EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

When the Cold War ended in 1990, many predicted a reign of peace under the auspices of the United Nations, with the blessing and support of the world's surviving superpower. What followed instead was a decade of surprisingly hot wars. Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in August of 1990; full-scale war against Saddam commenced in 1991. War broke out between Serbia and Croatia in 1991, between Serbia and Bosnia in 1992. Extensive hostilities erupted in Somalia in 1993. Tens of thousands were killed or displaced by attacks in Darfur beginning in 1993; hundreds of thousands were killed in a horrific genocide in Rwanda in 1994. NATO went to war with Serbia in 1999; and a semi-violent intifada erupted in Palestine in 2000.

The next decade proved even worse for peace. The 9/11 attacks sparked a decade long military campaign in Afghanistan commencing in 2001. In 2003, the U.S.A. provoked and blundered into an immense civil war between Shi'a and Sunni Islam that has subsequently devastated Iraq and Syria.[1]

There is every reason to believe that succeeding decades will see even worse levels of violence. The economies of the West and the Middle East, for different reasons, continue to generate high levels of unemployment, especially among young men. Some of today's unemployed will be tomorrow's terrorists, on the principle that it is more meaningful to die for honor in the Middle East than live on the dole in London. We know from the Ukraine that men on the ground can shoot down commercial aircraft; from New York, we learned that commercial aircraft can bring down skyscrapers, and from nearly everywhere, we discern that no remedy has yet been devised to stop a suicide bomber.

But looming larger than the threats of ethnic strife and terrorism is the disruption of governments and economies that will come with global warming. The expected population displacements, mass starvations, international epidemics, and other upheavals that will begin in mid-century will put severe stress on governments around the world. Many of them will identify "foreign enemies" as the source of domestic problems stemming from global warming. Such accusations,

[1] We have it on good authority that G.W. Bush became aware of the Sunni-Shi'a split only in 2006: Our authority for this is the policy expert who told him about it.

in a percentage of cases, will lead to conflicts and all-out war, perhaps between major military powers, like Pakistan and India, or China and Russia.

Given these unsettling prospects, what does philosophy have to offer? The first thing that emerges from philosophical considerations is the supremacy of ethics over all interests, including national interests. The current American President, on receiving the Nobel Prize for Peace, acknowledged in his acceptance speech the imperatives of justice developed in the just war tradition. But he went on to say, by way of rebuking this tradition, "I have a sworn duty to protect the American people." The trouble here is that a "sworn duty" is binding only if grounded in ethical principles of a more general sort, like "keep your promises," so that Obama, for all his disturbing, and in the context, discourteous reservations, has conceded that he, too, serves under the rules of ethics.

What, then, does ethics require of us in an increasingly violent century? Pacifists maintain that ethics requires that one must not respond to violence with violence, at least for the reason that violence begets more violence, and for deeper reasons besides, including the setting of moral examples of the Gandhian sort. Two of the contributors to this volume, Holmes and Ryan, carry the pacifist argument into the 21st century. Just war theorists maintain that the use of violence is permissible within limits strictly defined by justice. How to define these limits in the age of drone and cyber warfare is difficult, as is the problem of defining moral responsibility for those who administer drones and make decisions on the basis of computer-generated information. Three of the contributors, Alexandra, Peter-Baker, Adams, Primoratz, and Dobos, are just war theorists (of various sorts) addressing problems of this sort.

Pacifism and just war theory are typically portrayed as logically contrary positions, which might both be wrong but cannot both be right. The student of these theories should recognize that there is considerable common ground between the two. Pacifists reject violence, but if there is to be violence, they would prefer it to be limited by just war constraints than to run amok. Just war theorists will admit that there are some cases in which violence, though adhering to all just war constraints, is not morally advisable because a certain nonviolent alternative is a more effective means to an end than a legitimate but violent means. If the moral example of pacifists displays soft power, and the use of force in just war theory exhibits hard power, in the area between the two there emerges such a thing as smart power, considered by Lackey in the closing article. Given the magnitude of oncoming world problems, it will take a mixture of pacifist forbearance, just war self-constraint, and smart power to maintain ethical standards. Without these standards, things will go very badly for us all. ISIS has already given us more than a glimpse of what a world without ethics would be like.

The Editors