

## **Is War Ever Just, Necessary, or Inevitable?**

**Thomas R. Beall**

Good evening. I want to thank Nancy, Jan and the members of East Bay Citizens for Peace for affording me the opportunity to speak to you. I must confess that I have come here with a feeling of trepidation. As a career naval officer, it was my duty to support the lawfully elected government of the United States, support government policies, and obey lawful orders. While I am under no such legal obligation now, old habits are hard to break. At the same time, in questioning American militarism, which I am now doing and which I will ask you to do tonight, I open myself up to the criticism of failing to support the troops and of being unpatriotic. Such criticism would be hard to take, even as I know it would be unjustified. I served with many good people during my military career. To this day I regard the United States Navy as one of America's greatest institutions because it is the sum of the men and women who serve in it; sailors who at this moment practice the Navy's core values of honor, courage, and commitment in the four corners of the Earth. I wish to do nothing to harm or dishonor my former shipmates.

So why am I here? I am here because over the years, and particularly since 9 / 11, I have come to disagree with those, like President Obama, who, while recognizing the evils of war, believe that (quoting the President), "We must begin by acknowledging the hard truth: We will not eradicate violent conflict in our lifetimes. There will be times when nations -- acting individually or in concert -- will find the use of force not only necessary but morally justified."<sup>1</sup>

Unlike the President, I no longer believe that war is ever just, necessary, or inevitable. I alone, however, won't put an end to it. All I can do is what the members of East Bay Citizens for Peace have been doing for seven years and what those of you who agree with me can do today: bear witness to our beliefs and promote a meaningful dialog that might lead to a more

peaceful approach to world affairs. Far from failing to support the troops, such advocacy honors them because advocacy is an American core value, one which I served to uphold and which they serve to uphold today.

So, who am I? I am a master of the science and art of war – literally. In addition to a career in military service, I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in military history, a Master of Science degree in military operations research and a Master of Arts degree in national security and strategic studies. Like most career officers, I have studied the history of warfare, the science of battle, and the politics of the national security state. I have read the great military theorists, including von Clausewitz and Sun Tzu, written about Alfred Thayer Mahan, and have had published my own research on the mathematical modeling of naval combat. I am grounded in the theory of war and, as a naval commander, skilled in its practice. I am, therefore, both a scholar and master practitioner of death and destruction. This may not have been the most uplifting education but it has prepared me to question a paradigm virtually unchallenged in history – that theory of human affairs which states:

1. War, if practiced in accordance with certain broadly accepted rules, can be a just, even a noble endeavor.
2. War is practiced by just nations in self-defense and, therefore, is a necessary evil.
3. War is inevitable.
4. True peace, among all men and nations, founded on love, compassion, respect, and a profound sense of community is impractical and only embraced by un-pragmatic and foolish dreamers.

I have come to believe that this theory is false and that mankind *can* embrace a different path – one on which (paraphrasing journalist and theologian Chris Hedges) we put aside the myth of

war as a force that gives us meaning and begin to build what the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. called the beloved community on earth. This sounds awfully idealistic but, just as human history is littered with the folly of war, so it is also filled with examples of humanity's efforts to seek a better, more just community – literally peace for all mankind. In fact, human history is a struggle between these conflicting views of man's destiny. Perhaps this is the true battle between good and evil. How that battle is finally resolved has been and always will be up to us.

---

Those who would call me a foolish dreamer might consider reading Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The Homeric epics, the literary foundations of Western Civilization, speak to us across the centuries of the utter folly and futility of war and of the promise of peace. Achilles, the hero of the *Iliad*, is motivated by a vain lust for glory, honor for his military prowess, and vengeance – and by nothing else. The opening lines of the poem say it all (1:1 – 5):

*Rage – Goddess, sing the rage of Peleus' son Achilles,  
murderous, doomed, that cost the Achaeans countless losses,  
hurling down to the House of Death so many sturdy souls,  
great fighters' souls, but made their bodies carrion,  
feasts for the dogs and birds...<sup>ii</sup>*

Achilles and his fellow Greeks brutally kill their enemies and ultimately destroy the City of Troy, the archetype of the Greek city-state. In other words, they destroy human civilization as they know it – all for a lust for glory, revenge, and booty.

The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, bloody as it is, offers a promise of peace. Odysseus, whose Trojan Horse led to the downfall of Troy, is condemned to years of wandering and many trials before he can truly come home. As Chris Hedges writes in his book War is a Force That Gives

Us Meaning, this odyssey is a metaphor for the personal journey all soldiers must take to transform themselves from warriors into civilized men once their wars are over.<sup>iii</sup> Odysseus' goal is not glory but a peaceful death among those he loves (11: 153 – 156):

*And at last your own death will steal upon you...  
a gentle, painless death, far from the sea it comes  
to take you down, borne down with the years in ripe old age  
with all your people there in blessed peace around you.<sup>iv</sup>*

Having portrayed the reality of war in the *Iliad*, Homer offers us the promise of peace in the *Odyssey*. Together, his stories set the stage for competing visions of mankind's destiny, one of war and the other of peace, that preoccupy us to this day.

Unfortunately, our civilization has often disregarded Homer's cautionary tales mainly because, over the centuries, we have convinced ourselves that wars, particularly so-called just wars conducted ostensibly in self defense, are an inevitable part of the human condition and even necessary to human development. Rather than work actively for the eradication of war and the establishment of a just peace on Earth, we have institutionalized war in our laws, in our communities, and in our lives. To prove this to yourself, all you need do is examine employment statistics for Rhode Island. Defense and defense-related jobs account for over 7% of employment in the state's manufacturing sector and as much as 50% of the state's manufacturing wage base.<sup>v</sup> Even as jobs are lost throughout our state during the current recession, the Naval Undersea Warfare Center in Newport is expanding. Like most regions of our country, loss of the defense industry would have a very detrimental economic impact on our state and its citizens – in other words, you and me. We can't do without the defense industry because it has become an

integral and essential part of our livelihoods and, hence, our lives and our society. We are addicted to the industry and infrastructure of war and, hence, to war itself.

How did this happen? How did we turn away from Homer's portrayal of the reality and consequences of war? How did we institutionalize human conflict to such an extent that we are addicted to it? And how can we break the cycle of addiction?

It happened because we fooled ourselves into thinking that war is necessary, inevitable, and, when practiced by a just people, is a just act. This myth of necessary, inevitable, and even just war goes back to ancient times, almost to Homer's day. The ancient Athenians fought wars of imperial conquest under the pretext of enhancing their security by spreading democratic ideals (sound familiar?). Alexander the Great justified his war of choice on the Persian Empire by old arguments of Greek self-defense and by dreams of a peaceful world kingdom founded on Greek civilization. Finally, the great Roman emperor Caesar Augustus, who is justly credited with establishing the centuries-long *Pax Romana*, did so only as an afterthought, justifying a war that was little more than a naked power grab as necessary to bring peace and reestablish civil order. In this he succeeded but at the cost of a civil war that ravaged the ancient Roman aristocracy, laid waste to large portions of the civilized world, and nearly destroyed the fabric of ancient society.

While in the ancient world, wars were often justified as the means to spread or sustain civilization, Christian theorists developed a more insidious justification founded on their reading of early Christian theologians such as Saint Augustine of Hippo. According to these theorists, what matters is not so much the act but the motivation behind the act. Even though Christ enjoined his followers to "turn the other cheek" in response to being struck, Christians need not take this literally. Killing, when commanded by God or by a legitimate ruler who is carrying out

God's intent to restrain evil on Earth, is justified.<sup>vi</sup> This theory of just war sanctioned by God is gained traction as justification for the Christian crusades to the Holy Land in the High Middle Ages. At that time, Gratian of Bologna theorized that:

*The subordination of the individual to God allows (one) to resolve the apparent contradiction between war service and the precepts of the gospel, because...this subordination appears in man's intent rather than in his deeds. The demands of the gospel which apparently tell against war service relate to the 'preparation of the heart'...Wrongful individual conduct makes war service into sin: for example, a wrong motive such as hatred, or selfish behavior arising from greed for booty. Conversely, war service which seeks not personal advantage, but the good of the political community, is deserving of the highest praise.<sup>vii</sup>*

This concept that fighting for a just, God-sanctioned cause is praiseworthy was further refined by St. Thomas Aquinas into the Theory of Just War that is currently enshrined in international law and the United Nations Charter. The concept of just war is a logical theory embraced by people of good will and righteous conviction for centuries. I have embraced it and so have many of you.

And yet, I think you can guess where the logic of the theory breaks down. Since God very seldom offers guidance or direction on which wars we should fight and which we should not, it is left to men to make these decisions. Oliver Cromwell, Louis XIV, Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Hitler – our history is littered with leaders who spoke of a mandate from God to wage war, acting with justice to eradicate an evil they stated was offensive to God. Their peoples were convinced too – else they would not have kept their leaders in power. As David Hume said in 1740:

*When our own nation is at war with any other, we detest (the enemy) under the character of cruel, perfidious, unjust and violent: But always esteem ourselves and allies equitable, moderate, and merciful.<sup>viii</sup>*

Or, in a more modern context, we easily convinced ourselves that the 9/11 bombings in New York and Washington were evil but “shock and awe” perpetrated on the people of Baghdad was an act of justice.

Just War Theory founded on self-defense against evil aggression, which Western leaders have used to justify their own aggression for centuries, which President Bush used to justify the war of choice in Iraq and which President Obama uses to justify war in Afghanistan is, therefore, founded on a false premise – that fallible men can be trusted to make the choice between war and peace on the basis of justice and compassion alone without any consideration of self or national interest. Recent American history demonstrates that, even in democratic societies, they cannot.

---

On reflection, I think that my own personal journey from ardent believer to one who questions the justice of American militarism began in 1992 when I was the Operations Officer of U.S.S. *Worden*, a Navy cruiser deployed to the Arabian Gulf. A Russian cruiser was also operating in the Gulf and, in the spirit of the new, friendly relations with our recent Cold War enemy, it was decided that our two ships would operate together for a period of time.

Now this Russian cruiser was of a type that was particularly feared in the U.S. Navy – a large, seemingly powerful ship loaded with weapons that could wreak havoc on our own naval forces. In fact, all of our training in the Navy in the previous thirty years had been geared toward fighting and defeating ships like this one which we had been taught was part of a fearsome and possibly superior Soviet Navy.

As my ship pulled into the port of Abu Dhabi where the Russian ship was docked, we saw her for the first time – looking as fearsome as we had expected. It was not until we tied up at the pier that we noticed that only the side in public view had been painted – the other side looked decrepit with rust streaks down the side of the ship. When we went aboard, we found that the crew shared the ship with a lot of cats – to take care of the rat problem. Much of the equipment, including the weapons and fire control systems, was of 1950's vintage and very primitive. In

other words, this ship was a paper tiger. If she represented the Russian Navy's best (and she did, else the Russian Admiralty would not have sent her alone on an Arabian Gulf deployment) then perhaps the rest of their Navy was a paper tiger too.

It is hard for me to convey how profoundly revealing this experience was. For years, we had trained to fight the Russians under the impression that they were at least as capable as we were. We believed that the United States needed a large Navy, centered on multi-billion dollar nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, atomic submarines, and cruisers and destroyers with state-of-the-art weapons and fire control systems to meet this threat. We believed that we needed to train, train, train (in the words of my first commanding officer) at sea with these ships if we were to have a hope of surviving combat toe-to-toe with the Russian bear. Now, having seen this Russian cruiser, I began to suspect that none of this was true; that the Russians were not nearly as powerful as we were; that our overwhelming military power – built at great cost – had not really been necessary to our national security. I also began to suspect that people in our own government must have known this – our intelligence services are not that inept after all.

Of course, I still believed that the Soviet Union had been an aggressive, expansionist power, even if their military was not as capable as we had been led to believe. I still believed that they might have unleashed their large army on Western Europe and their nuclear-tipped missiles on the United States to achieve their goals. I still believed that somehow they were different from us – *we* loved peace and freedom, *they* valued power and a world in which human freedom and dignity were sacrificed if they stood in the way of national goals. I still believed that the Cold War had been a necessary conflict and that our powerful conventional and nuclear forces had been a necessary check to their supposed aggressive nature. I still believed that our national security strategy, and the magnificent military that supported it, had as its ultimate goal the

eradication of Communism and the establishment of a just peace on Earth. Following 9/11, I began to question these beliefs as well.

---

In 1948, George Kennan, a Soviet expert employed by the U. S. State Department stated that the Soviet leadership believed coexistence with the United States was impossible.

*We have here a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with US there can be no permanent modus vivendi, that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life destroyed, the international authority of our state be broken if Soviet power is to be secure...Impervious to logic or reason, (the Soviet Union) is highly sensitive to the logic of force. For this reason, it can easily withdraw – and usually does – when strong resistance is encountered at any point.*<sup>ix</sup>

Kennan's thesis was very appealing to government and military leaders who mistrusted Communists in the first place and who had just witnessed the Soviet Union assert control over most of Eastern Europe following the Second World War. His thesis provided the rationale for the policy of containment which became enshrined in the United States national security strategy for the next forty years. It provided justification for massive monetary expenditures, institutionalized deficit spending, stockpiling of over 30,000 nuclear warheads, a U. S. government and military maintained in a permanent state of wartime alert, military bases and facilities in virtually every city and town of the nation – in other words it provided justification for conversion of our republic into a national security state – “a state in which nearly all aspects of political, economic, intellectual, and social life are dominated by considerations of national defense and the drive to maintain a defense establishment capable of protecting the state against all comers.”<sup>x</sup> If you don't believe that we are such a state, just consider the distribution of discretionary spending in the U.S. Government budget today. Over one-half is allocated to military and military-related programs.<sup>xi</sup>

These consequences might have been acceptable if the threat of Soviet aggression had been real and the goal of containment just. Modern research, relying on materials made available after the collapse of the Soviet Union indicates, however, that the threat was not real and that it was the American policy of containment itself that fueled the arms race of the Cold War. According to Pulitzer Prize – winning historian Neil Sheehan:

*Preventing further expansion of the Soviet Union was sound policy for the United States to follow in the postwar era, but not from motives of fantasy and in an atmosphere of fear and irrationality that could bring excesses of its own. The idea that a man as respectful of American power as Stalin was would commit his badly wounded nation to a venture as foolhardy as the attempted destruction of the United States was ludicrous, but that is what many men in Washington wanted to hear. Having just triumphed over the expansionist monster Hitler and the forces of Imperial Japan, they seemed, unconsciously, to be seeking a new monster with whom to do mortal combat. The perception of Communism as some sort of contagion that could, by almost biological means, infect and destroy society was also widespread in the United States. If Russia was a society with a profound sense of insecurity...America was equally so.<sup>xii</sup>*

If the idea that the Soviets never embraced aggression is hard to accept, consider the Cold War arms race. Throughout, it was the United States that was always first with the newest technology – the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, the intercontinental bomber, intercontinental missiles, a practical submarine-launched ballistic missile system, etc., etc. Throughout, the Soviets simply tried to keep up and did so because *they were afraid of American aggression*, and with good reason. Twice since the beginning of the nineteenth century, Russia had been invaded and nearly destroyed by a Western power. In the years after the Second World War, the United States with its atomic bombs and the means to deliver them ringed the Soviet Union with air bases and battle fleets and warned there would be no sanctuary inside Russia. Writing of the first years of his father Nikita's leadership of the Soviet Union in the 1950's, Brown University Professor Sergei Khrushchev states:

*...the Soviet Union was surrounded by U.S. military bases and their nuclear armed bombers were able to reach almost any point in the country. The United States itself was*

*invulnerable. The Soviet Union had practically no nuclear warheads and did not possess a single airplane that could, even in theory, accomplish such a mission...Father (therefore) considered national security to be of the utmost importance...The Soviet Union had to acquire arms so modern that no adversary would even dream of invading. In those years policy was carried out only from a position of strength. However, the recent war had taught Father something else: hatred of war. He genuinely sought to avoid conflict. Throughout his life he retained vivid memories of dead bodies, the fetid smell of decomposition arising from battlefields, and ruins, ruins, ruins.<sup>xiii</sup>*

I am not trying to argue that the Soviet Union was a just society, it was not. But it also was not an evil empire whose goal was to destroy our way of life by whatever means possible. Rather, it was a state seeking to defend itself. But if it was not an aggressor, then the Cold War was not a just war founded on self-defense but a war sustained in part by our own dangerous, paranoid, unrealistic understanding of the true motivations of the Soviet state.

Could this happen again? In fact, it did. We attacked Iraq in March 2003 with the expressed purpose of removing from power a dangerous aggressor who possessed weapons of mass destruction and planned to use them either himself or by putting them in the hands of terrorists who would use them against us. In fact, as suspected by many observers and analysts at the time, Saddam Hussein possessed no such weapons and only obscured that fact to protect his regime against what he perceived to be the likelihood of aggression by the United States. Again, Hussein's Iraq was by no means a just society but it also did not pose the threat we used to justify our attack. The war was not a necessary act of self-defense. It was not a just war.

Could this happen again? Consider the case of Iran, a state that we have branded as part of an "axis of evil" and which we have declared is not to be permitted to develop nuclear weapons because possession of such will destabilize the region. Consider Iran's perspective, surrounded, with an American army to the west in Iraq and to the east in Afghanistan, American military and air bases to the north and a powerful American fleet in the waters to the south. Isn't it just

possible that Iran might perceive *us* to be the aggressor? Therefore, would an assault on Iran be just?

No, not any more than the Cold War was just or our attack on Iraq was just. While we may convince ourselves that we act with justice, in truth, we go to war for, at best, coldly calculated reasons of national interest and at worst out of fear and paranoia. We have been no better at putting just war theory into practice than have powerful, aggressive states in the past.

But if the theory of just war cannot be put into practice by fallible humans, what are we left with? Simply war as Homer portrayed it – brutal, inhuman, and evil and, therefore, never an act of justice.

---

President Jimmy Carter has said that war may be a necessary evil, but no matter how necessary, it is always evil. I agree that it is always evil but is it ever necessary? Is it ever inevitable? Heinrich von Treitschke, one of the philosophical fathers of Hitler's Third Reich thought so, stating in the late nineteenth century:

*War is not just a practical necessity; it is also a theoretical necessity, an exigency of logic. The concept of the State is power...That war should ever be banished from the world is a hope not only absurd, but profoundly immoral. It would involve the atrophy of many of the essential and sublime forces of the human soul...A people which becomes attached to the... hope of perpetual peace finishes irremediably by decaying in its proud isolation...*<sup>xiv</sup>

This idea that war is a necessary and inevitable consequence of human development is not confined to totalitarian states. National security advisors in the Reagan administration believed that, “war, not peace, is the norm in international affairs,” while George W. Bush's 2002 National Security Strategy advocated preemptive war and spoke of a war on terror of uncertain duration.<sup>xv</sup> Many of my students at the Naval War College firmly believed that war is inevitable. It is this sense of inevitability that has made it so easy for us to convert our republic into a

national security state. It is what makes it so easy for us to justify the continued expenditure of vast resources on defense even as other important elements of our society enter into advanced decay. It is what makes our addiction to war possible. To end our addiction to war, we must convince ourselves that it is not inevitable.

Cynics will once again say that this is a pipe dream. “The world is a complex place,” they will argue. “We all want peace but it is not practical. You are being too simplistic.” Yet isn’t it those who make the case for war who often reduce complex situations to simplistic rhetoric? Does the statement, “Over time it's going to be important for nations to know they will be held accountable for inactivity. You're either with us or against us in the fight against terror,”<sup>xvi</sup> adequately capture the complexities of the world as it is today or is it just political rhetoric designed to get ignorant people emotionally engaged in a war they really don’t understand?

Peace advocates on the other hand respect our intelligence and appeal to our better natures in making the argument for peace. Far from being overly idealistic, many recognize the world for what it is and appeal to us to take practical steps to make it better. President John F. Kennedy did this in his famous peace speech at American University in 1963:

*First examine our attitude towards peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it is unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade; therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable, and we believe they can do it again...Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace; no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process -- a way of solving problems.<sup>xvii</sup>*

Kennedy did more than just talk. He found practical ways in which we could advance the process of peacemaking. He negotiated the first meaningful arms control treaty with the Soviet Union. He consistently resisted calls by his generals to send ground combat troops into Vietnam, and he harnessed and channeled America's competitive spirit into the peaceful Apollo Moon landing program – arguably mankind's greatest achievement. Kennedy was not perfect and his record on war and peace is mixed. But, more than any other President in modern times, he embraced a vision that war is not inevitable, that mankind is not doomed, and that there is a better path for our country to take – one founded on peaceful solutions to mankind's problems.

---

So, I have concluded that war is never just, never necessary, and not inevitable. The next step for me, the newly-minted peace advocate is to advocate. Gradually, I have been doing that and have found that many who disagree with me offer the following arguments to substantiate that sometimes war is just, necessary, and inevitable:

1. “We had to fight for our freedom from the British. Freedom isn't free.”
2. “What about the fight to end slavery in the Civil War? Would you have just stood aside and let that continue?”
3. “Have you ever heard of a man named Hitler? Would you have just stood aside and let him take over and oppress the peoples of the Earth?”

These are compelling and emotionally engaging statements because they arise from a self-image of ourselves as a just people who fight to uphold the values and principles articulated in our Declaration of Independence and not to advance our own self-interests. While I would like to believe that we are that kind of people; our history demonstrates that we are not. Further, these

statements also are founded on an interpretation of history that is certainly open to being questioned and debated. For example:

1. Yes, we did gain our independence from Britain through resort to arms. What if, however, we had chosen not to fight – a choice many Americans of that time advocated? Most of the remainder of the British Empire won its independence without fighting and many of those former colonies are prosperous, democratic societies today. Isn't it just possible that we could have enjoyed that outcome without a bloody, brutal war?
2. Further, if we had remained part of the British Empire, isn't it possible that slavery would have been outlawed in America in 1834 as it was in most of the rest of the British Empire, without a bloody and destructive civil war?
3. Finally, with regard to Hitler, many historians have traced the development of German history along the path that led to the Nazi regime. Implicit or explicit in their analyses is the argument that, at any point along that path, men and nations could have chosen a different path. As Kennedy put it, "Our problems are manmade; therefore, they can be solved by man." Hitler and Nazism need not have happened if, at some point in history, we had chosen to solve the systemic problems that led to Hitler in a different way than we did.

Of course, no one can predict the future but we can learn the lessons of the past. If we open our minds and hearts to the idea that war is not just, necessary, or inevitable, we can better ask ourselves how it could have been avoided in the past; setting the stage for a conversation about how it can be avoided in the future.

---

Not long ago, I attended a workshop at Channing Memorial Church in Newport led by the Rev. Richard S. Gilbert, a Unitarian-Universalist minister and long-time social justice activist.

His example, and that of many others, has inspired me to advocate for peace even as the majority of my fellow countrymen honestly believe the wars we are fighting today are no less just, necessary, and inevitable than those great wars in our past. In the face of such overwhelming public opinion, it would be so easy for me to despair of my ability to bring about any change. As Rev. Gilbert reminded us at the workshop, however, (quoting peace activist Fr. Daniel Berrigan), “Despair is a luxury beyond my means.” Uplifted by those words and by the example of Berrigan, Gilbert, and many others, I’ve decided to advocate for peace. What I ask of you tonight is not to agree with me but merely to question whether war is ever just, necessary, or inevitable. I ask that we engage in this reflection and discussion before the next war begins. Thank you very much.

---

<sup>i</sup> Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize, Oslo, Norway, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Accessed online February 28, 2010 at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-acceptance-nobel-peace-prize>.

<sup>ii</sup> Fagles, Robert (translator, 1991). *The Iliad of Homer* (p. 1). London: The Folio Society.

<sup>iii</sup> Hedges, Chris (2002). *War is a Force That Gives Us Meaning* (p. 12). New York: Public Affairs.

<sup>iv</sup> Fagles, Robert (translator, 1996). *The Odyssey of Homer* (pp. 190 – 191). London: The Folio Society.

<sup>v</sup> Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation (2006). *The Defense Industry in Rhode Island: Economic Impact Report* (pp. 12 – 13). Downloaded 06 July 2009 from [http://www.riedc.com/files/DefInd\\_EconImpactReport\\_August2006\\_0.pdf](http://www.riedc.com/files/DefInd_EconImpactReport_August2006_0.pdf).

<sup>vi</sup> Holmes, Robert L. (2001). A time for war? Augustine's just war theory continues to guide the West. *Christianity Today Online* (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2001/septemberweb-only/9-17-55.0.html?start=1>), Sept. 2001.

<sup>vii</sup> Hehl, Ernst-Dieter (2004). War peace and the Christian order. In Luscombe, David and Riley-Smith, Jonathan (eds.). *The New Cambridge Modern History, volume IV c. 1024 – 1198, part I* (p. 220). Cambridge University Press.

<sup>viii</sup> Hume, David (1740). *A treatise on human nature*. Quoted in Hedges, Chris (2002). *War is a Force That Gives Us Meaning* (p. 1). New York: Public Affairs.

<sup>ix</sup> Cited in Sheehan, Neil (2009). *A Fiery Peace in a Cold War: Bernard Schriever and the Ultimate Weapon*. New York: Random House, p. 82.

---

<sup>x</sup> "national security state." The Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military, 2001. [Encyclopedia.com](http://www.encyclopedia.com). 23 Apr. 2010.

<sup>xi</sup> Kogan, Richard (2008). "Federal Spending, 2001-2008: Defense Is a Rapidly Growing Share of the Budget, While Domestic Appropriations Have Shrunk". Center for Budget Priorities Report accessed online 23 Apr 10 from <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=125>.

<sup>xii</sup> Sheehan, Neil (2009). A Fiery Peace in a Cold War: Bernard Schriever and the Ultimate Weapon. New York: Random House, p. 83.

<sup>xiii</sup> Khrushchev, Sergei (2000). Nikita Khrushchev and the Creation of a Superpower. University Park: Penn State University Press, p. 42.

<sup>xiv</sup> Quoted in Shirer, William L. (1995). The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich (p. 109). London: The Folio Society.

<sup>xv</sup> Bush, President George W. (2002). The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Washington: The White House, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2002. Downloaded July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 from <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/>.

<sup>xvi</sup> Statement of President George W. Bush, November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Cited in CNN article found online at <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror/>.

<sup>xvii</sup> Speech given by President John F. Kennedy at the commencement ceremonies of American University, Washington, DC, June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1963. Found at: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jfkamericanuniversityaddress.html>.