

SUMMARY

The present volume of the quarterly *Ethos* is concerned with a burning issue of our times, namely, the one of just war. The tragic events that the world has witnessed in the past few decades make one once again pose the question of whether it is still possible to wage a just war at the threshold of the twenty first century. No one will probably question the fact that war is always evil in some respect. The loss of human lives and the multitude of destruction and harm each war inevitably involves are the tragic evidence of this sad truth. However, the aftermath of the wars waged in the previous century involved not only massive destruction, large-scale deportations and harm done both to individuals and to entire nations, but also pervading moral corruption. Therefore one can say that war is not only and not primarily evil in the political or social sense, but that it is evil, above all, in the sphere of morals. However, is it the case, in the light of the above, that waging a war is never, under no circumstances, justifiable? After all, Western philosophy has worked out the so-called just war tradition which set certain criteria to be met in waging a just war. On the other hand, the latest developments in warfare, as well as the rise of terrorism, prompt the question of whether the just war tradition should not be revised or renewed for the modern times. The authors who have contributed to the present volume have attempted to address these and many other questions concerning the issue of war, among them the following: Which direction should a possible renewal of the just war tradition assume? Is the so-called presumption against war the default position of the Catholic Church? How realistic is the hope that international law and international organizations such as the United Nations will fulfill their duty to regulate conflicts between nations so that declaring a war will never be morally justified? The consideration of these questions is accompanied by reflection on the images and interpretations of war that can be found in the Bible, in literary works and in art.

The author of the text *From the Editors* stresses the fact that the question of just war is among the most burning social and moral challenges for the human community at the threshold of the twenty first century. The armed conflict in Iraq has not ceased and it greatly affects the international community, which triggers the need for deeper reflection on the conditions of a justified military intervention and on the function of international law in settling international conflicts. Many authors who have voiced their opinions on the subject have stressed that peace is the basic good for the international community. Therefore, as John Paul II expressed it, war “is always a defeat for humanity.” The task of the justification of an armed conflict undertaken on the grounds of its unavoidability remains the duty of the state which for some particular reasons and in some particular circumstances commences military action. Yet ultimately, the sources of war and peace lie in the depth of the human heart.

In his address to the Democratic Corps, delivered on 13 January 2003, the Holy Father John Paul II pointed out that numerous people in the world of today experience the feeling of fear due to

many plagues threatening the survival of humanity: insidious terrorism, unresolved political problems and international conflicts, social conflicts which prevent certain states from focusing on their development, diseases spreading contagion and death, the grave problem of famine and the irresponsible behaviour contributing to the depletion of the planet's resources. Nevertheless, the Holy Father stressed, the change of this situation is possible and it depends on each of us, but in a particular way on political leaders who are called to serve common good. Then John Paul II described the indispensable requirements which must be met if entire peoples, perhaps even humanity itself, are not to sink into the abyss. They include: a "yes to life," namely, respect for life itself and for individual rights (practices such as abortion, euthanasia and human cloning reduce the human person to a mere object), respect for law, the duty of solidarity, a "no to death," a "no to selfishness" and a "no to war." The present tragic course of events can be reversed once good will, trust in others, fidelity to commitments and cooperation between responsible partners are allowed to prevail. First, we must rediscover within states and between states the paramount value of the natural law. Second, we need the persevering work of statesmen who are honest and selfless. The third condition is to ensure that religious freedom is guaranteed for all. Believers who feel that their faith is respected and whose communities enjoy juridical recognition will work with greater conviction in the common project of building up the civil society to which they belong.

The first section of articles is entitled *The Problem of Just War*.

Wojciech Łączkowski states that in the modern world, total war is as incomprehensible a danger as legal regulations that ultimately aim at unrestricted termination of human life at its initial or final stage. In the face of the utterly inexplicable destructive tendencies predominant in the modern world the Catholic Church has adopted a general "presumption against war," attempting, however, to justify wars in specific situations. The present standpoint of the Church is the result of the course of development of her teaching. The documents that deserve particular attention in this respect are the encyclicals: Pope Pius XI's *Mit brennender Sorge*, Pius XII's *Summi Pontificatus*, John XXIII's *Pacem in terris*, and John Paul II's *Redemptor hominis*. Another document of the Catholic Church which addresses directly the issue of war is the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et spes* promulgated by the Second Vatican Council. Similarly, Paul VI's and John Paul II's addresses to the United Nations, as well as the latter's Messages for the World Day of Peace must be taken into account in presenting the Catholic Church's overall standpoint on the issue of just war. However, also the social teaching of the Church is in part concerned with an analysis and evaluation of the causes of war, as well as with moral evaluation of those who participate in armed conflicts. One can say that in general the Catholic Church favours passive resistance to aggression rather than war. This stance is clear and it is well grounded in the moral norms upheld by the Church. For centuries, Catholic thinkers have worked out a just war tradition with the purpose of limiting the recourse to the armed force in international relationships. This tradition was absorbed into the Christian doctrine and was further developed by the so-called school of natural law. Paradoxically, the resultant conception turned out much more advanced than the theories of war and human conflict proposed since the 18th century. Yet, even within the scope of the Christian just war tradition, it is extremely difficult to define the concept of justness itself. According to the most general of these definitions, justness involves actions that aim at the real goodness of man. Thus, just war tradition meets philosophical anthropology at this point.

Tadeusz Ślipko, SJ, applies the traditional approach to the thinking on just war which was worked out in the field of Christian philosophy and theology, starting with the thought of St. Augustine, to the present reality of war. In the light of its various definitions war is primarily a social fact: it is the state of social conflict on a large scale. Thus one can speak of aggressive wars, defensive wars, preventive wars, of military intervention and total war. Moral reflection, however, should not be concentrated on what war is, but rather on what war should be like. The crucial role in considering this latter aspect concerns the duties of the state, among which is the primary one to carry through the common good of the people. The state indeed has a duty and a right to efficient

self-defence and to the defence of the common good by way of proportionate action. Thus recourse to armed force is morally acceptable or morally just on the part of a state whenever aggression is underway and undermines the basic categories of common good by destroying or limiting the sovereignty of the state in question. However, the question remains whether killing, which is an inevitable consequence of any war, is not itself unjust. Introducing the category of morally neutral human acts which are at the same time morally evil in a restrictive sense helps address such a doubt. The life of the aggressor is not protected by the right to life, because aggression occurs outside the scope of the binding power of that law. Therefore the authorities of the state that has fallen victim to aggression do not take the moral responsibility for the evil done in the course of war. Such is the primary criterion of just war. Its secondary criteria concern, among others, good intention of those who participate in a given conflict (which involves the postulate of the humanization of war). However, if the state that has fallen victim to aggression was actually itself planning recourse to armed force, the resulting war is unjust on both sides. Also preventive wars are violation of the moral order as they result from a wrong definition of aggression.

Fr. Andrzej Zwoliński presents the history of the understanding of war and peace from the ancient times to the present and discusses the views of such authors as Heraclitus, Cicero, Hesiod, Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Lactantius, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, de Vitoria, Grotius, Hobbes, Montesquieu, Goethe, Kant, Fichte, Tolstoy, Pius XI, Lenin, Gumpłowicz, Koneczny and Toynbee, pointing out that in our age the most significant contributions to the topic have come from S. P. Huntington, who advances the thesis of the clash of civilizations, and from F. Fukuyama, who proclaims the end of history. This historical evaluation of the issue of war is accompanied by an analysis of the characteristics of modern wars. The causes of modern armed conflicts only infrequently appear to be of purely economic nature, and they rather tend to reflect personal ambitions of the particular leaders, as well as the desire to spread beliefs and ideologies. While the purpose of traditional wars was to build up the state, modern wars manifest greediness, corruption and aggression that springs from the will to get richer rather than from attempts to overcome poverty. Modern wars are characterized by a certain dispersion of aggression and by significant harm suffered by non-combatants. Such wars are frequently waged by non-state actors and they manifest an asymmetric structure, which is seen in particular in the case of war against terrorism. The present situation calls for development and refinement of the just war tradition worked out throughout the history of Western philosophy. That tradition comprised both *ius ad bellum* (just cause, sovereign authority and rightful intention being the conditions that must be met by those waging a just war) and *ius in bello* (eg. condition of minimum force being used, the principle that the expected unwanted consequences of aggression must not outscore its expected positive results, and the principle that armed force and violence are to be directed only against those who are the immediate object of the attack). It was stressed within that tradition that war must not be an act of revenge and that its good results must be greater than the evil that it is to remove. Thus it should be always considered whether all possible attempts at applying peaceful solutions have been made, having proved impossible to execute. Another point to consider is if there exists a real chance of a military success. Referring to the just war tradition, the late Pope John Paul II added that the right to self-defense should be restricted and he pointed that the principle of proportionality should be applied whenever recourse to armed force is made. However, since all these conditions have been subject to diverse interpretations two postulates can be made. Firstly, soldiers should be educated so as to develop virtues such as fortitude, obedience and ability of decision taking, side by side with moral integrity. The fundamental virtue that a soldier should exhibit is the attitude of sacrifice, in which he should follow the ideal of the good knight's code of honour. Secondly, total condemnation of war is impossible, since it would generate a spreading of unpunished cynical and irresponsible aggression in international relations. One must simultaneously remember that the difficulty in the moral appreciation of a given war springs from the difficulty in defining justice itself (like goodness or truth, this concept does not come from man,

but from God, and man is incapable of providing its exhaustive definition). According to a tentative definition, justice involves acting for the sake of the good of man. Thus the term "just war" should be used as a metaphor, and not understood literally. In fact, a war is unjust whenever it brings about the suffering of at least one innocent person, no matter whether this suffering is caused by the aggressor or by the self-defending army. As it is practically impossible to avoid this kind of suffering in any war, one cannot speak of just war in this sense. Justness is possible to define only in relation to the participation in war: a nation has a moral right to self-defence if it has been attacked. However, although it is not always the case that the side that first makes recourse to the armed force deserves condemnation, there is enormous difficulty in evaluating preemptive wars. All these are reasons why the UN Charter, while stating that war is always evil, realistically allows it and accepts the principle of the lesser evil.

Fr. Jerzy Bajda in turn reflects on the theme of peace as it developed in the moral teaching of the Holy Father John Paul II, expressed in his Messages for the International Day of Peace which always reflected the political, economic and cultural situation changing in the world throughout the last twenty five years. In time John Paul II's Messages gained a truly universal appeal. The late Pope considered in them moral, legal, cultural and religious dimensions of peace, always stressing that the human person and the human community are the ultimate goal of any action. John Paul II always proclaimed respect for freedom and opposed the ambiguity of this concept in modern culture. Peace was seen by him as the dynamism of human free will directed by reason and led towards the common good which is to be reached in truth, in justice and in love. The ethos of peace, the Holy Father would say, involves respect for human conscience. Another condition of peace is universal respect for justice. Individual morality does not suffice for peace to take over, as peace, although arising in the human heart, must be built into a polity. This, in turn, involves free participation of human persons in the political structures of their state. This basic human right to participation is refused in totalitarian systems. A crucial element of the culture of peace is respect for religious freedom. On the other hand, poverty is a threat to this culture. The crucial issue here is that respect for human rights, which is a condition of genuine peace, involves respect for the human dignity. This is the critical point where philosophy of law meets theology of law. Human rights must not be interpreted in the light of legal positivism, but in the light of the Christian conception of natural law. All the human rights should be protected with equal force as none of them will be protected if a single one is not. John Paul II's Messages for the World Day of Peace also demonstrate his deep theological insight. The late Pope stressed the necessity of conversion and of adopting the attitude of solidarity. He pointed that man was called to live in peace with all creation and must respect its laws. John Paul II's 25th Message has the character of a summing up: the Pope once again spoke of the role of prayer for peace, of the significance of peace for the ecumenical dialogue, of forgiveness and reconciliation, and of the indispensable role that the Catholic Church plays in strengthening world peace.

The succeeding section is entitled *Can War Be Justified Today?*

George Weigel observes that Catholics seem to have forgotten, during the last forty years, the distinctive way in which they had thought about world politics for centuries. Retrieving and renewing what was once called "Catholic international relations theory" could result in a wiser dialogue. That theory, first forged by Augustine in *De Civitate Dei*, and by Aquinas in his commentaries on ethics and politics, the *De Regimine Principum* and the relevant sections of the *Summa Theologiae*, was refined by theologians such as de Vitoria and Suárez in the Counter-Reformation period, and was further developed by the twentieth-century papal magisterium during the pontificates of Pius XII and John XXIII. This basic stance toward politics was itself built on more fundamental Catholic moral-theological convictions: that mankind is not "totally depraved," as some Reformation traditions taught; that society is a natural reality; that governance has a positive, not merely punitive or coercive, function; that political community is a good in its own right, an expression of the sociability that is part of the God-given texture of the human condition.

Politics, the Catholic tradition of moral realism insisted, always engages questions of virtue, questions of how we ought to live together. Second, the Catholic tradition taught a classic understanding of power: power is the capacity to achieve a corporate purpose for the common good. Third, the Catholic tradition had a distinctive understanding of peace: the peace of political community, in which order, law, freedom, and just structures of governance advance the common good in ways that lead communities toward that *caritas* that is their most proper and noble end. In the world of today the Catholic theory of international relations must face some new challenges, such as the change of the political situation in the world since the second world war, emergence of new actors in world politics despite the enduring reality of the nation-state system, the troubled state of the existing international organizations, antidemocratic (and often anti-Catholic) bias in regional associations such as the European Union, judicial activism and ideological bias in international legal institutions. These challenges simultaneously set the priorities for the intellectual development of the Catholic theory of international relations. Among them are developing an understanding of the relationship between “hard power” and “soft power,” reflection on various uses of armed force (against the thesis that the first use is always morally evil), verification of the “presumption against war,” critical evaluation of contemporary international and legal organizations, reexamination of the question of what constitutes “aggression underway,” and evaluation of the moral status of the UN system. Another reality of the contemporary world with which a reexamined and refined just war tradition would have to wrestle is the fact that precision-guided munitions and other forms of high-tech weaponry now make it more likely that a responsible country can use military force in ways that satisfy the *in bello* just war criteria of no-more-force-than-necessary and noncombatant immunity. Refining Catholic thinking on these questions is essential to the revitalization of Catholic international relations theory.

James Turner Johnson presents extensive analysis of the development of just war tradition from the Middle Ages up to the present times. Originally created within the theory of politics, just war tradition held that for a resort to the sword to be justified it must be on the authority of a sovereign, for a just cause rightly defined, and for a right intention, which included both avoidance of evil intentions and the positive aim of securing peace, conceived of as *tranquillitas ordinis*, tranquility of a just political order. Although this tradition, started by Augustine and developed by Thomas Aquinas, was continued in the early modern age, from the middle of the 17th century through the middle of the 20th creative religious efforts to think through its meaning and implications have ranged from occasional to notably lacking. The past forty years have brought a recovery of the idea of just war in Christian ethical discourse, and this has invigorated a larger engagement with the just war idea in policy debate, in the military sphere, in philosophical thought and in dialogue between moral reflection and international law. However, in much of this debate, also in recent Catholic thought, important elements of the connection with the earlier tradition, the idea of just war in its classic form, have been lost. A line of interpretation has developed stressing the inherent immorality of contemporary war and influenced well-intentioned but rather utopian investment in the United Nations system. Thus Catholic moral theology needs to reestablish the connection with the broader and deeper war tradition, and especially with the form given that tradition in the classic period of its development. Reflective engagement with the tradition of the Church is an essential element of the Catholic way to theological and moral clarity. It is important for the broader contemporary just war debate for Catholic moral and theological thought to reconnect with this normative tradition and to use that connection to advance and enrich the debate. The context of the classic tradition sheds new light on the problem of the so-called modern “presumption against war.” The phrase itself was invented and popularized by the US Catholic bishops. As a result, the function of the just war criteria was redefined as only to overturn this presumption in special cases. What is more, recently invented prudential criteria concerning justness of war are treated as if they deserved primary importance. In contrast to the traditional Catholic conception of the political community recent Catholic thought on war often treats the

state as a locus of injustice and the goals of particular states as inherently at odds with the achievement of common human goals. Instead, an internationalism defined in terms of the UN system is proposed as the best means to those common goals. Thus, the four particular challenges that are to be met in recovering the classic just war tradition for moral reflection, policy and action regarding the use of armed force today are the following: 1. to recover the moral element in the classic just war conception of sovereign authority: the conception of sovereignty as responsibility for the common good. 2. to examine in depth what should count as just cause for use of force in the contemporary context. 3. to examine closely and weigh carefully the question of right intention in any use of armed force. 4. to confront realistically the face of contemporary war, which involves civil wars, uses of force by non-state actors, and massive harm to the innocent. However, it must not be overlooked that in the recent use of armed force to remove the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, the United States, and to an important degree also the British, have channeled high technology in ways that allow war to be fought according to the actual principles of the just war *ius in bello*: this includes avoidance of direct, intended harm to noncombatants and avoidance of disproportionate harm in the use of otherwise justified means of war.

Maj. Gen. Bolesław Balcerowicz presents a characterization of modern wars. The symptomatic mark of modern times is general transformation taking place in all spheres of life, which affects also the perception of international security, as well as the causes, goals, means and methods of waging a war. The turning point that brought about this new situation was by no means the date of 11 September 2001, but rather the post-cold war international order. The present conceptual ambiguities concerning the proposed definitions of war are merely reflection of the various attitudes adopted by particular opinion shaping centres. As a result of these ambiguities, the notion of armed violence itself has also become unclear. However, despite this blurred picture, one can distinguish some tendencies in the present development of the form of armed conflicts. Firstly, they are no longer conflicts between world powers. These have been largely replaced by internal state conflicts which exhibit a tendency to reach an international level. The source of such conflicts is frequently dissolution of a state or dissolution of the government in a given state (in the case of the so-called fallen states or falling states). Also the geographical location of conflicts has changed and it is no longer Europe, but rather Africa, Asia and Latin America. The first Gulf War is often called the first "new war," as it was then that the newest technological advancements were applied for the first time, leading to the information advantage that allowed highly accurate attacks, which in turn limited the casualties and losses also on the part of the enemy. Another new aspect of wars is their purpose: the war in Kosovo in Yugoslavia was the first instance of war to safeguard human rights. Globalization, too, affects the shape of modern conflicts. One can speak of a twofold influence of the processes of globalization on the world order, involving both integration and disintegration, the latter frequently resulting in armed conflicts. Novelties can be observed also in the ways wars are financed in modern times. Degeneration of the modern ethos of war can be in turn seen in the ways wars have become a subject of media coverage, but above all in the practices of genocide or ethnic cleansing to which actors of war frequently make recourse. As far as the prognoses concerning the shape of wars in the future are concerned, one cannot speak of a linear development of war, as such opinion would amount to accepting simplistic determinism and to absolutizing the development factor. Although the Clausewitzian paradigm of victory through destruction has been overcome, speaking of virtual wars, of infowars or cyberwars is still premature. A certain clue as to what future wars will be like was offered together with the theory of civilization waves proposed by A. Toffler and H. Toffler. According to these authors, the world is divided between three fundamentally different co-existing, but competing civilizations, symbolized respectively by the hoe, the assembly line and the computer. In the light of this theory, the fact that new forms of war have appeared does not involve disappearance of the previous forms of war. Another conception of modern war, based on the theory of the clash of civilizations advanced by S. Huntington, refers to a potential renaissance of the ideologies competing in the world only to

generate its further divisions. This theory sees wars as religious crusades. An interestingly pragmatic standpoint is held by F. Heisbourg, who holds that within the next twenty five years the world will face: 1. wars started by villain states and directed against western democracies, 2. wars of succession, 3. wars that aim at destabilization of the world order (by means of acts of terrorism and destruction of information and finance flows), 4. classic wars in which the goals, however, will be pursued by means the 21st century methods. Beside the above, one should point to another category, namely, wars which are in fact instances of armed intervention and either have a United Nations sanction or are started by a developed and powerful state in order to safeguard its interests. Sometimes such wars will be started for humanitarian reasons. One can expect that in the closest future Poland is likely to participate in the military interventions of the latter kind.

Michael Novak reflects on the present concerns resulting from asymmetrical warfare and the recurrent use of clandestine terror by referring to the just war tradition that sprang from a twofold insight by St. Augustine which includes both *ad bellum* considerations and *in bello* considerations. According to St. Augustine, just war is a normal instrument of statecraft, in pursuit of noble ends and in fulfillment of necessary duties. Among these noble duties one can point to defense of one's own nation, or of another nation under unjust attack, to restoration of the international order so that the rule of law and the protection of the rights of people can flourish, and to punishing terrorists and others who destroy civil order or employ violence to drive peoples apart. Justice sometimes requires that a nation go to war. The so-called modern presumption against war is not only fraught with historical and methodological difficulties, but it is also theologically dubious. The just war tradition does not begin with a presumption against war, but with the presumption that the protection of international order in every generation is likely to require either going to war for the sake of restoring justice, or (better) at least the intimidating and well-honed capacity to fight just wars successfully, in order to prevent them in advance. Non-state actors are not the only new factor in our present perplexity. So also are technological developments in weapons of devastation, and in the miniature proportions in which great destructive capacity can now be packaged. Moreover, the kind of evidence available for judging the imminence of an aggressive attack by asymmetrical forces is no longer as it was in the days of great standing armies and their vast quantities of war-making equipment. The problem of legitimacy of the present Iraq war involves the issue of how to achieve a legitimate and working government in Iraq after the war. As Islamism is an ideology of total centralized control of the whole of life, both public and private, political and cultural, outward and inward, and its aim is total submission, it would be a grave error to turn self-governance over to Iraqis until it was certain that sufficient checks-and-balances were in place so that no one faction could seize total control over everybody and everything.

The next articles address the problem of The Moral Evil Of War.

Wojciech Chudy describes the close connection between war and deceit. War, being an aspect of politics, can be perceived in many ways, and one can speak of its irrational, psychological and economic grounds. According to the classic tradition, however, waging a war is in itself just whenever it results from the attitude of opposition towards a violation of justice. Thus the truthfulness or justness of war consists in restoration of both the internal order within a given state and the order of justice in the international relationships. In the light of this tradition, the decision that a nation should go to war is in certain situations the duty of those who govern. Since the times of St. Thomas Aquinas a certain evolution of the face of war can be observed. It consists in a certain democratization of war: in its mass character, as well as in its close bond with the world of current politics. Wars of the present age are conducted by means which involve omnipresence of the media, as well as recourse to the newest technological and organizational advancements. These changes, however, are accompanied by a growing savagery of wars, which often lead to genocide. Deceits as instruments of war result from the fact that information policy has entered war waging both in relation to one's own nation and in relation to the enemy. Thus wars involve recourse to lies of various kinds: lies told for the sake of propaganda, for the sake of a better defence, for ideological

reasons, often to overestimate the possibilities of one's army. Such lies may concern the causes of the conflict in question or the alliances of the state has entered. The intensity of deceit and the number of the acts of disinformation tend to grow during the course of war, also in the expression of the intention of peace. In the case of any war, lies are told primarily by those in power, by those who possess information, by experts or spokesmen (who are in a way liars by profession), by government members and by army leaders. One can say that deceit constitutes the principle on which modern war is waged. Also the pacifist ideologies, which become active during wars by questioning the right to self-defence, are sources of deceit that jeopardizes the nation's right to sovereignty, the universal right to safety and to information. As opposed to this negative aspect of war (namely, its deceitful nature), a positive axiology of war embraces the ethos of the soldier and the rights of the attacked nations and people. On the whole, however, war always appears to be deceit towards the human nature and towards the essence of human culture.

Rocco Buttiglione starts his reflection with the observation that war is a phenomenon that has always accompanied mankind. Thus, to the science of politics, the dogma of the primordial sin appears to be a certainty that helps explain the course of human civilization. According to the Christian realism, peace is a gift from God, and as such, it can be carried through on earth with the collaboration of people: although the Kingdom of God is not from this world, it is already present on earth in a hidden form. Despite the fact that the tendency to do violence is unchangeable, the forms it assumes have changed in history. War, as opposed to other forms of violence, was defined by Clausewitz as an act of physical violence which aims at forced acceptance of one's will by one's enemy. (In history, however, one can observe a tendency to limit the scope of violence and to replace its forms which directly abuse human dignity and life by such forms of it that are more suitable for the development of interhuman dialogue). The content of the will that is to be forced on the enemy can also vary - that is why one can distinguish, for instance, aggressive wars, as opposed to wars waged in self-defense. Also the form of the will that is being forced on the enemy can vary: in certain cases it is the demand that the enemy state affirm the law it has not observed so far, as was the case with imperial wars. However, together with the French Revolution, a new type of war originated: the war that was to end all wars, whose aim was not subordination, but destruction of the enemy, followed by the appropriation of his territory and resources. Thus war became a tool of strengthening national power, and as such, a natural state of international affairs. Peace was in that context merely a suspension of war, which could be seen in the case of the twentieth century wars. Such an attitude to war manifests a certain conception of the state and culture: the state refuses to accept any institution above itself, and by incorporating the Church into its structures becomes a god on earth. It subordinates art, which then becomes propaganda, and philosophy, which transforms into an ideology serving the civilizational mission of one nation. The invention of nuclear weapons was the climax of that conception of war and it at the same time ended that current of history, as armed conflict became too high a risk to take. In the modern age enemies strive to realize their will mainly by way of accepting common legal norms and avoid any recourse to violence. This, however, puts poorer states in a difficult political situation, as they have to look for allies among world powers. The end of the cold war calls for new structures of conflict control and ways of enforcing respect for the international laws. Certain clues have been offered in this respect by Pope John Paul II, who in his encyclical *Centesimus Annus* expressed the hope that the present course of history will eventually lead to the abandonment of war as the tool of conflict solving. The late Pope, an ardent follower of Christian realism, also pointed out that since courts of justice largely succeeded in eliminating private violence, international structures can work for the sake of controlling wars in the world, by preventing their outbreaks and reducing their scope.

The next section of the volume bears the title *Biblical Visions of War and Peace*.

Fr. Antoni Tronina looks into the Scriptures to seek for the explanation of the problems of war and peace in their historical and cultural complexity. This attempt at a reconstruction of the biblical message on questions of war and peace is preceded by a consideration of two methods

that can be applied for that purpose, namely, the philological one, which consists in analysis of the Hebrew concepts of war and peace, and the critical one, which seeks to find the explanation of current problems in the Word of the Scripture. However, in order to avoid both getting closed in the past and misinterpretation of the Scripture by referring it merely to the modernity, both methods should be used in combination. The presentation of biblical peace conceived of as the fullness of life, and the relationship between peace and conversion, as seen in the writings of the prophets, is aimed at pointing to the development of the reflection of the inspired authors and also at a description of the characteristics of biblical peace. Peace is not a central concept in the Hebrew Bible, as it gains centrality only in the New Testament. Firstly, in the Bible, peace is always associated with religious experience in the centre of which is not absence of war, but God and the salvation of man. The maturing of the conception of peace in the Old Testament is an important methodological clue for modern Christian reflection. Secondly, in the Old Testament, peace is a complex reality which concerns all the domains of human existence and embraces the entire cosmos. A lack of harmony in a single sphere of life means that the cosmic order is violated. True peace cannot spring from one sphere of life only, at the cost of others. Thus violence can be overcome in an action that takes place simultaneously on many levels, embracing the social, political and religious structures. Thirdly, peace involves conversion in every sphere of existence, and not a merely political transformation. It largely depends on the teaching and attitudes of the prophets and educators. Fourthly, according to the Bible, peace is the ultimate, eschatological reality and cannot be reduced to any form of its earthly implementation. Out of the two biblical descriptions: "Yahweh is a warrior" (Ex 15:3) and "Yahweh - peace" (Jg 6:24), the latter one gradually gains predominance in the course of the theological reflection of the Old Testament. Its fullness is in turn revealed only in Jesus Christ and in his saving work: "He is the peace between us" (Ep 2:14).

Hubert Ordon, SDS, presents an analysis of *The Sermon on the Mount* (cf. Mt 5-7), which constitutes a breakthrough in the Old Testament law of talion. The Christian insight into the sources of the threats to the human heart shows that they are generated by pride and despise for the weaker ones, by hatred and the will of retaliation, by unstoppable desire for power and riches, carried through at the cost of others. Yet, in the teaching of Jesus Christ, Christians find a way that eventually leads to understanding and reconciliation. The basic significance of *The Sermon on the Mount* lies in the two antithetic formulations which concern respectively the Old Testament law of talion (Mt 5:37-42) and the commandment of love of one's enemies (Mt 5:37.42). These formulations are juxtaposed against the notion that is superior to both of them. *The Sermon on the Mount* is frequently referred to as the constitution of the People of God. However, although the formulations "You have heard how it was said" and "But I say this to you" might suggest that Christ annulled the chosen regulations of the Torah, this is not the case. On the contrary, Christ's words bring the genuine reading of the Law, its deeper understanding that better corresponds to the original intention of God. The new norm introduced by Jesus involved not only abandonment of retaliation and violence, but also acceptance of the postulate to respond to wickedness with goodness and to refuse to subordinate oneself to evil. The novel character of the commandment of love of one's enemies lay in its absolute character, while ancient Israel did not recognize the duty to assume the attitude of love towards those who remained outside its area. Thus the commandment of love was radical in its introduction of the new scope of the notion of "neighbour." Jesus stressed that God's love constitutes the perfect pattern and the proper source of true love. His teaching transgresses any natural moral attitude which can at best reflect prudence and the ideals of humanism. Therefore, it might appear difficult to grasp and it can be rejected on the grounds of being supposedly unrealistic. Yet human history shows that despite the apparent impossibility of implementing this vision, the key to its realization is the inner peace of the human heart which overcomes evil and sin.

The succeeding section is entitled *Images of War* and it includes articles on the visions of war in art and literature.

Bożena Fabiani discusses the drawings and paintings by Francisco Goya y Lucientes in which the artist depicts scenes he witnessed during the brutal guerilla war that accompanied the Peninsular War between France and Spain of 1808. The works in question present disturbing scenes of horror, brutality, torture and the savagery of war. It is noteworthy that they originated from the artist's inner need to show massive destruction that war entails. Their artistic novelty lies in the subject matter: the artist no longer continues the tradition of depicting battle fields or marching armies, but concentrates on a realistic presentation of individual human pain, suffering and degeneration. The discussed works include *The Uprising of May 2, 1808; Execution of the Partisans on May 3, 1808; The Colossus* and *Portrait of Ferdinand VII*, and also the drawings *The Way Is Hard, I Saw This, And That Too, Barbarians, This Is Not to Be Looked At*, from the series: *Disasters of War*.

Maciej Nowak analyzes the vision of war as it is presented in the novel *Przemija postać świata* [So Passes the Shape of the World] by Hanna Malewska. Published in 1954, the novel is concerned with the ultimate decline of the Roman Empire in Italy in the 6th century AD. The author presents the relationships between the images of destruction depicted in the novel and the war experiences of Malewska and other writers (M. Białoszewski, B. Korzeniowski) from the period 1939-1945. Those experiences, as the author holds, proved to have a crucial significance for the understanding of history in the post-war Polish literature. In this respect Malewska's output is close to that of such authors as Cz. Miłosz, J. Stempowski and Wł. Odojewski, who also identified history with destruction. Malewska, however, differs from the other authors in that she exhibits an element of hope which is rooted in her religious faith.

Tomasz Garbol analyzes the vision of war as it appears in the literary output of J. R. R. Tolkien. The logic of war, expressing the temptation of power, is opposed to the logic of charity. In the face of war, charity turns out the only way to fight evil and to save the world, and those who have accepted the logic of the heart must also accept uncertainty which eventually leads to faithfulness and hope. The logic of war is predictable. He who starts a war sets its terms which inherently reflect the desire for power. Starting a war expresses dissent from the existing world order and above all denial of mortality. The desire for power is pervaded with the striving for immortality. War is also a consequence of the downfall. However, participation in a war is not itself morally dubious to Tolkien. It is sometimes the duty one must accept in order to find eternal peace of mind. A fatal attitude, however, is submission to the logic of war. Participation in war is justified as long as it retains faithfulness to the logic of charity. Although war is justified by the necessity to defend the primeval order of creation, its defence must not transgress certain limits and it must not involve recourse to the methods used by those who have surrendered to the temptation of power. This is an absolute condition and it must not be violated even if one is certain about the rightness of one's intentions, even if the price is the ultimate downfall of the values for which one is fighting. Although Tolkien used to be considered a pacifist, his attitude towards war combined readiness to recognize inevitability of war in the case of defence of the basic values, and a critical approach resulting from the fact that war is a tool of violence and expression of the desire for power. The sources of this realism, of its sober evaluation of the reality, of its recognition of human weaknesses, and of its affirmation of human freedom combined with a radical renunciation of the desire for power, can be traced to Christianity.

The next section is entitled *The Word Confirmed by the Life* and it is concerned with Father Professor Tadeusz Styczeń's 50th Jubilee of the Priesthood. The section opens with a short introduction which is followed by the homily by Andrzej Urbański, SDS, Superior General of the Society of the Divine Saviour, delivered during the Holy Mass to celebrate Fr. Tadeusz Styczeń's Jubilee. In his homily, Father Urbański thanks God for the gift of Father Styczeń's priesthood and speaks about the value of the sacramental priesthood which serves the priesthood

of all the faithful. Father Urbański then speaks about the particular way in which Father Tadeusz's priesthood is realized and which, apart from pastoral ministry, involves advancing moral philosophy, as well as popularizing the thought of his mentor the late Holy Father John Paul II. Father Urbański also points that Father Tadeusz is in a special way committed to the realization of the Salvatorian charism of the defence of life, thus becoming *lux mundi*. Father Urbański's homily is followed by two articles. Jarosław Merecki, SDS, presents an extensive biography of Father Tadeusz Styczeń and delineates the main areas of his academic interests, while Wojciech Chudy writes about the influence of Card. Karol Wojtyła and later Pope John Paul II on the shaping of Father Styczeń's academic profile and on his activity, which eventually led to the foundation of the John Paul II's Institute at the Catholic University in Lublin.

The section *Thinking about the Fatherland...* includes Kazimierz Braun's essay on Tymon Terlecki, a theatre critic, but also an analyst, commentator and editor concerned with literature, theatre, philosophy, culture and politics, who joined the Polish immigration after 1945.

In the section *Notes and Reviews* Krzysztof Dybciak reviews D. Heck's "*Bez znaku, bez śladu, bez słowa.*" *W kręgu problemów duchowości we współczesnej literaturze polskiej* ["Without a sign, without a trace, without a word." *Within the Circle of the Problem of Spirituality in Modern Polish Literature*], Jan Kłos reviews M. Novak's *The Universal Hunger for Liberty. Why the Clash of Civilizations Is Not Inevitable*, Andrzej Tarczyński reflects on Fr. J. Mariański's *Kościół katolicki w Polsce a życie społeczne* and Marcin Lachowski presents the Gallery of Modern Sacred Art in Kielce.

The section concludes with the *Proposals of the Ethos*.

The section *Reports* comprises Magdalena Arnold's report on The 47th Philosophical Week "The Labyrinths of Philosophical Education."

In the section *Through the Prism of the Ethos* Wojciech Chudy presents a feuilleton on the twenty fifth anniversary of the "Solidarity."

The volume concludes with a *Bibliography* of John Paul II's addresses on war and peace (by Tomasz Górka and Beata Bogusz) and *Notes about the Authors*.

Summarized by *Dorota Chabrajska*