

Bernard Lonergan's Authentic Moral Subjectivity and Objectivity: A Solution to the Problem of the Culture of War and Peace in the Contemporary World.

Dr. Eric Thomas Ogwora. Department of Philosophy and Religious studies. Kisii University
Mr. Paul Ondima. Department of Psychology. Kisii University
Dr. Callen Nyamwange. Department of Psychology. Kisii University
Dr. Peter O. Nyakan. Department of Education.

Abstract.

The question that underpins every act of war and its effects negates the value of life and humanity. Yet, it is true that war is not inevitable. In place of practical mercy, one can easily see the problem lies not in the action per se, but in the activity of human consciousness which motivate this kind of pervasive influences. Animals which are pure brutes are known not to go for war. This is because they don't imagine, think, reason, and conceive it at all. Human beings choose violence and war as ways of getting things reach their own scale of measure. In this pursuit, they seem to forget the faculty of moral judgment which should and ought to guide every human action. Thus, the problem of peace and war coils on the idea of moral self-rational judgment implicit in every conscious human act. It is this faculty, so to speak, that exonerates brute animals and human being in a sense that it command that every human act within and without should be mediated by meaning and motivated by objective values which are sought by authentic living of genuine attention, genuine intelligence, genuine reasonableness and finally genuine responsibility.

It is our intention in this paper to explain the cause of war in place of peace in the contemporary world. It further draws a true dichotomy between war and opposition which has been variously misunderstood. The paper offers practical solution to the state of war against peace which has dominated the contemporary global society. It highlights and explicitates how morally converted people would solve issues, even in place of opposition politically, socially, economically, and ideologically, without falling into the culture of violence which is a key to the current culture of death, of no future and of no peace. Finally, the paper suggest ways of embracing peace and solidarity which, as it will be see, begs the question to moral conversion.

Key words: Ethics of Value, Consciousness of human acts, Moral conversion, Peace and Ambience of harmony.

1.0 Introduction

Every act of conscious experience of the world portrays the world as being chaotic. This is not so because of the nature and natural phenomena, but mostly, because of pervasive human actions. There are in deed many human actions which have posed great challenges to man and they make him to live in fear of total disgrace. An example of this is the occurrence of war. There are many forms of war starting from the most ulterior to the most exterior one. One can be at war with himself, and this means he is not at peace, he can be in war with a system in place, or can be in war with others; people, nation, or continent.

Philosophy of war and peace is a vital topic to discuss in the sense that war is an existential phenomena and it is evident in the world. War can be said to be as old as humanity. Right from the beginning man's society has often been described to be at war. Just to mention, in the old testament there were different instances of war. People could fight as a nation, individual and even as territory or tribe. The choice of war as way of solving man's problem is what is at stake to philosophers, one after the other. Before I start this discursive and brainstorming paper, I would like to pose a question which will remain unanswered throughout. Do animals go for war? Is war a human act, and essential characteristic of human beings? Everybody familiar with the media will agree with me that there are many cases of war than it used to be a century ago. When you listen to people talk in streets and academic arena, one is led to think that there is an explosion within people themselves. In our own opinion, this is the worst and most difficult war to terminate.

1.2 Types of War

1.2.1 War Within Oneself (Personal War)

Man who is corporeal, possesses the soul, the mind, feeling and the will. He is made up of highly networked machinery which requires to be brought to equilibrium. He has feelings, desires, anxiety and conatus. Other than this he possesses activities which constitute his intellectual dynamic structure which guides his life. With all these activities, he thinks, reasons, reflects, makes judgment about things to be either true or false, and good or bad. Since he is the subject of all these activities, he often finds himself in war with what he knows and what he does, what is appealing to the senses and what is really good to him.

This war is set off by his conscience and the ego ideal which have to be in harmony with each other. This kind of war is not only known and explained by philosophers, but also, it is discussed by psychologists. For instance, Erik Erikson a Germany psychologist and psychologists, identified this war with the conflict that exists and has to be resolved in a healthily developing human as he passed from infancy to adulthood. If the crises in every stage are not resolved well the person will have an inner conflict in terms of his personality development. Consequently, trust and mistrust must be understood and accepted, in order for the realistic hope to emerge as a viable resolution. It is this that we call balance or equilibrium.

Sigmund Freud identified this war with the war that exists between the id, ego and superego. For him, man is always in constant war to control his repressed motivation, instincts, anxiety, wishes memories and impulses which threaten to deliberate or destabilize the individual's mind if they break into the conscious level. The mind or the ego has to maintain its tenuous balance through repression. Thus, the ego has to banish the urges of the id so that they don't continue to cause mental anguish. Hence this war is so strong and diverse and can only be resolved through realistic ways of dealing with the reality both inner psychic and external. In other words, the mind is constantly in conflict with itself, and this conflict is the primary cause of human anxiety and unhappiness. But is this not war? Authentic subjectivity of our anxiety, feeling, memories, motivation and instinct is an objective solution which is centred in self appropriation, self acceptance and self reproach.

1.2.2 War Between Two or More Parties

The second type of war, as mentioned above is the one that exists between two people, nation, two tribes and territories. From experience, there is no war that just happens by the way. In other words, every act has its cause. Thus, war is not unplanned. Before people go for war, there are a lot of deliberation that takes place as regards the reasons for it, the force to be in place before starting, and even the consequences of it all.

In the world today, there are a number of such forms of war. For instance, in Africa alone there has been war in different countries. This state has made Africa to be characterised by war and terrorism. In Kenya, there are wars going on between different ethnic groups who early on were living in harmony. The cause of war is not hard to see; it is the fight for resources such as land, cows and political dominance. Every struggle to end this war and killings have yielded just but little. The reason for this failure, as this research shows, is not contained in the approach and mechanism which has been employed, but so much related with the moral development and dynamic responsibility. People have expelled the moral values that ought to determine their action. Their massive actions do not carry any moral obligation and responsibility.

War is not only in Kenya, just to mention, there have been fights going on in Angola, Burundi, DRC Congo, Sudan, and in the Middle East especially the war between the Palestinian and the Israel. Unfortunately the reasons given for such fights are not convincing enough. They do not address the reasons why this war has existed endlessly, but only manage to show what triggered such a state. It is our humble understanding that the real cause for war and terrorism is not to be found within the man's insatiable grumbling for resources, power and dominance, but within one self from where all activities are intentioned and propagated. It is the self that is important in every human action. In other words, war is not without a choice. There are many alternatives which can be noble problem solving other than war.

1.3 Argument for and Against Wars

To what extent can we reason about war? It is true that there are reasons for every act of war? To start with, war is not blind and arbitrary. If two countries start fighting, each country has the best possible reason to justify that act of

war. There is intended good which they are looking for. So for the time being let us assume that both sides to a potential war are rational. Consequently, each side can be said to want to get the best possible outcome for itself for the least possible loss of life and property to its own side. Given this assumption, if both countries knew in advance how the war would turn out, it would be better for both of them to just accept the post war outcome without having to actually pay the costs of fighting the war. This is really to say that people have to give autonomy to pure intellect before engaging in any activity. It is only in this that they can be able to shun away from all the biasness, emotional wishes and feeling so that they can evaluate their course of action. People should choose attention, intelligence, reason, responsibility and love as an alternative to rush and unreflected decision. In this sense, people should think through and through to the end.

This argument can be summarized that wars are reciprocal, that all wars require both a decision to attack and also a decision to resist attack. There should be an intelligent and reasonable grasp of the sufficiency of reason to go for war or not. Yet this should precede the moral deliberation of the action to be taken. For instance, is it morally acceptable or permissible to resort to the act of war. Even with this open remark, some countries are unable to find a bargain and instead resort to war: issue indivisibility, information asymmetry with incentive to deceive, and the inability to make a credible commitment.

We will like to discuss each aside so that we can find their ground of justification. Issue indivisibility simple occurs when the two parties cannot avoid war by bargaining because the thing over which the two countries or territory or tribes are fighting cannot be shared between them. Ideally speaking, this is a common factor to many cases in the world. Thus the thing that they are fighting for can only be owned entirely by one side or the other. For instance, the fight that has been going on between the Israelites and the Palestine has been triggered and sustained due to this kind of understanding. They are fighting for the temple at Mount in Jerusalem. Though others argue that it is because of the economic issues but it is not the case.

The second reason is the one we have named as the problem of asymmetry with the incentives to misrepresent. This situation exists where the two parties involved cannot agree on who would win a war between them, or whether victory would be overwhelming or merely eked out, because each side has military secrets about its own capabilities. They will not avoid the bargaining failure by sharing their secrets, since they cannot trust each other not to lie and exaggerate their strength to extract more concessions. Two examples are evident in this case. For example, in the fight between the Masai and the Kisii in Transmara during the year 2002, their military by the name Chinkororo and the Morans could not compromise because they underrated each other. In this case, there is no bargaining that can take place. One group feels that they can defeat and get back the animals which have been confiscated by the other and vice versa is true. No spirit of letting go, each group wants overwhelming success.

Another example which fits this is the war between the Sweden and the Nazi. The Sween made efforts to deceive Nazi Germany that it would resist an attack fiercely, partly by playing on the myth of Aryan superiority and by making sure that Hermann Goring only saw elite troops in action, often dressed up as regular soldiers, when he came to visit. This theory is shared and greatly advanced by the scholars of international relations such as Geoffrey Blainey. In other words, people should be open to history and learn from it. This requires non other than attentiveness to the experience which constitute history of what resources other have and of what advantage it is to them. Intelligence in understanding of what your opponent is capable of doing is of greater importance before making resorting to war. Intelligence gathering may sometimes, but not always, mitigate this problem. For instance the American decision to enter the Vietnam War was made with the full knowledge that the communist forces would resist them, but did not believe that the guerrillas had the capability to long oppose American forces. Thus, it is not only being intelligent but also being reasonable in judgment that is made.

Perhaps, another good reason to justify war as an alternative is when bargaining fail due to the states' inability to make credible commitments. It is true that bargaining may avert war if they could stick to it, but the benefits of the bargain will make one side more powerful and lead it to demand even more in the future, so that the weaker side has an incentive to make a stand now.

Even granting all that has been said about the reasons to believe that war is permissible when bargaining fails, still careful investigation shows that the assumption of cost-benefit calculations become dubious in the most extreme genocide cases, for instance, World War II and Lwanda Genocide, where the only bargain offered in some cases was infinitely bad. For instance, the Lwanda Genocide between the Hutus and the Tusi never exhausted all the avenues in

their bargaining. The bargain was not meant to really solve the issue at the stake, but had wrong intention of bringing one tribe into suppression of the other. Thus, even granting the position of bargaining as a problem solving process, it should be clear what the bargaining is about and what is the intention of it all.

Furthermore, the reasons given for resorting to war assume that if it is a country or state or a territory or continent, acts as a unitary individual and doing what is best for the state as a whole; this is problematic when, for example, the country's leader is beholden to a very small number of people, as in a personalistic dictatorship. For instance, it is clear that President Bush decided to go for war in the Afghanistan without consulting the American people. This in essence means that he acted as a unitary individual, doing what he thought best for the nation. Contrary to his believe, many American have reacted and lamented seriously. On the same note, what is best may not be what is morally right or valuable. One can decide to do what is best but find himself doing what ought not to do, morally wrong act.

Moreover, the reason given for permissibility of war assumes that the actors are rational, able to accurately assess their likelihood of success or failure, but it is not always easy to predict accurately. Any occurrence has what we call classical laws and statistical laws which can be used to explain it. For instance, one can be sure what impact a nuclear bomb may cause but he cannot be able to know how many people it will kill or scare off. On the same plane, one can think that he will manage the opponent but because war is very traumatising especially when it involves to killing there are human aspect which can not be estimated clearly.

In conclusion, there are other reasons to explain the existence of war. Among them being that people participate in war because of culture, learned by nurture other than nature. They have a strong conviction that if human society were reformed war would disappear. But how can we reform the society? This is part of the intention in this paper. Thus it is not that war is inevitable.

1.4 War Understood as Opposition and Solidarity

The above exploration has shown that there is always rational deliberation or bargaining before sorting out war. There are two positions which are closely related to this situation in the sense that they determine the out come of the deliberations. These are opposition and solidarity.

Whenever one nation is trying to bargain it must put in mind the good. The good is that which everyone aims at. It can be a means or an end in itself. But there seems to be a highest good common to everyone. This is known to everyone as happiness, (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book 1 28) Likewise, everybody lives in a community. There should be the good for a community. This is called common good. Each and every member of our society must struggle and participate actively towards this attainment of this. Solidarity and opposition are two attitudes which relate to human action. While the two terms cannot be dissociated from each other, the former is supposedly a natural consequence of a community of human beings who are living together. In other words, it is the attitude of the community which generally initiates participation among the people who are mutually living and co existing together. This participation is a positive variable towards the realization of the common good. Ideally speaking solidarity is a positive aspect which is embraced by people who are living together and have formed social unit or cohesion. According to Karol woltyla, commonly known as Pope John II, "solidarity means a constant readiness to accept and to realise one's share in the community because of one's membership within that particular community," (Wojtyla, 1979: 285).

The culture of war and violence negates the participation in common good. Violence and war in essence destroys the spirit of human solidarity. We belong to a human family. No family, ethnic group can claim to stay in isolation from the rest. As a human family the pursuit for the greatest good (happiness) should not be hindered by war and violence. For the attitude of solidarity, so to speak, is the intrinsic manifestation of participation as a feature of the person. Consequently, it is this attitude that allows man to find the fulfilment of himself in complementing others and living with them in the great global society. The opposite would be true in the sense that man finds dissatisfaction of himself whenever he is isolated from others.

Opposition is common term nowadays. Every moment people oppose they are said to be in war. Opposition, like solidarity is not in any way related to war and conflict. It is neither a sign of war nor fire. We would like to concur

with John Paul II that opposition is not inconsistent with solidarity. In other words, when one is holding a different view or a divergent view it doesn't mean that he is in opposition. Opposition to the general rules or regulations of the community does not thereby reject his membership. Opposition should be taken positively if it doesn't withdraw one's readiness to work and live together. It is in this general understanding that war should not be mistaken to mean opposition.

Generally speaking, authentic human act of opposition, if it is done genuinely, objectively and reasonably does help in building and revitalizing the social cohesion and compatibility of the society of human living. In our honest view, this state does not lead to separation but accommodation of others of divergent ideas, beliefs and concepts. This is only possible if people are responsible and morally upright to see the value of each other in a group.

1.5 War as Human Act and not Animal Act

In this part three major issues are annexed. First, an attempt will be made to answer the question whether war is a human act. Second, we will try to show that as a human act, it can be avoided. Consequently, the argument will prove the famous claim that has been repeated in this text that war is not inevitable. Just to mention, this will be captured when we shall be unfolding the concept that war is a deliberate act.

The third issue that will be brought to light is the question who man is as opposed to any other animal and what obligation does he carry by his nature. First of all, man is not like other animals. Philosopher and psychologist agree that animals are generally much open to the outside world and have a wide range of active influence. They move about, inhabit a territory, and possess senses that enable it to maintain the relation with distant objects. They have memory which links them to other parts, they are seen to be social and belong to a group of the same kind. Their limitation is that animals are concerned only with a certain number of objects others remain unperceived and are unable to arouse the animal's interests.

Contrary to what human beings are, they don't raise questions about the past, the present nor the future. It has no self-consciousness to know when it has done wrong or good. This realm does not exist in their life. Thus, moral act cannot be within their capacity. In contradistinction, man, apart from the performance of life function which he shares with the plant and the animals, he has his own proper organisation. His activities and experience are centred in a self-conscious 'I'. Furthermore, his development is geared towards the formation of an integrated personality. His life is centred on a meaning, a sense of life. He is capable of endless relationships and he is related to all being. Even though he has limitation in his ontological perfection, man can rightly be attributed the quality of excellence. This quality of perfection, so to speak, makes transcendence to be a consequence and expression of man's ontological perfection. This is to say, his perfection enables man to transcend all the particular phenomena and realities, where war and violence are part of them. This transcendence is not in any animal apart from man and it is power which reveals his perfection. In this kind of perfection and transcendence, man does not act blindly, but he is motivated by this aspect of transcendence which is spiritual. He thinks of the cause of his actions, the moral implication as well as embodiment.

In view of this, every moral act has an end which arises from love of self not only to transform the world, or build the society or promote the progress of history, but to reach absolute truth and goodness. In this conscious process, man is aware of both the means and the end of his actions.

From the above analysis, I suppose, two distinctions can be drawn as regards action. We have human acts *actus humanus* and acts of human person *actus hominis*. However some authors think that the dichotomy is false, we will like to insist that there is a great difference that cannot be assumed in this terminology. Human acts are those that the human person consciously controls and deliberately wills, and thus, one can be held responsible for them. These are the acts which constitute human conduct and form the subject matter of ethics. For an act to be called human act, it must spring from the intellect and will, which in essence plays a key role in a person. This is to say that a person is the sole master of his actions. There is no mistaken action if it is done consciously with full knowledge and will. This is so because a person is at liberty to do a given act or not. All the human acts are voluntary acts. Moreover, human acts are specifically human, because only the human beings possess the two constituent elements of human action.

Furthermore, it is important to note that human acts can either be physical or mental as long as they are consciously controlled and deliberately willed. In essence, it doesn't matter whether they are executed externally or does not. In other words, if people, for any reason, decide to go for war and kill the opponent, but fail to get the kill, they will be guilty of murder even though doing the event of war, they didn't manage to kill.

A part from human act, we have acts of a human person. There are acts a person performs but are not consciously controlled or deliberately willed. In such acts a person is not held responsible for them. They do not constitute human conduct and have no ethical significance. A person does not need to think first before performing them. These actions are just a response to stimuli and they are not any different from animals. They are all involuntary.

The question that is remaining is whether war and violence are human act or act of human? Is war involuntary or voluntary acts? War in place of peace or simply the choice of violence, culture of killing and death as an option to problem solving process are not involuntary acts but voluntary. By this we mean that war is a deliberate human act which is thought, planned and willed by one. In our honest submission, war is not only act of free choice but also highly networked and intellectually coordinated to be able to be successive. War and violence which has become a culture in the modern world negates the moral dynamism and hence, humanity in general. This is not because any human act is subject to morals. It must confirm to the dictates of our nature as human being. And since all human acts are deliberate choices, they give moral value to the person who performs them.

Furthermore, rational ordering of the human acts to the good, in its truth and the voluntary pursuit of that good known by reason constitutes morality. War does not have any good in its ultimate end. This is because it is not a moral act.

In conclusion, we would like to strongly emphasize the fact that human acts have some ends, which may be proximate or remote, direct or indirect, intrinsic or extrinsic; hence the axiom in philosophy, every agent acts for some end. This end must be the good, that is, absolutely good, (Aristotle, 1870: 26) This phrase is of significance. The intrinsic end is that end which the act tends by its very nature and is inseparable from the act itself (finis operis). What is the intrinsic end for war? Intrinsic end for war is sought within the act of war itself. War as an act is not good but evil. War by its very nature is not separable from killing, violence, displacement, property lose, discrimination, intimidation, and many others.

1.6 War: Negation of Self Determination and Self Fulfilment

Action follow being, (Wojtyla, 1979:150). Ideally speaking, man realizes and determines himself through his action. It is the action that tells us what kind of person one is. Have two aspects, the inner and outer or transitive and intransitive with regard the person. The emphasis is on the inner and intransitive consequence of a person's efficacy. There is a relationship between the action and the person other than the effect man's activity has on the outer world. In the Acting Person, John Paul II maintains that because of self determination an action reaches and penetrates into the subject, into the ego, which is the primary and principle object. And because there is a lasting relation between the action and the individual who is performing the action, any action that is either morally wrong or morally good constitutes man as the subject of the action as morally good or bad. This in principle captures the meaning of the assertion that action brings self fulfilment. The fulfilment our action brings, more especially when they are good, is coordinate to self determination, (Wojtyla, 1979:150). Our actions brings fulfilment we are actualized and in a way it brings to its fullness that structure in man which is characteristic for him because of his personality and because of his being somebody and not merely something. This structure is technically called the structure of self governance and self possession, (Wojtyla, 1979:151).

What we mean by this is that our human acts are moral in so far as they confirm with the dictates of our nature as human beings. If we grant this to be true, then we can say that by nature we are human beings. We have a body intellect and soul. This is not to say that we are three composite parts but a substantial unit. Nobody should try to do away with this intrinsic unit. Killing is one way of destroying human nature. Therefore, it is against our human nature to engage in any act which ends up destroying human nature.

Consequently, it will be justifiable to conclude that war does not confirm with the dictates of our nature as human being. It doesn't contribute to the preservation and revitalisation of the human nature, but only in corrupting it so to speak. It is in this contention that John Paul II calls a war a defeat to humanity, (John Paul II, 2003)

1.7 Just War Tradition

One of the highly emphasized cases of justification for war is what has been termed as 'just war'. This came as a tradition among the ancient era, it was later emphasized in the Old Testament, and it continues to be used up to now especially in other religions. For instance, the Islam strong believe on Holy war, which is, fighting for the Allah. During modern and contemporary times this tradition has been incorporated in armed forces. I have chosen to discuss on this aspect not for the sake of studying its traditional element and its basic requirements but to underpin the process that is involves in it and show the unquestioned imaginative assumption which have been overlooked. In other words, is there a holy war if the two parties involved are morally upright, or as Lonergan says, morally converted?

For the sake of answering the above question, I suppose, let me explain how and why this conception came about and what it entails. Just-war theory deals with the justification of how and why wars are fought. The justification can be either theoretical or historical. The theoretical aspect is concerned with ethically justifying war and forms of warfare. The historical aspect, or the "just war tradition" deals with the historical body of rules or agreements applied (or at least existing) in various wars across the ages. 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 this philosophical paper to examine these institutional agreements for their philosophical coherence as well as to inquire into whether aspects of the conventions ought to be changed.

The just war theory also has a long history. Although parts of the Bible hint at ethical behaviour in war and concepts of just cause, the most systematic exposition is given by Saint Thomas Aquinas. In the *Summa Theologicae* Aquinas presents the general outline of what becomes the just war theory. He discusses not only the justification of war, but also the kinds of activity that are permissible in war. Aquinas's thoughts become the model for later Scholastics and Jurists to expand. The most important of these are: Francisco de Vitoria (1486-1546), Francisco Suarez (1548-1617), Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1704), Christian Wolff (1679-1754), and Emerich de Vattel (1714-1767).

1.8 Just War Tradition is Never A Solution

The outlined features of what just war entails and its principles leave a plethora of question.

The first question that is occasioned in the topic of our presentation is, 'really why would people opt for war as a human act, freely and willingly, yet war is not a solution?' The answer is simple and can be stated in simple words. It is because the two parties are not morally converted and developed. This answer seems unacceptable for it looks simple. The rule and the principles which have been stated do not answer the question of how the act of war is conceived. The act of war carries no moral value and obligation. If people were morally converted which is a fruit of human and intellectual development, they will be informed on how to treat others, how to live with others, how to solve issues using right and authentic problem solving mechanism which have as its basic tenet the respect for humanity.

Moreover, if the people who are in charge of making policy have moral responsibility, it will be easy for them to make rules which do not in any way discriminate and brings inequality. The case of war in many countries in the world is lack of moral foundation which is vital for building true human and liveable societies. Morality has been pushed aside, and especially in the contemporary era moral value are relative and selectable. People select what they want to follow and they are ready to defend it as being free. Morality is not only the foundation of true living but also a true way of evaluating events in the society. For instance, '*Jus In Bello*' requires that the agents of war be held responsible for their actions. This ties in their actions to morality generally. Great men such as Augustine of hippo argues against this assertion:

Who is but the sword in the hand of him who uses it, is not himself responsible for the death he deals. Those who act according to a divine command, or even God's laws as enacted by the state and who put wicked men to death "have by no means violated the commandment, Thou shalt not kill." Whilst this issue is connected to the concepts of just cause, it does not follow that individuals waging a just, or unjust war, should be absolved of breaching the principles of just conduct. (Augustine, 1984)

1.9 Moral Conversion A Solution to War and Violence

The consideration of morality as the key and fundamental solution to war is without any doubt a vital one. Benard Lonergan, a philosopher and theologian is the first to use the term moral conversion.

Conversion as Lonergan understands it is three-fold. Although he never uses the explicit phrase in *Insight*, in fact the entire book is an exercise in intellectual conversion. It is about coming to the realization that one's knowing is commonly a mixture of two different kinds of knowing, and about the process of learning to distinguish between the two and to discern their proper roles. To this *Method in Theology* adds moral and religious conversion. Moral conversion is the shift from self-satisfaction to value as the criterion of one's decision-making and action, (Lonergan, 1972 : 240). This involves the turning away from satisfaction to values and involves a radical transformation of the self because it is in moral decisions that the subject constitutes himself as a free and responsible subject. In other words, moral conversion is a dialectic by which we mean 'linked but opposed principle of change, (Lonergan 1957: 242-43). They are linked in that they work in the same subject, but they are opposed because one is urging to immediate, short term, selfish gratification of physical appetites and impulses. The other is urging the choice of true values, sublimation of gratification, a life lived according to moral values. Lonergan considered the act of making a decision not to be in isolation but as an activity which is dependent on many other activities. Among them is the cognitional structure which through experience, intelligent grasp and reasonable affirmation. Judgment of fact is attained. This is the judgment of the truth of the reality. Present in this process is the rational consciousness which is the awareness of making judgment of fact or truth of our knowledge after consideration of the sufficiency of evidence to pass a judgment. Man is not only a knower but a doer.

The rational self consciousness characterizes his level of judgment of value. In this level there is an awareness of the necessity of the consistency between knowing and doing. This level is accompanied with activities such as deciding, evaluating and doing. This is what Lonergan referred to as the level of moral action. This moral self rational consciousness of doing what one knows is what can be called conscience. It aims at true values. By true value is meant what is intended in the question for deliberation, what is responded to in the intentional response to value, what is grasped in deliberate insight, what is affirmed in a judgment of value, what is decided for and implemented by an authentic person. When one is able to listen to the imperative be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, and be responsible then attains a level of moral maturity, a level where he discovers true values, which when lived leads to moral conversion. In this stage of development of man, there is a felt moral obligation which is a dynamism that is immanent and operative urging him to be responsible, to do what is right and good. Lonergan reminds us:

Such judgments (of value) are objective or merely subjective inasmuch as they proceed or do not proceed from a self transcending subject. Their truth or falsity, accordingly, has its criterion in the authenticity or the lack of authenticity of the subject's being, (Lonergan, 1972: 37)

Moral conversion can only be effective and efficient in authentic people. Authentic person we mean a person whose existential self is realised in a true and sincere sense and lives according to these true values. He maintains that in authentic persons, affectivity and responsibility shape reasonable and intelligent operations, which in turn govern otherwise spontaneous interests, actions and passions.

At the same time, moral and affective orientations rely on intelligent and reasonable analyses of situations to produce moral precepts - an approach that contrasts with ethics that look chiefly to virtue and good will for practical guidance. Lonergan demonstrated how intelligent and reasonable analyses produce moral precepts in his works on the economy (*Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*) and on marriage (Finality, Love, Marriage).

On the same note, John Paul II insisted in his speech on war and violence, (August 12, 2002) in America that violence and war always brings a train of woe in its wake. For that reason, we should be skeptical when people say the use of force can resolve conflicts in any real and lasting way. Second, justice can be fought without violence and opting for war. If our society were to be morally converted, people could be able to recognize what belongs to the other person, nation and territory, and could give natural justice for it is constituted in this state of conversion. They will be ever willing to live with other in harmony, and seek justice without any violence. He emphasized on humanitarian intervention in any issue that aggravate human living and ambience of harmony in the society.

The same message is echoed by his holiness Pope John Paul II to the diplomatic corps, on (January 13, 2003). In this the Pope concurs with the intention on this paper. War and terrorism has brought fear in the heart of the contemporaries. Yet he takes an optimistic position when He maintains that everything can change because it depends on people's state of moral maturity and concern for others. The first step is to say yes to life. We should respect life itself and individual lives, everything states here, for the most fundamental right is certainly the right to life. Phenomena which threat life like war, is an attack on human life since it brings in its wake suffering and death.

Thus the battle for peace is always a battle for life. Second, and intimately related to morality, is the aspect of respect for law. The greatest law is the law to safeguard life at all cost. This negates war as an option in life. This is to say that the world would be totally different if people conceived this law. Third, people should vow a duty of solidarity. To be in solidarity means one feels part of the great and global society. This is because we belong to the same human family. Consequently, choices about moral good must be made so that humanity can still have a future. Therefore, people should say no to war and violence. No to death and everything that attacks the incomparable dignity of every human being.

1.10 No to the Culture of War and Violence

Before we conclude this paper, we would like to answer the question that I posed at the start of his paper. The question was is war a human act or an essential characteristic of human being? Can animals go for war? Animals cannot plan for war; they are not intelligent, reasonable nor responsible. They lack these faculties. War is a human act, which is deliberate and chosen. War is chosen among many options as way of solving aggression or differences between parties. There are many options which are morally acceptable and which carried moral worthy such as international honest, solidarity between states, the noble exercise of diplomacy and all stand as potential ways of solving aggression in a humanitarian way. War is a deliberate act, nobody or nation is forced to go for way. In conclusion war is not inevitable. It is a defeat for humanity. We should say NO TO WAR.

Bibliography

Blainey, Geoffrey. (1958) *The Causes of War*. New York: The Free Press, 1973. Barker, Ernest. *Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume, and Rousseau*. London: Oxford University Press.

Barringer, Richard E. (1972) *War: Patterns of Conflict*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Angell, Robert C. (1969) *Peace on the March*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.,

Aron, Raymond. (1966) *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*, Translated by Richard Howard and Annette Baker Fox. New York: Doubleday Garden City.

Loneragan, Bernard. (1972) *Method in Theology*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Wojtyla, Karol. (1979) *The Acting Person*. Trans. Andrezej Potocki. London: D. Reidel Publishing Comp.

Mondin Battista. (1985) *Philosophical Anthropology: Man: An Impossible Project?* Rome: Urbaniana University Press.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

