



HAL
open science

The nature of wars in World Politics

Charlius Pierre

► **To cite this version:**

Charlius Pierre. The nature of wars in World Politics. Paix et Sécurité Internationales - Journal of International Law and International Relations, 2024. <hal-04588164>

HAL Id: hal-04588164

<https://hal.science/hal-04588164v1>

Submitted on 26 May 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Copyright - All rights reserved

The Nature of Wars in World Politics

Charlius Pierre, PhD

May 2024

An Article presented to the Academic Department of International Relations of Atlantic International University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Post Doctorate in International Relations.

CONTENT

- **TITLE:** The nature of *Wars and World Politics*.
- **ABSTRACTS**
- **INTRODUCTION**
 1. Explain and evaluate Clausewitz's two trinitities.
 2. What is the difference between a limited war and a total war?
 3. In what ways is war the continuation of politics by other means?
 4. Analyze a war using the war and society approach.
 5. What is strategy? What are tactics?
 6. How did war and armed force shape the development of the modern state?
 7. What is the relationship between nationalism and war?
 8. Explain the difference between the national–international and global dimensions of war.
 9. How are the national–international and global dimensions of war connected?
 10. Explain how patterns of warfare differ in the Global South and North.
- **CONCLUSION**
- **ACRONYMS**

ABSTRACT

With the transformation of different groups of peoples and tribes into organized societies, including the dynamics of cultures and civilizations, wars seem become means related to the self-determination of peoples in achieving their goals and defending their particular interests. Thus, it seems also that the phenomena of wars and conflicts are intrinsic to human nature, and they occur with the volunteer to dominate, as well as the desires of large countries to expand their power, increase and strengthen their hegemony over other rival states. For some scholars, war remains the only alternative when the diplomacy of negotiation or bargaining fails, and the use of force to demand that the other side satisfy the desires of the other part, particularly the less powerful states, when the situation of political and diplomatic crash and conflicts occur. Other researchers and political scientists focus more on nationalist sentiments that guide citizens' behaviors in defending and protecting their nations' interests, and these interests lead nations to increase their power to threaten, deter, fight, and defeat their enemies.

Certainly since Antiquity, rules of law have been established to govern the conduct of wars, but it was only in the 14th century that the notion of wars has been developed in Europe, thanks in particular to the School of Salamanca and Grotius. Inspired since the 13th century by the Catholic philosopher-theologian St Thomas Aquinas, these authors laid the foundations of international law until The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, later the Four Conventions of Geneva of 1949 and their Additional Protocols in 1977, which constitute today the foundation of International Humanitarian Law.

Spending on military capabilities by superpowers has increased significantly in recent decades, and the desire of less powerful states to survive in this global anarchy drives them, alongside the superpowers, to increase their military arsenal to self-defense in the anarchical world.

In fact, it is obvious that the characteristics of war in any particular age might change, but the essential nature of war could not; thus, the novel characteristics of war were not the result of new inventions, but only of new ideas and social conditions. Clausewitz, through his trinity theories presents his conception of war as a compound of passion, reason and chance. For him, war, whether total or limited, causes considerable damage to humans and the environment. However, for other political scientists, war is clearly considered as a social activity, a tool for friendly cooperation. This is what we called the institution of war, for the conduct of war requires a society to cooperate in performing complex tasks on a large scale.

Moreover, war dominates not only domestic area, but also international and global society. For other scholars, the conduct of wars requires strategy and tactics without which it should be impossible for conflicting states to achieve their goals. However, even though wars are beneficial for the winners and tragic for the losers, they increase suffering in human existence and figure among the greatest tragedies that humanity is struggling with. In fact, wars actually produce neither winners nor losers, but victims, and they become more destructive in our time with the growth of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons, built to kill, destroy, threaten and deter the enemies.

INTRODUCTION:

Among the great tragedies which often shake the world and disrupt human existence, we can mention disease, hunger, pandemics, epidemics, natural disasters, wars, etc. And since the foundation of the world and the beginning of human existence, wars have been among the great tragedies that injure, kill, and destroy lives, goods and properties. With multiple wars that kill, destroy and paralyze human existence, it undoubtedly becomes impossible to deny that human beings are naturally and intrinsically warlike, and that wars constitute major events in the history of societies. No area of human action seems foreign to war. It can thus be considered as a total social fact. All civilizations and peoples of the world have experienced and continue to experience wars which paralyze their daily lives, and which prevent them from living in peace, concord, fraternity and harmony. Even if wars seem to change in nature and in the ways they are waged, human beings continue to experience this epiphenomenon, because there is no difference between peoples called “barbarians” and those called “civilized”. Throughout history, conflicts always turn into wars and people remain attached to their particular interests, economic or political, which causes disputes and conflicts transformed into destruction and murder.

Throughout history, ages, centuries, civilizations, humans through their tribes, religions or ideologies are always the promoters and influencers of wars. Wars are always armed struggles between different social groups, which seek to extend their influence with the aim of pursuing political, religious, economic and territorial goals, whether defensive or preventive, legitimate or legal, illegitimate or illegal. Some wars are fought either to defend law and justice, or to deter, threaten and eliminate enemies. In this modern world, wars are fought as rivalries between states, powerful and small states, often within states themselves. Wars result from the normal or abnormal

interplay of relations between states since no supranational authority can limit the sovereign decision of a state to use force to preserve its interests. On the other side, peace negatively defined as non-war, is only a state of exception. Wars are source of insecurity, they disrupt relations between states, societies and peoples, without however neglecting defensive alliances and multilateral cooperation, which rule the modern international relations.

For many sociologists, scholars, political scientists, historians and political philosophers, wars are perceived as a clash of civilizations between state powers and national armies that are necessarily rivals, such as the example of the Two World Wars which always used sophisticated military means, ignoring the international order as well as international law. Certainly, since Antiquity, rules of law have been established to govern the conduct of wars, but it was only in the 14th century that the notion of wars has been developed in Europe, thanks in particular to the School of Salamanca and Grotius. Inspired since the 13th century by the Catholic philosopher-theologian St Thomas Aquinas, these authors laid the foundations of international law, that is, the base of rules defining the reasons for waging war: The “jus ad bellum”, and the manner of doing it: The “us in bello”. These rules had firmly regulated the principles of proportionality in the use of force, respect for civilians and therefore made the distinction between civilians and soldiers.

Initially customary, the law of wars was gradually codified by international treaties, because after “The Hague Conventions” in 1899 and 1907, which were swept away by the First World War, numerous texts and treaties, including the Four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols in 1977, constitute today the foundation of International Humanitarian Law. These treaties and conventions protect civilians and prisoners, prohibiting the use of torture, prohibiting also certain biological weapons in 1972, chemical weapons in 1993, cluster munitions in 2008, or certain practices, such as the recruitment of child soldiers in 1989, etc.

Through established international and multilateral institutions, treaties, pacts and conventions have been signed and ratified by states in order to prevent interstate and intrastate conflicts and wars. In the event of wars, they must be waged within legal and legitimate frameworks. As early as the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the great powers agreed on the need to limit the right to use in wars. In this case, the First World War played a catalytic role through the disapproval it aroused in public opinion. Depicted as a moral and civilizational collapse, it led to the creation of the League of Nations then, after the Second World War, to that of the United Nations, responsible for ensuring the conditions for global collective security. With the creation of the United Nations, wars become a practice that is only justified by self-defense principles or collective decisions through the Security Council in the event of a threat to peace and security. Therefore, for a war to be legitimate, the use of force must require the approval of the international community.

However, the frenzied pursuit for sophisticated weapons continues to be proliferated, and despite treaties and laws on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, certain states arrogate to themselves the right to self-enrich of uranium in order to manufacture them. Biological and chemical weapons which are recognized as weapons of mass destruction are also prohibited for their use in wars. Nevertheless, despite the numerous measures imposed by the international community, these weapons are often used by actors involved in wars. And despite the rarity or reduction of interstate wars, the military budgets of states paradoxically continue to grow, particularly in some emerging countries and regional powers.

For example, we have seen how China has multiplied its military budget tenfold since 1998, leading, in the logic of the security dilemma, to a significant increase in its neighbors Vietnam. North Korea continues to acquire nuclear weapons, and Irian is on the verge of

possessing them. Israel owns its nuclear weapon facility, and threatens Iran for possessing them. The trend is still comparable in the Persian Gulf, particularly in Saudi Arabia, where spending on arms purchases from the great powers serves as much to strengthen military capabilities as for diplomatic and influence purposes. Its willingness to conclude a defense treaty with the United States testifies to the greatness of increasing of its power in the Middle East. Thus, even if states no longer wage wars directly, they continue to intervene in peripheral conflicts, although they lose control of major bloody wars.

Military spending by superpowers has increased considerably in recent decades, and the desires of less powerful states to survive in this global anarchy pushes them to desires to increase their military arsenal. It is from this arms crisis that the growing sophistication of weapons also results. But, faced with the rejection of wars by global public opinion, the great powers practice the doctrine of zero deaths, therefore that which henceforth consists of avoiding losses in their ranks, thanks to the improvement of weapons by the military-industrial complex. For centuries, military technology evolved little and the essential factor in victory was the number of men mobilized to face enemies. This is why, the arrival of gunpowder in the 14th century, then especially the generalization of aviation in the 20th century, radically changed the data by allowing massive bombings, a period marking the invention of nuclear weapons in 1945.

Moreover, the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and, more recently, military drones has completed the revolution in military affairs. From now on, it is possible to participate in a conflict without exposing oneself, and today, the number of men does not matter in a war. In fact, the deployment of killer robots, capable of deciding to kill in complete autonomy, is now raising unprecedented ethical debates. Either in the past or today, the question of ethic of wars remains a fundamental issue, for human beings must be protected, and wars are the main

factors that cause massacres, atrocities and casualties. Wars remain a human invention used to kill and massacre each other, and they serve the interest of statesmen and superpowers in maintaining their hegemony in the world. Thus, in the conduct of wars we can assert that wars occur between people who do not know each other, but who massacre each other for the benefit of people who know each other, but who do not massacre each other. Reflecting on theories of wars, which initially push us to present the thoughts of a Prussian and military scholar of 18th and 19th centuries named Carl von Clausewitz, who stressed the moral and political aspects of waging wars, by explaining, describing and evaluating the nature of wars through his theories of two trinities.

1. Explain and evaluate Clausewitz's two trinities.

Michael Sheehan, who is the author of the chapter entitled *The changing character of war*, presents Carl von Clausewitz's analysis on the characteristics of wars. For him, Clausewitz is an influential strategist for whom the fundamental nature of war is immutable. As Clausewitz himself sustains, "the characteristics or form of war typical in any particular age might change, but the essential nature of war could not; thus, the novel characteristics of war were not the result of new inventions, but of new ideas and social conditions"¹. "One of the central arguments of Clausewitz, is the fact that war is a form of social and political behavior"². About the nature of war, Clausewitz also distinguished the objective from the subjective nature of war, the former comprising of the elements of common to all wars and the latter consisting of those features that make each war

¹ Michael Sheehan cited in John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens. *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*, Oxford, Oxford University of Press, Edition4, 2008, 213.

² Ibid. 215

unique³. The first aspect on which Clausewitz fixes his reflection consists in describing the fundamental nature of war which is immutable throughout its history.

Hugh Smith, an Australian author who analyzes the two Clausewitz's divisions affirms that "Clausewitz frequently bases his analysis on opposites, polarities and contradictions: offence and defense, means and ends, action and reaction, war with limited aims and war fought for survival or total overthrow of the enemy, strategies of attrition and of all-out effort, physical and psychological elements of warfare, theory and practice, art and science. These dualities are essentially polar opposites with pressures and tendencies, claims and counter-claims in both directions"⁴. For Smith, what interested Clausewitz most was the complex and disputed no-man's land between two simple concepts, the ways in which two differing elements might combine and re-combine over time, and the potential for transition from one to the other. Smith explains that Clausewitz's dualist approach was intended both to identify the critical components of war in a clear fashion and to bring out its complexity.

Dualism is also evident in a quite different field of analysis, namely Clausewitz's discussion of the psychology of military commanders. While conceding that he is not an expert in the discipline, Clausewitz looks first at the degree of stability or steadfastness in a commander which can be high or low. A second quality is the level of emotion or personal involvement of a commander which can also be either high or low. The greatest potential for military genius, Clausewitz concludes, is to be found in commanders who are difficult to move but have strong feelings⁵.

³ Ibidem.216

⁴ Hugh Smith, "Clausewitz's Divisions: Analysis by Twos and Threes", Volume 5, Issue 3, Fall 2016.

⁵ Cf. Hugh Smith

About trinity, Clausewitz's celebrated trinity describes his conception of war as a compound of passion, reason and chance. For passion, reason and chance are in war what Clausewitz calls 'dominant tendencies'. Every war contains a mix of the irrational and uncontrollable (passion), the rational and instrumental (reason), and the unpredictable and unknowable (chance). War partakes of this remarkable trinity, because it is simply part of man's social existence⁶. Furthermore, for Christopher Bassford, Clausewitz's brief discussion of the trinity represents the capstone of "Clausewitzian" theory. First, it is the synthesis of his dialectical exploration of the nature of war. Second, every identifiable concept in *On War* can be related to one or more of its elements⁷. In fact, Clausewitzian trinities are a strain that runs across the entire ambit of warfare and at every level of the conduct of this human endeavor. As Clausewitz describes the triad in war, this triad would then lead to the achievement of the three objectives of war. These three objectives could not be separated from each other and hence are symbiotic to success.

Within many of these Trinitarian military axioms, Clausewitz describes the nonlinear nature of war. His description and understanding of the social dynamics of war give complex meaning to the interaction of various social elements in war, characterizing it as a complex adaptive system. Political and military leaders and policymakers should be mindful of the nonlinear nature of the social interactions in war. In doing so, they will be more prepared and adaptable to unpredicted yet material developments throughout a conflict. The trinities essentially present a picture of the war from the perspective of one actor, one 'side', perhaps even an alliance in war. Thus, in order to gain a complete perspective of war we have to visualize what we might term a 'clash of trinities'; essentially the idea being that we need to bring together the separate trinities of each belligerent

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Christopher Bassford, "Teaching the Clausewitzian Trinity: A Teaching Note", January 2003.

and analyze their interaction⁸. Clausewitz's two trinities doctrine describes and centralizes his perception on the nature of war and its consequences, what can provoke a war and what can happen during and after this war. Such reflections help us question on the difference between what is called a limited war and a total war.

2. What is the difference between a limited war and a total war?

Limited war is defined as military confrontation in which adversaries voluntarily limit the goals to achieve. For example, with the advent of nuclear weapons, the contemporary era is rediscovering the notion of limited war which is often the place of indirect confrontation between the great powers through intermediary nations. The opposite of a limited war would rather be what Clausewitz called "absolute war". But the Prussian theorist considered it as a pure concept, which the reality of war could approach without ever reaching it. However, the difference that Clausewitz made between limited war and total war is based on a postulate which attributes, in essence, a violent character to wars waged by nations rather than by princes. Clausewitz was aware of the difficulties posed to historical analysis by this essentialist trap. This is why, in a chapter eloquently entitled "Absolute war and real war", he confronts the concept of "absolute war" with historical reality⁹. Clausewitz's first arguments focus on the difference between absolute and limited war.

In fact, for some other political scientists, total war is the means used by states to mobilize their entire military and economic resources, and limited wars is the fact that states fight with something less with their full potential, often because their aims are limited or of relatively low value. Thus, it is an evidence to assert how a state evaluates the stakes of conflict determines where

⁸ Cf. Christopher Basfford, *Op. Cit.*

⁹ Hervé Drévillo, "Total war vs Limited war: A political lecture", Rennes university press, 2014/ 06/02

on this continuum its effort will be¹⁰. Other scholars conceive total war as a concept which refers to three dimensions of the development of a conflict. First of all, an unlimited goal, which could be characterized by the will of destruction not only military, but also political of the adversary. Must disappear not only its armed forces, but also its existence as a sovereign state or as an autonomous political entity. Secondly, it is then a question of mobilizing the entire society in the service of this goal as well as targeting all the components of the enemy power to prevent it from achieving its objectives. Finally, total war results in extreme violence, without any notion of regulation¹¹. This second approach differentiates between the power of strikes that occur during a war, to better identify whether one war is more destructive than another before categorizing it under the label of limited or absolute war.

As it is already precise, total war is in fact defined by the mobilization of all resources (human, economic, material and moral) of the belligerents, which does not necessarily imply unlimited use of violence. For example, the American Civil War is explained as the first total war of the industrial era, but was nonetheless limited in terms of the violence exerted on civilian populations who were, on the whole, spared¹². According to history, we can affirm that as early as 1815, Clausewitz spoke of absolute war, to designate the final stage of a conflict, the one where the belligerents use all their means not only to conquer, but to annihilate the enemy. Moreover, this notion of total war was taken up by the German command during the First World War. Because, in 1916, Erich Ludendorff (1865-1937), right-hand man of Chief of Staff Paul von Hindenburg, requested that all

¹⁰ Jeffrey A. Freiden, David A. Lake, Kenneth A. Schultz, *World politics: Interests, interactions, institutions*, New York. London, Norton, Third edition, 2010, 107.

¹¹ Dominique Trinquand, Benoît Durieux, Emmanuel Meyer, Rémy Février, "Total war" The return of war, 12th National Conference on Strategic Research, n° 864, November 2023.

¹² Thierry Widemann, "Unlimited war does not exist", Number 353, September 2010.

civil and military powers of the Empire be entrusted to military command. All resources, all the vital forces of the nation must be directed towards the war effort, organized by coherent and centralized military planning. After the defeat, Ludendorff presented these analyzes in a book, published in 1936, entitled, precisely, *Total War*¹³. Limited war and total war differ from military action that occurs, but depending on the degree of use of force, violence and the military power of a state to deter, threaten, destabilize and kill.

The global dimensions of war permit to also deepen the concept of total war, especially during the Napoleonic Era. Because the concept of total war is different from the limited wars of the distant past in several crucial respects. First, it is unlimited in that one or more of the belligerents seek total victory and will stop at nothing short of unconditional surrender. Second, total war is unlimited as to means. States use advanced technology to enhance the range, accuracy, and killing power of modern weapons. Third, war is unlimited as to participation: whole societies engage in the war effort. That is why, the Napoleonic Wars are the prototype of total war and the first such war ever fought. Napoléon waged an all-out drive for hegemony that recognized no limits on ends or means. He sought total domination of Europe, and he possessed all the resources available to a modern, centralized state at that time.

Most important, Napoléon brilliantly combined patriotic nationalism and mass conscription, drafting thousands of young men into the modern world's first people's army. Napoléon also used nationalism, propaganda, and patriotic symbols to mobilize the entire society behind the war effort. In this sense, we can consider the total wars fought in the first half of the twentieth century a single event with an interlude between two incredibly violent spasms – the horrific culmination of

¹³ Erich Ludendorff, "On War" by Carl von Clausewitz, and "Total War" by Erich Ludendorff, Tempus collection, Perrin editions, November 15, 2014.

processes set in motion more than century earlier¹⁴. Limited wars and total wars describe two main characteristics of wars, depending on the actors involved in wars, which also imply their intention, desires, perspectives and goals they want to pursue and achieve when they fight. In other terms, it is good to wonder if war is the continuation of politics by other means as many scholars and theorists affirm that.

3. In what ways is war the continuation of politics by other means?

It is generally said that war's very nature involves the use of violence. As Robert A. Heinlein put it, the army is a permanent organization for the destruction of life and property. However, in the other sense, it is affirmed that "war is clearly a profoundly social activity, an example of humanity's enormous capacity for friendly cooperation. This is why Michel Foucault called the institution of war the military dimension of society. This is because also the conduct of war requires a society to cooperate in performing complex tasks on a large scale. Societies can fight wars because they are able to cooperate at the internal level¹⁵. However, James D. Fearon asserts that "Prewar bargaining may fail to locate an outcome in the bargaining rang. While states have an incentive to avoid the costs of war, they also wish to obtain a favorable resolution of the issues. This latter desire can give them an incentive to exaggerate their true willingness or capability to fight, if by doing so they might deter future challenges or persuade the other side to make concessions"¹⁶. Moreover, pursues Fearon, "states can also have an incentive to conceal their capabilities or resolve, if they are concerned that revelation would make them militarily and hence

¹⁴ Thomas M. Magstadt. *Understanding politics: Ideas, institutions & issues*, Belmont, CA, Tenth edition, 2013, 413-414.

¹⁵ John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens, *Op. Cit.* 215.

¹⁶ James D. Fearon, "International Organization (Rationalist explanations for war)", Vol. 49, No. 3 Summer, 1999, 395.

politically vulnerable or would reduce the chances for a successful first strike¹⁷. Such descriptions presented by these authors opens windows of opportunity to allow politicians and statesmen to make compromises or concessions through avenues of negotiation and peace in order to avoid more destructions and casualties.

On the other hand, other authors agree to affirm that states feel themselves compelled to fight other societies because they often find it difficult to cooperate at the external level. This means, wars occur when nation-states loose the capacity to bargain, and outside of bargaining, the statesmen resort to the use of force either to self-defend and defend their interests or to apply the international law, and to deter and threaten voluntarily. In this case, we should also understand that war is the central problem of international politics. In the famous words of Carl von Clausewitz, “war is a continuation of politics by other means.” This means, governments are always conscious of the possibility that diplomacy or politics will fail and war with a neighboring state, or perhaps between rival ethnic or religious groups within a state, can break out at any time. Indeed, the most glaring defect of politics on all levels is its inability to prevent armed conflict in these myriad forms¹⁸. The failure of negotiations creates the main opportunity for the outbreak of wars between states, and no one can stop its devastating effects, in this case, the negotiation could retake place when one of the parties to the war fails or suffers more casualties than others.

In this case, Schelling’s focus on the strategy of conflict it is what we can call the strategic bargaining, that is, the manipulation of carrots and sticks in pursuit of one’s goals vis-à-vis other states. While interested in both carrots and sticks, he is more interested in sticks, particularly the

¹⁷Ibid. 396

¹⁸ Cf. Thomas M. Magstadt, *Op. Cit.* 398.

threat to use force¹⁹. As a realist, he tends to place greater faith in the stick, for war appears when bargainers lose the capacity to negotiate, such a negotiation cannot satisfy the two parties in conflict. War becomes the unique alternative to progress in diplomacy. The threat to use military force remains an important element in bargaining situations involving military deterrence, in many cases, for preventing military attack by making the potential costs of such action exceed the potential benefits in the eyes of the would-be aggressor.

In that case, warfare seems remain to states the last option to achieve the diplomacy or political goals. Because, to better “understand why some conflicts become wars and other do not, we have to think about the strategic interactions that states engage in when they seek to settle their disputes²⁰. Furthermore, states can refer to coercive diplomacy, “for a crisis occurs at least one state seeks to influence the outcome of bargaining by threatening to use military force in the even that it does not get what it wants. At this point, we enter the domain of coercive bargaining in which the consequences of not reaching an agreement can involve the use of force, including war”.

Thus, “we sometimes refer to bargaining under the threat of war as crisis bargaining or coercive diplomacy. In such all interactions, at least one state sends the message “Satisfy my demands, or else” –where the “or else” involves imposing costs on the other side through military action. In some cases, this message takes the form of an explicit ultimatum, or in other cases, the threat is conveyed implicitly, through menacing actions such as mobilization of troops or military maneuvers. The costs and likely outcome of a war determine which deals each side will consider acceptable in crisis bargaining²¹. War actually occurs when arbitrariness takes the place of

¹⁹ J. Martin Rochester. *Fundamental principles of International relations*, Philadelphia, Westview Press, 2010, 137.

²⁰ Jeffrey A. Freiden, David A. Lake, Kenneth A. Schultz, *Op. Cit.* 96.

²¹ *Ibid.* 97

international law, privileging the state of nature of human beings, or at least when the actors fail during negotiation and lose the patience and ability to continue the process of bargaining. Regardless of its devastating effects, the goals and strategies used to its achievement, warfare remains a specific area of study in international system which requires different analytical approaches.

4. Analyse a war using the war and society approach.

At the end of the 2023, the world is witnessing the war between two peoples on a single territory and land: Israel and Palestine. This is why it might be good to reflect and analyze the effects of this long conflict which began since 1947, when the Palestinians protested against the Israelites for the first time after the United Nations recognized and created the state of Israel, and ignoring the rights of Palestinian, in turn, to be a state. This war began when Hamas first attacked Israeli civilians, killing and kidnapping them, and in response to this attack, Israel deployed its army and vigorously bombed, killed thousands of Palestinians, destroyed infrastructures and in turn imprisoned numerous Palestinian civilians. However, in both sides, we can wonder who benefits from these odious, barbaric vile crimes which destroy lives and properties?

Our point of views and reflections must consist in urging the international community, under the leadership of the Security Council, to encourage these two peoples, Israel and Palestine, to sit at the same table to negotiate, in order for Israel to recognize the right of the Palestinians to be a state, as Palestine must also recognize the legitimacy of Israel as a state. Because these two nations were in the past a single nation, having received that heritage of their ancestors, but divided due to fundamentalist religious conflicts, generally between Muslims and Jews.

When we watch television and see the tragedies of the civilians in Gaza who are most affected by this war, we self-ask, what is the position of the international community? Why the war in Ukraine was and still is a major concern for the international community, alarmed by Russia's invasion of Ukraine, and why such a tragedy in Gaza demands silence from the *Masters* of the world? We believe that war has neither winners nor losers, but victims. So, as international law recognizes legitimacy, it means Israel's right to self-defend, to defend its territory and its population, but kill babies, students, elderly people and defenseless people becomes at the same time a nonsense. If Hamas is known by Israel as a terrorist group, can we wonder if all Palestinians are terrorists?

As human beings, aware of the negative impacts of the war, we can question the main role that the American government, Israel's partner, and more particularly the Biden administration, can also play in concluding a negotiation between the Palestinian or Hamas leaders and the Israeli government in order to obtain a ceasefire, but also to stop this war in order to stabilize this region. If the United States is recognized as the first state to have sanctioned Russia for having invaded Ukraine, the same situation also exists in Palestine. As Israel's partner, the U.S. government can intervene to end this conflict. Because on an ethical level, nothing justifies war even if some authors speak about a just war and legitimacy. The United States must change its overall approach and commit to a broad-based diplomatic process that can finally resolve the conflict and prioritize rights and dignity for people in the region.

“Many authors (agree and) argue that war, and violence in general, is often the product of anger, frustration, and raw emotions having to do with feelings of deprivation, especially relative

to what others have or what one has come to expect”²². Such a statement describes the situation in Palestine, as Israeli settlements in the West Bank and its embargo on the Gaza Strip do not allow Hamas to also attack Israeli civilians in revenge. However, the biggest mistake in this whole tragedy is the double standards (two weights, two measures) practiced by the international community, particularly the United Nations, which is responsible for settling international conflicts between nations and states, and the United States recognized for its leadership to manage the world politics. In 1947, the United Nations should create two states: Palestine and Israel, as it has freed Namibia from South Africa in 1990, has stopped the aggression of Iraq after invading Kuwait in 1990, and has also created the state of South of Sudan in 2011. For if the United Nations and the US government succeed in restoring peace, their credibility will be more appreciated.

For example, we can wonder, how the United States can continue to support Ukraine and condemn Russian aggression, if Israel continues to kill civilians, throw bombs on hospitals, schools, kill children and sick people? Mathew Doss and Nancy Okail relates this point when they assert, as “The United States has supported the International Criminal Court’s investigation into Russian atrocities in Ukraine, Washington must do the same in Israel and the Palestinian territories”²³. This means, the international law must apply both in Ukraine and Gaza. A short ceasefire is not the solution, both peoples must live in peace, and the lives of civilians in Israel and Palestine must be protected. It should be the most beautiful gift they can receive if the US government wants to be a credible state that promote democracy and human rights in the name of humanity. Washington must no longer allow Israel or any other country to use weapons purchased

²² J. Martin, Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 167.

²³ Matthew Duss, Nancy Okail, “Extend the Cease-Fire in Gaza— but Don ’t Stop There: Regional Diplomacy and an Overhaul of U.S. Policy Could Produce Lasting Peace”, November 27, 2023

from the United States or financed by U.S. aid to violate international humanitarian law. And the United Nations cannot lead the international diplomacy if the world is still transforming into anarchy, without an international system stopping the derive of the most powerful states.

Political dialogue, diplomatic negotiation and mediation can provide solution between Israel and Palestine. The most dangerous episode in this long crisis is the affirmation or statement making one believe that there is no possible solution to this long conflict. The international community must stop this genocide which occurs between Israel and Palestine. For since the establishment of the international order based on international law, humanity and more precisely human beings are not continually guided or lived under the leadership of the state of nature, but by reason which guides human actions in favor prosperity, peace, security, justice and happiness. Otherwise, the wars that break out in different regions of the world will be more devastating for people and the environment, because between the new strategies and tactics used by more powerful states with weapons of mass destruction, devastation and losses will remain the main concern of humanity. In the event of wars, what would be the first methods put in place for its accomplishment? It is in this sense that our minds revolve around the concepts of strategies and tactics to deepen our understanding of the application of wars.

5. What is strategy? What are tactics?

To begin, we can affirm that strategy is a concept with several meanings, related to a specific field. We can talk about strategy in education, in teaching, in business, in planning, in military, politics, diplomacy, etc. For instance, in military domain, strategy is understood as the best means of employing the threat and use of military force to acquire the goals. The free dictionary defines strategy as “The science and art of military command as applied to the overall planning and

conduct of large-scale combat operations”, and “A plan of action resulting from strategy or intended to accomplish a specific goal”. For tactics, it is defined as “The military science that deals with securing objectives set by strategy, especially the technique of deploying and directing troops, ships, and aircraft in effective maneuvers against an enemy” and also “A procedure or set of maneuvers engaged in to achieve an end, an aim, or a goal²⁴” It is in this sense that many specialists in military science agree that winning a war requires above all strategy and tactics.

In short, the difference between strategy and tactics can be summed up as strategy determines where you want to go and tactics determine how you’ll get there. Strategy is required to set the overarching direction and destination of the organization, and tactics are required to define the concrete actions you’ll take to reach your destination or to obtain your objectives. As Sun Tzu expresses that in the *Art of war*: “Strategy without tactics is the slowest route to victory. Tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat”²⁵. As we can assert that a good strategy is characterized by certain elements that contribute to its effectiveness in guiding decision-making and achieving long-term success. As also good tactics are vital for the success of the strategy since they are the specific actions that will help achieve the desired outcomes. Good tactics ensure the implementation and execution of goods actions to support broader goals and objectives. Nevertheless, despite its devastating impacts, many scholars verify and agree that the conduct of war and armed forces shape the development of the modern world, and states remain the primary beneficiaries of the war industry. In what sense we can agree with such a statement?

²⁴ Cf. thefreedictionary.com

²⁵ Sun Tzu. *The Art of War*, [Ralph D. Sawyer and Mei-chun Lee Sawyer Translated, with introductions and commentary], New York, Barnes & Noble, 1994, 203.

6. How did war and armed force shape the development of the modern state?

War can be understood as a human invention, existing since the so-called “barbarian” era. But in the so-called modern era, major wars intensified on the European continent, which occasioned later the great scientific inventions and the technical spectacular development. And since the industrial, technological and communication revolutions, military science achieved considerable advances in intelligence and defense, through the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, better known as weapons of mass destruction. War and military theories have therefore become a science which favors scientific progress, the expansion of technologies, innovation and research.

First of all, if we question modern history, the 12th century is remembered as the century of the great warlike upheaval started in Europe, and we would say during that time, wars were also the prerogative of the king. Therefore, wars expressed, better than any other activity, the sovereignty of the king. Whether it concerned representations, the royal function, the power he delegates or not, the king was first and foremost a warrior king, a knight king and war king. Thus, for many centuries wars were concentrated in the hands of the great powers in Europe, and the modern system has witnessed an average at least one great power per decade. This is why wars had also accelerated the scale of the mobilization of energies, human, financial and economic resources, accelerating the transformation of administrative practices.

By dint of administrative practices, it was therefore a question of understanding how warfare, as a permanent phenomenon, spread in the European societies, metamorphosed them sustainably, conditioned the evolution and transformation of the states which responded to it by profoundly modifying its administration, by establishing new normative frameworks, and by developing a

particular ceremonial. In other words, the modern states confiscated legitimate violence, developed particular elites, servants of the states and no longer of the king, and insisted on an essential symbolic capital of the states that showered the honors. As it is mentioned by Charles Tilly, “war made state, and the state made war”²⁶. This idiomatic expression explains the connection which existed in the modern era on the efficiency of wars, and the relationship between the development of modern states by the means of wars.

Wars are all the more important because they contribute to strengthening the powers of the states, to implementing absolutism in fact, and to giving rise to administrations revolving around the war phenomenon. That is why, it becomes an evidence for Michael Sheehan when he expresses that, “The machinery of state derived historically from the organized demands of warfare, and modern states owe their origins and development to a large degree to the effects of earlier wars. The modern state was born during the renaissance, a time of unprecedented violence. This intensity of armed conflict during this period triggered an early revolution in military affairs, in which the size of armies, their associated firepower, and the costs of warfare all increased dramatically. The need to survive in such a competitive and violent era favored larger, more centralized political units that were able to control extensive tracts of territory, master complex military technologies, and mobilize the immense human resources required for success in battle”²⁷. The era of modernity was known as the intense development of warfare which at the same time resulted in the development of European states, promoting their hegemony over the world.

With the war of thirty years, from 1618 to 1648, better known as a religious war, ended with the Westphalian treaty concluded in 1648, by the end of that conflict it is recognized that Europe

²⁶ Charles Tilly cited in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *Op. Cit.* 215.

²⁷ Michael Sheenan cited in John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens, *Op. Cit.* 215.

was entering a new phase of historical development, that of modernity, which would come to dominate international history for the next three centuries before giving way to post-modernity in the late twentieth century. Characterized by the nationalism, the period of modernity was increasingly centralized and bureaucratic states marked by the growth of secular ideologies with messianic visions and intolerance. The warfare that was characteristic of that period reflected the forces of modernity, and its enormous transformational effects. Such ideologies required from the populations self-sacrifices for the states. Because warfare of the developed states was governed by rules, an entire international law was developed to constrain and regulate the use of violence in wartime.

With the intensity of war, major transformations were made in industry, society and government in fundamental and permanent ways. Thus, it is historically recognized that war is a profound agent of change²⁸. This is why, it is impossible to conceive and perceive the development of the modern era without thinking about and including the aspect of warfare that favors the expansion of technologies to support the war industry and military capabilities. However, some thinkers and scholars believe that, since its invention, war remains the invention of nationalists and that, to protect and defend their interests, state leaders have resorted to waging war. This is why many people continue to believe that there is an essential relationship between war and nationalism.

7. What is the relationship between nationalism and war?

²⁸ Ibid. 216

Before expressing the relationship between nationalism and war, it is very significant to say what nationalism and war mean separately. Historically, war is an ancient phenomenon, born from the urgent needs and necessity of human beings for religious, tribal, economic and civilizational issues, and it is undoubtedly eternal in human history. While nationalism is very modern and seems to have emerged during the 18th century in France, more precisely known as the Enlightenment, having caused the French Revolution. Dating from 1798, the term nationalism referred to the armed struggles of the ruling classes of France and later in some European societies against the absolute Monarchy, or against the power of the royal class. Revealing the consciences of revolutionaries, at a time when wars were mainly attributed to the ambition of Princes and the interests of ruling castes, while people were seen as wise and peacemakers.

Expressing what means the term nationalism, we can say that it describes the ideas that membership of a nation has to focus on political identity and loyalty. About its definition, the term has a variety of meanings, it centrally encompasses two phenomena: (1) The attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their identity as members of that nation, and (2) the actions that the members of a nation take in seeking to achieve or sustain some form of political sovereignty²⁹. Each of these aspects requires elaboration for which it is useful to describe.

First of all, the term nationalism raises questions about the concept of a nation or national identity, about what it is to belong to a nation, and about how much one ought to care about one's nation. Nation and national identity may be defined in terms of common origin, ethnicity, or cultural ties, and while an individual's membership in the nation is often regarded as voluntary. The degree of care for one's nation that nationalists require is often taken to be very high:

²⁹ "Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy", "Nationalism", First published Thu Nov 29, 2001; substantive revision Wed Sep 2, 2020.

according to such views, the claims of one's nation take precedence over rival contenders for authority and loyalty³⁰. Thus, a nationalist is a subject of a nation in which his identity remains the most specific and precise goal to preserve, defend and honor.

Secondly, nationalism raises the questions about whether sovereignty requires the acquisition of full statehood with complete authority over domestic and international affairs, or whether something less than statehood suffices. Although sovereignty is often taken to mean full statehood possible exceptions have been recognized. Some authors even defend an anarchist version of patriotism-moderate nationalism foreshadowed³¹. In this sense, due to his nationality which justifies and legitimizes his status, defending the interests of the nation is essential for the nationalist, for whom there is no difference between himself and the nation which saw him born and provides him the best political, economic and social possibility to ensure his life and guarantee his existence.

In this case, we can assert that there is a fair amount of agreement about the classical, historically paradigmatic form of nationalism. It typically features the supremacy of the nation's claims over other claims to individual allegiance and full sovereignty as the persistent aim of its political program. Territorial sovereignty has traditionally been seen as a defining element of state power and essential for nationhood. It has been extolled in the classic modern works of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau and is returning to the forefront of debate, although philosophers are now more skeptical. Later, issues surrounding the control of the movement of money and people and the resource rights implied in territorial sovereignty make the topic politically central in the age of

³⁰ "Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy", "Nationalism".

³¹ *Ibid.*

globalization and philosophically interesting for nationalists³². At this point, nationalism was an area of study that increased and fueled the interest of many scholars who desired to explore it.

Furthermore, it is required to describe different types of nationalism presented by some modern scholars, making the difference between classical nationalism and liberal nationalism. For some scholars, classical nationalism is the political program that sees the creation and maintenance of a fully sovereign state owned by a given ethno-national group (“people” or “nation”) as a primary duty of each member of the group. Starting from the assumption that the appropriate (or “natural”) unit of culture is an ethno-nation, it claims that a primary duty of each member is to abide by one’s recognizably ethno-national culture in all cultural matters. Classical nationalists are usually vigilant about the kind of culture they protect and promote, and about the kind of attitude people have to their nation-state.

Besides classical nationalism, there are liberal nationalists which see liberal-democratic principles and pro-national attitudes as belonging together, thus, both determine various liberal nationalists which describe different views. For example, Tamir’s version of liberal nationalism is a kind of social liberalism, in this respect similar to the views of David Miller who talks about “solidaristic communities”. They both see the feeling of national identity as a feeling that promotes solidarity, and solidarity as means for increased social justice. Liberal nationalists, for instance, diverge about the value of multiculturalism, for whom Kymlicka takes it as basic for his picture of liberalism while Tamir dismisses it and asserts that multicultural, multi-ethnic democracies have a very poor track record. Liberal nationalism answers in the affirmative, and from its standpoint, national particularism has primacy: “The love of humanity is a noble ideal, but real love is always

³²Ibidem.

particular”³³. The difference that occurs between classical nationalism and liberal nationalism is the result of history and nourishes the understanding of scholars based on their different views on the concept of nationalism

Related to the concept of war, in fact, the Geneva Conventions in 1929 defines war as an armed conflict between two or more states. It is an organized military conflict between clearly identifiable groups that have a cohesive structure and recognized leadership³⁴. Moreover, some scholars assert that “A war is an event involving the organized use of military force by at least two parties that reaches a minimum threshold of severity. The requirement that force be organized rules out spontaneous, disorganized violence, such as large-scale rioting. The requirement that force be used by at least two sides distinguishes war from mass killings perpetrated by a government against some groups that does not fight back. The minimum threshold-scholars often require that a war cause at least 1,000 battle deaths –excludes cases in which military force is used at low levels, such as brief skirmishes or minor clashes”³⁵. Anyway, there is no war without tragedies, casualties and destruction.

From a realistic perspective, war is perceived as the inevitable result of international anarchy, that is, the absence of a central authority capable of policing interstate relations. In this case, war can happen because there is nothing to stop states from using force to get their way. Moreover, anarchy creates insecurity and competition for power. In this view, states wage wars either to increase their own power, by enlarging their territory, or to counter the power of others, by destroying adversaries and their allies. For this reason, realism emphasizes two primary dynamics

³³ Ibidem.

³⁴ Cf. “Geneva Conventions in 1929”, about war.

³⁵ Jeffrey A. Frieden, David A. Lake, Kenneth A. Schultz, *Op. Cit.* 91.

that can lead to war. “One is a preventive motive: the desire to fight in order to prevent an enemy from becoming relatively more powerful. This second is a phenomenon known as the security dilemma. This dilemma arises when efforts that states make to defend themselves, such as acquiring a bigger military, make other states fear that they will be attacked. If threatened states arm themselves in response, the result is a spiral of fear and insecurity that may end in war”³⁶. War can also arise out of conflicts over states’ policies. Such conflicts come about when one state enacts a policy that benefits it but harms the interests of another³⁷. In this case, the defense of self-interests increases the possibility for nation-states waging war.

However, if we consider war in the term of armed conflict, it is possible to get different levels or phases of armed conflicts. The first characteristic of an armed conflict, often takes place in the territory of a high contracting party between its armed forces and dissident armed forces or other organized armed groups which, under responsible command, exercise such control over a part of its territory as to enable them to carry out sustained and concerted military operations. Furthermore, war in its different levels or phases, according to its intensity and the level of conflicts, we retain more often wars between states, or at least between a group of states (alliances) with a state, between an international organization (collective security, such as the UN) and a state, between a state and an opposed group (internal conflict, civil war or intrastate armed conflict). War can also be perceived as a non-state armed conflict, which occurs between two organized armed groups, neither of which is the government of a state.

War can be characterized with other actors in the international system, for instance, the internationalized intrastate armed conflict, which occurs between the government of a state and

³⁶ Ibid. 91.92

³⁷ Ibidem.94

internal opposition groups but with additional intervention from other states in the form of troops³⁸. For example, the recent armed conflicts in Libya and Syria which implied international actors, national governments and opposed groups, can be considered as an internationalized intrastate armed conflict. Theories of war also retain extra-state armed conflict which occurs between a state and a non-state group outside that state's territory. For instance, the United States is known as the first enemy of many terrorist groups, and its fight against them can be considered as an extra-state armed conflict. These descriptions can serve to better understand the meaning of war, and its different phases and steps in national and international system.

If we now turn to the relationship between nationalism and war, that is, to focus on the fundamental link that exists between nationalism and war, this allows us to affirm that very often it is nationalist feelings which lead the nationals of a state to resort to war. These nationalist feelings very often translate into an exaggerated confidence in one's nation, its government and its military power, which, in turn, pushes these nationalists to demonize rival nations, caricaturing them as aggressive, scheming, deceptive, backward or uncivilized. The example of Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and Japan, and the Bolshevik Soviet Union, which propelled the Western world into Two World Wars can be considered as nationalist ideologies.

And as it is described, since the modernity, nationalism appeared as the resultant of war in the West, "where states mobilized mass armies through centralized bureaucracies and the power of nationalism. They self-armed and self-equipped with the products of industrialization and expected their populations to self-sacrifice for the state, and to show no mercy to the opposing population that was being called upon to make the same self-sacrifice for its own motherland"³⁹. Threats had

³⁸ Tuba UNLUC BILGIC, Notes on "International Security", University of St Thomas, Fall 2023

³⁹ Ibid. 215

taken place over the policy of deterrence and the conduct of war at that time was inevitable for the authoritarian leaders of these countries who viewed war as a competition to increase their sovereignty and prioritized the defense of their territory and of their economic conditions.

In this sense, “Many modern thinkers hold that war is inherent in the very existence of separate societies with sovereign governments. The manifestation of these potent separatist tendencies is nationalism, the patriotic sentiments citizens feel toward their homeland”⁴⁰. In the other sense, small wonder that nationalism has been called an idolatrous religion. Although it may foster unity and a spirit of self-sacrifice within a society, between societies it has led, directly or indirectly, to militarism, xenophobia, and mutual distrust⁴¹. It is very often nationalist feelings and xenophobia that produce so-called nationalist movements, causing considerable impacts on the outbreak of conflicts and wars between nations and organized groups.

This is why, to more focus on the relationship between nationalism and war, it is affirmed that “Nationalism can be manipulated in support of a war policy, and warfare can be used to intensify nationalism. The chemistry between them is sufficiently volatile to have caused many internationalists, or theorists favoring peace and cooperation among nations through the active participation of all governments in some sort of world organization, to single out nationalism as the main obstacle to achieving peace and harmony in the world”⁴². Thus, nationalist feelings often lead citizens of a state to pursue war in the sense of defending the national interests of their state, just as war often justifies and arouses citizens to nationalist feelings, just to justify their war.

⁴⁰ Cf. Thomas M. Magstadt, *Op. Cit.* 404

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 404

⁴² *Ibidem.*404

Regardless, war is a part of human existence, and this at various levels: national, international and global, and it typically and irremediably impacts human life without any possible consideration.

8. Explain the difference between the national–international and global dimensions of war.

When people think about war, they usually have in mind interstate wars, that is, conflicts between two or more nation-states. That is why, in the explanation given above, it renders possible to split war in many dimensions. Furthermore, the international or world politics splits war in three different levels: national or domestic war, international war and global war. National wars occur within a national boundary, and it is better known as a civil war, an intrastate conflict or at least an internal war. Civil war, internal war or national war is not clearly a new phenomenon, for as long as there have been nations-states, there have been conflicts within states that have led to internecine fighting between rival groups⁴³. These types of conflicts appear within a single country, and become more common than international wars today⁴⁴. We can also assert that type of “domestic war occurs between the government of a state with an armed group or more than one armed group within a nation-state. This intrastate armed conflict describes the interrelation of conflicts between a government and a non-governmental party, with no interference from other countries. In most cases, national war pits the government of the state against one or more rebel groups, which may also fight among themselves, or in the order side, with the government itself.

For the international war, it explains the interstate armed conflict which occurs between two or more states, and attains an international dimension, because this type of war negatively impacts

⁴³ J. Martin Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 152

⁴⁴ Cf. Thomas M. Magstadt, *Op. Cit.* 398.

the international relations among the nations in conflicts. Scholars and political scientists portray internationalized intrastate armed conflict among international war, which occurs between the government of a state and internal opposition groups but with additional intervention from other states in the form of troops. The extra-state armed conflict which also occurs between a state and a non-state group outside that states territory is also known as an international war.

It is the same for the internationalized intrastate wars which occur between a state and an opposed armed group, including the participation of an international organization in a peace enforcing mission. International war sometimes occurs with extreme violence, such conflict tends to increase violence or mitigate and suppress it depending on the interests of international actors involved in wars. Such conflicts are sometimes largely controlled by actors, as they can also escalate and involve the major powers or affect the general status quo. But the polarization of interstate wars which gives rise to violent conflictual behavior aggravates major violence that always influence the international society.

Global war for its intensive analysis can be perceived as the kind of war that poses the gravest threat of catastrophe. For example, the Two World Wars are considered as global wars, which include several actor-states with their allies, and sometimes these types of wars are made with the opposed blocks in the international military and ideological system. Another example of war that remains memorable in the minds of many generations around the world is the Cold War which pitted the two main blocs against each other: The Western Bloc led by the United States and the Eastern Bloc which was under the control of the Soviet Union.

However, without any war impact, it was considered a war due to the fact that threat and deterrence were very high and produced fear and anguish in human souls and minds. Between improbable war and impossible peace, the Cold War had the character of a world war. Thus, the

characteristic of global wars must attain the most important regions of the globe to be considered as a global war, and also must affect major populations around the world. Such wars can best be understood as an integral part of a long cycle, a recurring pattern in the development and operation of the global layer of the international system. However, we can wonder what is the possible connection between the three levels of war, and what are the three levels of war?

9. How are the national–international and global dimensions of war connected?

Recent years have seen the emergence of post-modernist approaches to international relations which has produced a somewhat distinctive perspective towards international security. Power politics is seen as an image of the world that encourages behavior that helps bring about war. According to this view, alliances do not produce peace, but lead to war. “This aim, for many post-modernists, therefore, is to replace the discourse of *Realism* or power with a different discourse and alternative interpretations of threats to national security⁴⁵. In conclusion of this statement, we can admit that all threats, conflicts and wars have only one impact which is the threat against any national border of a state, and at the same time, disturbs the international order. Whatever the dimension of war, whether national, international or global, it always affects above all human security and threatens the collective security of the international community and the states’ survival. Because, as it is explained that the reality of war is that it is never clean or bloodless.

Even in the age of smart weapons and space technology, war remains a brutal and bloody undertaking where political objectives are achieved through the infliction of human suffering on a

⁴⁵ Ibid. 236

major scale”⁴⁶. We can also agree on the cost of war, not only on the prices of human lives, and the injuries and suffering it produces to human beings, but also we can reflect on its huge economic, political, psychological, ecological impacts. And because all wars occur in a singular society or between societies, they always have a domestic price related to the societies affected by wars. This aspect also underlines the relationship between the three dimensions of war, on its negative repercussion on the environment, how such a war provokes political crisis and enmities between nation-states and societies, it perturbs human psychology and also provokes political, social and economic crisis for the countries which experience warfare. However, despite their relationship and connection, there are some differences between wars which occur with weapons of mass destruction, used by developed countries, called Global North and wars or conflicts which occur in less developed countries, usually called Global South, using light or small weapons. Thus, at the different levels where wars occur, there are therefore major differences between the Global South and the North which are often confronted with the scourges and tragedies of wars.

10. Explain how patterns of warfare differ in the Global South and North.

If we question history, we will find that during the Cold War more wars occurred within the states, what political leaders identify and call the Global South or the Third World, due to the two opposing blocks of the West and the East, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, led by the United States and the Soviet Union, which influenced and interfered in the internal affairs of small countries. However, after the Cold War, wars differed due to the unipolarity of the world under the leadership of the United States, and even if wars increased in intensity within the poorest states, some

⁴⁶ Ibidem.219

interstate wars occurred between some great powers and other nations in the defense of their reciprocal interests.

As it is reported “the current era has seen a major evolution in the structure of international relations, with the dramatic political changes that followed the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Changes in the international system on this scale are not common in history, ... changes are also occurring in the domestic attributes of many states that make up the international system. There has, for example, been a notable increase in the number of democratic political systems, but in the same period many other states have disintegrated into civil wars and insurgency”⁴⁷. Thus, it is obvious to state that it is very difficult for the countries of the North to experience insurrections or political unrest that allows rebels, armed and opposed groups to self-arm and lead political movements to overthrow the international political order, or to fight against the establishment of a democratic order. These countries experience stability because of their economic, social and political stability, and major wars occur in non-democratic countries or at least between a democratic country and a country ruled by a dictator.

This is what some scholars, such as Émeric Crucé, John Locke, Baron de Montesquieu, Jeremy Bentham, Thomas Paine, John Stuart Mill, Immanuel Kant, etc. express how good relations between states can reduce the risk of fighting and conflict. Cooperation and defensive alliance are two main dimensions in international relations to create proximity and interdependence among states. For instance, Émeric Crucé wrote in *Le Nouveau Cynée* (2010) that peace would require a new structure within countries and the spread of commerce. In 1789, Jeremy Bentham offered his Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace, which called for greater democracy and international

⁴⁷John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *Op. Cit.* 212

cooperation. John Locke, Baron de Montesquieu, and Thomas Paine all argued that the development of international trade is a force for international peace. After Kant, John Stuart Mill and others made similar arguments. Perhaps the strongest argument that links trade to peace was offered by Richard Cobden, an English radical and liberal politician, who advocated for trade, nonintervention, international cooperation, as he was also a leader in the London Peace Society⁴⁸.

However, Immanuel Kant, in his *Essay Perpetual Peace*, had better expressed the content of democratic peace theory, in which he explained how difficult it is for democratic countries to fall into conflict and fight against each other. In this work, Kant argues that, “Nations with constitutional republic governments are less likely to go to war because doing so requires the consent of the people—who would actually be fighting the war. While the kings and queens of monarchies can unilaterally declare war with little regard for their subjects’ safety, governments chosen by the people take the decision more seriously⁴⁹. The democratic peace theory does not claim that democratic countries are generally more peaceful than nondemocratic countries. However, the theory’s claim that democratic countries rarely fight each other is widely regarded as true by international relations experts and further supported by history.

In this sense, Robert Longley, for his part who describes that theory, underlines that proponents of the theory which draw on the writings of German philosopher Immanuel Kant certifies, “The Democratic Peace Theory states that countries with liberal democratic forms of government are less likely to go to war with one another than those with other forms of government”⁵⁰. Kant also expressed the reason for which democratic countries are less likely to fight, for “The theory is

⁴⁸ “Michael Minch”, “Democratic Peace Theory”, Article extracted from Encyclopedia of global justice, 245-247.

⁴⁹ “Robert Longley”, “What Is the Democratic Peace Theory? Definition and Examples”, January 02, 2022.

⁵⁰Ibid.

based on the fact that declaring war in democratic countries requires citizen support and legislative approval. The citizens of democracies usually have some say over legislative decisions to declare war”⁵¹. Recent wars that dominate the world occur between either authoritarian regimes or between a democratic regime and an authoritarian regime.

However, we can attest although many civil wars, guerrilla, internal and armed conflicts, or intrastate wars have occurred under the influence of some major powers that have armed rebels, supported terrorist and opposed groups to insurgent against governments, or led political and social movements and protests to obtain power, we can affirm that wars are more destructive and costlier between states despite its decline. About the influence of the great powers over the smallest countries, Rochester asserts that “Although many civil wars are stoked by outside actors and draw in outside actors once they are under way, as happened with the American-Soviet rivalry during the Cold War, when the two superpowers used intervention in the internal affairs of Third World states as a surrogate for great-power war, it is the domestic unrest within Third World states that often makes them inviting targets of intervention. It is not surprising that most civil wars have occurred in the South, particularly in Africa and Asia”⁵². In this perspective the South has been faced as it continues to struggle with different types of conflicts known as guerrilla, civil wars, terrorist attacks, separatist struggles, religious and ethnic conflicts which are transformed into collective violence that divide the populations of the poorest countries.

For the interstate wars, Rochester agrees that “Despite a modest decline in the occurrence of interstate war, the severity of wars, as measured by casualties, mounted with the invention of new weapons throughout the twentieth century... The decline of interstate war is especially marked

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² J. Martin Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 152-153.

since the end of the Cold War...One study found that between 1945 and 1989 highly developed states had stopped fighting each other... forty-eight richest industrial states had had no wars against each other except for the British –Argentine Falklands war in 1982 and the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956”⁵³. If in the one hand interstate wars declined for many decades, in the other hand more technological weapons were built to increase the threats and to deter opposing countries while at the main time intrastate wars continue to increase in the poorest countries.

However, if the South more often experiences civil and intrastate wars that kill numerous civilians and opponents, the North also faces interstate wars by using more sophisticated and mass destructive weapons to either kill militaries of the opposing army, civilians, and which damage the environment, cause harmful psychological impacts, weaken human behavior, destroy lives and goods, societies and the world. For example, no one can forget the impacts of the atomic bombs on the two Japanese cities: Hiroshima and Nagasaki, how these bombs killed and left huge impacts on the environment and people, even after the Second World War, and even the economic challenges that many European countries had to face in their reconstruction after the Second World War. This is why we can say that war in the North is costlier and more destructive, while war in the South occurs more often and much longer even if it is less costly and destructive.

Another aspect that reflects the characteristic of intrastate wars are the humanitarian aspect, more common during the civil wars. Most often, when civil wars break out in less developed countries, the United Nations, under the chapters 6 and 7 of the Charter and the resolution adopted by the Security Council, is mandated to intervene to restore political and social order. Sometimes the leadership is implemented by a regional organization such as NATO or the African Union to

⁵³ Ibid. 150.151

restore peace, security and stability. The United Nations, whose mandate is to create peace and stability and restore international security, finds itself involved in wars that have negative consequences in the South. NATO, which is a defensive alliance, is used by the United States to fight in order to defend its own interests, as the UN often mandates the African Union to intervene in some African countries facing civil, intrastate wars and conflicts.

What is new today in intra-state and interstate wars are the threats that represent new actors, both for the North and for the South. With the proliferation of terrorist groups, the North and the South are no longer safe from terrorist threats. Based more in the Middle East and some African countries, the terrorists come from Al-Qaeda, ISIS and Boko Haram. etc. threaten and kill civilians in the South, but also attack Western countries, their embassies, and kill and threaten workers, civilians and leaders. No one can forget the impacts of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 in the United States. And if the North develops its technological weapons and uses them to increase its military capabilities, major terrorist groups have used the same type of technology to threaten and create unrest in the North and the South.

Thus, as new fields of warfare have emerged, non-state actors as state actors can use cyberspace and the social and global media into crucial battlegrounds, alongside terrestrial military and terrorist operations, so that war is now fought on a number of different planes of reality simultaneously, and reality itself is subverted in the cause of war through sophisticated strategies of informational and electronic deception⁵⁴. All wars cause fear, instability and depression among civilian populations, and whether in the North or the South, wars have enormous consequences on

⁵⁴ Ibid. 213

the lives of those civilians who are most affected, as they also caused considerable damage to the economies of countries, and at the same time, disrupted the social and political order.

Conclusion

In this article, we develop several themes related to the concept of wars in world politics related to the field in international relations. Among these concepts we can note the Clausewitz's two trinitaries theories, which develop what constitute the key and fundamental conceptions of wars, on the nature of wars and on the way in which leaders should involve in the conduct of wars. Strategy, which is understood as the best means of employing the threat and use of military force to acquire the goals, and tactics which define the concrete actions that statesmen should take to reach the destination and to obtain their goals. Nationalism was also chosen as a key concept developed, and its relationship with wars helped us to understand how nationalist feelings can push citizens and leaders of a nation to involve in wars in order to defend their nation's interests, as also wars can become a stimulus and a means of pushing leaders to acquire nationalist feelings.

By studying the concept of war, we also, in the meantime deepen our research on two political theories, liberalism and realism which constitute the paradigms, that is, the dominant models of international relations. Realism describes the world politics system as an anarchy and human nature is considered as evil, this is why, the role of different leaders must consist in developing their hegemony to become more powerful. Deterrence and threats are essential to maintain the status quo and to ensure their safety and security in this social jungle. The realist approach consists of studying the reality as it is, and this reality is what appears, manifests and what human beings can experience in their existence and history. Realism is often described as an explanatory theory, not seeking to influence the course of events, but to analyze their causes.

Inspired by the theory of the *English philosopher Thomas Hobbes*, who describes the nature' state as a war of each against each, realism affirms that man is naturally evil; what Hobbes describes “Homo homini lupus est”: “Man is a wolf to man”. Therefore, realist theory models this vision of a selfish nature of man on states in a situation of anarchy.⁵⁵ And if we retain the ideas developed by Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt about realist theory, we can certify this evidence when they assert, “Realists argue that the basic structure of international politics is one of anarchy in that each of the independent sovereign states consider themselves to be their own highest authority and do not recognize a higher power above them”⁵⁶. That means, for realists, war is inevitable, because the distribution and the use of power are the main factors in interstate relations. Thus, realists sustain that “The legitimacy of the state is what enables it to exercise authority within its domestic borders. Yet, outside the boundaries of the state, realists argue that a condition of anarchy exists”⁵⁷. This current was the most dominant during the Cold War, appearing as the most relevant to explain the balance of power between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Thus, liberalism or idealism asserts that, if it is a fact that the world establishes on an anarchical system, and human nature is selfish, however, cooperation between statesmen and leaders can motivate and push them to build a better world, safer and more peaceful. For Liberal theory, statesmen can act to provide security and to stabilize the world, to bring peace and prosperity among nations and peoples. Inspired by liberal philosophy, liberalism takes into account, in addition to states and international organizations, the individuals who interact and make

⁵⁵ Dr. Tuba UNLU BILGIC, “Notes of courses”, 2023

⁵⁶ Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt cited in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *Op. Cit.* 93.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 93

up the international system. For liberals, “Although the character of states may differ, all states are accorded certain natural rights, such as the generalized right to non-intervention in their domestic affairs. The domestic analogy refers to the extension of ideas that originated inside liberal states to the international realm, such as the coordinating role played by institutions and the centrality of the rule of law to the idea of a just order”⁵⁸. Realists believe that the use of force is not inevitable, this is why, they postulate interdependence between states, even the international organizations, and insist on the formative role of norms, cooperation and international institutions to regulate and maneuver the international system.

If wars and conflicts are always the facts that remain inevitable and nation-states as well as human beings remain attached to wars, but many initiatives are taken to counteract the phenomenon of war through security and peace processes. And if alliances are always designed by leaders to allow nation-states to maintain certain forms of cooperation, the successive creation of two multilateral organizations (the League of Nations and the United Nations) with universal character are achievements to perpetuate fraternity, harmony and cordial agreements between states and humans. “Saving future generations from the scourge of war” is one of the main purposes of the United Nations; these words were the main motivation of the founders who created the Organization at the end of the Second World War, having already experienced Two World Wars themselves. Since the creation of the United Nations on June 26, 1945, when its Charter came into force, the United Nations has often been called upon to prevent disputes, hostilities, conflicts from escalating into wars or to help restore peace after the outbreak of an armed conflict.

⁵⁸ Ibidem.110

The United Nations was also called upon to promote long-lasting peace in societies emerging from war.

Over the decades and human history that led to its founding, the United Nations has intervened and helped end many conflicts, especially when civil wars plagued less developed countries. Under the auspices of the Security Council - the primary competent body under the Charter, the United Nations acts for the maintenance of international peace and security. When receiving a complaint alleging a threat to peace, the Security Council generally begins by inviting the parties to resolve their dispute by peaceful means. It can set out the principles which must be complied with in a possible settlement, order investigative and mediation measures in certain cases, send a mission, appoint special envoys or ask the Secretary General to use his good offices to achieve a peaceful settlement of the dispute. All this is done under the provisions made in Chapter 6 of the UN Charter, in order to put an end to hostilities.

Nevertheless, when wars and conflicts arise and the belligerents do not want to stop the hostilities, the Security Council has the duty to take resolutions to mandate the Secretary-General to use all means to end hostilities, whether the use of force against the aggressor state or groups opposed to peace, stability and security. In these lines of ideas, we can note that when a dispute leads to hostilities, the priority of the Security Council is to put an end to them as quickly as possible. In this case, the Security Council can order a ceasefire, which can prevent a worsening of the conflict; or deploy military observers or a peacekeeping operation on the ground to help reduce tensions, separate the forces involved and restore calm to facilitate the research for a peaceful settlement. If this is not enough, the Security Council can decide to take measures to impose peace, that is to say, the application of chapter 7 of the Charter, which has in its content

economic sanctions, arms embargo, financial restrictions and penalties and travel bans, severance of diplomatic relations, blockade or collective military measures.

In this sense, it is obvious to affirm that war makes neither winners nor losers, but victims. And if many thinkers consider that wars are used as a strategic means, with economic and political objectives to increase power and maintain hegemony, many others believe that there is no reason that can justify the use of military power and weapons of mass destruction to kill civilians and generally human lives, to destroy goods, properties and bring heavy consequences for the environment. It is today impossible for some leaders and *Masters of the world* continue to invade other states and nations and to destabilize human societies and the international order. Wars, armed conflicts and hostilities serve and are often used to create social injustice, social troubles, and to destabilize societies. Wars are always bloodshed, and cannot serve to promote human rights around the world, build a just world, and bring stability, peace and security.

There are certain reasons that many authors agree on to justify wars, in the case of self-defense and in the defense of a mandate received from the international community, because the Security Council can decide to give a mandate to the United Nations to use all means to stop wars or conflicts that undermine human dignity, kill civilians and destabilize the international community. The world cannot continue to be conceived as a social jungle where the reason of the strongest states is always the best. The world must have stability and security where human beings can live in peace and security, so that progress, happiness and social justice can enable leaders and people of good will to develop an agenda for peace and to defend not only their own interests but also those of the human community through cooperation and agreement.

ACRONYMS

ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

UN: United Nations

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1- BAYLIS John, SMITH Steve, OWENS Patricia, *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*, Oxford, Oxford University of Press, Edition4, 2008, 213.
- 2- BASSFORD Christopher, “Teaching the Clausewitzian Trinity: A Teaching Note”, January 2003.
- 3- DREVILLO Hervé, “Total war vs Limited war: A political lecture”, Rennes university press, 2014/ 06/02.
- 4- DUSS Matthew, OKAIL Nancy, “Extend the Cease-Fire in Gaza— but Don ’t Stop There: Regional Diplomacy and an Overhaul of U.S. Policy Could Produce Lasting Peace”, November 27, 2023.
- 5- FEARON D. James, “International Organization (Rationalist explanations for war)”, Vol. 49, No. 3 Summer, 199.
- 6- FREIDEN A. Jeffrey, LAKE A. David, SCHULTZ A. Kenneth, *World politics: Interests, interactions, institutions*, New York. London, Norton, Third edition, 2010.
- 7- “LONGLEY Robert”, “What Is the Democratic Peace Theory? Definition and Examples”, January 02, 2022.
- 8- LUDENDORFF Erich, “On War” by Carl von Clausewitz, and “Total War” by Erich Ludendorff, Tempus collection, Perrin editions, November 15, 2014.

- 9- MADSTADT M. Thomas. *Understanding politics: Ideas, institutions & issues*, Belmont, CA, Tenth edition, 2013.
- 10- “MINCH Michael”, “Democratic Peace Theory”, Article extracted from Encyclopedia of global justice, 245-247.
- 11- ROCHESTER J. Martin, *Fundamental principles of International relations*, Philadelphia, Westview Press, 2010.
- 12- SMITH Hugh, “Clausewitz’s Divisions: Analysis by Twos and Threes”, Volume 5, Issue 3, Fall 2016.
- 13- Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy”, “Nationalism”, First published Thu Nov 29, 2001; substantive revision Wed Sep 2, 2020.
- 14- Thefreedictionary.com
- 15- TRINQUAND Dominique, DURIEUX Benoît, MEYER Emmanuel, FEVRIER Rémy, “Total war” The return of war, 12th National Conference on Strategic Research, n° 864, November 2023.
- 16- TZU Sun, *The Art of War*, [Ralph D. Sawyer and Mei-chun Lee Sawyer Translated, with introductions and commentary], New York, Barnes & Noble, 1994.
- 17- UNLUC BILGIC Tuba, “Notes on “International Security”, University of St Thomas, Fall 2023.
- 18- WIDEMANN Thierry, “Unlimited war does not exist”, Number 353, September 2010.