

Byron B George  
Boston College  
June 30, 2009

Lonergan and *Jus Post Bellum*

How is a war justly ended? Within the last ten years this question has haunted state leaders, military generals, political scientists, and philosophers alike. This is due in large part to the realization of the inadequacy of an intelligible response to post-combat defeated nation-states. The bellicose scourge of resentment and hostility post-combat has in large part contributed to warfare's evolution toward terrorism in the form of suicide bombers, improvised explosive devices, and other gruesome forms of violence. Given the continued evolutionary upsurge in "post-combat combat" a critical reappraisal of the means of justly ending a war is what my proposed project calls for.

The project my paper calls for is developing the notion of *reconciliative justice* to serve as the primary vehicle for *jus post bellum* criteria. This development is constructed using the thought of Bernard Lonergan. The paper first critically analyzes the post-combat environment of defeated regimes in terms of a rupture in the good of order. Given the initial analysis, the paper next argues that the primary locus of power in *jus post bellum* defeated nation state environs resides in the societal, communal, and cultural matrix; and the political as well as economic structures involved are a limited secondary locus of power. The paper's conclusion is that reconciliative justice should serve as a heuristic vehicle to restore the good of order by reviving the societal, communal, and cultural matrix that is inevitably

emaciated during warfare, thus bringing about the emergent probability of converting the social surd of war torn nation states.