CHAPTER I

SCIENTIFIC METHOD AND THE STUDY OF WAR
1.1. Background

The rise and growth of civilization has been influenced by a number of factors amongst which 'war' has been recognized as a primeval one, so much so, as to have been regarded the fore-runner of the civilization and development, at least as a source of encouragement to the man to become more strong and versatile. As such, war reflects its position of an arbiter, more so, as the ultimate method after the failure of all means of resolving the disputes. War may be compared with a state of strife, tension and conflict having variation in terms of the intensity of effect, enmity and loss. In other words, it is the ultimate stage of resolving disputes through the use of force. It is also regarded as the state, situation or the fact of "warring violence or force against a state or other politically organised body, especially, a contest by force between two or more nations or states". For some people, it is the condition which permits "two or more hostile states to carry on a conflict by armed force" (Nerilli, A. Brent: 1962).

Different experts and scholars have defined war from their respective disciplines point of view but all having conformity
in the broadest sense that war is "a violent contact of
distinct but similar entities". To have a narrower or more clear
understanding about the war, the difference, though subtle, has
so be drawn because the contact, however violent it may be
between the distinct but similar entities; could be a fight
between the lions and tigers; a collision of stars; a battle
between two primitive tribes or the hostilities between the two
modern nations will have to be accepted as war. (Quincy Wright
1965) in his book "A Study of War" has considered war as the
legal condition, which equally permits two or more hostile groups
to carry on a conflict by armed force. He elaborates the legal
depart of the war as a condition or period of time in which
special rules permitting and regulating violence between govern-
ments prevail or a procedure of regulated violence by which
disputes between governments are settled (Quincy Wright; 1926).

Whereas in the material sense war is "an act or a series of acts
of violence by one government against another or a dispute between
governments carried on only violence (Quincy Wright; 1926), in brief,
he has regarded war as "the condition which prevails while groups
are contesting by arms (Quincy Wright; 1933). In both the cases
the existence of an objective, use of physical, biological and
social phenomena are applicable but with difference while in case
of the former the violence may not be in an organized form to
achieve rapid destruction as it is applicable in case of the
latter in the form of armed force."
On the basis of its nature and content the war has been understood differently by people from various shades but all of them agree in one way or the other; that war is a 'contention' which means it is a violent struggle through the application of armed force. (J. Nef; John; 1963). They can be broadly divided into two schools of thought, one opposing it while the other supporting it. The former school of thought considers war as a problem (J. Nef; John; 1963). For them "It is a plague which ought to be eliminated a mistake which should be avoided, a crime which ought to be punished and an anachronism which no longer serves any purpose". There as the other school of thought with a more respectful attitude towards the war; regards it is fruitful adventure, a useful instrument; a legitimate and appropriate procedure and "a condition of existence for which one must be prepared. At the level of tactics applied for the realization of foreign policy war has been regarded to be "the eliminating point in a rising scale of pressure. It is the last resort of power politics (Georg, Schwannberger; 1964). On the basis of this division of thought on war it would be essential to understand the underlying factors that influence the nature of war and its relativity to the origin and growth of the civilization.

1.1-a: What is War: To different people war may have very different meanings. To some it is a plague which ought to be eliminated; to some a mistake which should be avoided, to others
a crime which ought to be punished; and to still others, it is an anachronism which no longer serves any purpose. On the other hand, there are some who take a more receptive attitude toward war and regard it as an adventure which may be interesting, an instrument which may be useful a procedure which may be legitimate and appropriate, or a condition of existence for which one must be prepared.

To people of the latter type war is not a problem. They take it for granted whether with eagerness, complacency or concern. Its details may prove unspeakable or disagreeable; but they are not interpreted as presenting a problem of war-in-general. They can be satisfactorily handled by the professional historian, diplomat, international lawyer, or strategist.

War has ever remained man's most despicable but unavoidable concomitant. It might have been defined differently in various ages but essentially it remained the same dastardly act of violence, killing men for their singular fault of belonging to the opponent's side.

In modern times the war perhaps can be defined as a state of disturbed peace taking the shape of declared or undeclared hostility between two or more countries. History develops generalization true of a particular time and place of the past. Practice assumes generalizations true as guides to particular ends of the future. Science strives
for generalizations which accord not only with the observations
upon which they were based but also with all future and past
circumstances known at the time the generalization was made.

It has often been assumed that war is something which
happens with little possibility of prediction. The circumstances
of a war, its antecedents and consequences, can be recorded but
according to this opinion each war is unique. The record of wars
thus constitutes a history but cannot be made into a science.
There are, it is true, principles and rules of war which permit
either to predict the initiation and conduct of war or to guide
practicable to victory. These, however, are juridical or practical
laws establishing norms which may or may not be observed according
to the efficiency of international sanctions or the intelligence
of general officers. Are there also laws which may enable the
student to predict the incidence and manifestations of war because
of the characteristics and relationships of the populations;
 nations, states, and armies.

The difference between historic laws, normative laws,
and scientific laws ought not to be exaggerated; In fact, the
term "Natural Law" has at times been applied to all (O. Lovejoy,
Gilbert Chinard, George Boas, Ronald S. Crane (1935) and James,
Bryce (1901)). The biological nature of man which functioned in
past historic epochs differs little from that which functions
today or will function tomorrow. The sanctions behind juridical law
and the reason behind individual and strategic principles are characteristics of human societies which may be no less "natural" than any other of their characteristics:

"Yet nature is made better by no means; but nature makes that means".

- Thomas More

Precedents of human history and norms of human law and practice can be taken as evidence of the nature or law of human society no less applicable in the future than in the past. "The rule to which future events have a tendency to conform". Wrote Charles S. Peirce, "is an important thing, an important element in the beginning of those events", and as much a mode of being as are "actual facts and positive qualitative possibilities" (Charles Eastman and Paul Weiss. 1931). It seems therefore premature to deny the possibility of valid generalizations to which the course of war will tend to conform.

To extract such generalizations involves the application of scientific method (John A. J., 1941). Scientific method applied to social activity, which is typically a problem-solving activity, differs, in some respects from that method applied to physical phenomena and yields results which are much less precise. In dealing with social activity historic time can never be entirely eliminated as an unmeasurable factor, cause-and-effect relations cannot be entirely separated from means and end relations, constants cannot be clearly distinguished from variables and the
subject matter cannot easily be divided into disciplines with in which specialised method may be contextual. The problem of contingency, of purpose, of universal changes and of universal interrelationship, flowing from the human subjectivity; instability, ambiguity and problematic character of the factors involved renders the application of scientific method to human and social problems exceptionally difficult and frequently unpredictable.

The isolation of problems and disciplines, the establishment of standards of measurement and frames of reference the elimination of personal bias, must be accomplished by art in all sciences; but in the physical sciences the art is closely guided by the observation of nature (Pleasants, quoted in Childe, de Santsillana and Edgar Zilsel; 1941). Fictions, while necessary in the natural sciences are the essence of the social sciences. The social scientist must create a structure of assumptions and use a language which is at the same time symbolic and emotive. Unless he can establish his assumptions by successful propaganda, it is hardly worth while to make hypotheses or to investigate their validity.

For the problem of war this means that the scientific investigator must employ his own conviction of what the future of war ought to be as one of the assumptions for predicting what it will be. He must, however, recognise that others will similarly employ their own convictions. Wishful thinking about war constitutes a major elements in scientific thinking about war. An
1-11. THE MEANING OF WAR

The historical events which have been called wars have been characterized by:

(a) Military activity,
(b) High tension level,
(c) Abnormal law; and
(d) Intense political integration.

1-11-a. MILITARY ACTIVITY. The most obvious manifestation of war is the accelerated movement and activity of armies and navies. While modern states are at all times engaged in moving naval and military forces around, in constructing battleships, guns and munitions, in organizing and training armies, and in making military appropriations, war is marked by a great acceleration in the speed of such activities. Such acceleration as mobilization, concentration, blockade, siege, organized fighting, invasion and occupation may all occur without war but they occur more frequently and on a larger scale during war. Each of the terms "battle campaign", "war" "arms race and normal military activity" designates an increase in intensity of military activity. The type of events or conditions designated by each successive term manifest a lesser intensity of military activity but a wider space and a longer period of time in which such activity is occurring. The characteristics of each of these types of activity deserve attention.
1.II-a-I: **Battle**: The most concentrated type of military activity is the battle. It may be taken as a generic term to cover a period of continuous direct contact of armed forces in which at least one side is engaged in a tactical offensive. There may be a battle of land forces, of naval forces or of air forces. There may be a single battle combining all of these forces, as, for instance, in the siege of a port or a landing operation. In wars of past centuries battles have usually been identifiable events, seldom lasting except in the case of sieges, over a day seldom covering over a hundred thousand men. This is no longer true. The progress of invention with respect to instruments of annihilation, transportation, defence and attack has made it possible for centralized military direction to be maintained over vastly greater numbers of men, operating through greater areas, for longer period of time.

1.II-a-II: **Campaign**: A less concentrated type of military activity than the battle is the campaign. This term is used to designate a group of military operations within a limited period of time connected by a strategic plan under the control of a single command. Several battles may be fought during a campaign but a campaign may be conducted without any actual contact with the enemy. A campaign does, however, involve movements of actual armies, navies, or airforces, of which at least one side is engaged in a strategic offensive, such as an effort to occupy hostile territory, to acquire resources from the enemy to destroy
hostile forces to blockade hostile territory, to break civilian morale by military attacks or to accomplish other military objectives. A campaign is more likely than a battle to combine both the army and the navy, but essentially it includes only one. In the past, campaigns have usually been identifiable events, seldom lasting over six or eight months and involving only two or three cities of from 5,000 to 10,000 men each (Wright; Scam; 1943). Naval campaigns sometimes covered very large areas and continued over longer periods but usually involved fewer men. The conditions which have increased the duration, area and number of participants in battles have done the same for campaigns. In recent major wars it has been as difficult to distinguish and identify campaigns as it has been to distinguish and identify battles. In major hostilities colonial wars, interventions, and insurrections. The campaign is the normal unit of military activity. Thus many campaigns occur outside of recognized wars.

1.11-a-III: WAR: From the military point of view it is more difficult to identify wars than either battles or campaigns. The unity of a war derives more from legal or political than from military activities. The list of wars of modern history included in this study is based primarily upon the fact of legal recognition manifested by the application of the laws of war in the relations of the participants and of the laws of neutrality in the relations of participants to non-participants. As evidence of the beginning and end of this legal status declarations,
recognitions, and treaties were the usual criteria. Hostilities involving over 100,000 troops were, however, included even if not recognized as war, and even lesser hostilities were included if they led to important legal results. Such as the creation or extinction of states or territorial changes.

Periods of war have been characterized by military movements of abnormal size and frequency. The battles and campaigns of a war are usually united through the continuity of the political direction of each of the belligerents and the persistence of a grand strategical objective of at least one of the participating states. These unifying conditions, however, are not always present. From the military point of view a war does not usually have such clear time and space limitations as does a battle or a campaign (Duny, R.E., 1939). From the legal point of view its time limitations and its space limitations, at least with respect to land, are usually precise. The military activity of a war has seldom been continuous for over five years, but there has been a hundred years. War, a thirty years, war a seven years, war and a number of other wars, such as the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, in which some military activity continued for more than five years. Usually, however, these periods were broken by long truces. Some of these wars continued through revolutionary changes in the political control of all or some of the belligerents; through a disappearance of old belligerents and entry of new ones, and through radical changes
in the war aims or grand strategic objectives of most of the
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political relations may disclose that armament races, proceeding simultaneously with a group of states indifferent parts of the world, are distinct and unrelated phenomena, the growth of world communication and economic interdependence being in many cases to bring all states into the world balance of power and to synchronize accelerating armament progress everywhere into a single race.

17.-new trend in military politics: This is a conception which can be reenforced only by reading the history of a civilization over centuries to ascertain the size of military and naval budgets, the size of standing army, the proportion of national effort devoted to military affairs, and the frequency of minor and major wars of military forces until among the states of that civilization. Because of the dynamic character of western culture and of the operation of armament races, it is difficult to compare different epochs by activities. Because of the wide variations in the role of military affairs in different states, it is difficult to compare different areas at the same time. The concept of normal military activity is, therefore, difficult to apply to modern civilization. Theoretically, however, it constitutes a standard of comparison by which the more accelerated activity during armament races, wars, campaigns, and battles can be judged. If it is realized that the great periods of modern history have been formally at war nearly half of the time and have been engaged in minor military campaigns or armament-races a good share of the remaining time; it will be perceived that in
Fig. X

Trend of opinions in the United States toward France and Germany, 1910-28. Data are from the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Daily News and from the three papers combined. Intensity of opinion is plotted along the ordinate (1 = most "anti" and 11 = most "pro"), and time by years is plotted along the base line. The solid lines indicate trends in opinion toward Germany; the broken lines, toward France. (From American Political Science Review, XXVII [August, 1933], 268.)
modern civilization normal military activity would be quite
remote from an ideal conception of peace (Maurice Lieut.col. J.F.
1933 and Kallen, H.M., 1939).

1.II-b MANIFESTATION

Another manifestation of war is the high tension level
of public opinion within the belligerent states. Attention is
concentrated upon symbols of the nation and of the enemy. Only
favourable attitudes toward the former and unfavorable attitudes
towards the latter are expressed. Graphs constructed from stati-
istical analyses of numerous attitude statements taken from news-
papers indicate that on the approach of war the opinions of the
population of each country about the other become more hostile
and more homogeneous. During war itself these opinions reach levels
of extraordinary hostility (Fig. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3).

Such graphs present the best picture of the changing
direction, intensity homogeneity and continuity of the attitudes
of one people toward another, but easily observable phenomena
make possible a rough classification of the intensity of such
attitudes. Five states of tension level may be expressed by the
words "symbolic attack", threats of violence; "discrimination,
"disapproval" and "normal relations".

1.II-b-I: Symbolic Attack: In time of war the press, public
addresses, sermons, moving pictures, the radio, and other instru-
ments of publicity frequently contain direct attacks, upon the
Fig. 1. Trend of opinions in the United States toward France and Germany, 1933. Data are from the New York Times. The thickness of the vertical lines indicates the distribution of opinion statements each month. (From Quincy Wright, *The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace* [London, 1945], p. 110.)
enemy, emphasizing his naivete and urging his destruction. Such sentiment may appear not only in un-official but in official utterances. The latter were formerly rare except in time of war, but with the development of news, breaking down the distinction between domestic and foreign communication, they have become more common (Lasswell: J.S.: 1927).

1.41-b-II: Threats of Violence: Threats of violence against another state may be political in time of strained relations short of war, but if they proceed directly from high officials of the government they are likely to lead to a breach of relations or to war itself as "threats, especially if accompanied by naval and military manoeuvres, have been considered much more serious than formal diplomatic protests, though the latter may carry an implication of eventual resort of force. The United States represented the profussion of "grave considerations" in the Japanese Ambassador's note on the immigration crisis in 1923, interpreting it as a threat of war. The aggressive attitude of Hitler toward President Hoover of U.S. in 1936, in his address of September 12, 1938, indicated that hostilities might be near at hand. "Incidents involving nationals, vessels or officials of one country for which another country is considered responsible, but which might be of little political importance in normal times, are often interpreted as threats in times of high tension and may result in a breach of diplomatic relations" (Hoover, J.S.: 1906) and (Stowell, Ellery, C.: 1931)."
Fig. I-3 Trend of opinions in China toward Japan and in Japan toward China, 1930-32. Data are from the China Critic and other Chinese publications for opinion toward Japan (broken line) and from the O-ika Mainichi for opinion toward China (solid line). Intensity of opinion is plotted along the ordinate, and time (by quarter for 1930 and by months for 1931 and 1932) is plotted along the base line. (From American Political Science Review, XXVII [August, 1933], 562.)
1.11-b-III: Diplomatic: Private broadcasts and official
disclosures in tariff rates customs, import, and navigation
subsidies; and prohibitions against loans and concessions are
evidence of strained relations; but they frequently occur without
war and are usually considered less serious than threats and
displays of force. Such economic disclosures are always
understood between enemies in time of war (Simpson, Junior, C.:1935).

1.11-b-IV: Diplomatic: Official expressions of disapproval of
the policy or behavior of a foreign state manifest a serious
strain in relations if they concern the internal policy of that
state or its relations with third states. References to the policy
of another government are not, however, deemed as serious as
utterances disgraceful or contemptuous of the personalty of
high officials or of the state itself. The attitudes of governments
toward such criticism have varied with respect to the degree of
resentment which should be felt and with respect to the responsi-
bility of states for hostile utterances made by private individuals
or in private publications (Bright, C.: July:1936). Autocracies
are likely to be much more sensitive on such matters than demo-

1.11-b-v: Normal: Relations: In the normal relations of states
formal protests are usually confined to cases where the state,
its government, or its nationals have been injured because of a
breach of international obligations by another state. Objections
Fig. V-2. Trend of opinions in the United States toward China and Japan, 1937-38.

Data are from the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Daily News combined. The thickness of the vertical lines indicates distribution of opinion statements each month. (From Public Opinion Quarterly, III [January, 1939], 48).
to the policy of another state are not formally presented although
they may be made the subject of representations. Even in normal
times the private press sometimes abuses other states; but unless
excessive or uncorrected the press is controlled by the govern-ment
such license does not induce a strain in relations. The normal
level of tension manifested by the government of one state for
another varies greatly among different states and at different
times (Stowell, Illcy, C.: 1931).

A second manifestation of war is the entry into force
of new rules of law, domestic and international contracts with
alien enemies are suspended. Resident alien enemies are interned
or placed under surveillance (Humphreys, Roberts, N.W.: 1940).
Trading with the enemy is prohibited. Many privileges with the
enemy are terminated or suspended. Military forces are free to
move on the enemy territory and to attack its armed forces, limited
only by the rules of war. Neutrals are obliged to prevent the use
of their territory or vessels for military purposes by belligerents.
Neutral vessels at sea are liable to be visited and searched and to
capture if they assist the enemy (Oppenheim, N.: 1940).

In the case of war, recognized as such in the legal
sense, all these rules come into force. There are other situations
in which a modified form of domestic law prevails. The legal
situation consequent upon an outbreak of hostilities differs
accordingly as the violence occurs in a state's home territory;
In a colonial area of different culture, or in the relations of
the colonial system. It may also differ accordingly as the two
nations are equal or are necessarily or expressly disparate in
status & rights. (11930). The following nine exceptions may,
dependent, be distinguished with respect to the abnormal legal
situation with results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Act</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Colonial strife</th>
<th>Civil strife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Colonial war</td>
<td>Civil war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurrection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native unrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurrection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1150: Civil, Imperial, and International War: If
assumed as such imply that both sides are to be treated as
equals by other states designated neutrals. Both are entitled to
the rights and powers of belligerents as long as the war lasts.
In civil war and after in imperial war the revolt is in violation
of the municipal constitution and laws of the state and if the
legal government is successful, it may of course, apply its own
law to punish treason after hostilities are over. In international
war one of the parties may be acting in violation of its obligat-
ions under international law, and this fact may influence the
secondly, even though the states have generally recognised the situation as 'law' by maintaining neutrality (Eighth, 6 July 1943).

Collectively, the non-intervention principle has not been recognised as legal yet do not apply a duty of third states to cease the sending of arms as equal. In the case of insurrection or active opposition, the recognized government has usually been favoured by armed forces. The presence of the armed forces of a third with the insurgents under the non-intervention agreement of 1936 was an exception. In other cases (United States, 1938), if a state engaged in insurgency that has been found by the majority international community to be an illegitimate, in the sense that it committed acts in violation of its international obligations, third states may discriminate in favour of the state individuals engaged in defence.

For the purposes of international law, violence and active intervention in the state's domain and international law do not usually involve international law of sieges or martial law in such situations. In cases of a great power intervening to deal with disorders or international obligations in a much smaller independent state has often been treated in a similar manner. In law, however, the justification of the intervention is properly an internation question to be decided by international procedures according to international law (Dickinson, C.D., 1920). As treaties now generally prohibit forceful intervention except for defence, there is a presumption against the
implications of such action unless expressly prohibited by a
pre-existing treaty, or other treaty relation with the state
in whose territory the action is taken or unless that state has
been found guilty of an action which withdraws it from the
enjoyment of anti-war treaties and permits military sanctions
against it (3 Wright, 204).
The intensity, consequences, and costs of modern war demand the long-term attention of policy makers and scholars. The last sixty years has seen the control of religion (Society, State, and Religion, 1939).
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Quincy Wright (1976) in his book, "The Study of International Relations" says, "War is the art of organizing and employing armed forces to accomplish the purposes of group. It implies the practical, historical, political, and scientific studies as the contributing factors to this art (Quincy Wright, 1976). At another place he considers "war to be a contention by force or as a social situation characterized by conflict, tension and large-scale violence in the relationship of groups. More specifically "war is a species of conflict (Quincy Wright, 1955), according to him, war takes place as a consequence of a situation where in the legal sanctions failed to maintain an accepted system of law (Quincy Wright, 1955). Considering from the legal point of view, he sums up this conception by referring to the situation which permits the participating groups to contend by armed forces (Quincy Wright, 1976), and also "the situation during which two or more political groups are equally entitled to settle conflict by armed forces (Quincy Wright, 1954). Writing
mals and objections of the war, he maintains, "or as a method of international policies employed by the states for establishing their reputation and influence, it could also be employed by the insurgents and rivals in gaining independence by the national governments to suppress communist and colonial revolts and by the international organization to maintain or bring the existing peace. In sum-up the objectives of war could be territorial, economic and cultural expansion; national independence, security and solidarity, and international stability, law and peace. In this context, war has been regarded as to be a social institution based on a multiple of drives and a good deal of conflict. The social structure may be regarded as the mode leading to conflict in a particular direction influenced by traditions and customs. The conflict may be not only the nations, or between the classes within a state.

In some cases, the war with "a conflict carried on by public force between states or between state's communities..." (Carr, p.81, 1962). According to him the co-existence of contest and intention are essential for any war. In the absence of either of them it may be called reprisals or 'contest' but not war. Thomas R. Pickles has treated war to be a "condition or state of governments contending by force (in P. Tondon & Rajesh Tondon, 1973). It is a legal situation which permits the groups to expand wealth and power by violence on equal basis.

The views of the famous expert in international law; Oppenheim, L. (1963) provide sufficient guidelines to understand the concept of war from legal point of view. For him, war is
If we take into consideration the views and definitions collected by K. C. Nair in Nair in Studying Society, II (1926) pp. 31-34; the 'war' is a contention, i.e., a violent struggle through the armed forces and is compared with 'the condition of those submitting by force as such (Agrippina 1963).

Hans Loescher (1963) has considered 'war' to be an organised violence and an instrument in the hands of the foreign policy of the state.

Another International Law expert, J. C. Steenke (1972) in his book 'An Introduction to International Law' has pointed out that the war, in its most generally understood sense, is 'a contest between two or more states primarily through their
armed forces, the ultimate purpose of each contestant or contestant group being to conquer the other or others and impose its own conditions of peace. The nature of war according to him is "to overwhelm the opponent state, and to impose terms of settlement which that state has no alternative but to obey (J.G. Starks, 1972)." In the modern war this definition appears to be incomplete as the war now is a conflict not primarily between the armed forces of the states but it includes almost the entire population of the contesting states, rather it includes, some times, even the others, particularly the neutral sharing states. If we consider the war to be the absence of peace only, as some people think it to be, it may not be gross; because the absence of peace may be in the case of the existence of tension, hostilities or conflict. Such conditions may of course be regarded as the period of cold-war. Similar views have been expressed by Hall in "Peace". When differences between states reach a point at which both parties reach to force; or one of them does acts of violence, which the other chooses to took upon as a breach of the peace, the relation of war is set up, in which the contestants may use regulated violence against each other, until one of the two has been brought to accept such terms as his enemy is willing to grant (J.G. Starks, 1972).

War is also regarded to be, "implicit in the anarchy of the nation-state system as it can be done away with only by terminating the existence of sovereign states" (H. Fredrick,
Ancient (1988) each of which could aspire to "crucify the aspirations which had it to go to war or which it developed during the course of the war (Verhorn van Dyke 1988)." Palmer observes that war, in principle, is "the enforcement of action involving the use of armed forces for" by one state against another constituting as it does, one unlimited interference in the affairs of interests of the other state. (Palmer 1973)." The unilateral acts of force carried on by different states against the other without any reaction may not be war but a cause of the outbreak of the war. So the war takes place only when the opposite party reciprocates tangible or hostile acts (E. Oppenheim 1983) and the state of war does not come into being unless a formal declaration for it by one of more states is made; irrespective of the fact that active hostilities may or may not have taken place before; "although has suggested that war is "an organized conflict in accordance with institutionalized rules for regulating the violence" it involves. War is also recognized as conflict carried on by force of arms as between nations or between classes within a nation but always intended to "compel the opponent to fulfill our will." It is not merely a calamity befalling from without but it is, "sowed by men upon men for definite, though frequently mistaken, objects." (Jaffe, B.K. 1934). It is fought to protect what the states have to conserve their assets, to acquire resources, to eliminate the threat or to change a system, a government, an economy or a geopolitical entity. War is one of the methods; a brutal method, to resolve antagonism. Palmer and Perkins in their
book "International Relations have described war to be the

Despite the fact that sincere efforts have been made
by the mankind to eliminate war, it has become an integral part
of the human life. The emergence of the idea of total wars in
the uniled world has affected the nature and the contents of
the war. The events in the modern world have been taking place
so rapidly as to impose the changes in the socio-political set
up in an unprecedentedly rapid succession. While formerly, a
man might inherit the technical and economic skills, social and
moral code and the scheme of values which he received from his
father to last through life today each of these may change several
times in a single life. (Uehling: right: 1965). A renowned socio-
logist, Herace Kallen writes: Peace and war are the facts which
differ formally rather than materially and distinguishable by
their locus and implements rather than by their intrinsic qualities
as human behaviour. There are endless varieties of violent conflict
between individuals, groups and nations. War is the name we give
to one such variety peace is the name for all the others. Peace,
it could appear, is the aggregation of chronic, diffused, un-
organised domestic conflict. War is a conflict acute, organised,
unified and concentrated at the peripheries of the society's
habitat. (Herace, Kallen: 1929). According to John Locke there
are only two ways to solve human dispute the one by law and the
other by force and "there there is no law, force is the ultimate
arbiter (F. Adler, Mortimer: 1963). The acceptance of this view
sense to deny the legitimacy of war as an institution aimed at resolving disputes created by violence of reasons in the existing society. From the sociological point of view, mere “violent contention cannot be called war unless it involves actual conflict and constitute a socially recognised form of custom within the society where it occurs” (Quincy Wright 1945). Since the war is a social custom utilising a regulated violence in connection with inter-group conflicts (Quincy Wright 1945) it has been an integral part of almost all the existing human groups; however primitive they may be. It did not exist as a distinct phenomenon in the absence of human societies. War had been recognized as a means of livelihood to get food, slaves or booty to expand hunting groups in the form of an instrument.

Liddell, a prominent philologist, has defined war as a state of armed hostility between sovereign nations or governments. Goodwin has criticised the definition as given by Liddell with arguments that violent contention may not be called war unless it involves actual conflict.

Bernard Shaw has categorised war to be a biological necessity, an effective check against the population explosion. It is, therefore, not a natural calamity but is waged by men with definite objectives and is not an aim in itself but an instrument and a brutal method which divides mankind into masters and slaves, lords and serfs, imperialists and subjects, capitalists and wage-victims and suppressers and the suppressed.
If we go into its literal meaning the 'New English Dictionary' explains war as "a hostile contention by means of armed forces carried on between nations, states or rulers or between groups in the same nation or states in the employment of armed forces against a foreign power or against opposing party in the state". Mr. Dallin Rikersan in Encyclopedia Britannica has further elaborated war to be, "the use of organized force between the mass groups seeking to impose its policy upon the other". While referring to the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences the same war is generally applied to armed conflict between population groups conceived of as organic entities such as races or classes, states or other groups, the union, societies or political parties and economic classes. Armed conflict between states that fully enjoy complete and unlimited sovereignty in it...text thought created by initially war (Klein, P.A. Religions: 103).

Another, the renowned philosopher, has viewed war as "a moral scandal of man because it indicated man's failure to fulfill his moral development in civil society". On the basis of this assumption, he has defined war as "a contention by force between the two states" and "only organized violence among consolidated groups deserves to be called war", it takes place, more often, from the "links between things rather than between men (Stainsby, Hoffman: 1965). Roussean has regarded war not a human necessity or drive, where in one kills in order to win. He
has considered war, appropriately to be "a contest between
states (i.e. Artificial bodies) and not between the individuals.
(Stairley Hoffman: 1965). Elaborating on the stakes of war, he
has observed that it is not because of man's need but the frills
and fancies grafted on those needs by society. The war, therefore
is "a permanent condition that requires constant relations
(Stairley Hoffman: 1965).

Wars have been regarded as highly varied, diverse and
complex when considered as a phenomenon. Though inseparable from
the political system; they are, in fact continuation, with force
of arms, of the politics of a state, a class within the state
which have pursued them for a long time as they were unable to
survive without the use of force of arms.

Nautical and Leninist define war to be "a socio-
historical phenomenon occurring at a definite state in the
development of human society (V. D. Scholovsky: 1963). On the
basis of the studies of the Marxist and Leninist theories, it
may be derived that "war is armed coercion organised armed conf-
lict between the various social classes; states, groups of the
countries and nations in order to achieve definite goal. (V. D.
Scholovsky: 1963). Commenting on Clausewitz's dictum war is
politics continued by other (i.e. foreable) means; Lenin said
"the Marxist have always considered this axiom as the theoretical
foundation for the meaning of every war (Lenin: 1929). According
to S.K. Earle (1968) Lenin was aware that "warfare is not only
military but also diplomatic, psychological and economic in character, and that war and revolution were in continuous and fundamental relationship with one another.

Both Marx and Lenin understood and interpreted the war, in view of introducing changes in the socio-economic structure as a theoretical analysis was nothing but a space work and preparation for the final revolutionary assault. They characterized war as to be determined by the policy of which the war is a continuation "by the class that is using the war; and by the aims for which it is being waged" and that the war "itself does not change the direction in which the policies were moving unless the war, in only accelerates this development" (J. C. Fuller 1956).

The military thinkers and scholars have understood war as "the art which enables any commander to judge the forces at work on his side" (E. J. Smith 1960). For this, he should be conversant with a variety of experts such as grand strategy, strategy, tactics, armaments organisation, discipline, and, above all; that is required to achieve the ultimate objective.

Field Marshal Montgomery (1956), the famous British military commander in his book, "A history of warfare has called, "war to be a prolonged conflict between rival political groups by force of arms". He includes "insurrection and civil war" also his definition but excludes riots and acts of individual violence. He feels the war to be an integral part of the history due to its
concern with the basic necessities of life, food and a secured living place which worked as the absolute necessities for the primitive men as they are today. He traced the basic reasons of ocasional fighting in the competition for minimum conditions of existence.

According to S.M. Earle, when war comes, it dominates our lives as it is like a great tempest which flows upon us all mingling with the human organ, whistles through the streets, steals into our firesides clinks glasses in merriment, lifts the gray hair of statistics, enters the class room of our colleges, nestles the studies pages of our scholars. It offers incomparable tests of our allegiances of work and duty, private loves and public devotions, personal preferences and social ties (S.M. Earle: 1966) and according to Walter Mills, "it challenges virtually every other institution of society; the justice and equity of its economy, the adequacy of its political system, the energy of its productive plants, the basis, wisdom and purposes of its foreign policy. There is no aspect of our existence which is not touched; modified perhaps completely altered by the imperatives of war" (S.M. Earle: 1966). Commenting on the significance of war; he writes, justice without force is impotent and force without justice immoral; therefore we must combine justice with force (S.M. Earle: 1966).

While Machiavelli considered war to be, "an act of rendering justice" making it necessary to teach the individual
soldier the fundamentals of the use of arms and to accustom them
to action formation. To him "political life was a struggle for
survival" between growing and expanding organisms. War is natural
and necessary, it would establish which country would survive
and determine between annihilation and expansion. War, therefore,
must end in a decision, and a battle is the best method of reaching
a final decision; since it would place the defeated country
at the mercy of the victor (Gilbert, Felix: 1966). He made the
study of war as a social science, dissociating it from the
considerations of ethical purpose but closely related to the
constitutional, economic and political speculation.

J.F.C. Fuller has equated the war with an art like
the practice of medicine. "Just as the doctor is to prevent, cure
or alleviate the diseases of human body so should the statesmen
and soldiers prevent, cure or alleviate the wars which inflict
the internation body."

They should understand the war not to, "take it for
granted to wish to make of it something, which by the nature
of its relations, it is impossible for it to be (J.F.C. Fuller: 1960)."

Von Haller has described the war to be "a forceable
action of a people in order to achieve, or maintain a purpose of
state. Similarly Sun Tzu considers war to be "a great affair of
the state, the realm of life and death; the road to safety or ruin,
a thing to be studied with extreme diligence" and Vernon, Van
Dyke treats war to be the ultimate means by which the states
"seeks to make their will prevail the ultimate expression of power (Fenner, Van, Dyke: 1968).

Major Gen. D.K. Fallet of the Indian army writes in his book, the essentials of Military knowledge (1970), that the study of warfare has always been, a highly complicated subject wherein combat fighting may be, "a relatively uncomplicated cut but the processes that follow it involve complex and often contradictory problems.

Till the coming of the French Revolution the wars were essentially clashes between the rulers but thereafter they became increasingly clashes between peoples. The interpreters of the French Revolution's wars with particular reference to Napoleon's conduct of war in the extreme annihilitative form, have tended to treat the war to be "an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfil our will (Carl Van, Clausewitz: 1968). These interpreters prominent among which Clausewitz and Jomini have come to be known as the advocates rather opponents of the use of extreme violence in war with the objective of overthrowing the enemy. Clausewitz (1968) has compared war with "a duel on an extensive scale in which the extent of violence (force) used plays the decisive role for the achievement of the ultimate objective of "the compulsory submission of the enemy". He suggested that to eliminate all possible hostile reaction from the enemy the complete disarming and overthrowing of enemy must always be the aim of war. The war, therefore, is a means to
achieve the objective of the compulsory submission of the enemy to our will but for this the discerning becomes the immediate objective which can be materialised by shedding enemy's blood. It may be a horrible proposition but if it is not done the enemy would shed your blood which would be even more horrible. Therefore as observed by Roger Ashley Leonard, "one of the most dangerous of all errors in the prosecution of war is to permit a spirit of benevolence in interference with it (Roger, Ashley, Leonard: 1967) Clausewitz stressed that the art of war in its highest point of view is policy, but no doubt; a policy which fight battle instead of uniting nations. The political objective and the objective of war being compulsory submission to our will, carried on by military factor of the state, the process therefore, becomes, 'a continuation of state's policy by other means (Jurendoff, cited by V.J. Tapscott: 1954). It can not be treated separately in an isolated form but it is a social activity. War therefore, is not an independent thing in itself but we can as and when needed, have it. War, in other words, is an instrument to achieve an objective and not the contrary. To justify this aspect Clausewitz said, "War actually takes place more for the defensive than for the conqueror, for invasion only calls forth resistance, and it is not until there is resistance that there is war. A conqueror is always a lover of peace, he would like to make his entry into our state unopposed; in order to prevent this, we must choose war, and therefore also make preparations, that is in other words, it is just the weak or that side which
must defend itself, which should be always armed in order not
to be taken by surprise (Carl Van Clausewitz: 1968).

Having co-ordinated philosophy with experience, Clausewitz made the most significant analysis of war in his
treatise on war. It includes a critical analysis of the philoso-
phical aspect of the war as also its structural part based on a
pragmatic approach which called for the 'absolute war' or the
perfect war, that grew into the total war. He also laid equal
stress on the theoretical aspect of the nature of the war. For
his war is the transformation of absurdity into reality where in
the instinctive hostility and hostile intention joined each other.
However, war continues to be an act of force belonging essentially
to the society. It emerges as a reciprocal action which logically
is followed to the extreme. But the nature of war is decided by
the objective and therefore, is relative and cannot be understood
in isolation. It belongs to policy which decide its character.
Therefore a grand and potent policy may produce absolute form
of war. Clausewitz does not accept the war without violence which
is a "real business for the Brahmins" and feels that "to introduce
into the philosophy of war- a principle of moderation would be
an absurdity". For him the combat is the real activity and the
essence of war is conflict wherein "the direct destruction of
the enemy's forces is predominant (C.C. Palmers: 1840). However,
he also feels that the war "has to deal with living and moral
forces the consequence of which is that it can never attain the
absolute and the positive. There is, therefore, everywhere a
margins for the accidental, and just as much in the greatest things as in the smallest. This statement becomes more relative when viewed from the realistic angle as "war belongs to the province of costs life to settled by bloodshed."

Clausewitz has been interpreted as to be the follower of absolute or the real war as he was of the opinion that "there can be no other reality in war than the complete overthrow of the enemy (J.P.C. Fuller: 1960). After having discussed the absolute and the limited war, Clausewitz discussed the principles that governed the plan of war and its execution which are to be in accordance with the objective of war such as:

(i) To curtail and destroy the enemy’s armed force.
(ii) Target destruction of the material elements of aggression of the hostile Army, and
(iii) To gain public opinion (J.P.C. Fuller: 1960).

Like Clausewitz, his contemporary military thinker Antoine Henri Jomini studied the war from the conceptual and pragmatic angles. He has accused Bullow of having overemphasized the scientific aspect of warfare though himself stressed in his military doctrines scientific arguments and at the same time accusing Clausewitz of "making all military science impossible (Briton, Crane & A Craig Corden and Gilbert Felix: 1986). His writings may be broadly categorized into those which were mainly of historical or analytical aspect of war but both interdependent. He was convinced that the war, being a form of human activity on
the earth, must make some sense. He did not agree with Marshall De Croy that "war is a science covered with darkness, in the midst of which one does not walk with an assured step" and that "all the science have principle, but that of war as yet none (E.M. Earle: 1966). He was of the opinion that the human mind has the capability of discerning and stating, systematic and successful conduct of war. According to him, "there have existed, in all times fundamental and unchanging principles that are independent of the kind of weapon (of historical times and of places) on which depend good results in warfare (E.M. Earle: 1966). He did not agree with the systems of war as he regarded war to be "an unreasoned drama and in no way a mathematical operation (E.M. Earle: 1966) constituting war to be an integral part of the civilization, Jomini believed the progress of war in accordance with the progress of the fundamentals of strategy, weapons and tactics which symbolized the progress of mankind.
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