

2021

## War and Political Theory

Edward Erwin

Brian Orend

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Erwin, Edward and Orend, Brian (2021) "War and Political Theory," *Naval War College Review*. Vol. 74 : No. 1 , Article 15.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol74/iss1/15>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

reinvented Robert E. Lee. She clearly disapproves of the reconciliation efforts that saw U.S. military installations named for Confederate generals.

Samet does have a tendency to focus on the human condition as revealed through Grant's writing, rather than staying focused solely on the Civil War. She includes observations from Stephen Crane, Ambrose Bierce, and even Henry Morton Stanley. When Grant discusses the Navy's running of Confederate batteries at Vicksburg, Samet supplies a lengthy account of a sea battle from Frederick Marryat, a once-noted nautical writer and author of *Mr. Midshipman Easy*. The siege of Vicksburg is illuminated with an account of the Roman siege of Jerusalem in AD 70. There are descriptions by soldiers of being under fire in the Hürtgen Forest, and stories penned by Marines in World War II. The inner workings and dangers associated with Colt's revolving rifle are not discussed, but the impact of technology as expressed in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* is included. While these insights are interesting and at times moving, their utility in helping to understand Grant seems, at times, limited. This is not to imply that an annotated *Memoirs* dedicated to technical detail or uniform minutiae would be superior; it would not, by a long shot. The challenge is in finding the correct balance.

Surprisingly, Samet's annotated *Memoirs* does not open a door into Grant's private life to any great degree. In a day when the importance of family influences on a leader's personality, style, and emotional intelligence is understood to be significant, there is relatively little information provided in this annotated volume. Such information would need to be brought to the reader by the editor, for Grant himself rarely spoke of such matters.

Another area Samet could have explored in greater detail is the degree to which Grant the general was aware of and acted to influence civil-military relations. The *Memoirs* indicates that Grant was well aware of the political currents sweeping the country, and at times acted in accordance with that knowledge. Additionally, there were episodes Grant does not bring up in his memoirs that an editor could have explored. To her credit, Samet looks at some of these, including Grant's General Order 11, which expelled Jews suspected of war profiteering from portions of Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Grant himself did not discuss this event, just as he did not address accusations that he was drunk at Shiloh, and the volume is improved by Samet's editorial contribution on this subject.

As it should be—indeed, as it must be—Grant's remains the primary voice in this volume. Readers who have not read his *Memoirs* will find a very pleasant discovery waiting for them. Those for whom this will not be a first encounter will find that the book's reputation as perhaps the best military memoir ever published still has merit. It is easy to see why Samet listed Grant among those writers who exercised a profound influence on her. In turn she has, when all is said and done, done her subject justice.

RICHARD NORTON



*War and Political Theory*, by Brian Orend. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity, 2019. 211 pages. \$22.95.

In the latest of his contributions to scholarship on warfare, Brian Orend, professor of philosophy at the University of Waterloo (Ontario, Canada), has published *War and Political Theory*,

a volume drawn from the fields of applied ethics and international affairs. It provides a descriptive and prescriptive analysis of armed conflict that is bound to inform and challenge his readership with profound insights.

Orend admits that the purpose of his book is not so much to champion a particular theory but rather to craft an “excellent, detached understanding of the pros and cons of the most important theories, and the most meaningful factual contexts which make the theories come alive” (p. 2), drawing on the interdisciplinary resources of political theory, military strategy, applied ethics, philosophy, international law, etc. Regardless of whether the reader judges that Orend has completed his task satisfactorily, the fair reader undoubtedly will conclude that *War and Political Theory* exhibits relative impartiality, in-depth subject-matter expertise, and a daring spirit of discovery that make reading the book a worthwhile investment of time and inquiry. Adopting the latest political analysis of respected theorists, citing the traditional wisdom of ancient philosophers and theologians, illustrating germane principles with historical cases—all these and more are just a few reasons why *War and Political Theory* is as poignant as it is persuasive and why Orend is one of the leading authorities on the ethics of war today.

For example, in his evaluation of *jus post bellum*, Orend assimilates the virtues of the three major theories of war (realism, pacifism, and the just-war tradition [JWT]) to forge a win-win consensus that achieves success consistent with some core values from each of the different philosophies, under the auspices of revisionist JWT. (1) Orend includes as part of *jus post bellum* the important role of international authority

in occupation laws and war-crime trials, meeting the benchmarks of the laws of armed conflict. (2) Orend compares and contrasts the thick theories of retribution and rehabilitation but proposes a thin theory of five common elements (cease-fire, exchange of prisoners of war, public proclamation of war’s conclusion, accountability in war trials, and proportionality with regard to war’s cause and the terms of peace on issues such as border disputes) that bridge the chasm between the two clashing perspectives on justice. (3) A victor’s well-intentioned efforts to increase the odds of preventing future wars (rebuilding a defeated power with investments, demilitarization, security, and democratization) fulfill the predominant objective of pacifists. (4) Orend cautions that a greatly anticipated and planned postwar reconstruction, stabilization, and conflict-transition phase is the best way to secure the hard-won victories of any war, forging new alliances and deterring future aggression. This point incorporates the priority of a realist agenda, which is all about winning. If *jus post bellum* fails, then victors may have won the war tactically but lost the peace strategically. (5) Orend disputes the “mere adjunct thesis” that traditional JWT proponents maintain. Classic JWT argues that *jus post bellum* is unnecessary because the final phase is implicit in *jus ad bellum*, as the vindication of a just cause. Yet Orend rightfully points out that what is potentially implicit must be made practically explicit, because traditional JWT construals have overlooked pressing questions essential to any long-lasting peace.

Faithful to his task of furnishing a detached analysis of the three major theories and to supplying a descriptive and prescriptive evaluation of war, Orend writes his book on the basis of a

sympathetic engagement with divergent philosophies. He initiates a productive conversation among three theoretical adversaries, and in so doing points to the revisionist JWT position as one that effectively applies the most important tenets to the changing landscape of war. Equally important, Orend maintains the distinct criteria of *jus ad bellum*, *jus in bello*, and *jus post bellum* but asserts the interdependence of each for its logic and coherence. The inseparable connection of the different phases of war indicates the necessity of consistency between means and ends. Failure at any stage sabotages and undermines the validity of the *jus pax* (just peace) continuum: (1) an unjust cause, regardless of how nobly executed, will not culminate in a justly ordered peace after the war; (2) a war fought wrongly can bring into question the supposed just nature of its cause; and (3) a failed end state dishonors the service and sacrifices of those who died fighting for a virtuous cause.

As one of the leading voices who has defended *jus post bellum* as an authentic part of the JWT, Orend provides scholarship that is an interdisciplinary storehouse of knowledge filled with philosophical, political, and theological concepts and practices that enlighten both student and scholar with an astute reading of history and current affairs. In a word, Orend presents a promising revision of JWT via *jus post bellum* for international relations that liaises with the best of the three major theories of war and advocates a reinvigorated ethical viewpoint that synergizes classical and contemporary thoughts in a cohesive framework crucial for the twenty-first-century struggles of war fighting and peacemaking.

EDWARD ERWIN



*Burn In: A Novel of the Real Robotic Revolution*, by P. W. Singer and August Cole. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2020. 432 pages. \$28.

Already well-known for his 2009 book *Wired for War*, P. W. Singer in 2016 collaborated with August Cole to write *Ghost Fleet: A Novel of the Next World War*. *Burn In* is their most recent collaboration. In this extensively researched novel, we follow FBI agent Lara Keegan as she trains with a robotic partner, TAMS, in a futuristic context in which machine/human interface is commonplace, but in which this integration also is the subject of political and social resistance and unrest. Her task is the “burn in”: testing the limits of such a partner for police and agency work. Part buddy film, part political thriller/mystery, and part science-fiction dystopic reflection on humanity, machines, and society, *Burn In* is truly engaging and “a good ride,” as great fiction can be. On a more philosophical level, it also is thought provoking and engaging on a multitude of contemporary issues, including personhood and personal identity, as well as trust.

First the novel engages the issues of personhood and personal identity across time, as discussed by philosophers John Locke and David Hume. Is TAMS a person? When TAMS is decommissioned at a certain point in the novel and another TAMS with the same memories and programming is brought back, is it the same TAMS? Through Keegan’s character, the decommissioning feels like a death, even a murder; in addition, something seems to be missing from the second TAMS, even as it offers increased capacities, such as deception.