

Is There a Just Conflict? Analyzing Pastors' Understanding of Religious-based Conflict from the Just War Perspective

Stevany F. W. Pattiasina
Faculty of Theology
Satya Wacana Christian University
Salatiga, Indonesia
stevanypattiasina@gmail.com

John A. Titaley
Faculty of Theology
Maluku Indonesian Christian University
Ambon, Indonesia
j_titaley@yahoo.com

Abstract—This research explores pastors' understanding of the 1999-2004 conflict in Ambon based on "just war" principles. The research employs a Just War Theory to survey the perceptions of an interreligious based conflict. The theory claims that a war could be a just war if it meets the principles in the Just War Theory. This research uses the stories from pastors to analyze and criticize the principles. It employed a qualitative method to collect data from field and documentary research. Using a snowball data collection approach, 15 pastors were interviewed in Ambon who experienced the conflict directly with their congregation members. The results show that the conflict in Ambon was not a just war because of the different causes and processes in the conflict in Ambon and the principles of a just war. Moreover, the understanding and experiences of the pastors fundamentally reflect that the just war principles are ideal in theory, but it is extremely hard to make a conflict a just war in practice. Although the conflict engaged religious communities, the principles of a just war still did not exist in the real conflict.

Keywords—just war, Ambon conflict, pastor.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Ambon conflict from 1999-2004 is one of the facts that blood spillage and loss not only occurs between countries or ethnic groups, but it is also between religious followers. Then it is not only caused by political and economic reasons, but it is also due to the presence of religious intersections between the followers. This increasingly shows that there are conflicts between followers' existence with the meaning of the word 'religion' itself, meaning a situation that is orderly, especially when these religious intersections are ridden or used by political and economic interests, such as what really occurred in Ambon, so that it caused small disagreements to become a big conflict that involved hundreds of thousands of people with the loss of thousands of lives and valuables.

In the beginning, this Ambon conflict started with the news of 2 youngsters fighting around the BatuMerah terminal on 19 January 1999, on Idul Fitri day. These two youths were Jacob Leuhery (Yopi), a Christian, and Nursalin bin Kadir, a Muslim, who initially asked Yopi, a city bus driver, to exchange some money two times. However, since Yopi did not have any small bills, he was threatened with a knife to his neck. This action made Yopi angry, as he went home and grabbed a "parang" sword and tried to go after Nursalin. Knowing that he was being sought, Nursalin ran away and told

the people around him that a Christian was chasing him with a sword. From this incident, suddenly about five minutes late (about 3:10 PM), about 350 residents from Batu Merah village who were Muslims started burning the Christian residents' homes in Batu Merah Dalam (which was also where Yopi lived). Next, with an increasing number of people of about 700 individuals, they went to the Mardika region, of which all the residents there were Christian and succeeded to damage and burn a number of homes and vehicles, beat an elderly person who was unable to run, and killed four others.[1] Not only at Batu Merah Dalam and Mardika, pillaging and burning occurred suddenly of 12 homes in the Silale region, including the Sumber Kasih church.[2] After hearing about the incidents, a number of Christian residents, especially males from Kudamati and other areas, went to Mardika and Silale, but they were stopped by Islam residents of Waringin village, so that there was fighting and they threw rocks at each other around the area. Since this incident on 19 January, sudden and continuous attacks occurred in regions that were inhabited by Christians, so that it caused a big conflict, where Christians had to respond to the conflict.

Interestingly, the phenomenon of religious group participation, using religious accessories, praying before attacking, and using the name of God in the conflict depicted a belief that their involvement in the conflict was for the right cause. Besides that, theoretically, a big conflict or war, whether it occurs today or hundreds of years ago, can be said to be just or justified when a previous attack has been committed and causes much loss for the country or an ethnic group. This is one of the criteria that is found in the Just War Theory. This viewpoint was originally stated by St. Augustine in the 5th century, related to the Christian soldiers' involvement in a war. Three criteria that were given by him were right cause, legal authority, and just purpose. The increasing developments through Aquinas' thinking in the 15th century, Francisco de Victoria in the 16th century, as well as Michael Walzer, James T. Turner, and other figures in the 21st century, were combined to become the right cause, legal authority, just purpose, proportionality, probability, last effort, and discrimination. This theory causes several possibilities to occur towards a conflict. First, based on the considerations towards these principles, a war or conflict can be conducted. Second, there is an increasing viewpoint that there is a just conflict.

Based on the Ambon conflict and just war theory, this research emphasizes two things: the first is how preachers understand the Ambon conflict that can then be connected with the just war principles. Second, it looks at how the just war principles are analyzed from the conflict experience in Ambon. Based on this problem, the purpose of this research is to analyze the conflict in Ambon through an understanding of the pastors, whether the conflict was just based the just war principles, and second, analyzing these just war principles based on the conflict that occurred in Ambon.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research employed a qualitative method with descriptive analysis. The research material focused on literature data and interview results. The literature data was related with the just war theory, whether in classic thinking or contemporary thinking, and the Ambon conflict in 1999-2004 were obtained from the interview results of 15 pastors who in the same period experienced direct conflict with their congregation members in their service areas of Klasis Pulau Ambon, in Synod of Maluku Protestant Church.

III. JUST WAR THEORY

A. *Just War in Early Thinking*

1. St. Augustine

Modern just war figures believe that thinking towards just war started from the writings of Augustine in the 5th century. In these writings, Augustine tried to challenge the viewpoint that Rome's loss was the result of Christian citizens and showed that there was mercy towards Christians who participated in Rome's army with justifying the usage of defensive weapon strength and found that there was no moral mistake with that task.[3] The following is a depiction of just war in his writings.

a. In *Contra Faustum*

In *Contra Faustum*, Augustine put forward the idea that there is nothing wrong with a soldier obeying and being responsible to carry out a military command. He revealed that war is only just in God's authority. Therefore, soldiers can be exempted from mistakes.[4] Related with authority, he stated that the presence of humans in this natural order can eliminate peace. Therefore, authority and decision making are needed to declare a war and it must be placed in the ruler.[5]

b. In *letter 229—to Darius*

A year before he died, Augustine wrote to Prince Darius that he accepted war as a consideration and justification for Christians to participate in a war, but he still prioritized maintaining peace.[4]

c. In *DeVerbisDomini*

"As a just follower of God, war cannot be used for greed or cruelty, but from a desire for peace, to prevent criminality and help increase goodness." Therefore, although war is declared by an official authority and there is a just reason, by having an evil intention, it is an unjust decision.[6]

d. *Questions Concerning the Heptateuch*

In this writing, Augustine stated that if a war is unjust, then Christians cannot partake in it. But if a war is just, then Christians can participate in it and especially if ordered by God. Another important aspect of justifying a war is if the

purpose of a war is to avenge loss. The loss meant here is national loss, and it occurs when a nation or ethnic group fails to make reparations towards loss done by its citizens, for instance, when people or a nation fails to return land or goods that are seized in an inappropriate manner.[6]

e. In *The City of GOD*

In this writing, Augustine provided a defense towards the Christian congregation, who at the time of Roman rule were accused of being the cause of the weakening power of the kingdom. In facing that charge, Augustine wrote that Christianity did not negate patriotism at all, but actually promoted that enthusiasm to become a faith adherence (religious obligation). For him, war is not based on being motivated through the enjoyment of violence, but due to adherence to God and His punishment towards evildoers to prevent bigger sins, is an act of love.[7] Besides that, although he admitted that war can become an endemic disease in global cities, he believed that war can be done with a final goal of peace. In other words, the goal of war is peace, so that world peace can be said to be a result of war.[4] Therefore, if someone decides to engage in war, it must be done "for the purpose of goodness without undue violence." He revealed that in certain situations, peace can be achieved through forgiveness without having to do violence. However, in other situations, allowing violence without any effort to prevent it in some way, including using violence, is the same as allowing violence to suppress justness. In other words, war is an action that is characterized as "permissible", but only and if "it is done in a forced condition and to obtain peace." [7]

Based on these writings, it can be concluded that there are three important things that must be considered towards a war that is viewed as just by Augustine. First, there is a reason, meaning there was a previous attack or a loss experienced by a country or ethnic group. Second, it is done on behalf of an official authority. Third, it has an ultimate goal to defend justness and bring peace. In other words, according to Richard Miller, it is done to punish a misdeed, put a situation back in balance due to an injustice, and restore fairness and peace.[8]

2. Thomas Aquinas

In the 13 century, Thomas Aquinas was a philosophical theologian who was very influential in the Roman Catholic Church. He continued the teachings that Augustine had started earlier. A killing that is unwanted towards someone else is unjust. However, just like Augustine, he stated that in war, it is just when there is an authority "that is official" and has "a just cause", and a "rightintention". There has to be an official authority because he has the right to declare war. For instance, when responsibility for a public matter is trusted to a ruler, then the responsible party should be accountable for defending the city, group, or province, which is under the person's rule. For the second principle, a just cause is that an attack is done because there are several crimes that were previously committed, and not from another unjust need. The third principle is that a rightintention to engage in war means every goal that wants to be achieved should have a good purpose or avoid another crime. In other words, it should be done to support fairness and goodness, not wickedness.[6]

B. Just War Principles after Augustine and Aquinas

Continuing the perceptions that were started by Augustine and Aquinas, the figures of today still defend the three early criteria of the two figures. However, with different period situations, it demands the application of wider criteria. For instance, as stated by Francisco de Victoria, a just war can also be declared by a whole group but through an official party. War that is conducted is especially by that group when in a dangerous situation, so that they need to defend themselves as a just means in war.[9] This was also emphasized by Amaladoss, in that if previously the just war criteria were only used towards a war that occurred between countries or ethnic groups, developments today show that these criteria can be applied in a balanced manner towards war between groups.[10] Although there are wider developments, the main points of the just war theory are still the same, meaning providing special attention to moral issues that permit a war effort and how to control or limit a war from occurring. The just war concept began with a perception about countering an injustice that happens.[11]

From the continuation and development of this just war theory, the principles that are held up until now, include dividing them into two parts, which are *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. *Jus ad bellum* is an effort before deciding to go to war, while *jus in bello* means actions taken while a war is ongoing.

Jus ad bellum

Jus ad bellum is a collection of six principles which justifies taking a path to war, which consists of the first three principles with a deontological characteristic, while the next three principles are assurances for the best consequences.

- Have a just reason

This first condition is due to the danger faced by the party which will decide to go to war, which is because an attack was made first by the other party. This reason is considered fair because it has the purpose to protect and sustain innocent lives, to demand the rights that were taken unfairly, which sacrificed fairness and human values.

- Have an official authority
The decision to declare war must be done by an official authority, even if it is a joint/public declaration. For instance, it can be decided by a party who has the responsibility to defend the public welfare. They are entrusted by the public to state what is allowed in using violence or conducting a war.
- Have a rightintention
The intention that is meant is to protect those who are innocent from an unjust attack, to demand rights that are wrongly taken, and to reestablish a fair condition.
- Have proportionality
Proportionality means comparing the importance of good deeds that can be produced through war compared with the bad deeds that will occur. The purpose of this principle is to ensure that the

destruction of human values due to using force (armed) at least will be balanced with the number of values that are protected and maintained.[9] In addition, this principle also must consider that the bad effects that surface should not be bigger than the losses that result from the attack made.[12] Therefore, the good and bad possibilities must be calculated in a war before making a decision to go to war.

- As a last resort
War should only be done as a last resort after all other non-violent means like negotiations and mediations have been held.[12] In other words, a war effort should only be done if other peaceful alternative measures have failed.
- Probability of success
A war that is conducted is not based on something illogical, fruitless, and with disproportionate predictions. However, it is predicted to succeed by reaching the goals of a war, which will be carried out, or in other words, there is a possibility of success in ending a wrongdoing through war.

Jus in bello

Jus in bello means justice during a war, which consists of two principles: proportionality and discrimination.

- Proportionality
Continuing the principle of proportionality before a war, proportionality during a war emphasizes comparability in means and instruments used during a war until the end of a war. Using war instruments has the purpose to reduce the destruction and number of people injured and killed from one's group. This principle demands that the war instruments used should not be bigger than those owned by one's opponents. These war instruments should be used appropriately with the goals and purposes of the war.
- Discrimination
This discrimination stipulates that there are differences in targets, meaning towards people who are not involved in a war. Since it is in a war, targets are only allowed to be attacked if they participate directly in the war. This difference is made to protect civilians or those who do not participate in the war, including children, women, preachers or religious leaders, foreigners, and also the rest of civil society who love peace.[11]

C. Goals of Just War Principles

As mentioned previously, this theory provides a number of useful principles as a consideration of whether a war should be carried out and can be deemed as a fair war. Besides that, the just war theory provides a moral framework that is not only used for political leadership and military personnel but also the responsibility of civil society in public life to question the causes of war, authority, goals, time, and risks, and can think about the appropriate or inappropriate war methods.[8]

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Overview of Maluku

Understanding the Ambon conflict cannot be separated from an overview of Maluku. Maluku Province has nine regencies and two cities, which are Maluku Tenggara Barat Regency, Maluku Barat Daya Regency, Maluku Tenggara Regency, Maluku Tengah Regency, Buru Regency, Buru Selatan Regency, Kepulauan Aru Regency, Seram Bagian Barat Regency, Seram Bagian Timur Regency, Tual municipality, and Ambon municipality, which is the capital of the province.[13]

The Ambon residents originally came from Seram Bagian Tengah Island – which is better known as “Nunusaku”. Seram Island is often referred to as “Nusa Ina”, which means “Mother Island” for Ambon society. Within it, there are two different ethnic groups, who are Alune and Wemale. Then they spread to the surrounding islands, especially in Maluku Tengah. When the Dutch colonial government was here, Ambon Island and the surrounding area (Ambon cultural area) were split into sections. The sections were administrative units equivalent with villages, which were established during the Dutch colonial government period. They were important identities for Ambon people.[14] Besides being inhabited by the original inhabitants, Maluku Province was also inhabited by people from Java and Sulawesi (Buton, Bugis, and Makasa) and Sumatera who came later.

The majority of the residents of Maluku are Muslims and Christians, followed by a number of other religious followers. The spread of Christianity occurred along with the presence of the Portuguese and Spaniards related with the spice trade in the 16th century. It was also the case with the Dutch during their rule. In addition, before the colonization period, Islam had already spread to the Maluku region due to the influence of the Ternate and Tidore kingdoms.[15]

Moreover, within the Maluku community’s lives in general and Ambon people’s lives in particular, there is a strong familial relationship between one administrative unit or village and another one. This family relationship is formed through traditional ceremonies and is the culture of Maluku people and is mostly known with the term “PELA.”[16] The primary purpose is to help each other and develop a community life, where people feel good times and bad times together. This *Pela* relationship has three types based on how the relationship is formed, including *Pela Keras* (which originates from the presence of opposition and war), *Pela Gandong* (based on family bonds), and *Pela Tempat Sirih* (formed through assistance given from one village to another village). This *Pela* connection has a series of values that bind each individual who is part of this familial association or kinship.[17]

B. Pastors’ Understanding of the Ambon Conflict

From the 15 preachers who were the resource persons, only one of them felt that the conflict was not a big conflict, because it is violence resulting from political games and the role of provocateurs. While the other 14 respondents stated that

the conflict was a big conflict (war), with the following reasons.

- It did not only occur on 1 island, but it spread to other regions.
- There were attacks and defensive actions taken.
- It was a big conflict that was conspired by using religion as an instrument that succeeded to destroy all the Maluku people’s life joints.
- It was a big conflict (war) that was intentionally created, by having weapons, bombs, mortar, and other things prepared and brought to Ambon by the parties who planned it.
- It involved thousands of people and was added by the arrival of jihadists.
- It resulted in many victims who ‘fell’ not only from those of Christian faith but also Islam and other religions.
- It resulted in the relocation of a large number of refugees to other places that were considered safer on Ambon Island or outside of this island.
- Compared with the previous small conflicts that usually occurred between villages or village districts and could be quickly resolved, this big conflict lasted for a prolonged period.

Based on the reasons above, it can be stated that on behalf of a planned attack, some of the congregation members or preachers partook in defending themselves and engaged in protection in the conflict. Therefore, related with the principles of a just war, the following summary of the data results is explained.

1. Reason to defend oneself

The primary reason why church members and preachers had to defend themselves was because they were attacked first, such as what was experienced by the following congregations.

Benteng Karang Congregation: In general, the conflict occurred first in Batu Merah and Mardika, but in the scope of the Pulau Ambon diocese, at first an attack occurred in the Benteng Karang region. The attack in the Benteng Karang area may have been caused by information that Alfatah Mosque (Agung Mosque in Ambon) had been burned by Christians. Due to that, a group of Muslims from Wakal, Hila Islam, and Hitu united to attack or maybe also because it had already been previously planned. There was suspicion that this was planned, because before there was a burning, a truck was used to carry various items.

Hila Congregation: Besides damaging the congregation members’ homes, the attack also killed youngsters and a preacher who were joining a bible camp around the Hila area.

Hunut Congregation: The attackers numbered in the thousands as they went to the Hunut area and plundered

and burned church members' houses, including an elderly person who was still inside the house.

Negeri Lama and Nania Congregations: An attack was initially carried out on 20 January by throwing bombs, burning homes, burning a church, and killing a preacher who was still inside the church. As a result of the attack, they could not go through the Passo area, which was primarily inhabited by Christians to head towards the city center.

KebunCengkeh Congregation: Hearing about the conflict which had already happened, on 22 January, there was a group prayer at the crossroads of KebunCengkih Road, in order to make the situation peaceful, which involved a preacher, a congregation, an assembly, Islamic religious leaders, and the Islamic and Christian community members around the area. However, this effort failed because on 23 February, there was looting and burning of homes as well as the slaughtering of several church congregation members.

Waai Congregation: Attacks were made on the Waai area several times. It started with small attacks on 23 February 1999 and continued until May 2000. The pinnacle of "the fall of Waai" happened on 6 July 2000, which resulted in the preacher and a number of congregation members having to traverse through a forest and go to the Suli area on 1 August.

Galala Congregation: Besides the Mardika area, Galala is one of the areas that borders with Batu Merah-Galunggung. Therefore, attacks were conducted continuously, such as the shooting of 17 youths and the burning of a garage, the shooting of 7 youths around the church, and the burning of homes and a church. Besides that, jihadists from outside of Ambon Island came in 2001, which made the situation more difficult to become peaceful because they kept trying to attack with weapons that were complete and sophisticated.

From the attack experiences, a number of church congregation members decided to take refuge, which other ones, especially males, decided to take up a defensive position against the ongoing attacks to protect and sustain their lives. This was considered as a reason why the church congregation members had to take action by participating in this attack.

2. Authority in leadership

The participation of the church members in this conflict was a spontaneous decision that was not led by an authority figure who decided to declare war. They just wanted to face the war together to protect themselves and sustain their lives from the attack.

The authority to declare war was not done by a pastor at that time. However, it cannot be denied that pastors as congregation leaders played an important role at that time. This role was seen in general when the pastors advised the congregation members numerous times to not get involved in the attack, especially when there was no direct attack made.

Another role that was done by the pastors was when the condition become increasingly less conducive, they asked the congregation members to seek refuge in another area, whether to coordinate to pick up a number of Hunut congregation members, walk together through the forest like the Waai congregation, or take refuge separately.

On another side, there were pastors who chose to stay with their congregation members to defend their regions. Maintaining a stand and self-defense were done without any previous guidelines. Although the defensive effort was done together, there was no instruction to attack first. But there was a general instruction to maintain their position and attack if they were attacked first.

3. Goal

Since there were many houses destroyed and burned as well as killings that were experienced by the church members from the initial attack, the church members, especially the males, decided to defend themselves. The purpose of this self-defense was not to conquer the Muslims, but to protect their lives if they were attacked. This defensive effort was done so that the attackers would cease attacking. The churches did not teach to kill or how to kill, but instilled a belief that life was given by God. Therefore, a number of church congregation members chose to defend their lives and those under their protection.

4. Proportionality

Since the beginning of when the attacks were done and to avoid even bigger attacks, the congregation members started to make weapons like machetes, spears, bows and arrows, and homemade weapons from iron, matches, and other materials. These weapons were made to protect themselves from an attack, so that the attackers could not just "finish off" the congregation members, such as what was done in the early stage of the attack. However, when the initial attack was conducted, the church members did not have a meeting or discussion about counting the financial and other losses incurred. The losses experienced were only talked about between people, especially church members who experienced loss. However, at that time, the Communications and Information Center recorded the losses experienced by the church congregation members, like the result of the initial attack (in a period of 10 days from 19-29 January 1999) that resulted in much loss, including: 681 houses were burned and 96 houses were damaged (only in the Benteng Karang, Hunut, Waiheru, Nania, and Negeri Lama areas).[19]

5. Final Effort

Since the beginning of the attack on the Batu Merah and Benteng Karang congregations, several efforts were made to achieve peace. One of the efforts was done in Kebun Cengkih on 22 January 1999, which involved Islamic and Christian religious figures, as well as Muslims and Christians from the area, by praying

together at the crossroads of Kebun Cengkih. However, this effort did not succeed because a month after, the conflict occurred, and the congregation members still had to leave their homes.

On another side, besides the lack of communication which made it difficult to reach peace, the congregation members in another area could not reach peace because the attacks were done suddenly and after the attacks, the security apparatus forbid the church members to meet and discuss directly with the Muslim residents, such as what happened in the Hunut and Nania regions, so that no effort was made to meet and find a peaceful resolution.

6. Possibility of Success

Defending with traditional weapons or homemade ones was not done to defeat or destroy Muslims but rather to prevent future attacks and restore peace. For many of the church members who partook in a defensive effort, one of the factors of the possibility of success was through prayer and the hope that God would heal all, so that they would be safe. As a result, during the conflict, accompaniment and prayer were done every night by pastors and church members.

7. Proportionate (while an attack is on going)

While the war was happening, the strategy used was to defend and protect oneself. This was stated by a majority of the pastors. On this island, there are several defense center regions and border areas, such as Galala, Passo, Karpan, Amahusu, Batu Gantung, and Kudamati. In the defensive effort, the church residents did several actions together, and there were also groups that were led by certain subjects that organized the groups in defense.

As seen from using instruments during the attack from the attackers and the church residents who were defending themselves, there were imbalances as the attackers used more sophisticated and organic weapons than the church members. This was especially since Laskar Jihad came from outside of Ambon Island in 2000 with a complete arsenal of weapons. This was seen by finding shell casings and bombs which did not explode after being thrown in the areas of church members, like in Galala, which it was not known for certain whether it belonged to the attackers purely or from apparatus members. It was similar with the finding of bullets from N16 and MK3 guns, which were fired from the sea to this area, which added to the indication that unjust actions were taken by the apparatus when the attack occurred, which let the attack be carried out against the church members in several locations and/or even participated in the attack.

8. Discrimination

While the war took place, it was undeniable that there were church members who killed women or children, because whether women, kids, or men, when the

attackers entered the congregation region to stage an attack, there was no way out to defend themselves, except if they had no intention to attack, then no actions would have been taken towards them, as what was done by Waai congregation members who assisted several Muslim women who were in public transportation vehicles heading towards their location, Liang, by bringing them to a safety post.

In addition to that, it cannot be denied that when there was shooting between the church members and attackers in the border areas, it could have caused people who were not part of the war to become victims. Similarly, houses were burned and it may not have been known that there were women and children inside. However, elders often provided advice and direction to church members, especially youngsters, so that they would not kill those who were not attacking, especially women and children.

C. *Analysis of the Ambon Conflict and Just War Conflict*

1. Just Cause

In just war theory, a reason that is considered fair to partake in an attack is if one is attacked first and if many losses are incurred by a particular group or country. Related with the Ambon attack, by having an attack made first by Muslims towards Christians, and the large amount of loss experienced by church members since the initial attack in Mardika and which continued in other regions was the main consideration why a number of church members chose to get involved in the conflict.

However, according to this principle in Ambon conflict, there is one basic aspect just war theory does not talk about, that is the reason behind the first attack. In Ambon case, there are two factors that may contribute to the first attack. First, internal factors such as cultural and social life between Christian and the Muslim from Bugis, Buton and Makassar, especially, when the Muslim residents' homes being burned in Wailette. Therefore, because of frictions in social lives in Maluku society between the two religious groups, when the verbal exchange from Nursalin at the Batu Merah terminal on 19 January 1999 that a Christian was chasing him with a sword, it could easily light a fire of rage from other Muslims which ultimately led to an attack. Second, external factor is it had been previously planned by certain parties in authority for political or economic reasons. Thus, the first attack in just war theory, in fact, may not be the right reason to conduct a war.

2. Legitimate Authority

In the early thinking of the just war concept, Augustine revealed that there should be a moral responsibility by those who have authority towards people who are threatened by another party.[11] In this period, the term "official authority" meant implicitly that a war was done on behalf of those who had the authority and based on the people's betterment. Therefore, they could consider the reasons for a war and decide whether a war was just

or not. Next, an official authority's insight could have meaning, as a function of uniting people who were connected together under a power that was recognized together.[9] Therefore, by having responsibility from a party considered appropriate by a united group, then preparing to defend oneself and others in the surroundings could be justified.

Based on the statement above, this principle of official authority can provide two possibilities, which are an appropriate authority can provide limitations in using force (weapons) and limit the destruction of people's lives when the war is ongoing or as a last option. However, on another side, when authority is used by a party who has political and economic interests to dominate a certain region, then the party can look for or use means which can justify a war.

Besides that, in certain cases, as what actually happened in Ambon, there was no person who was considered authorized to order an attack. This happened due to the desire of a group of people to stop an attack that was happening and defend themselves and those who had ties to them. As what happened on 19 January when Christian residents were attacked in Mardika, spontaneously, a number of Christian males from other regions like Kudamati and Batu Gantung advanced towards Mardika.

It cannot be denied that pastors as religious leaders played an important role in the Christian residents lives in Ambon when the attack occurred, because they were with the church members and accompanied them, whether church members who stayed at their locations in border areas or those who led church members to relocate to safer areas (refugee camps). However, based on this theory, the pastors were not official authorities to declare war, because in several cases, young people still returned to the border areas when several pastors forbid the church members who had arrived at the refugee camps from returning to join the war. This was a feeling of wanting to strive together through solidarity.

Since there was no official authority, one of the factors that could influence this desire for unity was the provocation issue. The provocation that was meant here had two meanings, which was first, a provocation that was directed towards the issue of peace, and second a provocation that was directed towards the issue of disruption. The provocation that was found in this second meaning predominantly happened in the beginning and middle of the conflict. For example, the issue about the Maranatha Church burning by Muslim residents, which in fact was not true, almost caused the Christian males to attack and burn Agung Alfata Mosque.

3. Right Intention

The purpose of a just war is not to eliminate and subjugate others, but to achieve peace and justice. Johnson also stated that having this war gave people the right to defend justice, in that the attackers did not have

the right to attack others and those who were not involved in the attack.[11] This statement is equivalent with the statement given by pastors that a defensive action was taken in an effort to protect people's lives not take people's lives or rob others. Nevertheless, there was also a discrepancy, in that achieving justice in a just war was different with the involvement of the church members, who just wanted to protect their lives. This was because in the just war principle, the aspect of demanding loss compensation was part of the goal to reach peace, while in the Ambon war, there was no demand for loss compensation from the church residents towards the attackers because it was seen that their involvement was to protect their lives and hope that the war would be over soon.

However, it was also undeniable that besides a number of the church members were involved in the conflict to protect themselves and the areas where they lived, there were also church members who decided to attack out of a feeling of revenge, such as by burning several mosques and Muslims' houses which were in and around the church members' areas.

4. Possibility of Success and Proportionality before a War

The principle of possibility of success and proportionality before a war has a direct relationship, which is there are weapon comparison calculations of one group or country with the adversary, in order that the weapons owned by the group are not more or more destructive than those owned by the adversary, but by having a desire that the war is conducted for their side to win. Therefore, calculations need to be made of losses experienced as a basis of going to war, the good and bad possible outcomes of having a war, and even done at certain times during a war to evaluate the proportionality of good and bad outcomes found.[20]

In the Ambon conflict, predictions were also made towards aspects of success or failure in defending their areas. Therefore, they made traditional weapons and homemade weapons that were used to halt the adversary from attacking them. However, their meaning of success was more towards stopping the attack done by their adversaries, so that they could protect their lives. Their idea of success was also not in how many weapons they had but in trusting in God that He would aid them. For instance, besides carrying weapons, some youngsters also brought small Bibles with them.

5. Final Effort

In the just war theory, a final effort is one of the most important components to determine whether a war should be conducted or not, even if the reasons and motivations are considered just to declare war.[12] As a form of defense, power (weapons) must be used as a final step, which require a defensive effort when there is no other way and after various efforts for peace have failed.

Related with this final effort principle, after an initial attack was done, several church members' areas that

could not find a peaceful resolution, like in Waai and Hila, because the condition did not make it possible to engage in a peaceful effort, the apparatus forbid the church members from meeting with the Islamic residents. On another side, several efforts to acquire peace were done, but most of them failed because attacks also occurred in areas where these peace efforts were conducted, such as in Kebun Cengkeh. In addition, in the middle of the conflict, there were also meetings to make a peace agreement by religious leader representatives and government representatives. However, some of the meetings did not necessarily reduce the conflict. One of the failures was because the meetings that were held did not discuss or find out what was the real cause of the attack, how to handle it at the societal level, meaning by using a cultural aspect and how to handle it appropriately and fairly that should have been done by the apparatus and government.

However, interestingly, in the middle of the conflict that occurred, there was one area called Waiheru which was able to keep a peaceful relationship between Christians and Muslims. One of the main points of this success was by being fair and firm by the apparatus in that region, besides cooperation between Christian and Muslim people together with all the residents of that region. If compared with the church members of other areas, there were indications of injustice done by the apparatus, such as bullets shot from their organic weapons towards the church members. Therefore, there are three subjects that have contributions to maintain the peace, they are the people (Christians and Muslims), the apparatus, and the government.

6. Discrimination

Ideally, this just war principle proposes that war targets should just be those who partake in the war, and they should not attack women, children, religious leaders, and the rest of civil society. However, in fact, such as in the Ambon conflict, the adversaries who joined in the attack were not only adults but also children. Beside that, it could not be confirmed whether one of the attackers was a religious leader during an attack. The principle that was held at that time was that whoever joined in an attack should be considered as an enemy who could be killed. Therefore, the understanding for people who did not participate in the Ambon war was those who did not partake in attacking and defending during the war. Despite this, there was no guarantee that those who did not join the war would be safe. This was assumed because whether intentionally or unintentionally, those who were not involved in the war also became victims from the actions done in the war, such as victims as a result of stray bullets and bomb explosions that destroyed houses and killed people within the houses, especially in the border areas in the Ambon war. As a result, a person was only guaranteed to be able to avoid situations like this from their own personal actions or with advice from pastors to protect themselves by temporarily relocating to another area that was considered safer.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on an analysis of the pastors' understanding of the Ambon conflict and seen from the principles of a just war, it can be concluded that the conflict in Ambon was not a just conflict or a justified conflict. The main differences between these two were in the principle of official authority, a just cause, a possibility of success, proportionality before and after the war, and discrimination. Beside that, the theory itself have flaws to be applied in real conflict. Therefore, based on the theory and facts in the conflict, it shows that it is very difficult to create a just conflict or war, maybe even impossible. In fact, conflict leaves people in loss and trauma.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tim Pengacara Gereja, *Gambaran Kerusuhan di Kotamadya Ambon Mulai Tanggal 19 Januari*. Ambon, 1999. Unpublished
- [2] Communication and Information Post, recordings of various instances of disturbances in Ambon, Sanana (Maluku Utara) and Piru Seram Barat. Ambon, 1999.
- [3] Antonia Malone, "The Just War Theory: A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing?" in *Studying War-No More*. Ed. Brien Wicker. 1993.
- [4] D. A. Lenihan, "The Just War Theory in the Work of Saint Augustine" in *Augustinian Studies*. Volume 19, 1988.
- [5] William V. O'Brien. *The Conduct of Just War and Limited War*. USA: Praegar Publisher, 1981.
- [6] R.E. Santoni, "The Nurture of War, Just War Theory's Contribution" in *Philosophy Today*. 1991.
- [7] Kalvin Budiman, "Prinsip Dasar Etika Kristen Tentang Perang: Sebuah Tinjauan Terhadap *Pacifism* and *Just War Theory*." *Veritas Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan*. Vol. 4, No. 1, April 2003.
- [8] Richard B. Miller, "Just War, Civic Virtue, and Democratic Social Criticism: Augustinian Reflection." *Journal of Religion*. Vol. 89, 2009.
- [9] James T. Johnson, *Can Modern War be Just?* America: Murray Printing Company, 1984.
- [10] Michael Amaladoss. "A Just War?" dalam *Vidyajyoti: Journal of Theological Reflection*. Volume 66 Januari-Desember tahun 2002
- [11] James T. Johnson. *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War, A Moral and Historical Inquiry*. USA: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- [12] Roger Burggraeve & Jo De Tavernier, "Radicalism and Realism of a Peace Ethic of Christian Inspiration in a World of Evil and Injustice" in *Studying War-NoMore*. Ed. Brien Wicker. 1993.
- [13] Badan Pusat Statistik, *Statistik Indonesia, Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2012*. Jakarta: BPS Indonesia, 2012.
- [14] Marwati Djoened Poepoenegoro, *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia IV, Kemunculan Penjajahan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2008.
- [15] Th. Van der End. *Ragi Carita 1, Sejarah Gereja di Indonesia Tahun 1500-1860*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2007.
- [16] Bagian Proyek Pengkajian dan Pembinaan Nilai-Nilai Budaya Maluku, *Perwujudan Pela dalam Kehidupan Sosial Budaya Maluku*. Indonesia: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1996.
- [17] Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, *Adat dan Upacara Perkawinan Daerah Maluku*. 1977/1978.
- [18] Data obtained from the Secretariat office of Pulau Ambon diocese, on 7 September 2012. Unpublished.
- [19] Communications and Information Post, recordings of various instances of disturbances in Ambon, Sanana, and Piru Seram Barat. Ambon, 1999. Unpublished.
- [20] William V. O'Brien, *The Conduct of Just War and Limited War*. USA: Praegar Publisher.

