

# Case Study: Just War Doctrine

Nikolaos Tzenios<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Public Health and Medical Research, Charisma University, Grace Bay, Turks and Caicos Islands

<sup>2</sup>MCPHS University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

<sup>3</sup>Northcentral University, Scottsdale, AZ, USA

Email: Nicolas@Trccolleges.com

**How to cite this paper:** Tzenios, N. (2023). Case Study: Just War Doctrine. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 13, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2023.131001>

**Received:** November 12, 2022

**Accepted:** January 10, 2023

**Published:** January 13, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

---

## Abstract

The paper explores the question of just war. For nations to wage war, there is a political, social, and moral necessity to justify such war. Consequently, the doctrine of just war then arose to ensure that nations could justify their declarations of war and armed conflict against other nations. However, as is expected, while the doctrine of just war has existed for centuries, it has also elicited debate for as long as it has existed. Rarely have people agreed on what war was just and what exactly being “just” means. There are questions as to whether the term is not just another political gimmick meant to allow nations to justify the death of millions of people. For example, a war, such as the second world war, that leads to the death of millions of people can be a just war regardless of its justifications on political grounds. Through the analysis of views of various authorities, including classical ones such as St. Thomas and St. Augustus, the paper will illustrate that the concept of any war being just is becoming an outdated precept as war is not consistent with the human need for love, peace, and justice.

## Keywords

Just War, Conquest, Just Authority, World War

---

## 1. Introduction

The just war conception supplies a moral grammar, notably a predominant issue in contemporary society, for thinking about the rights and wrongs of war. Nations base their justifications for waging war on the just war theory (Pattison, 2018). The theory of a *just war* has been reworked over the years by thinkers including Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Hugo Grotius (Vorster, 2015). The concepts of just authority, just cause, right intention, and last resort formed the foundation of the just war doctrine that Augustine laid out. Over the

years, various rules have been established to distinguish what makes a conflict justifiable. Augustine distinguished between the essential and moral elements of war; *Jus Ad Bellum* (the right to war) and *Jus In Bello* (the correct conduct in war). The *ad bellum* criteria of Augustine's beliefs are no longer considered an essential condition for warfare. It is suggested that ideas belonging to character evaluation may not necessarily apply to action evaluation. Instead, the current debate is characterized by an attempt to develop explicit standards that can easily be used in conflict situations (Joo, 2019). The world has always fallen into disorder. More than ever, a clear, unapologetic, and uncompromising opinion on war is a sine qua non to the question of whether war is consistent and based on humankind's reasoning of love, peace, and justice.

## 2. Conditions of a Just War

Saint Thomas (1265-74) argues that one of the core just war theory assumptions is "Just Authority," which lays the foundation for the other three. Debates have emerged on whether deciding to go to war is built on a proper political and legal process (Reichberg, 2010). War can be warranted under various conditions, whether something important warrants going to war for, whether one followed the necessary protocol to declare war, or if war is entered for a petty reason, such as simply disliking the other country. A lawful authority must also decide when it comes to proclaiming war under just war principles. Proceeding with the first principle of a just war is a reasonable cause, which is self-explanatory. When declaring war, it must be for the right reason, which is in tandem with the first principle of just authority, which argues whether the fight is worthwhile or whether the actions are simply based on personal feelings towards the opponent (Kunkel, 2014). When debating if a cause is worth defending or standing up for, it is essential to consider if a wrong has been committed to which declaring war would be the proper response. The consideration for good intentions must be followed when pursuing a just cause. Questions abound regarding such a response; is war the appropriate response considering the situation that occurred? What are the intentions behind this war, and what is the fight intended to achieve? These questions are considered when assessing if the reason behind a war has the proper purpose and if, when rewarded a victory, a good outcome will be achieved. Rodriguez contends that there are three reasons acceptable when debating a just cause: self-defense, recovery of stolen possessions, and punishment for wrongdoing (Rodriguez, 2011). In this respect, a just war must fulfill three principles.

To begin with, when debating about war, the likelihood of success must be realistic and practical. For instance, if an army consisted of 20 men and women, while the antagonist's army consisted of 50, the chances of succeeding are minimal, which would fail to make the war justifiable. Secondly, Forge believes that the proportionate cause needs to be considered before any war is declared, considering the argument that the methods used must be proportional to the end

that the war seeks to achieve (Forge, 2018). The force applied must be comparable or equivalent to the energy required to correct the problem. Lastly, to consider a war just, war must be the last resort for remedying the wrong (Rengger, 2013). Aloyo supports these sentiments arguing that war is terrible and that it inevitably results in death and thus should be avoided at all costs (Aloyo, 2015). Through this lens, Whitman supports the idea that confrontation and nonviolent meetings should take place before declaring war to correct the issue without using force (Whitman, 2012).

### **3. Just War Doctrine: Wishful Thinking, Reality, or Both?**

The debates on whether to go to war need to satisfy specific attributes that must be just and have the right ideas, information, and understanding to have a fruitful outcome. To put this into perspective, the U.S. went to war in a foreign country because an alien force attacked it. The violence of the September 11 attacks had to be answered in this fashion. It is legitimate to attack others to defend oneself. One is justified in getting violent if their life is in danger, considering that self-defense is an essential component of survival and is entirely reasonable. Countries fight wars to ensure their people's protection and security are guaranteed in their effort to bring freedom, security, and safety to the masses. Life and conflict are games; both require strategy and skill; play it smart and gain more. Even though people are born with societal positions (some are positioned high in the societal hierarchy while others are positioned low in the societal hierarchy), life is unjust, considering everyone is born unequally. In that regard, how can conflicts become to be justified? Citizens are not permitted to choose their lives, like when they were born, what type of family they will be raised in, what color their skin will be, who their parents will be, what language they will speak, or how much money they will earn. In general, while organizations are a mirror of the personality of their members, similarly, governments and nations reflect their members. From the beginning of existence, people are born into a world where their natural, social, and anthropological impulses are unjust. Most people begin their lives in a state of conflict and misalignment with their duties in life, which worsens over time. The same way people do not choose their lives suggests that conflicts should not be justified through war perpetrated by governments

### **4. The One Leading War Is Always Right**

The "just war" tradition is a compilation of political theories that rely on religious and philosophical writing, theories, and international law practice. War and brutality can be considered more justified when a legitimate ruler carries them out (Lazar, 2016). The story behind it is heartbreaking, but this is political candy for politicians and their constituents. In a conflict, people can fight in a pushy or evasive manner to gain specific advantages or resources in their favor. Every individual is given a reason to do anything. Insecure people tend

to engage in battles both for psychological and political reasons. Nevertheless, human nature constitutes aggression, ego, and the need to acquire more, whereby competition inspires the ego (Tzenios, 2022); the ego gets a kick out of the perks. Wars are a transaction in which the costs of war must not considerably outweigh the benefits.

Even though discussions about the justification of warfare are ancient, there are a variety of rationales. Numerous arguments must be considered regarding the opposing person, party, individual, nation, or people since one might easily conclude that they are right in the conflict. The crux of the matter is the goal. Nonetheless, war is terrible and inhumane, especially when trying to rationalize war in a way that merely makes it dirtier. People want to be comfortable and confident about their morality even though it is impossible to reconcile their actions in the realm of war with their ethics. The decision to go to war is entirely personal, yet making this decision gives people a sense of ethicality. The Nazis had their notions, and their just war doctrine was able to justify their conflicts. Therefore, it is subjective; both sides of every fight believe in their righteousness, and their equivalents are the victims and the attackers (O'Callaghan, 2019). "Just war" is a long-held political doctrine that combines ideas about international law, religious and philosophical writings, and, more recently, political philosophy. Conflicts take an aggressive or defensive nature when seeking material or monetary gain.

## **5. The Constant War Just War Doctrine: An Excuse for Conquest**

Internal conflict is mirrored in their disputes with each other. Wilkinson argues that it is impossible to make humanity wholly fair and just because humans were born as biological events, and existence has never been genuinely fair or just (Wilkinson, 2015). In this regard, many people have a low level of inner peace and struggle with themselves to the point of being dysfunctional; that is why conflicts are being fought on a massive scale around the world, an aspect evidenced during Hitler's last days in World War II. The idea of a just war is merely an exercise in applying soft messaging before presenting the plan so that the true intentions can be hidden under a pretty facade. It must be remembered that Hitler, Idi Amin, and other dictators were humans. It is important to remember that even humans may be deceptive in appearance and way of thinking. One tenet of the just war advocates' strategy is to teach people that war is OK, which is a big, nonsensical contradiction. And to that end, some people are working for a better life, while others try to justify violence by claiming it is necessary, yet violence is always unethical. Individuals that take up arms believe that they support justice, just like Hitler did during his reign, and although Hitler was a symbol of evil to the rest of the civilized world, he thought he was right. What a person feels about themselves makes a difference regardless of how hideous the battle becomes; each side will rationalize its actions. Cian recounts that people in

classical Greco-Roman and Christian philosophy created the just war theory, but others in Chinese and Hindu civilizations helped develop it. Every great empire was constantly stealing from culture and geography during its expansion. People and territory were both necessary to expand as empires in nature. To feel better and grow, one needed to wage a just war where masters, kings, Caesars, and other authorities in the Greek and Roman empires and civilizations found ways to boost their power or convince themselves they were in the right, often through territorial expansion.

## **6. Case Study on Just War Doctrine: World War**

The debate about the just war doctrine continues to elicit mixed reactions among its proponents and opponents. While different countries adopt the just war doctrine, the world overdraws its concepts from the just war theory, where every war provides a unique insight into the war. World War II is among the most publicized large-scale conflicts, hence its suitability in shedding light on the just war doctrine concepts. World War II was a war between powers, namely Italy, Germany, Japan, and allied forces, namely Britain, the United States, France, and the Soviet Union (O'Malley, 2019). Over the years, several rules have been developed to support the reasons for the conflict, most of which were witnessed in World War II. For example, World War II was triggered by a German attack on Poland but motivated by other issues, such as the extermination of Jews. The problems alluded to include the global economic depression, appeasement failures, the treaty of Versailles, militarism in Germany and Japan, and failures of the League of Nations. Participants, including the United States and Germany, are legitimate leaders in World War II, which means the battle observed just war doctrines. Against this backdrop, the current paper is a case study on the Just War Doctrines through the lens of World War II and evaluates the conditions and demerits of the war. Moreover, an evaluation of whether World War II was just war was wishful thinking, reality, or both have been detailed. Finally, an analysis of whether the World War II protagonists were right and World War II trade-offs will be discussed.

### **6.1. Conditions of World War II**

Several philosophies underpin the just war doctrine, but the just authority is outstanding because it lays the foundation for three tenets: just cause, right intentions, and last resort. Thinkers, including Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Hugo Grotius, provide a perspective on just war that can be vastly observed and linked to events of World War II. Against this premise, this section analyzes conditions for a just war by exemplifying events from the world's second war. In this respect, just cause, just authority, last resort, and correct intentions are discussed alongside reasonable opportunities for success and end being equal to the strategy applied. With the world's fate at stake, World War II puts the just war doctrines into perspective, as illustrated herein.

## 6.2. World War II and Just/Proper Authority

Like many wars, the second world war hinged on various conditions. As discussed, the immediate cause of the war was Germany's attack on Poland, but factors including the global economic depression fueled the conflict (Beck, 2018). On the other hand, war can be warranted by strategic significance, protocol, or reason. However, the proclamation of war just depends on an authoritative declaration or decision, and World War II is not an exception. Essentially, the war proponents hold the view that it was just, which means that it met the just war's irreducible minimums, including the strategic role of authoritative parties in its declaration. Seven countries are heavily linked to the events of the Second World War. Therefore, the question that arises is whether the countries were the proper authorities to declare it. To answer this question, it is vital to determine the individual interests of the axial and allied nations in the world war.

World War II resulted from unsettled disputes arising from World War I, which involved powerful countries mainly in control of the global economy. Given the axis and allied countries' considerable influence on international proceedings, they were legitimate authorities in World War II (Naffey, 2021). Therefore, the Second World War complied with one just war doctrine, just authority. Essentially, the axis powers comprised a coalition of countries led by Germany, Italy, and Japan. That said, axial powers opposed the allied powers in World War I. Tentatively, Axial powers gave leadership and direction to axial forces, claiming authority in World War II. The alliance among axial powers resulted in an agreement between Germany and Rome, hoping that the Rome-Berlin axis would dictate world order. Axial powers take the authoritative mantle in the second world war out of a desire to conquer the world. In response, the rest of the world rallied behind France, the United States, the Soviet Union, and China to oppose the central powers. The United States is globally viewed as the world superpower, mainly because of its military and economic capabilities (Coccia, 2019). Although the position of a global superpower gives the United States indisputable leadership role in international matters, many reasons made the U.S. enter the war. For example, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was a major conflict between two legitimate global economic leaders.

Further, Japan had a growing control over China and Asia, which perhaps explains Chinese allegiance to allied forces. Allied and axial forces were characterized by countries with the most robust economic and military capabilities, such as the United States, France, the Soviet Union, and Japan. Therefore, these countries had considerable authority over member states in both coalitions, hence meeting the first just war doctrine, namely just authority.

## 6.3. World War II and Just Cause

People and countries go to war for supremacy, pride, and selfish interests. However, the just war doctrine has a specific prescription for making a war fair and

just. Specifically, the just war doctrine argues that a war must be waged for the right reasons to be just. The assertion mentioned above raises the question about reasons considered suitable for war. The explanations provide a critical background from which it can be determined whether World War II had a justifiable reason. Therefore, some right reasons for war include revolution, defense, and economic gains.

On the other hand, war is wrong if it seeks revenge, displacement, and territorial gain. The tandems provided in the previous paragraph either make a war just or unjust. That said, World War II is widely regarded as a just war because it sorts out to attain noble goals. While individual countries and leaders such as the United States and France could have had specific national interests in the war, the world stood to gain from the outcomes of the war. For example, China and Asia became free from growing Japanese influence within their territories (Zhang, 2018). Moreover, the world was free from the Rome-Berlin axial power, which means that countries had a say in global political and economic debates even though the United States and other powerful countries had more significant influence.

#### **6.4. World War II and Last Resort**

After just authority and just cause have been met, war should only ensue as a last course of action. Essentially, all other avenues for solving conflict should be explored before countries or territories decide to go to war. For example, governments should attempt diplomatic efforts such as negotiations and mediation, and war should only occur if diplomatic efforts fail. Many efforts, including treaties and agreements, existed after the world's first war. However, countries could not abide by the terms of such contracts, mainly contributing to the Second World War. Military supremacy laws attempt to restrict the event of solving conflicts in combat. Essentially, other actions, including sanctions and embargoes, are preferred to wars due to the adverse impacts brought by war (Shyrokykh, 2021). In wars, lives are lost, diplomatic ties are broken, and many people lose their lives. For example, approximately seventy-five thousand people lost their lives during the Winter War. Nonetheless, before a war, all other mechanisms of resolving conflicts should be examined and implemented. Through this lens, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was one reason for the United States' involvement in the War. The only rational approach to championing sovereignty in case of an external attack is revenge, which means an attack attracts a counter-attack. In response to the global need for order and peace, the United States and allied forces adopted peaceful but effective ways to avoid war escalation. For example, the United States adopted conventional means such as sanctions and embargoes to force Japan into submission. Sanctions are set to punish countries that disobey specific agreeable laws, often in the form of threats (Shyrokykh, 2021). The United States practiced the mentioned means on Japan to force it to withdraw its influence over China and Asia.

World War II qualifies as a just war considering that the United States intended to intimidate Japan by showing off military might. For instance, the United States Pacific fleet's position in Asian waters was a constant reminder of who was in charge. Still, Japan intended to send a message that would render alternative ways of averting the war. The attack on Pearl Harbor was aimed at preventing the U.S. fleet from participating in the planned attack in Southeast Asia. It must be noted that the United States tried alternative actions ranging from intimidation to sanctions. Therefore, Winter War was a just war since the United States entered the war as a last resort in response to an attack on the homeland. Additionally, many efforts were geared towards preventing the Winter War, especially by the authoritative members of allied and axial forces. The United States tried to avoid involvement in the war by preventing the arms race (Smith, 2020). For example, the U.S. signed treaties that helped achieve neutrality in European and Asia affairs. After the Great War, many Americans realized that their participation was a mistake because the war seemingly arose from ancient rivalries in which the U.S. had no role. As a result of lessons learned, isolationism was an alternative or mitigation measure for future conflict. To avoid war, the U.S. would evade involvement in European and Asian issues. Against this premise, the U.S. participated in the winter war as a last resort in a retaliatory move to the Japanese attack on U.S. soil. Other approaches were pursued before the winter war, including the League of Nations, which made efforts to prevent the spread of Germany's brutality. Precisely, the League of Nations needed to promote disarmament, war prevention through collective security, settling disputes diplomatically, and improving world affairs. The League of Nations is thus an initial attempt to prevent a war that failed because the league inadequately made endeavors to stop the growth of German brutality (Smith, 2020). As a result of German ruthlessness, allied forces had enough, hence deciding to oppose axial forces through military action. Therefore, World War II qualifies as a just war because allied forces tried other means of conflict prevention before resorting to war.

### **6.5. World War II and Right Intentions**

Another condition to be met by war to qualify as just is possessing the right intentions. The intentions for war are diverse, and each uniquely reveals if the war is fair and if its outcome justifies the war (Edele, 2017). For a war to abide by the just war doctrines, participants must portray the right intentions for involvement in conflicts through decisions made by just authorities. The League of Nations was established during the Great War to reduce Germany's brutality, especially in its colonies. The brutal rule was accompanied by selfish interests where a colonial power imposed wills on its territories. By having the League of Nations in place, global leaders intended to prevent the Winter War but failed because efforts were not substantive (Müller, 2020). Germany continued to showcase brutal rule prompting a military response from allied forces. Specifically,



through military action against Germany, allied forces hoped to restore peace and stability in German colonies such as Poland. Moreover, the war aimed at promoting peace in war-torn zones because of German rule. On the other hand, national autonomy advocates sovereignty, and nations should be free to conduct national affairs without external interference. The only checks and balances to sovereign authority and governance circumvent global orders and peace. Specifically, countries subscribe to the mutual protection of global peace through international treaties and conventions. Actions done within national boundaries must not affect global stability. The Rome-Berlin axis was purposed to disrupt the global concept of sovereign governance as its intended global affairs to rotate around the axis. Therefore, allied forces opposed axial forces to foster national sovereignty and maintain international order, stability, and peace.

### **6.6. World War II and Reasonable Chance of Success**

There must be reasonable chances of success rather than failure to justify war. Essentially, the likelihood that the war will result in desired or planned objectives must be higher than the chance it will fail in its mission. As highlighted, the Winter War pitted the allied forces against axial coalitions. On the one hand, the axial forces were led by Germany, Italy, and Japan, presenting the threat of artillery and human resource because of Japan's population. On the other hand, allied forces comprised Great Britain, China, the United States, the Soviet Union, and France (Wanda & Das, 2017). The number of participants in conflicts in wars affects both parties' opportunities for success. During the world wars, military prowess was not as sophisticated as it is today. Therefore, the battles were likely to be decided based on the sides with many soldiers or participants (Wanda & Das, 2017). Against this premise, the axial forces in the Winter War were led principally by three countries, namely Germany, Italy, and Japan. Germany was recognized as the dominant country in most of continental Europe. Italy's strategic importance to the axial coalition was its domination over the Mediterranean Sea, while Japan was recognized for its dominance over East Asia and the Pacific. The allied forces were united under five principal leaders: Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, the United States, and China. Therefore, the allied forces were likelier to win because of the superior number of participants. Additionally, the United States had undisputed domination over aerial combat, while China had a population more significant than the Japanese population.

### **6.7. World War II and Proportionality to Means**

An additional principle for just conduct in a war is that offensive actions taken by warring parties remain strictly proportional to the desired outcome. Simply put, these aspects replicate the proportionality theory regarding the just cause in wars. Against this premise, the proportionality tandem requires that the extent of violence and war activities are altered to reduce casualties and destruction. The proportionality principle borrows from utilitarianism because it seeks

maximum benefits and minimum harm to involved parties. The U.S. bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki highlights the proportionality principle. While it may be argued that the bombing targeted defenseless Japanese, the means justified the end of a war that claimed the lives of over seventy-five thousand men. Additionally, the Winter War resulted in thousands of casualties and property destruction. With the war escalating and new forces joining, there was no telling how many more years it would last after six years of unprecedented loss of lives.

## **7. Disadvantages: The Constant War Just War Doctrine as Manifested in WW II**

Opponents of the just war doctrine assert that its principles disguise the true intentions of warring factions under the pretense and fallacy of justness (Murphy, 2017). Simply put, the just war doctrine argues that war is good, which contradicts the call for global peace. Fabricating the ills of war are the justifications provided by coalitions for the actions when the actual reason is long-term conquest. The stated assertions have been witnessed in the reigns of terror of well-renowned leaders such as Idi Amin of Uganda and Adolf Hitler of Germany. Therefore, participants and interested parties in the just war doctrine are reminded that war is occasioned by human beings, most of whom are not trustworthy.

The disadvantages of the just war doctrine are revealed through the Winter War in many ways. On the one hand, the doctrine argues that war is good for the right reasons. Therefore, the doctrine seemingly licenses murder, destruction of property, and instability, as witnessed in the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to end World War II. Regardless of the Japanese in Hiroshima and Nagasaki being defenseless and inactive in the war, they were bombed to end the war. Records suggest that between one hundred and forty thousand people and three hundred and fifty thousand died in the Hiroshima bombing alone. Should a mass killing of the mentioned degree be justified for any cause? Christian ideals detest any killing as life is considered God-given and sacred (Molle, 2019). Natural law and justice read from a similar script, and common sense caps it all. Any event that increases human suffering should not be accepted, and war is one of them. The just war doctrine is also unrealistic because it does not consider that the most vital sides, people, or coalitions will always emerge victoriously. Finally, the just war doctrine promotes violence not encouraged by moral principles that regulate societal order.

### **7.1. Just War Doctrine: World War II Wishful Thinking, Reality, or Both?**

The conception of the ideas of the Winter War was motivated by wishful thinking, which does not necessarily imply that the war was hinged on wishful events. For example, Italy and Germany needed to conquer the world, forming their alliance to meet this objective. In response, the allied that the United States spear-headed was opposed by Germany because of the malicious intentions held. Just

war doctrine advocates that war is just if it is fought for the right reasons and preventing German brutality appeared to be the right reason (Murphy, 2017). Against the stated premise, the just war doctrine is not wishful thinking because brutality interferes with human rights and states' sovereign rule. However, there are no winners and losers in a war but casualties, property destruction, and life loss. Therefore, it is wishful thinking to allude to the fact that some wars are more justifiable than others because the consequences are the same. Human lives are sacred, so it does not matter how many are lost in proclaiming it is wrong.

## 7.2. The One Leading War Is Always Right: World War II

Just war theories are hinged on authoritative leadership and subjects' unconditional trust -in the leaders. Essentially, groups of people or warring factions entrust their fate and wives and children to a few perceived legitimate leaders. Such recognized leaders make decisions that potentially result in battles on behalf of their subjects (Chakravarty, 2021). World War II exemplifies the notion that people leading wars are always right, yet behind this notion lies selfish motives and wide-scale hypocrisy. Over thirty countries participated in the Winter War, but the influential members made the decisions that led to the axial and allied coalition's war. Axial forces comprised three countries, and allied forces included five main countries that made decisions. Rome and Germany shared a mutual interest in global conquest that offered nothing to other axial members. On the other hand, the United States joined World War II to attack its people. Even so, the other member states of axial and allied forces fell in line with the decisions made from selfish interests such as vengeance.

## 7.3. Trade-Offs

Funding wars wedged on a large scale, such as World Wars, is expensive and necessitates financial trade-offs. The frontline members of allied and axial forces had a primary interest in the war. Therefore, countries such as Japan, Germany, the United States, and China did their best to ensure that their respective coalitions emerged victoriously. Conventionally, countries' budgetary planning is guided by policies that advocate for citizen welfare through sufficient financing of important sectors of the economy (Zhang, 2018). However, to increase the chances of winning World War II, the United States sanctioned an increment in its military budget at the expense of other sectors of its economy. The U.S. traded off domestic spending for military spending because of perceived superior benefits that would accrue when the war was won.

Moreover, the allied bombing of Germany traded off international regulation of combat and perhaps contravened the proportionality principles of just war doctrine. Furthermore, the decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki using atomic bombs was unprecedented, given the prohibition of such explosives. However, the potential of the bombing to end the war was better than not using

the bombs. Evidently, over the years, it has been evident that the U.S. intentions have been transformed, nonetheless. It could be argued that the second world war created a platform that enabled the U.S. to understand just how powerful they were. The bombings in Japan gave way to more atrocities witnessed in different countries, ranging from Afghanistan to Cuba. Their interests have surpassed the general concession of enhancing peace and the world order. They waged war in Afghanistan and bought about war in the region, but it failed to attain its goal 20 years after its invasion. Their invention apparently created significant adverse effects, even after the Taliban leader was arrested. Through this lens, it is questionable whether such invasions aimed at attaining their interests, and it could be argued that its participation in Japan did more harm than good. It is imperative to understand such trade-offs given that it gives more insights into the just war doctrine as an aspect that determines interactions between nations.

#### **7.4. Summary of Just War Theories the Western War Theory**

The Western war theory largely borrows from the deliberations of Augustine on Christianity and warfare by taking into account a series of invasions that the Roman Empire experienced for centuries that changed their perceptions about the notions of statehood, justice, and coherent war. The theory affirms that as long as the fourth standards of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* have already been met, war is regarded as justified regardless of its cause or the nature of its expected outcomes (Lacourse & Stone, 2020). From such theory, it can be deduced that war is regarded as just if the rules governing why and how it is being fought are just (Buzar, 2020). On that note, Western nations focused on implementing such a theory currently regard an aggressive approach to battles and unusually rigid forms of discipline as necessary in overseeing the success of just war.

#### **7.5. The Chinese War Theory**

The development of the Chinese war theory was largely due to the loss of influence experienced in China by the House of Zhou (772 BCE) tasked with ruling the nation. Due to the destruction and instability caused by an incessant war which finally led to the decline of the regime, various political and philosophical systems were sought by Chinese citizens to restore peace and harmony within the nation (Buzar, 2020). In this regard, the Chinese war theory asserts that there is a need to focus on promoting nationalism to provide social distracts from internal struggles as a strategy for maintaining peace and harmony that can easily be interfered with by just war (Pattison, 2018). To achieve such a goal, the theory emphasizes the need for exploring alternatives to battle and only perpetrating just war if it is considered effective in limiting the morale of an opposing force (Pattison, 2018). Therefore, it emphasizes the use of strategies such as spies, delay, and dialogues for keeping just way at bay until it becomes inevitable.

## 7.6. The General Reasons for Waging War

Certainly, a significant number of wars that have been fought in the past have been due to various political, economic, and religious reasons. Nevertheless, proponents argue that many of the wars that are fought today are due to ideological reasons (Shaw & Wong, 2020). One of such reasons for waging war is seeking to punish an opposing force mainly because such punishment has been deemed by the perpetrators of war as justified in creating a notion of oppression and agony by the opposing force in regard to a specific social, political, and economic behavior (Bellamy, 2019). In many cases, those who wage war to punish an opposing force do so because of the displeasure in the social, political, and economic behaviors of the opposing force with the aim of discouraging such behaviors in the future regardless of whether they have a positive or negative effect on the perpetrators (Bellamy, 2019). Apart from seeking to punish an opposing force, war can also be waged as a revenge mechanism based on specific behaviors that may have been war-related or socially, politically, and economically oppressive (Hartnett & O' Driscoll, 2021). Vengeance has long been considered the major reason behind war for centuries due to its effectiveness in revealing a high level of displeasure towards specific acts that are mainly war-related by a perpetrator (Hartnett & O' Driscoll, 2021). On that account, through revenge by waging war, a perpetrator intends to express military dominance over an opposing force whose previous acts may have been aggressively intended to oppress it.

## 7.7. The Characteristics and Disadvantages of the Just War Doctrine

Even though just war may still have negative implications characterized by destruction, oppression, and agony, perpetrators of such war must be mindful of the factors that make it to be considered just. For that reason, one of the main characteristics of the just war doctrine is that there must be a just cause for perpetrating war, given the implications of war are always negative regardless of whether it is just or not (O'Driscoll, 2020). Another characteristic is that the intention of waging war must be good even if it may be associated with negative effects because the just war doctrine puts emphasis on the protection of innocent human life and defending social and moral values that have led to the promotion of peace and harmony for years (O'Driscoll, 2020). Lastly, another characteristic of the just war doctrine is that war should be considered as a last resort for solving a problem for it to be deemed as "just" (Pattison, 2018). For that reason, such doctrine emphasizes the need for measures such as dialogue and reconciliation to prevent the necessity for war, regardless of whether it is just or not.

Clearly, the just war doctrine has various disadvantages, proving that it is invalid in fostering the promotion of a cohesive and peaceful society focused on implementing various measures before opting for war as a last resort. One such disadvantage is that the normal rules of society and morality immediately vanish

in the event of war, regardless of whether it is just or not (Pattison, 2018). Such a disadvantage is due to the fact that war is inherently immoral largely due to its negative implications, which invalidate the efficiency of the doctrine in applying to conditions resulting in conflicts in modern society (Buzar, 2020). The other disadvantage is that the just war doctrine can promote acts of war, such as terrorism, by reserving a place for ethics in such acts (Pattison, 2018). In essence, the doctrine appears to legalize the reasons why war should be considered necessary and justifies the need for war instead of shunning it (Pattison, 2018). On that note, acts of war have been inevitable worldwide despite global recognition of the need to implement the just war doctrine.

## 8. Conclusion

Despite human reasoning on love, peace, and justice, war is never the best course. It is only an option when nothing else will work. When dealing with violent situations, armed force is only appropriate in three different scenarios: one, the problem is a preemptive measure; two, the use of force is a response to an unprovoked attack; and three, the use of force is necessary to aid another country which is the victim of another state violating international law. Furthermore, the just war theory does a better job of protecting innocent people, getting rid of an even more significant problem, and keeping democracy and freedom safe. No matter how much an individual or a group fights for their freedom, those who want to enslave others will always get in the way. Every citizen should know what defines a just war and be prepared to push for it to be supported morally and reasonably by decision-makers in the future. Another equally important facet of the justification of war is ensuring that the rights of the helpless and the innocent are preserved.

This report suggests that the just war doctrine must be adapted to the current global political situation. Preemptive warfare, humanitarian intervention, targeted assassinations, drones, and cyber warfare also need to be revisited to reflect the “just war doctrine.” Cyberwarfare is a new dimension of warfare and is continual because it is difficult to prove. It is a battle that may be fought continuously. Many aspects of this theory must be thoroughly defined and classified correctly to separate all the elements properly, an essential guiding platform for future research. The Just War Doctrine exists to encourage nations to accept the unjust wars they have led in stark opposition to beliefs, such as those taught by religions constitute doctrine. The Just War Doctrine is more of a psychological theory. Who likes admitting they messed up, that they were at fault, or had something to be ashamed of? Few people would; therefore, it is safe to assume that the government is only unintentionally harming itself by supporting self-destruction.

In summary, the case study of World War II reveals a considerable adherence to just war doctrines. Regarding just authority, the Winter War’s participants were grouped into allied forces and axis forces. The most influential countries

led these forces in terms of military and economic capabilities. The authoritative members or countries thus decided to go to war within allied or axial coalitions. Additionally, the war was for a just cause since the world was responding to the perceived planned sabotage of the global order by the so-called Rome-Berlin axis. Moreover, World War II abides by the just war doctrine because before the war decision was made, countries tried alternative conflict aversion methods such as negotiations through the League of Nations. Moreover, the Winter War was just because its right intention included promoting global stability, order, and sovereign governance within the countries' boundaries.

World War II was just because allied forces had a reasonable chance of winning, given that it had five main participants compared to three participants in axial forces. The proportionality principle was observed during World War II, as evident in the U.S. bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which effectively brought the war to an end. Although World War II meets the just war doctrines, the demerits it bears cannot be overlooked because it glorifies violence and war. Trade-offs made to facilitate the just war doctrines evident in World War II include revamped military spending, the allied bombing of Germany, and the use of atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Overall, World War II meets most thresholds for just war doctrines. While some wars that follow the western and Chinese theories of just war can be for a good cause, wishful thinking asserts that human lives and property are collateral damage. Finally, efforts must be made to resolve conflict without glorifying war and violence because the reasons wars are waged are mainly ideological, leading to just war having a wide range of disadvantages, such as vanishing the normal social rules and morality and promoting acts of war.

### Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

### References

- Aloyo, E. (2015). Just War Theory and the Last of Last Resort. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 29, 187-201. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679415000064>
- Beck, E. D. (2018). The Winter War: Its Causes and Effects. *Channels: Where Disciplines Meet*, 2, Article No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.15385/jch.2018.2.2.4>
- Bellamy, A. J. (2019). *Comparative Just War Theory: An Introduction to International Perspectives*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Buzar, S. (2020). The Principle of Double Effect and Just War Theory. *Philosophia*, 48, 1299-1312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-020-00209-2>
- Chakravarty, R. (2021). *Unit-3 World War I: Causes and Consequences*. Indira Gandhi National Open University.
- Coccia, M. (2019). The Role of Superpowers in Conflict Development and Resolutions. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (pp. 1-6). Springer Nature.

- [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5\\_3709-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3709-1)
- Edele, M. (2017). Fighting Russia's History Wars: Vladimir Putin and the Codification of World War II. *History and Memory*, 29, 90-124. <https://doi.org/10.2979/histmemo.29.2.05>
- Forge, J. (2018). Proportionality, Just War Theory and Weapons Innovation. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 15, 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-008-9088-z>
- Hartnett, L., & O'Driscoll, C. (2021). Sad and Laughable and Strange: At War with Just War. *Global Society*, 35, 27-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2020.1828294>
- Joo, M. Y. (2019). *The Principle of Proportionality in the Law and Ethics of War: Steps toward a Unified View of Proportionality in Jus Ad Bellum and Jus in Bello by Moving from Subjective Political to Objective Legal Criteria*. American University.
- Kunkel, J. (2014). *Just War Doctrine*. Value Inquiry Book Series.
- Lacourse, K., & Stone, P. (2020). Rethinking the Foundations of Just War Theory. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 23, 475-481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-019-10040-8>
- Lazar, S. (2016). *War*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Stanford University.
- Molle, A. (2019). Religion and Right-Wing Populism in Italy: Using "Judeo-Christian Roots" to Kill the European Union. *Religion, State & Society*, 47, 151-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2018.1532266>
- Müller, T. (2020). Institutional Reforms and the Politics of Inequality Reproduction: The Case of the League of Nations' Council Crisis in 1926. *Global Society*, 34, 304-317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2020.1739629>
- Murphy, J. G. (2017). Just War Thought and the Notion of Peace. In *The Nature of Peace and the Morality of Armed Conflict* (pp. 105-122). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57123-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57123-2_6)
- Naffey, K. (2021). *Unit-6 World War II: Causes and Consequences*. Indira Gandhi National Open University.
- O'Callaghan, P. (2019). Is the Christian Believer Conservative or Liberal? *Church, Communication and Culture*, 4, 137-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23753234.2019.1616580>
- O'Driscoll, C. (2020). No Substitute for Victory? Why Just War Theorists Can't Win. *European Journal of International Relations*, 26, 187-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066119864706>
- O'Malley, J. W. (2019). PART TWO. Participants. In *When Bishops Meet* (pp. 83-170). Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674988361-003>
- Pattison, J. (2018). The Case for the Nonideal Morality of War: Beyond Revisionism Versus Traditionalism in Just War Theory. *Political Theory*, 46, 242-268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591716669394>
- Reichberg, G. (2010). Thomas Aquinas on Military Prudence. *Journal of Military Ethics*, 9, 262-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2010.510866>
- Rengger, N. (2013). *Just War and International Order: The Uncivil Condition in World Politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382670>
- Rodriguez, R. (2011). *The Principles of the Just War Doctrine and the Invasion of the Iraq*. Online Book.
- Shaw, R. P., & Wong, Y. (2020). *Genetic Seeds of Warfare: Evolution, Nationalism, and Patriotism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003105459>
- Shyrokykh, K. (2021). Human Rights Sanctions and the Role of Black Knights: Evidence from the E.U.'s Post-Soviet Neighbours. *Journal of European Integration*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.1908278>



- Smith, R. P. (2020). The Influence of the Richardson Arms Race Model. In N. P. Gle-ditsch (Ed.), *Lewis Fry Richardson: His Intellectual Legacy and Influence in the Social Sciences* (pp. 25-34). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31589-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31589-4_3)
- Tzenios, N. (2022). The Duke Lacrosse Scandal and Ethics in Prosecution. *International Journal of Political Science and Governance*, 4, 118-121. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2022.v4.i2b.181>
- Vorster, N. (2015). Just War and Virtue: Revisiting Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 34, 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2015.1010135>
- Wanda, G., & Das, M. (2017). Remembering World War I: Memory Influences and Im-pact on Intentions to Visit War Heritage Sites. *Journal of Tourism & Hospitality*, 6, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2167-0269.1000273>
- Whitman, J. (2012). *The Verdict of Battle: The Law of Victory and the Making of Modern War*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674068117>
- Wilkinson, P. (2015). *Terrorism & the Liberal State*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Zhang, L. (2018). Research on Reasons for the Rapid Economic Growth of Japan after World War II. In *2018 International Conference on Economy, Management and En-trepreneurship (ICOEME 2018)* (pp. 255-259). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoeme-18.2018.89>