

power than violence, and the practical lesson which was embedded in the Easter story was that 'He who takes the sword shall perish by the sword'.

- (v) **As long as Christianity was a protest movement within the Roman Empire the pacifist tradition was dominant, and for centuries Christians could not undertake military service.** However, when Christianity became more 'respectable' and eventually, under Constantine, the official religion of the Roman Empire, there had to be some accommodation to political realities. Nonviolence might be a sustainable position for an individual, but difficult for a vast empire surrounded by hostile forces. The Just War tradition emerged out of this tension between the ideal of pacifism and political reality.
- (vi) **Great cultural traditions are never discarded. They remain part of us, the raw material for the future.** The non-violent tradition remained very much alive, and eventually gave rise to the political and legal humanitarian movement which took shape in the Hague Conventions at the beginning of the nineteenth century. One of the original inspirations of the humanitarian international-law tradition was the work of Henri Dunant, a Genevan who had seen the suffering of wounded soldiers on the battlefield who were deprived of medical care.

In accord with this original inspiration, the humanitarian tradition was not at all concerned with just wars. It was concerned rather with the injustice manifested in all wars. A central concern of international regulations has always been subjects like the treatment of prisoners, the treatment of wounded, the treatment of noncombatants, the conduct of neutral states - all those problems, in fact, which were peripheral for the just-war theorists; problems which they touched on very lightly, if at all.

- (vii) **The sharpest contrast in the manner of treating these subjects between the just war and the humanitarian tradition was in the question of neutrality.** Instead of being a regrettable situation in which some nations find themselves uninformed, neutrality in international law acquires a privileged and assured status. Neutrals have international privileges of inviolability, and must observe a strict code of conduct in return for these privileges. In the just war tradition on the other hand, the rules drawn up depend entirely on the judge-criminal relationship. Strictly speaking, there are no general 'rules of warfare'; there are only rules for the conduct of war by the just side. So far as the just side is concerned, it must not do unnecessary harm, but at the same time it must not neglect its function as judge and punisher. Neutrality in a just war is wrong. It is like being neutral when you are a witness to a serious crime.