War Crimes and Just War. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.1

[180] As cited in Eric A Heinze, and Brent, J. Steele, (eds), Ethics, Authority, and War: Non-State Actors and The Just War Tradition. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 4

[181] Michael W Brough, John W Lango, and Harry Van Der Linden, (eds). 2007. Rethinking the Just War Traditions. New York, Albany: State University of New York Press, p. 1

[182] Mervyn Frost, 2001. Ethics in International Relations: A Constitutive Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.2

[183] Matthew 22:37-40

[184] Augustine, Concerning The City of God Against the Pagans. Translated by Henry Bettenson and edited by David Knowles. 1972. London: Penguin Books, p. 873

teaching of Jesus. They argue that Jesus's teaching is very clear that we should love our neighbor and our enemy and even pray for them. Therefore, taking up arms and participating in the killing of people are completely incompatible with the love Jesus offers. In other words, this tradition maintains that love and war is by nature unreconciled. Moreover, Ten Commandments is very clear on "Do not kill." This demonstrates an absolute prohibition of taking one's life.

On the other hand, just war tradition holds view that it is not always wrong to take arms particularly when defending the innocent against aggressor. This tradition was developed by St. Augustine where he tries to reconcile the love of neighbor with war. Augustine's articulation of 'just war' has dominated Church teaching and war ethics discourse from the time right up to the present. In the light of this tradition, this paper tries to examine Augustine's just war tradition in the light of the intentions (ultimate goals) and the primary motive of the just war.

As misunderstanding sometimes arises over the meaning of 'intention and motive,' it is noteworthy to distinguish them. The framework of distinction proposed by Finnis will be used for this discussion. According to Finnis, intention is 'an act, a deed, is essentially what the person who chooses to do it intends it to be. Intention looks always to the point, the end, rather than to means precisely as such; intention corresponds to the questions, "Why are you doing this?" On the contrary, motive is, 'the spirit in which one acts, the emotions which support one's choice and exertions…'[185]

Given this distinction, it appears possible to understand two different but inseparable fundamental tenets of Augustine just war principles. It is sufficient to say that the principle of Augustine's just war requires a satisfaction of both right intention and right motive. The motive to be discussed is how Augustine reconciles Christian ethical doctrine of love for one's neighbor with the teaching of just war. Before embarking on a discussion of Augustine's just war teaching, a brief profile of Augustine is made to show his contribution to western thought.

Profile of Augustine

Among the early church fathers, Augustine (354-430 AD) is perhaps the most well known and most cited thinker, parallel to ancient secular great thinkers such as Plato and Aristotle. His original name is Aurelius Augustinus, known to us as Augustine of Hippo. He is acclaimed as the greatest Christian thinker and theologian Christian church has ever produced. In Catholic encyclopedia, this recognition is evident. It says, 'It is first of all a remarkable fact that the great critics, Protestant and Catholic, are almost unanimous in placing Augustine in the foremost rank of Doctors and proclaiming him to be the greatest of the Fathers.[186] Also, due to

[185] John Finnis, The Ethics of War and Peace in the Catholic Natural Law Tradition," in Terry Nardin (ed), 1996. The Ethics of War and Peace: Religious and Secular Perspectives. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, p. 17. See also the distinction between Intention and Motive by David R. Mapel, Realism and the Ethics of War and Peace, in Terry Nardin, Ethics of War , p. 63

[186] New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, Teaching of St.

his greatest and invaluable contribution to the development of Christian doctrine and faith, Catholic Church acclaims him Doctor of the Church or Doctor of Latin Church, an official honor in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made. Even some Christian literatures call him 'Doctor of the West; the Great African Doctor; *Doctor Gratiae*; and the second founder of the faith and traditionally regarded as father of Just War theory.[187]

Augustine is also a prolific writer. After converting to Christianity in 386, Augustine has produced a number of works in the form of books, epistles, autobiography and sermons. But the 'City of God' is considered the greatest of his works. These works have been much of importance to these days and have been used as reference in regard to doctrinal and ethical issues including ethics of war. Reichberg, et al in their superb collection states, 'in formulating their views on war, canon lawyers, scholastic theologians, Reformation thinkers, and a vast array of modern Christian thinkers have all referred to Augustine and used his language and ideas.'[188] Similarly, the late professor, Adolf Von Harnack, declared, 'between St. Paul the Apostle and Luther the Reformer, the Christian Church has possessed no one who could measure himself with Augustine; and in comprehensive influence no other is to be compared with him.'[189] This remarkable recognition shows a great gratitude from people over the centuries to the idea and knowledge of Augustine. Augustine is and will always remain one of the preeminent figures in philosophy, theology and ethics of war.

Augustine's Biblical Interpretation

Augustine criticized the literal interpretation of Jesus teaching 'resist not evil and striking cheek.' Writing against Manicheans, he said, Jesus teaching, 'I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but if any one strike you on the right cheek, turn to him the left also,' does not call for literal obedience.

> *"...the answer is what is here required is not a bodily action, but an inward disposition. The sacred seat of virtue is the heart...."*[190]

Therefore, for Augustine, there are occasions when war becomes necessary and permissible for the sake of goodness. Russell, for example, argues that the percept 'resist not evil' (Matt. 5:39) did not prohibit wars..., and the command to 'turn the other cheek' (Luk 6: 29) referred to the inward disposition of the heart rather than to the outward deed.[191] In similar fashion, Cady

---

Augustine of Hippo, http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02091a.htm. Accessed on September 10, 2013

[187] As cited in John Mark Mattox, 2006. Saint Augustine and the Theory of Just War. London: Continuum, p.1

[188] Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre Begby (eds), 2006. The Ethics of War: Classic and Contemporary Reading. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, p. 70

[189] Frederick W. Loetcher,. Augustine's Conception of the State." Journal of Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture 4/1 (March 1935) : 16-42.

[190] New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia. Augustine, Contra Faustum, Book XXII, Chapter 76. http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/140622.htm accessed on October 10, 2013

[191] Frederick, H. Russell, 1975. The Just War in the

points out:

> "*Jesus' words, "resist not evil," were interpreted to require an inward disposition to love that did not preclude killing. It was not actions that were right or wrong but attitudes; the point was to avoid hate. Killing and love could go hand in hand for Augustine because salvation, not the life of the body, was of extreme importance. The destruction of the body may even benefit the sinner."*[192]

The position of Augustine is remarkably different from those of Christians in the earlier period. Some scholars have argued that during the first three centuries (pre Ambrosian and Augustinian era), majority of Christians refuse to participate in war and take passive resistance stand. For example, Reichberg, Syse and Begby argue,

> *During the first three centuries AD, the mainstream of Christianity adopted what we could call a moderate pacifics stance. This pacifism had two sources of inspiration: Christ's clear injunctions to nonviolence in the New Testament, and the view that the world is evil and will soon wither away.*[193]

These Christians and then later followed by modern Christians called as 'Peace Churches' hold view that war requires violence and bloodshed; and doing violence to others is not compatible to the teaching of Jesus. They rely on non violent ways such as prayers and submissiveness to bring peace. Tertulian and Origen, for example, in the third century certainly thought bloodshed unlawful and 'prayers are greater than weapons.'[194] Moreover, they response to injustice was not force but the armory of the spirit and prayer.[195] In his teaching '*Against Celcus*' Origen states,

> *...the Christians fight through their prayers to God on behalf of those doing the battle in a just cause and on behalf on an emperor who is ruling justly in order that all opposition and hostility towards those who are acting rightly may be eliminated. What is more, by overcoming with our prayers all the demons who incite wars, who violate oaths and who disturb peace we help emperors more than those who are supposedly doing the fighting...*[196]

Similarly, Tertulian demonstrates his total rejection on using force and arm. He says, 'Lord has cursed the sword forever, the duty of the Christian is to suffer death rather than inflict it, and the sword can never produce truth, gentleness, or justice and (*peace)*.'[197] In the early Christians, the suffering is considered a blessing as they partake the suffering of Jesus and part of salvation. According to O'Donovan, suffering and martyrdom is a testimony to God's faithfulness when there is nothing left to do; and Christian should not begin with the martyrdom but end with it.[198]

Middle Ages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 17

[192] Duane L Cady, 2010. From Warism to Pacifism (2nd edition). Philadelphia: Temple University Press,p.7

[193] Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre Begby, The Ethics of War, p.61

[194] Roland G. Musto, 1986. The Catholic Peace Tradition, New York: Orbis Books, p. 36.

[195] Harfiyah Abdel Haleem, et al, (eds), 1998. The Crescent and the Cross: Muslim and Christian Approaches to War and Peace. London: Macmillan Press LTD, p.33.

[196] Origen, Against Celcus, bk 8, Chapter. 73, In Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre Begby, The Ethics of War, p. 65

[197] Ronald G. Musto, The Catholic Peace Tradition, p.36.

[198] Oliver O'Donovan, 2003. Just War Revisited. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.10

The radical shift from pacifism to just war signify a new development of the just war tradition. Yet, the alternative interpretation by Augustine is embraced by the medieval to late christian thinkers such as Thomas Aquinas, Francisco de Vitoria, Franciso Suarez and Hugo Grotius. They develop a more systematic theory of just war. Even, in secular society, UN and international organizations use just war criteria as the basis for humanitarian intervention.

St. Augustine's Just War Teaching

In developing his teaching, Augustine derives his theory from the factual phenomenon--war as part of human existence where no one can escape. Therefore, he addressed the problem of war in very specific way based on biblical narratives. War, as the realm of human existence is also shared by political theorists. In fact, the new dicipline called as "International Relations" originally emerged to study the "causes of war and and conditions of peace."[199] Theories about war were developed and different recipes are offered.

Realism believes human nature and appetite for power are the cause of recurrent wars and there are no possibilities to eliminate war except limit its occurrence. Therefore, realism offers states hard power[200] maximizing based policy as the safest guard for state security. On the contrary, liberalism with its variations of idealism, neo-liberal institutionalism understand that the war is not caused by human nature but by the subscription of states to a particular system. Consequently, they argue that non-democractic states are principal cause of war and the cure for war is nothing else but democracy. Meanwhile, neorealism is not convinced with the arguments of both theories. Instead, neorealism claims the international system of anarchy is the cause of the war.[201] Anarchy shapes states' behavior and states under anarchy tends to be conflictual. Neorealism offers state the recipe of maximizing security through military power.

If one would like to put Augustine under the theoritical category, it would be fair to include Augustine within realism camp. However, it is in a limited sense. Both Augustine and realists share the same view on the wickedness of human nature. And yet, Augustine and realists understand that perpetual peace could never be achieved contrary to the claims by liberalists and idealists. Loriaux, for example argues, "Augustine and the realist share, first, a common skepticism regarding the capacity of humankind to use its powers of reason to discover and implement progressive reforms leading to an enduring peace."[202]

[199] Steve Smith, , Introduction: Diversity and Disiplinarity in International Relations Theory. In Tim Dunne; Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, (eds). 2013. International Relations Theory: Dicipline and Diversities (3rd). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[200] Hard power here means military power

[201] For comprehensive theoritical analysis of the relations between these three theories and war, Kenneth Waltz's book "Man, the State and War: Theoritical Analysis is worth reading.

[202] MichaeLoriaux, The Realist and Saint Augustine: Skepticism, Psychology, and Moral Action in International Thought. International

Augustine, exists because people are utterly deprived in nature as they inherit first human sins or what he calls '*original sin*.' He argues that war was both a consequence of sin and remedy for it.[203] Consequently, if there has to be a war, it should be waged only as a necessity and waged with sadness and the only war Christians can participate is in just war. Realists, for example Morgenthau, also believes in the fallen man due to original sin as the cause of war. He says, "It was through lack ofreason that evil came into the world. This is the original sin by which man has disturbed the order of the world."[204]

Although sharing some commonalities, Augustine's approach to war is rather different from that of realists. Realists reject the value of morality and limitness of war. For realists, in war "morality and law have no place. *Inter arma silent leges*: in time of war the law is silent.[205] And Clausewitz writes, "War is an act of force which theoritically can have no limits."[206]

Just War tradition tries to place moral limitations on war for those who would undertake it and lay down strict conditions to be satisfied. One of the compelling works in which St. Augustine firstly articulates the notion of the type of war Christians can participate is in *The City of God.* Although in his City of God Augustine does not list the criteria in a systematic order, as the texts is scattered and one needs to read the whole passage particularly Book XIX[208] about war and peace specifically, it is clear that Augustine understands that a war can be called just if it serves to the purpose of bringing peace and restoring justice and should be waged by what Augustine calls "warlike prowess either in command or in the actual fighting."[209] Ronald A Wells fashionably illustrates Augustine's just war criteria as follows:

> The *Just War is to be fought under the authority of the state, and is to limit its goals to the restoration of justice or the preservation of peace. Moreover, the Just War ... in order to be just ... must be a last resort, entered into only after all methods of solving disputes non-violently have been exhausted. Further, the Just War must be fought justly, that is, with special care taken to protect non-combatants, and with the level of violence strictly limited to the minimum necessary to accomplish the goal of justice, that is, the restoration of peace or the preservation of justice.*[210]

Augustine, in his doctrine of of just war, explicitly sets up certain criteria for a war

Studies Quarterly, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Dec., 1992), p. 404

[203] Frederick H Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages*, p. 16

[204] Morgenthau, Hans J, 1947. *Scientific Man vs Power Politics*. London: Lamiter House Limited, p. 19

[205] As cited in Michael Walzer, ,1977. *Just and UnJust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (4th ed). New York: Basic Books, p.3

[206] Ibid, p.23

[207] Eric A Heinze, and Brent, J. Steele, (eds), *Ethics, Authority, and War,* p. 4

[208] For this purpose, I use Augustine, Concerning The City of God Against the Pagans. Translated by Henry Bettenson and edited by David Knowles 1972 as a reference. One can consult any other translations which they might find different in the divisions of the book and chapter

[209] Augustine, Concerning The City of God Against the Pagans, p. 866. Current literatures equates "warlike prowess" to authority of the state or UN Security Council as the legitimate authority.

[210] Ronald A. Wells, (ed) 1981, The Wars of America: Christian Views. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William

to be called a just war. The key point Augustine is making is a just war is always a reaction to wrong doing and punishment to evil doers. Hence, a war is morally justified if it is declared by legitimate authority, has a just cause and right intention, and should be the last resort.

Augustine formulated the doctrine of just war within Christian framework as he recognizes that war is an inseparable part of human existence. That war always has been and will be a part of earthly life do not necessary mean that all wars are acceptable and justified. Augustine parallels Christians attitudes in just war as a wise man. He points out that a wise man will wage just wars and if the wars were not just, he would not have to engage in them, and consequently there would be no wars for a wise man[211] and "it is the wrongdoing of the opposing party which compels the wise man to wage wars."[212] This is, of course, to say that wise man will understand what war he can and can not participate. Augustine's principles of the Just War entails a nature of high necessity for wars to be waged and this denotes principles of right intention and just cause.

Right Intention

Augustine is very clear that it is necessary for a rightful authority to wage war to restore peace and justice. However, in this context, one should be aware that the Augustine's concept of peace is different from those of secular thinkers. The difference is because Augustine formulated the concept of peace under Christian tradition deriving from his understanding and interpretation of Jesus teaching.

In Augustine's view peace should be true peace or just peace or what he calls *tranquility of order* where peace of body and soul, peace of mind (free from disturbance of mind), and perfectly ordered and perfectly harmonious fellowship in the enjoyment of God exist.[213]

Reichberg et all, in their commentary on Augustine concept of peace uses the term lower peace and higher peace. Thus, it says, 'there is lower peace, which merely entails enforcement of someone's arbitrarily will by force. And there is a higher peace which consists in concord and order. It is this latter peace that must be sought for a war to be just.'[214]

The concord and order in Augustine view is very specific in nature. He defines concord as, 'agreement and harmony in willing, that is, in deliberating, choosing, and acting. On the other hand, order is, 'the arrangement of things equal and unequal in a pattern which assigns to each its proper position.'[215] The implication drawn for these

B. Eerdmans, p. 8.

[211] Augustine, Concerning The City of God Against the Pagans, pp. 861-862. Walzer also mentions that Catholic philosophers and theologians believes that Catholic can not participate in unJust Wars. Michael Walzer, 1977. Just and UnJust Wars: A Moral Arguments with Historical Illustrations. New York: Basic Books, p. 39

[212] As cited in Davis Brown, 2008. The Sword, The Cross, and the Eagle: The American Christian Just War Tradition. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher, p.29

[213] Augustine, Concerning The City of God, p. 871

[214] Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre

[215] Begby, (eds), The Ethics of War, p.77.
Augustine, Concerning the City of God, p. 871.

conditions of peace is that the peace established under Saddam Hussein or Nazis, for example, does not fit under the criteria of Augustine's peace and should not be called peace because it is iniquitous peace, lacking concord and order. In other words, people live in peaceful condition but it is false peace as their heart is not filled with peace but fear.

True peace as the primary aim of war is very clearly stated in Augustine letter to Boniface. He said, '"peace is not sought in order to provoke war, but war is waged in order to attain peace. Be a peacemaker, then, even by fighting, so that through your victory you might bring those who you defeat to the advantage of peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers," says the Lord,' for they will be called children of God (Matthew 5:9)."[216]

This Augustine's statement entails three things. First, peace requires violence. Augustine says, "...When men choose war, their only wish is for victory; which shows that their desire in fighting is for peace with glory...Even wars, then, are waged with peace as their object,...Hence it is an established fact that peace is the desired end of war. For every man is in quest of peace, even in waging war, whereas no one is in quest of war when making peace."[217]

Second, war is conducted against evil-doers. But the war here has to be seen as corrective or punitive rather than defensive. Augustine calles war as charitable punisment for sin.[218] Augustine illustrates the function of war as positive punishment in his interpretation of St. Paul letter. In his letter, accoding to Augustine, St Paul thinks one person's sin should cause grief (*luctus*) to all the Church, but the punishment must seek to save the sinner's spirit (1 Cor. 5:2 and 5).[219] Agustine believes that the unrighteous man's grief in his punishment is more appropriate than his rejoising in sin[220] and his destruction of the body can bring eternal salvation.[221]

The function of war as punishment is widely acknowledged by various scholars. Syse, for example, argues 'The gist of St. Augustine's just war teaching is that war is undertaken to punish and correct wrongdoing so that peace may follow.'[222] Further, Walzer states that it is morally justified to fight against agression because it is a crime.[223] In fact, within the just war theoritical tradition, the punishment theory begins with St. Augustine.[224]

Accordingly, when a political regime is doing massacre against his own people or his neighbor country, war becomes necessary

---

[216] Augustine Letter 189 to Boniface. In The Ethics of War, edited by Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre Begby. p.79

[217] Augustine, Concerning the City of God, p.866

[218] Davis Brown, 2008. The Sword, The Cross, and the Eagle:p. 29

[219] As quoted in Richard Sorabji, and David Rodin, (eds), 2006, The Ethics of War: Shared Problems in Different Traditions. Oxford: Ashgate, p. 16

[220] Augustine, Concerning the City of God, p.871

[221] Davis Brown, 2008. The Sword, The Cross, and the Eagle, p. 29

[222] Henrik Syse, "Augustine and Just War: Between Virtue and Duties," In Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (eds), 2007. Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives. Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press, p. 40.

[223] Michael Walzer, 1977 , Just and UnJust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations (4th ed). New York: Basic Books, p. 21

[224] David Luban, War as Punishment. Philosophy and Public Affairs. 2012, Vol. 39, No. 12, pp. 299-330

to be waged as last resort in order to correct his wrong doing or possible change the regime or even to the point of his death. It will be considered more evil not to do anything to stop an aggressive tyrant that it is to fight him in war. This means that war may be ugly and evil, but it is more ugly and evil not to do anything. Gulf War or the massacre of Tutsi by Hutu might be a good example to illustrate the point of St. Augustine. In the Gulf war, for instance, international force under UN resolution did intervention to stop the killing of Kuwait people by Saddam Hussein and this is the right way to do to create peace to Kuwait people and correct Saddam's evil-doing based on Augustine framework.

Third, Christians are called to be peacemakers. St. Augustine's concept of peacemakers requires something beyond passivity and pacifism. In other words, Augustine understands that striving for peace requires not only prayers but also deeds. He says, 'Be a peacemaker, then, even by fighting, so that through your victory you might bring those whom you defeat to the advantages of peace.'[225]

Waging war is also necessary if it aims to restore justice. In fact, it is the central theme in just war tradition. Johnson argues that the Western just war tradition begins 'with a presumption against injustice focused on the need for responsible use of force in response to wrongdoing.'[226]

Justice is one of the four virtues in the teaching of Augustine.[227] In discussion about war, both Augustine and Aquinas did not begin with 'presumption against war' but rather a 'presumption against injustice.' Syse states, '…it is the pursuit of justice and the punishment of wrong doing that lie at the heart of his [St. Augustine] case.'[228] This indicates that the war is not the choice but it could be possible employed by right authority when injustice prevails. Yet, according to Brown, "Just War is a war of vindication, whereby force is used to impose or restore justice to a situation in which injustice would otherwise prevail."[229]

In addition, Augustine makes clear that peace and justice should coexist. The relationship between peace and justice remains central in Augustine's just war teaching. He says, 'the peace of unjust, compared with the peace of the just, is not worthy even of the name of the peace.[230] In other words, the kind of peace that is based on injustice does not deserve the name of peace. The distinctive point in this Augustine's pronouncement is that waging a just war should result in two ends, peace and justice. This means that, taking the example of Gulf War, bring peace to Kuwait people should be followed by

[225] Agustine Letter to Boniface, Gregory M.Reichberg, Henrik Syse, and Endre Begby, The Ethics of War, p.79

[226] As cited in Nahed Artoul Zehr, James Turner Johnson and the 'Classic' Just War Traditions. Journal of Military Ethics, Vol. 8, No. 3, 190-201, 2009

[227] Augustine divided virtues into four divisions: prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance. See Augustine, Concerning The City of God, p.158

[228] Henrik Syse, "Augustine and Just War: Between Virtue and Duties," In Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (eds), 2007. Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War, p. 47

[229] Davis Brown, 2008. The Sword, The Cross, and the Eagle, p. 18

[230] Augustine, Concerning The city of God, p. 869

bringing justice. If Kuwait people feel peaceful but still suffer from injustice employed by Saddam Hussein, for example, it would be considered as incomplete outcome of good intentions. In similar way, if justice is enforced but people still live under false peace, then no harmony is established.

Speaking about justice, however, leaves us with question. This is because we do not really know what kind of justice that Augustine speaks of. In his works, Augustine does not explicitly formulate his definition of justice. Rather, he attaches the concept of justice within different accounts.

One account that justice is often discussed and therefore can help us understand the concept of Justice Augustine refers to is under the frame of government, empire or ruler. It is obvious when Augustine makes a comparison of kingdom without justice with robberies. Thus he asks, 'Remove justice, and what are kingdoms but gangs of criminals on a large scale?'[231] For Robberies taking things without fairness and just rule and subdue people, we understand that justice in Augustine's understanding is justly and fairly governed. It deals with administering a society or government with just rule so each act is valued and judged according to agreed law.

Correspondingly, in discussing of Cicero's opinion of the Roman Republic, Augustine expounds his ideal concept of government and republic. He maintains that when republic is governed justly and fairly, it will deserve to be called republics. Once, they are no longer justly governed, they stop being called republic. Augustine says, '...that a country can not be governed, and cannot continue in being, without a high degree of justice.'[232] Given the noble value of justice, Augustine 'expects rulers who are Christians to rule with justice and to put their power at the service of God's majesty to extend his worship far and wide.[233]

In addition, Augustine seems to criticize the view of Cicero in which Cicero does not consider Rome as republic as it is governed by tyrant ruler and stained by corrupt practice. Cicero points this out in a very strong statement. He says that Rome never was a republic, because true justice had never a place in it.'[234]According to Augustine, Rome possesses some characteristic of republic. Augustine says, '…But accepting the more feasible definitions of a republic, I grant there was a republic of a certain kind, and certainly much better administered by the more ancient Romans than by their modern representatives.'[235]

Once again, holding Augustine view on justice helps us draw a normative conclusion that wage a war is necessary to restore justice taken by tyrant ruler who administers government unjustly and fairly.

Two recent cases that can help us understand the principle of Agustine's rights

[231] Ibid, p. 139

[232] Ibid, p.73

[233] John O'Meara, Concerning The City of God, Against The Pagans. A New Translation by Hendry Bettenson. (London: Penguin Group, 1984), p. xxvi

[234] Philip Schaff, (ed), Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of Christian Church: St Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine Vol. II., (Michigan : Christian Classics Ethereal Library,1890), p.70

[235] Ibid

intention are NATO interventions in Kosovo in 1999 and Libya in 2011. Both these cases meet the conditions of Augustine's principle. First, NATO's interventions were primarily to restore peace[236] and stop and prevent civilians killings, ethnic cleansing and massive human rights violations conducted by authoritarian rulers. In Kosovo crisis, prior to NATO interventions, approximately 2,000-3000 deaths have been reported; and mid 1998, 1500 Kosovar albanians have been killed and 400,000 had to flee homes; by the beginning of April 1999, Serb forces have caused 226,000 refugees in Albania alone and within Kosovo itself around 580,000 people had been rendered homeless.[237]

Second, the act of NATO is considered an act of moral responsibility against injustice. As Augustine defines justice as "justly and fairly governed," the conduct of NATO is to bring justice where people do not enjoy it under both regimes. Augustine believes that it is responsibility of Christians to wage war to bring and restore justice. As Walzer notes, "There can be no justice in war if there are not, ultimately, responsible men and women."[238] NATO believes that moral responsibility dictate them to take military actions.

Accordingly, it is believed that if NATO had not take the action, more Albanian civilians would be killed. In NATO press release in response to Kosovo crisis, the connection between moral obligation and preventing ethnic cleansing is clearly articulated. It says, "We must halt the violence and bring an end to the humanitarian catastrophe now unfolding in Kosovo...We have a moral duty to do so...The responsibility is on our shoulders and we will fulfill it."[239]

Similarly, in Libya crisis, UN Security council adopt a resolution at its 6498th meeting, on 17 March 2011 urging member states to "take all necessary measures to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including Benghazi."[240] The Kosovo and Libya cases illustrate Augustine's principle of right intentions have been fulfilled. The interventions were undertaken as both regimes were engaged in mass murder; and this justifies NATO action morally to take actions to stop the killings.

Right Motive

But if war is to be waged to attain peace and justice and as a form of punishment,

[236] It should be noted here that among members of security council, there is different views whether Kosovo crisis is a threat to international peace and security. The United States, United Kingdom and France recognized that humanitarian crisis in Kosovo was a threat to international peace and security but China and Russia consistently oppose such affirmation. As cited in Christine Gray, International Law and the the Use of Force. (Oxford: Oxford Uniyersity Press, 2004), p. 40. Also, UN Security Council resolution 1973 determines that the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security. The resolution is available at http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement

[237] As cited in John Janzekovic, 2006. The Use of Force in Humanitarian Intervention: Morality and Practicalities, Burlington, VT : Ashgate, pp. 177-183

[238] Michael Walzer, 1977 , Just and Unjust Wars,p.288

[239] NATO Press Statement 19 March 1999 can be accessed here NATO Press Statement 19 March 1999, http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-040e.htm (accessed 20 February 2014)

[240] UN Resolution is available at http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement

what are then the primary motive that must be met to ensure that the war is morally justified? In other words, 'What should be the primary motive for a right authority to wage war to attain peace and justice for those who can not defend themselves against evil doers?

This question is vitally important as one might wage a war for different motive but the goals are to pursue peace and confront injustice. Thomas Hobbes, for example, mentions different causes people wage war as for gain, safety and reputation.[241] These motives are based on Hobbes political theory that human nature are egoistic and self-driven interests operated under anarchic state of nature where there is no higher authority to regulate the behavior of states and individuals. Therefore, according to Mattox, "For Augustine, motivation is absolutely fundamental in assessing the justice of a nation's participation in war."[242] United States and NATO conducting numerous interventions into the territory of sovereign countries, as have been argued many times, are largely motivated by political and economic interests not based on humanitarian concerns.[243] For example, although NATO interventions in Kosovo and Libya meet the conditions of Augustine's rights intentions, several scholars argue that the interventions are motivated by political and economic interests. It has been argued by most scholars that humanitarian interventions are only legitimate if it is based on sentiment of humanity.[244] Looking at the NATO interventions in Kosovo and Libya, it shows that the interventions fail to uphold humanitarian purposes. First, the motive of the intervention is basically to overthrow the ruling regimes. Obama is very clear saying, "Colonel Qaddafi needs to step down from power and leave. That is good for this country. It is good for his people. It's the right thing to do."[245]

Both Milosevic and Gaddafi were successfully removed from their power. Milosevic was brought to International Criminal Tribunal on the charge of committed war crimes and Gaddafi was expected to be presecuted in International Criminal Court but was found dead before such prosecution. Kuperman argues, "NATO's primary aim was to overthrow Qaddafi's regime, even at the expense of increasing the harm to Libyans."[246] According to Walzer, regime change should

[241] Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan,. Edited by Sir William Molesworth, Bart Vol. III. (London: John Bohn) p. 112

[242] As cited in John Mark Mattox, 2006. Saint Augustine and the Theory of Just War. p.16

[243] For example see, David N Gibbs, 2009. First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and Destruction of Yugoslavia. Nashville: Vanderlbilt University Press, ; Alan J Kuperman, , Lessons From Libya: How Not To Intervene. Policy Brief, September 2013. Harvard Kennedy School. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs; Michael Chossudovsky, , "Operation Libya" and the Battle for Oil. http://www.globalresearch.ca/insurrection-and-military-intervention-the-us-nato-attempted-coup-d-etat-in-libya/23548 ; David N Gibbs, , Power Politics, NATO and , The Libya Intervention.

[244] Alex J. Bellamy, Motives, Outcomes, Intent and the Legitimacy of Humanitarian Intervention. Journal of Military Ethics (2004), 3 (3) pp. 216-232

[245] Aamer Madhani, "Obama says Libya's Qaddafi Must Go," National Journal, March 3, 2011. Available at http://www.nationaljournal.com/obama-says-libya-s-qaddafi-must-go-20110303

[246] Alan J Kuperman, , Lessons From Libya: How Not To Intervene. Policy Brief, September 2013. Harvard Kennedy School. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs

not be the primary aim of interventions.[247]

Second, NATO member states, particularly US, are more motivated by promoting democracy and US interests. Spreading democracy has been the central theme in US foreign policy in the post-cold war. It is very clear that US and other NATO members fail to take impartial and neutral position but taking side with the rebels and pro-democracy groups. In Kosovo, it is surprising that United States took side with Kosovo Liberation Army against Serbia[248]and in Libya NATO provides military assistance to the rebel.[249]Taking side with the rebel in Libya violates the principle of impartiality.[250]

Augustine is very clearly that war must be based on ultimately on 'Christian Charity or Love i.e loving one's neighbor as oneself.' This means that if the goals are good (bringing peace and justice) but the motive is not love or based on political interest motive, the war is not morally justified; and Augustine calls this a vice not virtue.[251]

Love is fundamental theme in Augustine's just war theory. In his letter to Boniface, Augustine treats the obligation of military action as an obligation of love to the neighbor. [252] According to Deane, 'St. Augustine insists that it is not only right for public authorities to punish wrong doing, since in doing so they are acting as ministers of God, but that such punishment is an act of love which is intended to lead to the correction and reform of those who are punished.'[253] Furthermore, Deane says, 'although we are commanded to love our enemies, yet we must also in the spirit of love, correct their errors[254] and preventing them from doing further wrong was an act of love.[255]

In addition, use violence to defend the innocent against evil constitutes what Augustine calls loving obligation. Christians are called to take arms if necessary to defend those who can not defend themselves. Consequently, Christian who willingly refuse to participate in a just war for the sake of defending the innocent against the evil, they fail to show the love of God. Cole states,

> *...the Christian who fails to use force to aid his neighbor when prudence dictates that force is the best way to render that aid is an uncharitable Christian. Hence, Christians who willingly and knowingly refuse to engage in a Just War do a vicious thing: they fail to show love toward their neighbor as well as toward God.* [256]

It is clear that in Augustine's view, those who go to war in defense of the innocent and correct the wrong doing of evil doers do

[247] Michael Walzer, Just and Unjust War, p. x

[248] Christopher Lane, Miscalculations and Blunders Lead to War. In Ted Galen Carpenter (ed). 2000. NATO's empty victory : a postmortem on the Balkan War. Washington: CATO Institute, p. 15

[249] Claudia Gazzini, Was the Libya Intervention Necessary? Middle East Report 261, Winter 2011, p 5

[250] Jennifer M Welsh, Civilian Protection in Libya: Putting Coercion and Controversy Back into RtoP. Ethics and International Affairs. Vol. 25 No. 3, 2011, pp. 256-262

[251] See Augustine, Concerning The city of God, Book V, particularly Chapter 12,13,19,20 for this issue.

[252] Oliver O'Donovan, 2003. Just War Revisited, p.9

[253] Philip W. Gray, Just War, Schism, and Peace in Augustine. In Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Reichberg (eds), 2007. Ethics, Nationalism, Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press, p. 67.

[254] Ibid, p. 63

[255] Frederick Russell, H, The Just War in the Middle Ages, p. 17

[256] Keith Pavlischek, Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism, and Just War Theory A Critique , 2013

not violate the commandment against killing. In other words, the act is in conformity with love command of Jesus.

Conclusion

Augustine's just war teaching appeals the use of force for very limited purpose. Augustine essentially rejects war and considers war as the source of evil. However, realizing that war as part of human existence, Augustine began to develop justification for the use of force that Christian can participate. As a result of this, he lays down certain criteria for a war to be deemed just. This just war tradition developed by Augustine has become the referent and most widely discussed in the contemporary ethics of war.

In his teaching, certain criteria for a war to be justified are: if it is declared by legitimate authority, has a just cause and right intention and should be last resort. Two fundamental intentions Augustine appeal for the use of force as reaction to wrong doing and punishment to evil doers are to bring peace and restore justice. True peace consisting of concord and order is the one which just war should be fought for.

Furthermore, war, in Augustine's view, must be based ultimately on 'Christian Charity. The love of neighbor should be the primary motive in just war. Defending the innocent against evil doer is an act of charity and this act should be carried out in pursuit of peace and justice. This means that Augustine calls legitimates authority and Christians to keep this principle when waging war and defend the innocents. Using Agustine's principles of Right Intention and Right Motive in evaluating two NATO interventions; Kosovo 1999 and Libya 2011, shows that both interventions meet the condition of right intention but fails to uphold right motive.

References

Augustine, 1972. *Concerning The City of God Against the Pagans*, Translated by Henry Bettenson and edited by David Knowles. London: Penguin Books.

Bellamy, Alex J, Motives, Outcomes, Intent and the Legitimacy of Humanitarian Intervention. Journal of Military Ethics (2004), 3 (3) pp. 216-232

Brough, Michael W; Lango, John W, and Linden, Harry Van Der (eds). 2007. *Rethinking the Just War Traditions*. New York, Albany: State University of New York Press

Brown , Davis, 2008. *The Sword, The Cross, and the Eagle: The American Christian Just War Tradition*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher.

Cady, Duane L, 2010. *From Warism to Pacisfism* (2nd edition) Philadelpia : Temple University Press.

Chossudovsky, Michael, *"Operation Libya" and the Battle for Oil* http:// www. globalresearch.ca/insurrection-an-military-intervention-the-us-nato-attempted-coup-d-etat-in-libya/23548

Gibbs, David N, 2009, *First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Nashville: Vanderlbilt University Press.

Gibbs, David, N, *Power Politics, NATO and , The Libya Intervention*. http : // www. counterpunch . org / 2011 / 09/15/power-politics-nato-and-the-libyan-intervention

Gray, Philip W. "Just War, Schism, and Peace

in Augustine. In Syse, Henrik and Reichberg Gregory M. (eds), 2007. *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*. Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press.

Gray, Christine, *International Law and the the Use of Force*. (Oxford: Oxford Uniyersity Press, 2004)

Finnis, John, "The Ethics of War and Peace in the Catholic Natural Law Tradition," In Nardin, Terry. 1996, *The Ethics of War and Peace: Religious and Secular Perspectives.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Frost, Mervyn, 2001. *Ethics in International Relations: A Constitutive Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gazzini, Claudia, *Was the Libya Intervention Necessary*? Middle East Report 261, Winter 2011

Haleem, Abdel Harfiyah, et al, (eds). 1998. *The Crescent and the Cross: Muslim and Christian Approaches to War and Peace*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.

Heinze, Eric A and Steele, Brent, J (eds). 2009. *Ethics, Authority, and War: Non-State Actors and The Just War Tradition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hobbes, Thomas, 1839. Leviathan. Edited by Sir William Molesworth, Bart Vol. III. London: John Bohn

Janzekovic, John, 2006. *The Use of Force in Humanitarian Intervention: Morality and Practicalities*, Burlington, VT : Ashgate

Kuperman, Alan J, Lessons From Libya: How Not To Intervene. Policy Brief, September 2013. Harvard Kennedy School. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs

Lane, Christopher, *Miscalculations and Blunders Lead to War*. In Ted Galen Carpenter (ed). 2000. *NATO's empty victory : a postmortem on the Balkan War*. Washington: CATO Institute

Loetcher, Frederick W. "St. Augustine's Conception of the State." *Journal of Church History : Studies in Christianity and Culture 4/1* (March 1935) : 16-42

Loriaux, Michael, *The Realist and Saint Augustine: Skepticism, Psychology, and Moral Action in International Thought.* International Studies Quaterly , Vol. 36, No.4 (Dec.,1992), pp.401-402

Luban, David, War as Punishment. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. Vol. 39, No. 12, 2012

Madhani, Aamer, "Obama says Libya's Qaddafi Must Go," *National Journal,* March 3, 2011. Available at http://www. nationaljournal. com/ obama-says-libya-s-qaddafi-must-go-20110303

May, Larry, 2007. *War Crimes and Just War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Musto, Roland G. 1986. *The Catholic Peace Tradition*. New York: Orbis Books.

Mattox, John Mark, 2006. *Saint Augustine and the Theory of Just War*. London: Continuum

Nardin, Terry, (ed), 1996. *Ethics of War and Peace: Religious and Secular Perspectives,*Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

NATO Press Statement 19 March 1999 can be accessed here NATO Press Statement 19 March 1999 , http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/ 1999/p99-040e.htm

New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, Augustine, Contra Faustum, Book XXII, Chapter 76. http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/140622 .htm

New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, *Teaching of St.Augustine of Hippo*, http://newadvent. org/cathen/02091a.htm

Oliver O'Donovan, 2003. Just War Revisited. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

O'Meara, John, 1984. *Concerning The City of God, Against The Pagans. A New Translation by Hendry Bettenson*. London: Penguin Group

Pavlischek, Keith,, *Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism, and Just War Theory A Critique* http ://www.eppc.org/docLib/2008 20080205_palpatterson03.pdf

Reichberg, Gregory M., Syse, Henrik, and Begby, Endre, 2006. (eds) *The Ethics of War:Classic and Contemporary Reading*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Russell, Frederick, H, 1975. *The Just War in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schaff, Philip, (ed), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of Christian Church: St.Augustin's St.Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine* Vol. II., (Michigan : Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1890).

Smith, Steve, Introduction: Diversity and Disiplinarity in International Relations Theory. In Dunne, Tim; Kurki, Milja, and Smith, Steve (eds). 2013. International Relations Theory: Dicipline and Diversities (3rd). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorabji, Richard and Rodin, David, (eds). 2006. *The Ethics of War: Shared Problems in Different Traditions,* Oxford : Ashgate

Syse, Henrik and Reichberg Gregory, 2007. *Ethics,Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives.* Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press

UN Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya, http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement

Walzer, Michael,1977. *Just and UnJust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (4th ed). New York: Basic Books.

Wells, Ronald A., ed. 1981. *The Wars of America: Christian Views. (*Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Erdmans

Welsh, Jennifer M, *Civilian Protection in Libya: Putting Coercion and Controversy Back into RtoP*. Ethics and International Affairs. Vol.25 No.3,2011, pp.256-262

Zehr, Nahed Artoul, James Turner Johnson and the 'Classic' Just War Traditions. *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 190-201, 2009