

THE APPLICABILITY OF JUST WAR THEORY: THE CASE OF GULF WAR IN 2000 AND THE REINTERPRETATION OF CHRIST'S NONVIOLENCE APPROACH IN NORTHERN NIGERIAN CRISES

AYUBA GIMBAMAVALLA (PhD)

Peace and Conflict Studies in Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Veronica Adeleke School of Social Science,
Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State
mavallaa@babcock.edu.ng

&

JOAN MBAGWU (PhD)

International Law and Diplomacy in Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Veronica Adeleke School of Social Science,
Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State
joanmbagwu@yahoo.com

&

KOLAWOLE ADEEJAT

Private Law Department,
Faculty of Law,
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye,
Ogun State, Nigeria
nikky_kol@yahoo.com

Abstract

The justifiability of the applicability of the Just War theory in war conditions continues to be a difficult and painful subject because Christian teaching was totally against violence of any sort. But the question of how will humans deal with aggressors and war mongers continue to demand answers. The use of military force in Iraq by the US led coalition in the liberation of Kuwait from the Iraqi invasion has been criticized and this essay try to seek answers to the queries following the attack of Iraq by the UN forces. There are two views: the view that the Gulf war met the just war requirement in spite of some lapses for the simple reason that Iraqis threat to peace was not just to Kuwait but to other nations in the middle east. The second view argues that the purpose of the just war is not only to create lasting peace but to minimize deaths of whether civilians or military where avoiding it is totally impossible, yet, the use of the air campaign left both civilians and military with much causality. The paper is multi-disciplinary, employing library research methodology. The discipline is Peace and Conflict Studies. The sources will include: interviews, internet, and library resources, personal and historical events.

Keywords— Justifiability, aggressors, war mongers.

INTRODUCTION

War is a perennial issue which has existed from history of human kind and continues to be a major predicament. Traditionally, war has been used as an instrument of settling differences between nations. It is

regrettable to note how often such armed conflicts have been pursued, totally devoid of any ethical considerations. Although war has remained part and parcel of human experience, there seems to be a consensus or an agreement that permeates through all civilizations as to the limit and extent of war and the methods by which armed conflict should be conducted (DeForrest, 2005). The ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki led to a new appreciation of the fragility of human existence and the possibility that the human race might be terminated through the sophisticated arms invented by human hands. This has led to the conclusion that there is no evil greater than the risk of nuclear warfare. To deal with this dilemma which confronts the human race, there is need to pay heed to the voice of conscience and to the counsel of reason, which may provide a guide to the meaning and nature of rational warfare (Ramsey, 1961).

Issues of morality, in association with legal and political spheres, have raised questions about the right and acceptable means by which war should be conducted. These have been the subject of great consideration. Consequent attempts to evaluate rightful military action in war has led to the development of the just war theory (DeForrest, 2005). In the early 5th century of the Christian era, St Augustine of Hippo recorded his ideas about the use of violence and these have exerted a profound influence on western culture.

However, the theory of just war continues to be a difficult and painful subject. This is because Christian teaching was totally against violence of any sort. The question is how will humankind deal with aggressor and war mongers this has remained unanswered. Should the Church not defend the Roman Empire from invasion? This dilemma led St Augustine to develop further what had been started by the Romans as an alternative solution and it has had a profound effect on the human race today. He argued that war could be right if fought under certain prescribed conditions “with genuine limit to the harm that could be done even in a justified war” (Johnson, 1984: 1). This is generally accepted as the birth of the doctrine of just war in Christian teaching (ibid)

This essay will now attempt to determine whether the Gulf conflict of 1990 falls under the parameter of Just War theory? It will first attempt an overview of just war theory, noting its origins in some detail. The development of the theory of just war will be examined in relation to religious and secular sources. The essay will then critically apply the said principles to the Gulf war of 1990.

A. Clarification of Concept

The concept of just war has been interpreted in many ways. Some seem not to uphold the notion that there is a war that is just, but rather there is a justified war. This cleared the fact that war is evil: to call war anything less than evil must be a self-deception. But the view that war is evil inevitably compounds the problem of waging a just war even though the ideas of just war stems from the acceptance that some evil cannot be avoided. Evil is not just a personal problem, which goes beyond the deeds and thoughts: it is an insidious condition of human fallen nature that riddles the political and social reality with which we most contend (Clouse et al: 1991). “Real life situations are twisted and perverted that often no altogether good option remains. We are trapped in moral dilemmas whose roots lie in the past as well as the present, such that whatever we do involves us in evil of some sort” (ibid p118). Considerations of what is right does not totally depend upon the outcome, because right and wrong are not just a matter of good and evil but must also be concerned with the issues of both intent and action.

However, an action may be performed with the right intention and yet may produce evil consequences. To consider an action right is not determined by consequences alone, or by the twisted situations of life or by good intention alone. Matters involving morality are complex: they involve both deontological as well as utilitarian deliberations, which concern motive, action and consequences. The causes of war may include the following: “deliberate aggression, unbridled greed, lust for power, fear and mistrust, an exaggerated national

pride, a perverted sense of honor or some form of social injustice” (Clouse, 1991: 117) Whatever the causes, the consequences may vary in intensity in terms of the loss of human lives and the sufferings of survivors with irreparable injuries. Children may be rendered orphans and wives may be rendered widows. The concept Just war is used in this essay as “justified war” that is aimed at limiting its destructive effect (Elshatain, 1992).

THE ORIGIN OF JUST WAR THEORY

The idea of Just War could be traced back as far as the beginning of human existence. However the essay will focus first on the concept of just war in the Hebraic era. The authentic history of the Hebrew people is codified in the Old Testament where the story of Israel’s engagement in warfare is amply discussed. Israel engaged in warfare during her exodus and wandering in the wilderness prior to entering into Palestine (see the books of Exodus and Numbers), the period of conquest and settlement in Palestine (see the books of Joshua and Judges) and also the period of Israel’s existence under the rules of Kings. The objective was not the usual spoils of the war (See Joshua 6:17).

In a general sense, Israel’s engagement in war was not without instances of mitigation. In Joshua 11 we see the example of non-combatant immunity been displayed where only those cities involved in aggressive action against Israel were destroyed (Kelsay, and Johnson, 1991). The concept of Just War has been a progressive development through the ages. The Roman contribution on the development of the just war theory is worthy of noting.

A. The Roman Contribution

The idea of *jus ad bellum* is a moral justification for waging war which included certain conditions (defence, or reclaiming from an enemy that which he has wrongfully taken, or punishment). It is important to recognize that St. Augustine seems to have drawn from the Roman concept of justification of war which was an overall notion of statecraft that considered war as instrument of political sovereignty. “The concept of divine involvement in justifying war was Roman practice, subordinated to the requirement that the fetish priests, officials of state religion, review every ostensible cause for war by sacrifice and augury and pronounces it justified or unjustified” (Kelsay, and Johnson, 1991: 7). The enormous contribution of St. Augustine in the theory of Just war will remain in the annals of history until eternity.

B. St. Augustine’s Concept of Just War Theory

St. Augustine concept of just war stemmed from moral justice. The wrong doers who perpetrated evil should not be left to continue their activities. But he says the wise man should fight in a justified war. His entire concept is built on the premise that it is the wrongdoing of the contending group which obliges the wise man to fight a just war. Augustine believes that even when wrongful acts do not lead to war, they still create immense pain to the human race (St Augustine,.) . St. Augustine made a clarion call that “let everyone, then, who thinks with pain on all these great evils, so ruthless, acknowledge that this is misery. And if any one either endures or thinks of them without mental pain, such has lost human feeling” (ibid) St. Augustine also clearly identified wrong motives for engaging in a war to include the following; “the love for violence, vengeful cruelty, fierce and implacable enmity, wild resistance and the lust for power and such like it” (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991: 24)

C. The principle of Just War

War faces everyone, most pacifists share this central problem, of how to deal with a marauder, people who are perpetually thirsty for bloodshed. For instance, unbridled greed, which has the propensity to lead to war

for clearly selfish reasons, illustrates what an unjust war is. We shall describe why just wars are fought. The theory of just war is not an attempt to justify war but to control war (ibid p120). There are guides or rules that will justify a war as just or unjust. In this section I shall discuss the acceptable principles for a Just War. Fisher, (1985) and Ceadel, (1987) both describe the *jus ad bellum* as follows: that a competent authority must declare war, war must be the last resort, the only reason must be for the purpose of justice, and the war fought must be for a proportionate reason. The concept of *Jus in bello* makes two more stipulations. First, that the harm will not supersede the good to come out of the war and secondly, the civilians should be immune to attack (Fisher, 1985; Calcutt, 2016). An interesting view is presented by Vincent Ferraro in his article “principle of just War” who describes the *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* as follows:

- A just war can only be waged as a last resort. All non-violent options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
- A war is just only if it is waged by a legitimate authority. Even just causes cannot be served by actions taken by individuals or groups who do not constitute an authority sanctioned by whatever the society and outsiders to the society deem legitimate.
- A just war can only be fought to redress a wrong suffered. For example, self-defense against an armed attack is always considered to be a just cause (although the justice of the cause is not sufficient--see point #4). Further, a just war can only be fought with "right" intentions: the only permissible objective of a just war is to redress the injury.
- A war can only be just if it is fought with a reasonable chance of success. Deaths and injury incurred in a hopeless cause are not morally justifiable.
- The ultimate goal of a just war is to re-establish peace. More specifically, the peace established after the war must be preferable to the peace that would have prevailed if the war had not been fought.
- The violence used in the war must be proportional to the injury suffered. States are prohibited from using force not necessary to attain the limited objective of addressing the injury suffered.
- The weapons used in war must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Civilians are never permissible targets of war, and every effort must be taken to avoid killing civilians. The deaths of civilians are justified only if they are unavoidable victims of a deliberate attack on a military target (<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/poll16/justwar.htm> 2016 Ferraro, 2005).

The theory of just war centres on the attempt to justify why and how wars are waged. The validation can be seen from a theoretical or historical point of view. The theoretical point of view dwells exclusively on ethics of why war could be necessary. The historical aspect deals with traditions that have come down from the ages past centring on body of rules or agreements applied in various forms of warfare (ibid). According to the internet Encyclopaedia of philosophy:

“for instance international agreements such as the Geneva and Hague conventions are historical rules aimed at limiting certain kinds of warfare. It is the role of ethics to examine these institutional agreements for their philosophical coherence as well as to inquire into whether aspects of the conventions ought to be changed” (Ferraro, 2005).

As already cited above, just-war tradition is as old as warfare itself. History has revealed that in most wars there have been some moral considerations upheld by both the warring parties. These considerations may have included the treatment of women and children and of prisoners of war. These considerations seem to have been based on a notion of honour. However, some acts of war have always been deemed dishonourable; whilst others have been deemed honourable. This explains the ethical or unethical nature of warfare. It is also important to recognise that what is honourable may differ radically from one generation to another and from one place to the other. For instance, what is honourable in warfare at one time or one place may evoke a moral concern to another time or place in such a way that it will be sufficient to infuse warfare as a result (ibid).

D. Background of the Gulf War

The reasons advanced by Hamdi A. Hassan for why Iraq invaded Kuwait is that of economic factors (Hassan, 1999). Iraq considered that the economic threat posed by Kuwait by lowering the price of her oil was indeed a major threat. Iraq considered the threat as a political conspiracy and decided to use military aggression as a method of addressing their threat. To counteract these plans, the Iraq government decided to tackle her depressing economic situation, she undertook the following measures:

1. To annex the wealth of Kuwait. By this Saddam hoped to pay off a large portion of his foreign debt.
2. By the occupation of Kuwait. Saddam hoped to add to his national prestige by what he considered as reclaiming back the usurped Iraq land.
3. The annexing of Kuwait will give Iraq a bigger voice in the world market and also make Iraq dominant in the Gulf region (ibid).

On the 2nd of August 1990 at about 2:10 am, Kuwait time, about 100,000 Iraqi armed forces, and 350 tanks overran Kuwait military forces. By 5:30 am the Emir's palace had been captured and the Kuwait government had fled to Saudi Arabia (Mahmoud, 1998).

In a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, an Iraqi representative stated that the reason for Iraq's occupation of Kuwait was just to discharge their civic duties as pan Arab members to their people in Kuwait by helping in maintaining stability and security. In addition, he assured the UN that withdrawal would commence on Sunday 5th of August 1990, as long as no threat to either Iraq or Kuwait emerged (Greenwood, 1991).

In response, the Kuwait permanent representative wrote to the UN refuting all the stated Iraqi claims (ibid). Later, Kuwait repeatedly requested that the Iraq claims be set before International Court of Justice. There was also the question of why Iraq had previously refused Kuwait's proposal that an Arab commission be set up to investigate the boundaries between the two countries and also its other neighbors (ibid p181). At the expiration of United Nations ultimatum for Iraq to unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait, a coalition force from 36 countries led by the USA began an operation Desert Storm which involved a total of 800,000 military personnel. The countries that participated in the air campaign included: US, Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, and Qatar. The conflict lasted 43 days from the start of the war to the cease fire (ibid 69, 72).

APPLICABILITY OF JUST WAR IN THE GULF CONFLICT

The concept of a just war in the case of the Gulf conflict needs to be critically examined using the parameters set forth in the generally accepted principles. My analysis is based on Vincent Ferraro's check list of Just Wars'. The following questions constitute the checklist which will be considered in order to determine whether or not the Gulf war meets the requirement of being a just war: Was the war a last resort? Was it authorized by a legitimate authority? What wrong or injustice did the war seek to redress? Was there a reasonable time for success? Was peace re-established in the region? Were civilians protected from attacks? Was the violence used in the war proportional to the injury suffered? Was the War a Last Resort?

To answer this, it is necessary to consider whether all possible non-violent options were exhausted before the operation Desert Storm commenced? What were the options taken by the UN to try to resolve the conflict before the use of force? Turner and Weigel argued that the criterion of last resort should not be understood as meaning that all non-military options must be tried first; rather, a sensible and practical judgment be made as to whether the use of force is the only option available to achieve the desired good in a just war. This mandate does not mean that other methods be tried indefinitely (Johnson, Weigel, 1991). When Iraq invaded Kuwait, there were several appeals from other nations including the UN Security Council. Johnson and Weigel continue to affirm that the just war criteria were applied in the case of the use of military force on

Iraq. The decision to stop further negotiation or to impose economic sanction were all in agreement with the criteria of the last resort in just war. Besides the continuous torture of the Kuwait civilians by the Iraqi military, the history of Iraq's relationship with her neighbors and the threat of violence against the neighbors and Saddam's contentious buildup of military force against Kuwait, did not only rendered the Geneva meeting a failure but also justified the action taken against Iraq (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991). The crucial Geneva meeting of 9th January 1990 had among other issues the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait on the top list of great concern. But Tariq Aziz the Iraqi foreign minister's behavior at the meeting with the U.S Secretary of State James Baker coupled with Saddam Hussein's rejection of Perez de Cuellar and French initiatives in the critical moment just before the UN deadline of 15th January 1991 seemed to foil a possible concession. This seems to render the argument against Bush remarks that all non military options have been exhausted to be weak (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991).

Was it authorized by a Legitimate Authority?

UN resolution 678 was adopted by the Security Council on the 29th November 1990, authorizing the use of force against Iraq for her illegal occupation of Kuwait since August 1st 1990 "unless Iraqi withdrew from Kuwait and fully implemented all relevant Security Council resolution on or before January 15th 1991" (Human Rights Watch, 1991: 69). The UN sanction empowered all member states to cooperate with Kuwait for her emancipation. The United Nations, in this case, is clearly the right authority to vote for such an action. "Within the United States, right authority derived from the president's powers as defined by the constitution and the war powers act, then by the congressional resolution adopted on January 12 and 13 authorizing use of U.S. military force against Iraq (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991).

Therefore, this constitutes the right authority that justifies the use of force to emancipate Kuwait from Iraq's illegal occupation hence serving justice to international arena. A medieval theorist cites Romans 13: 4, as the moral claim for the use of force to enforce peace. The passage demanded that those in political authority have the right to maintain moral order which makes for a conducive atmosphere for community coexistence (ibid).

What was the Injustice the War Seek to Redress?

The injustice in this case was the fact that Iraq had illegally occupied the state of Kuwait claiming that it was part of Iraq. The following were the reasons presented as the causes of the Gulf war viz:

(1) to defend Saudi Arabia and deter aggression against other Arab States; (2) to restore Kuwait's territorial integrity and its brutal oppression of the Kuwait people; (3) to free all hostages held by Iraq; (4) to contribute to long-term stability in the Middle East by reducing the threat Iraq poses for its neighbors; (5) to guarantee secure access to oil supplies for the international community; and (6) to prevent Iraq from achieving nuclear capabilities (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991: 1324-5).

For his part, Father Michel disputes the fact that the coalition army in the Gulf war had no basis for carrying arms against Iraq. Firstly, he argues that every person acquainted with the history and the geography of Iraq knows that Iraq has always claimed Kuwait as her territory. Secondly, he argued that "since the Arabs consider themselves a single people artificially divided into various states, their nationalistic sentiment are always oriented more toward the unity of the Arab people..." (ibid p81). Yet, these two claims seem to have been nullified by the testimony of some of the Arab nations. For instance, the Kuwait Permanent Representative to the United Nations strongly opposed the occupation of Iraq and also presented documentary proof of his case. Furthermore, all the resolution so far referred to have one thing in common: the unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait immediately (Greenwood, 1991).

Was there a reasonable time for success?

To justify the resort to military conflict, there must be a clear assurance that the conflict is likely to attain a reasonable success. However, this is difficult to judge, because war is difficult to be determined due to a number of unpredictable factors. For example, war can attract unexpected new foreign supporters. However, the Gulf War went on for 43 days which may meet the criterion of just war (Johnson and Weigel, 1991). The use of military force may bring peace, justice and at the same time eliminating further threats to peace, which is the real success in the use of force.

However, it is required according to the just war tradition that the *jus in bello* - which are a set of restraints imposed upon individuals concerning what is morally acceptable when fighting a justified war is ambiguous. However, this calls to question the methods and the means employed in the war (*ibid*). “The ultimate goal of a just war is to re-establish peace. More specifically, the peace established after the war must be preferable to the peace that would have prevailed if the war had not been fought” (Ferraro 2005).

Was peace re-established in the region?

Johnson and Weigel seem to affirm that coalition forces had the right intention and they also fulfilled the requirement that the use of force is aimed at re-establishing peace in the region. This criterion should be understood naturally in terms of three values: peace, order, and justice (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991). In the case of the Gulf conflict, the concept of right intention is closely tied to peace: the restoration of Kuwait territory and her sovereignty. It could be described as the right order and justice, but also, this act serves as a deterrent to such aggression in the future. Johnson and Weigel argued that some condemned the just war principles because their understanding of the real meaning of the principle of just war are perverted due to the influence of the critics of this principles. They say some critics of just war make wrong selective used of some terminologies of the just war more often than not, making wrong interpretation, consequently developing their argument to be at odd with the fundamental principles and the central suppositions in the just war tradition. To them, these critics view just war as against the use of violence but to the contrary, just war tradition is not at odd with the use of force if that is the only means to bring about order, justice and peace (Johnson and Weigel 1991).

Were Civilians Immune from Attacks?

Vincent Ferraro emphasises the precautions necessary during the Just war in relation to weapons: The weapons used in war must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Civilians are never permissible targets of war, and every effort must be taken to avoid killing civilians. The deaths of civilians are justified only if they are unavoidable victims of a deliberate attack on a military target (Ferrero, 2005). The principle of civilians’ immunity required that they are not directly and intentionally targeted even when the use of force is proportionate. It is possible to identify or distinguish civilians from the military: the former have no formal participation in war, while the latter do (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991). All arms are not only dangerous but also cannot on their own accord discriminate who to destroy, but the person handling them should be able to draw such distinction by making his enemies the target and not the civilians. The use of weapons that cannot be controlled to make these distinctions is morally wrong, for example, the use of poisonous gas cannot be guarded in such a way that it affects only military personnel. However, the use of weapon that intentionally strikes military targets are morally allowed even if civilian lives and property are also put at risk (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991). It seems Johnson and Weigel justify the coalition force for using air raid as a method of the warfare. How possible was this air raid pilots able to distinguish between civilians and the military hence protecting the civilians and directing their attacks on military only?

A. Was the Violence Used Proportional to the Injury Suffered?

Were sufferings arising from the war worthy of the advantage that was anticipated? In other words, is the survival of the Kuwait as a people and a political entity worth taking up arms against Iraq? Will the success of this mission leave the people of Kuwait and the entire Middle East better or worse off (ibid)?

In the just war tradition, adherence to the principles of *jus in bello* is very crucial, especially as it concerns proportionality and discrimination. Thus the weapons used in the warfare must be commensurate with or antidotal to the evil fought against and that attacks must be directed upon the perpetrators only and not on innocent civilians (Johnson, and Weigel, 1991). According to Johnson and Weigel, the Desert Storm operation achieved the proportionality in that there were not only low casualties among the coalition forces but also in the Iraqi forces. This is validated by the large number of prisoners of war taken by the coalition forces (ibid).

A. Resisting No Evil

In Matthew 5: 39 “But I say “... resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” This was the Command of Jesus to His followers. I consider the influence of the theory of Just War has led some Christian in Northern Nigeria in the face of violent conflict to reinterpret the text. They argued that Christians have only two cheeks and they believed to have already turned both cheeks according to the Lord’s injunction but that now there is no other cheek to turn. Further argued that Christian humility has been misunderstood and taken as cowardice. They however, advised against being aggressors but should defend themselves against aggressors (Mavalla, 2014).

The concept of turning the other cheek was understood to mean that Christians should possess an active love that banned them from retaliation or taking vengeance, most respondents eluted to this meaning as correct interpretation of Mathew 5: 39. The Northern Nigerian Christians consider it wrong to be the aggressors by many, however some added that Christian should be prepared for self-defense in the face of violent attack. Whatever the case, Christians should avoid incurring harm from others as much as possible but at the same time without causing harm to anybody. However, the paradox is that most Christians are against the idea of vengeance (ibid).

B. Vengeance

Christianity teaches against retaliation or vengeance in Romans 12: 19: “Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God; for it is written, “Vengeance is mine, I will repay, and says the Lord”. “We attended a Langham preaching seminar, where we were taught the importance of knowing God our creator who made all humans in His own image and not to take somebody else’s life. Vengeance is not ours, but the Lord’s” (Mavalla, 2014). He added that at this seminar the participants took a resolution that they should never be tempted to take vengeance for themselves. Christians need to pray in all situations and seek more peaceful ways of resolving disputes (ibid). Violence blinds both the perpetrators and the victims.

People in violent conflict, paradoxically, think they see, but they are ignorantly grown blind to their shared humanity. This has led humans to see another human beings, much less brothers and sisters, or as the image of God. Instead they see each other as non-humans, aliens, outsiders and competitors, objects of class, race or nationality. This aptly describe the attitude of some Christians in Northern Nigeria towards others who they consider as enemies and declare them as expendable. The relationship has gone so low that neighbours no longer trust each other, but suspicious of one another (Kadala 2009).

C. Claimed Reasons for Retaliation

Some Christian leaders argued that the reason why some Christians are tempted to take laws into their own hands is as a result of the failure of the Nigerian security. What the measure they take can be euphemistically describe as personal self-defense is as a result of their inability to make a difference. Self-defense should not tempt to revoke Christ's nonviolent approach to retaliation.

Conclusion

While war seems to have become part and parcel of human experience, there is a need to seek ways through which war may be waged with some moral integrity, hence limiting the extent which war may be fought. Just war theory is a human endeavor to think of war in moral terms. The Just War theory seems to have been generally accepted not just by secular philosophers but also by theologians. The essay examines the applicability of the just war criteria to the Gulf war under the *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* principles. On the basis of arguments examined here it is arguable that the Gulf war met the just war requirement in spite of some lapses here and there for the simple reason that Iraqis threat of peace was not just to Kuwait but to other nations in the middle east. However, it is possible to raise questions about the outcomes of this particular conflict especially in reference to the lapses noted in the method the warfare was carried out. The Gulf war may be considered by some to have met the legal requirement for just war, but certainly, to others it has not only failed morally but also legally. The criterion of last resort should not be understood as meaning that all non military options must be tried first; rather, a sensible and practical judgment be made as to whether the use of force is the only option available to achieve the desired good. However, this mandate does not mean that other methods be tried indefinitely. This is a weak argument because the purpose of the so called just war is not only to create lasting peace but to minimize deaths of whether civilians or military where avoiding it is totally impossible. Yet, the use of the air campaign left both civilians and military with much causality. Christ's nonviolent approach that forbid, retaliation, vengeance, and the law to resist no evil is being reinterpreted to suggest that those nonviolent approaches were just for a limited time that the Christians could endure then defend themselves from aggressors.

REFERENCES

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- [1] St. Augustine, *The City of God* XIX p7
- [2] Calcutt, B. (2016). "Just War Theory and the War on Terror" Available at <http://wp.vcu.edu/hsep/wp-content/uploads/sites/3338/2013/06/Just-war-theory-and-the-war-on-terror.pdf>, last visited 2nd September 2016.
- [3] Ceadel M. (1987). *An opus book: Thinking About Peace and War* Oxford, Oxford University Press p11.
- [4] Clouse, R. G.; Hoyt, H. A.; Augsburg, M. S.; Holmes A. F.; and Brown, H. O. J. (1991) *WAR: Four Christian Views* Illinois: Intervarsity press .p118
- [5] DeForrest, M. E (2005). "Just War Theory and the Recent U.S Air Strikes Against Iraq" in Gonzaga University web site (online) <http://law.gonzaga.edu/borders/documents/deforres.htm>. (march 10th, 2005)
- [6] Elshatain, J. B. ed (1992). *Just War Theory* Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd 1992 p1
- [7] Fisher, D. (1985) *The Just War Tradition, in Morality and the Bomb*, Croom Helm, p16
- [8] Ferraro, V. (2005). "principle of just War" (online) available in <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pol116/justwar.htm> 2005
- [9] Hamdi A. Hassan, H. A (1999). *The Iraqi Invasion of Kuwait: Religion, Identity and Otherness in the Analysis of War and conflict* London, Pluto Press 1999 p21
- [10] Johnson, J. T. (1984). *Can Modern War Be Just?* London and New Haven, Yale University p1.

- [11] Johnson, J. T and Weigel, G. (1991). *Just War and the Gulf War*, Washington, D.C. Ethic and Public Center p24
- [12] Kelsay, J. and Johnson J. T. (1991). *Just war and jihad: Historical and theoretical perspectives on war and peace in western and Islamic traditions* Westport USA, Greenwood press p7
- [13] Mahmoud, M. M. (1998). *Iraq and the Second Gulf War: State Building and Regime Security* London Austin & Winfield, publishers, P211
- [14] Mavalla, AyubaGimba (2014) *Conflict Transformation: Churches in the face of Structural Violence in Northern Nigeria*. Oxford: Regnum Publishers.
- [15] Ramsey, P. (1961). *War and the Christian Conscience/ How shall modern war be conducted justly?* London, Cambridge University Press, 1961 pvii.
- [16] The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Just War Theory" in (online) available: <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/j/justwar.htm> (March 10Th, 2005)
- [17] Greenwood, M. W. and Bethlehem, D. (1991) *Cambridge International Documents Series, Vol.1 The Kuwait Crisis: Basic Documents* Cambridge:Grotius Publications Limited p177