

# The Theory of War and Peace



# The Theory of War and Peace:

*The Geophilosophy of Europe*

By

Oleg Bazaluk

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe

By Oleg Bazaluk

Translated by Tamara Blazhevych

Proofreading by Lloyd Barton

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Oleg Bazaluk

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9883-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9883-6

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One.....	5
The Problem of War and Peace: A Historical and Philosophical Analysis	
1.1 The categories of good and evil as a theoretical basis for war and peace.....	7
1.2 War and peace in the theories of international relations .....	10
1.3 War and Peace in the history and literature.....	29
Conclusion of Chapter One.....	31
Chapter Two .....	35
Methodology and Axiomatics of the Theory of War and Peace	
2.1 Research Methodology .....	35
2.2 Axiomatics of the Theory of War and Peace .....	38
Conclusion of Chapter Two .....	43
Chapter Three .....	45
The Features of Manifestations of a Mental Space in the Locus	
3.1 In what ways does a mental space realize its potentials in the locus?.....	47
3.2 What does a locus of civilization mean for the mental space?.....	59
3.3 What factors influence the manifestations of a mental space in the locus of civilization? .....	64
Conclusion of Chapter Three .....	66
Chapter Four.....	69
The Causes of Endless Localisation of Earth's Space, or the Theory of War and Peace	
4.1 The definition of war and peace.....	70
4.2 The causes of endless localisation of Earth's space, or otherwise – the causes of war .....	71
4.3 The causes of endless localisation of Earth's space, or otherwise – the causes of peace .....	102
4.4 The theory of war and peace. The main assertions .....	105
Conclusion of Chapter Four.....	108

Chapter Five .....	111
The Philosophy of War and Peace	
5.1 Comprehension of war and peace in Plato's line .....	111
5.2 The theory of war and peace in philosophical comprehension ....	114
5.3 War and Peace is a prerogative of educational technologies .....	121
Conclusion of Chapter Five .....	127
 Chapter Six .....	 129
The Theory of War and Peace About Endless Localisation in Europe in the 20 <sup>th</sup> and the Beginning of the 21 <sup>st</sup> centuries	
6.1 The features of geophilosophy of Europe .....	132
6.2 Regularity of endless localisation in Europe of the 20 <sup>th</sup> and beginning of 21 <sup>st</sup> century. The prognostic potential of the theory of war and peace .....	136
Conclusion of Chapter Six .....	147
 Chapter Seven.....	 149
The European Security Strategy	
7.1 A brief history of the development of the European Security Strategy .....	150
7.2 The features of the geophilosophy of Europe after the collapse of the USSR (1991–2013) .....	152
7.3 A new theoretical framework of the European Security Strategy ..	163
Conclusion of Chapter Seven.....	169
 Conclusion.....	 171
 Bibliography .....	 175

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author has started writing this book twice. The first version was written primarily thanks to Cambridge Scholars Publishing, my desire to fulfill a civic duty to the motherland – Ukraine - and thanks to Tatiana Matusevych, who undertook to translate the book into English, as well as taking part in its writing. In late 2014, a book entitled “War in Ukraine – the Turn to European Values” co-authored with Tatiana Matusevych was sent to Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

In early 2016, the book was returned to render the new translation, because the quality of the translation was poor and did not correspond to the user level. After reading the book again, I concluded that it made no sense whatsoever to correct. By that time, the expert opinions on the events in Ukraine were published in many languages, and I felt that my emotional attitude to Ukraine had lost its relevance and value.

My desire was to write a fundamental research of war and peace. Thus, having analysed literature in Russian, Ukrainian, and English, I found that the discourse on the problem of war and peace was mainly in English. Therefore, only after Tamara Blazhevych agreed to translate the manuscript in English, I started the work on the book. Within a few months, I have plunged into the study of the problem of war and peace and written a completely new book, the terminology of which was a source of great confusion for Tamara, and often led her to despair. She needed to find the right words to convey my thoughts accurately, which is why she had to turn to research in neuroscience, psychology, philosophy, political science, military history, etc. I am very thankful to her for her patience and professionalism. I hope she managed to penetrate and convey the meaning of my thoughts.

I also want to thank Lloyd Barton, the proofreader of Cambridge Scholars Publishing for his work and professionalism. It is the third book of our fruitful collaboration.

Sincere thanks go to the reviewers of the book. First of all, I am grateful to Professor Sergei Krichevsky, who advised that I change the structure of

the book, and insisted on using my research in the field of cosmic philosophy by analysing the problems of war and peace. Thanks to his advice, as well as communication with Professors Sergey Klepko and Roman Dodonov, I paid more attention to the philosophy of war and peace.

Professor Boris Zlokazov's and Professor Denis Sviridenko's advice helped me to find "weak spots" in the theory that allowed to reinforce its argumentation.

This book is dedicated to Ivan Ilyin, who, along with Vladimir Vernadsky and Vladimir Vysotsky, is a master of my creative activity and professionalism. Dear Ivan Aleksandrovich, I hope my book "The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe" corresponds, at least a little bit, to the level of your works "On Resistance to Evil by Force", "The Path of Spiritual Renewal", and "Path to the Evidence." At the beginning of my creative process, your books impressed me with the depth of penetration into the mysteries of human existence, the mesmerising syllable in presentation and sincerity, which bordered on the cry of the soul. For me, you remain the unsurpassed master of the clear and emotional presentation of philosophical thought.

Oleg Bazaluk  
Kyiv,  
August 2016



# INTRODUCTION

The history of this book began February 19 2014, in Kyiv, when the author decided to publish commentaries from the central square of the capital of Ukraine – Independence Square (Maidan Nezalezhnosti). It was at that time when, under the control of Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych, the police units shot people who arrived at the square in Kyiv who were against corruption, usurpation of power, and restrictions on civil rights and freedoms.

The author wrote his reportages to mainly inform citizens from south-eastern Ukraine – the colleagues, the friends, and readers of the Russian Federation – for all those who speak and read in Russian. Using his credibility of the officer<sup>1</sup> and the scientist<sup>2</sup>, the author tried to oppose someone's sick imagination, which presented the struggle of the Ukrainian people for independence, and their violent future with Ukrainian nationalists against Russian-speaking Ukrainians in the media. The author believed naively that his real emotional reportages from the heart of the capital would affect the minds of the Russian-reading audience and compete with strings of lies, filling Ukrainian, Russian, and some European, information space...

Two years have now passed. On the one hand, from reportages, the book “War in Ukraine: Reportages from the burning Kyiv. Two bloody days in February” [Bazaluk, 2014] was published, which, judging by the number

---

<sup>1</sup> From 1985 to 1989, I studied in one of the best educational institutions of Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, Ordzhonikidze Military Command College named after Sergei Kirov (now North-Caucasian Military Institute of Internal Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation). In June 1989, I graduated it with honors. From 1989 to 1992, I served in Independent Special-Purpose Motorized Rifle Division F. E. Dzerzhinsky of the MVD Internal Troops. As a cadet and an officer I went on special missions for international conflict resolution to Georgia, Moldova, twice in Azerbaijan and Armenia. I have the Government Awards.

<sup>2</sup> A specialist in the theory of consciousness and cognition, philosophy of education.

of broken relationships in Russian society, has not found a response from those to whom it was intended. On the other hand, Russia annexed the Crimea and went to war in the Donbas. The actions that the Russian Federation carried out according to plan, and would go on to carry out against Ukraine, demanded a separate comprehension. A sense of civic duty, as well as interest, from Cambridge Scholars Publishing inspired the author to tackle the new problem – comprehension of war and peace.

Ukrainian politicians and officials call the events that occur in south-eastern Ukraine “anti-terrorist operations” (ATO) and emerging Ukrainian civil society the “War against Russia.” In the Russian Federation and the pro-Russian publications abroad, the events in Ukraine are called “Civil War” or “War of the Ukrainian nationalists against the Russian-speaking population.” Journalists and researchers from Western civilization have called the events in Ukraine “Armed conflict between pro-Russian mercenaries and the Armed Forces of Ukraine”, or, more often, “Hybrid War of the Russian Federation against Ukraine.” However, although the events in south-eastern Ukraine would not be mentioned, they have caused:

- A violation of international security agreements in Europe.
- The military aggression of one European country against another and the consequent annexation of the territory.
- EU economic sanctions against the Russian Federation.
- The flow of refugees.
- Changes in the European security strategy.

Most importantly, the war being waged by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, and ways of war, again updated the thinking and philosophy behind war and peace.

The author wrote the first version of the book, titled “War in Ukraine – the Turn to European Values”, within a short period. The book was based on the reportages that the author wrote in 2014 for the online publication “Ukrainian Politician” (<http://www.ukrpolitic.com/>). The book offered an emotional evaluation of the events in Ukraine.

However, through continuing to study literature on the subject, the author found the prevalence of emotional evaluations over impartial analytics. In Russian, Ukrainian, and English, the writers and research teams described their sensory-emotional attitudes to events in Ukraine and evaluated them

from their life, experiences, and peculiarities of world perception. For instance, in the Russian language, books were published by Alexander Dugin [Dugin, 2015] and Boris Rozhin [Rozhin, 2015]; in Ukrainian, Olga Kalinovska, Oleg Krishtop, Eugen Nazarenko, Valentina Trokhimchuk and Darina Fedenko [Kalinovska et al., 2015], Yaroslav Potapenko [Potapenko, 2016], Roman Dodonov [Dodonov, 2016]; and in English, Anders Aslund [Aslund, 2015], Maksymilian Cziperski, Eliot Higgins, Alina Polyakova and Damon Wilson [Cziperski et al., 2015], Rajan Menon and Eugene B. Rumer [Menon & Rumer, 2015], Greg Norton [Norton, 2014], Richard Sakwa [Sakwa, 2015], a collective monograph edited by Artis Pabriks and Andis Kudors [The War in Ukraine, 2015], Elizabeth A. Wood, William E. Pomeranz, E. Wayne Merry, and Maxim Trudolyubov [Wood et al., 2015], Serhy Yekelchuk [Yekelchuk, 2015], and others.

A sufficient number of emotional evaluations of the events in Ukraine spoke about one thing – there was no point in repeating. That is why there was a desire to rewrite a book, already prepared for publication by Cambridge Scholars Publishing, in which the author relied too much on theory. The previous work on the book “Corruption in Ukraine: Rulers’ Mentality and the Destiny of the Nation, the Geophilosophy of Ukraine” [Bazaluk, 2016] has opened up possibilities for the author concerning the methodology of geophilosophy. In geophilosophy, war in Ukraine, as well as the actions of the Russian Federation, the countries of Western Europe, and the United States, appeared as a fragment of regular events, which were not only possible to anticipate and prevent, but which in general repeated a prelude of the First and Second World Wars. A comparison inevitably comes to mind that required theoretical understanding.

The empirical and theoretical basis of the book: “The Theory of War and Peace: The Geophilosophy of Europe” on which the author has built the system of his ideas, consists of three main blocks:

1. The facts and regularities from the field of neuroscience, psychology, and social philosophy.
2. The facts and regularities from the field of geophilosophy.
3. The facts and regularities from the field of military history and a history of the art of war.

In the book, the author consistently solves six objectives:

1. *He carries out historical and philosophical analysis of the problem of war and peace;*
2. *He defines the methodology and axiomatics of the theory of war and peace.*
3. *Using the methodology of geophilosophy, he formulates the basic concepts of the theory of war and peace.*
4. *He comprehends the results and builds the philosophy of war and peace.*
5. *Based on the analysis of the geophilosophy of Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, he checks the basic assertions of the theory of war and peace, as well as its prognostic potential.*
6. *He offers a new theoretical basis for the establishment of the European Security Strategy.*

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE PROBLEM OF WAR AND PEACE: A HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS

§ 1. In the article “War and Peace in Semantic Space of Philosophy: A Methodological Aspect”, Alexander Stepanov has tried to understand a variety of meanings of the concepts “war” and “peace” [Stepanov, 2007]. He highlighted six semantic aspects in the concepts “war” and “peace”: formal logical, existential, ontological, axiological, praxeological, and epistemological. As a result of the analysis, Stepanov came to the following conclusions [Stepanov, 2007]:

1. As for the formal logical aspect, it is noteworthy that the definition of the word “peace” is often given in the negative form, i.e. as an opposite to war, feud, quarrel, rivalry, violence, etc. The word “war”, unlike the word “peace” has a positive, direct definition, and is often used in a broader sense, as a synonym for “struggle”, “conflict”, “opposition”, etc.
2. As to the existential aspect, at first view, the word “war” is concerned with “death”, and the word “peace” with “life.” However, since Heraclitus’ time, one can reveal the paradoxical development of the philosophical thought: the concept of “war” is connotatively concerned with “life”, or existence that is on the verge between being and non-being, and the concept “peace” – with “death” as a state of absolute tranquillity. “Rest in Peace”, people say to someone who has died.
3. The same paradoxical feature is observed concerning the ontological aspect: “war” is immanent and phenomenal, whereas “peace” is transcendental and noumenal. “War” is concerned with movement, change, and formation, and consequently, with time and space; “peace” is concerned with constancy, tranquillity and eternity. “War” is a natural, innate state of the world. “Peace” is

something artificial that requires external efforts for its emergence or formation.

4. By considering the axiological aspect, in most cases, “war” is the absolute evil, whereas “peace” – the absolute good.
5. As for the praxeological aspect or the aspect of activity, “war” is the means, and “peace” is the aim. People fight for “peace”, often using war.
6. Regarding the epistemological aspect, the existence of such characteristics as denotations, phenomenality and immanence, localisation in time and space et al. indicates that the concept “war” is the research subject of the methods of the empirical sciences. In turn, such characteristics as the absence of empirical denotations, transcendence, noumenality, purposeful representation et al. indicate that the concept “peace” is studied only by the philosophical methods, without reference to empirical reality.

From the research of meanings of the concepts of “war” and “peace”, Alexander Stepanov concludes that: “Innate character of “war” gives a possibility to describe it by the language of the natural sciences, or by the phenomenal language of spontaneous processes, habitat conditions, as well as including the use of scientific terminology and regularities. The artificiality of “peace” requires the use of teleological terminology: aims, projects, norms, techniques, etc.” [Stepanov, 2007: 34].

From the research of meanings of the concepts of “war” and “peace,” Alexander Stepanov concludes that: “*Innate* character of “war” gives a possibility to describe it by the language of the natural sciences or by the phenomenal language of spontaneous processes, habitat conditions, as well as including the use of scientific terminology and regularities. The *artificiality* of “peace” requires the use of teleological terminology: aims, projects, norms, techniques, etc.” [Stepanov, 2007: 34].

**§ 2.** We cannot agree with all of the conclusions of Alexander Stepanov, but a variety of meanings of the concepts “war” and “peace” definitely stand.

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.

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

§ 3. 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 13<sup>th</sup> 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 17<sup>th</sup> 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<sup>1</sup>.

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.

## **1.2 War and peace in the theories of international relations**

**§ 4.** 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The philosophy of evil is researched in details in the similar-named book of Lars Svendsen [Svendsen, 2008].

theories of international relations, the consideration of the problem of war and peace comes to the fore.

Edward Hallett Carr [Carr, 1964], Gennady Novikov [Novikov, 1996], Boris Chicherin [Chicherin, 2001], 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.

§ 5. 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 BC<sup>2</sup>), 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 Thucydides<sup>3</sup>.

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"<sup>4</sup> [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 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

---

<sup>2</sup> Supposedly, Democritus lived 30 years longer than Thucydides (he died about 70–80 years old).

<sup>3</sup> However, Plato believed that his philosophical antagonist was Democritus.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Thuc.+2.63&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0200>

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*)<sup>5</sup> 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> [Schaff, 1887].

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 18<sup>th</sup> century Machiavelli’s idea of the balance of power was formulated by David Hume, and in the 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> 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 peace<sup>6</sup>.

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 17<sup>th</sup> 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]<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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].

<sup>7</sup> 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

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 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> 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:

---

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 [Neorealism and Neoliberalism, 1993] Gennady Novikov [Novikov, 1996], and others.



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.

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 [Kersnovsky, 2012]; Andrew Snesev [Snesev, 2003; Snesev, 2007]; Martin van Creveld [Creveld, 2005]; Jack S. Levy [Levy, 2010]; Kenneth Waltz [Waltz, 2001], 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-19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 [Wright, 1965].
- 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, 1957]. 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 19<sup>th</sup> century impeded the intensity of wars and, on the contrary, the wars of the 20<sup>th</sup> 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 [Boulding, 1962].
- 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<sup>8</sup>.

§ 6. 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

---

<sup>8</sup> The collapse of the USSR, Johan Vincent Galtung predicted, pointing to the five major contradictions:

- 1) Between the USSR and its allies, which wanted independence.
- 2) Between Russia and the other republics of the USSR, which wanted greater autonomy.
- 3) The relationship between urban and rural areas that were characteristic for the construction in the USSR.
- 4) The relations between the socialist bourgeoisie and socialist working-class.
- 5) Between the liquidity of money and the deficit on consumers’ goods (the population had money, but there were not enough goods).