

Evolution of Warfare from Grotius to Rousseau

Posted on September 15, 2018

Hugo Grotius might not have been the first to develop the doctrine of international society. However, he was the first one to explain the concept of a society functioning in a state without being controlled by warfare. Grotius expanded on the idea that any nation could be governed by implementing laws that were mutually agreed upon by the representatives.

Hedley Bull asserted that Grotius' concepts make him the father of the first peace settlement in the modern era. In the book titled *On the Laws of War and Peace*, Grotius writes in the first chapter that any disputes that arise among men who belong to no state or conflicts among men who are governed by laws, these disputes are linked to the circumstances of war and peace (Grotius, p.6). He adds that since war is initiated to seek peace, such quarrels should be treated as common among nations. In the book, Grotius posits the difference between wars and right, the purpose of the latter is to be established (Grotius, p.6).

Grotius held views that were different from Cicero's perception of war. Cicero believed that war was a forced action, while Grotius contends that war is a state that is initiated by different parties. He then defined the different connotations associated with the word conflict, such as battle, disputes, and quarrels. Grotius distinguishes between Justice and War, seeking to explain how Justice is not a part of the war (Grotius, p.7). He poses the question of fighting being just or not and what factors can constitute conflict as being a just act. Grotius asserted that starting a war because it is someone's right is not just and, therefore, contradicts the true meaning of what a right is. To elaborate more on this point, Grotius gave the example of an individual taking someone else's property only to his advantage, which goes against the law of nature (Grotius, p.7).

Kenneth Walt's book has left quite an impression on his audience as his work helps in apprehending the functioning of world politics. Waltz categorized international competition into three images. On the other hand, Rousseau critiques the word politics and his vision of the states being in a state of conflict, all of which have been derived from the basic notions of man and society (Scott, p.25). Rousseau did not believe in indulging in the concept of God or community, and he also based his ideas on man as a social or a moral being. Instead, Rousseau directly focused on man as part of nature with no social or moral values attached to him and neither any concept of good or evil associated with him (Scott, p.25). Rousseau held the belief that the state of nature was recognizable by few men who had generous nature and were troubled by desires that could exceed their needs (Scott, p.26).

Therefore, according to Rousseau, if any two individuals were to get involved in a clash over anything, such as over the same food, then the two individuals would have the option of flight and fighting. The

conflict should be considered a brawl of minor intensity. Rousseau paid emphasis on the following attributes: independence, indifference, and abundance, all of which can be found in an idyll. These attributes mark the qualities of a pure idyll. He believes in the concept of a peaceful state of nature that does not exhibit any signs of inequality. Rousseau differs in his ideas from other intellectuals as he looked at the man as a social animal, asserting that the society was founded as an outcome of human drive. Furthermore, Rousseau declared that the organizations are responsible for initiating inequality, war, and competition. However, all of this is temporary and can be fixed by implementing laws created by political communities. Rousseau refutes the claim that societies came into existence due to the process of socialization. Instead, he asserts that societies were developed as a result of varying accidents that contributed to the formulation of the community. Rousseau blames the human situation, claiming that the circumstances in which people have been left are responsible for setting the foundations of society (Scott, p.26). Aside from this, Rousseau is concerned with the issue of violence and seeks to find its origins. He does not believe that human nature is corrupt; instead, society is just evil because it carries the moral contradiction that fuels disputes and leads to war (Scott, p.27).

Michael Walzer's book *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* is a result of the author's reflection on the Vietnam War. He drew on the old concept of just war theory to assess the reasons that could be used to justify why wars took place and what the limits were regarding war (Walzer, p.1). Walzer initiated this process so that the traditional theory and old concepts could be used to apprehend the current situation along with the secular theory of just war. His work is considered a standard of warfare ethics as it helps apprehend the just war theory. In chapter 4 of his book, Walzer asserts that aggression is one of the reasons behind the crime of war (Walzer, p.1). The crime disrupts the peace in any society, forcing men and women to stake their lives for a just cause. The peace that the author talks about is devoid of fights and provides people with liberty and security, all of which can only exist if there is no aggression in society.

Works Cited

Grotius, Hugo. *Hugo Grotius on the Law of War and Peace*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Scott, John T. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Political Principles and Institutions*. Vol. 3, Taylor & Francis, 2006.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Basic books, 2015.