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But, it does not have direct definitions. Is it true that civil wars do not just happen but are preceded by multiple and varied signals? Also, why do people choose to go to war instead of taking other peaceful measures to resolve conflict?

While Buddhism is less associated with religious warfare than both polytheistic and monotheistic religions, some exceptions exist such as in southern Thailand where the killing of a Buddhist monk is considered such a sacrilege as to prompt a furious call for immediate killing of the murderer.

However, in an area such as that, the Buddhists have been the minority and fear for their lives from militant Muslims. As co-editor of the book, "Buddhist Warfare" he said that, "Buddhism differs in that the act of killing is less the focus than the 'intention' behind the killing" and "The first thing to remember is that people have a penchant for violence, it just so happens that every religion has people in it.

It appears to me that to classify a war as one type or another, one must evaluate objectives of both warring parties. For example the American Indians fought for food and water which required land. The English fought for resources, land, and economic gain. So the Indians fought for survival while the aggressor fought for economic gain, along with egocentric ideas regarding religion and culture. The Indians did not fight for land.

Most had no idea of the concept of owning land until the English introduced it. Wow this is very nice. U have expanded my research capacity. I have a lot to gain here.

Thank you very much. Example B.? War on Terror - Began in Afghanistan A commom mistake. Seems to me that all the 8 reasons are associated one way or another with ownership of one thing or another, which can be said to be due to ignorance?

Philosophically, how can one own what one did not create? No human created the universe. How can human own parts of the universe? One of the most prevalent aggressors of war against others for over 1, years is missing. That would be Islamic wars against everyone else. Islamic warring is now in the form of terrorism worldwide and can be categorized under several of the eight reasons for war that are mentioned; Economic Gain is a primary reason for Islamic warring along with Territorial Gain, both of which are claimed to be for the purpose of Religion as well as a form of Nationalism as Muslims strive for everyone to be under the same Islamic rule.

Civil War has been a factor of Islamic warring as different factions of Muslims war over which faction should be in control. Revolutionary War is how Islam describes turning a nation that has been taken over by Muslims also take over the nation. Defensive War on Islam is mostly due to others defending themselves from Islamic aggression or defense of one Islamic faction against another.

Missed one in the list. There is a common term for it: when a country has a pact with a country that it will go to war against a given third country if it is attacked. I will be referring to this again thank you for your hard work. Thx I had to wright speech, I chose to Wright about war and this is probably the most helpful website by far. Thank you, this an a great source for an essay I am writing in my Honors World History class!

Thank you for the information. This will help me get back into harvard which I lost my scholarship to when I called a ginger a cheezit and she got
me expelled from my high school. I am currently working on an essay about the effects of war and needed some background information about the main causes for armed conflict. This article has been a great help, thanks!

This article really helped me a lot it was just something I was looking for and I think this could help a lot of other students to that need help with the subject. War is started because it exists. It exists because humanity exists.

No other beings that we know of kill their own kind like we do, and its because of having intelligence, souls, and opinions. As long as opinions exist, there will always be conflict. The only reason we go to war is to pay back and give money to the backers of all the people that are in Washington DC so they can put money in their pockets and who cares about how many young people you kill that's it there's no philosophy here.

Nice and easy. Psychology can answer this question a bit. Human beings have ego, some a bit higher and they want to dominate others and that's their way of showing they are more powerful. A sort of animalistic trait though.

When this combines with materialistic needs greed wars happen. I see a common thread of one wanting to have some kind of power over another running through the multiple reasons for war. I like the examples you use for the different types of war. See 82 more comments. Other product and company names shown may be trademarks of their respective owners.

HubPages and Hubbers authors may earn revenue on this page based on affiliate relationships and advertisements with partners including Amazon, Google, and others. HubPages Inc, a part of Maven Inc. As a user in the EEA, your approval is needed on a few things. To provide a better website experience, owlcation. Please choose which areas of our service you consent to our doing so.

Paul Goodman more. What Is a War? According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "war" is defined as A state of armed conflict between different countries or different groups within a country. A state of competition or hostility between different people or groups. A sustained campaign against an undesirable situation or activity.

What Is the Cause of Conflict? Economic Gain Often wars are caused by one country's wish to take control of another country's wealth. These wars led to the establishment of British colonial rule in India, which gave Britain unrestricted access to exotic and valuable resources native to the Indian continent. Territorial Gain A country might decide that it needs more land, either for living space, agricultural use, or other purposes.

Proxy wars were particularly common during the Cold War. The U. Serbo-Bulgarian War — Bulgaria and Serbia fought over a small border town after the river creating the border between the countries moved.

Religious Religious conflicts often have very deep roots. The aim of crusaders was to expel Islam and spread Christianity. The wars were fought between the orthodox Catholic and Muslim populations of former Yugoslavia. Second Sudanese Civil War — This ethnoreligious war was caused by the Muslim central government's choice to impose sharia law on non-muslim southerners. Nationalism Nationalism in this context essentially means attempting to prove that your country is superior to another by violent subjugation.

In his essay " Most wars are not fought for reasons of security or material interests, but instead reflect a nation's spirit ," he writes: [Literature on war and its causes] assumes security is the principal motive of states and insecurity the major cause of war. World War I — Extreme loyalty and patriotism caused many countries to become involved in the first world war. Many pre-war Europeans believed in the cultural, economic and military supremacy of their nation.

Revenge Seeking to punish, redress a grievance, or simply strike back for a perceived slight can often be a factor in the waging of war. Bush to initiate a war on terror.

This global war began with an invasion of Iraq and is ongoing. Civil War These generally take place when there is sharp internal disagreement within a country. Revolutionary War These occur when a large section of the population of a country revolts against the individual or group that rules the country because they are dissatisfied with their leadership. Revolutionary wars can easily descend into civil wars.

French Revolution — The French Revolution was a battle that represented the rise of the bourgeoisie and the downfall of the aristocracy in France. Haitian Revolution — The Haitian Revolution was a successful slave rebellion that established Haiti as the first free black republic. The war was controversial as the allegations made about the weapons of mass destruction made by the US and UK were shown to lack substance.

Question: What causes war? Answer: There is a multitude of causes of war, and they can only be learned through an extensive study of human history.

Helpful Question: Why do some people believe that war is a good thing? Answer: In the modern age, people rarely think that war is good, but often they can see it as necessary.

Answer: It really depends what you mean by "solve". Answer: Nobody knows for sure. Answer: The roots of the Napoleonic wars lie in the French Revolution. Answer: The different types of war include civil wars, revolutionary wars, wars to achieve economic gain or capture territory, wars of revenge, religious wars, nationalistic wars, defensive or preemptive wars. Answer: A "buffer zone" in this context is a neutral area, the purpose of which is to keep apart hostile forces or nations.

Answer: War is a state of armed conflict between two or more countries or groups within a country. Answer: Although wars are typically fought between two or more armies, that is not always the case. Answer: It depends on the political system that the leader operates in, but in most cases, the answer is yes.

Answer: There are many potential reasons, including competition over territory and resources, historical rivalries and grievances, and in self
defense against an aggressor or a perceived potential aggressor. Answer: Wars are usually destructive, causing loss of life and damage in many other ways. Answer: Wars don't usually come out of nowhere. Answer: Wars have numerous different purposes.

Political Science. I hate that there is war!! I believe that almost all initiation of force in war has one objective in mind: Theft. Great information! Very helpful for my tutoring assignment! Hi, This is nice information and this information is helpful. Thank you so much. Weren't religion, money, and power the main reasons that war ever happened.

Thank for this website I research what I want for course work. This is sooo great because I'm doing an essay right now and it's been such a great help. I agree my teacher had set a task to do and this was helpful in many ways.

I like your writing and it helped me a lot thank you very much. Sign In Join. The same body of magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given themselves in quality of legislators.

They may plunder the state by their general determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions. The whole power is here united in one body; and though there is no external pomp that indicates a despotic sway, yet the people feel the effects of it every moment.

Hence it is that many of the princes of Europe, whose aim has been levelled at arbitrary power, have constantly set out with uniting in their own persons, all the branches of magistracy, and all the great offices of state. The executive power ought to be in the hands of a monarch; because this branch of government, which has always need of expedition, is better administered by one than by many. Whereas, whatever depends on the legislative power, is oftentimes better regulated by many than by a single person.

But if there was no monarch, and the executive power was committed to a certain number of persons selected from the legislative body, there would be an end then of liberty; by reason the two powers would be united, as the same persons would actually sometimes have, and would moreover be always able to have, a share in both.

Were the legislative body to be a considerable time without meeting, this would likewise put an end to liberty. For one of these two things would naturally follow, either that there would be no longer any legislative resolutions, and then the state would fall into anarchy, or that these resolutions would be taken by the executive power, which would render it absolute. It would be needless for the legislative body to continue always assembled. This would be troublesome to the representatives, and moreover would cut out too much work for the executive power, so as to take off its attention from executing, and obliges it to think only of defending its own prerogatives, and the right it has to execute.

Again, were the legislative body to be always assembled, it might happen to be kept up only by filling the places of the deceased members with new representatives; and in that case, if the legislative body was once corrupted, the evil would be past all remedy. When different legislative bodies succeed one another, the people who have a bad opinion of that which is actually sitting, may reasonably entertain some hopes of the next: But were it to be always the same body, the people, upon seeing it once corrupted, would no longer expect any good from its laws; and of course they would either become desperate, or fall into a state of indolence.

The legislative body should not assemble of itself. For a body is supposed to have no will but when it is assembled; and besides, were it not to assemble unanimously, it would be impossible to determine which was really the legislative body, the part assembled, or the other. And if it had a right to prorogue itself, it might happen never to be prorogued; which would be extremely dangerous, in case it should ever attempt to encroach on the executive power.

Besides, there are seasons, some of which are more proper than others, for assembling the legislative body: It is fit therefore that the executive power should regulate the time of convening, as well as the duration of those assemblies, according to the circumstances and exigencies of state known to itself. Were the executive power not to have a right of putting a stop to the encroachments of the legislative body, the latter would become despotic; for as it might arrogate to itself what authority it pleased, it would soon destroy all the other powers.

But it is not proper, on the other hand, that the legislative power should have a right to stop the executive. For as the execution has its natural limits, it is useless to confine it; besides, the executive power is generally employed in momentary operations. The power therefore of the Roman tribunes was faulty, as it put a stop not only to the legislation, but likewise to the execution itself, which was attended with infinite mischiefs. But if the legislative power in a free government ought to have no right to stop the executive, it has a right, and ought to have the means of examining in what manner its laws have been executed; an advantage which this government has over that of Crete and Sparta, where the Cosmi and the Ephori gave no account of their administration.

But whatever may be the issue of that examination, the legislative body ought not to have a power of judging the person, nor of course the conduct of him who is intrusted with the executive power.

His person should be sacred, because as it is necessary for the good of the state to prevent the legislative body from rendering themselves arbitrary, the moment he is accused or tried, there is an end of liberty. To obtain this end, there are only two ways, either that the persons employed in the army, should have sufficient property to answer for their conduct to their fellow subjects, and be enlisted only for a year, as customary at Rome: Or if there should be a standing army, composed chiefly of the most despicable part of the nation, the legislative power should have a right to dishanm them as soon as it pleased; the soldiers should live in common with the rest of the people; and no separate camp, barracks, or fortress, should be suffered.

From a manner of thinking that prevails amongst mankind, they set a higher value upon courage than timorousness, on activity than prudence, on strength than counsel. Hence, the army will ever despise a senate, and respect their own officers. So that as soon as the army depends on the legislative body, the government becomes a military one; and if the contrary has ever happened, it has been owing to some extraordinary
It is because the army was always kept divided; it is because it was composed of several bodies, that depended each on their particular province; it is because the capital towns were strong places, defended by their natural situation, and not garrisoned with regular troops. Holland, for instance, is still safer than Venice; she might drown, or starve the revolted troops; for as they are not quartered in towns capable of furnishing them with necessary subsistence, this subsistence is of course precarious.

Whoever shall read the admirable treatise of Tacitus on the manners of the Germans, will find that it is from them the English have borrowed the idea of their political government.

This beautiful system was invented first in the woods. As all human things have an end, the state we are speaking of will lose its liberty, it will perish. Have not Rome, Sparta, and Carthage perished?
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Certain types of war, for example, a “defensive” war, might be fought with the desired outcome being peace. However, most wars are fought with the intention of beating the enemy and effectively imposing peace on the victor’s terms.

The Crusades actually fall under defensive wars. The primary goal was to curb Islamic raids on villages in eastern European towns. Well written, easy to understand, and great examples. Very clear, understandable and to the point, which can be challenging to some that write about History!

Thank you!!! I’ve referred back to this website several times already!! The list goes on, but the objective is always the same As for the Iraqi Conflict being a “defensive” war, it was just the theft of oil. Hi I’m a fifth grader and completely over 10 thank you. This info really helped me with my assignment!

I think this is really good for note taking in a history class. But, it does not have direct definitions. Is it true that civil wars do not just happen but are preceded by multiple and varied signals? Also, why do people choose to go to war instead of taking other peaceful measures to resolve conflict?

While Buddhism is less associated with religious warfare than both polytheistic and monotheistic religions, some exceptions exist such as in southern Thailand where the killing of a Buddhist monk is considered such a sacrilege as to prompt a furious call for immediate killing of the murderer.

However, in an area such as that, the Buddhists have been the minority and fear for their lives from militant Muslims. As co-editor of the book, "Buddhist Warfare" he said that, "Buddhism differs in that the act of killing is less the focus than the 'intention' behind the killing" and "The first thing to remember is that people have a penchant for violence, it just so happens that every religion has people in it.

It appears to me that to classify a war as one type or another, one must evaluate objectives of both warring parties. For example the American Indians fought for food and water which required land.

The English fought for resources, land, and economic gain. So the Indians fought for survival while the aggressor fought for economic gain, along with egocentric ideas regarding religion and culture.

The Indians did not fight for land. Most had no idea of the concept of owning land until the English introduced it. Wow this is very nice. U have expanded my research capacity. I have a lot to gain here. Thank you very much. Example B.? War on Terror - Began in Afghanistan A commom mistake.

Seems to me that all the 8 reasons are associated one way or another with ownership of one thing or another, which can be said to be due to ignorance? Philosophically, how can one own what one did not create? No human created the universe. How can human own parts of the universe? One of the most prevalent aggressors of war against others for over 1, years is missing. That would be Islamic wars against everyone else.

Islamic warring is now in the form of terrorism worldwide and can be categorized under several of the eight reasons for war that are mentioned; Economic Gain is a primary reason for Islamic warring along with Territorial Gain, both of which are claimed to be for the purpose of Religion as well as a form of Nationalism as Muslims strive for everyone to be under the same Islamic rule.
Civil War has been a factor of Islamic warring as different factions of Muslims war over which faction should be in control. Revolutionary War is how Islam describes turning a nation that has been taken over by Muslims also take over the nation.

Defensive War on Islam is mostly due to others defending themselves from Islamic aggression or defense of one Islamic faction against another. Missed one in the list. There is a common term for it: when a country has a pact with a country that it will go to war against a given third country if it is attacked. I will be referring to this again thank you for your hard work.


As long as opinions exist, there will always be conflict. The only reason we go to war is to pay back and give money to the backers of all the people that are in Washington DC so they can put money in their pockets and who cares about how many young people you kill that's it there's no philosophy here. Nice and easy. Psychology can answer this question a bit. Human beings have ego, some a bit higher and they want to dominate others and that's their way of showing they are more powerful.

A sort of animalistic trait though. When this combines with materialistic needs greed wars happen. I see a common thread of one wanting to have some kind of power over another running through the multiple reasons for war. I like the examples you use for the different types of war.

See 82 more comments. Other product and company names shown may be trademarks of their respective owners. HubPages and Hubbers authors may earn revenue on this page based on affiliate relationships and advertisements with partners including Amazon, Google, and others. HubPages Inc, a part of Maven Inc.

As a user in the EEA, your approval is needed on a few things. To provide a better website experience, owlcation.

Please choose which areas of our service you consent to our doing so. Paul Goodman more. What Is a War? According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "war" is defined as A state of armed conflict between different countries or different groups within a country. A state of competition or hostility between different people or groups. A sustained campaign against an undesirable situation or activity. What Is the Cause of Conflict?

Economic Gain Often wars are caused by one country's wish to take control of another country's wealth. These wars led to the establishment of British colonial rule in India, which gave Britain unrestricted access to exotic and valuable resources native to the Indian continent.

Territorial Gain A country might decide that it needs more land, either for living space, agricultural use, or other purposes. Proxy wars were particularly common during the Cold War. The U. Serbo-Bulgarian War — Bulgaria and Serbia fought over a small border town after the river creating the border between the countries moved. Religion Religious conflicts often have very deep roots.

The aim of crusaders was to expel Islam and spread Christianity. The wars were fought between the orthodox Catholic and Muslim populations of former Yugoslavia. Second Sudanese Civil War — This ethnoreligious war was caused by the Muslim central government's choice to impose sharia law on non-Muslim southerners. Nationalism Nationalism in this context essentially means attempting to prove that your country is superior to another by violent subjugation.

In his essay "Most wars are not fought for reasons of security or material interests, but instead reflect a nation's spirit," he writes: "[Literature on war and its causes] assumes security is the principal motive of states and insecurity the major cause of war. World War I — Extreme loyalty and patriotism caused many countries to become involved in the first world war. Many pre-war Europeans believed in the cultural, economic and military supremacy of their nation.

Revenge Seeking to punish, redress a grievance, or simply strike back for a perceived slight can often be a factor in the waging of war. Bush to initiate a war on terror. This global war began with an invasion of Iraq and is ongoing. Civil War These generally take place when there is sharp internal disagreement within a country. Revolutionary War These occur when a large section of the population of a country revolts against the individual or group that rules the country because they are dissatisfied with their leadership.

Revolutionary wars can easily descend into civil wars. French Revolution — The French Revolution was a battle that represented the rise of the bourgeoisie and the downfall of the aristocracy in France.

Haitian Revolution — The Haitian Revolution was a successful slave rebellion that established Haiti as the first free black republic. The war was controversial as the allegations made about the weapons of mass destruction made by the US and UK were shown to lack substance. Question: What causes war? Answer: There is a multitude of causes of war, and they can only be learned through an extensive study of human history. Helpful Question: Why do some people believe that war is a good thing?

Answer: In the modern age, people rarely think that war is good, but often they can see it as necessary. Answer: It really depends what you mean by "solve". Answer: Nobody knows for sure. Answer: The roots of the Napoleonic wars lie in the French Revolution. Answer: The different types
of war include civil wars, revolutionary wars, wars to achieve economic gain or capture territory, wars of revenge, religious wars, nationalistic wars, defensive or preemptive wars.

Answer: A "buffer zone" in this context is a neutral area, the purpose of which is to keep apart hostile forces or nations. Answer: War is a state of armed conflict between two or more countries or groups within a country. Answer: Although wars are typically fought between two or more armies, that is not always the case.

Answer: It depends on the political system that the leader operates in, but in most cases, the answer is yes. Answer: There are many potential reasons, including competition over territory and resources, historical rivalries and grievances, and in self-defense against an aggressor or a perceived potential aggressor. Answer: Wars are usually destructive, causing loss of life and damage in many other ways.

Answer: Wars don't usually come out of nowhere. When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner. Again, there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers.

Were they joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for the judge would then be the legislator.

Were they joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with all the violence of an oppressor. There would be an end of every thing were the same man, or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people to exercise those three powers that of enacting laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and that of judging the crimes or differences of individuals. Most kingdoms in Europe enjoy a moderate government, because the prince, who is invested with the two first powers, leaves the third to his subjects.

In Turkey, where these three powers are united in the sultan's person the subjects groan under the weight of a most frightful oppression. In the republics of Italy, where these three powers are united, there is less liberty than in our monarchies. Hence their government is obliged to have recourse to as violent methods for its support, as even that of the Turks witness the state inquisitors, and the lion's mouth into which every informer may at all hours throw his written accusations.

What a situation must the poor subject be in, under those republics! The same body of magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given themselves in quality of legislators.

They may plunder the state by their general determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions. The whole power is here united in one body; and though there is no external pomp that indicates a despotic sway, yet the people feel the effects of it every moment.

Hence it is that many of the princes of Europe, whose aim has been levelled at arbitrary power, have constantly set out with uniting in their own persons, all the branches of magistracy, and all the great offices of state.

The executive power ought to be in the hands of a monarch; because this branch of government, which has always need of expedition, is better administered by one than by many. Whereas, whatever depends on the legislative power, is oftentimes better regulated by many than by a single person. But if there was no monarch, and the executive power was committed to a certain number of persons selected from the legislative body, there would be an end then of liberty; by reason the two powers would be united, as the same persons would actually sometimes have, and would moreover be always able to have, a share in both.

Were the legislative body to be a considerable time without meeting, this would likewise put an end to liberty. For one of these two things would naturally follow; either that there would be no longer any legislative resolutions, and then the state would fall into anarchy; or that these resolutions would be taken by the executive power, which would render it absolute.

It would be needless for the legislative body to continue always assembled. This would be troublesome to the representatives, and moreover would cut out too much work for the executive power, so as to take off its attention from executing, and oblige it to think only of defending its own prerogatives, and the right it has to execute.

Again, were the legislative body to be always assembled, it might happen to be kept up only by filling the places of the deceased members with new representatives; and in that case, if the legislative body was once corrupted, the evil would be past all remedy. When different legislative bodies succeed one another, the people who have a bad opinion of that which is actually sitting, may reasonably entertain some hopes of the next: But were it to be always the same body, the people, upon seeing it once corrupted, would no longer expect any good from its laws; and of course they would either become desperate, or fall into a state of indolence.

The legislative body should not assemble of itself. For a body is supposed to have no will but when it is assembled; and besides, were it not to assemble unanimously, it would be impossible to determine which was really the legislative body, the part assembled, or the other. And if it had a right to prorogue itself, it might happen never to be prorogued; which would be extremely dangerous, in case it should ever attempt to encroach on the executive power.

Besides, there are seasons, some of which are more proper than others, for assembling the legislative body. It is fit therefore that the executive power should regulate the time of convening, as well as the duration of those assemblies, according to the circumstances and exigencies of state known to itself.

Were the executive power not to have a right of putting a stop to the encroachments of the legislative body, the latter would become despotic; for...
as it might arrogate to itself what authority it pleased, it would soon destroy all the other powers. But it is not proper, on the other hand, that the legislative power should have a right to stop the executive.

For as the execution has its natural limits, it is useless to confine it; besides, the executive power is generally employed in momentary operations. The power therefore of the Roman tribunes was faulty, as it put a stop not only to the legislation, but likewise to the execution itself, which was attended with infinite mischief.

But if the legislative power in a free government ought to have no right to stop the executive, it has a right, and ought to have the means of examining in what manner its laws have been executed; an advantage which this government has over that of Crete and Sparta, where the Cosmi and the Ephori gave no account of their administration.

But whatever may be the issue of that examination, the legislative body ought not to have a power of judging the person, nor of course the conduct of him who is intrusted with the executive power. His person should be sacred, because as it is necessary for the good of the state to prevent the legislative body from rendering themselves arbitrary, the moment he is accused or tried, there is an end of liberty.