WARRING TO WARRANT WORLD PEACE: BUDDHIST ETHICS

Arlene Bobadilla, Krittiya Tumtong, Phra Panyarattanakorn (Somruay Pindon), Thawash Homthuanlom and Thanee Suwanprateep
Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University, Thailand.
Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Thailand.
Email arlene_sc14@yahoo.com

Abstract

Warring with "*jus bellum justum*" (justified and necessary wars) will instead fuel retributive extremism and miseries. "*The War to End Wars*" coined by H.G. Wells, Woodrow Wilson, David L. George has thus to be declined. "*Si vis pacem, para bellum* (if you want peace, prepare for war)" is then cautioned by Plato, Renatus, Shi Ji and Rama VI. Buddhist ethics nevertheless believes that apartheid and holocaustic warring discriminates peacefulness. Warring to warrant world peace through Buddhist ethics emerges two kinds of understanding, i.e. first, the *pañca sīla* codes,"*Thou shalt abstain from killing beings*" but authorities like policemen and military armforces exploiting lethal arms for suppressions and battles are justified and not guilty. Second, "*Jus bellum justum*" ethically clashes between duties of abstaining from killing with the duties of national defense, and security from threats. Had war been purposively waged for the national defense through implementing the principle of *Aparihāniyadhamma 7;* it will never decline but enrich prosperity, welfare and common good because in war-defense and security. It is not declaring war but defending oneself from assaults. So, it is imperative to wage wars with one's *taṇhā* (lusts) and *lobha* (greeds); only then morality of each one would at the end warrant world peace.

Introduction

"The war to end wars" or "The war to end all wars" a renowned catchphrase coined by H.G. Wells is a precept for the WWI in 1914 -1918 (BBC, 1998; Rampel, 2003; Wagar, 2004 and). Years later, Woodrow Wilson, the 28th US President (1913-1921) raised an exegesis of "*war to end all wars and make the world safe for democracy*", a dogma that US entry to any wars was to preserve human freedom and peace (Jamieson, 1990). David L. George, a UK politician (1890-1916) has ever stated, "*This war, like the next war, is a war*

to end war." (Stimpson,1952). However, empirically, no wars ever ends war but leads to war-chains for example. WWI followed by WWII, cold wars, sectarian wars, civil wars, apartheid wars and so on like Archibald Wavell, a viceroy of India, sadly remarked during the Paris Peace Conference, that 'war to end war', instead dialoguing 'Peace to end Peace'. (Pagden,2008). The authors believe that no violence can end violence; no worldly wars can end worldly wars, and even those who claim for peace are never be peaceful themselves when they stage protests to claim for peace. For example, Greenpeace groups have to avoid Redpeace of fired bullets. It is likely common today that world peace talks gradually and serpentinely lead to world pieces, schisms and disharmonies.

Buddhist ethics is then an alternative founded on the perspectives of the Lord Buddha and the enlightened beings like the Bodhisattvas emphasize *sīlabhāvanā* (moral development: A.III.106). *Sīlabhāvanā* is a practice of self-restraints and harmony adherent to imbuing nonviolence, but free from imposing harm through leading life of *sīlabhāvanā*, developing conducts, *sīlabhāvanā* training and adherence to discipline, neither mediating nor troubling nor being destructive to others, but happy co-existence with mutual supports. The meaning is warring to ones' lobha (greeds), Dosa (hatred) and Moha (delusion) or lusts while nurturing

harmony; then it is possible to warrant world peace. Buddhism much favored by many nihilistic might be antithetical by Confucianism because Buddhism fountains faith of nothingness rightfully examining self but Confucianism is otherwise emphasizing social roles and self-development (Cultural China 2010-2018). In addition, a new atheist and a Buddhist meditative practitioner, Sam Harris (2006/2010) contends that many Buddhist practitioners inappropriately embrace Buddhism as a religion while criticizing its belief as naive, petitionary, and superstitious which impede dissemination of the Buddhist principles (Dawkins et al., 2010). The Thai societies are recently and currently at the stake of top-boots political ideologies as the neo-red-shirt claims where possible clashes are at near and deepening schism spread to group segregations and they are clouding over the Thai sky (Paritta Wangkiat, 2019). Civil war is then possibly roaring and probably devastates even every grain of the Thai sands. If as such, warring to warrant peace enormously impacts societies and might entail civil wars. Wars would devastate resources, environments and extreme miseries for the war-involvers and neighbors. When Buddhism spread to various regions domestically and internally, monks as the inheritors of the Buddhist ideologies and the spiritual supporters of its believers have to encounter alienated environments and political and cultural situations in particular the situations of warfare catastrophic remnants. It is common and normal that every society encounters conflicts because changes in even the least things in any sides not only lead to political schisms but also are often claimed for the political rights of participation, and of national-resource gains. The most critical thing in the

political changes conventionally leads to conflicts, enmity and opinion clashes among leaders and rulers (Likit Thiravekin, 2009.PP. 59-65). Humans are reciprocal social animals for co-existence reasoned to survival necessity and unity to fight invaders or to dagger those hungering to destroy their tribal descendants. It certainly fuels conflicts and turns to warfare. Due to humans improve their knowledge and ability incorporated with the advancement in sciences and technology; they can invent deadly weapons for killing such as automatic guns, tanks, fighter planes speedier than sound waves, atomic bombs and informal warfare as terrorism using biochemical weapons, acid rains, sarin gas and so many and many more.

Whenever conflicts arise, ones are demanded to find the end and not the causes and it is the duty of all to seek ways to create peace for this globe through (1) it demands the international, regional and local cooperation and at least alleviates conflicts and clashes. (2) It needs to implant tides of thought to secure peace, propagates ideology of peace and resists all types of violence. (3) It is imperative to encourage nations to accept diverse conflicts among races, religions and cultures; basically, it comes from rejections of ideas or barring others because they think that their own are the best and rejecting other differences. Finally, (4) it needs to adopt and abide in the Buddhist doctrines a religion creating social norms for social peacefulness. As such, religions become important to the world identifying the values of peace. With the belief of war is to end 73 types of war and the possibility of peace is to end peace; this article is aimed to analyze whether it is justified warring to warrant world peace based on Buddhist ethics and its paradox if any. Toulmin argument and discourse analysis method will be employed to clarify this para-Gordian Knots. Benefits of the finding would awaken societies that religions share both societal prosperities and miseries. Religions cannot disregard the common welfare of societies, in particular, Buddhism provides dhamma to war for social goodness and shield household, economy, monks, education the foundation of life advancement, worldly wealth and spiritual enrichment (Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto), 2013, pp.18-21).

Concept of Waging Justified

Cicero, a Roman thinker much influences St. Augustine who recognizes him "The Sage and the Most Rhetoric Person Amid Humanity", says Mattox (2006). St. Augustine not less than 18 times refers Cicero in his work of "City of God" and recognizes Cicero as his leader leading to the philosophical world through his work of "Hortentius" and remarkably the first thinker of the just wars. A doctrine of *jus bellum justum* (the Just War Theory) is focused on traditional and military ethics probed by theologians, ethicists, military masters, political and military policymakers, in particular. It is purposely to ensure whether war is justifiably moral through succession of criteria cohesive to

justness. By criteria, just wars are divided into two groups: "right to go to war" (*jus ad bellum)* and "right conduct war" (*jus in bello*). The former involves morality of going to war, and the latter involves the moral conduct within war. Lately, post just war (*jus post bellum*) has been included as the third type to address its morality on reconstruction and settlement (Guthrie and Quinlan, 2007, pp.11-15).

The concept of fair war has extensively been developed for centuries by many Roman thinkers but the fairest performance is found in the work of Cicero (406 - 500AD). Therefore, John Brinsfield a Chaplain and a professor in Ethics comments that in the 4th Century, the theories of the Roman just wars intervened in every main component. Each of its component is deemed in just cause, just conduct, proper authority, and the intent to establish peace and justice. The just war must then be the last resort. Cicero proposes to separate between the innocent with offense and it must be certain the punishment is proportional to those crimes. All these rules have been exempted only in the case of rebellion, guerrilla warfare, and barbarian wars, says Brinsfield (1991). Cicero prescribes the principle of a just war its causes and its righteous and appropriate actions, to which Bainton (1960) concludes that it is founded on some ancient Roman practices - war will be just when it is staged by the military state that does not pass taking oath and cannot enter office for legitimate function. A state should not stage war with another state without formal declaration of enmity. Treating enemy must be adhered to good faith and able to separate guilt from innocence among the enemies. Any actions of the rulers and people should legitimately follow humane principle because humans have their natures containing excellence and dignity worth respect and honor.

The *jus bellum justum* asserts that war terrors and can be minimized with the right conduct, is not always the worst alternatives but important responsibilities. The undesirable outcomes and brutalities might justify war (Guthrie and Quinlan, 2007, pp.11-15). However, the rivals of *jus bellum justum* might either have tendency to accept a more rigid pacifist standards and do ensure that there has never been and/or can never be a justifiable basis for war (Fiala, 2014) or toward a more permissive nationalist standards and do propose that a justifiable war needs only to serve the national gains (Vinx, 2016). In most cases, philosophers mention that persons need not feel guilty in conscience if it is necessary to fight. Some war philosophers ennoble the military-armforce virtues while fearing wars themselves. For example, oppressive rules could be insurrected, Rousseau argues (McHenry, 2010).

To conclude, the concept of *jus bellum justum* is centered in the state as the powerful organization and legitimacy under the following principles, (1) only the state can declare war. (2) Any war combatants must pass oath taking. (3) War must be staged with pure mind. (4) War waged must not harm the innocent and strictly adhere to humaneness. (5) Warring must be focused on

keeping peace and interest of the state. (6) Warring must be focused on protecting citizens to be free from devastating enemies. (7) Warring must be aimed at safeguarding the state from being devastated by enemies; and (8) culprits must deserve punishing by their deeds. Even so, opponents to war reject the principle but propose more rigid pacifism, warring for national gains, and for the noble virtue of the military arm forces. However, Rousseau coins that retaliating oppressive rules is possible but he never says through either violence or non-violence but comprehensible.

Root of War

Si vis pacem, para bellum (if you want peace, prepare for war) reminds and cautions Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus's tract De Re Militari (4th-5th Century AD), Plato in his *Nomoi* (Laws) translated by R. G.Bury, (1967 and 1968) the Chinese *Shi Ji*. (Ostwald, 2009, p.87) and His Majesty Rama VI, (1911.). Ayn Rand (1966) asserts that humans fear wars because subconsciously and consciously they never reject it instead accept the doctrine influencing present, past and future possible wars. The doctrine is that it is right or practical or necessary for men to reach their goals by means of physical force against other men and that some sort of "good" can legitimize and justify it. It is the doctrine that coercion or force fits and is unavoidable part of human societies and human existence. Niccolò Machiavelli (1513) ever aphorizes "*the prince as the leader should be the fox to avoid the snares, and a lion to overwhelm the wolves and impose criminal virtue to secure power through cruelty, immoral deeds, and elimination of political rivals*" (Machiavelli's The Prince, VIII, cited in Skinner, 2000). Richard Christie, a US psychologist, centers on manipulativeness, callousness, and an indifference to morality or calls the Dark Triad – narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopath are the roots of wars (Paulhus and Williams, 2002, pp.556-563).

Machiavelli advises evil means of cunning, duplicity, and bad faith to sustain political power (Strauss and Cropsey, 2012, p.301). With natural dogmas postulated by Ayn Rand (1966), Machiavellianism and Dark Triad; human are DNA-rooted with internal eruptive rage and statism and cannot avoid violent conflicts through vengeance, civil wars, proxy wars and wars with neighbors with rhetorically countless rationalization. Even in marketing, marketeers have to timelessly continuous stage wars with rivals to gain (mar = declare war; ket = gains and – ing = continuous tense/gerund form). These lava of violence is ready to be exploded at any moment when conflict of interest appears. Violence even cumulated to war is ever ready in human instinct when people feel they were cornered or when they feel they will lose their dominion.

His Most Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh (1994/2017) ensures that when parents stage fights; they implant seeds of miseries which root wars. If children are unhappy, they will eye for alternatives similar to war — drugs, alcohol, and

some violent TV programs, films, magazines, and other boisterous "cultural products." Trembath (2008) maintains that aggressive interferences acted for the sake of higher ideals of democracy or freedom, the right to self-determination, or even capitalism and free trade, frequently savor backups of most common people believing that the ends justify the means or the violent acts can be legitimate and justified if they generate a better world for the majority good. Babara O'Brian (2019) asserts that Buddhist scholars advocate there is no justification for war in Buddhist teaching but Buddhism has not always separated itself from wars such as monks from the Shaolin, Mongolia, Japanese Samurais, and very recently in Sri Lanka and Myanmar. Though we do not want wars but wars will be introduced to us by possible justified excuses. Monks as humans and citizens will never be directly and indirectly exempted from statist wars with invaders and civil wars waged by rulers, politicians and sectarians because power-trades are rooted in their genes under the banner of democracy.

Conflicts claiming personal rights in societies are common but whether could there be an end to them under the mechanically societal framework. There are three common causes leading to human conflicts possibly leading to wars i.e. (1) conflict of economic interests, (2) conflicts of social status since in human societies, there are differences in honor and dignity, and (3) conflict of power and those having power to deal with resources, to set criteria and to entail power relation (Galtung, 1973 cited in Kurtz, 2008, pp.391-400). However, in Buddhism, life taking shall never be justified as in the first precepts. However, societies have to move on else the conflicts are likely and proportionately viral until disable to end them. It seems by overview the society can still exist with reconciliation but when the conflict reaches the point of no return. Social alternatives are then focused on two exits, i.e. (a) solving conflicts with peaceful method through negotiation or compromise and (b) by force or by violence. Wars could thus be explained as below:

Primarily, Thonglor Wongthamma (2011, p.26) advocates that conflict emerges from each different values, generation and ages. Conflicts are often seen with generation gaps. Whereas the old generation might have special experiences through political fights and wars for liberating the country, and economic loans until bringing peace to societies; they have values and norms in what they are confident that they are right and things should be resumed on their ways. Upon time passes, the new generation emerges with worldview, values and norms different from the past. The compliance between the old and the new generations are unlikely but brings unavoidable conflicts of generation gaps. These also include dressing, hairstyle, foods and meals, singing, dancing, and entertainments such as type of movies, documentary, and type of cars for driving even including family values, religion traditional cultures, speaking manners. Such different favoritism are ever unavoidable and found in every society until today. Civil wars would then be possible if serious conflicts had been fueled.

Secondly, conflict comes from social change – Dahrendorf (1959) contends that societies have been changed from agriculture to industries and the waves of migration influx into cities from most rural areas and from abroad. Industrial goods production, location of factories and employee residences of large groups, unions, and clubs and so on are incessantly established, which certainly bring differences between the rural areas being the agricultural sector and the urban areas being the industrial sector. Such situation will lead to significant change with social-class differences and certainly social-class conflicts would be unavoidable. The rural and urban living styles are different. The city-men are demanded on speed, punctuality, and intelligence in solving personal problems while the local men are contradictory. The differences of both societies lead to unavoidable clashes of values and behavioral pattern. They shall meet more other violent problems of attitudes and norms which the rural people are intolerant, which finally, such phenomena would impel them to return to their own locality where they have migrated from.

Thirdly, social conflicts might come from the influx of different local cultures and civilizations such as the entry of the western religion in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The adoption of new ideas, cultures, civilizations and new public administration is disseminated to the native people. Such transfer would unavoidably meet resistances, protests, unrests and riots. For example, those fervent with Islam might dissatisfy with the entry of priests evangelizing Christianity and other non-Islamic religions and so on.

Fourthly, the conflicts of political ideology-WWII was the conflict between Fascism and Communism with Democracy. After the fascists failed, it began between Communism with Democracy until leading to the internationally political tension called the Cold War in our time. At the meantime, it led to enormous social change with the heated war like the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Afghanistan War, the Persian Gulf War and the Iraq War. In the internal change, there were fights between military coups with Communisms leading to civil war in China Mainland and conflicts using violence on different countries in Asian Continent including Thailand. It was witnessed that the ideological conflicts led to solving problems with violence and force risky to atomic war and might devastate the entire world. For example, the conflict of religious ideology is witnessed with the Crusade Wars taken for 200 years. Both conflicts of political and religious ideologies affected not only local communities but societies worldwide (Huntington, 1996).

Fifthly, clashes broke in societies among tribes and races such the invasions for colonization which led to fight with force but after regulation among the colonizers; society may resume for a certain period. The final consequences are unavoidable clashes claiming for independence through using forces. Even after independence given, the inability to agree in power distribution, political position and the difference of the races, tribes, religions

and cultures affecting the history and the government of the colony hunts. This might lead to civil wars and the political units completely break. For example, the Indian Continent has broken into India, Pakistan and Bangladesh and so on. The measure to prevent wars might break and the best way is to build defensive cultures among the national members better than waiting for problem to appear and then seeking solutions. It is also seen that the peace keeping exercise is just a measure in peace retention and the national security. However, the mission of peace keeping demands to be conscious of limitations that what situation must be used. Deploying the peace keeping force in the inappropriate location wastes budget. Therefore, considering the limitation of the peacekeeping mission and the national resources should be clear on entry - exit strategy.

Ayn Rand coins that just a "liberal" reformer President Woodrow Wilson, marched USA into WW I "to save the world for democracy". Another "liberal" reformer Franklin D. Roosevelt led USA into WWII, in the name of the "Four Freedoms.": Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear on Monday, January 6, 1941. The "conservatives" and mega-business interests opposed war but they were silenced while in the WWII, business tycoons and the conservatives were dirtied as "reactionaries," "isolationists," and the "America-First'ers" or Americans Come First. Rand (1966) furthered that WWI headed not to "democracy" but to the procreation of Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, the three dictatorships. Also, WWII distorted the "Four Freedoms," but enslaving one-third of global citizens to Communism. Responses were wars and bred by poverty and material greed. Then what breeds poverty? The historical and empirical answers are the degrees of the national freedom and prosperity. Another present catch-phrase of the "have-not" and the "have" countries; it is also empirically and historically observed that the "have" countries are the nations fostering freedom while nations without freedom become more "have-nots". If men want to oppose war, Rand (1966) maintains they must oppose statism. So long as men nurture their tribal notions that the person is sacrificed for the whole or the purpose of some men own their rights to dominate others with force, and that any alleged "good" men can justify it; then it is impossible to have peace within their country and there is no peace among nations.

Thomas Powers (1997) pointed out that the roots of wars engulfed many justified reasons for example the American Civil War ended slavery and preserved the Union. The WWII ended the German occupation in most Europe and halted Hitler annihilating the European Jews. Korean War prevented the North Korea to militarily annex South Korea. The Vietnamese wars were to free itself from the French and the Americans. The Persian Gulf War ended the Kuwait occupation from Iraq and to prevent the annexation of Kuwait the 5th World Oil reserves and nuclear weapons program from Saddam Hussein and so

forth (Thomas Powers, 1997, pp. 88-92). Roots of War could be concluded in power-wants, threats-seeing and to justify force.

King Asoka the Great around 262 BC, reasoned to invade Kalinga was political, economic, repulsive, and secure because Kalinga was a prosperous region on Bengali offshore southeast trades and ports with powerful navy and seems to be the threat to him and his Maurya Empire (Das, 1949, p. VII; 271; Mohapatra, 1986, p.10; Roy 2015, p.15). The just war is the conflict of ethics between duties of not to kill or exploit others with the duties of the national defense or to warrant peace. The theory of just war attempts to solve this conflict through proposing conditions that sometimes, not killing is violating ethics. However, even the theory of just war proposes killing in war is justified under some conditions but speculating from the Buddhist standpoint and it is found that the Lord Buddha prohibits slaughtering living things and it is in the *Pañca-sīla* No.1: *Pāṇātipātā veramaṇī.* Though Buddhism forbids destroying life but sometimes life spending would encounter ethical conflicts between the life course for survival and with the religious principle with the real world of strives as a conflict of interest as mentioned above (Duangden Nooreram (2003).

Considering such ethical conflict founded in the Buddhist ethics thus becomes its standpoint against the issue of just war, which should be complement for examination in weighing the punishment found in *pāṇātipāta* (destruction of life). It includes the motive of the action emerged into either *kusalamula or akusalamula* with its consequences of action. Most documentary researches investigating the Buddhist concept about war conclude killing or life taking in any wars and even the just war are all sinful. Rationally, battling to defend a country demands preparation and planning for wars or even the motive in using weapons to fight enemies and destroying lives of the opposite parties and it violates the *pāṇātipāta veramaṇī.* When investigating the criteria for examining its punishment, it is found that though killing is sinful but each killing deserves unequal punishment. As such, it is possible that had the reason of warring coming from *kusalamula*-or self-defense, to safeguard either the innocent or righteousness, the sin is light and it is corresponded with Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto), who proposes, "In the case of violence is not intended such as the military armforce who battle for self-defense in the battle-field; the self-defense without harming intention or vengeance and exploiting others; it deserves lighter sinfulness. The war resulted is not exploiting or troubling oneself and others but beneficial to happiness (of the majority), should likely be the just thing." (Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto), 1995).

Buddhism likely accepts then there are some wars deemed just such as a war with the intention of *kusalamula* containing mercy in the national defense for public happiness. Buddhism is thus different from the theory of just war in the western ethics. That is, Buddhism has no perspective that killing in war is not against ethics but the since committed is not as equally violent as killing

with *dosa* alone. In addition, other things acted during war is not all just but demanded to be reflected case by case. For example, had there been torturing prisoners of war or abduction; it is sinful and unrelated to the good intention in any warfare. The war between USA and its Allies in Iraq for example is almost ending but the USA and its Allies deploying forces to attack Iraq, is based on bio-chemical weapon risk. Beside the reason above, USA has raised an excuse in declaring war to resist Iraq is for "justification" or "a just war". A just war is a war of non-contradicting morals or even being the moral duty, and if failed to take action; it would be destructive. Through exploration, it is found that ancient writers never raise morality of war for discussion.

Though there are more than 73 categories and subcategories of warfare waged around the world since human settlements and they could be categorized into land, sea, air and space, cyber, biochemistry; most are rooted with the Dark Triad: narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopath (Paulhus and Williams, 2002, pp. 556-563), DNA-rooted eruptive rage, statism and poverty (Rand, 1966), Human instinct of survival (Nicholson, 2019; Mobbs et.al, 2015; Taylor, 2012; Pianka, 2012), parental fights or brutal model (His Most Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh (1994/2017), for the sake of higher ideals of democracy or freedom, the right to self-determination, or even capitalism and free trade (Trembath, 2008), the rulers, politicians and sectarians because power-trades rooted in their genes under the banner of democracy (O'Brian, 2019), conflicts of economic interests, social status and powerplay (Galtung, 1973 cited in Kurtz, 2008, pp.391-400), the shift from agriculture to industries and the influx of migrants for employment (Dahrendorf, 1959), power-wants, threats-seeing and to justify force (Thomas Powers, 1997, pp. 88-92).

Analyses

The Lord Budhha has already foresee such roots of conflicts, clashes and warfare and prepared his doctrines to counter them. Paulhus and Williams (2002, pp. 556-563) contends that the Dark Triad: narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopath are the root of conflicts, clashes and wars. Narcissism is referred to egocentrism, self-admiration, self-centeredness, which should be battled with *Dāna* or philanthropic deeds and its battalions are the material alms (*Āmisadāna*), and the alms of truth or the spiritual alms (*Dhammadāna*) (A.I.90), contributed to a particular person (*Pāṭipuggalika-dāna*) and to the community of monks as a whole (*Saṅghadāna*) (M.III.254-6; A.III.392). On the other hand, Machiavellianism is criminal virtues to secure personal power through cruelty, immoral deeds, and eliminating political rivals, which should be attacked with royal virtues (*Rājadhamma*) of charity/generosity (*Dāna*), high moral character (*Sīla*), self-sacrifice (*Pariccāga*), honesty/integrity (*Ājjava*), kindness and gentleness (*Maddava*), austerity/ self-control/non-indulgence (*Tapa*),   non-anger/non-fury   (*Akkodha*),   non-violence/   non-oppression

(*Avihiṁsā),* patience/forbearance/ tolerance *(Khanti),* and non-deviation from righteousness or conformity to the laws (*Avirodhana*) (J.V.378). Finally, psychopath is referred to people with antisocial personality disorder socially unacceptable behaviors of deceitfulness, impulsiveness, aggressiveness, irritability, recklessness, irresponsibility and remorselessness. Such personality should be battled with virtues for a good household life or virtues for lay people (*Gharāvāsa-dhamma*) embracing being truthful and honest (*Sacca*), taming and adjusting oneself or adjustment or self-development (*Dama*), patience/ forbearance/tolerance (*Khanti*), and liberality/ generosity (*Cāga*) (S.I.215;Sn.189). However, Harvard Medical School (2019) advises that psychopath is lifelong patterns and there is no preventive ways to this disorder even the improved social conditions is possible to alleviate its incidence while better social environment might decrease severity. Researches have yet to display a practical or effective way to achieve the goals. Nevertheless, the writers have conviction that under meditation of Buddhist ethics and practices; these roots could be abated and with *Khanti* (patience/forbearance/ tolerance) because this dhamma. A Christian proverb says, "An unfriendly person pursues selfish ends and against all sound judgment starts quarrels" (The Old Testament Proverbs, 18.1).

Ayn Rand (1966) maintains that roots of clashes, conflicts and wars are in the DNA-rooted eruptive rage, statism and poverty. Buddhist ethics proposes the roots of good actions or the wholesome roots *(Kusala-mūla)* to fight them. *Kusala-mūla c*ould strike the DNA-rooted eruptive rage backed by non-greed/ generosity (*Alobha*), non-hatred but love (*Adosa*), non-delusion but wisdom (*Amoha*) (D.III.275; It.45.). In political science, at the meantime, statism is the conviction that the government should rule both social policy and economic to some degree. It is effectively opposite to anarchism since the 1850s, and popular throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Nevertheless, over statism should be encountered with foundations of mindfulness (*Satipaṭṭhāna*) in seeing thing as it is. This includes the arrays of mindfulness about the body (*Kāyānupassanā*), about the feeling (*Vedanānupassanā*), about the mental conditions *(Cittānupassanā)* and finally about objects or ideas *(Dhammanupassanā)* (D.II.290-315; M.I.55-63). Finally, poverty should be fought with the *Vaḍḍhana-mukha* (gateway to progress) allied with good health (*Ārogya*) ready to work, being with moral conduct and discipline (*Sīla*), compliance to the ways of great and enlightened being (*Buddhānumata*), learning (careers) with aspiration (*Suta),* practicing the Dhamma or the law of righteousness (*Dhammānuvatti*), and industriousness (*Alīnatā*) (J.I.366). However, Joseph Sobran (1994) argues that statism by personal rage and at the same time people are soaked with poverty; the more force one deploys, the more antagonists one shall make. The more laws one enacts, the more criminals one shall create. Moreover, when one coerces and criminalizes surplus people who cogitate

themselves as law-abiding, one destroys his/her legitimacy before their eyes. Moreover, Adam Smith the father of modern economics ever convinces that no society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which by far the greater part of the numbers are poor and miserable (Adam Smith, cited in Robert L. Heilbroner, 1980, p.59). Still, the authors ascertained that Buddhist ethics never fail any authentic Buddhists for more than two thousand and five hundred years and it shall be mighty and eminent as the ranges of the Kunlun, the Hindu Kush and the Himalayas to support anyone who never fail but foster Buddhist ethics practices.

Conflicts and wars are rooted in human instinct. The Buddhist ethics offers *Ariyasacca* (the Four Noble Truth) to combat human instinct and to offer a better way to survive, which elucidate miseries and suffering (*Dukkha*), their causes (*Dhukka-samudaya*), their cessation (*Dukkha-nirodha*) and the path leading to their extinction (*Dukkha-nirodha-gāminī-paṭipadā/ Magga*) (Vin.I.9; S.V.421; Vbh.99). However, Herbert Spencer is the first one who articulates to use the phrase of "Survival of the Fittest", after he reads Charles Darwin's work, "On the Origin of Species, in his Principles of Biology (1864)'. The authors believes that survival without *Ariyasacca* (the Four Noble Truth) would only fuel conflicts, clashes and wars, where more miseries, suffering and strives would be more propelled.

His Most Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh (1994/2017) preaches that parental fights and brutal model (family violence) imprint seeds of disappointments and miseries which root clashes, conflicts and wars. If children are unhappy, children will eye for alternatives those are exactly similar to proxy warfare like drugs, alcohol, and violent TV programs, films, magazines, and other boisterous "cultural products. The Buddhist ethics could battle this root so well if children are seriously encouraged to practice the five precepts (*Pañca-sīla*: the rules of morality) arrayed with the abstinence from killing (*Pāṇātipātā-veramaṇī*), the abstinence from stealing (*Adinnādānā-veramaṇī*), the abstinence from sexual misconduct (*Kāmesumicchācārā-veramaṇī*), the abstinence from false speech (*Musāvādā-veramaṇī*), and the abstinence from intoxicants causing heedlessness (*Surāmerayamajjapamādaṭṭhānā-veramaṇī*)(D.III.235;A.III.203, 275; Vbh.285). However, Buddhism scholar Somparn Promta argues that humans own their natural rights from a Buddhist perspective, and that is the *attūpanāyika-dhamma*, or a kind of golden rule if compatible to others. Promta ends that Buddha has designed the five precepts to safeguard personal rights (property and life). Human rights, Promta furthers, are implicit in the five precepts. Buntham Phunsap another scholar argues, however, that though human rights are advantageous in pluralistic cultures but not as the part of the Buddhist doctrine (Seeger, 2010 pp.78-88). The authors are certain that the Buddhist Five Precepts are similar to the Islamic10-*Furu al-Din* and the Christian *Ten Commandments*

but most believers in each religion are too familiar with them to likely forget the precept existence except in some scholar works.

Trembath (2008) assert that just for the sake of higher ideals of democracy or freedom, the right to self-determination, or even capitalism and free trade deeply root conflicts, clashes a and war such as USA vs Russia and China either in political ideology or capitalist trades. Similarly, Galtung, 1973 cited in Kurtz, (2008, pp.391-400) claims conflicts of economic interests, social status and powerplay stage conflicts, clashes and wars like Frederic Bastiat cited in Nicholas Snow (2010) even advocates, "if goods do not the border the army will." The Buddhist ethics offers *Kusala-mūla* (virtuous deeds) to tame those who are pro-claimants of democracy, the self-determinants, the greedy capitalists and the pro-free trade which encompasses non-greed/generosity (*Alobha*), non-hatred but love (*Adosa*), non-delusion but wisdom (*Amoha*) (D.III.275.; It.45.). This Buddhist ethics should be coupled with wisdom or knowledge or understanding (*Paññā 3*) acquired from reflection or thought-out (*Cintāmaya-paññā*), from study and learning (*Suta-paññā*), and from mental development and practices (*Bhāvanāmaya-paññā*) (D.III.219; Vbh.324). Yet, Troy Jollimore (2012) claims that moral truths are, in essence, logical truths, so that the content of morality can and ought to be determined from the philosopher's armchair and many religious believers feel skeptical about modern secular ethics because they cannot see any possibility for this sort of integration between theory and experience, between moral principles and how life is actually lived. Still the authors believe that ethics without wisdom could not be compatible with those rogue pro-democrats and violent propagandists claiming for self-made democracy and fraudulent freedom, those distorted self-determinants, and those greedy free-trade capitalists.

Babara O'Brian (2019) maintains that the rulers, politicians and sectarianism or religious extremism because power-trades rooted in their genes under the banner of self-made democracy, which will root conflicts, clashes and wars. To calm those supreme extremists, Buddhist ethics coins three dominant influences and supremacies (*Adhipateyya*) flag-shipped with self-supremacy and dependence (*Attādhipateyya*), supremacy of the world and public opinion (*Lokādhipateyya*), and supremacy of Dhamma or righteousness; rule of the Dhamma and rule of the true law (*Dhammādhipateyya*).Therefore, those *Attādhipaga* are required to much exercise their mindfulness (*Sati*) while those *Lokādhipaga* are required much on self-govern with wisdom (*Paññā*) and thoughtfulness and those Dhammādhipaga or chiefs and administrators should behave according to the principle of Dhamma. (D.III.220; A.I. 147). However, humans at least sometimes unchain their own egoism either worldly or ethically, while pursuing their interests and sometimes extremely exaggerate self-importance, self-justification, anarchism and even suitheism or apotheosis thinking or glorifying one-selves as deities, which possibly lead to conduct

clashes and the distortion on Dhamma principles. The authors believe that altruism, enlightened self-interest, selflessness, non-egocentricism and sense of public would glorify one to be the authentic leader who can tame political and sectarian extremists.

Buddhist ethics indoctrinates wisdom, knowledge or understanding (*Paññā 3*) acquired from reflection or thought-out (*Cintāmaya-paññā*), from study and learning (*Suta-paññā*), and from mental development and practices (*Bhāvanāmaya-paññā*) (D.III.219; Vbh.324) to overcome such invasions and threats. However, Andrew Moran (2015) advised that ancient Greek philosopher Socrates once wrote, "*I know that I am intelligent, because I know that I know nothing.*" In wisdom and smartness there are 10 disadvantages, which are all turn to the wise for everything, facing the Dunning–Kruger effect (do not know to assess competence levels), able to thinking but without feeling, alienated hard work, people's high expectations, envy, disdain, and annoyance to the wise, overthinking rather doing, everyone thinks the wise is bragging, absence of social skills & common sense, and zero challenges in life. Yet, the authors also believe that the shift from agriculture to industries could lead to rivalry of earning and daily survival where intelligence is required and high IQ never guarantees one would become wealthy since it is sometimes unable to survive though with thorough knowledge. Therefore, it is better doing with *paññā* rather than saying.

Powers, Thomas. (1997, pp. 88-92) maintains that conflicts, clashes and wars are rooted in power-wants, threats-seeing and to justify force. Buddhist ethics provides dhamma to combat such perception with *Ariyasacca* (the Four Noble Truth) which elucidate miseries and suffering (*Dukkha*), their cause (*Dhukka-samudaya*), their cessation (*Dukkha-nirodha*) and the path leading to their extinction (*Dukkha-nirodha-gāminī-paṭipadā/ Magga*) (Vin.I.9; S.V.421; Vbh.99). However, truth either noble or ignoble is infinitely immortal but it could mortalize the speaker. For example, if we whisper to an authoritarian that the more laws he/she enacts, the more criminals he/she shall create. The more he/she coerces and criminalizes people who cogitate themselves as law-abiding, he/she will destroy his/her legitimacy before those people. Though they are perfectly true in both cases and it is also true the whisperer might be executed on hindering the authoritarian's hidden agenda and particularly his/her face-saving. Still the authors maintain that to combat power-players, seen threats and justification-made force require the realization of *Ariyasacca* (the Four Noble Truth) and everything is impermanent but it needs to align powerplays, threats and justified force for justice and fairness of societies.

Historically, this world breeds badness and goodness, we are required to commit less badness to prevent greater badness. The Theravada Buddhism does not support warring because religions have completely separated from the state. As such there is no rejection. Considering by the principles of the Theravada

Buddhist ethics, it is found that warring is wrong because it leads to killing and deems transgression of *sīla* No.1: *pāṇātipāta, kusala kammapatha* on *kāyakamma* of never exploit other's body and *vimokkha* on *sammākammanta* (Damrong Vichiansingh, 1987, pp.6-7). However, it is explicable in other perspectives and that is legitimacy in warring through considering from the intention and necessity of duty. The intention must not be immoral but by duty and not by personal retributions. Another perspective is Buddhist ethics emphasizes repressing a person who deserves, recognizing a person who deserves and thus what one does one deserves it.

Conclusion

No violence can end violence, no wars can end any wars like poisonous trees always yield poisonous fruits but peace can end peace if "*si vis pacem, para bellum*" cautioned by Plato, Renatus, Shi Ji and Rama VI, is not heeded. Many scholars coin roots of personal and public conflicts, clashes and wars. The Dark Triad: narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopath are advocated by Paulhus and Williams but Buddhist ethics can trench them with *Dāna 1 and 2* (charitable virtues), *Rājadhamma10* (royal virtues) and *Gharāvāsa-dhamma 4* (the household virtues), respectively. Ayn Rand convinces that the DNA eruptive rage, statism and poverty are the roots and Buddhist ethics battles with *Kusala-mūla 3* (virtuous acts), *Satipaṭṭhāna 4*(mindfulness), and *Vaḍḍhana-mukha 6* (gateway to progress), consecutively. Nigel Nicolson, Dean Mobbs and team, Jim Taylor and Eric Pianka maintain that clashes, conflicts and wars are rooted in human instinct and Buddhist ethics could combat with *Ariyasacca 4* (the Four Noble Truth). His Most Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh preaches that parental fights and brutal model breed family violence and Buddhist ethics could battle it with *Pañca-sīla 5* (the rules of morality). Trembath asserts that just for the sake of higher ideals of democracy or freedom, the right to self-determination, or even capitalism and free trade are the roots and Galtung,1973 cited in Kurtz, claims similar roots of economic interests, social status and powerplay. Buddhist ethics can tame them with *Kusala-mūla 3* (virtuous acts) and *Paññā 3* (wisdom, knowledge and understanding). Babara O'Brian (2019) maintains that the rulers, politicians and sectarianism or religious extremism are the roots but Buddhist ethics could encounter with the realization of *Adhipateyya* (supremacy) and therefore, the *Attādhipaga* are demanded to rigidly exercise their mindfulness (*Sati*) while the *Lokādhipaga* are demanded on serious self-govern with wisdom (*Paññā*) and thoughtfulness and the *Dhammādhipaga* or chiefs and administrators should strictly abide in the principle of *Dhamma*. The shift from agriculture to industries and the influx of migrants for employment from rural areas and from abroad but Buddhist ethics could battle with *Paññā 3* (wisdom, knowledge and understanding). Thomas Powers believes that conflicts, clashes and wars are rooted in power-wants,

threats-seeing and to justify force. Then Buddhist ethics could offer dhamma to combat such perception with *Ariyasacca 4* (the Four Noble Truth). In fact, warring to warrant world peace in Buddhist ethics perspective is to declare war with oneself and when all are moral; clashes, conflicts, sectarianism, extremism and warfare would unlikely waged.

It is unbelievable here that intelligence and high IQ persons many times may not guarantees that one would become wealthy as a proverb cautions "unable to survive though with thorough knowledge" and if disregarding an adage, "better doing with *paññā* rather than saying". Certainly, everything is impermanent as the Lord Buddha teaches but while living it needs to align powerplays, threats and justified force for justice and fairness of societies. Seriously truth either noble or ignoble is infinitely immortal but it could mortalize the speaker particularly when the speaker makes the superiors lose faces or when the speaker attempt to teach grandmothers to suck eggs (Thai meaning: to teach crocodiles to swim or to lecture the Supreme Patriarch to read and to write). No violence can totally eradicate violence, no wars can eradicate any wars like poisonous trees always yield poisonous fruits but peace can end peace if "si vis pacem, para bellum" is unheeded.

References
Tipitaka and Bible
A.I.90: Dāna2[1]: Āmisadāna and Dhammadāna

A.III.106; Aṅguttaranikāya Pañcakanipāta 22/79/121 cite in Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto) (2013). Dictionary of Buddhism. 25th ed. Suan Luong, Bangkok: Pli Dhamma, p. 70.

D.II.290-315; M.I.55-63.foundations of mindfulness (Satipaṭṭhāna): Kāyānupassanā, Vedanānupassanā, Cittānupassanā, Dhammanupassanā

D.III.219; Vbh.324: Paññā 3 - Cintāmaya- paññā, Suta- paññā, and Bhāvanāmaya- paññā

D.III.220; A.I. 147: Adhipateyya- Attādhipateyya, and Dhammādhipateyya.

D.III.235; A.III.203, 275; Vbh.285: Pañca-sīla: the Five Precepts/ the rules of morality - Pāṇātipātā-veramaṇī, Adinnādānā - veramaṇī, Kāmesumicchācārā- veramaṇī, Musāvādā- veramaṇī, and Surāmerayamajjapamādaṭṭhānā -veramaṇī

D.III.275; It.45: Kusala-mūla - Alobha, Adosa, and Amoha

J.I.366: Vaḍḍhana-mukha: Ārogya, Sīla, Buddhānumata, Suta, Dhammānuvatti and Alīnatā

J.V.378: the royal virtues (Rājadhamma) encompassing: Dāna, Sīla, Pariccāga, Ājjava, Maddava, Tapa, Akkodha, Avihiṁsā, Khanti, and Avirodhana.

M.III.254-6; A.III.392: Dāna2[2]: Pāṭipuggalika-dāna and Saṅghadāna

S.I.215; Sn.189: virtues for lay people (Gharāvāsa-dhamma): Sacca, Dama, Khanti, and Cāga.

The Old Testament: Proverbs, 18.1

Vin.I.9; S.V.421; Vbh.99: Ariyasacca (the Four Noble Truth) - Dukkha, Dhukka-samudaya, Dukkha-nirodha, and Dukkha-nirodha-gāminī- paṭipadā/ Magga.

Thai References
Damrong Vichiansingh (1987). *Ethical Problems Related to Warring*. Bangkok: Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, pp.6-7

Duangden Nooreram (2003). *Buddhist Ethics and the Concept of Just War: a case study of scholar perspectives in the contemporary Thai social context.* Master Thesis, Program of Ethics Studies, Graduate School: Mahidol University.

Likit Thiravekin. (2009). *Thai Politics and Democracy.* Bangkok: Master Copy Company (Thailand) Limited, 2009, pp.59-65.

Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University. (1996). *The Tripitaka Thai Version.* The Mahachulalongkorn-rajavidyalaya University copy. Bangkok: Mahachulalongkorn-rajavidyalaya University Press.

Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto). (1995). *Abortion: how to decide and when to begin? Abortion in the Buddhist Perspective*. 2nd ed. Bangkok: Sahathammic Company Limited.

Phra Brahmagunabhorn (P.A. Payutto). (2013). *Dictionary of Buddhism*. 25th ed. Suan Luong, Bangkok: Pli Dhamma, pp. 18-21; 175.

Therdphong Konhjan (2001). *Modernity and Absolute Monarchy*. Bangkok: Arts and Cultures Magazine.

Thonglor Wongthamma. (2011). *Basic Ethics: human and ideology and moral measures*. Bangkok: Odeon Store Printing Office, 2011, p.26.

International References

Bainton, Roland H. (1960). *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace*. New York: Abingdon Press.

Bastiat, Frederic. "If Goods Don't Cross Borders, the Army Will." Cited in Nicholas Snow. "*If Goods Don't Cross Borders……*" FEE: Foundation for Economic Education. Tuesday, October 26, 2010. Retrieved from https://fee.org/resources/if-goods-dont-cross-borders/ on September 13, 2019.

BBC News (1998). *The war to end all wars.* 10 November 1998.

Brinsfield, John W. (1991). "From Plato to NATO; the Ethics of Warfare; Reflections on the Just War Theory". *Military Chaplains Review*, 1991.

Bury, R.G. (trans. 197-1968). *Plato, Laws, 1.628c9–e1: Plato. Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vols. 10 & 11*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1967 & 1968.

Cultural China. (2010-2018). *Confucian Responses to Buddhism throughout Chinese History*. Wayback Machine. 4 Mar.2010-20 No. 2018. RAC: http://history.cultural-china.com/en/165History5834.html, on 17.08.2019

Das, Manmatha Nath (1949). *Glimpses of Kalinga History*. Calcutta: Century Publishers. p. VII; 271.

Dawkins, Harris, Hitchens and Dennett, Daniel (2010). *Discussions with Richard Dawkins* "Four Horsemen" of the "New Atheism": Episode 1, RDFRS - RichardDawkins.net and » Blog Archive » The Four Horsemen of the New Atheism Archived 2010-07-30 at the Wayback Machine.

Fiala, Andrew (2014-12-21). Zalta, Edward N. (Ed.). *Pacifism*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2014 ed. 21. December 2014).

Galtung, Johan (2008). "Conflict Theory: Definitions, Dimensions, Negations, Formations" in Lester Kurtz, ed. *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Amsterdam etc.: Elsevier, 2nd edition, 2008, pp. 391-400.

Guthrie, Charles; Quinlan, Michael (2007). "III: The Structure of the Tradition". *Just War: The Just War Tradition: Ethics in Modern Warfare*. pp. 11–15.

Harris, Sam (2006/2010). *Killing the Buddha*. 19 March 2006. Shambhala Sun: Buddhism Culture Mediation Life. RAC: https://samharris.org/killing-the-buddha/ on 17.08.2019.

Harvard Medical School. (2019). *Antisocial Personality Disorder: trusted advice for healthier life*. Harvard Health Publishing. March 2019. Retrieved from. .https://www.health. harvard.edu/a_to_z/antisocial-personality-disorder-a-to-z. on September 13, 2019.

Heilbroner, Robert, L. (1980). *The Worldly Philosophers: the lives, times and ideas of the great economic thinkers*. 5th edition. New York: A Touchstone Book published by Simon and Schuster, p.59.

HM Phra Mongkut Klao, King Rama VI. (1911). *Boy Scout Motto*. Office of Boy Scout: Sanam Suia Pa. Bangkok: 1 May 1911.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall (1990). *Eloquence in an Electronic Age: The Transformation of Political Speechmaking*. Oxford University Press US. p. 99.

Jollimore, Troy. (2012). *Godless yet Good.* edited by Brigid Hains. AEON: California State University. Retrieved from https://aeon.co/essays/rules-and-reasons-are-not-enough-for-an-ethics-without-god. on September 13, 2019.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. (1513/1532). *The Prince [Il Principe]: Chapters VIII, XVII, and XVIII.* distributed in 1513 after political exile in 1512 and published 1532. Originally De Principatibus / Il Principe. Publisher: Antonio Blado d'Asola, Italy.

Martin Ostwald, (2009). *Language and History in Ancient Greek Culture.* University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 87. ISBN 9780812241495

Mattox, John, M. (2006). *Saint Augustine and the Theory of Just War*. London: Continuum, 2006.

May, L. and Sharatt, S. C., Eds. (1994). *Applied Ethics: A Multicultural Approach*. Prentice-Hall Inc.

McHenry, Robert (2010). "*William James on Peace and War*". blogs.britannica.com. Britannica Blog. 22 March 2010. Archived from the original on 27.08.2019.

Mobbs, Dean, et.al. (2015). *The ecology of human fear: survival optimization and the nervous system*. Neurosci. Published online Mar 18. 201. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2015. 00055. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4364301/. On September 13, 2019.

Mohapatra, (1986). *Military History of Orissa*. Cosmo Publications, New Delhi ISBN 8 Ramesh Prasad 1-7020-282-5; p. 10.

Moran, Andrew. (2015). *Entrepreneurship: 10 Disadvantages of Being Incredibly Smart.* October 2, 2015. CareerAddict: DeltaQuest Media (Ireland) Limited (IE). Retrieved from https://www.careeraddict.com/10-disadvantages-of-being-incredibly-smart. On September 14, 2019.

Pagden, Anthony (2008). *Worlds at War: The 2,500-year Struggle between East and West*. Oxford University Press US. p. 407.

Paritta Wangkiat. (2019). *Apathy fuelling renewed culture of violence*. Opinion: Bangkok Post, 1 July 2019

Paulhus, Delroy L.; Williams, Kevin M. (2002). "The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy". *Journal of Research in Personality*. 36 (6): 556–563. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6.

Pianka. Eric, R. (2012). *Can Human Instincts Be Controlled?* University of Texas.19 September 2012. Retrieved from http://www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/Thoc/ HumanInstincts.html. September 13, 2019.

Powers, Thomas. (1997). *The Roots of War*. The Atlantic Monthly; August 1997; Volume 280, No. 2; pages 88-92.

Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus (4th-5th Century CE). *De Re Militari, Vegetius: epitome of military science* - Google Books. Books.google.com. Retrieved on 28.08.2019.

Rempel, Richard A., ed. (2003). *The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell*. Routledge. p. 10.

Roy, K. (2015). Military Manpower, Armies and Warfare in South Asia. Warfare, Society and Culture. Taylor & Francis. p. 15

Seeger, M. (2010). *"Theravāda Buddhism and Human Rights. Perspectives from Thai Buddhism"* in Meinert, Carmen; Zöllner, Hans-Bernd, pp. 78- 88.

Skinner, Quentin (2000). *Machiavelli: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP Oxford. ISBN 9780191540349. 12 October 2000.

Sobran, Joseph. (1994). *The Crisis of Statism*. The Free Market, Austrian Economics and Peace: Mises Institute. The Free Market 12, no. 7 (July 1994). Retrieved from. https://mises.org/library/crisis-statism. On September 13, 2019.

Stimpson, George William (1952). *A Book about American Politics*. Harper. p. 365.

Strauss, Leo. (1978). Thoughts on Machiavelli. The Phoenix Book: University of Chicago Press, ISBN 0226777022, 9780226777023

Strauss, Leo; Crapsey, Joseph (2012-06-15). *History of Political Philosophy*. University of Chicago Press. p. 301. ISBN 9780226924717.

Taylor, Jim. (2012). Is *Our Survival Instinct Failing Us?: Does the "fight or flight" response work in today's complex world?* The Power of Prime. June 12, 2012. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-power-prime/201206/is-our-survival-instinct-failing-us. on September 13, 2019.

Thich Nhat Hanh (1994/2017). *The Roots of War.* Lion's Roar: Buddhist Wisdom for Our Time. AUGUST 3, 2017. Retrieved from https://www.lionsroar.com/the-roots-of-war/ on 27.08.2019.

Trembath, Kerry. (2008). *What is Buddhist Perspective on War and Peace*? CHÙA QUANG MINH: Vietnamese Buddhist Temple| Saturday, 13 September 2008 11:45 Retrieved from http://www.quangminh.org.au/index.php? Option=com_content&view= article&id=172: what-is-buddhist-perspective-on-war-and-peace&catid=28: what-is-buddhism&Itemid=47 on 27.08.2019.

Vinx, Lars (2016-03-21). Zalta, Edward N. (Ed.). *Carl Schmitt.* The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2016 ed.: 21 March 2016).

Wagar, W. Warren (2004). *H.G. Wells: Traversing Time*. Wesleyan University Press. p. 147.