

# Some Approaches to the Concepts of War and Peace in Terms of Philosophy of Religion

## Savaş ve Barış Kavramlarına Din Felsefesi Açısından Bazı Yaklaşımlar

Saim GÜNDOĞAN<sup>1\*</sup> 

<sup>1\*</sup> Doç. Dr., Hakkari Üniversitesi,  
İlahiyat Fakültesi, Din Bilimleri  
Anabilim Dalı, Hakkari, Türkiye.

\*Sorumlu yazar/  
Corresponding author:  
saimgundogan@hakkari.edu.tr

Başvuru/Submitted: 14.05.2025  
Kabul/Accepted: 03.11.2025

Atf/Cite as:  
Gündoğan, S. (2025). Some  
approaches to the concepts of war  
and peace in terms of philosophy of  
religion, *Çankırı Karatekin  
Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler  
Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(2), 624-637.

### Abstract

**Aim:** This study seeks to provide a set of philosophical and theological reflections on war and peace by engaging selected themes within the philosophy of religion. Adopting a novel and interdisciplinary perspective, the research aims to reframe the concepts of war and peace through a conceptually delimited framework, offering theoretical analyses and constructive proposals.

**Method:** Employing the method of literature review, the paper examines the legitimacy of war from moral, religious, and philosophical standpoints. It further analyzes the approaches of world religions to war and peace, the search for sustainable peace, and universal ethical perspectives related to conflict. The study presents and compares diverse views on war and peace within the discursive horizon of the philosophy of religion.

**Results:** Through an analytical synthesis of diverse sources, this research discusses the concepts of militancy, just war theory, pacifism, and universal peace from a philosophical-theological perspective. Under the rubric of militancy, arguments in favor of the necessity of war are explored in light of scientific, ethical, and religious reasoning. Within the just war tradition, the study evaluates principles emphasizing the avoidance of war as a moral imperative and the limitation of harm where war becomes unavoidable. In the section on pacifism, the paper categorizes and analyzes absolute, conditional, and moderate forms of anti-war ethics. Theological analyses of universal peace underscore the notion that peace remains a highly endorsed moral aspiration. Among the central claims, peace is defended as a coherent life philosophy, positioned as a precondition for human freedom and dignity.

**Conclusion:** Although religions may leave room for war in cases of absolute necessity, they do not promote it as a systematically divine imperative. Rather, religious encouragement for war is interpreted as a reflection of subjective theological interpretations and socio-political positioning. The study concludes that in contexts of both war and peace, religious discourse is often instrumentalized to legitimize underlying economic, political, or philosophical agendas.

**Originality:** War and peace are not commonly addressed as core topics within the philosophy of religion. Framing them in this way provides a speculative and critical contribution to the field, demonstrating the broader ethical relevance of religion in contemporary global challenges.

**Key Words:** Philosophy of religion, war and peace, militarism, just war theory, pacifism.

## Öz

**Amaç:** Bu araştırmada savaş ve barışa yönelik farklı yaklaşımlarla din felsefesinin bazı konularından hareketle bir takım çözüm önerileri sunulmuştur. Yeni ve farklı bir perspektifle savaş ve barış kavramlarını ele almayı amaçlayan çalışma, kavramsal bir çerçeve ile konuyu sınırlayarak birtakım çözümler ve öneriler sunmayı hedefler.

**Yöntem:** Çalışmada teorik olarak savaşın meşruluğu, ahlâkî, dinsel ve felsefî yönü; dünya dinlerinin savaş ve barış yaklaşımları, barış için çözüm arayışlarını ve buna ilişkin evrensel perspektifleri, savaş ve barışa dair farklı görüşleri, din felsefesinin bakış açısından literatür taraması yöntemiyle tartışılmıştır.

**Bulgular:** Farklı kaynakların taranması vasıtasıyla ele alınan bu çalışma, savaşçılık, adil savaş teorisi, pasifizm ve evrensel barış kavramları din felsefesi açısından bazı yaklaşımlar bağlamında tartışılmıştır. Savaşçılık kavramı çerçevesinde, savaşın olması gerektiğini savunanlar ve onların argümanları ile bilimsel, felsefî ve dinî açıdan sözü edilen görüşün doğruluğu incelenmiştir. Adil savaş teorisinde, savaş gönüllü bir şekilde istenmemeli, hatta savaştan kaçınılmalıdır görüşü ve pratiğe döküldüğünde zararı en azla sınırlı tutacak ilkeler ele alınıp tartışılmıştır. Pasifizm kavramında, her türlü şiddet ve savaşa karşı çıkma anlayışı sonucunda ortaya konulan mutlak, görelî ve mutedil savaş karşıtlığı kavramları analiz edilmiştir. Evrensel barış konusunda ise savaş ve barış kavramları teolojik açıdan ele alınmıştır. Burada yapılan kavramsal analiz ve çözüm önerileri çerçevesinde barışın önemli ölçüde desteklenen bir umut ışığı olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öne çıkan fikirler arasında barışın savunulması, tutarlı bir yaşam felsefesi olarak ifade edilmiştir. Bu felsefe, özgür yaşamın bir ön koşulu şeklinde belirtilmiştir.

**Sonuç:** Dinlerin mecburi hallerde savaşa açık kapı bırakmakla beraber yönlendirmeyi sistematik olarak esas almadığı; savaşla ilişkin teşvikin sistematik bir din anlayışının ya da söyleminin ilâhî bir kaynağın ürünü olmadığı, bunun aksine din temsilcisinin dini kavrama, idrak etme, yaşam biçimlerinin bir yansıması olduğu; savaş veya barış söz konusu olduğunda, arka perdede değişik iktisadî, siyasi, felsefî, sosyolojik saikler onaylamak için dini alet olarak kullandıkları gibi sonuçlara varılmıştır.

**Özgünlük:** Din felsefesinin ana konularından biri olarak kabul edilmeyen savaş ve barış konusunun bu şekilde ortaya konulması, varsayımsal bir bakıştır, ancak din felsefesi açısından konunun tartışılması büyük bir değerdir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Din felsefesi, savaş ve barış, savaşçılık, adil savaş teorisi, pasifizm.

## Introduction

Man has encountered the concepts of war and peace both theoretically and practically. In this respect, human beings have met with war and peace either in the psychological sense, in the individual, sociological sense, social or global sense. War or peace, which leave deep traces in a person's life in a positive or negative sense, is effective in acquiring a "worldview" in a philosophical or religious context, and also contains a power that determines "a way of life" in accordance with this view. Rather than existential questions such as "Where did we come from?", "Where are we going?", which people ask themselves from time to time, philosophy gives answers to many questions such as "How should we determine our lives?", "How and why should we live?", "What should be our criterion or theory to be based on and defend while maintaining our lives?", "What should we act on?", especially in an environment of war or peace. "The philosophy of life" consisting of these answers and the "principles of belief" consisting of the answers given by religion are the views that emerge from the answer to the question of whether one should support war or peace by thinking about both this world and the world after death. In this regard, it is possible to argue one or some of several approaches, both philosophically and religiously, as will be explained in detail later in this study.

War can be expressed as the armed/unarmed struggle that occurs when the disputes that cause crises in the relations of states or organized social classes with each other are not resolved through diplomatic initiatives and mediation to achieve their economic, political and similar goals (Yaman, 2009a, p. 189). On the other hand, the concept of peace means that there is no state of war or that violence is not used to achieve certain goals, or more generally, that all people are in fraternal harmony without interfering with each other's right to life (Yaman, 2009b, p. 489). One of the most fundamental features of war is that, although it is not human, it is something unique to the living world and especially to human beings. Undoubtedly, "human beings are one of the creatures that attack, torture, injure and kill their own kind, even though their needs such as nutrition and protection are satisfied, and they are not under threat or danger" (Balçioğlu, 2001, p. 36). In this context, considering the history of the relationship between man and war, it is apparent that war is perceived and expressed as if it were the destiny of man (İbn Haldun, 1988, p. 37). Examining some numerical statistics on this subject, the truth of such an approach becomes clearer. During the 5600 years of human history, there have been more than 14,600 wars. These figures indicate that there is an average of 2.6 wars each year on average. In addition, of the roughly 185 generations of people born, lived, and died during the same period, only 10 generations had the opportunity to live in peace (Archer and Gartner, 2005, p. 247). Moreover, from the 16th century alone to the present day, according to official records, 142 million people have died and 40 million people have died as a result of war or war-related starvation and disease. 75% of the figures given here were achieved in the 20th century (Krieger and Kelly, 1992, p. 15). The damage and cruel face of war against all humanity, regardless of children, young people, the old and women, has increased more in the modern period than in previous periods. Because, as Hannah Arendt (d.1975) stated, the 20th century was "the century of wars and revolutions, of violence that is believed to be the common denominator" (Arendt, 2005, p. 7). This brutal reality of the phenomenon of war has also manifested itself at the very beginning of the 21st century. Is it impossible to prevent these wars today? Will this century, like some others,

be written with the blood of innocents? Are there things scientists can do about what the future may bring, or more accurate perspectives and more humane approaches they can choose? These and similar questions will be discussed in the relevant parts of this study.

In our opinion, the necessity of dealing with the issue of war and peace in the context of religion and philosophy has become inevitable. As a matter of fact, one of the most striking developments of recent years is the revival of pro-war actions undertaken to support political, economic or religious goals and which can be justified on philosophical and religious grounds. Some Western writers call this approach “holy” or “sacred.” According to them, this approach can be found in many parts of the world, in the United States, in the Middle East, in India and in Israel (Rapoport, 1990, p. 104).

War and peace can be considered in the context of discussions of the philosophy of religion. In our opinion, it is important for philosophers, religious scholars, and especially philosophers of religion to focus more on both theoretical and practical issues such as war and peace, and to discuss the practical implications of their philosophical-religious views. With such approach, this study will try to analyze the projections of this discipline regarding the concepts of war and peace by adhering to the systematic structure of the field of philosophy of religion.

Three main points are pointed out to distinguish philosophy of religion from other disciplines. These will be briefly discussed to express the reason why the subject should be considered in the context of philosophy of religion. The first, its subject or field, is religion. The subjects of religion are generally expressed as belief, worship and morality. Among these issues, philosophy of religion is mostly concerned with the belief dimension of religion. In this case, philosophy of religion focuses on the belief dimension of religion and its logical messages (Yaran, 2017, p. 18-19). The second is its purpose. Its aims can be briefly listed as follows: to analyze religious belief and to attempt to purify and rationalize it as much as possible; to strive to reach the most up-to-date and accurate information on God, the universe and human subjects; to attain wisdom focused on wisdom, thus helping people with theological and philosophical problems. The third is the method or approach. They can be listed as induction, deduction, analysis, synthesis, dialectical critical method and phenomenological method. Without going beyond these three basic elements of the philosophy of religion, it is possible to develop its subjects and problems. As a matter of fact, addressing a problem from the point of view of philosophy of religion does not make it a problem of philosophy of religion. Moreover, when it comes to developing a specific topic and determining problems specific to the philosophy of religion, it is necessary to put the last point, not to consume topics and problems, but to produce new thoughts in the context of determining different approaches. When a subject is discussed in the context of philosophy of religion, it is necessary to focus on the historical adventure of the relevant subject to determine whether it has been dealt with before, and if so, what is different from today (Yasa, 2013, p. 15-26). Finally, conceptual analysis should also be used when developing a specific topic for philosophy of religion. As a matter of fact, the most basic reason and justification for dealing with the concepts of war and peace in terms of philosophy of religion, along with all these, is to develop the conceptual structure of the philosophy of religion by adhering to the history of philosophy of religion in the analysis of the concepts of war and peace, to acquire a strategic idea and a systematic attitude based on the philosophy of religion, and to show a tendency not only to determine but also to expand its field of function.

The problem of war and peace is not among the main topics of philosophy of religion. However, in the philosophy of religion, there are many concepts that are considered together in a dual way: for example, God and the universe, God and evil, religion and morality, religion and science, reason and faith. Although there are different approaches, the philosophy of religion in the main line, as stated by Yaran, deals with the issues in an analytical, critical or argumentative method, as well as the subject is clearly and distinctly revealed in the thought of the interlocutor through concepts and evidence, and re-evaluated in the light of alternatives, if any, on the one hand, the consistency and reasonableness of the clarity of mind in the actions of the interlocutor, knowledge of alternatives aims to give rise to virtues such as tolerance and modesty (Yaran, 2004, p. 50). In this context, determinations, evaluations and analyzes will be made on the axis of philosophy of religion to reveal the basic information and discussions about the concepts of war and peace, to deal with them philosophically and theologically, and to reveal their place in the philosophy of religion.

While the above-mentioned concepts are considered together in the philosophy of religion, opinions and their representatives are usually put forward in a quadruple (or tripartite) classification. First, that there are negative approaches such as conflict between the two concepts; secondly, there are those who argue that there is no relationship between the two concepts; thirdly, that there is a “middle way” between both concepts, and fourthly, that there is a relationship, dialogue and a convincing solution between both concepts (Barbour, 2000, p. 8-38; Ward, 2004, p. 103). Presenting the issues in this way makes it easier for the reader to comprehend the text more easily and to clearly state the evidence and advocates for and against. For this reason, the concepts of war and peace will be tried to be handled in a similar classification. In this respect, the concepts of war and peace will be discussed under the following headings. These include 1. Militarism, 2. Just War Theory, 3. Pacifism, 4. Universal Peace. By focusing on these concepts, we will try to put forward the argument that both world religions and philosophy emphasize peace more in terms of philosophy of religion between war and peace.

## Militarism

War, which is a reality of human history, shows variations such as “Primitive (ceremonial), political (ambitious), epic (exalting), sacred (in the name of God), defensive (protecting a group or country), terrorist or guerrilla (defender against an invisible internal enemy)”, together with its qualities such as the reason for its occurrence, the methods used and its motivating elements (Zur, 2010, p. 131). Along with these, the concept of “holy war”, which is defined as “struggles arising from religious motivations, usually for the purpose of defending or spreading religion” (McKim, 1996, p. 132; Climenhaga, 2010, p. 26), is also brought to the agenda. For example, the “Crusader Wars” are perceived as a “holy war” for Christians for reasons such as the fact that they were organized in a papal center, aiming to liberate the holy lands under the rule of Muslims and to make it possible to visit (Düzgün, 2004, p. 73-76). Similarly, the concept of “jihad” is considered sacred by some circles and evaluated in the same context (Jones, 2007, p. 943).

The German philosopher G. W. F. Hegel (d.1831) sees war as a necessary stage, a constitutive and inevitable element in the transition from peace to victory. W. F. Nietzsche (d.1900) put forward this Hegel-like view in the context of the concept of power-will. In this respect, Nietzsche puts forward the following statements: “I advise you not to work, but to war, not to peace, but to victory. Let your work be war and your peace be victory” (Nietzsche, 2007, p. 69). The approaches of these philosophers undoubtedly inspired Hitler’s Nazism and revolutionary communism (Gonsalves, 1981, p. 492-493; Magee, 2000, p. 163). Hegel, in his *Elements of the Philosophy of Truth*, states that “if no consensus can be reached between certain wills, conflicts between states can only be decided by war” (Hegel, 1991, p. 27; Coates, 1997, p. 117).

Those who argue that there should be war, such as the philosophers mentioned, base their ideas around the following two basic views. The first of these, war, is a natural form of human aggressive impulses. The second is a necessary argument for the development of a state/society and a natural consequence of its realization of its role in history. Those who are pro-war see this and similar statements as a basis. However, we do not have to defend the absoluteness of this view. If the view prevails that the cause of war is an integral part of human nature, there is little point in opposing war and envisioning a peaceful world ideology.

Here, considering the concepts of “holy war” and “jihad” and pro-war views such as Hegel and Nietzsche, it can be said that war is tried to be brought to the fore as a concept that is legitimized and even praised. However, in general, world religions, especially the philosophy of religion, do not come to the fore with discourses that encourage war. To claim that the main works, holy books and texts attributed to religions reveal a pro-war attitude in an emphatic and systematic way is to evaluate all of these in an incomplete and biased way. To state that there is a systematic relationship or hypothesis of agreement between religion and warriorship would be an incomplete and unfair statement. However, exclusionary, radical and biased discourses put forward in the context of the truth claims of religions in the field of philosophy of religion may excite those who are in favor of war.

In the philosophy of religion, three basic approaches have been put forward about the conflicting truth claims of religions. First, religious exclusivism means accepting one’s own religion as the only correct and savior religion in the afterlife, and excluding religions other than one’s own from the realm of righteousness and salvation. Second, religious inclusivity is the belief that one religion is the truest and most redemptive religion, and that other religions are not wholly wrong and useless, but that the truest and most perfect religion is a single religion. The third is religious pluralism, which sees all religions or major religions as paths of equal value in righteousness and salvation (Maister, 2009, p. 26; Aktürk, 2013, p. 174).

These approaches do not develop a perspective that directly encourages war and belligerence and accuses the other of intolerance. However, if we reflect for a moment, considering some indirect and probabilities, it can be argued that among the approaches mentioned, a particularly strict, fundamentalist or extreme religious exclusivism can leave the door open to the legitimacy of war. Exclusivism can be seen as possible to see believers in other religions as people of evidence who need to be saved or enemies who prevent the transmission and dissemination of the truth, to consider it their duty to convey the true religion to other people, to consider it legitimate to try different ways for the sake of this duty, and to add the path of violence among the ways. Because, according to some philosophers of religion, this mentality is the basis of the participation or support of the violence of the participants in the Crusades and the missionaries who contributed to the global colonization activities in the 19th century (Yaran, 2004, p. 53). For example, according to John Hick (d.2012), “the Christian superiority complex has supported the exploitation of what we now call the Third World by Western imperialists” (Hick, 1987, p. 18).

Within the discipline of philosophy of religion, it is possible to come across thinkers/philosophers who advocate religious pluralism and inclusiveness, as well as those who advocate religious exclusivity (Plantinga, 2000, p. 437-457). We will not go into detailed discussions here because it is not relevant to our topic, but we would like to open a parenthesis to the approach of religious exclusivism in the context of war. Religious exclusivism, along with some of the facts stated above, is an approach that should be re-filtered, abandoned or turned into a more moderate-soft understanding to see its historical and potential connection with religious violence or even war, although it does not have a logical connection with religious violence or even war. As a matter of fact, it is possible for people belonging to

different religions to exclude, marginalize and consider each other as enemies, and to treat others with methods that are not approved by the religion they believe in, which is aimed at violence in particular, and war in general (Kartal, 2021, p. 64). The systematic support of this situation with a philosophical and religious-based view legitimizes and popularizes this approach. However, it is difficult to say that this issue is given a wide place in the definitions of the concept of “wisdom” in philosophy. “Wisdom’ can be defined as a direct and practical insight into the meaning and purpose of things, which comes to intelligent, insightful, and attentive minds, from their own life experiences and from everyday relationships with the world, or it is a promising and attempt at truth in life” (Gordon, 1921, p. 12). According to another definition, wisdom is “the name given to every knowledge that is useful and every deed that is right.” It contains a meaning corresponding to the organic totality of the sciences and is realized by “prioritizing science over ignorance, justice over cruelty, generosity over stinginess, and gentleness over misery” (Kutluer, 1998, p. 508). Wisdom is an intellectual concept and the most important moral value common to the philosophical systems of world religions. For example, according to a statement in the Old Testament, “Just as light has superiority over darkness, so wisdom has superiority over foolishness” (Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pa, 2008, Ecclesiastes, 2:13). The New Testament says, “If any one of you is lacking in wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives generously to all, without rebuke; it will be given to him” (James, 1:5). In the Qur’an, it is said, “To whom wisdom has been given, surely much good has been given to him” (Qur’an, al-Baqarah, 2:269, trans. H. Altuntaş and M. Şahin, 2009). In Indian religions and Confucianism, religion, wisdom, philosophy, and morality are considered as a whole (Gordon, 1921, p. 744). Considering how wisdom is handled among the great philosophers and philosophical systems, the Ancient Greek philosophers Plato (427-347 BC) and Aristotle (384-322 BC) express wisdom as the basis of virtue, happiness and goodness (Platon, 1992, p. 117-135; Aristoteles, 1998, p. 1). Islamic philosophers Ibn Miskeveyh (d.1030) and Ghazzali (d.1111) regard the concept of wisdom as the mother and basis of morality (Miskeveyh, 1983, p. 23-24; Gazzali, 1974, p. 127). Based on the views of religions and philosophers, it is possible to indicate that wisdom is a value with peaceful characteristics and wise people are in favor of peace. When the common characteristics of the sages are listed, the most prominent feature among them is the following: “A wise person is not a disruptor of society” (Rudolph, 1987, p. 403). The following historical fact is an example of this: between 2852 and 2205 B.C., the villages in the Yellow River valley, where Chinese civilization began, determined kings who ruled them. Fu Xi, the first King of China, did not possess an extraordinary metaphysical quality, a miracle, nor did he receive authority from God, to save his people from any flood. It is his wisdom that has made him beloved by the people. Through his wisdom, he established a relationship between the world and the self, between the order of nature and the human mind’s impulse to bring order to the things around him, and from this he established peace between society. Thus, instead of the idea of hereditary kingship in the Sumerian land, wisdom was taken as a basis in China, starting from Yao, and the Three Philosopher Kings Period was experienced (Bauer, 2013, p. 58-59).

All these examples indicate that there is a relationship between wisdom and peacefulness. Despite this relationship, it may be natural and normal to come across some confusion or evil caused by an exclusionary attitude. However, in the wisdom understanding of world religions and philosophy, rather than an understanding that marginalizes and excludes, an idea that integrates, encourages the peaceful and the good is dominant. The basis of this view is that religions and philosophy have virtues, truths, goodness and beauty in moral and spiritual terms. The ways of excluding, despising people of other religions, inflicting injustice, hostility, evil and violence on them can only be the product of a view that wants to open up space for violence or war.

War, which is expressed as a primitive motive and behavior that destroys peace and peaceful understandings, is not systematically encouraged in the sacred texts of religions, except in some exceptional cases, as stated below. One of the common goals of religions is human happiness. As a result of the belief systems that exist for this purpose, one of them completely excludes, ignores and even constantly challenges the other, it can lead to some material and spiritual problems among people belonging to religions. The growth of problems in a way that casts a shadow on peace and destroys human happiness opens the door to war rhetoric and action. Indeed, war or belligerence is encouraged to legitimize the individual, political and economic motives of some clergy (Albayrak, 2010, p. 12). In this respect, it is stated that the Crusades were financed by the Jewish rich and loans were given at high interest rates (Nânâ, 2008, p. 573).

As a matter of fact, from a scientific, philosophical, and religious point of view, there is no general systematic structure that legitimizes, justifies, and constantly obliges war. The topic will be discussed from these perspectives respectively. From a scientific point of view, it is possible to proceed from the following point: In 1986, on the International Year of Peace, the text titled “Declaration on Violence”, which was jointly signed and published by scientists from many countries of the world, contains very valuable information on the subject. In the declaration, it was underlined that some scientists in different fields made some claims by justifying violence and war, and it was clearly explained that these claims did not have aspects that could be scientifically proven. Without going beyond our main topic, we can express a few of these explanations as follows:

i- It is scientifically incorrect to say that we inherited from our animal ancestors a tendency to fight. Although there is a great deal of fighting between animal species, only a few destructive fighting incidents have been reported

between organized intra-species groups in species living in the wild, and none of these have used tools designed as weapons. Humans are more prone to war than animals.

ii- It is scientifically incorrect to say that war or any violent behavior is genetically programmed in human nature.

iii- It is scientifically incorrect to say that in the process of human evolution, there is a greater selection of aggressive behaviors than other behaviors.

iv- It is not a scientific determination to state that the human brain is intensely war, conflict and violent.

v- It is scientifically incorrect to say that war is caused by instinct or any single motivation (Şiddet Üzerine Bildiri, 2005, p. 37-41).

Clearly, science, especially biology, does not condemn humanity to war or violence. On the contrary, it is clearly emphasized in the declaration that war is contrary to human nature from a scientific point of view. War begins in the heart, conscience and brain of man, why shouldn't peace begin like this? The pro-war supporters' associative use of war as normal, natural, necessary, and even beneficial to attribute war to the innate characteristics of human beings lacks a scientific basis (Yaran, 2010, p. 270-271).

The arguments advocated by the supporters of war have no scientific side, nor do they have a necessary basis for world religions. Although these religions state that human beings have bipolar qualities, they emphasize that they are educable and put forward teachings and advice in this context. Negative psychological and biological factors affect people's decision-making. However, these decisions depend on the free will of the human being. The following statements of the Qur'an, which clearly and unambiguously reveal the subject, can be consulted: "By the soul and the one who properly shapes it and inspires in it the sense of evil and piety (the ability to avoid evil), he who purifies his soul has attained salvation" (al-Shams, 91: 7-9). In another verse, the Qur'an says, "Say: The truth is from your Lord. Let him who wishes believe, and let him who wishes disbelieve" (el-Kehf, 18: 29). It is clear from these verses that man has the ability to make decisions of his own free will without being bound by chains.

To say that the arguments advocated by the supporters of war cover the entire history of philosophy is to defend a biased view. Plato, one of the most important philosophers in the history of philosophy, expresses in his work *Laws* that he is not pro-war saying: "The best thing is not war or insurrection, but peace and mutual goodwill" (Platon, 2012, p. 52-53). Aristotle, another Ancient Greek system philosopher, declares that he is not in favor of war in his *Politics* by the logic: "We choose war for peace" (Aristoteles, 2010, p. 222). In addition, in the Hellenistic period, the Stoics had an anti-war attitude (Cevizci, 2015, p. 154-155). In the Middle Ages, St. Augustine (d.430) constantly emphasized that war should be avoided and there should be an environment of peace under the influence of the Christian approach (Ferguson, 1978, p. 104-106; Yeşilçayır, 2016, p. 63). In the New Age, on the other hand, it is seen that a pro-war attitude was not adopted in general, on the contrary, the philosophers of this period emphasized that there should be more peace (Topakkaya, 2016, p. 105). Although selfishness and self-preservation instinct are inherent in human nature, it is pointed out that these qualities are expressed emphatically in a way that does not lead to war. If the opposite were the case, the struggle of people to build a world without war would have been in vain, and this effort would have been a utopia in the philosophical sense. However, the fact that the pro-war view is not widely and systematically defended by science, religion and philosophy is obvious.

### Just War Theory

Just war is put forward as a concept used to explain "armed struggles that occur when war is inevitable due to certain conditions and compulsory reasons, mostly for defensive purposes" (McKim, 1996, p. 152; Lemennicier, 2003, p. 2).

According to the theory of just war, the best attitude towards war is to be in the "middle ground". The middle ground is a just war approach between pro-war and anti-war. According to the proponents of this theory, war should not be voluntarily desired, but should be avoided as much as possible. However, there may be situations where war cannot be prevented. For example, if the lives and freedoms of individuals living under the roof of institutions such as the state cannot be protected by means other than the use of force, that institution has the right to use force. This understanding allowed the development of the theory of just war. Although, the concept of just or just war has been etymologically known since Ancient Greece. This concept was defended and developed by philosophers and theologians such as Cicero (d. 43 BC) and St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274). According to this theory, war should be based on just and serious reasons, it should be done fairly, there should be a legal authority that decides war, war should be a last resort, there should be good intentions and war practices should be followed (Gonsalves, 1981, p. 495-500).

The issue of just war theory is discussed in the context of two basic approaches. The first of these is the right or obligation to enter/participate in war; the second is human rights in war, with an understanding that prevents harm to civilians, especially during war. Aquinas, who developed this theory, puts forward some conditions for armed struggle to be justified. The first of these is that war is not declared in a personal way, but by a ruler/power with authority. Second, the audience to be attacked, even if the mistake they have made is serious, there must be justifiable reasons that may cause them to be attacked. Thirdly, when an attack is made, there must be a well-intentioned orientation towards the

solution of the problem in question. Aquinas points out other points out while explaining his views on this subject. According to him, the right to life of every person is extremely important. Therefore, the proportionate prevention of violence against a person should be seen as self-defense. The use of disproportionate power removes the aforementioned legitimacy. He also indicates that failure to intervene in a proportionate manner so as not to kill others will not serve peace (Aquinas, 1947, p. 3074; Kızılabdullah, 2015, p. 40-41).

On the other hand, some principles are mentioned today about just war. The most important principles related to today's concept of just war are: the principle of discrimination, the principle of proportion, the principle of humanity and the principle of necessity. Now let's try to explain these principles in turn.

The first of these principles, the principle of discrimination, states that power should be focused on a military purpose. Second, according to the principle of proportion, power should not be displayed more than is needed to achieve a military result. Thirdly, according to the principle of humanity, children, women and elderly people who are exposed to harm and vulnerable part of the society from force, prisoners of war and enemy forces should be intervened with care, and their rights and personalities should be respected. Fourth, the principle of necessity, force should be used only if it is not possible to use non-violent means of achieving a military goal (Falk, 2001, p. 69).

The understanding of just war, if put into practice as a more reasonable understanding than pro-war, has principles that will limit the damage to the least. However, is it possible to properly apply these principles, which seem to be theoretically quite good here, in a war environment, or have they been applied in wars throughout history? In our opinion, these principles cannot be easily applied either in the past or in the present. On the issue of just war, one needs to explore, chase and ask beyond historical boundaries with a philosophical perspective, a religious belief and a high moral consciousness, in the name of peace, not war, by adopting an idealistic attitude rather than a realist attitude. Because the historical and social realities that have been continuing in the form of a heritage since the day human beings existed should be evaluated with a philosophical approach required by what should be without ignoring the existing facts. In this context, theologians, clergymen, philosophers, and scientists should look for ways to ensure peace rather than debate whether war is fair or not. Because to say that the theory of just war will be successful in practice is to ignore the situations that occurred during the war in history.

When the theory of just war is evaluated in terms of philosophy of religion, the relationship between philosophy of religion and the theory of just war is based on how basic concepts such as justice, ethics and moral responsibility, which affect the depths of questions about the moral aspect of war, are handled. While the philosophy of religion offers different intellectual structures in the context of God's will, the nature of reason, the rationality of belief, universal morality and absolute justice (Davies, 1993, p. 1, 20, 32, 168), the theory of just war offers a comprehensive reflection on the conditions under which war can be considered legitimate, its moral limits and internal laws. The intersections of philosophy of religion and the theory of just war are fundamental elements such as the legality of war, the grounds for a just war, who has the authority to wage war, and what actions are moral during war. The philosophy of religion's attempt to attribute even the most destructive human activities, such as war, to a principle of justice, combined with the rational and moral determinations of the theory of just war, suggests that a war should be considered not only as a physical conflict but also as a broad moral challenge (Philosophy of religion has no such purpose. However, this inference can be drawn from his definitions of "an attempt to think deeply about fundamental questions and problems" and "a critical reflection on religious beliefs" (Evans and Manis, 2009, p. 17-18; Ören, 2022, p. 189-190).

In this context, we can refer to the concept of fideism, which is among the discussion topics of philosophy of religion. Fideism, or faithism, is the view generally held by philosophy of religion circles that religious belief systems are not subject to rational evaluation (Peterson et. al., 2012, p. 57; Bunnin and Yu, 2004, p. 255). In other words, it is the approach that argues that reason has no place in matters of faith (Kartal, 2021, p. 91), that it does not need to be, and that even if it does, it cannot be of any use. To believe in any religious belief system, fideism is to consider no one and no rational proof. The basic approach here is the understanding that the most essential assumptions for a sincere religious believer are found in the religious belief system itself. In other words, in order for a person to come to faith, he must believe in the purest way, without having the reasons and evidence to prove that his belief is true. According to Fideism, reason and faith are completely separate and independent of each other. According to this approach, faith, which means giving up reason, is to surrender and approve the basic theories of religion, which means to give up reason, in a "formless-doubting", "unquestioning-questioning" manner because reason does not comprehend them, to adhere to them and to fulfill all their requirements (Carroll, 2008, p. 2-5).

If the relationship between fideism, which is one of the subjects of philosophy of religion, and the theory of just war is to be touched upon, this relationship arises in the tension between the autonomy of faith and the moral and rational foundations of war. Fideism is a theory of knowledge that argues that religious belief should be accepted without being based on rational or philosophical foundations (Amesbury, 2022, p. 2). The theory of just war, on the other hand, proposes rational and moral criteria that will morally justify war, and this provides a framework for their applicability (Tzenios, 2023, p. 1-3). The main problem posed by Fideism within the framework of the theory of just war is related to the need for rational or moral criteria to morally justify war. According to the Fideist understanding, when a religious authority or a sacred text state that there must be war, the moral dimension of war can be accepted without question. In

this respect, fideism resists the rational questioning of the just war theory, since in the fideist conception faith itself is considered an ultimate and unquestionable authority. In Fideist thought, faith-based orders of war are not subject to rational evaluation. On the other hand, the just war theory argues that war should be determined by rational, ethical and moral criteria. It asserts that war should be waged only for a just cause, for reasons such as self-defense or the protection of the innocent. From this point of view, even if the decision to go to war comes from a divine authority or text, the decision must meet certain grounds and be based on moral grounds.

This dichotomy between just war theory and fideism<sup>1</sup> leads to a distinction in the relationship of religious belief to reason. Far from limiting war to rational ethical principles, as required by the theory of just war, Fideism unquestioningly accepts religious precepts. However, if a fideist approach argues that war is a “sacred command” or an “absolute belief”, this leads to the neglect of the ethical and moral principles aimed at by the theory of just war. Thus, the relationship between fideism and the theory of just war focuses on the role of reason when it comes to war and whether religious rulings are questionable. Thus, fideism and the theory of just war differ on the moral foundations of war.

At this stage, in the context of the theory of just war in terms of philosophy of religion and fideism, the following can be stated: There is always no one-to-one identity between the pure ideal religion approach in the heart of a believer or the concept of absolute religion in his mind and the concept of religion that continues to exist in reality, culture, society and history. It is not undeniable that in the texts and doctrines of religions, which reflect the effects of historical and cultural conditions, there may be elements that can leave the door open to violence, terror and war when knowledge, wisdom, reason and conscience are not interpreted and comprehended correctly. Similarly, it should not be seen as a miracle that among the methods of religion, which aims to transform the bad and unhappy course of people and societies into a positive direction, there are elements that can be interpreted in favor of war or, to put it mildly, violence, even if they are wrong. The best attitude to be taken here is not to ignore or ignore all these and not to stay away from religions because of the risks that may arise from these situations. In other words, it is necessary to take into account and accept the possibility of interpretations and discourses that may lead to extremism, and even if there are individuals, children, new generations and young people who are encouraged to religiosity, it is necessary to take into account and accept the possibility of realization of interpretations and discourses that may lead to extremism, together with the goodness, usefulness and benefits of religions, in the context of investigative faith or critical rationalism (Investigative faithism is “an epistemological conception of faith” and “the result of critical rationalism.” Critical rationalism, on the other hand, refers to “the rational criticism and evaluation of religious belief systems” (Yaran, 1997, p. 233, 236). To ignore this is to ignore the rational foundations of both oneself and the philosophy of religion. Therefore, to say that there is no connection or relationship between the philosophy of religion and violence in particular and war in general is to put forward a discourse that does not correspond to reality and does not make a serious contribution to the solution of problems as soon as possible without examining them in depth. The ultimate goal of one’s journey in this regard should be to focus on and believe in peace, rather than defending the theory of just war.

### Pacifism

Opponents of war, or pacifists, refer to violence, killing, and war as a wrong act, even if it is for a defensive or good cause. Philosophically, there are different forms of anti-war. These are absolute, relative, and moderate oppositions to war. Absolute opponents of war condemn all wars. In their opinion, a person cannot use violence against another person to defend his personal rights, while a state, nation or nation should not resort to war to protect and defend its territory and rights. The most basic argument put forward in this context is the approach that violence should be met with nonviolence, because according to them, only those who do not resort to violence will eventually triumph. Such a view was held by Mahatma Gandhi (d.1948) and some Christian groups (Gonsalves, 1981, p. 492-493). One of the most well-known proponents of this view is Lev Tolstoy (d.1910). As a matter of fact, in his *Tolstoy’s Diary: Calendar of Wisdom*, he expresses it as follows: “Killing is always a crime, no matter who it is, no matter how it is tried to be justified” (Tolstoy, 2001, p. 114).

Opponents of relative and moderate war, on the other hand, oppose certain types of wars, such as modern and nuclear war. Because, according to them, the harms of modern and thermonuclear war are enormous. Therefore, such a war would not be within the boundaries of a just or just war (Gonsalves, 1981, p. 494). From a philosophical point of

---

<sup>1</sup> In philosophy of religion, fideism is considered in two different categories: strict and moderate fideism. Strict fideism is the approach that accepts religious belief systems beyond reason. He also argues that the concepts of reason and faith are diametrically opposed, that the deep secrets and enigmas claimed by religions can only be comprehended through faith, and that religious truths are impossible according to rational evaluations. According to Tertullian (d.240), who is shown as the representative of this attitude, fideism is a kind of dogmatism and represents a kind of fanaticism in the face of religious doctrines. This approach to fideism was reinterpreted by Soren Kierkegaard (d.1855) with a critical perspective, the view of the concept of fideism was developed and expressed with a new understanding called moderate fideism. According to moderate fideism, reason is a faculty that can play a role in understanding and explaining religious beliefs (Bunnin and Yu, 2004, p. 255; Popkin, 2003, p. xxii). The fideism referred to in this study is strict fideism.

view, it is seen that Bertrand Russell (d.1970) is one of the philosophers whose ideas are closest to this view. In his works, he opposes modern and nuclear wars and fights for the establishment of peace. In addition, an anti-war declaration was published in London on July 9, 1955 with the signatures of many scientists (Bartosch, Neuneck and Wunderle, 2016, p. 23).

From the point of view of the philosophy of religion, pacifism can be considered in both moral and metaphysical aspects. The philosophy of religion can present the understanding of opposing all forms of war and violence in pacifism with an approach that is echoed in the tensions between the sacred and the profane. This approach can be expressed in relation to understanding God, the universe and existence, as well as knowing oneself, transcending oneself, going beyond one's desires, reaching an ultimate good or God. This issue, which stands out as an ontological stance, the existence and meaning of the sacred, the order of the universe and an investigation into the existence in the universe, can be discussed on the axis of the "problem of evil", which is one of the subjects of philosophy of religion.

The problem of evil, when put forward in its essence, is a problem that questions why God, who bears attributes such as goodness/love/mercy, justice, knowledge, power, and will, allows and enables evil in this universe. While this problem is addressed in the context of the relationship between the existence of God and the free will of man and the nature of evil, it also lays the groundwork for the introduction of pacifism in terms of the philosophy of religion.

Pacifism can be posited in terms of two basic problems in the context of the problem of evil. The first of these is that in pacifist thought, war and violence are asserted as true signs of evil. The evil in question is the preference and perpetuation of violence by human free will. In this respect, pacifism stands out as one of the most deep-rooted attitudes that can be put forward against evil. As a matter of fact, according to the pacifist-based moral view, evil is a human act that must be denied (McMahan, 2010, p. 44). With this approach, the "free will theodicy", which is considered within the framework of the problem of evil, can be evaluated in the same context. According to this theodicy, the cause of evil in the universe is not God, but the abuse of man's will (Hick, 1990, p. 42; Bor, 2007, p. 154; Turhan, 2022, p. 332).

The second is the reaction of man to evil, which the pacifist view points to. People face a dilemma between reacting violently to evil or taking a pacifist attitude and settling it within themselves. The pacifist view does not consider it appropriate to respond to evil with evil or violence. Because pacifism seeks to develop peaceful and internal foundations in the face of evil. From this point of view, pacifism can be expressed as a moral principle that seeks to minimize evil (Christoyannopoulos, 2023, p. 6). In the context of the problem of evil, the "soul-making theodicy" put forward by the English philosopher Hick can be interpreted from this point of view. Because, according to this theodicy, "the spiritual and spiritual maturation of man throughout his life, even if it is by the will and desire of God, the real actor in this matter is the will of man" (Hick, 1985, p. 51). A relationship between theodicy (Theodicy, put forward in the context of the search for a solution to the problem of evil, is "an attempt to reconcile the infinite goodness and justice of God Almighty with the existence of evil in the universe" Kiriş, 2008, p. 87) and pacifism can be explained by the free will that God has given to man. Free will allows man to choose between good and evil—war and peace. This choice can provide a basis for the existence of evil. However, pacifism emphasizes that man must prevent evil with his free will. Related to this, according to Augustine, "evil is a void or deficiency in existence, and it arises from the will of man rather than the goodness of God" (Hick, 1990, p. 42). Pacifist philosophy tries to achieve harmony between the peaceful aspect of man and God at the point of eliminating this gap and deficiency. In Augustine's approach to evil, pacifism can be interpreted as a kind of spiritual purification. The connection between his theory of evil and pacifism determines man's attitude toward evil and violence in his experiential choices. Pacifism can be expressed as a moral attitude by showing an inner attitude in the face of evil. In this way, evil can be minimized and its impact can be limited. As a sign of respect for God, the universe, the beings in the universe and nature, man's non-violence in the face of evil can be considered as a moral attitude in terms of the philosophy of religion.

## Universal Peace

The concept of universal peace is a concept that has a very serious place and meaning both theologically and philosophically in the context of philosophy of religion. From a theological point of view, one of the aspects that the world's religions refer to is that when it comes to war and peace, the concept of peace is given more prominence. For example, Indian and theistic religions are fundamentally based on peace and reconciliation, not violence and war. As a matter of fact, one of the most basic principles of the Hindu religion is that it is necessary to avoid causing physical and psychological harm to other people in thoughts and actions. In other words, it is insisted that war and conflict between both individuals and societies is an absolutely undesirable attitude and approach, that violence must be avoided absolutely and that harmony must prevail in the whole way of life (Thompson, 1994, p. 63-65). This principle was advocated by Gandhi. Based on this principle, he has made his philosophical understanding of non-violence a model all over the world (Köylü, 2012, p. 44-45). The attitude of Buddhism, another religion of Indian origin, towards war and violence is the first article of the five commandments, "not to take a life and not to be a part of the one who takes a life". Because, according to the Buddhist approach, the end of taking a life is a sad and painful reincarnation (The Dhammapada Gerçeğin Yolu, 2008, p. 405). In Indian religions, a passive approach to war and conflicts is accepted,

peace and tranquility of the individual is established, and it is pointed out that a universal peace should be established by spreading this to all people and nations.

To reveal the theological aspect of the issue more comprehensively, it is necessary to consider the approach of theistic religions to war and peace as well as Indian religions. In Judaism, the first of the theistic religions, traces of both war and violence and peace can be seen. In Judaism, war is believed to be blessed by God (Exit, 15:3, 17:16). By contrast, the sixth of the Ten Commandments' principle of "thou shalt not kill!" and the strong emphasis on God seeking to end war in the Old Testament indicate that the paths to peace are not completely closed (Psalms, 46:9; Isaiah, 2:4; Hosea, 2:18).

In Christianity, another theistic religion, it is seen that the concept of peace comes to the fore in terms of war and peace. For example, in the Bible, Jesus had a very peaceful attitude towards his enemies. In this context, he commanded Peter to put away his sword, to extend his left cheek to anyone who struck him on the right cheek, and to have love, respect, and mercy for his enemies, and drew attention to the sanctity of the peaceful approach (Matthew, 26:52, 5:39,44) by saying "Blessed are those who make peace! For they shall be called the sons of God" (Matthew, 5:9). As can be seen, the understanding of universal peace covers a wide place on the basis of the Christian faith.

According to Islam, the last theistic religion, man is the most valuable and honorable of all creatures. Allah has honored mankind in many ways by subjugating angels and jinn to him (al-Baqarah, 2: 34), by teaching him the name of things (al-Baqarah, 2: 31), by making him the caliph of the universe (al-Baqarah, 2: 30), by entrusting him with the task of trust that heaven and earth cannot bear (al-Saba, 33: 72), by creating him in the most beautiful way, both physically and spiritually (al-Hiir, 15: 29), and by putting all the creatures in the universe at his service (al-Ibrahim, 14: 32). Therefore, according to the understanding of Islam, respect for and protection of human life is the most fundamental and sacred duty of all humanity. Because it is clearly stated in the Qur'an that killing a human being unjustly is a crime and a sin, just like killing all humanity (al-Ma'ida, 5: 32). However, what is accepted as the "peace verse" is, the verse "If they are in favor of peace, be you also peacemakers" (al-Anfâl, 8/61) is proof that when it comes to war and peace in Islam, peace is much more important and brought to the fore.

As seen above, in both Indian and theistic religions, the idea that universal peace must be established and maintained is insistently expressed. In order to ensure a universal peace environment, it seems to depend on the protection of the sanctity of human life and religious-moral life offered by theological data, the end of strife and mischief on earth, and the establishment of social order and justice in society. To put it more simply, for universal peace, based on the peaceful arguments inherent in religions, it is necessary to increase the number of virtuous, wise and peace-loving individuals, to increase the existence, authority, power and opportunities of more active and fairer international and supra-state organizations, to carry out more humane, conscientious and rational policies for peace studies and efforts, and to have a global understanding of morality that will nurture peace.

When universal peace is evaluated from a theological point of view, we can easily say that the prominent ideas form an organic unity with the philosophical approach. Because the pro-peace put forward by Kant in his article "Towards Eternal Peace" is directly related to the understanding we are talking about. Because, according to him, it is possible to achieve peace between states by eliminating war. There should be no war, because wars have no salvation. The damages caused by the wars, especially in Europe, can be minimized by ensuring the aforementioned peace. These damages are expressed in the form of human losses, tyranny and destruction, looting and poverty in the country, especially after major wars. Some of the consequences of the war can be shown as enslavement and loss of freedom. At this point, the following statements can be made with reference to Kant: just as a peace treaty puts an end to the damage caused by a war, the peace union must "end all wars forever" and eliminate the damage caused by a war from the beginning. Only in this way can eternal peace be achieved (Kant, 1960, p. 24).

Along with Kant's proposals for solutions here, as already stated in the relevant sections, the anti-war views of biologist scientists, Tolstoy and Russell always point to the concept of universal peace. In addition, we believe that it would be useful to mention here a few statements from the peace proposals of the World Moral Declaration signed by the delegates of the Parliament of World Religions of different religions in 1993.

The world is in great pain and is almost dying. But this should not be the fate of the world. Because there are common values in the teachings of religions that can form the infrastructure for a world morality. In the context of these self-values, differences should be respected and everyone should be treated humanely. A non-violent, respectful, fair and peaceful culture must be established (Küng and Kuschel, 1995, p. 9-30).

In the aforementioned declaration, in the context of the values inherent in religions, it is emphasized that in the context of the values inherent in religions, avoiding all forms of violence, respecting differences as human beings deserve, ensuring social reconciliation and especially establishing a common world peace. In summary, it is clear that there are sufficient philosophical and theological arguments and data to ensure global peace.

At this stage, in the context of philosophical and theological arguments within the framework of an organic integrity, the concepts of war and peace can be put forward as follows in terms of the subject of God, which constitutes the most basic and primary subject of the philosophy of religion: Theism, deism, pantheism, panentheism, among the conceptions of wisdom put forward in the philosophy of religion, largely accept that God has attributes such as

knowledge, power, goodness and justice. In the expression of the philosophy of religion, goodness or benevolence, and with the insistent attitudes of religions, love, mercy and mercy are shown among the most basic attributes of God (Aydın, 2007, p. 113-150). Violence in particular, which is in an unauthorized and unjust method with God, who has the most competent and absolute attributes, regardless of whether it is right or wrong, guilty or innocent, child-young, woman-old, does not seem possible to reconcile, overlap, deal with in relationship, establish a direct link or reconcile the war activity in general. As it is known, the fact and belief that God created the universe and all the beings in the universe over a very long period of time without resorting to a hasty and coercive way, and that He has put forward the same approach in controlling and keeping human excesses under control, ensuring justice in relations between people, and giving reward and punishment is known to every believer. On the other hand, we clearly see that violence or war, which advocates a hasty, coercive and merciless approach, is not the right method, regardless of its purpose. Therefore, in the light of all the information that has been expressed so far, we can say that the philosophy of religion does not give a wide place to arguments that encourage violence or war.

## Conclusion

In terms of war and peace, the history of humanity, especially the history of the 20th and 21st centuries, does not carry a proud picture in terms of the basic virtues and values that human beings should have. However, it is undeniable that there are scientists, philosophers, literati and philosophers in the aforementioned history who have turned to what is more virtuous, peaceful, true and good, who have made great efforts for this and have expressed it, even if they are not able to completely eliminate the negativities that occurred as a result of the war. However, it is seen that almost all world religions have theories and arguments in their essence that there should be no such negativities. With the continuous increase in the existence of these people and their ilk all over the world, the approaches of religions on this issue stand out as one of the greatest guarantees of the hope of universal peace in the future. From this point of view, both advocacy of war, the partisanship of the theory of just war, and the approach of being in the middle of the road may not be sufficient to build a world without war and in peace. Thus, the understanding of establishing universal peace will emerge. Establishing universal peace means both establishing the ideal of a world without war and providing an environment in which people can show their personal talents.

Universal peace gives birth to human development and a pluralistic moral philosophy. This development and philosophy, on the one hand, becomes functional for human happiness, inner fulfillment, common ethical values, and on the other hand, leads to a correct explanation of the diversity of religions and thoughts and their ultimate goals. This perspective, based on the unifying, pluralistic, dialogue and tolerance approach of religions, unites at the point of a common ideal of peace and reveals an ethical understanding that will analyze the internal and external struggle of people and societies. In this understanding, values emerge not only to desire an eternal peace, to sign a peace treaty or to eliminate violence, but also for societies and people to respect different values and improve the way of coexistence. Augustine's view of universal peace as an integration with God, and Kant's expression of eternal peace as a moral obligation can be given as examples of this understanding. At this point, the philosophy of religion refers to universal peace, the harmony of the individual with God, his moral obligation and his integrity with ethical principles in society. In addition to all these, the last point that needs to be stated is that all kinds of unjust causes and violence that lead to war cannot and should not have any positive connection or harmony with truth, religiosity, morality and humane approach.

## References

- Aktürk, E. (2013). Dini çoğulculuğun Kantçı temeli ve epistemik belirsizlik sorunu. *İslâmî Araştırmalar*, 24(3), 173-187. Erişim adresi: <https://www.islamiarastirmalar.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/4-15.pdf>
- Albayrak, K. (2010). *Semavi Dinlerde Barış ve Şiddet İkilemi*. Ankara: Sarkaç Yayınları.
- Amesbury, R. (2022). Fideism. Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Stanford University. Stanford: Department of Philosophy Stanford University, Summer 2022: 1-48. Erişim adresi: [https://www.academia.edu/83471619/\\_Fideism\\_Stanford\\_Encyclopedia\\_of\\_Philosophy\\_2022\\_Revised\\_Version](https://www.academia.edu/83471619/_Fideism_Stanford_Encyclopedia_of_Philosophy_2022_Revised_Version)
- Aquinas, T. (1947). *Summa theologica*. Ohio: Benziger Bros. Erişim adresi: [https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/12251274,\\_Thomas\\_Aquinas,\\_Summa\\_Theologiae\\_%5B1%5D,\\_EN.pdf](https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/12251274,_Thomas_Aquinas,_Summa_Theologiae_%5B1%5D,_EN.pdf)
- Archer, D. & Gartner, R. (2005). Barış dönemi kayıpları: Savaşa katılmayanların şiddet içeren davranışlarında savaşın etkisi. çev. Aysun Babacan. *Cogito*, 6-7, 237-253. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Arendt, H. (2005). Şiddet üzerine. çev. Bülent Peker. *Cogito*, 6-7, 7-21. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Aristoteles. (1998). *Nikomakhos'a etik*. çev. Saffet Babür. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları.
- Aristoteles. (2010). *Politika*. çev. Mete Tuncay. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Aydın, M. S. (2007). *Din Felsefesi*. İzmir: İzmir İlahiyat Vakfı Yayınları.
- Balcıoğlu, İ. (2001). *Şiddet ve toplum*. İstanbul: Bilge Yayınları.

- Barbour, I. (2000). When science meets religion. London: SPCK. Erişim adresi: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/53f23335e4b0af31b6eb8ffe/t/5a31927653450ae372814957/1513198202051/Barbour+Science+and+Religion.pdf>
- Bartosch, U., Neuneck, G. & Wunderle, U. (2016). The Russell-einstein manifesto – 60 years on. Berlin: VDW. Erişim adresi: [https://vdw-ev.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/VDW\\_REM\\_EN\\_WEB-1.pdf](https://vdw-ev.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/VDW_REM_EN_WEB-1.pdf)
- Bauer, S. W. (2013). Antik dünya tarihi: İlk kayıtlardan roma'nın dağılmasına kadar. çev. Mehmet Moralı. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Bor, İ. (2007). Kötülük sorunu ve Kantçı 'negatif teodise'. Dicle Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 9(1), 151-168. Erişim adresi: [https://isamveri.org/pdfdr/D02042/2007\\_1/2007\\_1\\_BORI.pdf](https://isamveri.org/pdfdr/D02042/2007_1/2007_1_BORI.pdf)
- Bunnin, M. & Yu, J. (2004). The Blackwell dictionary of western philosophy. (1st ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Carroll, T. D. (2008). The traditions of fideism. Religious Studies, 44, 1-22. Erişim adresi: <https://hslcorner.wordpress.com/wpcontent/uploads/2018/08/the-blackwell-dictionary-of-philosophy.pdf>
- Cevizci, A. (2015). Felsefe tarihi. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Christoyannopoulos, A. (2023). Pacifism and nonviolence: Discerning the contours of an emerging multidisciplinary research agenda. Journal of Pacifism and Nonviolence, 1-27. Erişim adresi: [https://brill.com/view/journals/jpn/1/1/articlep1\\_001.xml?language=en&srsltid=AfmBOooyXH54w7kP6imDTAr-vvCo0FYn9muX17kcRnFzIJAElIWI1GDdb](https://brill.com/view/journals/jpn/1/1/articlep1_001.xml?language=en&srsltid=AfmBOooyXH54w7kP6imDTAr-vvCo0FYn9muX17kcRnFzIJAElIWI1GDdb)
- Climenhaga, N. (2010). Holy peace and holy war. M. Forough (Ed.). A war for peace. (pp. 21–33). Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press. Erişim adresi: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265657655\\_Holy\\_Peace\\_and\\_Holy\\_War](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265657655_Holy_Peace_and_Holy_War)
- Coates, A. J. (1997). The ethics of war. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Davies, B. (1993). An introduction to the philosophy of religion. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. Erişim adresi: [chromeextension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://monoskop.org/images/b/bf/Davies\\_Brian\\_An\\_Introduction\\_to\\_the\\_Philosophy\\_of\\_Religion\\_2nd\\_edition\\_1993.pdf](chromeextension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://monoskop.org/images/b/bf/Davies_Brian_An_Introduction_to_the_Philosophy_of_Religion_2nd_edition_1993.pdf)
- Düzgün, Ş. A. (2004). Bir şiddetin anatomisi: Latin batı'nın haçlı terörü. *Dini Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(20), 73-92. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/51821>
- Evans, C. S. & Manis, R. Z. (2009). Philosophy of religion: Thinking about faith. (2nd ed.). Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Falk, R. (2001). Adil bir savaşı tanımlamak. çev. A. Demirhan. ABD, terör ve İslam İçinde. Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.
- Ferguson, J. (1978). War and peace in the world religions. New York: Oxford University Press. Erişim adresi: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004057368003600425?icid=int.sj-abstract.similar-articles.3>
- Gazzâlî. (1974). İhyâ ulûmi'd-dîn. çev. A. Serdaroğlu. İstanbul: Bedir Yayınları.
- Gonsalves, M. A. (1981). Right and reason: Ethics in theory and practice. London: The C. V. Mosby Company. Erişim adresi: [https://archive.org/details/fagotheysrightre0000fago\\_x6o2/page/n1/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/fagotheysrightre0000fago_x6o2/page/n1/mode/2up)
- Gordon, A. R. (1921). Wisdom. In J. Hastings (Ed.), The encyclopedia of religion and ethics. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. Erişim adresi: <https://archive.org/details/encyclopaediaofr08hastuoft/page/n7/mode/2up>
- İbn Haldun. (1988). Mukaddime II. çev. Z. K. Ugan. İstanbul: M.E.G.S.B. Yayınları.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). Elements of the philosophy of right (A. W. Wood, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Erişim adresi: <https://dl.3danet.ir/Zali/Hegel,%20Georg%20Wilhelm%20Friedrich%20Nisbet/Hegel,%20Georg%20Wilhelm%20Friedrich%20Nisbet,%20Hugh%20Barr%20Wood,%20Allen%20W%20%20Elements%20of%20the%20Philosophy%20of%20Right.pdf>
- Hick, J. (1987). The non-absoluteness of Christianity. In J. Hick & P. F. Knitter (Eds.), The myth of Christian uniqueness. London: SCM Press.
- Hick, J. (1985). Death and eternal life. London: The Macmillan Press. Erişim adresi: <https://archive.org/details/deatheternallife0000hick>
- Hick, J. (1990). Philosophy of religion. (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, J. W. (2007). Violence and religion. In D. A. Leeming, K. Madden, & S. Marlan (Eds.), Encyclopedia of psychology and religion. Springer. Erişim adresi: <https://alingavreliuc.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/encyclopedia-of-psychology-and-religion-d-a-leeming-k-madden-2010.pdf>
- Kant, I. (1960). Ebedî barış üzerine felsefî deneme. çev. Y. Abadan & S. L. Meray. Ankara: Ajans Türk Matbaası.
- Kartal, B. (2021). Dinsel şiddet ve yıkıcılığın psikolojisi. İstanbul: Lisans Yayıncılık. Erişim adresi: <https://www.lisansyayincilik.com.tr/pdf/30-Bilal%20Hoca%20cin--13,5x21.pdf>
- Kartal, B. (2021). Dini inanç ve dindarlık. ed. M. Cengil & N. Gencer. Din psikolojisi. İstanbul: Lisans Yayıncılık. Erişim adresi: <https://www.lisansyayincilik.com.tr/pdf/Din%20Psk-cindekiler.pdf>
- Kızılabdullah, Ş. (2015). *Dinlerin birey, aile ve toplum barışına katkısı (Yahudilik, Hristiyanlık ve İslâm)*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

- Kiriş, N. (2008). Tarihsel olarak kötülük problemi ve çözüm yolu olarak teodise. *FLSF Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5, 81-96. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/803644>
- Köylü, M. (2012). Dünya dinlerinde ahlak. İstanbul: Dem Yayınları.
- Krieger, D. & Kelly, F. K. (1992). Introduction. D. Krieger & F. K. Kelly (Eds.). *Waging peace II: Vision and hope for the 21st century*. Chicago: Noble Press.
- Kutluer, İ. (1998). Hikmet. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 17/503-511. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları. Erişim adresi: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/hikmet#1>
- Küng, H. & Kuschel, K. J. (1995). Evrensel bir ahlaka doğru. çev. N. Y. Aşıkoğlu. Ankara: Gün Yayıncılık
- Lemennicier, B. (2003). Classical just war theory: A critical view. Libertarian International Spring Convention, Krakow, March 22-23, 1-17. Erişim adresi: <file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/Justwartheoryanditscritics3042OO3.pdf>
- Magee, B. (2000). Felsefenin öyküsü. çev. B. S. Şener. Ankara: Dost Yayınları.
- Maister, C. (2009). *Introducing philosophy of religion*. London & New York: Routledge. Erişim adresi: <http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/10847/1/9.pdf.pdf>
- McKim, D. K. (1996). *Dictionary of theological terms*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press. Erişim adresi: <https://archive.org/details/westminsterdicti0000mcki/page/n5/mode/2up>
- McMahan, J. (2010). Pacifism and moral theory. *Diametros*, 23, 44-68. Erişim adresi: <https://diametros.uj.edu.pl/diametros/article/view/381/377>
- Miskeveyh, İ. (1983). Ahlakı olgunlaştırma. çev. A. Şener & C. Tunç, & İ. Kayaoğlu. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Nânâ, M. (2008). Yahudi tarihi. çev. A. Batur. İstanbul: Selenge Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (2007). Böyle Buyurdu Zerdüşt. çev. M. Batmankaya. İstanbul: Say Yayıncılık
- Ören, E. (2022). The just war in political thought: From Cicero to Grotius. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(3), 188–204. DOI: 10.18074/ckuiibfd.1182026
- Peterson, M. (2012). Akıl ve inanç: Din felsefesine giriş. çev. R. Acar. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları. Erişim adresi: <https://archive.org/details/reasonreligiousb0000pete/page/n9/mode/2up>
- Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian belief*. New York: Oxford University Press. Erişim adresi: <https://www.ccel.org/p/plantinga/warrant3/cache/warrant3.pdf>
- Platon. (1992). Devlet. çev. S. Eyüboğlu & M. A. Cimcoz. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi. Erişim adresi: [https://ia802802.us.archive.org/20/items/PlatoTheRepublicCambridgeTomGriffith/Plato%20The%20Republic%20\(Cambridge%2C%20Tom%20Griffith\).pdf](https://ia802802.us.archive.org/20/items/PlatoTheRepublicCambridgeTomGriffith/Plato%20The%20Republic%20(Cambridge%2C%20Tom%20Griffith).pdf)
- Platon. (2012). Yasalar. çev. C. Şentuna & S. Babür. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları. Erişim adresi: [file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/Platon\\_Yasalar.pdf](file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/Platon_Yasalar.pdf)
- Popkin, R. (2003). *The history of scepticism: From Savonarola to Bayle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Erişim adresi: [https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9780195355390\\_A23603548/preview-9780195355390\\_A23603548.pdf](https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9780195355390_A23603548/preview-9780195355390_A23603548.pdf)
- Rapoport, D. C. (1990). *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind*. W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Erişim adresi: <https://archive.org/details/originsofterrori00walt/page/n3/mode/2up>
- Rudolph, K. (1987). Wisdom. M. Eliade (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. Erişim adresi: [https://archive.org/stream/encyclopediaofre00macm/encyclopediaofre00macm\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/encyclopediaofre00macm/encyclopediaofre00macm_djvu.txt)
- Şiddet üzerine bildiri. (2005). çev. B. Ö. Düzgören. *Cogito*, 6-7, 37-41. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- The Dhammapada: Gerçeğin yolu. (2008). çev. A. C. Büker. İstanbul: Cinius Yayınları. Erişim adresi: [https://www.bps.lk/olib/bp/bp433s\\_Feldmeyer\\_Dhammapada.pdf](https://www.bps.lk/olib/bp/bp433s_Feldmeyer_Dhammapada.pdf)
- Thompson, H. O. (1994). *World religions in war and peace*. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Tolstoy, L. N. (2001). Tolstoy'un günlüğü: Bilgelik takvimi. çev. A. Aker. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları
- Topakkaya, A. (2016). *Hukuk ve adalet*. Ankara: Adalet Yayınları.
- Turhan, G. (2022). Şiddeti önlemede aşk teodisesinin rolü. *Amasya İlahiyat Dergisi*, 19, 315-350. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18498/amailad.1184758>
- Tzenios, N. (2023). Case study: Just war doctrine. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 13, 1-17. Erişim adresi: [file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/Case\\_Study\\_Just\\_War\\_Doctrine.pdf](file:///C:/Users/PC/Downloads/Case_Study_Just_War_Doctrine.pdf)
- Ward, K. (2004). *The case for religion*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Yaman, A. (2009a). Savaş. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 36/189-194. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları. Erişim adresi: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/savas#1>
- Yaman, A. (2009b). Barış. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. 37/489-490. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları. Erişim adresi: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/sulh--baris>
- Yaran, C. S. (2004). Din ve terör ilişkisinin din felsefesi açısından tahlili. *Dini Araştırmalar*, 7(20), 47-59. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/51819>
- Yaran, C. S. (2010). *Ahlak ve etik*. İstanbul: Rağbet Yayınları.

- Yaran, C. S. (2017). Din felsefesine giriş. İstanbul: Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Yayınları.
- Yaran, C. S. (1997). Eleştirel akılcılık ve tahkikî imancılık. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9, 217-238. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/188685>
- Yasa, M. (2015). Bütüncül ve eleştirel din felsefesi okumaları I. Ankara: Elis Yayınları.
- Yasa, M. (2013). Bütüncül ve eleştirel din felsefesi. Ankara: Elis Yayınları.
- Yeşilçayır, C. (2016). Platon'dan rousseau'ya barış düşüncesinin evrimi. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2(2), 59-72. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/264687>
- Zur, O. (2010). Savaşın psiko-tarihi: Kültür, ruh ve düşmanın birlikte evrimi. çev. G. Kağnıcı. *Tarih Okulu*, 6, 125-143. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/144883>