Can war bring peace

War is considered as a particular branch of a specific philosophy, with Carl von Clausewitz being considered as the " only philosopher of war," stated in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. It also says that it refers to, " a phenomenon which occurs only between political communities" or " certain political pressure groups, like terrorist organizations, might also be considered ' political communities,' in that they are associations of people with a political purpose" (Stanford, War, 2005). On the other hand, peace is the pursuit of justice with opposite methods of human diversity and total inconsistency.

Individuals who seek peace are more or less responsible for social changes in visionary ways, while the proponents of war are considered to be narrow minded with one thing in mind—to win something they want, using whatever methods they need to accomplish this. Religion has been blamed as the cause of many wars, yet they considered themselves to be an advocacy for non-violence. A source of conflict, religion is also a philosophy and practitioner of peace. Contradictory in itself, this explains the conflicting views bringing war into existence.

Not all wars are caused by opposing religious views, but the majority of them are. Jenny Teichman wrote in The Philosophy of War and Peace that " Aggressive wars have often been waged for religious reasons and still are today" (Teichman, 2002, pg. 2). According to Alexander Mosley in Philosophy of War, " man cannot stop war—it is his nature to wage war" which backs my theory that war is the product of man's ideas and hence is a product of choice. We fight for peace through war, and war continues on until peace comes into being–these are contradictory statements.

Peace found through war is not peace, only a win-win situation, or a give-in situation at the cost of lives, money, and total destruction because those with the most money and power win. " Man chooses war, and by this is meant that each individual participant chooses war (or has to choose differently, if war is thrust upon him through invasion or conscription). " Mosley also states that, " The individual is a volitional being, whose cognition is free to use and direct; and in group activity such as a battle, each individual must contribute his thought and effort even if only accepting the orders of others" (Mosley, pg. 39).

Does this refer to the desire for peace—hardly. It refers to the fact many are at war through the desires of others for ulterior gain that has nothing to do with achieving peace. . There is nothing wrong with different views—they are only different, with each individual thinking their viewpoint is the correct one —unfortunately, many feel their way is correct for absolutely everyone with everyone else wrong or evil.

To sum it up, how each one goes about getting their way is what sets the scene for war or peace: one may peacefully go about it with diplomatic and peaceful ways, such as sitting down and peacefully stating, " I realize that we differ in opinions but we can compromise for the prosperity or growth of all involved"—or become angry, resentful, and forceful, which eventually will bring into being other countries with eventual war at the destruction, to some extent, of all countries involved.

Under this kind of situation, the peaceful country may be forced into war against their will or lose the battle from the start. They may be forced to give

in but feels resentful over having to do so—therefore, waiting at a later time to retaliate or simply give in peacefully, being forced into another way of life and thinking, which usually goes against what they have been taught as acceptable or correct. Peace comes from peace, and anger breeds anger.

Different countries that have a background of anger, rage, hostility, abuse, etc. will certainly not respond in a peaceful manner to a kind suggestion— they only want to win and get their way, as a power control they are used to and feels familiar with as normality. With this in mind, it is impossible for anyone to comprehend that war brings peace. The only solution is to do as we do with our children, remove violence from the surroundings– and retrain the thinking. It needs to be realized that war is a negative way of life with nobody ever winning, and everybody losing.

Conclusion Peace is the absence of war, so when both sides—peace and war —are at opposite ends of the spectrum they involve the same emotional level of desire to do " what is right. " Theories of philosophy involve opinions of intelligent and knowledgeable people, based on historical context and research they have gathered and formed into a persuasive line of thought, supporting what they feel is morally and ethically right for mankind.

Once a person looks at the war involved, the war when it is done, or the war that is developing—they will find that always something else is involved in a manner other than that theory which supports money, political power, gain, etc. that has absolutely nothing to do with the idea of peace for the common man. Those in power develop the war to make money, with the average

person fighting and dying to support that purpose. Peace in this case is giving up or winning—nothing less or nothing more.