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Nature of War

In Immanuel Kant’s paper, *Perpetual Peace.* He talks a lot about peace and war, what I want to focus on analyzing his is take on war. I find that he has some very interesting thoughts when it comes to war. First off, he does seem to truly hate war, he despises it so much that he believes that no country should have a standing army. He believes that if a state has an army, they will eventually find a way to use it, and that they will be signaling to other states to do the same. Now I disagree with this notion for one reason in particular, I don’t disagree with the idea that the state will find a way to use the army. I just argue the necessity for a standing army because if an evil country that wishes to take over other states has an army and you do not the evil country will have the means to do whatever they see fit. Each state needs a standing army for the soul purpose of dissuading other states from engaging in warfare, it is the idea of mutually shared destruction. One state doesn’t destroy you because they know you will take them down with you.

Now for his even more interesting idea, Immanuel Kant was rather confident that while war was evil and needs to be ended, he seems to believe that it was a necessity at some point. This is because he believes that nature itself pushes man to go to war with each other. The reason for this is so that mankind will populate the entirety of the earth. Kant wrote about how one thing that war accomplishes is pushing groups of people out of their preferred habitations and into more harsher areas of the world that they would not go if they were not in danger of being destroyed by and opposing army. He cites groups of people that speak similar languages but are in completely different places as the reasoning and proof for his belief. I find this theory of his to be rather interesting mainly because it seems as way that one might justify war as being more than a horrendous act. This is why I was really surprised to hear Kant talk about this, but I guess that philosophers will still believe in things that they despise.

The main part of *Perpetual Peace* is Kant explaining what must be done in order for the world to finally come to a “perpetual peace.” He goes over lists of rules and guidelines that must be followed; you can tell that this is someone who wants all war to come to an end. Another one of his guidelines is that we have to stop glorifying war. In this way he refers both the Americas and the Europeans as savage countries. This is because of the tendencies that both of the countries always seem to find themselves in wars of some kind. Part of the reason he believes this is because the fact that both of them are very firm about having a powerful military force. It also doesn’t help that Europe doesn’t have the cleanest record on invading other countries. It is also that glorifying war and combat is pretty common in our cultures. This is something that Kant states as another problem that is stopping us from reaching a perpetual peace. He believes war to be a very tragic thing and he seems to blame a decent part of it with how we view combat as an honorable action. We honor things such as war and like to glorify it in our stories and culture. He isn’t really wrong here, though I do believe that he doesn’t give enough respect to those who do fight for the country, especially those who are doing so to preserve their country or other countries freedoms. I can agree on the other hand that we tend to over glorify war and combat, though I am not sure what can really be done about it. If you look at our entertainment and news you’ll notice that we seem to really enjoy violent things, it’s just part of our nature.