Given how much harm can be done after the fighting part of wars end, and given recent failures to secure lasting peace after conflicts (e.g. in Afghanistan and Iraq), developing an account of the conditions of a just peace, or *jus post bellum*, is crucial. Unfortunately, *jus post bellum* has long been largely ignored. In this dissertation, I present and briefly defend the compensation theory of *jus post bellum*, according to which the arrangements that parties formerly at war owe each other in virtue of having fought each other are really instrumental claims about how best to discharge the duty to compensate for war-related injustices. By being clear on the moral foundations of *jus post bellum*, this theory is helpful both in evaluating the morality of peace settlements, and in settling conflict between competing post-war arrangements.