**IS HUMAN NATURE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS?**
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# Introduction

Human nature debates have existed for as long as there has been civilization. Is there a shared human nature that binds people from different cultures and countries? Do various civilizations "create" various human natures, or is it the other way around? And how does human nature influence every element of our life, from casual encounters to national politics at the highest levels? This essay is dealing with human nature and if it is the most crucial factor in international politics and how the concept of human nature lies at the heart of conceptions of political community2and their relationships. The paper will demonstrate how the foundation of the classical realism and liberal ideologies resides in beliefs about human nature. The various approaches in which realists2and liberals describe how international politics, here regarded as governments/states, structure their relations with one another are fundamentally impacted by differing conceptions about human nature. This will be illustrated throughout the paper by examining how realist2and liberal theories of human nature describe governments' inclination to start wars with one another.

Human nature has a direct bearing on issues of warfare and peace. Some academics and intellectuals contend that conflict and warfare are ingrained in our DNA, but others disagree. Such presumptions have a significant impact because they determine whether we acknowledge that we live in a pretty terrible society where conflict is accepted and an essential aspect of life or whether we think that people can overcome the everlasting military confrontation and build a more stable society (Harris, 2017, p. 1-15). The essay makes the case that this is in fact how realist and liberal views vary from one another: Realists believe that because of human natural egoism and violent tendencies, war will inevitably break out; liberals have more faith in human nature potential to advance society and end the constant state of conflict.

# Origins of Human nature

According to James (1993, p.34) the idea of "human nature" is not one that has its basis in concepts of international relations. Instead, it stands for one of the earliest reference points in a variety of philosophical systems. The reality is that since the21980s, the field of2international relations (IR) have endured a comprehensive and comprehensive evaluation of its key concepts is one facet, nevertheless, that renders the current state of the human nature in IR fascinating. Beyond all else, this work has made academics conscious of the dual deployments of their terminology as ontological realities and scientific conceptions. While different facets of humanity have long been included in theorizing about international politics, little rigorous thought has been given to the actual effects of the equally numerous "models2of man" on the latter (James, 1993, p. 34).

Human nature theories are not a product of IR academia. Instead, they are already there in the first attempts to understand and characterize the (political) environment. The works listed below are not IR literature, but instead some of the foundational literature that have greatly influenced the numerous concealed and overt viewpoints on the (post)human in international politics. Their writings are the primary thematic and argumentative "attractors" of several discussions regarding people in general, and "human nature" in specific (Stenmark, 2012, p. 543). Numerous of them have given rise to and continue to serve as the foundation for different global political ideas and perspectives. In this regard, Aristotle (1995) and2Plato (2008) set the groundwork for concepts concerning how human nature is inextricably linked to the establishment of political systems. Descartes (2008) and Marx2and Engels (2011) all discuss the capacity of human sovereignty in different ways. Focus is placed on how learning and adaptation can shape the human through Hobbes (1991) and2Darwin (2013).

The writings of Aristotle show how the political system2and the human nature is interdependent. He contends that only in relationship to one another do both show and assume their actual shape. The context in which human purports to be a political2animal (zoon politicon) is in politics, which is always thought of as a political society (polis). Only by doing this can he accomplish the teleology of "goodness for mankind" while also carrying out his special natural purpose of "the dynamic life of the reasoning part of the soul”. This unquestionably still has a lot of significance in early 21st-century2politics as the pursuit of fulfillment (Aristotle, 1995).

Darwin's work, which was first published in21859, sits at the crossroads of various theories on evolution: although the notion that the2human species evolves over time has existed since Greek mythology, it wasn't until this publication that it became widely acknowledged. Due to the prevalence of evolutionary approaches in IR today, it is still important as a basic reading.  Notably, Darwin's tripartite interpretive procedure has been used to analyze a number of key global political occurrences and can be seen in various political concepts (Darwin, 2013).

Descartes rewrites2the classical concept of the hypokeimenon—a self-sufficient2entity that founds2its own being2and, in turn, everything else—in his Meditations, first authored in 1641, by incorporating it with the concept of the cogitans and thereafter deferring the grounds of certitude from an objective outside2to the subjective2inside. As a result, humans were2no longer merely "things" in a universe of other things, but became2the world's cornerstone. This established the still-dominant concept that humans are persons whose identity is based on their2consciousness (Descartes, 2008).

This work, initially written in 1642, gives a unique picture of the human. Hobbes is most known for his contribution upon realism. The book explains why Hobbes' "state of nature" should not be confused with a concept of global "human nature." The booklet demonstrates that his writings focus on a few (although undesirable) characteristics of human nature that stem from a faulty education and upbringing. While individuals do have2a biological predisposition, it is considered that it is adaptable (Hobbes, 1991).

Marx's idea of history is described in Marx and Karl Long2Unpublished, which was written in 18462but not published2until 1932. This displays his perspective on the human nature, especially in light of his sixth2thesis on Feuerbach. Marx criticizes traditional notions of "human nature," preferring the term "species-being," and explains how human connections, rather than genetics, define who we are as people. The phrase can be interpreted both anthropologically2and post-anthropologically because it is debatable what constitutes man's "true2nature," from which2he is purported to be alienated (Marx & Engels, 2011).

Plato emphasizes on the soul, which he defines as the first of the two as a representation of mind-body materialism, and its threefold nature (reason, appetite, will). Different civilizations and governing structures are produced by the various possible relationships between these factors. Nevertheless, the person and consequently society are only in equilibrium when the soul is in peace. The path laid out by Plato culminates to a just society managed by political knowledge. Comparable to Aristotle, but from a different perspective, it is clear in this case that ideas about "human nature" and the structure of international political entities are closely related (Plato, 2008).

# Human Nature and Classical Realism

In classical realism, conceptions about human nature occupy a major importance. Conflict is believed to be caused by human natural tendency, and violent confrontation is a recurring aspect of social life (Freyberg-Inan, 2004, p92). This "hardwired" propensity for conflict is what causes states to prioritize gaining power and, eventually, results in interstate warfare (Van Evera, 1999, p10). These presumptions suggest a dismal view of human nature that inevitably results in war. In fact, tragedy plays a crucial role in comprehending human nature according to classical realism. Although attempts to keep order and stability may be effective in the short haul, according to classical realists like2Greek tragedians, those endeavors will fail in the longer - term, with warfare being the inevitable result (Lebow, 2010, p59).

This section of the article will demonstrate how the ideas and concepts of classical realism, which derive from Thucydides2and Thomas Hobbes, have taken on this specific view of human nature. While Thucydides and2Hobbes were political scientists rather than scholars of international relations, their writings had a profound and significant influence on how classical realist2philosophers like Reinhold Niebuhr2and Hans J. Morgenthau perceived human nature and2international relations. Identified as Morgenthauian/Niebuhrian-styled2international-political theorizing (Schuett, 2010), Niebuhr and2Morgenthau hold similar beliefs and portray what Waltz termed (and critiqued as) the "first image" strategy to realism, centered on human nature and behavior: "Wars arise from egoism, misguided aggressive tendencies, from ineptitude" (Waltz, 2001, p16).

This section of the essay commences with Hobbes' view of the state2of nature, which was strongly influenced by2Thucydides' writings (Ahrensdorf, 2000). It is not a surprise that classical realism is sometimes alluded to as Hobbesian Realism; comprehending the fundamental premises of the state2of nature is necessary to be equipped to connect to the idea of a totally anarchical society presented by classical realism. Hobbes developed his idea of a completely chaotic state of nature as the antithesis of a completely organized political state governed by a sovereign authority (Hull, 2009, p88). People’s livelihoods are governed in this chaotic world by "brutality, vulgar egotism, and unbridled emotion that is driven by instability and dread" (Klej, 2003, p9). As Morgenthau maintains, this egotistic aspect of human nature leads to a conflict in which "every individual is against fellow individuals"(Morgenthau, 1946, p164).

In Hobbes' state2of nature, there are no rules governing how people should behave; anyone can use force whenever they want. Everyone is wary of others and probable to take preventive measures to guarantee their own survival because they are all motivated by fear: "In such unpredictable circumstances where everyone is a prospective troublemaker, attempting conflict on others2is a more beneficial tactic than peaceful actions, and one2needs to understand that supremacy over others is essential for one 's own continuing existence" (Korab-Karpowicz, 2013).

Consequently, violent preventive measures are viewed as the only morally acceptable and rationally reasonable human behavior patterns. Hobbes' "Leviathan," the government authority or2supreme conqueror, is the remedy for this2anarchic nation: People become permanent residents of a nation and transmit the monopoly of coercion and authority2onto the government since the establishment of the state2is the only "vehicle" that can end the spiral of conflict that is ingrained in the human nature (Kauppi and Viotti, 1999, p.60-61).

The central factor that results in the endless cycle of violence among countries that is typical of classical realist thought may be found if we apply this reasoning from the2domestic domain to the global one, a globe made up of many unique countries: States are fundamentally power-driven and try to amass greater power since the existence of the government is only made feasible by the transfer of the privilege of might and authority from each individual onto the government. The common man casts his ego onto his country and indulges2his anarchic desire indirectly because his desire for dominance and status is denied by his own constraints and the demands of human society (Niebuhr, 2001, p.93). Human beings transmit their attributes, including their self-serving, power-, fear-, and violently motivated behavior, onto the government in addition to their individual authority. Hobbes believed that a state was no more than a larger family that coexisted for mutual defense. State rivalry for greater supremacy and power is hence inevitable;

“*And just as2families did back then, urban areas and monarchies today "magnify their empires upon all false assumptions of threat, worries of encroachment, or support that may be granted to intruders"; they "seek as much as they can to incapacitate or destabilize their neighbors by expansive coercion, and hidden arts, for desires of other caution, legitimately" (Hobbes, 1999, pp. 103–104).*

Humans were able to avoid a civil conflict in which everyone was pitted against one another by delegating their authority to the government, but warfare between nations will always happen. Because there is no2Leviathan to enforce law between countries in the international framework, the chaotic condition of nature's domain simply expands from the human to the global scale (Kauppi and Viotti, 1999, p.61). Peace is seldom a sustainable situation; instead, it is a time for rebuilding from the last warfare and getting ready for the subsequent ones (Bull, 2011, p.105).

Thucydides offers a description of the Athenian notion of seeking unrestricted self-interest in his description of the2Pelopponesian Warfare between Athenian2and Sparta: "The powerful do what2they have the strength to do and the inferior embrace what they2have to endure" (Thucydides, 1972, p.402). This again reverts to the fundamentally self-centered, power-driven aspect of human nature, where the dominant constantly seek to increase their authority and ultimately enslave the helpless. This implies that in2the international realm, governments only want to control one another and have no regard for morality or ethics. Additional evidence provided by Thucydides demonstrates that Athenian expansionism was "legitimate on the basis of economy, stability, aspiration, the quest for fame and the inherent impulse to seek more and therefore control, but never on ethical reasons" (Boucher, 1998, p.74).

The government does not have the entitlement to prioritize prosperous political activities over moral aspects for the defense of freedom because these are frequently motivated by the general ethical beliefs of the country's survival, according to Morgenthau, who also believes that individuals have a moral obligation to compromise themselves for the sake of liberation (Soendergaard, 2008, p.6). In other terms, the government only upholds moral ideals when they are perceived as assisting in the continuation of the nation. If governments can achieve their objectives through warfare, then there are no ethical constraints that would prevent them from fighting one another: there are no morality duties to regulate government interactions in the absence of2any social compact between (or power over) them (Kauppi and Viotti, 1999, p.61).

As this paper has demonstrated, classical realism is predicated on the idea that human nature is catastrophic, self-centered, and power-driven2and that it can ultimately be transcended by the nature of2the state, that has2the exclusive right to defend its inhabitants from one another. The Hobbesian Warfare of all versus all is simply translated to the international stage when dispute moves from the human to the government level (Steiner, 1980, p.342). The reasoning behind classical realism is bluntly summed up by Weber (2010, p. 16) as follows: "The nature of humanity (...) is profoundly faulty (...) [and] skepticism about how2man and collectives of person (structured into sovereign country) will act is the only plausible manner to regard international politics. Therefore, due to the nature of human, international politics will always be unstable and violent.

# Human Nature and Classical Liberalism

The classical liberal philosophy likewise places a high value on presumptions about human nature. Liberals acknowledge that anarchy prevails in international politics, but they contend that lawlessness can be transcended or controlled to some extent, making conflict less probable and not as inevitable as realists claim. The liberal paradigm can be linked to John Locke's significant views, much as the realism tradition can be linked to Hobbes' theories. His idea of how things are in the natural world serves as the foundation for understanding liberalism's optimistic perspective of the universe.

Liberal presumptions about human nature, derived from Locke, represent a more upbeat perspective in comparison to the horrific perspective of human2nature that pervades realist reasoning: Liberals trust in the sensible characteristics of people, put trust in human's capacity to learn from historical past and thus to accomplish progressive change, and they are persuaded that people are confident and eager to collaborate and build a more tolerant civilization (Russett, 2010, p.96).

The so-called first major argument in International2Relations theory was sparked by the disparity among realists and liberals' fundamental beliefs regarding human nature. This demonstrates how crucially different interpretations of human nature2have influenced IR philosophies: "The narrative of the first critical discussion has become a2dominant part2of the self-image of the domain and has repetitively been rewritten in innumerable reading materials and 'state of2the discipline' publications, and it has functioned as the reference point for majority of the traditionalist curricular track records of IR" (Schmidt, 2012, p.1).

Influential realists like Morgenthau and Carr harshly attacked liberalism's optimistic view of human nature during the first major debate. Both claimed that realists might concentrate on how the universe is realistically, whilst liberals would concentrate on how people and the universe should be (Kurki and Wight, 2010, p.17). As a result, realist philosophers criticized liberals’ as2idealists and liberalism2as a utopian ideology. This realism paradigm, which was solidly founded on a concept of a permanent and identifiable human nature, opposed this idealism school by acknowledging the importance of self-interest2as the motivating factor behind human nature (Ashworth, 2006, p.295-296).

Nevertheless, in the2liberal tradition, self-interest is2also a core element of human. Whilst realism views human rational2self-interest as a zero-sum matchup in which everyone competes against everybody to obtain a comparative advantages over another, liberalism believes that rational2self-interest can result to positive returns if humans collaborate: "But the overall effect of2rationally chosen, self-regarding2courses of initiative by people tends, joyfully, to steer to improved results for all, or at least2for the large percentage" (Lawson, 2012, p.40).

Whilst Locke draws on Hobbes' concept of the state2of nature, his inferences are fundamentally distinct. Whilst Hobbes recognizes human nature as preplanned and captured in an endless culture of hostility, Locke perceives humankind's ability to advance and break free from the phase of innumerable conflict. Both Hobbes' and Locke's2states of nature are marked by a scarcity of sovereign authority, but Locke's2state of nature is profoundly dissimilar in that it is not populated by vicious, self-centered human beings who aspire to conquer one another. It is, instead, a "state also2of equality, in which all the authority and territory is mutual, no one2having extra than2the other; there being hardly anything more clearly apparent, that living beings of the identical genus and position, promiscuously conceived to all the identical benefits of nature, and the utilize of the identical capacities, ought to be equivalent one amongst the2other without enslavement or confinement (...)" (Locke, 1980, p. 8).

Locke's notion of human nature adheres to a particular inherent rule that allocates some powers and responsibilities to everyone, in contrast to Hobbes' notion of human nature2as being fully unfettered in the state of nature. Logic, which is that rule, "instructs all humanity, (...) that becoming all identical and sovereign, no one should hurt anyone in his life, health, freedom, or belongings (...)," according to Locke's law2of nature (Locke, 1980, p9). Therefore, Locke's natural law guarantees the traditional human rights as human beings, freedom, and property as they exist today. It also serves as a moral concept that stresses the responsibility to respect the values of everyone else (Reno, 2009, p.642).

People are mandated to implement their own entitlement and to take appropriate step against anybody who infringes their obligations to others because there is no supreme power to do so. "And therefore, in the state2of nature, one person emerges with authority over another;  but nevertheless no ultimate or unjustifiable authority, to use a lawbreaker, when2he has him in2his hands, (...) but only to2retribute to him, so far2as calm purpose and moral compass govern, what is adequate to him,"  (Locke, 1980, p10). Therefore, even in2the state of nature, criminal acts like homicide, enslavement, and robbery are definitely forbidden (Doyle, 1997, p.217).

The state of nature and state of conflict, which are not equivalent as Hobbes believed, were distinguished by Locke plainly: "Men dwelling peacefully in accordance with rational, without a single authority on the globe, with capacity to govern amongst them, is appropriately the condition of nature." However, the use of violence, or a stated intention to use coercion, against another individual when there is no collective authority on the globe to whom to turn for help, characterizes the state2of conflict (Locke, 1980, p.15). This once more illustrates how liberalism and realism hold distinct perspectives on human nature: Locke contradicts realist notions that the state2of nature equates to a state of conflict in which everybody aspires to subjugate one another since Locke's state2of nature is founded on liberty, impartiality, and fairness between all humans and is an ideal "state of absolute liberation" (Locke, 1980, p. 8).

Even Locke's theory of the state of nature, nevertheless, has certain flaws: The original state of human cohabitation is demonstrated by a dearth of social frameworks, which brings with it a multitude of difficulties, utilizing an empirical instead of normative perspective (Hindess, 2007, p.14). The bias and subjectivity2of judges who decide their own disputes due to lack of a sovereign authority is the most glaring indication of how far from flawless law of nature is as the only basis of law enforcement (Doyle, 1997, p.217). Locke's state of nature is ultimately highly weak if rules are disobeyed or taken incorrectly. That is why most individuals opt to dwell in a civil community, a union based on a social compact involving the government and its inhabitants.

Because humans are not explicitly compelled, as in Hobbes's view, to cede their authority to the nation for the sake of existence, they are not willing to submit to any form of tyrannical governance and instead fight to maintain their basic rights (Doyle, 1997, p.218). We can deduce that humans, together with their authority, also transmit their features onto the government, much as in Hobbes' notion of state creation. Here, we can see the key distinction among liberalism and realism as well as its presumptions that conflict is not inevitable: While Locke's individuals are distinguished by their capacity for cooperation and eventually accomplish social development, passing many more "positive" attributes onto the government, Hobbes' individuals are identified by their self-centered and aggressive human nature.

As a result, the core finding of liberalism is that governments are strongly constrained in their behavior by both local and international civil community (Moravcsik, 1992, p.2). States are capable of working together internationally just as individuals are equipped to do so. States understand the prospect of overcoming a persistent state of war2in the international sphere, just as people do, that it is conceivable to transcend a continuous condition of interpersonal war. Hobbes' view of the world is one that is fundamentally militaristic, but Locke views it as a time of unsettled peace where acts of violence against privileges to life, freedom, or possessions constitute a definite act of war (...). The rest is peaceful according to Doyle (2007, p. 219).

# Conclusion

As this article has demonstrated, presumptions about human nature have a significant impact on the international politics and on how governments structure their interactions with one another. While liberalism has more confidence in people's abilities to transcend their "basic inclinations" and accomplish progressive change that reduces the likelihood of warfare between nations, realism prefers to emphasize the confrontational, self-centered, and violent elements of human nature. Both schools of thought view people as rational, but their inferences are very different. Realists believe that it is rational for people to try to conquer one another viciously in a globe of chaos and irresponsibility, whereas liberals believe that it is in people's best interests to work together and avoid violent disputes.

Although the article has demonstrated how the many conceptions of human nature have influenced international politics, it is unable to address the issue of whether conception of humanity2is more accurate and realistic. The next logical step would be to contrast the ideas of the most influential theories of2international relations regarding human2nature with ideas and research on human nature2that have been developed in academic fields including anthropology, psychology, sociology, and biology. Beyond any doubt, beliefs regarding human2nature have evolved over time and with the advancement of knowledge.
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