

speaking Caribbean appears in the brief reference to Dublin-born Richard Madden, a medical doctor in Jamaica and Cuba (chap. 9). Given that the Caribbean was a singular region shaped by the impact of enslavement and the church, it would have been important to point to readings about and from that region. For example, Maureen Warner-Lewis reconstructed a biography of the enslaved African Archibald Monteath (née Aniaso), an Igbo who was kidnapped and trafficked to Jamaica around 1802. He became active in the Moravian Church, later purchasing his freedom. His dedication to the Christian faith made him special to the missionaries and enslaved people alike. B. W. Higman has studied the life and thought of pro-slavery Scottish Anglican priest John Lindsay (1729–1788), whose unpublished work presented a theological justification for the enslavement of Africans along similar lines to Catholics of that period. Andrew Dial published an article on the Jesuit Antoine Lavalette, who tortured to death four enslaved persons in Martinique. Kellerman’s research points to the need for a similar monograph on the nature of the theological and practical impact of the Catholic Church’s responses to slaveholding in the Caribbean.

ANNA KASAFI PERKINS

*University of the West Indies and
St. Michael’s Theological College, Jamaica*

Justice After War: Jus Post Bellum in the 21st Century. By David Chiwon Kwon. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2023. xviii + 294 pages. \$29.95.

Over the last three decades, scholars, policymakers, and practitioners working within the just war tradition have increasingly gravitated to the concept of *jus post bellum*: “justice after war.” Proponents of “*jpb*” (a now standard shorthand) claim it is a necessary supplement to the more familiar just war categories of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. Whereas *jus ad bellum* concerns the causes of war, and *jus in bello* the means employed in warfare, *jpb* provides moral guidelines for the aftermath of war. What do victors owe the vanquished, and vice versa? What does a just postwar settlement look like? Do non-belligerent actors—civil society groups, or international NGOs—have a necessary role to play? These are central questions in the growing field of *jpb*. But while their urgency is obvious, their answers remain highly disputed.

In this context, David Chiwon Kwon’s *Justice After War* is a most welcome contribution. A Catholic moral theologian, Kwon does not confine himself to his own discipline, but aims to offer a comparative analysis of how *jpb* has developed across “moral philosophy, moral

theology, security studies, international law, and peacebuilding work” (3). Simultaneously, he seeks to justify *jpb* as a legitimate addition to the just war tradition and advance a constructive argument about what it comprises. Challenging the prevalent view that “political reconciliation” should be the primary objective of postwar reconstruction, Kwon contends that *jpb* ought instead to focus on “human security,” and identifies “just policing,” “just punishment,” and “just political participation” as its three primary elements (3).

Kwon’s constructive argument is, in my view, the most original and compelling aspect of *Justice After War*. The book mounts a forceful critique of “maximalist” approaches to *jpb* that expect too much from postwar actors, while failing “to fully examine the essential features of human reality in postwar societies” (70)—in particular, the limitations of time, resources, and human moral agency that constrain what is possible after war. Kwon advocates instead a “maxim(um) of ethical minimalism” that takes these limitations more seriously, and “aims to restrict what just actors ought to do” (148). He also presses for distinguishing the more limited obligations of postwar justice, and the field of *jpb* itself, from the broader and longer-term projects of “transitional justice” (157) and “peacebuilding” (232), often conflated with *jpb*.

There is much to be said for Kwon’s argument. Conceptually, narrowing the scope of *jpb* as he suggests offers a much clearer delineation of the field and the problems that define it. Substantively, Kwon’s case for greater realism, and less idealism, in *jpb* is persuasive. It rests not only on political pragmatism, but on deeper moral and theological grounds: in particular, the Thomistic tradition of common good ethics (Kwon’s principal framework) and the Christian realism of Reinhold Niebuhr, which Kwon synthesizes creatively, if not (as he admits) wholly consistently (266). In the book’s final three chapters, Kwon utilizes this ethical framework and draws on a range of interdisciplinary literature to flesh out what his realist conception of *jpb* would involve in practice. His proposals exemplify the Thomistic prudence he advocates.

Not every aspect of *Justice After War* is equally successful. The book’s opening engagement with four “foundational” just war theorists (Aristotle, Aquinas, Michael Walzer, and Brian Orend) is too narrow in scope and idiosyncratic in selection to fully situate Kwon’s argument, and the category of *jpb* itself, in the broader tradition. Conversely, Kwon scarcely engages critiques of the just war tradition as a whole. Moreover, while Kwon’s engagements with non-theological disciplines add important support to his constructive argument, they seem too limited to provide a true comparative analysis of how *jpb* has developed in these fields, as against moral theology. This is partially because Kwon proceeds in dialogue with individual

thinkers rather than surveying each field more systematically, a methodological choice that also makes it challenging, at times, to track all the threads in his complex argument. For these reasons, I believe other works might provide a better orientation for students new to the field of just war.

On the other hand, for readers already somewhat versed in Kwon's subject, his book has much to offer. Its interdisciplinary breadth, theological depth, and prudent realism genuinely advance the argument about *jpb*, and yield a plausible vision of what "justice after war" might look like.

NICHOLAS HAYES-MOTA
Santa Clara University

A Christian and African Ethic of Women's Political Participation: Living as Risen Beings. By Léocadie W. Lushombo. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2023. xvi + 292 pages. \$116.00 (hardcover), \$45.00 (e-book).

In an era when gender inequality in politics remains a pressing issue, Léocadie W. Lushombo's book offers a critical examination of this multifaceted problem. Her book centers around both African and Christian ethical frameworks, and how their intersection can encourage African women to participate more in political spaces; she maintains a consistent thread throughout the book, arguing that ethical reform is necessary at both theological and cultural levels to achieve genuine gender equality, largely drawing on insights from the Circle of Concerned African Women Theologians, postcolonial critiques, feminist ethics, inculturation theories, liberation theology, and Catholic social teaching.

A notable aspect of Lushombo's work is her ability to combine African and Christian feminist perspectives, which proves her work to be not only a powerful reminder of the patriarchal systems that limit women's voices and agency in Africa, but also solid interdisciplinary scholarship that dives deep into connections between gender dynamics, cultural traditions, and theological imperatives in shaping women's political engagement. This book is broken up into four parts. In the first two parts, Lushombo delves into the issue of "anthropological poverty" and how African Traditional Religion(s) or ATR often overlooks the impoverishment of women. Central to her concerns is anthropological poverty among African women, a concept she adopts from Engelbert Mveng. The term captures a profound loss of identity and dignity stemming from historical traumas such as slavery and colonialism, which continue to be reinforced by ongoing cultural and religious oppression, as shown by the elements of ATR