

The Problem of War and Peace: a Historical and Philosophical Analysis¹

OLEG BAZALUK — Doctor of Philosophy, Professor
Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi State Pedagogical University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: bazaluk@ukr.net

Many different views on the problem of “war” and “peace” were substantively explored for several millennia. From our point of view, the theoretical and empirical basis of “war” and “peace” was made up principally from research in three areas: (1) Religion, ethics, philosophy and psychology, as comprehension of the normative-evaluative categories of good and evil; (2) Philosophy, political science, sociology and jurisprudence, in the theories of international relations; (3) History, fiction as well as documentary, memoir, reference, technical literature on the subject of “war” and “peace.” For such a significant amount of time, there was a wealth of factual and theoretical material accumulated in each of the three areas of research, which highlights the problem of “war” and “peace” in all variety of its meanings. To understand the scope of coverage and a range of research on the problem of “war” and “peace,” as well as the level of achievements in this field, let us briefly examine the history of “war” and “peace” in each of these three areas, proposed by us.

Key Words: problem of “war”, problem of “peace”, category of good, category of evil, theories of international relations, Democritus’ line, Plato’s line, Thucydides

Introduction

Many different views on the problem of “war” and “peace” were substantively explored for several millennia. From our point of view, the theoretical and empirical basis of “war” and “peace” was made up principally from research in three areas:

1. Religion, ethics, philosophy and psychology, as comprehension of the normative-evaluative categories of good and evil.
2. Philosophy, political science, sociology and jurisprudence, in the theories of international relations.
3. History, fiction as well as documentary, memoir, reference, technical literature on the subject of “war” and “peace.”

For such a significant amount of time, there was a wealth of factual and theoretical material accumulated in each of the three areas of research, which highlights the problem of “war” and “peace” in all variety of its meanings. To understand the scope of coverage and a range of research on the problem of “war” and “peace,” as well as the level of achievements in this field, let us briefly examine the history of “war” and “peace” in each of these three areas, proposed by us.

¹ This is the Chapter One of the book “The Theory of War and Peace” [Bazaluk, 2017].

© Bazaluk, Oleg, 2017

The categories of good and evil as a theoretical basis for war and peace

Almost five thousand years ago, Zoroaster, a priest and the founder of Zoroastrianism (Mazdaism), presented good and evil in his sermons as the two highest spirits of worship, and as not having anything in common with each other. Gods Ahura Mazda (Illuminating Wisdom) and Angra Mainyu (Destructive Spirit) were in irreconcilable conflict with each other. Zoroaster urged to follow God Ahura Mazda, who was the patron saint of righteous men and the forces of Good.

For the Western world, the ideas of Zoroaster about the Gods of Wisdom and Destruction, over several thousand years of development, turned into a religion that had gone through various smaller sects. By about 400 BC, based on this religion, two general lines of philosophising in the history of culture were formed. Alexander Lyubishchev called them the “lines” of Democritus and Plato [Lyubishchev, 2000]. According to Lyubishchev, Democritus’ line (natural philosophy, materialist philosophy, etc.) is a dead one, and Plato’s line, thanks to free theoretical creativity, lack of dogmatism, synthetic nature of the research and rationalism (different from skeptical rationalism of Democritus’ line), is the main line of the development of science to this day [Lyubishchev 2000: 110].

Around 360 BC, in the treatise “Timaeus”, Plato put forward the idea of the unity of nature of good and evil [Plato, 1994]. In the third century AD, Plotinus, who was a follower of Plato, wrote about the unity of good and evil as an obvious reality. In the collection of writings “The Six Enneads” of Plotinus, edited and compiled by his follower Porphyry (c. 270 AD), we find the following: proof of the existence of “the greatest power, to be able to use even the evil nobly, and to be strong enough to use things which have become shapeless for making other shapes” [Plotinus, 1967: 61].

The reasoning that was set out in “The Six Enneads” by Plotinus about the unity of good and evil, as well as the consequences of this unity, so impressed the Christian theologian Aurelius Augustine that he created a whole system of worldviews from this idea, which maintained its relevance for more than a thousand years. Between 380 and 430 AD, Augustine argued that everything in the world that was created by God, in one way or another was involved in absolute good, in the depth of which, by necessity, was born evil. For example, in 398 AD, in the seventh autobiographical book “Confessions”, Augustine wrote: “Who made me? Was it not my God, who is not only good but goodness itself?” [Augustine, 2007]. God created all things good (“Thou made all things good”). However, due to that fact, “nor is there any substance at all that was not made by You; and because all that You have made are not equal, therefore all things are; because individually they are good, and altogether very good, because our God made all things very good” [Augustine, 2007]. It is from here, from a variety of the unity, formed by the divine harmony of the world, according to Augustine, evil emerged. Evil is something that disturbs the harmony, created by God. In Augustine’s “Confessions”, evil is a weakened good that is a necessary step towards good.

Developing his system of views of good and evil, Augustine constantly mentioned Plotinus, his idea of the primacy of good, and that “evil as a falling short of good” [Plotinus, 1967: 61]. Therefore, Augustine concluded that “good” could not be understood without “evil.”

Augustine had his system of views on the fact that God is good and evil is a necessity, due to which the understanding of good became possible in principle, turned into dogma. In the second half of the 13th century (after almost 800 years), Thomas Aquinas responded to the objection that not every being is good, only because there is evil in the world, so no evil is good: “Woe to you that call evil good and good evil” (Isaiah 5:20). He answered

authoritatively the following: “every being, as being, is good”, and that “no being can be spoken of as evil, formally as being, but only so far as it lacks being” [Aquinas, 2008].

The authority of Augustine remained so strong that the statement “God is good” did not require proof. Biblical infallibility and Biblical inerrancy developed the persistent stereotypes of views, which, for hundreds of centuries, considerably expanded and specified the categories of good and evil, having turned them into the regulatory-evaluative categories through which all manifestations of human activity, including war and peace, were examined.

Only in the middle of the 17th century did the dogmatic perception of the regulatory-evaluative categories of good and evil reach a new level of comprehension. Immanuel Kant translated Horace’s dictum “Sapere aude!” as “Have the courage to use your own reason!” and proclaimed it as the motto of the Enlightenment [Kant, 1966]. The problem of good and evil from the field of theology and philosophising passed into a plane of life practices and became regarded as the manifestation of concrete actions. The categories of good and evil began to be studied in ethics, psychology and political science, and were implemented in everyday life. The numerous theories and concepts exploring the nature of good and evil, and the features of its manifestation in human activity, have emerged. For example, in the variety of theories about the origin of good, we can highlight the following research areas:

- a) Transcendental realism. The representatives: Immanuel Kant, Eduard von Hartmann, Tony Lawson, and others.
- b) Perfectionism. The studies of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Anthony Shaftesbury, Wolfgang Pauli, and others.
- c) Hedonism and Welfarist theories: Epicurus, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, Meher Baba and others.
- d) Pragmatism: John Dewey, Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and others.
- e) Emotivism: David Hume, Charles Stevenson, Bertrand Russell, Alfred Jules Ayer and some others.

In the study of the origin of evil, Lars Svendsen identified four strategies [Svendsen, 2008: 12]:

- a) People are possessed (or seduced) by supernatural powers of evil.
- b) Human nature determines a behaviour that we can denote as evil.
- c) The influence of the external environment creates people that generate evil.
- d) People are free and do their choice in favour of evil.

A certain number of theories correspond to each identified strategy. For example, the fourth strategy corresponds to the theory of freedom for good and evil of Friedrich von Schelling; the theory of radical evil of Immanuel Kant [Kant, 1966]; the theory of banal evil of Hannah Arendt [Arendt, 1965], and others.

In the theories of good and evil, the problem of war and peace is studied as a special case. Moreover, for the most part, it is understood clearly: good is peace, evil is war. Even “just war”, as a concept that originated from Aristotle and Cicero, sets itself the aim of preventing evil, and not achieving good. The evidence of peace as good and war as evil forced researchers to turn their attention not to the research of war and peace as the manifestations of being, but to the study of more fundamental and defining processes. For example, to the ontology of good and evil (Martin Heidegger [Heidegger, 1997]); or to the study of the features of the manifestations of good and evil that concentrate on the moral, political, and psychological components of this problem (for example, Lars Svendsen [Svendsen, 2008]).

Against the background of religious, philosophical, ethical, political, and psychological comprehension of the categories of good and evil, the concepts of war and peace were

perceived as immanent. Only Hugo Grotius in his treatise “The three books of the Law of War and Peace”, published in 1625, considered the problem of war and peace as a self-contained problem, but only in the context of the theory of international law. For other scholars, until 1832, before the publication of the writings “On War” of German General Carl von Clausewitz, the categories of good and evil had a deeper and broader context. Part of which, if necessary, they used to explain war and peace.

War and peace in the theories of international relations

The second important area, which forms the theoretical and empirical basis of war and peace, is the development of the theories of international relations in philosophy, political science, sociology, and law. In the theories of international relations, the consideration of the problem of war and peace comes to the fore.

Edward Hallett Carr, Gennady Novikov, Boris Chicherin, and other researchers believe that when analyzing the features of the use of war and peace, force and law, national selfishness and universal organization, and others in the policy of the state (i.e. when considering the political relations between the states), there are two dominant ideological traditions that remain relevant to this day. Both traditions originated in ancient Greece. By and large, we are talking about the origin of the two lines of philosophising that Alexander Lyubishchev called the lines of Democritus and Plato [Lyubishchev, 2000]. Only, in international relations, these lines of philosophising have two features.

The first feature is that, unlike the comprehension of the categories of good and evil, in the theories of international relations, Democritus’ line led to results that are more significant. The major schools of thought of realism and neorealism (structural realism), which represented Democritus’ line, have always played a leading role in the theoretical comprehension of the internal and interstate relations.

The second feature concerns the liberalism and neoliberalism schools of thought, which represented Plato’s line in the theories of international relations. Given the fact that the international (political) relations, for example, in the understanding of Raymond Aron, are the relationship between “political entities: between states, or between the “diplomat” and the “soldier”” [Aron, 2000], then the line of Plato was represented in them quite specifically. To understand this specificity, we consider, for example, an evaluation of Augustine’s writings in terms of philosophy and political science.

As we discussed above in comprehending the categories of good and evil in philosophy, Augustine’s writings are evaluated as the most important contribution to the development of Plato’s line of philosophising. Plato → Plotinus → Augustine → Aquinas → Kant → Heidegger and others, that is, in ontology, in the study of the fundamental principles of being, its most common being and categories, structures and regularities. Plato’s line of philosophising forms the basis of humanity’s perception of the world. For example, the same Augustine’s ideas have remained relevant for over 1,000 years! Plato’s line of philosophising is presented by fundamental research in philosophy, cosmology, biology and neurosciences. Its final product is the theory of evolution that determines the origin and the main stages of the deployment of the material world, or in philosophical terminology — the doctrine of being. In the theory of evolution as a product of scientific knowledge, and in the doctrine of being as a product of philosophical reflection, the theory of war and peace is a special case, which is considered as a consequence of manifestations of more fundamental processes.

Quite differently Augustine’s writings are evaluated in political science and, consequently, in international relations. Political scientists (sociologists, historians, and others) do not

investigate entities and the manifestations of being. In the understanding of Alexander Lyubishchev, this is Democritus' line. However, the separate ideas of Augustine were interpreted, for example, in his treatise "The City of God" (we consider them below), they open the manifestations of being, but not the study of being. These ideas in the theories of international relations lay down the basis for the theories of liberalism and neoliberalism. Similarly, in the writings of Plato, Plotinus, Aquinas and other reputable representatives of Plato's line, one can find reasoning about the manifestations of being which, in philosophy, one would attribute to Democritus' line. But, in political science, sociology, history and other disciplines, representing Democritus' line, one could refer to Plato's line. Indeed, in comparison with Realpolitik, these ideas are really fundamental and defining.

The understanding of this feature is very important for our research. Once again, we can formulate *the fact that many scientific disciplines attribute to ontology, to fundamental and determining (Plato's line), actually, ontology as the doctrine of being is considered (and rightly so!) as the manifestation of being, and accordingly, attributed to Democritus' line*. It is here we answer the question: why philosophers attribute the problem of war and peace to Democritus' line (though, it is merely the manifestation of being) and do not pay much attention to it (focusing their efforts on the study of being), and why political scientists (historians, sociologists and et al.) consider the theories of war and peace as basic theories. The latter corroborate "ontology" of their theories in terms of the ideas of the classic authors of Plato's line, ignoring the fact that most of these ideas regarded the manifestations of being, rather than the study of being itself.

Thus, considering the theoretical and empirical basis of war and peace in international relations, we see Democritus' and Plato's lines of philosophising (in the understanding of Alexander Lyubishchev), knowing that Plato's line in this field of research examines the development of the manifestations of being, rather than the study of being.

Democritus' line in the theory of international relations originates from the book "History of the Peloponnesian War" (written in the 5 century BC), in which the ancient Greek historian Thucydides, describing the events of the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta (431–404 BC), anticipated the basic provisions of the modern school of "political realism." Despite the fact that Democritus and Thucydides were the same age (both born about 460 BC³), and that Democritus is attributed to the founders of materialist philosophy, his name is not mentioned in the theories of international relations, and Democritus' line (in the understanding of Lyubishchev) originated from Thucydides⁴.

According to Thucydides, the use of force is the norm of the political behavior of the fittest. For example, in the first book of "History of the Peloponnesian War", revealing the cause of the war between Athens and Lacedaemonians, Thucydides wrote: "The real cause (of the war), I consider to be the one which was formerly kept out of sight. The growth of the power of Athens, and the alarm which this inspired in Lacedaemon, made war inevitable" [Thucydides, 1910]]. In the second book, Thucydides came to the following conclusion, which is important for our research: "for the retiring and unambitious are never secure without vigorous protectors at their side; in fine, such qualities are useless to an imperial city, though they may help a dependency to an unmolested servitude" [Thucydides, 1910]].

The next important step in the understanding of war and peace in Democritus' (Thucydides) line of philosophising is the work of the Roman politician and philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero (the years 106–43 BC). For example, Fiona Forsyth noted the practical

³ Supposedly, Democritus lived 30 years longer than Thucydides (he died about 70-80 years old).

⁴ However, Plato believed that his philosophical antagonist was Democritus.

and theoretical contribution of Cicero in the development of political and legal ideas of Rome in the 1st century BC, in particular, his supporting the republican system [Forsyth, 2003]. It is noteworthy that Cicero was strongly influenced by the representatives of the different line of philosophising: Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoic philosophers.

In the last philosophical essay “On Duties”, written in October-November 44 BC, in the form of a letter to his son (Cicero dedicated it to his son Mark) Cicero wrote: “11. ... There are also certain duties to be observed toward those who may have injured you. For there is a limit to revenge and punishment ... In the public administration, also, the rights of war are to be held sacred. While there are two ways of contending, one by discussion, the other by force, the former belonging properly to man, the latter to beasts, recourse must be had to the latter if there be no opportunity for employing the former. Wars, then, are to be waged in order to render it possible to live in peace without injury...” [Cicero, 1887].

A new stage in the understanding of war and peace is connected with the works of Niccolò Machiavelli. In the treatise “Il Principe” (the Prince) (written around 1513, but it was published only in 1532, five years after Machiavelli’s death), Machiavelli carried out the analysis and generalisation of the real facts of the history of political relations, and systematised information about the state and its governance. Machiavelli’s “Il Principe” is the transition from Augustine’s view of human history as the relationship between the earthly city (Dei ciuitas) and the heavenly city (terrena ciuitas) to the analysis of the functioning of the earthly city — to politics as the empirical science and the analysis of the problems of war and peace with the help of the empirical methods.

Niccolò Machiavelli caused a revolution of sorts in the worldview of the Middle Ages, actualizing maximally and bringing Augustine’s understanding of the earthly city closer to reality. For the first time, Machiavelli:

1. Considered the state as a political state of society and the main participant in international relations.
2. Examined the role of the ruler’s personality in the fate of the state.
3. Actualized the problem of the correlation between moral standards and political expediency in philosophy and history.
4. Revived and developed the ancient views on war and peace in line with Thucydides.
5. Concluded that Christian morality is not the basis of policy and political relations, and the interests and power, thus freeing politics from theological dogmas.
6. Proved that war and peace are immanent states of bilateral relations.

However, the most important thing, in our opinion, is that Machiavelli made a contribution to the understanding of the problem of war and peace through his idea of equilibrium (the balance of power). This idea (only in a modern interpretation) continues to dominate in international relations and the theories of war and peace. For example, at the end of chapter three of “Il Principe” (the Prince), Machiavelli wrote: “... and on Cardinal Rouen observing to me that the Italians did not understand war, I replied to him that the French did not understand statecraft, meaning that otherwise they would not have allowed the Church to reach such greatness. And in fact it has been seen that the greatness of the Church and of Spain in Italy has been caused by France, and her ruin may be attributed to them. From this a general rule is drawn which never, or rarely, fails: that he who is the cause of another becoming powerful is ruined; because that predominancy has been brought about either by astuteness or else by force, and both are distrusted by him who has been raised to power” [Machiavelli, 2006].

In the 18th century Machiavelli’s idea of the balance of power was formulated by David Hume, and in the 19th — 20th century, on the basis of this idea, Hans Morgenthau, and others

created the theory that is now widely used in the practice of international relations and the theories of war and peace⁵.

The next step in the understanding of the problem of war and peace in the theories of international relations in Democritus' (Thucydides) line were the ideas formulated in the 17th century by English philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Outstanding political analyst Richard E. Flathman, studying the impact of Hobbes' work on the development of political philosophy, called him one of the founders of modern political philosophy and political science [Flathman, 2002]⁶.

In a range of works (one of the main is considered "Leviathan; or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil" (the book was published in 1651)), Thomas Hobbes created a full and systematic doctrine about the state based on beginnings of human nature and natural law. In his political doctrine, Hobbes proceeded from the ideas about the natural origin of man and societies. Hobbes believes that naturally man is not made for communication because selfishness is dominant over him — the basic human passion (it follows: "man is a wolf to man" — homo homini lupus). According to Hobbes, the natural state of man is "war of all against all" (bellum omnium contra omnes). However, the instinct of self-preservation (saecuritas) forced people to seek peace. On this basis, Hobbes formulated the basic laws of nature: *obliged to seek Peace (est quaerendam esse pacem)*! From these laws, it follows the laws of nature as prescribing the moral virtues that are necessary to achieve peace and to forbid the opposite vices. One of these laws prescribes that *to save peace, one must abandon the right to all; otherwise, the war will continue*. To refuse the right to all, it means to give in to others or to transfer their rights to others, that is, not to resist when they do something that by the laws of nature and I could have the same right [Chicherin 2001: 172]. Later, the idea of the social contract was developed in the works of Samuel Pufendorf (1673), John Locke (1689), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762), and Immanuel Kant (1797).

Thus, in the 16th — 18th centuries, several generations of scientists laid down the basic markers of Democritus' (Thucydides) line in the study the problems of war and peace in the theories of international relations. In the scientific literature, these ideas are called "classic" and preceded the ideas of "political realism", which were formed after the Second World War. Their main difference is the understanding of international relations as the sphere of conflicts and actions of states that are guided by their interests and resorted to the use of force as a decisive factor of interstate communications [Novikov, 1996].

In the "classic" approach, two ideas are of interest to us:

1. The theory of state sovereignty, in particular, a consideration of states as independent loci of civilization. Niccolò Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, and others developed it.

2. The concept of equilibrium (the balance of power) (Henry St John Bolingbroke, Emer de Vattel, David Hume, and others). In the similarly named essay "On the Balance of Power", David Hume formulated this concept as follows: "politics, at the highest level of generalization, is an action aimed at preventing any state from accumulating strength that is superior to coalition forces of the rivals [Hume, 1987]. In the basis of this concept, the search for a form of reconciliation between the state selfishness and the security of each country, as well as the stability and peaceful development of the whole system, was laid down.

⁵ The history of the concept of the "balance of power" was written, for example, in the article of the Norwegian political scientist Torbjørn L. Knutsen [Knutsen, 2007].

⁶ The provocation of this book is that Richard E. Flathman is a theorist of liberalism and in his study, he monitors of the ideas of liberalism in the works of members of the opposite line — the school of political realism. However, in recent decades, the trend towards convergence of the lines of Democritus' (Thucydides) and Plato in the theories of international relations, became more pronounced. This fact was noted in the works, for example, of David A. Baldwin, Gennady Novikov, and others.

The next step in the understanding of the problem of war and peace in the theories of international relations was the work of the Prussian General Carl von Clausewitz “On War” [Clausewitz, 2007]. A treatise on the art of war, on which Clausewitz worked from 1816 until his death (1831), remained incomplete. In 1832, Clausewitz’s widow published her husband’s work. The recognized researchers of the theories of war and peace (e.g. Anton Kersnovsky; Andrew Snesev; Martin van Creveld; Jack S. Levy; Kenneth Waltz, and others) are unanimous in affirming that the work of Carl von Clausewitz not only made a decisive contribution to military theory, but also significantly enriched the study of war as a phenomenon of international relations.

Carl von Clausewitz treated the representatives of the ideas of Plato’s line of war and peace with irony, and regarded war as a realist and an officer, who planned and participated in many battles. According to von Clausewitz: “War is not merely a political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means” [Clausewitz, 2007: 25]. War is “an act of violence to compel our opponent to fulfill our will” [Clausewitz, 2007: 15], which “belongs necessarily also to the feelings” [Clausewitz, 2007: 16].

Carl von Clausewitz first drew attention to the psychological aspects of the war, including the peculiarities of the influence of national character and morale of the people on the political aims of the war. In the chapters of the book: “Defence of Mountains” (Chapter 15 and 16), “Defence of Swamps” (Chapter 20), and others, von Clausewitz suggested the options for conducting military operations in different terrain conditions, which are used in military strategies and now.

In the late-19th — early 20th century, Democritus’ (Thucydides) line was enriched due to the theories of geopolitics, in which, as a special case, the theories of war and peace were considered. The basis of the theories of geopolitics was the idea of the influence of geographical environment on the destinies of nations. At the root of the emergence and development of this idea were Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Strabo, Cicero, Machiavelli, and others. In 1748, a book “The Spirit of Laws” of Charles-Louis de Montesquieu was published, in which he introduced the idea of geographical determinism, i.e., the defining influence of geography on the history and politics of states. In 1897, in the book “Political Geography” of the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel, the idea of geographical determinism of de Montesquieu reached a new level of understanding, which was based on the prevailing conditions of the new reality.

It should be reminded that at the turn of the 19th — 20th centuries, for the first time in the history of civilization, the Earth’s territory was divided into the spheres of influence and colonies between several powerful states. However, the current division of spheres of influence did not suit Germany, which under the leadership of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck was rapidly gaining economic and military power. There was the violation of the balance of power, which led to massive border changes, and to the First World War. It was during this period in Germany that Friedrich Ratzel developed a doctrine of “living space”, based on the idea of geographical determinism of Charles-Louis de Montesquieu, which encouraged imperial expansion. Ratzel claimed that a state had no clear borders, and like any living organism, a state sought to expand its space for the acquisition of natural resources, or for the purpose of greater security. Ratzel asserted that the higher development of culture in the state was, the more natural and justifiable joining the territories rich in natural resources to it was.

The idea of world domination by Friedrich Ratzel (or the possibility of highly developed countries expanding the borders of their influence at the expense of expansion of less

developed states) was evolving in practical implementation and theoretical works of Halford John Mackinder, Alfred Thayer Mahan, Douglas MacArthur, Johan Rudolf Kjellén, and others. After the First World War, promoting the idea of expanding the “living space” of Germany, Karl Haushofer gave geopolitics the meaning of “practical politics.” In his works, he argued that the directions and borders of the foreign policy of any state were drawn on the geographic map.

In the early 20th century, Cecil John Rhodes, John Atkinson Hobson, Rudolf Hilferding, Nikolai Bukharin, Vladimir Ulyanov (Lenin), and others created mainly the economic theory, under the provisions of which a state of peace (a balance between the imperialist coalitions) is only a “respite” between wars, the division and re-division of the world [Lenin, 1971]. Imperialism is a source of irresistible international conflicts, in which the small nations are absorbed by the more powerful nations [Lenin, 1971].

The Second World War and the emergence of nuclear weapons strengthened the understanding of international relations as the relations of power. In 1948 in the USA, the book “Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace” of Hans Morgenthau was published [Morgenthau, 1985]. In the book, Morgenthau pursued two aims: to understand international politics and the problem of international peace. In the basis of his reasoning, Morgenthau laid out the principle of the national interests developed by him that are understood in terms of authority and power. The main factor determining the development of international relations was the force or power, understood primarily in terms of its military expression. The struggle for military predominance (or authority, power) on the international scene corresponded to human nature and aimed at protecting national interests.

According to Morgenthau, the basis of national interests and the categories of national power is formed by the eight elements: 1) geography, 2) natural resources, 3) industrial capacity, 4) military preparedness, 5) population, 6) national character, 7) national morale, 8) quality of government. Morgenthau insisted on a dynamic understanding of national interests, which, in his view, depended on the period of history, political and cultural context. The ideas developed by Morgenthau in the book, not only consolidated the success of the school of “political realism” but also, for decades, they sent into oblivion the research of the problem of war and peace by the representatives of Plato’s line.

In addition to Hans Morgenthau, the foundations of political realism were developed by George Schwarzenberger, George F. Kennan, Robert Endicott Osgood, Robert Strausz-Hupé, Raymond Aron, and others.

Around the middle of the 1950s, understanding the problems of war and peace was enriched through so-called “modernist” theories that were based on the provisions of behaviorism, general systems theory, information theory, and cybernetics. Conventionally, the modern theories of international relations can be divided into two groups:

1. The theories, operating with non-mathematical concepts, in particular, based on the theory of structural-functional analysis of Talcott Parsons, and the method of system analysis of policy of David Easton. Among the representatives of this area, we should highlight:

– Philip Quincy Wright, who in the two volumes “A Study of War”, published in 1942, systematized all the data on the wars that had taken place in the history of humanity by the method of structural-functional analysis.

– Morton Kaplan, who, in his 1957 book “System and Process in International Politics”, based on general systems theory and with the use of cybernetic concepts, tried to define more precisely the basic rules of optimal behavior of states “actors” in the system of the “balance-of-power”. Kaplan described the six rules of normal, which are, from his point

of view, how the system operates,, in which each of the five actors should follow the rules: (1) Act to increase capabilities, but negotiate rather than fight; (2) Fight rather than pass up an opportunity to increase capabilities; (3) Stop fighting rather than eliminate an essential national actor; (4) Act to oppose any coalition or a single actor which tends to assume a position of predominance with respect to the rest of the system; (5) Act to constrain actors who subscribe to supranational organizing principles; (6) Permit defeated or constrained essential national actors to re-enter the system as acceptable role partners or act to bring some previously inessential actors within the essential actor classification. Treat all essential actors as acceptable role partners [Kaplan, 1957].

– Harold and Margaret Sprout, who considered the features of manifestations of states' foreign policy, depending on the environmental conditions. They introduced the concept "ecological triad" in the theory of international relations: (1) an actor, or entity, of some sort, (2) an environment that surrounds the entity, and (3) the entity-environment relationship [Starr, 2000].

2. The theories that use quantitative methods and mathematical theories such as the theory of games of John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern; information theory of Norbert Wiener and William Ross Ashby; factor, multivariate, correlation, regressive, variance analysis; time series analysis, etc. Among the representatives of this area, we should highlight:

– Karl Wolfgang Deutsch, who developed the method of the cybernetic analysis of military strategies.

– Lewis Fry Richardson, who developed a mathematical model of war and international conflict.

– J. David Singer, who in 1963 at the University of Michigan (USA) launched the Correlates of War (COW) Project, which was based on the level-of-analysis problem in international relations, developed by Singer. The project provided for two objectives: (1) to establish a correlation between the various types of war and military potentials of the European states since the Congress of Vienna (1815–1965); (2) to establish a correlation between several parameters of wars (occurrence, intensity, duration), and the parameters that characterize the international system (the number and the force of unions, the number of international organizations). One of the project conclusions was drawn as follows: the long-term equilibrium relationships of the European system of the 19th century impeded the intensity of wars and, on the contrary, the wars of the 20th century caused by changes in the balance of forces in favor of one state or a coalition [Sarkees & Wayman, 2010].

– Kenneth Ewart Boulding, who was a founder of a general theory of conflict, the dominant methodology of which is systemic, structural-functional approaches combined with cyber-behaviorist methods.

– George Modelski was one of the first who applied the behaviorist approach using cybernetic tools for the analysis of foreign policy decisions and the actions of the state.

– Anatol Rapoport, who first described the conflict behaviors of the states by two types of games: two-person zero-sum and non-zero-sum games, as well as complex motivations for several players — international actors.

– Johan Vincent Galtung was the founder (1959) and the first Director of the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, Norway, a participant of more than 45 of international, regional, and domestic conflict resolutions. Originality in Galtung's approach is that he examines the actions of the states through the prism of sociological analysis of their internal structure and the structure of their relationship on a scale of "equality of rights — dependence." This approach allowed Galtung, yet in 1980, to predict the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the USSR.

The representatives of Stoicism — a philosophical school, which was founded in Athens around 300 BC, interpreted, opposing Democritus' (Thucydides) line, the understanding of the problem of war and peace in the theories of international relations. Developing the ideas of Plato, the Stoics were speculating on a "unified world state" formed and existing according to universal reason. The Stoics put the idea of human freedom at a new level of understanding at the scale of the Earth, which was first expressed by Socrates and Diogenes. The ideology of global or cosmopolitan citizenship developed by the Stoics meant an important stage in the development of Greek thought. From comprehension of the origin, development and relationship closed autonomous poleis, the ancient Greek philosophers moved to comprehension of the moral unity of the human race.

A century later, the idea of cosmopolitanism of the Stoics became the basis of a Christian worldview concerning the global unity of people created in God's image and likeness. St. Augustine in his treatise "The City of God" (*De Civitate Dei* in Latin), written in 413–427, formulated the two important ideas for our research.

First, Augustine introduced the history of humanity as the coexistence of the Heavenly City (lat. *Dei ciuitas*) and the Earthly City (lat. *Terrena ciuitas*). In book 11, chapter 1, he wrote: "I will endeavor to treat of the origin, and progress, and deserved destinies of the two cities (the earthly and the heavenly, to wit), which, as we said, are in this present world commingled, and, as it were, entangled together" [Schaff, 1887]. Augustine's idea remained relevant for more than a thousand years (up to the Renaissance) and was laid down as the basis of the confrontation between the political doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church and the secular power. Guided by Augustine's idea, the fathers of the Roman Catholic Church with war and peace tried to impose a uniform European political system — the dominance of "the City of God." In the 11th century, Pope Gregory VII almost succeeded to do it. However, as a result of the bloody and centuries-long conflict, the Earthly City defended its right to exist after all. In the 13th century, in the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Renaissance of Aristotle's political ideas and the recognition of the rights of states and political communities for the autonomous existence took place [Aquinas, 2008]. The reality of political life took precedence over the utopia of the Heavenly City.

Augustine's second idea is related to the understanding of the importance of a just kingdom⁷ that was implied in the concept of "just war." In book 4, chapter 15, Augustine wrote: "...to carry on war and extend a kingdom over wholly subdued nations seems to bad men to be felicity, to good men necessity" [Schaff, 1887]. Alternatively, in book 19, chapter 7, Augustine formulated the same idea as follows: "...the wise man will wage just wars. As if he would not all the rather lament the necessity of just wars, if he remembers that he is a man; for if they were not just he would not wage them, and would therefore be delivered from all wars" [Schaff, 1887].

Augustine's ideas highlighted by us contributed to the further development of theoretical understanding of the problem of war and peace in international relations. We emphasise that both ideas Augustine deduced from the basic for Plato's line of philosophising postulate about a single beginning (creation) of the universe. Following Plotinus, Augustine improved Plato's idea of the unity of the world: "...the one God, the author of this universe, who is not only above every body, being incorporeal, but also above all souls, being incorruptible — our principle, our light, our good" [Schaff, 1887].

⁷ For example, in book 4, chapter 4, in the treatise "The City of God", Augustine wrote: "Justice being taken away, then, what are kingdoms but great robberies?" [Schaff, 1887].

Plato's line in comprehension of the problem of war and peace in the theories of international relations was most clearly manifested at the beginning of the 16th century when it was directly opposed to Democritus' (Thucydides) line, which was represented at the time in the works of Niccolò Machiavelli, Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, and later in Francisco de Vitoria, Francisco Suárez, Hugo Grotius, Emeric Crucé, abbé de Saint-Pierre, John Locke and some other researchers laid the foundations of the ethical and legal (idealistic) paradigm, which is currently represented in the theories of international relations by the theories of liberalism and neoliberalism. In this paradigm, the idea of continuity of policy and morality, the idea of the possibility of improving reality, and the principle of duty are defended.

Each of the scientists mentioned above pays close attention to the problem of war and peace. For example, Erasmus, in the book "The Complaint of Peace", published in 1517, gives the following definition of peace and war: "Now, if I, whose name is Peace, am a personage glorified by the united praise of God and man, as the fountain, the parent, the nurse, the patroness, the guardian of every blessing which either heaven or earth can bestow; if without me nothing is flourishing, nothing safe, nothing pure or holy, nothing pleasant to mortals, or grateful to the Supreme Being; if, on the contrary, war is one vast ocean, rushing on mankind, of all the united plagues and pestilences in nature; if, at its deadly approach, every blossom of happiness is instantly blasted, everything that was improving gradually degenerates and dwindles away to nothing, everything that was firmly supported totters on its foundation, everything that was formed for long duration comes to a speedy end, and everything that was sweet by nature is turned into bitterness" [Erasmus, 1917].

In the same essay, Erasmus formulated his famous phrase: "There is scarcely any peace so unjust, but it is preferable, upon the whole, to the justest war. Sit down, before you draw the sword, weigh every article, omit none, and compute the expense of blood as well as treasure that war requires, and the evils which it, of necessity, brings with it; and then see at the bottom of the account whether, after the greatest success, there is likely to be a balance in your favour" [Erasmus, 1917].

In the treatise "The three books of the Law of War and Peace", published in 1625, following the basic ideas of Desiderius Erasmus concerning the establishment of a peaceful world order, the elimination of forces from the international order and careful regulation of the legality of the war, Hugo Grotius systematized international law and prescribed the legal basis of the war, which formed the basis of international law in the modern period.

In 1713, abbé de Saint-Pierre proposed the project of "perpetual peace." In 1795, a treatise, "Perpetual Peace", by Immanuel Kant was published, which can be regarded as the main work among "small treatises" on the issues of philosophy of history and politics, published in the years 1784–1798 [Kant, 1966].

The creators of the American democracy made a significant contribution to the comprehension of war and peace in international relations. For example, Thomas Jefferson in the United States Declaration of Independence, which was adopted by the Second Continental Congress on July 4 1776, wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness" [The Declaration, 1776].

Charles-Louis de Montesquieu, Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and others defended the idea that the law was able only to stop the violence, but not eradicate it; that the destinies of independence of states, and the Republican system, depended only on the moral development of people.

The makers of the French Revolution of 1789, their ideas and the practical realization of those ideas narrowed the understanding of war and peace in the lines of Plato and Democritus (Thucydides). The ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Charles-Louis de Montesquieu from the field of philosophical discussions were embodied in daily life, for example, the changes which have taken place in the international legal status of the French people. A new revolutionary law that was adopted in that period in France rejected the sovereignty of the monarchs and recognised the sovereign people as a subject of international law, which exercised their will through representative institutions. The French of “subjects” of the state (sujet) became “citizens” (citoyen), which possessed equal rights to participate in the development of the nation and the state.

A new level of understanding of the problem of war and peace in international relations of Plato’s line gave the works of German philosophers: Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Hegel and some others. For example, Georg Wilhelm Hegel criticised the idea of “perpetual peace” and put the idea of war at a new level of understanding. In the third part, “Philosophy of Right”, published in 1820, Hegel wrote: “War has the higher significance that, by its agency... the ethical health of peoples is preserved in their indifference to the stabilisation of finite institutions; just as the blowing of the winds preserves the sea from the foulness which would be the result of a prolonged calm, so also corruption in nations would be the product of prolonged, let alone ‘perpetual’, peace” [Hegel, 1990: 361].

Hegel has enriched the idea of war and peace by a new approach that Gennady Novikov formulated as follows: “The world is immortal in the dialectics of life and death epochs, societies, civilizations; some of them die, producing others, making the further ascent to the knowledge of absolute spirit. The destiny of each nation is unique. In some periods, this or that nation is called upon to perform its mission, using violence, resorting to imperialism in relation to other peoples. Thus, the world’s progress is carried out” [Novikov, 1996].

An important step in the understanding of war and peace were the fourteen paragraphs of the draft of the peace treaty that were the final stage of The First World War, made by US President Woodrow Wilson in a letter to Congress, on January 8 1918. Wilson’s 14 paragraphs were against the provisions of Lenin’s famous “Decree on Peace”, which was adopted unanimously on October 26 (November 8) 1917, at the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers’, Peasants’ and Soldiers’ Deputies. Moreover, this opposition was carried out within the framework of the ideas of liberalism (Plato’s line) and realism (Democritus’ line). According to Gennady Novikov’s “From Woodrow Wilson’s mouth, the US government promoted the ideas of Western liberalism in international relations, as opposed to the Lenin’s doctrine of a “world socialist revolution” [Novikov, 1996].

Despite the fact that Wilson’s program was the basis of the Treaty of Versailles and, on its basis, the League of Nations was established, Woodrow Wilson’s views on war and peace in international relations were considered, and continue to be considered, as idealistic and moralistic.

The understanding of the problem of war and peace in Plato’s line greatly enriched the ideas expressed by the outstanding philosopher Henri Bergson in the last book “The Two Sources of Morality and Religion”, published in 1932. In the final chapter of the book “Mechanics and mysticism”, Bergson tried to convey the biological understanding of the war

by human nature and human society. According to Bergson, natural society is the opposite of democracy. It is a monarchical or oligarchic regime [Bergson, 1977].

To Plato's line, in the understanding of war and peace in international relations, one could include the fundamental research of Pierre Renouvin on this problem. Renouvin was a participant of the First World War. In April 1917, he lost his left arm, because of being wounded. Perhaps this is why in the research of Renouvin, one could observe not only realism but also the search for deeper meanings inherent in Plato's line of philosophising. In the book "Immediate Origins of the War", as well as in other studies, Renouvin researched the origins of war and came to comprehension that the development of international relations was caused by so-called "deep forces", to which he attributed: geographical conditions, demographic processes, economic and financial interests, the features of mass psychology, significant emotional flows. Renouvin focused on studying the role of the individual (the head of state, a political leader) in the history of war and peace and believed that emotions, the features of a mentality and the value orientations of a political leader were the important factors in the assessment of foreign manifestations of the nation and the state. Together with other prominent French historian and political scientist Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, they developed a typology of characters of political leaders, highlighting the most important, from their point of view, quality of an individual.

The new ideas in the understanding of the problem of war and peace were added by military strategy, which was called the "New Look", developed and embodied in the 1950s by US President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In the struggle against the Soviet Union and its allies, except reliance on nuclear weapons, Dwight D. Eisenhower hoped for the lasting effect of gradually spreading democratic values and institutions; the attraction of a viable economy; advanced technology; the ability to conduct psychological warfare; the economic and military aid to developing countries [Mandrahelya, 2003].

In recent decades, the understanding of the problem of war and peace in the lines of Plato and Democritus (Thucydides) in international relations became closer. As we have said before, their division was initially conditional and artificial, because the subject of the study of war and peace in international relations is only the field of philosophising of Democritus' line. In the book "Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary. Debate", which was published in 1993, edited by David Baldwin, six key points were highlighted that made the theories of neorealism and neoliberalism in international relations closer (and, accordingly, their views on war and peace) [Neorealism and Neoliberalism, 1993]:

1. The neoliberals recognise that the structure of the international system is characterized by a certain "anarchy", but in contrast to the neorealists, the neoliberals believe that the certain patterns of interactions between the states were developed. The neorealists insist on the fundamental importance of the international system. (For example, the studies of American political scientists Robert Axelrod, Robert Owen Keohane, and others).

2. The neorealists agree with the neoliberals that international cooperation is possible, but in contrast to the latter, they assert that cooperation is difficult to implement and more dependent on the mentality of political leaders.

3. The neorealists insist that cooperation brings only a relative advantage, while the neoliberals insist on its absolute benefit for all participants.

4. Supporters of neorealism and neoliberalism recognise national power and economic wellbeing as the most important characteristics for each state, but at the same time, the neorealists emphasise the importance of national power, and the neoliberals emphasise economic power.

5. The neorealists in their theories rely on the real resources of the state, and the neoliberals believe that the political intentions of the leaders and the people are more important, as well as the hypothetical potential of the nation and the states.

6. The neorealists recognise the influence and impact of international organizations on international relations, but believe that the neo-liberals overstate their importance.

Convergence of the theories of neorealism and neoliberalism in international relations is largely reflected in the understanding of the problems of war and peace.

Summing up the development of empirical and theoretical foundations of war and peace in the theories of international relations, we emphasize the conventionality and superficiality of our analysis. We have only focused on the key, in our view, stages of the development. In the semantic space of philosophy, political science and sociology, apart from the authors mentioned above, the problem of war and peace was investigated by Francis Bacon, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Pitirim Sorokin, Vladimir Solovyov, Norman Angell, Michel Foucault, Karl Popper, Henry Kissinger, Alvin Toffler, Thomas Schelling, Samuel Huntington, Morris Janowitz, Charles F. Doran, John A. Vasquez, Manuel de Landa, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Philip Quincy Wright, Nassim Nicholas Taleb, Mary Kaldor, and many others.

War and Peace in the history and literature

The third area, which forms the empirical and theoretical basis of war and peace, is historical and literary sources. The history of wars and the peaceful development of the states as well as fiction and documentary literature, memoir, reference, and technical literature on the subject of “war” and “peace”, written by professional historians and writers, or the direct participants of the events, formed together a rich layer of factual material about war and peace. All this versatile and detailed information significantly enriches Democritus’ (Thucydides) line in the research of the problem of war and peace and makes it urgent and topical.

The first sources of wars and the peaceful development of the states, which have come down to our time, belong to ancient Greece. “History of the Peloponnesian War” by Thucydides [Thucydides, 1910], the writings of Zeno from Kition, Marcus Tullius Cicero et al. marked the beginning of documenting of the most important events related to the research of the problem of war and peace. However, the work “On War” by the Prussian General Carl von Clausewitz gave independence and self-sufficiency of historical events and literary records concerning war and peace.

From our point of view, the merit of Carl von Clausewitz is that in the book “On War,” he first:

– Used the experience of the strategy officer (he not only planned but also participated in the battles) to enrich empirical and theoretical knowledge about the war (i.e. the rationalism in philosophising of Democritus’ (Thucydides) line).

– Built a rational line of philosophising on Georg Hegel’s dialectical approach, i.e. used the philosophical construction of Plato’s line for the analysis of war and military art (for example, the exaltation of the “spirit of the people” and generalship-genius in the victories of war).

– In the argumentation of his ideas about the war, he relied on the history of war, while at the same time acting as a historian and recording the course of the battles in which he took a direct part.

It was such synthesis of the professional knowledge, life experience, and prevailing philosophical ideas of that epoch that laid the foundation for the third area of the theoretical and empirical understanding of war and peace — historical and literary. Later on, up to

the present day, this area enriches the problem of war and peace by actual, theoretical, and existential generalizations. From our point of view, most of the authors that are conducting the research in this area are relying on their life experience; bringing existential depth in Democritus' line of philosophising. Rethinking Kant's slogan: from theoretical philosophy to practical realm [Kant, 1966] (or from the movement of philosophical thought "from reasoning for the sake of reasoning — to practice" [Svendsen, 2008: 258]), historians and writers moved from comprehension of reality, in which their worldviews were formed and tempered to cognition of being that is fundamental and defining.

Many works of this area not only and not so much document the events of war and peace, but they also make us think more of being, the causes of war and peace. For example, reading the naked and frightening truth of the military prose of Erich Maria Remarque, Svetlana Alexievich and many others, one feels not only an aversion to war (as the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2015 Svetlana Alexievich said: "I wanted to write such a book that even the generals would feel sick of war" [Alexievich, 2008]) but also the desire to understand the causes to prevent death and destruction at the scale of the Earth.

Among the most prominent representatives of this area, in the research of which the problem of war and peace is revealed in a variety of palettes, we highlight: Raimondo Montecuccoli, Alexander Suvorov, Carl von Clausewitz, Antoine-Henri Jomini, Ivan Bliokh, Helmuth von Moltke, Alfred T. Mahan, Hans Gottlieb Delbrück, Alfred von Schlieffen, Mikhail Tukhachevsky, André Beaufre, Leo Tolstoy, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Andrew Snesev, Erich Maria Remarque, Ernest Miller Hemingway, Richard Aldington, Boris Uralis, Jesse Glenn Gray, Svetlana Alexievich and many others.

Conclusion

We have examined three main, from our point of view, areas of the research, the results of which form the theoretical and empirical basis of the theories of war and peace. In these areas, we have highlighted two main lines of the research problem: the lines of Democritus and Plato, in the understanding of Alexander Lyubishchev [Lyubishchev, 2000]. The difference between the lines of Democritus and Plato, one may compare to the difference between a photograph and a portrait of the artist: "The photo shows everything that can be seen with the naked eye. The portrait does not show everything that can be seen with the naked eye, but shows what the eyes cannot see in general: human nature of a personality, which served as a model" [Aron, 2000: 31].

From the analysis of the problems of war and peace in the theories of good and evil, international relations as well as history and literature, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. In Plato's line, the priority areas of scientific research are the development of determining evolutionary theories (fundamentals of the scientific picture of the world), and the priority of the philosophical comprehension of the world is the study of the fundamental principles of being (the doctrine of being). War and Peace are external manifestations of the fundamental processes, not being itself. That is why war and peace are not of great interest to researchers, in developing the doctrine of being. The only thing that we can take from this area for our further research is Plato's idea of the unity of the nature of good and evil, which Augustine turned into an ideological system, and the manifestations of which can be found at present: "...that everything in the world that was created by God, in one way or another was involved in absolute good, in the depth of which as the need was born evil" [Augustine, 2007]. The other ideas of "eternal peace", "just war" etc., which were originated in this area of philosophising, are far from modern realities.

2. In Democritus' line, which was mainly represented in the theories of international relations, history and literature, the problem of war and peace comes to the fore. The following ideas are the most relevant to the understanding of war and peace:

– “War is a necessity of the world.” Marcus Tullius Cicero first formulated it in the year 44 BC as follows: “Wars, then, are to be waged in order to render it possible to live in peace without injury” [Cicero, 1887]. Georg Wilhelm Hegel in the book “Philosophy of Right”, published in 1881, put this idea at a new level of understanding: “War has the higher significance that by its agency... ‘the ethical health of peoples is preserved in their indifference to the stabilisation of finite institutions; just as the blowing of the winds preserves the sea from the foulness which would be the result of a prolonged calm, so also corruption in nations would be the product of prolonged, let alone ‘perpetual’, peace” [Hegel, 1990: 361];

– “The role of the ruler’s personality in the destiny of the state.” This idea was reasoned and expressed by Niccolò Machiavelli at the beginning of 16th century. In the 20th century, in the research of Pierre Renouvin and Jean-Baptiste Duroselle it was developed as the theory.

– “Equilibrium (the balance of power).” It was first formulated by Niccolò Machiavelli in his treatise “The Prince”, published in 1532: “...From this a general rule is drawn which never or rarely fails: that he who is the cause of another becoming powerful is ruined” [Machiavelli, 2006].

– “Man is a wolf to man” (*homo homini lupus* in Latin), or the idea of “natural state of man is “war of all against all” (*bellum omnium contra omnes* in Latin). In the middle of the 17th century, both ideas were offered and justified by Thomas Hobbes.

– “The basic law of nature: obliged to seek Peace” (*est quaerendam esse pacem* in Latin), with all the ensuing consequences. Thomas Hobbes formulated this idea in the middle of 17th century.

– “The influence of the geographical environment on the destinies of the states” (or the idea of “geographical determinism”). Although this idea was considered in ancient Greece by Herodotus, Plato, and others, it was reasoned by Charles-Louis de Montesquieu in his book “The Spirit of Laws”, published in 1748.

– “Psychological roots of war.” Carl von Clausewitz in the book “On War”, published in 1832 first drew attention to the psychological aspects of war, including the features of influencing of national character and morale of the people to the political aims of war.

– “In some periods, this or that nation is called upon to perform its mission” in the history of civilization, resorting even to violence. Georg Wilhelm Hegel expressed this idea in the book “Philosophy of Right”, published in 1820.

– “National interests as the basis of the foreign policy of any state, understood in terms of authority and power.” The idea was first expressed and developed by Hans Morgenthau in his book “Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace”, published in 1948. Raymond Aron later proposed a similar idea of “power politics” [Aron, 2000].

Our analysis, in any case, does not purport to cover all the problems of war and peace. We have highlighted just the areas and identified the ideas, on the basis of which we will build our theory of war and peace.

The relatively full bibliography of works on theories of war and peace is presented in the review of Jack Levy [Levy, 2015]. These theories are collected in the reviews and collective monographs: “Theories of War and Peace”, edited by Michael E. Brown [Theories, 1998]; John A. Vasquez [Vasquez, 2009]; Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson [Levy & Thompson, 2010], et al.



References

- Alexievich, Svetlana. *War's Unwomanly Face*. Moscow: Time, 2008.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. New York: Viking Press, 1965.
- Aron, Raymond. *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*. Kyiv: Universe, 2000.
- Augustine of Hippo. *Confession*. Moscow: Dar, 2007. http://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Avrelij_Avgustin/ispoved/
- Bazaluk, Oleg, and Tamara Blazhevych. *The Philosophy of War and Peace*. Philosophy and Cosmology, Vol. 17. Kyiv: ISPC, 2016: 12-25.
- Bazaluk, Oleg. *The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.
- Bergson, Henri. *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Chicherin, Boris. *Political Thinkers of Ancient and Modern World*. Moscow: Gardariki, 2001.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Andrew P. Peabody. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1887. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/cicero-on-moral-duties-de-officiis>
- Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Moscow: Eksmo, 2007. https://vk.com/doc-29524660_95601680?hash=3c0bf71973705f0fa8&dl=e87da65bd55b7764ce
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Complaint of Peace*. Translated from the Querela Pacis (A.D. 1521) of Erasmus. Chicago: Open Court, 1917. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/erasmus-the-complaint-of-peace>
- Flathman, Richard E. *Thomas Hobbes: Skepticism, Individuality, and Chastened Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
- Forsyth, Fiona. *Cicero: Defender of the Republic*. New York: Rosen Publishing Group, 2003.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Philosophy of Rights*. Moscow: Mysl, 1990.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Moscow: AD MARGINEM, 1997.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Works in Six Volumes*. Moscow: Mysl, 1963-1966.
- Kaplan, Morton. *System and Process in International Politics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957.
- Knutsen, Torbjørn L. *The Rise of Balance-of-Power as an Ordering Institution*. Paper presented at: The 6th Pan-European Conference on International Relations University of Turin, Italy 12-15 September 2007. <http://www.eisa-net.org/be-bruga/eisa/files/events/turin/Knutsen-The%20Rise%20of%20Balance-of%20Power%20as%20an%20Ordering%20Institution.pdf>
- Lenin, Vladimir. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Full composition of writings. Moscow: Politizdat, 1971. Vol. 27.
- Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson. *Causes of War*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Levy, Jack S. *Theories of War and Peace*. Political Science 522. Rutgers University. Spring, 2015. <http://home.uchicago.edu/~mjreese/CurrentStudents/LevyPS522.pdf>
- Lyubishchev, Alexander. *Lines of Democritus and Plato in the History of Culture*. St. Petersburg: Aletheia, 2000.
- Machiavelli, Nicolo. *The Prince*. Translator: W. K. Marriott. The Project Gutenberg EBook, February 11, 2006. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1232/1232-h/1232-h.htm#link2HCH0003>
- Mandrahelya, Vladimir. *The Causes and Nature of Wars (Armed Conflicts): Philosophical*

- and Sociological Analysis*. Kyiv: European University, 2003.
- Mandragelia, Volodymyr. Supranational Nature of European Law and Horizons of National Legal Systems' Acculturation: Theoretical and Historical Analysis. In *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Vol. 16. Kyiv: ISPC, 2016: 171-178.
- Morgenthau, Hans and Kenneth Thompson. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 6th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985.
- Nazaretyan, Akop P. Mega-History and the 21st century singularity puzzle. In *Philosophy and Cosmology*. Vol. 15. 2015: 84-98.
- Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. Edited by David A. Baldwin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Novikov, Gennady. *Theories of International Relations*. Irkutsk: Irkutsk University Press, 1996. <http://www.twirpx.com/file/42501/>
- Plato. *Collected Works in Four Volumes*. Moscow: Mysl, 1994.
- Plotinus. *Ennead*. Volume III. Harvard University Press, 1967. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/LCL442/1967/pb_LCL442.1.xml
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid, and Frank Wayman. *Resort To War: 1816 — 2007 (Correlates of War)*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2010.
- Schaff, Philip. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. II St.
- Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine*. Editors by Philip Schaff. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Co., 1887. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/schaff-a-select-library-of-the-nicene-and-post-nicene-fathers-of-the-christian-church-vol-2>
- Starr, Harvey. *Anarchy, Order, and Integration: How to Manage Interdependence*. University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Svendsen, Lars. *A Philosophy of Evil*. Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2008.
- The Declaration of Independence: A Transcription*. In Congress, July 4, 1776. http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html
- Theories of War and Peace (International Security Readers)*. Edited by Michael E. Brown. MIT Press, 1998.
- Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War*. London: J. M. Dent; New York: E. P. Dutton, 1910. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Thuc.+1.23&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0200>
- Ursul, Akady, and Tatiana Ursul. Towards a global sustainable future. In *Philosophy and Cosmology*. Vol. 15. 2015: 110-160.