

RESEARCH ARTICLE

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

The Ethics of War: A Teleological Perspective

Abdelkader Boutebal

Mascara University, Algeria. Email: boutebalabdelkader@gmail.com, ORCID: 9009-9036-0002-0000

Received: 25/01/2025 Accepted: 02/06/2025 Published: 10/10/2025

Abstract

The expression “Ethics of War” at first glance appears paradoxical, as war evokes violence, destruction, and the collapse of order, whereas ethics signifies justice, restraint, and the safeguarding of values. This study explores the reconciliation of these two poles within the framework of Islamic jurisprudence and Qur’anic guidance. In Islam, war is not an end in itself nor a pursuit of power or material gain; rather, it is a morally conditioned necessity, undertaken only when oppression, aggression, or corruption threaten the higher objectives of the law (maqāṣid al-sharī‘a): the preservation of religion, life, intellect, progeny, and property. Unlike certain Western discourses that misrepresent Qur’anic principles to portray Islam as inherently violent, the Islamic paradigm establishes war as a last resort, bounded by divine ethics that prohibit injustice, excess, and the violation of human dignity. Through historical and philosophical analysis, the article highlights how the conduct of Imam ‘Ali and Imam Ḥusayn embodies this ethical model, combining resistance with compassion, sacrifice with justice. Ultimately, the research demonstrates that in Islamic thought, war is inseparable from morality, functioning not as blind violence but as a regulated act of defense, bound to the preservation of humanity and justice.

Keywords: Ethics of war; Islamic jurisprudence; Human dignity; Resistance; Moral philosophy.

Introduction

The phrase “Ethics of War” calls for a pause at its main boundaries that compose the expression. For, ethics, in essence, is a system of values and principles that seeks justice, love, transcendence, and human elevation, while war is the end of humanity, the death of values, destruction, and the demise of human civilization. The phrase brings together boundaries with contradictory meanings, to the point that the recipient may believe there is a contradiction in its very construction. Yet, the relationship between them is not an ontological immanence in which concepts are equal, but rather a dialectical relationship, where ethics stands as a guardian and a moral overseer of every individual or collective behavior resulting from war. As a social institution, ethics encompasses values and rules that determine what we ought to do and what we must avoid. Besides, the reference from which the ethical system draws its principles is religion; it is the first womb of the culture of values, and the interpretations promoted by

Western theories are nothing but hypotheses that imperialism has sought to entrench and disseminate in order to undermine the spiritual foundations of Eastern society in particular, and of humanity in general. In this paper, we aim to highlight the stance of the Islamic religion on wars, as reflected through the juridical institution.

Signification and Context

The connotations of the word war do not go beyond the circle of violence or negativity that views or deals with the other as negative and opposed to existence. Owing to the fact that in language, it is the opposite of peace, and thus becomes the absence or the suppression of peace, on the basis that peace is the primary space and domain for the practice and development of human faculties, and the meanings contained in *Lisān al-‘Arab* by Ibn Manẓūr converge on connotations of conflict, killing, and plunder. Among the meanings we note the following: “In the hadith of al-Mughīra (may God be pleased with him): ‘Her divorce is ḥarība,’ meaning she has children with him; if he divorces her, they are deprived and afflicted by it, as if they have been stripped and plundered. And in the hadith: ‘The ḥārib is the stripped one,’ meaning the usurper, the looter, who strips people of their clothes. And ḥarība al-rajul (with kasra), yaḥrabu ḥarban: his anger intensified.” (Ibn Manzur, 2016 AD, p. 816) From these linguistic definitions, we can conclude that war is conflict, fighting, and the stripping away of peace from reality. Its negative connotations prevent the recipient from perceiving even a single positive meaning. Yet, a precise and objective perspective on war as a phenomenon makes us pause before a set of elevated moral values that can be derived from it. For war, before being a clash of forces, is a clash of values. Justice is a conditional attribute that can both exist and be absent. Based on the relation that binds judgment with its subject, war may be just. We find this usage in new ethics and contemporary philosophies, where war is described as “just” or “unjust.” Such description is a moral judgment that may be true or correct, but may also be false or invalid. This does not imply that opposites coexist ontologically within the judgment, but rather that judgment itself is relative. Hence, we currently observe a duality in the judgment and treatment of wars. The root of this duality lies in the psychological and cultural makeup of the human being. Tribal and clan affiliation governs human judgments in general, except for the sincere ones whom God Almighty has chosen. One manifestation of tribal affiliation is aligning with civil society in its political and national orientations. For example, the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas, who extolled constitutional democracy, the ethics of dialogue, and the public sphere, fell into the trap of Talmudic affiliation at the first Zionist crime that shook human consciences. The true measure of the greatness of thought and the strength of a theory lies in human participation and adherence to the moral system, not in the logical construction of the theory or its novelty in its time. Truth is not tied to persons. As the Commander of the Faithful (peace be upon him) said: “Recognize the truth, and you will recognize its people,” and “Truth is not known by men; rather, men are known by truth.” (Al-Rawandi, 1406 AH, p. 374)

Accordingly, it is necessary to deal with theories and intellectual visions with objectivity stripping away partisanship and subjectivity. Moreover, acknowledging difficulty does not entail the impossibility of uncovering truths, because truth exists, and standards exist in our Islamic heritage. But the absence of the will to search and the love of truth is what lies behind the delay in striving to attain it, for God Almighty has set for humanity the entrances and

prerequisites for objective inquiry through His Beautiful Names, and truth is the ultimate goal. Since God is Absolute Existence, truth too must be absolute and transcendent above the individuals who seek it. And since the Truth, exalted is He, is eternal and everlasting, truth remains ever-present and ever-sought. While it exists through the standards and measures derived from the purposes of the Divine Lawgiver, it is also sought relatively, owing to the limitation of the human being who pursues it. The West and its followers have relied on distorting and altering the meanings contained in Qur'anic texts regarding the matter of war and its legitimacy, describing Islamic law and Muslims as terrorists and among the most bloodthirsty peoples. Yet by merely pausing at the context and meanings of the verses, we discover that the Divine Lawgiver did not call for war for its own sake, or for secondary or personal aims. Rather, He set primary purposes and higher values that render war legitimate, which is evident in the Qur'anic verse: "Permission [to fight] has been granted to those who are being fought, because they have been wronged; and indeed, God is capable of granting them victory." (al-Hajj: 39) This verse shows that the declaration of war requires a legitimate authorization; it is not the property of political authority bound by ideology, which is no more than a human theory springing from tribal or ethnic notions. The decision of war is a legitimate authorization held by scholars and juristic authorities, for scholars are the heirs of the prophets. The model who embodies this quality is the people of remembrance and the pious within society. In the jurisprudence of Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them), this is known as Wilāyat al-Faqīh (Guardianship of the Jurist), which is the manifestation of the scholars' authority in society. Without delving into the current debates among scholars and intellectuals on the authority of jurists, we note here the importance and gravity of scholarly judgment in matters of war, for the destiny of the community rests upon such decisions. Thus, the Qur'anic verses on war clarify its gravity and the necessity of resorting to war only in cases of utmost necessity, when war becomes essential to change a situation and achieve justice. For example, the verse: "Those who have been driven out of their homes unjustly only because they said: 'Our Lord is God.' And if God did not repel some people by means of others, monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, wherein God's name is often mentioned, would surely have been destroyed. And God will surely support those who support Him. Truly, God is Strong, Mighty." (al-Hajj: 40) The contents of this verse explicitly affirm the legitimacy of defending oneself, one's honor, and one's property. Conflict or war is a necessary condition for a people of faith who have been displaced. Indeed, the Qur'an does not accept aggression against any human being, even a non-believer. Humanity is the standard of obligation, not belief or affiliation. Yet the duty of believers in defending themselves is even greater, for humanity, as the Commander of the Faithful (peace be upon him) says, is either "a brother in faith or an equal in creation." The Qur'anic verses clarify to nations the necessity of defending oneself and the other moral values required by the common good, for neglecting to repel corruption necessitates declaring war against it. War is not waged merely against oppressors or enemies; fighting them is a religious obligation. Otherwise, those who neglect it are classified among the circle of enemies who must be fought. God Almighty said: "But if you do not, then be informed of a war from God and His Messenger. Yet if you repent, you shall have your principal [capital sums]; you do no wrong, nor are you wronged." (al-Baqara: 279). This does not mean that Islamic law calls for bloodshed without justification; rather, the purposes of the Sharia must set the horizon for the conditions of war. The primary implications of these purposes do not deviate from moral

values. They represent moral science in Islamic jurisprudence. The *maqāṣid* (purposes) are a moral ceiling against which actions and behaviors are measured. Jurists of law refer to them as principles. To affirm this, we recall al-Shāṭibī's concept of the *maqāṣid*, wherein he stated: "The five universals, or five necessities, refer to interests indispensable for the sustenance of religion and worldly life. Without them, worldly affairs would not proceed in order but in corruption, turmoil, and the loss of life; and in the Hereafter, the loss of salvation and bliss, and a return to manifest ruin." (Al-Shatibi, 1997 AD, p. 291) The jurists' and *usūlīs*' choice of the term universals for the essential purposes reveals the philosophical and logical spirit present among thinkers and jurists at that time. Universals are a logical concept employed by logicians in constructing the logical system. They are general concepts upon which the mind builds its process of thinking. They are general boundaries that include particular concepts. They are five: genus, species, specific difference, property, and common accident. Upon deeper reflection, the researcher will find them foundational to many knowledge systems. Even language itself does not depart from these universals, from which all linguistic fields branch. Therefore, selecting universals as the expression for legal purposes is nothing but an epistemic bridging that fuses the objective and methodological differences among the sciences. Thus, we will adopt the five universals religion, life, intellect, lineage (progeny), and property in reading the *maqāṣidī* approach to the ethics of war, since the scope of jurisprudential rulings is the human being in all his instances, whether individual or collective. On the other hand, the particulars we find in jurisprudential works are but foundations for moral purposes that place the human self together with all that pertains to it of material or spiritual gains, or what is known in legal language as rights at the center. In its purposes, war is not merely fighting, but also the stripping away of rights, the restriction of freedoms, and the suppression of human activity in general.

The Principle of Life (al-Nafs):

Throughout the history of human thought, the concept of *nafs* (soul/self) has carried a fluidity in its semantic connotations, owing to the multiplicity of its manifestations. It appears as "the self," "the ego," and other expressions. Thus, the *nafs* has been present in philosophy across ages, with each thinker offering an interpretation shaped by his intellectual and cultural experience ranging from an essentialist approach that seeks a scientific explanation, as with the Greek philosopher Aristotle, to moral approaches such as Plato's classification, which places the rational soul as the leader of the appetitive and irascible souls. Other philosophical and ethical theories also contributed interpretations, for the *nafs* is the foundation of human existence. The foundational intent of the Sharia in preserving the *nafs* lies in respecting the individual's right to life natural, first of all, and dignified, by consideration. For life, in its existence and continuity, depends on the existence of the *nafs* (self). Furthermore, the afterlife is built upon it, since accountability for deeds in the abode of recompense is tied to the original *nafs* that lived among others in the mortal world. The Qur'anic texts are explicit in their judgment regarding transgression against the (self). It is among the prohibitions that admit neither compromise nor concession. This shows that the individual soul possesses sanctity and legal inviolability that cannot be substituted or diminished. God says: "Say, Come, I will recite what your Lord has forbidden to you: do not associate anything with Him, and be good to your parents, and do not kill your children out of poverty; We provide for you and for them. And do

not approach immoralities, what is apparent of them and what is concealed. And do not kill the soul which God has forbidden, except by right. This He has enjoined upon you, that you may understand.” (Al-An‘ām 6:151) The verse is explicit in prohibiting killing, which is an assault on the human soul. It even mentions the killing of children, signaling that parenthood does not confer the right to strip life away from the child. The nafs is not a contingent existence that can be bargained away or sacrificed for trivial ends, but rather a station and locus of divine honor: “And We have certainly honored the children of Adam, and carried them on the land and sea, and provided them with good things, and preferred them over many of those We created, with distinct preference.” (Al-Isrā’ 17:70). Islamic law does not take killing lightly, allowing exceptions only in cases of unintentional homicide. Even then, the treatment of such cases is not a matter of leniency or absolute pardon, but is conditioned with precise stipulations. Thus, diyāt (blood-money compensations) serve as formal redress for the victim’s family. God says: “It is not for a believer to kill a believer except by mistake. And whoever kills a believer by mistake, then freeing a believing slave and a compensation payment presented to the victim’s family unless they remit it as charity. If the victim belonged to a people at war with you and was a believer, then freeing a believing slave; and if he belonged to a people with whom you have a treaty, then a compensation payment presented to his family and freeing a believing slave. But if he cannot find one then fasting two consecutive months as repentance from God, and God is All-Knowing, All-Wise.” (Al-Nisā’ 4:92). The details of diyāt reveal the moral objectives intended by the Lawgiver. Likewise, God says: “For that reason We decreed upon the Children of Israel that whoever kills a soul unless in retribution for murder or for corruption on earth it is as though he has killed all mankind; and whoever saves one, it is as though he has saved all mankind. Our messengers came to them with clear proofs, yet many of them, after that, still committed excesses throughout the land.” (Al-Mā’idah 5:32). The human soul is individual in existence yet universal in essence this is what the verse implies. As ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī explains: “The operative cause in it, from its root, is human external nature, which seeks to complete its deficiencies and meet its existential needs. This external reality is not the accidental numerical multiplicity of humans, nor is it the singular social form; rather, it is humanity itself and its nature. There is no difference between one individual and the thousands combined, for all are human, and the value of the one and the many is equal in existence.” (Al-Tabataba’i, 1417 AH, p. 436). The Sharia did not stop at the material dimension of the nafs, but emphasized its moral value its karāmah (dignity). The dignity of the believer remains sacred even after death, as it was in life. The moral worth of the self is inseparable from the bodily existence, which expresses the embodied “self” carrying all human potentials psychological, social, and cultural. Thus, violation of the self is not merely an infringement of the right to life but of human dignity as well. Dignity is one of the human concepts difficult to define with absolute clarity, given the relativity of its content. Positive laws have varied in delineating its contours, based on the cultural and political determinants of each theory. Most of these theories took on a legal aspect, tying dignity to equality in rights, as codified in human rights charters. Wars throughout history have been assaults on human dignity, as colonialism in Arab lands not only inflicted killing but extended to violating honor and plundering wealth and possessions. Yet the sacrifice of the nafs is among the highest forms of human elevation this is what is meant by shahāda (martyrdom). Inasmuch as, sacrifice in the path of God is a divine grace attained only by those of great fortune, and the term shahāda itself carries rich meanings: in Qur’anic

context, the realm of shahāda (witnessed reality) corresponds to the realm of the unseen (ghayb). The one martyred is present ontologically in the cosmos, yet unseen in the world of the senses. Thus, martyrdom is a concept holding two meanings simultaneously: presence and absence. The martyr is present, yet cannot be perceived with worldly eyes. Martyrdom is a moral station attained only with divine enablement, a refinement of the self and purity of spirit, rooted in a monotheistic worldview called the philosophy of martyrdom. It is a knowledge system that makes God the One the origin and goal of existence: “Who, when disaster strikes them, say: ‘Indeed we belong to God, and indeed to Him we will return.’” (Al-Baqara 2:156). The martyr perceives this principle as an existential reality, not as a mere phrase repeated by tongues. Thus, self-sacrifice becomes an offering to God. Lady Zaynab (peace be upon her), on the day of ‘Āshūrā’, offered a model when she said: “O God, accept from us this sacrifice.” The martyr is thus the offering of himself, a ransom for his family and nation. The example set by Imām Ḥusayn (peace be upon him) through his sermons that day remains timeless, as he declared openly that he neither sought worldly gains nor power, but only: “I only desire reform in the nation of my grandfather.” Martyrdom, or sacrificing one’s life and precious possessions, must not be for worldly, transient aims, unlike suicide, which is the taking of life driven by despair. Social sciences focus much on suicide, linking it to psychological disorders and economic conditions it reflects clinging to life, not renunciation of it for a higher principle. The moral worth of an act lies in the gravity of the moment and the actor’s ability to transcend it. Thus, fighting is not evil in itself, but rather a necessity dictated by human existence in specific circumstances bounded by public interest and diagnosed precisely by the scholar-jurist (‘ālim-faqīh). Most wars throughout history were decided by governments motivated by economic interests. In international relations, interests are the foundation of state interactions unlike certain Islamic circles that hinge the decision to wage war on the ruling of the jurist. For this reason, today we see the community of resistance subjected to fierce attacks by Zionist imperialism, as it poses a threat to their security and strategic interests.

The Faculty of Progeny:

Among the issues that have accompanied wars throughout history is the assault on women both as bodies and as independent beings, and the most dangerous among of them is rape. Despite its civilizational claims, the West did not concern itself with studying this matter until recently, beside, the following text confirms this: “Susan Brownmiller, in her 1975 book *Against Our Will*, was the first to provide evidence of rape in Homeric epics, in writings about the Crusades, the American and French revolutions, and the Vietnam War. In fact, for centuries the issue had been regarded as a regrettable but inevitable phenomenon, unworthy of much attention. Even the kidnapping and rape of tens of thousands of women during the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 was seen merely as collateral damage of that conflict.” (Cohen, 2017, p. 136) In our view, this delay in addressing the condition of women in war goes back to society’s and culture’s perception of women. Giving that, the West did not view her as a human being, and the proof of this lies in the debate held at a conference in France in 673 on the nature of woman, where it was agreed that she was indeed a human creature, but one without rights equal to those of men. Thus, women’s oppression in human wars was a reality, and their bodies became symbols of dominance or subjugation. If we pause at the phenomenon of captivity (saby) that

occurs after wars or sometimes becomes a goal of war, we find it applies most specifically to women. For, in linguistic dictionaries, a *sabiyya* is defined as a woman taken in war: “The *sabiyya* is a woman taken captive... *saba* (without hamza) means to possess, while *asba* means to enjoy the full youth of a concubine... *istabahu* like *kasabahu*, and *as-saby* is the captive; the plural is *saby*. Captivity means plunder and the taking of people as slaves and maidservants, and the *sabiyya* is the plundered woman.” (Ibn Manzur, 2016 AD, p. 367) Women were thus considered part of the spoils of war. This in itself indicates the extent of harm inflicted on their status throughout the history of warfare. The overarching principle here, which overlaps with the principle of the Self, is the preservation of progeny, whilst assault on women through rape during war makes regulation of lineage or control of descent impossible. For, the wisdom behind the prohibition of adultery is evident: the prevention of lineage confusion, for in such circumstances it becomes impossible to know even who one’s brother or sister might be. Islamic jurisprudence addressed the preservation of progeny by detailing the rulings of marriage. When listing invalid forms of marriage, jurists did not mention unions by force or coercion in war, because such acts were already prohibited on the grounds of usurpation and compulsion. Over and above that, if we examine the conditions for valid marriages, we find them entirely absent in sexual relations that follow wars. This stems from the ancient notion of woman as a mere instrument of pleasure, which is an idea found among Western philosophers and, surprisingly, adopted by some in the Arab intellectual sphere, and the most troubling is that many pioneers of philosophical thought carried forward Greek philosophical views of women especially Aristotle’s theory. Imam Abdel-Fattah Imam notes: “The negative image of women among us is the very one drawn by philosophers at the dawn of philosophy in Greece. It then found fertile ground here, to the point that it even donned a religious robe and became a sacred idea beyond reproach. This is clear among the giants of Greek thought Socrates, Plato, Aristotle whose views became part of the philosophical heritage that was transmitted into both the Christian and Islamic worlds.” (Imam, 1996, p. 05) Consequently, the issue of women in human heritage at large, and in Islamic heritage in particular, remains fraught with the difficulties that accompanied the history of Islamic legal theorization, shaped by the power and authority of rulers who imposed legal rulings aligned with their political vision. In Islamic history, whether during the Caliphate, the Umayyads, or the Abbasids, numerous examples can be found. The story of Malik ibn Nuwayra with Khalid ibn al-Walid is but one, and the tragedy of al-Harrah during Yazid’s rule when thousands of women in the city of the Messenger (PBUH) were raped is another. For this reason, we must revisit the jurisprudence of spoils and rulings on captivity, recognizing them as products of ruling authority rather than authentic jurisprudence rooted in the genuine Muhammadan Islam.

The Faculty of Wealth:

Wealth or economy constitutes the primary driver in the declaration of wars. Throughout history, we see the use of deception and false media to establish the legitimacy of war, while the real purpose is the exploitation of the resources of weaker nations. The occupation of Iraq in 2003, for instance, was aimed at stealing Iraq’s oil and economic wealth. The pretext used by the United States, on the surface, was the fight against weapons of mass destruction. The results of that colonialism, however, were dispossession in its ugliest forms, and what happened

in Abu Ghraib prison with the violation of the rights of prisoners stands as sufficient evidence of the West's crime and its wickedness, justifying its designation as the Great Satan. It still continues to strip nations of their wealth and has excelled in inventing multiple cultural methods to tighten its control over peoples. Globalization is nothing but the Americanization of the world and its subjugation by robbing it of the will for revival and liberation. Islamic texts affirm that death in defense of honor and wealth is considered martyrdom, for human dignity is derived from one's relationship with, and stance toward, one's homeland, children, and possessions. To turn a blind eye to the assaults on land and family reduces a person to the level of bestiality. We find in the life of Abu Dharr al-Ghifari (may Allah be pleased with him) a worthy example when he said: "I am astonished at the one who does not have food in his house and yet does not go out with his sword unsheathed." Jihad or fighting in defense of the land is a legitimate right guaranteed by both divine and human laws, on the basis of the link between individual and collective identity with the land—or, in political terminology, the geographical territory that forms the material foundation of the state, which represents the material dimension of national identity. Hence, the defense of the homeland is among the most sacred duties. The texts that urge jihad against disbelievers and hypocrites describe them as a rebellious group seeking to strip people of their right to life and their right to faith. What is strange is the fabrication by court scholars of the debate over whether defense with the sword or with the pen is better and more obligatory. In reality, the theoretical issue was nothing but deception and sedation of the peoples, for the defense of the homeland, in all its forms, is a duty upon every capable individual. Allah says: "So do not obey the disbelievers, and strive against them with it (the Qur'an) a great striving." (Al-Furqan: 52). The permission to fight and to perform jihad is not arbitrary, for the very first verse about it refers to the repulsion of corruption. Al-Bashir al-Ibrahimi says: "Among the wise subtleties is that fighting was not legislated in the Qur'an with the expression (it has been legislated) or (it has been made obligatory) or other formulas of rulings. Rather, the first verse concerning it came in the form of permission, indicating that it is something customary in human society. Yet it is not pure good, nor is it eternal righteousness. Rather, it is an evil whose best condition is to repel another evil." (Al-Ibrahimi, 1997 AD)

The Faculty of Religion:

Religion in language means obedience and submission. In terminology, it refers to a set of ideas that constitute a creed ideas related to the principle of existence, the Creator of the universe, and the mechanisms of communication between God and human beings, i.e., the prophets and messengers. Religion is thus a doctrinal system composed of cognitive and moral concepts. The only true religion is Islam. Allah the Exalted says: "Indeed, the religion with Allah is Islam." (Al-Imran: 19). It is the criterion for distinguishing between beliefs. Allah also says: "And whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it will never be accepted from him, and in the Hereafter he will be among the losers." (Al-Imran: 85). Moreover, if we examine the principles and goals of religion, we will uncover the reasons for wars declared against religion. Inasmuch as, on the basis of the unity of origin and the unity of relation between humankind and God "All of you are from Adam, and Adam is from dust" all are servants of God the One and Only. Besides, these are truths acknowledged by all, yet we differ in how we deal with one another, oppressing and wronging each other, and the cause of this is the human soul, with its

love of dominance, its desire to control others, and its greed for possession. These are the instincts that fuel human aggression, and scramble against the Arab nation: Yemen, Iraq, Libya in which returns to the desire to seize its wealth and take hold of its strategic locations. Furthermore, we state one of the most important elements that distinguish the Islamic religion is its method in shaping the personality of the Muslim human being. For, a strong believer is more beloved to Allah than a weak believer, because the believer is a noble model of morality and spiritual elevation, and the production of negative models within Islamic sects does not go beyond an attempt to distort the image of authentic Muhammadan Islam. Over and above, the war waged against the Noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) by maligning his honorable person sought nothing other than to diminish true Islam.

The war the West wages against the Islamic creed aims at strategic purposes, chiefly the fragmentation of the Islamic nation and its division in order to exploit its wealth and enslave its peoples. In addition, the history of wars confirms this: rarely do we find signs of mercy and humanity in wars. Indeed, we can almost assert that manifestations of love and mercy in warfare, outside the Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them), are nonexistent. Inasmuch as, in the biography of the Commander of the Faithful, Imam Ali (peace be upon him), there is ample evidence, and he was known for calling upon his adversaries to reflect on the common grounds among humankind in general and the People of the Book in particular. For example, with al-Harith and Marhab al-Khaybari, he never initiated fighting until the enemy exhausted all efforts to fight him and sought his death. Besides, this embodied the spirit of Muhammadan Islam in warfare and Imam Ali's conduct was nothing but the embodiment of the ethics of true Islam: Ali is with the truth, and the truth is with Ali; wherever he turns, it turns with him.

In the biography of the Master of Martyrs, Imam Husayn (peace be upon him), we find a living example of the ethics of war in Islam. Alongside his family and companions, he embodied the ideal model of human ethics in warfare. It is narrated that Husayn (peace be upon him) felt compassion for his enemies, grieving only because his struggle would cause them to enter Hell. Logically and conventionally, compassion for an enemy who becomes your prisoner is acceptable; but to feel compassion for an enemy who thirsts for your blood, this is the peak of human nobility. Thus, it is necessary to return to the heritage of the Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them) in order to establish and reinforce the culture of love and benevolence that Islam set forth in dealing with other nations.

The reference of this philosophy in laying down the regulations of war goes back to the Islamic moral outlook. For, the aim of war or fighting, as Wahbah al-Zuhayli says, "is not colonization, nor the usurpation of peoples' choices, possessions, and resources, nor the opening of markets for products and exports, nor an ethnic-racial ambition. Rather, it is a just war whose purpose is not domination over other nations and peoples, for that is injustice, and injustice is forbidden." (Al-Zuhayli, 2000 AD, p. 07)

Owing to the fact that, ethics is thus the domain and horizon within which wars are situated. There is no declaration of war in Islam unless moral values are violated. The obligation of fighting in Islamic jurisprudence is a moral and social necessity for the restoration of human dignity. Allah says: "And what is [the matter] with you that you fight not in the cause of Allah

and for the oppressed among men, women, and children who say, ‘Our Lord, take us out of this city of oppressive people and appoint for us from Yourself a protector and appoint for us from Yourself a helper?’” (Al-Nisa: 75). Hence, what we deduce initially is that fighting in the cause of Allah is a social and human necessity that should not be relinquished or neglected. The state of surrender within the Islamic nation is due to the deficiency of general understanding and awareness of Allah the Exalted. A subtle point here is that we always mention the word Ta‘ala with the name of Allah without pausing at its meaning. As, Ta‘ali means transcendence in its utmost abstraction, and common people cannot perceive the abstract dimensions of the divine essence due to their limited and restricted experience, bound by sensory and ethnic-cultural chains. Because of this deficiency and limitation in comprehending the creed, the Islamic religion has been subjected to ferocious assaults by the forces of Satan throughout history. The harm endured by the prophets (peace be upon them) confirms the eternal nature of the struggle, and what complicates matters further is that religious scholars and thinkers often fell into the trap of dogmatism and conformity to their personal inclinations, as happened with the scholars of Israel, and similarly with the Islamic message after the martyrdom of the Noble Messenger (peace be upon him and his progeny). Thus, a distinction must be made between religion and religiosity. Since, religion, as a doctrinal and jurisprudential system, transcends the individuals who belong to it, based on relativity. Religious practice, when compared with doctrinal elements, is shaped by personal and social experience. As Martyr Sayyid Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr (may Allah sanctify his soul) said, the nature of society is movement, and if the community ceases to move, the nation becomes a phantom. This movement must be directed toward an absolute horizon. Therefore, religiosity in all religions is relative and, generally, deviates from the truth. Enemies of religions have exploited these gaps to distort the image of religion, with Islam as the prime example. Islam has become, in the Western imagination, the religion of slaughter and Islamophobia is the clearest expression of the Western conception of Islam. Even within the Muslim nation, there is a deliberate plan to distort youth’s perceptions of Islam by presenting the Wahhabi with his strange beard as the model of the religious Muslim. This is one form of warfare against Islam. Thus, defending the Islamic creed requires multiple forms of jihad, the lowest of which is the defense of the homeland and family, and the highest of which is the jihad of clarification, i.e., presenting the Muhammadan creed in its true image as a religion of mercy and love, not as a religion of fighting, slaughter, and bloodshed. The prohibition of killing a soul except in truth closes the door to any interpretation that seeks sedition and distortion.

Conclusion:

The phrase Ethics and War at first reception suggests a strange contradiction between the two poles, for ethics is a social, civil, and peaceful system, while war denotes disorder, violence, and lack of stability. Bringing them together in one phrase, or in one issue, is, in the language of logicians, merely a fallacy. Yet, reflection on the matter places us within the system of opposing dualities that enter into the original fabric of the cosmic weave. As the gentle saying of the Commander of the Faithful (peace be upon him) states: “If you look at the world through it, it will blind you, but if you look with it, it will give you insight.” Thus, affliction, trial, and all that we conventionally regard as evil conceal good within them, and most often, this good

is deferred. Accordingly, war is a manifestation of human contention that drives toward elevation: “And were it not for God’s repelling people, some by means of others, the earth would have been corrupted, but God is full of bounty to the worlds.” (Al-Baqara: 251). For this reason, there is a view in the history of moral philosophy that holds war to be behind the emergence of ethics, namely the pioneers of the social approach to ethics, who acknowledge its relativity. As for the phrase Ethics of War, it is a moral grounding of conflict and fighting. If human nature is composed in oppositional or dialectical form, where opposites clash, then wars are but a natural outcome; hence, the moralization of war is a religious necessity. Among the observations drawn from the study is the limitation of contemporary jurisprudence and the science of objectives (maqāsid) in keeping pace with new changes, particularly within Sunni jurisprudence, which traces back to objective historical causes, the most important of which are the Tatar and Crusader invasions that the Islamic nation faced, as well as the closure of the gate of ijtihād, which made classical juridical compendiums the primary basis and reference for interpreting contemporary reality, where the jurist was unable to keep up with the changes taking place. In contrast, we find that Ja‘fari jurisprudence presents Islamic juridical studies on the basis of the connection between jurisprudence and scholarly ijtihād that proceeds from the scholars. The legislative authority of juridical rulings concerning the organization of the family and civil society returns to the capacity for scholarly derivation, not to the rank or position that the scholar holds. For this reason, we observe a unique ethical quality in the value culture of the followers of Ahl al-Bayt. The most recent wars endured by the Islamic nation against Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Iran, reveal the moral level that distinguishes the Muhammadan Muslim in his jihad compared with the other.

List of References

1. Abdel Fattah Imam Imam .(1996) .*Plato and Women* .Egypt :Madbouly Library.
2. Abu Ishaq Ibrahim bin Musa bin Muhammad Al-Lakhmi Al-Shatibi 1997) .AD .(*Al-Muwafaqat* .Saudi Arabia :Dar Ibn Affan.
3. Al-Bashir Al-Ibrahimi 1997) .AD .(*Complete Works* .Algeria :Dar Al-Gharb.
4. Al-Zuhayli, W. (2000 AD). *The Rulings of War in Islam*. Damascus: Al-Maktabi.
5. Carol Cohen .(2017) .*Women and War* .Damascus :Al-Rahba Publishing and Distribution.
6. Ibn Manzur, M. i. (2016 AD). *Lisan al-Arab*. Egypt: Dar al-Maaref.
7. Qutb al-Din Saeed bin Hibat Allah Al-Rawandi 1406) .AH .(*Minhaj al-Bara’ah fi Sharh Nahj al-Balagha* .Iran: Qom, Al-Hiyam Press.
8. Sayyid Muhammad Husayn Al-Tabataba’i 1417) .AH .(*Al-Mizan in the Interpretation of the Qur’an* .Beirut :Al-A’lami Foundation.