

In war, ethical considerations come second to the imperatives of strategy and military tactics. Discuss.

War, a perennial aspect of human existence, has left an indelible mark on the trajectory of civilizations, molding societies and reshaping the destiny of nations. This multifaceted phenomenon transcends mere military conflict, encompassing intricate layers of political intrigue, social dynamics, economic ramifications, and, inevitably, ethical considerations. The very nature of war prompts a profound examination of the moral implications entwined with armed conflict. As military leaders and commanders navigate the complexities of warfare, their decisions become the focal point of a rigorous debate on the prioritization of ethical considerations vis-à-vis strategic imperatives. The crux of this discourse lies in discerning whether the imperatives of strategy and military tactics take precedence over ethical norms, a question that delves deep into historical narratives, theoretical frameworks, and the moral foundations that underpin human conduct in times of conflict.

To initiate this exploration, it is paramount to draw upon foundational concepts elucidated by military theorist Carl von Clausewitz. His seminal work "On War" provides insights into the dichotomy between the lawful engagement in warfare with defined rules and limitations and the illicit actions of those who operate beyond such constraints.¹ Clausewitz's distinctions lay the groundwork for understanding the inherent tension between ethical considerations and the imperatives of military strategy. This examination is further enriched by the perspectives of Quincy Wright, whose work on "Definitions of War" adds depth to the nuanced understanding of the ethical dimensions of armed conflict.² The ensuing discourse will unravel the intricate layers of the moral dilemma within the context of war, shedding light on the

¹ John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, (London: Pimlico, 1993), pp.3-60.

² Quincy Wright, *Definitions of War* in Lawrence Freedman, ed. *War* (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.69-70.

dynamic interplay between ethical considerations and the imperatives that drive military decision-making.

The moral dilemma surrounding war, particularly the tension between ethical considerations and strategic imperatives, finds its roots in the foundational concepts of the renowned military theorist Carl von Clausewitz. In his seminal work "On War," Clausewitz introduced a critical distinction between the lawful bearer of arms engaged in warfare within established rules and limitations and the brigand, who operates outside these constraints.¹ This dichotomy forms the basis for understanding the intricate relationship between ethical considerations and military imperatives during times of conflict.

Clausewitz's framework recognizes the inherent violence associated with war but underscores the significance of defining limits and rules to maintain a degree of ethical conduct on the battlefield. The notion of a lawful bearer of arms implies a recognition of rules that govern armed conflict, reflecting an attempt to mitigate the brutality of war. This perspective provides a theoretical foundation for military actions guided by principles that seek to strike a delicate balance between the necessity of achieving strategic objectives and upholding ethical norms. By acknowledging the existence of rules in war, Clausewitz opens the door to a nuanced exploration of how ethical considerations can coexist with the imperatives of military strategy.

This Clausewitzian perspective becomes particularly relevant when examining historical and contemporary instances of warfare. It prompts an examination of the ways in which military leaders grapple with ethical dilemmas in their decision-making processes, emphasizing the need for a thoughtful and principled approach to achieving strategic goals without compromising fundamental ethical principles. The tension between ethics and strategy, as illuminated by

¹ John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, (London: Pimlico, 1993), pp.3-60.

Clausewitz, serves as a starting point for a comprehensive analysis of the moral dimensions inherent in the conduct of war.

In the exploration of the moral dilemma of war and the intricate interplay between ethical considerations and strategic imperatives, Quincy Wright's contribution becomes significant. Building upon the foundational insights of Clausewitz, Wright's article, "Definitions of War," delves into various perspectives on the nature of warfare. His analysis, particularly focusing on attitudes toward war, provides a valuable lens through which scholars and practitioners can scrutinize the ethical dimensions of armed conflict.² By expanding the discourse on the definitions of war, Wright contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the complexities inherent in the ethical decision-making processes of military leaders. This, in turn, enriches the ongoing dialogue surrounding the ethical considerations that commanders must grapple with when formulating and executing strategic objectives in times of war.

Martin Ceadel's categorization of attitudes toward war offers a valuable framework for comprehending the multifaceted nature of the moral dilemma in the context of armed conflict. Ceadel's five stances—pacifism, pacificism, defencism, crusading, and militarism—provide a structured taxonomy that captures the diverse ways individuals and societies approach the ethical dimensions of war.³ Pacifism represents a viewpoint that deems war as inherently evil, advocating for its outright rejection. Pacificism, on the other hand, perceives war as a phenomenon to be avoided, reflecting a cautious approach to armed conflict. Defencism acknowledges the necessity of defending vital interests, introducing a pragmatic element to ethical considerations in the face of external threats. Crusading involves the active pursuit of protecting and imposing values through war, while militarism views war as a social good.

² Quincy Wright, *Definitions of War* in Lawrence Freedman, ed. War (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.69-70.

³ Adrian Gregory, *The Last Great War*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp.37-9. D.

This categorization serves as a valuable tool for analyzing the ethical considerations in war, allowing for a nuanced examination of how different attitudes may shape strategic imperatives. As individuals, military leaders, and societies adopt distinct stances from Ceadel's framework, the interplay between ethical considerations and strategic imperatives becomes apparent. By applying this taxonomy to historical examples, researchers can gain insights into the complexities of decision-making during times of war, offering a comprehensive understanding of the moral dilemmas faced by those involved in armed conflict. The spectrum of attitudes identified by Ceadel provides a lens through which to explore how ethical considerations are navigated and sometimes subordinated to strategic goals in various historical contexts.

The bureaucratization of force, as elucidated by Christopher Dandeker, adds a nuanced dimension to the moral dilemma of war by examining the transformation of military structures and the consequential impact on ethical considerations. Dandeker's insights, as presented in his work "War and the Military Establishment," delve into how the bureaucratic apparatus influences military strategy. ⁴ By understanding the bureaucratization of force, we gain valuable perspectives on how institutional structures and decision-making processes within the military hierarchy shape the ethical framework within which strategic imperatives are pursued. This conceptual framework becomes crucial in assessing the moral challenges faced by military leaders as they navigate the intricate balance between achieving tactical objectives and adhering to ethical norms.

Furthermore, the evolution of military cohesion and the motivations driving soldiers to engage in armed conflict, as discussed by Lester Mason in his lecture on military cohesion,

⁴ Christopher Dandeker, *War and the Military Establishment in Lawrence Freedman*, ed. War (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.109-11.

presents another layer to the ethical discourse surrounding war.⁵ Mason's exploration underscores the interconnectedness of effective leadership, firepower, patriotism, and morale in the context of armed conflict. The examination of military cohesion offers valuable insights into how the human element influences the ethical considerations within the broader strategic context. As military leaders grapple with the moral dilemmas of war, understanding the intricacies of military cohesion becomes imperative for comprehending the ethical challenges faced by those responsible for making critical decisions in the pursuit of strategic goals.

In the context of the moral dilemma of war, historical case studies serve as poignant illustrations of the intricate relationship between ethical considerations and strategic imperatives. One such compelling example is the aerial bombardment of civilian cities during World War II. The decision-making process behind these strategic choices, notably the bombing raids on cities like Dresden and Hiroshima, highlights the profound ethical questions that arise in the midst of armed conflict. The imperative to expedite the end of hostilities and achieve strategic goals clashed with the moral obligation to safeguard non-combatants, creating a complex ethical landscape for military commanders.¹

The bombing raids on Dresden and Hiroshima epitomize the ethical dilemmas faced by military leaders during World War II. The ethical considerations were often subordinated to the exigencies of war, as commanders grappled with the challenging decision to sacrifice innocent civilians for perceived military objectives. Drawing upon the insights of military historian John Keegan, who expounds on the nature of warfare, the principles of Clausewitz, and Martin Ceadel's categorization of attitudes toward war, one can discern the complex interplay between

⁵ HPHI 4901 - Lecture 9 November 29, 2023. 4 views. Lester Mason.

¹ John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, (London: Pimlico, 1993), pp.3-60.

ethical concerns and strategic imperatives.² The case of World War II's aerial bombardments serves as a poignant reminder of the ethical challenges inherent in wartime decision-making.

The historical case study approach allows for a nuanced examination of the moral dilemmas faced by military commanders. It provides an opportunity to delve into the intricacies of decision-making under the pressures of war and to assess how ethical considerations are weighed against strategic imperatives. By analyzing the events of World War II through the lenses of renowned military theorists and scholars, a deeper understanding emerges regarding the complexities that arise when ethical norms collide with the practical necessities of achieving military objectives.³ This historical perspective contributes valuable insights to the ongoing discourse on the ethical dimensions of warfare and the moral responsibilities of those tasked with making crucial decisions in the heat of battle.

The Vietnam War serves as a compelling case study that vividly illustrates the moral dilemmas arising from the intersection of military cohesion, strategic imperatives, and ethical considerations. Lester Mason's lecture on military cohesion, delving into the importance of effective leadership and the motivations propelling soldiers into battle, provides valuable insights into the human dynamics of warfare.⁵ This lens allows us to appreciate the intricate interplay between the psychological aspects of military engagement and the ethical challenges faced by commanders.

Christopher Dandeker's exploration of the bureaucratization of force adds another layer to our understanding of the Vietnam War's complexities. The structural elements shaping military

² Quincy Wright, *Definitions of War* in Lawrence Freedman, ed. *War* (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.69-70.

³ Adrian Gregory, *The Last Great War*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp.37-9. D.

⁵ HPHI 4901 - Lecture 9 November 29, 2023. 4 views. Lester Mason.

strategy during this conflict, as outlined by Dandeker, highlight the institutional constraints and challenges faced by military leaders in navigating the ethical dimensions of armed conflict.⁴ The Vietnam War thus emerges as a nuanced study of the ethical considerations subordinated to strategic imperatives, underscoring the difficult choices commanders had to make in balancing military necessity with moral responsibility. This historical analysis provides a rich context for examining the broader moral dilemma of war, shedding light on the intricate relationships between military exigencies, ethical considerations, and the societal framework within which armed conflicts unfold.

In conclusion, the exploration of the moral dilemma of war, specifically the delicate balance between ethical considerations and strategic imperatives, underscores the complexity inherent in decision-making during armed conflicts. The foundational concepts of Clausewitz, emphasizing the need for rules and limitations even in the chaos of warfare, set the stage for understanding the intricate relationship between ethics and military strategy. Quincy Wright's definitions of war, Martin Ceadel's categorization of attitudes, and the insights into the bureaucratization of force contribute to a nuanced comprehension of the ethical dimensions of war, revealing the various perspectives that individuals and societies may adopt in the face of armed conflict.

The scrutiny of historical case studies, particularly the aerial bombardment of civilian cities during World War II and the Vietnam War, acts as a poignant reminder of the ethical quandaries faced by military leaders. These instances underscore the complex interplay between strategic imperatives and ethical considerations in the decision-making process during armed conflicts. The deliberate targeting of civilian populations in pursuit of strategic goals presents a stark

⁴ Christopher Dandeker, *War and the Military Establishment in Lawrence Freedman, ed. War* (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.109-11.

illustration of the moral dilemmas confronted by commanders. The examination of such historical episodes illuminates the enduring tension between achieving military objectives, which often demands ethically challenging decisions, and the imperative to adhere to ethical norms that safeguard the well-being of non-combatants. This recurrent theme throughout the annals of warfare highlights the perennial struggle military leaders face when navigating the intricate landscape of ethical considerations in the pursuit of strategic success.

This understanding is not only vital for enriching scholarly discussions on the nature of war but also for emphasizing the moral responsibilities entwined with decisions made in the crucible of battle. Fostering meaningful discussions on these ethical considerations is not only an academic pursuit but a practical necessity for shaping the future discourse on war. Such discussions play a pivotal role in guiding the actions of military leaders entrusted with making arduous decisions on the battlefield, reinforcing the importance of ethical considerations in the relentless pursuit of strategic goals.

Bibliography

Keegan, John, *A History of Warfare*, (London: Pimlico, 1993), pp.3-60.

Wright, Quincy, *Definitions of War' in Lawrence Freedman*, ed. War (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.69-70.

Gregory, Adrian, *The Last Great War*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp.37-9. D.

Dandeker, Christopher, *War and the Military Establishment in Lawrence Freedman*, ed. War (Oxford: OUP, 1994), pp.109-11.

HPHI 4901 - Lecture 9 November 29, 2023. 4 views. Mason, Lester.