

On one side of this polarity is the just war tradition, which enshrines the belief that war is a necessary instrument of justice in the global community of nations. The central concept of the Just War tradition, most clearly expressed by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century, was that war is regarded as an instrument of justice in the international community. The concept depends on a comparison between the internal life of a nation, in which individuals are ruled by the State, with the life of the international 'community', in which states themselves are like individuals (though there is as yet no world State).

The logic is compelling. In the international community, as in the national one, there must be order. Internally, every state finds it necessary to have some system of judicial restraint and punishment in order to restrain its criminals; clearly, someone must do the same job in the international community. But in the international community, there are 'sovereigns' - that is, states of princes who are, by definition, supreme; and as they have no superiors, no one could keep order if they did not do so. Therefore sovereigns must have a right of duty of judicial restraint and punishment in international matters, just as they have in internal matters. The only alternative would be international anarchy. This idea gives positive status to war as an instrument of justice; and, in spite of all the careful restrictions as to its use, this is the central light which illuminates the whole system.

(iii) **The 'conditions' of the just war are best understood under the three categories of St Thomas: legitimate authority, just cause and right intention.** There must be legitimate authority: that is, the war must be declared by a genuinely **sovereign** state, since this is the basis of the whole system, and only sovereigns have judicial capacity. There must be a **just cause**: that is, a crime must have been committed, a grave right violated, for which there is no remedy other than war. Finally, there must be **right intention**: that means that the warring state must **intend** to promote the good and avoid the evil - and under this last condition we could group the '**rules of proportionality**', which require the sovereign to weigh up the possible good results of the war against the possible evil results. The sovereign must decide whether victory itself is probable enough to justify such a dangerous means of achieving it.

(iv) **The second side of the polarity in western civilization is the tradition of nonviolence.** Outside the United Nations headquarters in New York is a magnificent bronze emblazoned with the prophecy from Isaiah which envisions the time when 'swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, nation will not lift up hand against nation, neither shall they make war any more'. The just war tradition seems dry and inhumane in comparison with the deep resonance of the prophetic anti-war tradition. In Christianity the anti-war tradition has its roots in the New Testament and the martyrdom of Jesus Christ. This is taken as the ultimate proof that non-violence is a greater