

Explaining war and the level of analysis



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The concept that 'war is never won rather it is only varying degrees of defeat of war' dominated the twentieth century. Social scientist defined the concept of war and peace by analysing the apparent disproportion between effort and product desire and results.

According to Waltz, War is inevitable phenomenon in international relations. So, instead of asking can we now have peace? The social scientist should seek peace by searching out the ways to decrease the frequency of war. Moreover, the ultimate goal of war is peace but only the difference is in the ways seeking peace. There are many activities to seeking peace. Thus, some of the Social scientist suggests the possibility of combining activities in different ways in the whole that some combination will lead us to closer to the goal. However, Waltz opines that to explain how peace can be more readily achieved requires an understanding of the cause of war.

Realist such as, Confucius to Christian pacifist explained their concept of war in reference to the approximation of causes and cures of human affairs. They focused on the important cause of war is found in the man's bellicose nature and behaviour of which is product of centuries old tradition. Human nature cannot be changed or his drives suppressed but they can be diverted. Thus, realists think that human beings should be uplifted and enlighten or their psychic social readjustment should be secured to elimination the war. Moreover, for realist, Wars results from selfishness, from misdirected aggressive impulses from stupidity whereas; all other causes are secondary and have to be interrupted in the light of these causes.

Likewise, the concept that right policies can be only adopted if only they know that what the right are policies. Their instincts are good, though their present gullibility may prompt them to follow false leaders. In 1920s, Bertrand Russell opined decreasing possessive instincts as a prerequisite to the peace. So, in 1930s education is taken as remedy of war.

To conclude the according to the first image of war the irrational human behaviour is the main cause of war so it must be changed in respect to its moral intellectual outlook or their psychic social behaviours. Where Waltz finds it unpractical prescription to achieve peace as he argues that in this way, war will end before the next generation is dead and those who thinks that wars will continue to occur though them we may all die.

Similarly, realism believes that State acts when we mean that the people in it act but Waltz argues only human nature can not possibly be the single determinant for war. Such as, running water from a faucet can be turned into steam energy or can be sealed and heated to extreme temperature and use as a destructive explosion. Similarly, people's behaviours are not all acting by them but the system constructs them to 'behave' in different ways. So, Waltz opines human nature is not only responsible for war but the so many areas of the events that lead to the war should be explained.

Some Social scientist argued that war most often promotes in the internal unity of each States involved. The use of internal defects to explain those eternal acts of States that brings war can take many forms. The bad GovernmentBad states lead to war. So reforms in the States were thought to bring World peace. Social scientist suggested reforms of States to

achieve a world peace. They forwarded a concept of same pattern of internal organisation in each nation of the world (democratic system) but this also did not work as it sowed the platform for civil conflicts.

Men make the societies including the international societies in which they live. The actions of States or men acting for States make up the substance of international relations. However, Waltz argues that the international political environment has a much to do with the ways in which States behave

According to Waltz, the influences of the internal structure of states in attempting to solve the war peace equation cannot be determined until the significance of the international environment has been reconsidered.

There is no system of law enforceable above the many sovereign states. . each states judge its grievances and ambitions according to the dictates of its own reason or desire which lead to conflict and to war. Moreover, all states are not equal in all the terms.

In anarchy there is no automatic harmony. A States use force to attain its goal if after assessing the prospects for success, it values those goals more than its values of the pleasure of peace. All States must constantly be ready either to counter forces with force or to pay the cost of weakness. So, arms breed not war but security, and possibly even peace.

If Harmony is to exist in anarchy, not only must be a perfectly rational but must be able to assume that everyone else is too. Cooperative actions as rational and aviation form it irrational, we must agree that conflict results form the irrationally of man.

However, the proposition that irrationality is case of all worlds' troubles the sense that a world of perfectly rational mean would know no disagreements and conflicts is impossible. The very real problem is how to achieve an approximation to harmony in cooperative and competitive activities is always with us and lacking the possibility of perfections; it is a problem that cannot be solved simply by changing men. So, Man, the States and the State system are wedded together to understand the international system

If anarchy is the problem, there are two possible solutions. One is to impose an effective control on the separate and imperfect states. And the other is to remove states from the sphere of the accidental that is to define the good states as s perfect that it will no longer be particular. However, the possibilities of war still exist as if any individual states will perfectly good for it may provoke the violent resistance of other states. Moreover, we can not deny that there have been wars among the States in every stage of history.

The political structure does not act to bring the conflict and lead the use of forces, it is specific act that are the immediate causes of war. Waltz opines that the general structure that permits them to exist and wreak their disaster. No doubt that elimination of every vestige of selfishness, perversity and stupidity in nations would serve to establish perpetual peace. But Waltz argues that to try directly to eliminate all the immediate causes of war without altering the structure is a utopian concept.

Waltz concludes that the liberals' concept of ' A world government' is directly to a utopian prescription. The third image, or the view of world government there would be no longer be international wars, though with an ineffective

world governments there would be no doubt be civil wars. As, the concept of single world government does not hinge on accidental causes of irrationalities in men, defects in states but upon its theory of framework within which any accident can bring about the war.

Moreover, the act that by individual moral standards would be accepted when performed by a state, be an invitation to war we seek to avoid. In international politics a partial solution as one major country becoming pacifist might be a real contribution to world peace but it might as easily hastens the coming of another major war.

Undeniably, desire of States may be different. If State A wants certain things it can get only by war. States are motivated to attack each other and defend themselves by the reason and or passion of comparatively few who make policies of States and of the many more that influences the few.

Most often liberals ask that the every war is preceded by act that we identify as causes, then why can we not eliminate the wars by modifying individual or State behaviours? Waltz reply is if an effect or war is produced by two or more causes, the war effect is not permanently eliminated by removing one of them. If war is caused because of irrationality of men, improving only states is too little to decrease the intensity of the war. Moreover, if we work to solve one cause and neglect of others it makes the situation worst, such as the western democracies became more inclined to peace, Hitler became more belligerent.

Waltz views that the fear of modern weapons, of danger of destroying the civilizations of the world is not sufficient to establish the condition of peace

<https://assignbuster.com/explaining-war-and-the-level-of-analysis/>

as identified in discussion identified three image of international relations.

However, fear and permanent peace are more difficult to connect.

Development of atomic and hydrogen weapons may nurture the peace wish of some, the war sentiment of others. We can equate fear with world peace only if the peace wish exists in all States and is uniformly expressed in their policies. But peace is the primary goal of only few men or states.

In conclusion, Waltz criticises the concept of the world government as remedy for world war as he opines it the remedy as unattainable in practice. For Waltz, it is a utopian approach to world politics. For the reason that, each states pursues its won interest, however defined, in ways it judges best. Forces is a means of achieving the external ends of states because there exist no consistent, reliable process of reconciling the conflicts of interest that inevitably arise among similar units in a condition of anarchy. A foreign policy based on this image of international relations is neither moral nor immoral, but embodies merely a reasoned response to the world about us.

Realism

Neorealist

Use of human nature to explain International politics and views states behaviour directed by its self-interested nature .

Waltz argues that structure directs states conduct as he explains the importance of the structure of international system and its role as the primary determinant of state behaviour.

realism prioritizes national interest and security over ideology, moral concerns and social reconstructions

Develop offensive military capabilities, for foreign interventionism and as a means to increase their relative power security dilemma.

The structure of the international political system is defined first by its organizing principle, which is anarchy

power was both a means and an end, and rational state behaviour was simply accumulating the most power

power was both a means and an end, and rational state behaviour was understood as simply the course of action that would accumulate the most power

power is more than the accumulation of military resources and the ability to use it to coerce and control other states in the system

neorealist assume that the fundamental interest of each state is security and would therefore concentrate on the distribution of power

anarchy is given condition of the system and states react to it according to their size, location domestic politics and leadership quality

anarchy defines the system and the states react to it in line with their power capabilities