

Is the Use of Force Ever Morally Justified?

A Response from Americans to Colleagues in Germany

August 8, 2002

Dear Colleagues:

We received your recent letter, *A world of peace and justice would be different*, which 103 of you publicly released from Germany in May of this year, in response to our letter, *What We're Fighting For*, which 60 of us publicly released in Washington, D.C. in February of this year.¹ We are grateful to you for taking the time to write to us, and wish to continue the dialogue.

We note with appreciation and agreement your statement that “there can be no moral justification for the horrible mass murder on September 11” and your recognition that the inherent and equal dignity of human persons is a necessary foundation for serious moral reflection on this subject.

Our overall reaction to your letter is that, although you describe it as a “response,” you respond only indirectly to our central argument. Above all in *What We're Fighting For*, we seek to draw upon the just war tradition to argue that the use of military force against the murderers of September 11 and those who assist them is not only morally justified, but morally necessary. You apparently disagree with that conclusion, but, apart from calling the just war tradition “an ill-starred historical concept,” you never coherently articulate any position on the morality of the use of force.

Let us review. Moral and intellectual approaches to war divide into four basic categories. Pacifism says that all war is morally wrong. Realism says that war is essentially about power and self-interest, and that moral analysis is therefore largely irrelevant. Holy war or crusade says that God, or some secular ideology of ultimate concern, can authorize the coercion or killing of non-believers. And just war says that universal moral criteria should be applied to specific situations to determine whether the use of force is morally justified.

¹The two letters, *What We're Fighting For: A Letter from America* and *A world of peace and justice would be different*, can be read in English in their entirety (along with other related responses and analyses) at www.americanvalues.org and at www.propositionsonline.com.

Which of these positions is yours? You never tell us. If you are pacifists, you should say so. It's an honorable position, although one with which we respectfully disagree. Your statements about the use of force in Afghanistan after September 11 strongly suggest an essentially pacifistic orientation. Yet you also describe U.S. participation in the Second World War as "an outstanding contribution."

If you are realists who disdain moral arguments about war, you should say so, although we doubt that you are, since your letter is full of moralistic assertions. We assume that you reject the principle of holy war. Regarding the just war tradition, the only remaining intellectual option available to you – a tradition, we remind you, that primarily seeks to *limit* rather than extol the use of force, and that has strongly influenced international law and international institutions such as the United Nations – you dismiss this entire school of thought in one contemptuous phrase, as a prelude to your harsh attack on the decision by the U.S. and its allies, including Germany, to use force against Qaeda and Taliban fighters in Afghanistan.

So which is it for you? Is the use of force ever morally justified? If not, why not? If so, what are the proper moral criteria for the use of force? And how would these criteria, as you understand them, apply to the current crisis? Simply denouncing the United States for nearly everything that it has done in the world since 1945, while certainly your prerogative, does not relieve you from the responsibility of taking a clear position on these questions. We await your response.

In alarmist tones, you declare that "fundamentalist forces," which foster racism, nationalism, and religious fanaticism, are gaining ground in the U.S. and have now extended their influence "all the way to the White House." Rather than attempt to evaluate this assessment, we will simply point out that nowhere in your letter do you express alarm about "fundamentalist forces" gaining ground in the Muslim world. Quite the contrary. In your letter you suggest that the U.S. should withdraw all military personnel from Saudi Arabia, since the mere presence of these troops "is obviously regarded by many Muslims as a thorn in their flesh and an attack on their culture and self-esteem."

Why this discrepancy? Is it only "fundamentalism" in the U.S. to which you object? Is it your contention that "fundamentalist forces" in the Muslim world – groups that, in addition to disliking U.S. military personnel in their midst, prevent women from voting and even from driving cars, seek to murder novelists whose writings are perceived as critical of their religious teachings, and periodically declare war on foreigners and unbelievers – pose a lesser threat to the world today than do the "fundamentalist forces" that you fear are gaining ground in the United States?

This same indifference to the threat posed by Muslim radicals is also evident in your advice to us about how our government should have responded to the events of September 11. You recommend that criminal justice systems now operating at the national level should in the future be “extended globally,” an idea that is not only vague, but also blurs the distinctions between an individual crime and an act of war. You further advise us that there are “various ways” that people who are attacked can defend themselves, but you fail to mention even one of these ways.

You describe the rise of Islamicist violence in the world as “a consequence of the instability of the balance of power in the present unipolar world order.” If we understand this viewpoint correctly, you are suggesting, at least in part, that if the U.S. and its allies had less power and influence in the world, and if states such as Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, and other states in the Middle East and in the Muslim world had *more* power and influence in the world, then the world would become a safer, less violent place. Recognizing that many (though not all) of these states whom you regard as insufficiently powerful and influential in the world are run by unelected authoritarians who oppress their own people and frequently nurture and export the terrorist violence that now threatens the world, including the Muslim world, we disagree with your prescription.

Your letter raises the subject of civilian casualties in the war in Afghanistan. The subject is a serious one, which concerns us deeply, but your treatment of it is not serious. Your factual claims are, at best, unsubstantiated. Conceptually, you conclude that civilian casualties in the war in Afghanistan constitute an example of U.S. “mass murder” that is, in moral terms, exactly the same as the murders of September 11 in New York, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania. You tell us that no moral calculation can “justify one mass murder by another.” We are saddened by these comments. For you to equate unintended civilian casualties in a theater of war, in which the cause is just, and where the goal of the combatant is to *minimize* the loss of civilian life, to the intentional killing of civilians in downtown office buildings, in which the cause is unjust, and where the goal of the combatant is to *maximize* the loss of civilian life, is an act of moral blindness.

Near the end of your letter, you write: “Only if the view that the West, as the most economically and militarily powerful group of cultures, is serious about the universality of human rights and dignity, that this is not merely a phrase trotted out when convenient, [and it] becomes accepted throughout the world, [including] the economically and militarily weaker nations, only then will the likelihood increase that terrorist suicide bombings will not find the intended response, but encounter vehement rejection in all countries.” Notwithstanding our disagreements with you in other areas, we find

important elements of insight in that statement, which may serve as one basis for future dialogue.

Thank you again for writing to us.

Signed,

John Atlas

President, National Housing Institute; Executive Director, Passaic County Legal Aid Society

Jay Belsky

Professor and Director, Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Social Issues, Birkbeck University of London

David Blankenhorn

President, Institute for American Values

David Bosworth

University of Washington

R. Maurice Boyd

Minister, The City Church, New York

Gerard V. Bradley

Professor of Law, University of Notre Dame

Margaret F. Brinig

Edward A. Howry Distinguished Professor, University of Iowa College of Law

Allan Carlson

President, The Howard Center for Family, Religion, and Society

Lawrence A. Cunningham

Professor of Law, Boston College

Paul Ekman

Professor of Psychology, University of California, San Francisco

Jean Bethke Elshtain

Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics, University of Chicago Divinity School

Amitai Etzioni

University Professor, The George Washington University

Elizabeth Fox-Genovese
Eleonore Raoul Professor of the Humanities, Emory University

Hillel Fradkin
President, Ethics and Public Policy Center

Samuel G. Freedman
Professor at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism

Francis Fukuyama
Bernard Schwartz Professor of International Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University

Maggie Gallagher
Institute for American Values

William A. Galston
Professor at the School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland; Director, Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy

Claire Gaudiani
Senior research scholar, Yale Law School, and former president, Connecticut College

Robert P. George
McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and Professor of Politics, Princeton University

Carl Gershman
President, National Endowment for Democracy

Neil Gilbert
Professor at the School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Mary Ann Glendon
Learned Hand Professor of Law, Harvard University Law School

Norval D. Glenn
Ashbel Smith Professor of Sociology and Stiles Professor of American Studies, University of Texas at Austin

Os Guinness
Senior Fellow, Trinity Forum

David Gutmann
Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry and Education, Northwestern University

Charles Harper
Executive Director, John Templeton Foundation

Sylvia Ann Hewlett
Chair, National Parenting Association

The Right Reverend John W. Howe
Episcopal Bishop of Central Florida

James Davison Hunter
*William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of Sociology and Religious Studies and
Executive Director, Center on Religion and Democracy, University of Virginia*

Samuel Huntington
Albert J. Weatherhead, III, University Professor, Harvard University

Byron Johnson
*Director and Distinguished Senior Fellow, Center for Research on Religion
and Urban Civil Society, University of Pennsylvania*

James Turner Johnson
Professor, Department of Religion, Rutgers University

John Kelsay
Richard L. Rubenstein Professor of Religion, Florida State University

Judith Kleinfeld
Professor of Psychology, University of Alaska, Fairbanks

Diane Knippers
President, Institute on Religion and Democracy

Thomas C. Kohler
Professor of Law, Boston College Law School

Robert C. Koons
Professor of Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin

Glenn C. Loury
*Professor of Economics and Director, Institute on Race and Social Division,
Boston University*

Harvey C. Mansfield
William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of Government, Harvard University

Will Marshall
President, Progressive Policy Institute

Jerry L. Martin
President, American Council of Trustees and Alumni

Richard J. Mouw
President, Fuller Theological Seminary

Daniel Patrick Moynihan
*University Professor, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs,
Syracuse University*

John E. Murray, Jr.
Chancellor and Professor of Law, Duquesne University

Anne D. Neal
Executive Director, American Council of Trustees and Alumni

Virgil Nemoianu
WJ Byron Distinguished Professor of Literature, Catholic University of America

Michael Novak
*George Frederick Jewett Chair in Religion and Public Policy, American
Enterprise Institute*

Rev. Val J. Peter
Executive Director, Boys and Girls Town

David Popenoe
*Professor of Sociology and Co-Director of the National Marriage Project,
Rutgers University*

Gloria G. Rodriguez
Founder and President, AVANCE, Inc.

Robert Royal
President, Faith & Reason Institute

Nina Shea
Director, Freedom's House's Center for Religious Freedom

Fred Siegel
Professor of History, The Cooper Union

Max L. Stackhouse
*Professor of Christian Ethics and Director, Project on Public Theology,
Princeton Theological Seminary*

William Tell, Jr.
The William and Karen Tell Foundation

Maris A. Vinovskis
*Bentley Professor of History and Professor of Public Policy, University of
Michigan*

Paul C. Vitz
Professor of Psychology, New York University

Michael Walzer
Professor at the School of Social Science, Institute for Advanced Study

George Weigel
Senior Fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center

Roger Williams
Mount Hermon Association, Inc.

Charles Wilson
Director, Center for the Study of Southern Culture, University of Mississippi

James Q. Wilson
Collins Professor of Management and Public Policy Emeritus, UCLA

John Witte, Jr.
*Jonas Robitscher Professor of Law and Ethics and Director, Law and
Religion Program, Emory University Law School*

Christopher Wolfe
Professor of Political Science, Marquette University

George Worgul
Executive Director, Family Institute, Duquesne University

Daniel Yankelovich
President, Public Agenda

Signatories' affiliations are listed for identification purposes only. This statement was published under the aegis of the Institute for American Values. For more information, please visit our website at www.americanvalues.org or write to us at: Institute for American Values 1841 Broadway, Suite 211, New York, NY 10023; email: info@americanvalues.org.