

## Criteria of *Jus ad Bellum*

Augustine is credited with being one of the first formulators of jus ad bellum criteria. His criteria are few and, arguably, vague. Later writers such as Aquinas and Cook add more criteria. It may be helpful to think of the latter criteria as refinements of Augustine's. Aquinas' criterion of "just cause" roughly tracks Augustine's general justification for resort to war, but makes it more specific and restrictive; Aquinas' criteria of "Lawful Authority" and "Right Intention" can be regarded as refinements of Augustine's authority requirement. Similarly, Cook's "just cause," "proportionality," "last resort," "reasonable hope of success," and "end of peace" can be regarded as spelling out particulars arising from Aquinas' "just cause": they describe not only the sort of wrong the enemy "has inflicted," but also help to ascertain whether the enemy "deserves" to have waged war against it (or, more broadly, whether waging war is a good idea whether or not the enemy "deserves" it).

Augustine	Aquinas	Cook
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authority to wage war belongs to rulers (<i>Against Faustus the Manichean</i> XXII).</li> <li>- War should be pursued "mournfully" (Cook, p. 24), i.e., with regret.</li> </ul>	<b>Lawful Authority</b> private citizens have private means for settling disputes, and lack authority to command other citizens to fight	<b>Legitimate Authority</b> - similar to Augustine & Aquinas
	<b>Right Intention:</b> "to promote good or avoid evil," "to restrain the wicked and assist the good," not "desire to harm, vengeful cruelty...lust for dominance," etc.	<b>Public Declaration</b> - legal requirement (for some, like US) - moral requirement (for all): this time we mean it
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our world is not a just one, and fighting will not make it just.</li> <li>- However, fighting may bring the world closer to justice than not fighting; then it's OK.</li> </ul>	<b>Just Cause</b> "enemy <i>deserves</i> to have war waged against it because of some wrong the enemy <i>has inflicted</i> "  [Note that "wrong inflicted" by an enemy does not by itself entail that war against it is "deserved." Hence Cook's "proportionality":]  [Note that even if the enemy "deserves" war, it could still be a bad idea. Hence Cook's last three:]  ( <i>Summa Theologica</i> , II-II, Q.40, 1, emphasis added)	<b>Just Intent</b> - one worry: mission creep (Gulf War example) - another: ulterior (and unjust) motives
		<b>Just Cause</b> - primarily, "aggression received" (cf. Aquinas) - potentially others: humanitarian intervention, pre-emption, etc.
		<b>Proportionality</b> - might it be better to accept the loss? - is the provocation serious enough to warrant war? - examples: Swiss incursions into Liechtenstein North Korean satellite launch
		<b>Last Resort</b> - b/c military option is most dangerous and destructive
		<b>Reasonable Hope of Success</b> - don't waste blood and treasure pointlessly - cp. Walzer pp. 67ff. on presumption in favor of resistance
		<b>End of Peace</b> - cf. Augustine