Chapter one
Changing Concept of War: An Introduction
The thesis deals with war writing, it mainly focuses on an exploration of the psychological consequences of war. The most dangerous and irreparable consequence of war is the loss that can be easily seen on human life. Three things happen in the war; some men are killed, some men lose one or the other part of their body and some men come back all right physically but suffer from psychological problems. They live death in life. They become problem for society. The study focuses on these psychological problems caused by war, therefore Pat Barker’s war novels have been taken for study.

Barker is internationally known British war writer. Most of her novels in some way or the other are concerned with the devastating aftermaths of war. Her most popular *Regeneration Trilogy* portrays the First World War soldiers’ struggle for survival. They protest against the authority who denies realities of war in order to sustain power. Ms. Barker’s novels are about war’s lasting wounds of the mind and soul. Barker won the Booker Prize in 1995 for her novel *Ghost Road*, at that time “The Guardian” (Newspaper) described her as “The woman who understood war”. In her major work, a *Trilogy* of the novels on the First World War, she achieves something extraordinary: she opens a new perspective to the subject, about which everything has been said and written – war. Barker’s important novels are historical, however the ideological background of war is often not depicted in her novels as it was in the earlier war writing. With her Psychological and anthropological approach, the author has redefined the novel about war and applied a modern approach to the historical material.

It is the question of how people can survive after having been traumatized that interest Pat Barker. Barker thus strays from the expected First World War elegy by focusing on the character of the psychologist William Rivers, avoiding direct battle scenes while probing into psychological damage as well as moral and
ethical dilemma. *Regeneration Trilogy*, which is defined by the horrors of twentieth century war, is a historical experience so powerful that it serves as an archetype of evil, with its complex interrelation of perpetrator and victims. David Waterman observes that Barker:

“Highlights the importance of human beings, of their bodies and minds which become... the locus of political struggle, manipulated, controlled and finally destroyed by the same power which creates and defines it”. (Waterman, 2009: xi)

Barker gives voice to the psychological trauma that extends its battlefield into the individual and collective psyche across divisions between the public and private spheres.

The study includes war writing and focuses on the manner in which Pat Barker presents war. The project intends to ground Barker’s fictions in “War Writing” context. However, before discussing war novels and the psychological approach to it, it will be appropriate to discuss war and war writing.

**War:**

War is about strategy and tactics, about politics, technology and culture, about class and sex, about power and dominance, war is about everything, but above all, it is about killing and being killed. The very purpose of war is to have dominance over victims and marginalize them. Wars have always been criticized for their horror, destruction and mass slaughter. Those who were in power always marginalized them who were without power. In the history of wars, the First World War is considered as the mother of all wars because it came to stand in for other wars. The root cause of the First World War was colonization. It is true that if we go back to history from Homer onwards, we will find that the strongest war stories are antiwar stories. During this bloodiest century, the men who served in the
trenches of France in the First World War produced some of the most powerful war literature. In particular, British writers whose lives were shattered by the war left an antiwar legacy. Robert Grave, Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon who lived through the First World War produced many antiwar poems. These poets also appear by name as undisguised characters in Pat Barker’s highly original novels of *Regeneration Trilogy*.

War is brutal, violent, bloody and dehumanizing. It is also a source of artistic and literary inspiration. From Homer to Tolstoy, Hemingway to Barker, writers through the century have found war a fertile ground for creating fiction, and the visions of war, touch on all aspects of human experience: heroism, bravery, cowardice, tragedy, pain and loss, romance, love even humor. Some books make passionate arguments against war; others glorify it.

The fact remains that war is not confined to the battlefield but the whole population of the world becomes part of it. However, the image of war portrayed by the media is one that restates the official statements, where the rhetoric of “Freedom” and “Democracy” have been misused to justify the unjustifiable i.e. war. Poets are well aware of the abuse and manipulation of language by politicians and the rhetorical escalation to justify the war; they have to counter official statements projected by the media and try to rescue truth, which is always war’s first causality. War originates in the mind of men, particularly, those who are leaders. If the idea of war as political force is to change, the mind of those with power must change.

“Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending its money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the
genius of its scientists, and the hope of its children”. (Eisenhower, 1953:71)

Military trauma, emotional suffering and daily exposure to violence and death caused mental distress in the participant countries of the Great War. Psychiatrists in each country were asked to observe, cure and even re-examine their views of mental illness in the light of war experiences.

**Concept of War:**

Etymologically the word ‘war’ came from late Old English (c.1050), ‘Wyrre’, ‘Werre’, from Old North French ‘Werre’, from Frankish ‘Werra’, from Proto-Germanic ‘Werso’. Cognates suggest the original sense was “to bring into confusion”. (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2010)

War has been defined by different people differently in different ages. It has been constantly changing and being modified. As science and technologies are developing, new weapons and means of war are being invented, so the concept of war has been changing. Technology has defeated human will and courage. A man is rarely killed because he faced a mentally and physically superior opponent. Death does not come from close by but from far away. A man does not see death in the eye; it is great, unknown, far beyond the horizon. You can hardly ever choose death. It chooses you.

War is a behavior pattern exhibited by many primate species, and found in many ant species. The main feature of this behavior pattern is a certain state of organized violent conflict that is engaged in between two or more separate social entities. These conflicts attempt to alter either the psychological hierarchy or the material hierarchy of domination or equality between two or more groups. In almost all cases, at least one participant (group) in the conflict thinks to dominate
the other participant either psychologically or materially. Human being’s need for domination often arises from the belief that an essential ideology or resource is either so incompatible or so scarce as to threaten the fundamental existence of one group experiencing the need to dominate the other group. War has been defined in a number of ways such as “a state of armed conflict between different nations, states or armed groups”, (Dictionary, 2002: 1613) “Organized violence carried out by political units against each other”. (Bull, 1977: 184) It is also defined as “the legal condition which equally permits two or more hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed force”, (Wright, 1942: 698) and as “an act of force to compel to our enemy to do our will”. (Clausewitz, 1984: 75)

These definitions show the notion of war as political, as organized violence carried out by groups of people, and it has rules and customs of behavior. Margaret Mead sees warfare as one of the many inventions constructed to order our lives, in the same realm as “writing, marriage, cooking” and so on. Mead points out that war is an invented and learned activity and is not inherent in human behavior. The contending opinion suggests that “innateness” of human aggression, the consequences of which are sometimes violence and war. Humans fight over land, resources, and personal relationships in much the same way as other primates do, hence war in this perspective is not a social or cultural invention.

The term ‘war’ is broadly used to include organized aggression and violence between states or other significant political actors. There is nothing wrong in legitimate defense and humanitarian intervention, nor is that the use of force morally wrong. Large-scale political violence is wrong for selfish motives. War has become more destructive and has challenged the very existence of human being; this is not just, because technology has created weapons of mass destruction. The genocide in Rwanda resulted from small handheld weapons, often
no more than knives. It is information technology, which has permitted aggression to be organized and promoted on a genocidal scale. Asymmetrical war provides the new dimension to the war; the obvious example seems to be the US. Decades of war in the form of aggression foreign policy has become suicidal because those who see themselves as victims, rightly or wrongly, (Rubin, 2002: 73) can now find novel ways of employing technology to retaliate (Mackenzie, 2002: 4). In future, the main weapon of mass destruction will be the human mind, particularly the minds of leaders, if the idea of war as a political force is to change, the minds of those with power must change and that is where prevention must start.

The main drivers of competition and aggression are evolutionary and biological, (Fromm, 1973: 36) and include status, possessions, and group loyalties and hunting instinct. These motivations are not declared purpose or reason of war, but they remain a means to inspire men to fight. Well known Philosopher, John Gray in his book *Straw Dogs*, argues that humans are simply another kind of animal, war is a game, and those who play it greatly enjoy it. (Gray, 2002: 182) Stephen Pinker shows that one of the goals of tribal raiding was men’s desire to capture women. (Pinker, 1997: 509) It is leaders, who can manipulate our primitive instincts to fight. It is leaders, who set goals, plans, and strategies and arrange for the production and accumulation of weapons. Soldiers never fight; it is the order of their higher authority, which forces them to kill people of opposite group with whom they have no personal quarrel. It is the leaders, who arrange resources and sue public money for war. War compromises various acts of aggression that are performed not because the aggressor is driven by the desire to destroy, but because he is told to do so and consider it his duty to obey orders. It is considered that to obey the authority is moral and religious obligation of the soldiers, they should be ready to sacrifice their lives. Contemporary conflicts are not caused by
nationalism, ethnic hatred or a clash of civilizations; such conflicts are constructed and fuelled by powerful people to serve their own ends.

Erich Fromm points out that,

“When Hitler started his attack against Poland and, thus, as a consequence triggered the Second World War, popular enthusiasm for the war was practically nil. The population, in spite of years of heavy militaristic indoctrination, showed very clearly that they were not eager to fight this war. (Fromm, 1973: 288)

Same kind of point of view more broadly was presented by Mark Thompson about Balkan Wars (1912-13):

The real culprits… are not, we repeat, the Balkan people… The true culprits are those who mislead public opinion and take advantage of the people’s ignorance to raise disquieting rumors… inciting their country and consequently other countries into enmity. The real culprits are those who by interest or inclination, declaring constantly that war is inevitable, end by making it so, asserting that they are powerless to prevent it. The real culprits are those who sacrifice the general interest to their own personal interest… (Thompson, 2000: v)

The conclusion is simple, although the implication of powerful individual is clear; the word ‘leader’ has not appeared until very recently. Now the leaders are considered responsible for war disaster.

Another form of war involves force, but does not use violence, as Mahatma Gandhiji used non-violence force, and his war tactics avoided directly attacking the British Army. The British forces could not build group solidarity and hatred for the opposite group in the way armies usually do because of attack. Perhaps British leaders understood this, and so sought a resolution. Contrary to these armies who were willing to use any degree of violence to win were the Japanese in the Second World War, and Hitler against the Russians. The result was defeat. So the lesson from the history can be learnt that war can be won without using violence.
Great follower of non-violence, Sun Tzu remarks,

The supreme act of war is to win without fighting... Thus, those skilled in war subdue the enemy’s army without battle... They conquer by strategy. (Tzu, 500 B.C.)

War is due to leaders in the same way as peace, security, harmony, unity and many other good things of life. Therefore, the country that has progressive, intellectual, social and humanitarian leaders has less chances of war.

War is an organized violent conflict. The objective of warfare differs according to a group’s role in conflict. There are two types of war. One is offensive warfare and the other defensive warfare. The goals of offensive warfare are submission, assimilation or destruction of another group, while the goals of defensive warfare are simply the repulsion of the offensive force and often, survival itself. Combatants of opposite group in warfare are called ‘enemies’. The organized and trained group, combatants and even supportive staff are called ‘military’. War is armed conflict between two or more parties, usually fought for political ends. The focus of the idea is on the use of force between large-scale political units such as state or empires, usually over control of territory. The boundaries and limits of the idea are difficult to show. Some of this difficulty is suggested by the numerous adjectives that can be placed in front of it: class war, civil war, cold war, gang war, guerrilla war, limited war, liberation war, propaganda war, race war, tribal war, trade war, total war, and so forth.

There are many theories about causes of war, but no unified view. Some argue that war is simply a large-scale expression of the violent, selfish, and power-seeking elements in human nature. Neorealists argue that anarchic structure of the international system cause war. Many argue that war is caused by the political construction of states and the ideologies they express. Liberals argued during the
nineteenth century that aristocratic states were aggressive because of the material inclinations of their ruling class. At the time of the Second World War, almost everyone argued that fascist states were aggressive. Marxists argue that capitalist states are driven to aggression by their ruthless competition for markets while socialist states relate to each other peacefully.

Imperialism, Fascism and Communism are responsible for the major wars in the history of war like the First World War, the Second World War and Cold War respectively. Imperialism, which is the policy of extending power and influenced by establishing colonies is responsible for the First World War, as, both central power and allies were in competition of having more and more colonies to have dominance over other group. Imperialists attacked weaker neighbors and enslaved them; this is the reason, which caused the First World War. Fascism, which is a system of government characterized by extreme nationalistic belief and hatred for other, caused the Second World War. Fascists used the Jewish population as scapegoats. Communists attacked capitalist wealth creators and developed class warfare, which resulted in cold war.

Morality of War:

War has been raising serious questions throughout history. Concerns about the morality of war have gradually increased, although many ancient nations and few modern ones have viewed war as noble. Today, many see at war as undesirable and morally problematic. At the same time, many view war as necessary for defense of their country. On the other hand, pacifists believe that war is inherently immoral and no war should ever be fought.
International law recognizes only two cases for a legitimate war:

1. Wars of defense: When one nation is attacked by an aggressor, it is considered legitimate for a nation along with its allies to defend itself against the aggressor.

2. Wars sanctioned by the UN Security Council: When the United Nations as a whole acts as a body against a certain nation, it is considered legitimate, and examples include various peacekeeping operations around the world, as well as the Korean and First Gulf Wars.

It is also necessary to discuss “Just War Theory” to understand the concept of war and morality of war. Just War Theory deals with the justification of how and why wars are fought. The justification can be either theoretical or historical. Historical aspect deals with the historical books of rules or agreements that have been applied in various wars across the ages, for example, Geneva and Hague Conversations are historical rules about warfare. The historical aspect may also consider the thought of various philosophers and lawyers through the ages about the war ethics. Their thoughts have contributed to the body of conversations that have evolved to guide war and warfare. A set of mutually agreed rules of combat may be applicable between two culturally similar enemies. We often find that they implicitly or explicitly agree upon limits to their warfare. However, when enemies belong to different background like religious belief, race or language, they see each other as less than human, in such situations war conventions are rarely applied. The just war tradition is as old as warfare itself. Early records of collective fighting indicate some moral considerations which were followed by warriors to limit the outbreak and devastation of warfare.
During the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, Just War Theory has undergone a revival mainly in response to the invention of nuclear weaponry and American involvement in the Vietnam War. The most important recent texts include Michael Walzer’s ‘Just and Unjust Wars’ (1977), Barrie Paskins and Michael Dockrill’s ‘The Ethics of War’ (1979), Richard Norman’s ‘Killing and War’ (1995), and Brian Orend’s ‘War and International Justice’ (2001). Just War Theory offers a series of principles that aim to retain a plausible moral framework for war. From the just war (justum bellum) tradition, theorists distinguish between the rules that govern the justice of war (jus ad bellum) from those that govern the just and fair conduct in war (jus in bello) and the responsibility and accountability of warring parties after the war (jus post bellum). The three aspects of Just War Theory are by no means mutually exclusive, but they offer a set of moral guidelines for waging war that are neither unrestricted nor too restrictive.

The justice of war (jus as bellum) convention includes the principles of justice of war, which is the first and most important principle. Secondly, war should always be a last resort; all forms of solutions must have been attempted prior to the declaration of war. Thirdly, war should be declared by proper authority. Fourthly, the possession of right intention i.e. a nation waging a Just War should be doing so for the cause of justice and not for reasons of self-interest. Fifthly, there should be reasonable chance of success and lastly, end should be proportional to the means used whilst this commonly entails minimizing the destruction caused by war.

The principles of just conduct in war (jus in bellow) include the rules of just conduct within war, which fall under the two broad principles of discrimination and proportionality. The principle of discrimination concerns who are legitimate targets in war. In waging war it is considered unfair and unjust to attack
indiscriminately since non-combatants or innocents are deemed to stand outside the field of war zone, whilst the principle of proportionality concerns how much force is morally appropriate and what kind of force is morally permissible. Principle of proportionality of just conduct is that any offensive action should remain strictly proportional to the objective desired. A third principle can also be added, namely the principle of responsibility, the justification of going to war involves responsibility as well as acts ordered and committed in war.

After the war (jus post bellum) three possibilities emerge at the end, either the army has been defeated, has been victorious, or it has agreed to a ceasefire. Here, principle of justice may be applied in each situation. Brain Orend presents a useful summary of the principles of jus post bellum: the principle of discrimination should be employed to avoid imposing punishment on innocents or non-combatants; the rights or traditions of the defeated deserve respect, the claims of victory should be proportional to the war’s character. Compensatory claims should be tempered by the principles of discrimination and proportionality; and controversially, the need to rehabilitate or re-educate an aggressor should be considered.

War kills, and that is why the argument about war is so intense. The Just War Theory is an argument about the moral standing of warfare as human activity. War is considered sometimes justifiable and the conduct of war is always subject to moral criticism. The first of these propositions is denied by the pacifists, who believe that war is a criminal act and the conduct of war is denied by the realists, for whom “all’s fair in love and war” in such situations laws are silent. So just war theorist set themselves in opposition to pacifists and realists. “Just War” is nothing more than a theoretical version of all this, designed to help us resolve, or at least to think clearly about the problems of definition and application. Ideas like self-
defense and aggression, war as a combat between combatants, the immunity of noncombatants, the doctrine of proportionality, the rules of surrender and the rights of prisoners etc. are our common issues. Those of us who defend and apply the theory are moralizing war and by doing that, we are making it easier to fight. When we define the criteria by which war and the conduct of war can be judged, we open the way for favorable judgments. War is a crime no matter how much necessary, or justified. Though war is justified, but still as soon as it starts, it loses its grip from just and it becomes, unjust.

Ralph Peters in his book *New Glory: Expanding America’s Global Supremacy* writes:

“The nature of warfare never changes, only its superficial manifestations. Joshua and David, Hector and Achilles would recognize the combat that our soldiers and Marines have waged in the alleys of Somalia and Iraq. The uniforms evolve, bronze gives away to titanium, arrows may be replaced by laser-guided bombs, but the heart of matter is still killing your enemies until any survivors surrender and do your will”. (Peters, 2005: 30)

The Just War Theory is criticized, for it forms wars in wrong way. It focuses our attention on the recent Iraq war. For example, on inspections, disarmament, hidden weapons, and so on and then on the conduct of war, battle by battle, and the global struggle for resources and power.

Aggressive wars, wars of conquest, wars to extend spheres of influence and establish satellite states, war for economic aggrandizement etc. all these are unjust wars. Though some individuals make obscene amount of money from wars, states do not. Nor do states often start wars, which are falling behind in military strength. In fact, in each of the major war from 1600 to 1945, war was initiated by a state with marked military superiority. Actually, states, which begin wars often, do not
win them; no nation, which began a major war in the 19th century, emerged as a winner. So starting war is a self-destructive activity. The US currently spends over a half trillion dollars a year on its military, more than the rest of the world combined is not a measure of its strength. It has the hidden purpose of making enemies worldwide, and of costing so much, that it makes the US a debtor to the rest of the world.

Until quite recently, war was considered a legitimate practice of states in pursuit of their national interest, pursuit of territory, dynastic claims and colonies, resort to war was an accepted mechanism for maintaining the balance of power. In the late nineteenth century, laws of war were modified and there were some constrains on the use of nastier technological possibilities for weapons. The shock of unexpected cost and carnage of the First World War established war prevention firmly on the international agenda but due to weak and overambitious security mechanism of the League of Nations absolutely failed to expunge war from practice of states. After the Second World War, a strange legal regime against war was constructed, making war illegal for nearly all purposes except self-defense and collective security. The lesson of the First and Second World Wars for the great power was that their capacity to inflict destruction on each other had outrun the possible gains to be made from the war amongst them except as a last resort of self-defense.

Erich Maria Remarque writes in his book *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1928) about the First World War:

“We are not young any longer. We don’t want to take the world by storm. We are fleeing; we fly from ourselves, from our life. We were eighteen and begun to love life and the world; and we had to shot it to pieces. The first bomb, the first explosion, burst in our hearts. We are
cut off from activity, from striving, from progress. We believe in such things no longer, we believe in the war.” (Remarque, 1928: 123)

**Theories of War:**

Theories of war help us to understand the concept of war in a broader sense. As the strategies and tactics of war have been changing, theories and doctrines relating to warfare are often reformulated before, during and after every major war. Clausewitz observes, ‘every age had its own kind of war, its own limiting conditions, and its own peculiar preconceptions’. (Clausewitz, 1976: 593) One common factor of war is an organized violence and the resultant destruction of property and lives that follows necessarily. The major theories of war are as follows.

**Economic theories** show that in a competitive international system war can be seen as a growth of economic competition. In this view, wars begin as a pursuit of markets for natural resources and for wealth. This theory has been applied to many conflicts; it is wealth differences, which may fuel wars. Some centrists, capitalists, world leaders, including Presidents of the United States and US Generals, expressed support for an economic view of war asserting a natural right of the strong to whatever the weak cannot hold by force.

**The Marxist theory** of war states that all modern wars are caused by competition for resources and market between great powers. It claims that these wars are a natural result of free market and class system. This theory also states that war will disappear once a world revolution, over-throwing free markets and class system takes place.

**Psychological theories** see war as an extension of animal behavior, such as territoriality and competition. Animals are naturally aggressive, and in humans,
this aggression manifests itself as warfare. Though war has natural causes, the development of technology has accelerated human destructiveness to a level that is irrational and damaging to the species. Some psychologists such as E.F.M. Durbin and John Bowlby have argued that ‘human beings are inherently violent’. (Durbin, Bowlby, 1939: 78) This aggressiveness is fueled by displacement and projection where a person transfers his grievances into bias and hatred against other races, religions, nations or ideologies. This theory states that in history only a tiny fraction of wars have originated from a desire for war from the general populace, more often general population has been reluctantly drawn into war by its rulers. Maurice Walsh, a psychologist argues that the general populace is neutral towards war and that wars occur only when leaders with a psychological abnormality are placed into power. War is caused by leaders that seek war such as Napoleon and Hitler, such leaders most often come to power in time of crises when populace opt for a decisive leader, who then leads the nation to war.

**Sociological theories** have different opinions about war. Some see war as the product of domestic conditions, with only the target of aggression being determined by international realities. Thus, the First World War was not the balance of power but a product of economic, social, and political situation within each of the states involved in it. Some sociological theorists argue that, it is the decision of political leaders and the geopolitical situation that leads to peace.

**Malthusian theories** are based on the thoughts of Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) who wrote that populations always increase until they are limited by war, disease or famine. This is one of the earliest expressions, in which wars are caused by expanding populations and limited resources.
Youth Bulge theory is another important war theory. Gunnar Heinsohn has proposed youth bulge theory in most generalized form, a youth bulge occurs when 30 to 40 percent of the males of a nation belong to the “fighting age” cohorts from 15 to 29 years of age. It will follow periods with total fertility rate as high as 4-8 children per woman with 15 to 29 year delay. A total fertility rate of 4-8 children per mother implies 2-4 sons per mother. Consequently, one father has to leave not one but two to four social positions (jobs) to give all his sons social position, which is usually difficult to achieve. Many unemployed “angry young men” find themselves in a situation that tends to escalate their adolescent anger into violence. Youth bulge theory sees a large youth male cohorts graphically represented as a “youth bulge” in a population pyramid with lack of regular, peaceful employment opportunities as a risk pool for violence. This theory focuses on a disparity between non-inheriting ‘excess’ young males and available social positions within the existing social system of division of labor. Samuel Huntington has modified his clash of civilizations theory by using youth bulge theory as its foundation:

“I don’t think Islam is any more violent than any other religions, and I suspect if you added it all up, more people have been slaughtered by Christians over the centuries than by Muslims. But the key factor is the demographic factor. Generally speaking, the people who go out and kill other people are males between the age of 16 to 30. During the 1960s, 70s, and 80s there were high birth rates in the Muslim World, and this has given rise to a huge youth bulge. But the bulge will fade. Muslim birth rates are going down; in fact, they have dropped dramatically in some countries... I don’t think there is anything inherently violent in Muslim theology.” (Steinberger, 2001: Interview)

Religions and ideologies are seen as secondary factors that are being used to legitimate violence, but will not lead to violence by themselves if no youth bulge is present. French Revolution of 1789, Nazism in Germany in the 1930s and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide can be analyzed well by applying youth bulge theory.
Rationalist theories of war assume that both sides of war are rational; each wants to get the best possible outcome for itself for the least possible loss of life and property to its own side. Based on this assumption, if both countries know in advance how the war would turn out, it would be better for both of them just to accept the post war outcome without having to pay the cost of fighting the war. Almost all the scholars of war since Carl Von Clausewitz agree that war is reciprocal, that all war require both a decision to attack and a decision to resist attack.

Political Science theories argue that the motivation of state is the quest for security. Military adventurism can sometime be used by political leaders as a means of boosting their domestic popularity.

Types of Warfare:

There are many types of warfare but most important types of warfare are as follows.

1. Conventional Warfare attempts to reduce an opponent’s military capability through open battle. It is a declared war between existing states in which nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons are not used. It has limited goals; once those goals are achieved, the war is stopped.

2. Unconventional Warfare is an opposite of conventional warfare. It is an attempt to achieve military victory through acquiescence, capitulation, or clandestine support for one side of an existing conflict.

Conventional and unconventional warfare further can be divided into following categories.
### Conventional Warfare

1. Defensive warfare
2. Offensive Warfare
3. Jungle Warfare
4. Urban Warfare
5. Desert Warfare
6. Border Warfare
7. Maneuver Warfare
8. Mountain Warfare
9. Winter Warfare
10. Naval Warfare
11. Napoleonic Warfare

### Unconventional Warfare

1. Guerilla Warfare
2. Biological warfare
3. Psychological Warfare
4. Chemical Warfare
5. Mine Warfare
6. Air Warfare
7. Sub-aquatic Warfare
8. Space Warfare
9. Electronic Warfare
10. Cyber Warfare
11. Directed-energy Warfare
12. Nuclear Warfare
13. Tribal Warfare or Gang Warfare.

The environment in which a war is fought has a significant impact on the type of combat, which takes place, and can include within its area different types of terrain.

3. **Nuclear Warfare** is a war in which nuclear weapons are the primary method of attack, as opposed to a supporting tactical or strategic role in a conventional conflict. It is the most destructive type of modern warfare.

4. **Civil War** is a war, fought among the people of same nation where the forces in conflict belong to the same nation or political force and are vying for control of or independence from that political force or opposing party of the same nation.
5. **Asymmetric Warfare** is a fight between two populations of drastically different levels of military or size. Asymmetric conflicts often result in guerrilla tactics being used to overcome the vast gaps in technology and force size.

6. **Chemical Warfare** is a war in which poisonous gases as chemical weapons are used, for example, the First World War that resulted in an estimated 91,198 deaths and 1,205,655 injuries. It created a big hazard for international air pollution. Various treaties have sought to ban its further use. Non-lethal chemical weapons, such as tear gas and pepper spray, are widely used, sometimes with deadly effect.

**Long term consequences of War:**

As war is an act of destruction it has many consequences in the world, the first one is death. War has always had soldiers and civilian causalities. It is estimated that 378,000 people died due to war each year, between 1985 and 1994. Near about 60 million people were mobilized in the First World War, 8 million were killed, 7 million were permanently disabled, and 15 million were seriously injured. (Kitchen, 2000: 61) Many wars caused significant depopulation in different countries, such as during the Thirty Years War in Europe, for example the German population was reduced by about 30%. (McFarlane, 2003: 43) The Swedish armies alone approximately may have destroyed up to 2,000 castles, 18,000 villages and 1,500 towns in Germany, one-third of all German towns. The First World War was a military conflict that lasted from 1914 to 1918 and involved most of the world’s great powers, assembled in two opposing alliances: the Allies (centered around the Triple Entente) against the central powers. More than 70 million military personnel, including 60 million Europeans were mobilized in one of the largest wars in the history. The most dangerous moment was the act of
surrender, when helpless soldiers were sometimes gunned down. Conditions were terrible in Russia; starvation was common for prisoners and civilians alike; about 15-20% of the prisoners in Russia died.

“Once lead this people into war and they’ll forget there ever was such a thing as tolerance. To fight you must be brutal and ruthless and the spirit of ruthlessness will enter into the very fiber of our national life, infecting congress, the courts, the policeman on the beat, the man in the street”. (Wilson, 1917: 106)

Estimates for the total casualties of the Second World War are different according to different scholars but most suggest that some 60 million people died in the war, including about 20 million soldiers and 40 million civilians. The Soviet Union lost around 27 million people during the war, about half of all the Second World War casualties (Web., BBC News, 2005). The largest number of civilian deaths in a single city was 1.2 million citizens died during the 872-day Siege of Leningrad. Axis invasion inflicted lot of property damage in the Soviet Union, which was estimated to a value of 679 billion rubles. The combined damage consisted of complete or partial destruction of 1,710 cities and towns, 70,000 villages, 2,508 church buildings, 31,850 industrial establishments, 40,000 miles of railroad, 4100 railroad stations, 40,000 hospitals, 84,000 schools and 43,000 public libraries (The New York Times, 1946, V-95).

War has always been about the cost, war cost money. It cost more than human lives, it costs billions or in the case of our last war, trillions. However, one of the over, looked effects of war is the effects it has on our environment. Throughout history, war has been invariably responsible for environmental pollution. Modern military technology is growing more and more powerful. The use of chemical and nuclear weapons, the destruction of structures, fires, military movements and chemical spraying are all examples of how war monger countries
are destroying our environment. All the modern wars had dangerous consequences on environment.

“Some of our friends had been killed, others maimed. We had survived, but in war, a man does not have to be killed or wounded to become a casualty. His life, his sight, or limbs are not the only things he stands to lose”. (Caputo, 1977:53)

The Vietnam War has greatly affected our environment. Agent Orange (the chemical used in this defoliation program) was sprayed in millions of liters over 10% of Vietnam from 1962 and 1971; it later destroyed about 14% of Vietnam’s forests. This war was very harmful for Vietnamese still the people are suffering from health problems. Scientists documented extremely high levels of dioxin in 2001 in blood sample, taken from kids born after the end of the Vietnam War.

Many men who were exposed to spray died or they are suffering from cancers and even their children are affected. The dioxin, which was in the soil of Vietnam’s forests later spread to the water, and killed innumerable fish, which is a huge part of average Vietnamese’ diet. It shows that the consequences on environment are irreparable which is killing us in long run. A report published in 2003 claimed that 650,000 people in Vietnam are still suffering from chronic diseases as a result of chemicals dropped on the country during the war, since the war the Vietnam's Red Cross has registered an estimated one million people disabled by Agent Orange. It is also estimated that 500,000 people in Vietnam have died from numerous health problems created by these chemical weapons. There are many other things, we can still learn from it. We have no idea if the country will ever fully recover.

Persian Gulf War was also one of the deadly wars in the history of war, which damaged the environment a lot. During this war, the United States and
Britain fired 320 tones of Depleted Uranium (DU) ammunition. They used such ammunition because it is highly effective in slicing through enemy’s armor. However, when DU hits hard target, it creates a small, radioactive fireball. Pulverized dust can enter the air, soil and water and it remains radioactive for billions of years. Iraqi doctors blame many childhood cancers and birth defects are due to use of depleted uranium. It is just downright horrible, there is no need to use something that remains on the earth for billions of years, who knows, how it will affect after millions of years from now to our coming generations, how will it later affect the earth. What will happen to the earth is unforeseeable; it can on a later date, destroy us all. We cannot even imagine the effects this DU can have before it disappears from the earth. War has done a large amount of damage to our earth and to all humankind. The effect of war on this environment kills two things that are irreplaceable, human life and the planet earth.

“In all wars the object is to protect or to seize money, property and power, and there will always be war so long as capital rules and oppressed people are there”. (Friedrich, 1924: 13)

According to Chomsky, the Vietnam War was fought to prevent Vietnam from becoming a successful model of economic and social development of the Third World. With Iraq having one of the biggest oil reserves of the world, and having the capability of manufacturing nuclear weapons, one wonder if the war was to stop it from becoming a developed model for the Arab World and Third World. However, both are called wars of “Freedom and Democracy”. Operation “Liberating Iraq”, on the other hand, according to President Bush was “a war to liberate not to conquer” (Web., BBC News, 2003), recalling memories of Napoleon on entering Egypt in 1798 and saying, “People of Egypt… I have come to restore your rights!” and Sir Stanley Maude, commander of British Forces in Iraq in 1917, when he said: “Our armies do not come into your cities and lands as
conquerors or enemies, but as liberators”. (Said, 2004: 27) The fact that they did not bring liberation is straightforward. The American occupation is no strange phenomenon, it has been expressed since the beginning of war with slogan painted on the walls asking “liberators to go home”. Yet the resistance was overlooked.

Another similarity is the military strategy: Economic sanctions have ‘bleded both Vietnam and Iraq, making both easy-kills or as Chomsky calls it, “Gulf slaughter” (Mitchell, 2002: 197). Vietnam War was called a quick kill, short and effective; similar to the “shock and awe” technique and chemical weapons used in the Iraq War has been compared to the nuclear bombs dropped on Japan in 1945. The most important fact is that, both wars have invited the warmth of our homes, which has come to be known as TV battles. The war reports were carried daily; reporters were giving minute-by-minute live coverage, media was used as a propaganda tool to win the “hearts and minds”. Thus an official media that projects a “clean war” fought against the evil supporters of Saddam, with images of the coalition forces liberating Iraqis were shown dancing in the streets after toppling Saddam’s statue, kept circulating and repeated over and over again, making them icons that authenticate the image of liberator.

An important element of war propaganda is the “demonization” of the enemy by alienating it as much as possible to make it utter “other”. Media plays an important role in this process, creating the hatred for those ‘other’ by representing them as evil, a threat for their own country and making the war inevitable. One may conclude that war is not the only solution; there are many other ways of solving the problem. It is the leader, and evil-minded people who create background for war and force the country into the war. War is just madness, as Joseph Heller suggests.
“I’m nuts. Cuckoo. Don’t you understand? I’m off my rocker…”
‘So?’
‘So?’ Yossarian was puzzled by Doc Daneeka’s inability to comprehend.
‘Don’t you see what that means?
Now you can take me off combat duty and send me home.
They’re not going to send a crazy man out to be killed, are they?’
‘Who else will go?’ (Heller, 1955: 204)

As History teaches us, war brings destruction to both the conqueror and the loser. As far as the First World War is concerned, it has been argued that no European power, even the victors France and Britain, benefited sufficiently to be able to claim that they ‘won’ the war. Though it was formally declared that Allies (France, Britain, America and others) have won and Central Power (Germany, Russia, and others) lost the war. After looking at the consequences, it was clear that no European power ‘won’ the First World War. The most obvious effect of the war was the annihilation of an entire ‘lost generation’ of young men across Europe, which had caused dangerous effect on marriage system and therefore dropped the birth rate, depriving the country of the leaders, managers and workforce of the future. In France birth rate declined dramatically. In 1919, the birth rate was only two thirds, what it had been in 1912. The effects of this were evident in 1930’s, when there was only half the ‘normal’ number of young adults entering the workplace. The French state filled millions of vacant places in the workplace through immigration during 1920s. However, the situation in Britain was more complex because of decline in the birth rate. Although Britain did not suffer as much physical damage as France, her economy did. It was equally adversely affected by the war. The industries of textiles, coal, iron, steel and shipbuilding on which the British economy was dangerously reliant, lost vital oversea markets to either domestic production or USA and Japanese Firm. Only one-third of wartime expenditure was covered by increase in taxation, which had forced Britain to
liquidate many of her foreign investments and to borrow heavily from the USA. Before war, Britain was the creditor and after war, it became debtor. The city of London had been the hub of global financial services such as banking and insurance before the war, but with its assets depleted, New York displaced it as the world’s premier financial center. In general, Europe’s historical world dominance, economic and political, was terminated by the First World War. Her share of world manufacturing production fell from 43 percent (1913) to 34 percent (1923) with the main beneficiary being North America.

**Objection to War:**

The objection to the war was not taken seriously until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, which shattered the illusions of soldiers. They came to know the reality of war, its horrors and atrocity, hypocrisy and uselessness of war and dared to take objection to the war. Then the new phenomenon, conscientious objection came into existence. The concept of the objection to war was deliberately exempted from the history before the First World War. However, the emergence of democracy and the industrial revolution had rendered war an outdated and unnecessary tool in the eyes of the civilian. Society was fascinated then appalled at conscientious objector, guilty of the “crime” of refusing to fight for something they did not believe in, did not support and did not understand.

There were various reasons due to which many people including soldiers became conscientious objectors. First of the reasons is religion. Some preachers wholeheartedly supported fighting to rid the world of evil. Many men were torn between devotion to God and their country, and often felt let down by their beliefs when faced with the horrors of trench warfare. The poet, Wilfred Owen is famous for his bitter tone, notes in his poem *Exposure*, how “love of God seems dying”.

The priests, preachers, and religious men sat comfortably at home, sang hymns and sent the young soldiers to face death, it was one of the reasons, which led men to take objection to the war.

Another key reason for conscientious objection was societal progression. The people of 1914 had no experience of major war except Boer War of 1899. Many citizens had its vivid memories of inefficiency and the atrocities committed. It is not surprising therefore, that around 16,000 men become conscientious objectors. These men were not prepared to die for a war that they considered as anachronistic and avoidable. Their views were echoed in Siegfried Sassoon’s Declaration that appeared in ‘The Times’ on July 31, 1917. It states how the war was being “deliberately prolonged by those who have the power to end it”, and many men in society agreed with this. There was nothing rational in these wars so they did not want to risk their lives for a war that may achieve nothing, and saw better ways to end the conflict. These men refused to fight as it was against human morals and emotions. Society ostracized these people, handing them white feathers in the street to shame them, yet for most part, their courage is to be respected. These men felt that killing, for whatever purpose, was murder, and that war was unnecessary. “War will exist until that distance day when the conscientious objector enjoys the same reputation and prestige that the warrior does today.” (President John F. Kennedy)

Pacifism is essentially the refusal to fight and insist on peaceful alternatives. These men could justifiably believe that the conflict they were involved in was morally sound. Killing a fellow human being was irreconcilable for them, and they saw the violence of war as avoidable and damaging. A famous antiwar campaigner, Bertrand Russell, believed “Patriotism is the willingness to kill and being killed for trivial reasons”. It was these sentiments that many men had, and
belief in peace was so deep-rooted that, for some of them, imprisonment was more acceptable option than fighting. It is not unconceivable that many men were simply scared of war, many were simply selfish, and could not see the point in self-sacrifice instead of a comfortable life at home. Whatever the emotions some men were simply so swayed by their conscience, that war became an impossible option for them.

Human free will and its preservation was another important factor that caused people to become conscientious objectors. As Britain was democratic country, many people were outraged at being told what to do by their government. The war was such an immense risk; many men were convinced that such self-sacrifice should be based on free will, not government intervention. Many men refused to fight on military level, as they believed their skills would be better utilized in other areas. The most delicate and psychological reason for conscientious objection was due to an adverse reaction to the strong pre-war patriotism which was built in order to encourage war support. Many people blindly followed government instructions and volunteered, indoctrinated by the mass of propaganda, initiatives such as the commissioning of artist and writers to produce propaganda. Perhaps this flood of patriotism sparked a moral repulsion in many men, and ironically, turned them against war. Conscientious objection did not receive status as a human liberty until 1987. Before 1987, particularly in the First World War and the Second World War the men who refused to fight were subject to verbal, mental, emotional and physical abuse from the media, public and government. However, these men stood their ground and rejected militarism. They had deep-rooted emotions and values, which many did not, and were gifted with a level of clarity and analysis that escaped the masses who joined up to fight.
Conscientious objectors were considered as cowards but actually, they were the heroes who understood the reality and futility of war. They dared to oppose the war. They refused to fight because they could not support something they did not believe in and that is why these pioneers of conscientious objection shall always be remembered for fighting their own personal war. Nowadays the concept of protest and pacifism has become more important as more number of people have become aware about reality of war and politics played by leaders.

Modern concept of War:

The French government, towards the end of the First World War inspired by Georges Clemenceau, appointed Prime Minister (PM) in November 1917, who rejected any talk of compromise with the enemy and remobilized the nation in its pursuit of victory. After the war was over the phrase, “Total War” acquired a currency in English, German and French. It was a language of warning and commitment, a reminder of how destructive European warfare had become. The Second World War proved that war has become more destructive than its predecessor. The dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, suggest that any future war would be shaped by similar considerations by full national mobilization, intellectual, cultural, economical and social. Moreover, the air forces of the United States imagined that they now had the weapons to guarantee the effectiveness of aerial bombardment as an independent war-winner. The subordination of war to policy bought the destructiveness back under control, by setting limits.

Since the end of Cold War in 1989, and the attacks on the twin towers in New York on September 11, 2001, the term “War” has been broadened to embrace many more levels of violence including its uses for purposes that are not strictly
political. The United Nation’s declaration of the “global war on terror” is one such example. A war waged against a means of fighting rather than for an identifiable purpose. Significantly, international lawyers have preferred to drop the word “war” altogether, and to speak of “armed conflict”. War cannot be defined just by the use of force. War and crime are different. War is not the same as murder, for all the radical slogans to the contrary. However, the fact is that in war groups are involved not individuals whereas crime is committed by individual or a small group of people. Therefore, the concept of war is constantly changing although its consequences are death and destruction.

**War and Literature:**

Literature portraits life of man. War is a part of life and is represented through literature. However, to represent war is not an easy task. Homer in *The Iliad* despairs “How can I picture it all? It would take God to tell the tale” (Rieu, trans. 1950: 225) and this is perhaps the greatest way of representations ever. War literature always expresses the inadequacy of representing war completely and properly. It has difficulty to find words to convey war because war is a massive and complex phenomenon. War reconfigures nations, displaces populations, and devastates land. ‘The Second World War lasted for six years, ranged over the globe, and killed some fifty million people’. (Martin, 1989: I) Shakespeare also expresses his inability to represent war particularly in theater:

```
Pardon, gentles all,
The flat upraised spirits that hath dared
On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth
So great an object. Can this cockpit hold?
The vastly fields of France? Or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casqued
That did affright the air at Agincourt? (Shakespeare, 1600: 11)
```
Acknowledging that full-scale military conflict can hardly be enacted on stage, Shakespeare petitions audience to marshal their “imaginary forces” (Ibid: 18). Apart from these problems, other difficulties also beset the war writer. These problems include censorship, political expediency, and squeamishness. The validity of writing of those who do not have firsthand experience is generally challenged by the critics. Traditionally women were denied access to the war zone, as they didn’t have firsthand experience. It is difficult for writers to describe and bring forth the destruction and miseries of people. It makes the writers confused how to begin, how to compress the vast war into limited words. Ernst Junger’s the First World War novel *Storm of Steel* (1920) is a fine example of such description:

On the floor were drifts, sometimes several feet deep, of drawers pulled out of chests, linen, corsets, books, newspapers, nightstands, broken glass, bottles, musical scores, chair legs, shirts, coats, lamps, curtains, shutters, door off their hinges, lace, photographs, oil paintings, albums, smashed chests ladies’ hats, flowerpots and wallpaper, all tangled together. (Ernest, 2003: 94)

This list evokes the bewilderment of where and how to start disentangling the wreckage: piling up random items of debris and attempting to make sense of the accumulation by picking through the rubble. War cannot be represented in simple words. The purest word for war would therefore be an unquotable scream of pain. Even those who have firsthand experience of war cannot represent war fully as they also suffer from articulation and silence. War can also produce different kinds of silence – psycho-physiological silence is one of them that constitute another obstacle to its representation. Frequently encountered in war writing is the proposition that war defeats language, as though words themselves have been blasted to smithereens or else suffer from combat fatigue. Frederic Henry in *A Farewell to Arms* (1929) rejects war-weary words in a verbally rich description:
“I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and that expression is vain... I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards of Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it. There were many words that you could not stand to hear and finally only the names of places had dignity... abstract words such as glory, honor courage, or hollow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages.” (Ernest, 1999: 165)

Though, war is difficult to write about due to logistical, ethical, psychological, and myriad other reasons, still it has to be written. The great, inarticulable motive at the base of all war literature is “written for the sake of writing” (Bao, 1994: 51). Many times, it is considered that writing about war brings about peace. This important idea emerges probably through the poignant hesitations of Wilfred Owen’s Preface to the volume of poems he planned:

I have no hesitation in making public
[?] Publishing such
Yet These to this generation
My ^ elegies are not for the consolation
the is in no sense consolatory
a bereaved
They to this generation. They may be to the
Next. If I thought the letter of this
Book would last, I would have
All a poet can do today is warn. (Wilfred, 1983, II: 535)

Representing war verbally makes it seem more comprehensible. To prevent or at least to control war are worthy aims of war writing. War literature can also be used as a record for others, those who have witnessed war and can no longer speak for themselves, and those who were not there and need to be told. Those who were the victims and could not speak and express themselves; for them it is the duty of a
writer to give voice to their silence. Those who survived must write about the suffering of the victims and their own:

"He had a burden of his generation, a debt to repay before dying. It would be tragic and unjust in the extreme if he were… To be buried deep in the wet earth, carrying with him the history of his generation. (Bao, 1994: 112)"

To give meaning to the mass death can be understood in two ways: to make the deaths matter and to explain why they occurred. Homecoming veterans have been subjected to unthinkable fear and horror they have changed so much that it becomes impossible for them to reintegrate and adjust themselves in peacetime society. Another important reason for writing about war is that ‘it is cathartic’ (Nattal, 1996: 36) even curative. Painful memories of war should be articulated to reduce its intensity. Telling and retelling war can be, then at some psychic level, therapeutic. Jonathan Shay emphasizes that the key element of curative telling is communatazation: the traumatized require a community of listeners who are “strong, compassionate, and empathetic”. (Shay, 1995: 188) Words of war do not bring peace but if properly used, might make the old lies of politicians and leaders less credible. Indeed, “Success” is twofold, since the ensuing depiction comprises both all that the writer can convey and all that the reader can apprehend.

Ever since man began telling stories, war has been a prominent subject. From Biblical saga or David fighting Goliath to Nordic folk tale, Greek epic poems and legends of King Arthur, the world’s tales are filled with bloody battles and that tradition has endured through history. Whether recorded by Homer, Virgil, Leo Tolstoy or Ernest Hemingway, the words of war are riveting and hard to forget. One of the earliest war poems is *The Iliad*, which is fraught with the terrors of war. However, for every book that portrays the harsh realities of war, on the other hand it also portraits the heroism and victory of war. There is a close relation between literature and war, which illuminates the savagery of armed combat. The Old
English epic Beowulf tells the story of a dedicated hero fighting battles of good and evil. Often throughout history, war heroes are lionized and believed to be immortal. In Le Morte d’Arthur, Sir Thomas repeats the legend that the great king was not killed by his son. Some men say, in many parts of England that king Arthur is not dead, but had gone by the will of Lord Jesus into another place; and some say that he will come again and will win the holy cross.

Stephen Crane knew about the costs of armed fighting in The Civil War. His novel *The Red Badge of Courage*, published in 1895, become famous for its thoughtful depiction of Henry Fleming, a young soldier fighting a bloody war, whose heroic vision quickly turns into disillusion.

The First World War poet, Wilfred Owen also wrote out of his own experience. He was killed in action just days before the war ended. He was only 25, but his poetry endures, offering a testament to the horrific reality of war for a generation of young soldiers. In his celebrated poem, “Anthem for Doomed Youth” the horror weighs out over duty:

“What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?
Only the monstrous anger of the guns,
Only the stuttering rifles’ rapid rattle
Can patter out their hasty orisons,
No mockeries now for them; no prayers nor bells;
Nor any voice of mourning saves the choirs …
The shrill, demented choirs of wailing shells;
And bugles calling for them from sad shires.” (Owen, 1917)

A strong tradition of women’s poetry emerged in response to the First World War from the experiences of nurses and women on active service in the war zone, these women were manufacturers of weapons who lost their lovers, sons or brothers in the trenches. Among these poets were Edith Sitwell, Rose Macaulay
and Edith Nesbit. Their poems were generally antiwar and provoked a strong sentiment about loss of so many young soldiers. Margaret Mitchell’s novel *Gone with the Wind* presents a compelling portrait of southern Antebellum Society and the fierce pride that leads the south into the Civil War. Mitchell depicts fiery battle scenes and vividly describes the wounded. She also manages to present both sides of war as three of the novel’s main characters oppose to fighting while others go off bravely to die for their cause.

Hemingway also wrote a lot from his personal experience as a war correspondent in Paris and then in Spain, during the Spanish Civil War. Hemingway’s experience inspired his classic novel ‘*For Whom the Bell Tolls*’ set during the Spanish Civil War. Hemingway observes that the ancient writers wrote that it is sweet and fitting to die for one’s country. However, he comments regarding death in modern war, that there is nothing sweet nor fitting in your dying, you will die like a dog for no good reason.

The Second World War gave rise to a new crop of literature, this time reacting to new forms of horror, the evils of the Holocaust and the diabolic power of the atomic bomb. William Styron’s novel ‘*Sophie’s Choice*’ takes readers into hell, where a mother in a Nazi death camp has to choose which of her two children will live. George Orwell’s ‘*Nineteen Eighty-Four*’ offers a portrait of a society perpetually at war. German author Maria Remarque wrote ‘*All Quiet on the Western Front*’ drawing on his own experiences which remains the most significant work by soldier who experienced the atrocities of combat in the Great War. The novel drew criticism from the National Socialists in Germany resulting in the author’s exile from Germany to Switzerland and in mass burning of his book by the Germans.
“We have become wild beasts. We do not fight, we defend ourselves against annihilation. It is not against men that we fling our bombs, what we know of men in this moment when Death is hunting us down”. (Remarque, 1929: 52)

Joseph Heller’s classic antiwar novel *Catch-22* offers a satirical, bitter and funny view of the Second World War. The title came from an Air Force regulation that declares a man insane if he willingly engages in dangerous combat missions, but if he refuses to fly dangerous combat missions, he is declared sane. In the novel, Yossarian is the only person who seems to recognize the insanity of war.

With the Vietnam War, the nature of writing about war took a new path. Unlike Owen and his peers, who struggled with a sense of duty and distaste for war, those writing about Vietnam War express more outrage for the ugly reality of war. Author Tim O’Brien won the National Book Award in 1979 for his novel ‘Going After Cacciato’ which tells the story of a soldier named Cacciato who decides to walk away from Vietnam, literally. O’Brien also wrote ‘The Things They Carried’ an acclaimed collection of interrelated stories about a soldier’s experiences in Vietnam. This compelling book offers a profound study of men at war illuminating the depths of the human heart and soul.

Recent Gulf War books have also focused on the insanity of war. ‘Jarhead’, by Anthony Swofford, a decorated veteran, is a compelling new memoir about operation Desert Storm that presents an unforgettable portrait of the battlefield. He chronicles the life of a marine, from boot camp to the bombings, victory and peace.

Good literature about war reminds us of the horrors of war. The war, which is although miles away and is remote and unconnected to our life, still we can view the carnage on television newscasts, safe in the comfort of an armchair without any immediate physical threat to our safety, it can be difficult to imagine that these
atrocities actually are being committed. In this case, a book can provide more information and detail than a thousand pictures, making us feel as if we are there.

**War and People:**

The profound human consequences of war have always been at the core of war writing, from *The Iliad* (c.750 BCE) to *War and Peace* (1865-69) to *Slaughterhouse-V*. War takes people, as they already are –deeply flawed, fully un-heroic, brutally savage, and at times strangely beautiful –and sweep them into its destructive vertex. They look pathetic, vulnerable and negligible. War smashes apart and arranges its human participants, as every soldier in every war has noted that death is indiscriminate. War writing focuses more and more on dead and wounded body to create an opposition for war. Siegfried Sassoon in his poem *A Night Attack* (1916) sympathetically considers the man behind the corpse:

He was Prussian with a decent face,
young, fresh and pleasant, so I dare to say.
No doubt he loathed the war and longed for peace,
and cursed our souls because we’d killed his friend.
(Sassoon, 1983: 42)

The anger at the death of friends represents a ubiquitous emotional configuration of English writers from the First World War generation. Rebecca West in *The Return of the Soldier* (1918) provides the only window into the battle zone of France:

“We were all of us in a barn one night, and a shell came along.
My pal sang out, ‘Help me, old man, I’ve got no legs!’
And I had to answer,
‘I can’t old man, I’ve got no hands!’”. (West, 1998: 5)

The division is, of course, there and here: the western front of France versus the home front of peaceful England. Today with the memory of the extermination
camps, the explosion of atomic weapons, and the carpet-bombing of many parts of
the world in mind; with the ever-escalating facts of war caused statelessness and
refugeeism as defining features of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries; with
children captured and forced into military service in war-ridden countries, it is
difficult to imagine ourselves as fully excluded from the terrain of total war.

There is an important problem in studying physical death. We have plenty of
descriptions to enable us to form an image of death in the Great War, but
everything ever written about death suffers from the major shortcoming that it tells
us only about the experiences of survivors. We can only guess at the tribulations,
the final thoughts and emotions of those who were killed. Soldier’s families were
informed in errors. ‘Other families had to live with uncertainty for months, after
which they were frequently told that a son, brother or husband had been killed, but
not where, when and how’. (Schaepdrijver, 1997: 117) Families’ grief would be
terrible enough without all the distressing details. The truth, it was felt, would only
make the loss harder to bear.

Prisoners of war, was another issue to be discussed to understand the
vastness of war. Many soldiers did not want to be captured, or felt ashamed at
being caught and tried to escape. Whatever else might bring, captivity meant
hardship and the loss of Freedom. Osburn wrote with much resentment about the
British soldiers who allowed themselves to be taken prisoners during the retreat in
the opening months of the war:

Once taken prisoner under circumstances for which they could not
very strictly be blamed, they would naturally think themselves safe, at
least safe from being roused at three o’clock in the morning, safe from
forced marches with an eighty-pound pack on their backs; safe from
any more pitched battles with the possibility of death and mutilation…
Suddenly released from all discipline, with no adjutant-major to shout
or threaten… they could hurl their burdensome packs into the nearest ditch and wait until the German advance patrols… arrive[d] and they could comfortably surrender. (Holmes, 196: 7)

As the war went on, Osburn began to have far more sympathy with men who chose this course of action. Osburn remarked ‘not those who had surrendered but those still on active service at the front line were prisoners, prisoners of war’. (Latzko, 2010: 258-9) Soldiers preferred to be prisoners of war than to fight on in the face of almost certain death. ‘Fate was usually well disposed towards them, especially if they quickly transformed themselves from soldiers into men by removing their tin hats or gas mask and holding up crucifixes or photos of wives and children. There was no absolute guarantee, however’. (Holmes, 2006: 381-3) It was important to surrender immediately and to signal the fact unambiguously. ‘If there was any doubt about man’s intentions - he… asked for mercy but his eyes said murder – his opponent would take no chances’. (Winter, 1992: 213-14) This indicates that in most cases life as a prisoner of war did not begin with a free choice but it is the only option left to a man who wanted to save his own skin.

When one opposing party attacks the other, they kill every soldier as Prior and Wilson describes the First World War:

It is an impossibility to leave wounded Germans behind us because they are so treacherous. They all have to be killed. Too often after an advance, our men have been shot in the back by the wounded they left on the field. Now to obviate such a thing we have what is called a ‘mopping up party’. This consists of a small number of troops and [they] dispatch any of the enemy who might have been passed over in the first rush. Sometimes in our hurry, we leave a wounded man and then the duty of the mopping up party is to finish him. Their work would be light today for we are determined to kill every German we came across. (Prior and Wilson, 2002: 63-4)
Should the killing of the wounded, or of the unarmed men with their hands in the air, be called murder? From strictly judicial point of view, it certainly should, since it is clearly against the rule of the Hague Convention of 1899 and 1907. However, as war become obvious, it has its own rules, one of which is: ‘the Victor finishes off the Vanquished’. (Holmes, 2007: 144)

Another important issue, which must be discussed to understand war, better is court martial and punishment. Some soldiers who refused to fight or not followed strict discipline were subjected either to court martial or corporal punishment. Generally, they were given death penalty. If an accused man was lucky, he was given corporal punishment instead of death penalty. Corporal punishment existed in all the armies on the Western Front, but it was used most often and most harshly by the British, whose sentences were known as Field Punishment no. 1 (FP1) and Field Punishment no. 2 (FP2). These involved unrelenting hard labor and the binding of feet or hands, lasting for a specified period, usually about three weeks, in a few cases up to sixty days. The condemned might have to run back and forth for hours with full kit, under the eyes of military police. ‘A man condemned to FP1 was tied to a fixed object usually a wagon wheel for number of hours a day on three out of every four days. Financial aid to his wife and children would be stopped’. (Putowski and skies, 1998: 14) ‘In Wellington’s army FP1 had involved whipping as well sometimes as many as 800 lashes, Frank Maxwell, who was in favor of the penalty, abolished FP1 in his unit in June 1916’. (Cecil and Liddle, 1996: 307) ‘When Rowarth (a soldier) was sentenced to five days of FP1 he was pleased, surely anything was better than Front-line duty’. (Bourke, 1996: 99) Wilson Trevor wrote:

‘I don’t think I have ever seen anything which so disgusted me in my life and … such inhuman punishment… I would like to see the devils who devised it having an hour and two lashed up like that on a bitter
cold winter’s day he helped carry out such a punishment, imposed by major ‘with a very sour nature’. They put some warm clothe on the man but were ordered to remove them. No one was allowed to speak to him at any stage during the punishment, which lasted an hour and half. Afterwards Pressey and two others removed him from the wheel, virtually frozen. He could move neither arms nor legs because of the cold and because the major had ordered the men to tie the ropes extra tight, so they had to help him. ‘As no officers were around, we carried him to the cookhouse. Plenty of pain, for as we loosened him and rubbed him, tears flowed from his eyes and unprintable words from his mouth. (Wilson, 2010: 358)

As the examples demonstrate, some of the accused were no longer psychologically capable of taking part in the war. ‘They were not cowards and they had not deserted. They were suffering from Shell Shock’. (Babington, 2003: 55-6) Many of them fought many battles and reached their limit. ‘Many victims of shell shock were condemned to death and around ten percent were executed, which is no different from the overall figure’. (Winter, 1985: 140) The question remains as to why death sentence was commuted in nine out of ten cases, or rather why it was carried out in the remaining one in ten. Graham Green comments: “Our mutiny was only in heart, such was the power of discipline”. (Ibid: 44)

Death could be seen everywhere, and in some sense it came visible itself; it sat next to you in the trench and walked beside you on the battlefield. It lay next to you in the hospital. It was such an overwhelming presence that the boundaries between it and life faded. ‘Corporal Jack Beument would never forget the things he saw as he and his men marched forward during the Battle of Somme. He saw a corpse without a head, a hand sticking out of the ground. Human remain wherever you looked’. (Macdonald, 1993: 140) The massive numbers meant that from time to time the living had to walk over the bodies of the dead. ‘During night marches up to the line, dead men lying in the way were kicked aside, the wounded trampled to death. Soldiers trod on heads, the wheels of gun carriages crushed chests’.
(Horne, 1994: 175) ‘It was terrifying. You’d tread on one on the stomach, perhaps, and it would grunt all the air out of its body. It made your hair stand on end. The smell could make you vomit’. (Macdonald, 1993: 186-7) Men usually trod on dead bodies only when they had no alternative. The vast death toll was not always the result of a long and bloody battle. Sometimes huge numbers were killed without intimation. A single heavy shell could wipe out a whole platoon almost instantly.

Siegfried Sassoon noted in his diary:

‘There are still pools in the craters, they reflect the stars like any lovely water, but nothing grows near them; snags of iron just form there banks, tin cans and coils of wire, and other trench refuse. If you search carefully, you may find skull, eyeless grotesquely matted with what was once hair; eyes once looked from these detestable holes, they made the fabric of a passionate life, they appealed for justice, they were lit with triumph, and beautiful with pity.’ (Siegfried, 1916:61)

However much scenes like these depressed the spirit and eroded morals, it was the audible process of dying that affected the nerves of soldiers. Ernest Toller observed:

One night we hear cries, as if someone is in excruciating pain; then all is quiet. A man must have been killed. We think. After an hour the cries begin again. This time they do not stop. Not this night. Not the next night. Naked and wordless, the cries moan on. … We press our fists to our ears to block out the moaning; it does not help, the cries cut into our heads like circular saw, stretching minutes into hours, the hours into years…We have discovered who is crying out; one of ours, hanging on the barbed wire. Nobody can save him. Two have tried and were shot. Some mothers’ son is hopelessly trying to fight off death. Hell, he is making so much fuss; if he goes on much longer we’ll go mad. On the third day, death silences him. (Toller, 1978: 51-2)

Unfortunately, there were places where the area of the ground was extremely hard to dig a suitable deep hole for dead bodies. Sometimes it was difficult to
adjust long body into a small hole so the legs would be left poking out of the ground. They could be used to make a cross. There were hundreds of bodies to be buried. We may have good reason to feel sorry for those who had to bury the corpses, but those they buried might have imagined their funeral very differently. Most of the graves were inevitably too shallow. With attempts to rescue the wounded from no man’s land, burial was given secondary place as there were thousands of dead waiting to be buried. A safer and easy option of burial usually applied. The dead might be wrapped in ground sheets and rolled over the parapet of the trench into a nearby shell-hole. Acting corporal Roper Weeber was one of those who took part in funeral. He observed:

As far as you could see there were all these bodies lying out there, literally thousands of them, just where they’d been caught on the first of July. Some were without legs; some were legs without bodies, a terrible sight. They’d been churned up by shells even after they were killed. We were just dumping them into crater-just filling them over. (Macdonald, 1993: 113)

Bodies had weight and volume, and the advantages of this did not pass unnoticed. Corpses were used to repair the walls of trenches damaged by shelling; they even served to fill holes in roads essential for military traffic. After the war a considerable amount of time passed before the dead were truly given a chance to ‘rest in peace’. The French in particular were troubled by the question of what to do with the bodies. Later on, they decided to lay them to rest close to where they had died.

In the belligerent countries, there was hardly a single family that did not have at least one human loss to mourn. It was at the level of the family and of personal relationships that the pain was the hardest to bear. Of course, there were parents who had lost none of their sons, but there were others, who had lost all or
almost all. For them the war and suffering would never end. There was the misery of 630,000 French widows, for instance, many of them young, and a million fatherless French children, a substantial number born after their fathers left for the front, and the sufferings of millions like them in the other belligerent nations. Mental institutions were flooded with people unable to overcome their grief. Some found it impossible to settle back into the lives they had left before. German ex-servicemen returned to a bankrupt society. ‘Hundreds of thousands of parents, wives, sons, daughters, friends and girlfriends watched helplessly as the men they loved lost their battle with physical wounds’. (Gibert, 1970: 541) ‘Others succumbed to psychological afflictions brought home from the war, often exacerbated by their long separation from those dear to them, and committed suicide’. (Winter and Baggett, 1916: 371)

Many died who would have lived, had it been possible to treat them in time. There were few doctors, nurses, hospitals, operating theatres, drugs and instruments, and too many sick and wounded. ‘It was impossible to treat every casualty after a major battle, despite the willingness of doctors and nurses to work without break’. (Brants, 1994: 196) Those who were not expected to live were laid aside and left unattended. It was very difficult to ignore their cries for help. There were not enough surgeons, ambulances, often no drugs, not even chloroform, only the wounded in vast number. A despairing Georges Duhamel remarked:

“Doctors and orderlies, their faces haggard from a night of frantic toil, came and went, choosing among the heaps of wounded, and tended two while twenty more poured in... Many of them had been there for several days... Every moment I felt my coat seized, and heard a voice saying: ‘I have been here four days. Dress my wounds, for God’s sake’. And when I answered that I would come back again immediately’, the poor fellow began to cry, ‘They all say they will come back, but they never do”. (Duhamel, 2010: 121-3)
There were many diseases among the soldiers but the gas gangrene was the most dangerous, the odor of which was abominable that even other patients and nurses vomited repeatedly. Some wounds were so appalling that doctors, nurses and even fellow soldiers concluded that it would be better to let a man die. Such cases raised questions as how to respond in the best way. Should a man be left to die in fear and agony, or should his end be hastened and made more bearable? Even if the doctors did not feel a wounded man would be better dead, the man himself might well come to that conclusion. Fussell Paul observed:

The more pitifully wounded did not wish to live. They constantly begged doctors and nurses, sometimes at the top of their voices, to put an end to them. Some made attempts to end their lives with a knife or fork... one of the orderlies told me that a blinded man who was suffering greatly and did not wish to live had killed himself at one time with a fork. It was hard to drive it deep enough through his chest to end his life, and he kept hitting it with his clinched fist to drive it deeper (Fussell, 1992: 170-1)

Lessing, a German doctor, philosopher, socialist, pacifist and Jew remarked that war was nothing but one great experiment in natural science for the benefit of politicians, army chiefs and doctors, who reasoned that war would be good not only for medicine but for the mental and physical condition of the soldier. Lessing further questions about what do the doctors ask the nursing staff? About daring operations, unprecedented tests, new medicines, bold physiological trials. And what was a person and what was a soul?’ It was an experiment involving a wealth of encounters with bacteria and unhygienic conditions rare in peacetime.

Here is a man without legs or arms or ears or nose or mouth who breathes and eats is just alive as you or me. The war had been a wonderful thing for the doctors and he was a lucky guy who had profited by everything they learned... He would be an educational exhibit...to show it to people so they could see the difference between a war that’s in newspaper headlines and liberty loan drives and a war
that is fought out lonesome in the mud somewhere a war between a man and a high explosive shell. (Trambo, 2007: 76-80,205-6)

Hospitals were staffed, as ever by doctors and nurses who wanted to make patients better as quickly as possible, but ‘better’ no longer meant ready to be discharged healthy, it meant being fit enough for front line service. ‘It was like being sent from heaven to hell, a hell run by devils whose task was apparently either to heal or to kill. The preoccupation with sending men back only serves to complicate their treatment’. (Whalen, 1984: 188) ‘The whole object of the medical service in war is to provide men for the fighting line, to keep them fit, and if sick or wounded, to make them fit and ready for further fighting as soon as possible’. (Cecil and Liddle, 1996: 505) Patients complained about the inhuman, hard-hearted, patronizing treatment they received.

Brutal injections, regulation quantity given to every man regardless of his condition. Eye wash for inspections. Dying men made to sit up and smile. Doctors looked on every man as a scrimshank. Brutality in treatment of patients when they were unwilling to undergo a particular cure. Men wounded and minus an arm insisted on not being put on electric treatment, was knocked down and held on the bed by two orderlies. (Winter, 1992: 201-2)

Patients might be wounded and later died of pneumonia, but the official report would still say that he had ‘died of wounds’. If he was brought in with frostbitten feet and died after amputation, he would be listed as having ‘died from illness’. Oskar Maria Graf in his book ‘Wir Sind Gefangene’ (Prisoners All) tells his readers that he and his fellow patients were not mad. ‘The doctors who tried to cure them were mad, since it was their job to incite people to kill on a massive scale and to ensure those who had at some point refused to kill were brought to the stage where they would be able and willing to kill again’. (Whalen, 1984: 63-4) Leonhard Frank
takes a similar stance in his ‘Der Mensch ist Gut’. A soldier who in Frank’s eyes had become human being again by refusing to shoot his fellow man would be declared insane. ‘He could be healed, that is to say, it was possible to persuade him to take up a gun again. Whereas in peacetime the role of the psychiatrist was to keep aggression under control, in wartime his task was precisely the opposite’. (Frank, 1983: 84) The most touching description of human wreckage in war is presented by Mery Borden in her The City in the Desert which posits a visitor from another world, who comes upon a field hospital and attempts to make sense of its awful wreckage and counter intuitive physical objects:

You say that these bundles are the citizen of the town?... Those heavy brown packages that are carried back and forth, up and down, from shed to shed, those inert lumps cannot be men… What do you mean by telling me they are men?
Why, if they are men, don’t they walk? Why don’t they talk? Why don’t they protest? They lie perfectly still. They make no sound. They are covered up. You don’t expect me to believe that inside that roll there is a man, and in that one, and in that one?
Ah, dear God, it’s true!...
But how queer they are! How strangely they lie there. They are not the usual shape. They only remind one of men. Some, to be sure, are wearing coats, and some have on iron hats. But all of them seem to be broken and tied together with white rags. And how dirty they are!...
Ah, what a pity. Here is one without an arm, and another and another, and there, dear God, is one without face! Oh! Oh! (Borden, 1930, :120-1)

The very purpose of war is to kill people. People are at the center of the war. They begin war, they injure, and kill people and they destroy all things. War is created in the minds of the people. Therefore, the minds of the people should be altered with peace and harmony. People can make hell in the heaven and heaven in the hell.
**War Zone:**

War zone is the space where war takes place; it is a place of sacrifice, a testing of honor and virtue, place of punishment. The distinction between military and civilian zones, which Front lines of the First World War observed has fallen away as war technology has trained its terrible eye on civilian populations. The genocide wars of the twentieth century the blitzes and area bombing campaigns of the Second World War, the Holocaust, the deliberate terrorist shelling of civilians in war zone cities, the Cold War targeting the entire populations by nuclear weapons have expanded the potential war zone to include the whole world and all its civilians. Up to the First World War, war was limited to particular territory, which was declared by the authority, away from cities, locality and civilians. However, these modern wars have changed the concept of war zone. Now it is not limited to the battlefield only, it has been encroaching in the villages, cities, markets and the houses of innocent civilian. In these modern wars, more than soldiers, civilians have been killed. The missiles, nuclear weapons and modern weaponry have made it possible to destroy the whole city, by pressing the button of remote. Nowadays, there is no limit of war zone; whole world has become the war zone. No surety when and where bomb will be blasted and destroy the population. We always listen in news that the bomb is blasted in this corner of the world and that corner of the world.

**Concept of War in Christianity, Islam and Hinduism:**

Every religion gives the message of peace and harmony. As far as war is concerned no religion gives freedom to people to go for war. It is allowed only as the last option when all other means of resolution fail. Though war is allowed in very rare condition, there are strict codes of conduct and behavior, which must be
followed in the war. Every religion has its own concept of war. Concept of war in Christianity, Islam and Hinduism is follows.

**Concept of War in Christianity:**

The concept of “holy war” is found in both Islam and Christianity. In both the religions, it has been variously interpreted, as a spiritual war, or by the militants as a physical war. The enmity foretold between Eve and the serpent in the Bible is translated by John Milton to the cosmic battle between the ‘Son of God Most High’, the fruit of Mary’s womb, and the serpent who can expect only “mortal pain’. (Milton, 1667, 12:379-85) *Paradise Lost* (1667) opens with a report of how the “infernal Serpent” “raised impious war in heaven” (I: 34, 43), fighting the forces of Michel and Gabriel, finally to be defeated by Christ, the Messiah, in Book six. In the poem, the war in heaven sets the stage for the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. Though traces remain in the Hebrew Bible of mythological stories of primeval warfare between the Gods and the comic battle between good and evil, these are generally subsumed under the conditions of the Holy War in which Yahweh, the Lord of Hosts, fight for and as the head of his people against their enemies.

In the New Testament, the imagery of the Lord of Host is introduced, Christ revealed as Savior, Messiah, and Lord, continuing Yahweh’s purpose of defeating his enemies and finally bringing peace to his people (Luck, 2:14). The definitive image of the miles Christi, the soldier of Christ whose final military victory is on the Day of the Lord, is found in St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians (6:10-17). In the seventh century, the courtly tradition sees Christ, (and therefore his Christian Soldiers) as a knight who finds its greatest expression in the medieval poets of the Franciscan tradition. As late as the early sixteenth century, in the mysterious
Corpus Christi Carol, Christ is described as the ever-bleeding knight, his wound flowing for our redemption. By the mid-twentieth century, the image of the warrior Christ and Christian knight, rendered honorable in the holy warfare of the Crusade, had become the surreal horrifying face. Crusader had fought for Christianity. If the Pauline imagery of the miles Christi flourished in the age of chivalry, it persisted but underwent changes under the influence of Renaissance Christian humanism. 

Erasmus’s *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* (Handbook for the Christian Soldier) (1503, translated in English in 1518) stressed the two primary weapons of Christian warfare – prayer and knowledge. Milton’s *Areopagitica* (1644) is clearly descended from Erasmus in a Protestant Crusade to reform church and society. Edmund Spenser in his *Faerie Queene* (1590-96) led his chivalric knights on allegorical quests of virtue. Apart from Milton, other major puritan of the miles Christi tradition in literature is John Bunyan. In *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678) Christian (protagonist) is armed with piety, prudence, charity, and “all manners of furniture, which their Lord had provided for pilgrims, as sword, shield, helmet and best plate” (Bunyan, 1965: 86) weapons with which he quickly defeats Apollyon. The theme of Christ as soldier more or less dies out in eighteenth century literature, to reappear in imperialist hymns. However, twentieth century literature begins to show a weary and cynical direction from the biblical tradition of divine warfare, particularly after the Holocaust and under the threat of nuclear devastation. From Wilfred Owen to the Australian emigrant Peter Porter react to mass slaughter and the nuclear threat with rage and irony.

Thus, in the twentieth century, the totality of the Holy War increasingly became merely theoretical. The biblical apocalypse is replaced by the postmodern apocalypse of implosion envisioned by Jean Baudrillard – ‘a descent into utter nihilism in a hyper-real war-ravaged wasteland without redemption and without God’. (Baudrillard, tran. 1994: 1-28)
The Bible teaches that war happens because “you want, and have not” (James). It is based on the nature of man to commit sin that is why wars are reality in this fallen world. Wars exist because of the fallen state of humanity, and the root cause is sin. The solution is the saving grace that is available in the person of Jesus Christ. Christianity teaches that “thou shall not”, but one also has to defend oneself, one’s family and nation when under attack in a fallen world. That is the reality of life. Therefore, the real concept of war, which was mentioned in the Bible, has been changing from period to period. Now it is at its zenith it has become opposite of what is mentioned in the Bible. There is a conflict in The Bible, which was fought between good and evil and the weapon of good was always prayer, knowledge and good virtues. The wars were fought for the favor of good not for land or any natural recourses, honor or pride. These wars were fought as the last option of the resolution under the strict codes of conduct.

**Concept of War in Islam:**

Islam, like other monotheistic religions such as Christianity and Judaism, is a glorious and noble religion that gives the message of peace and respect the dignity of all humanity. The recent terrorist attack on twin tower in America has brought the religion into the spotlight. It is unfortunate that Muslims have become the scapegoats for attacks of terrorism perpetrated locally or internationally. In addition to this, Afghanistan’s declaration of a “Holy War” conjure in the minds of non-Muslims, images of mullahs in their particular robe, killing and destroying everything and everyone in their path ‘for the sake of Allah’ (SWT). Reality is far removed from the erroneous illusion that is portrayed by un-informed people, and record has to be set right. There will always be Jews, Christians, Muslims, Hindus and other fanatics who will commit crimes in the name of religion. One should not condemn a religion or a nation, based on the actions of a few individuals.
Generalization breeds hatred. Furthermore, one should guard against the misinformation that is disseminated by some biased media.

**Jihad:**

The translation of Arabic word “jihad” means “striving; exerting oneself in any endeavor; going the extra mile; endurance in the face of obstacles.” For example; a student who is studying for his exams, is performing Jihad, because he is striving to succeed in his studies. A businessman, who is striving to be successful in his business, is performing Jihad. A husband, who is trying to save his marriage and facing obstacles, is performing Jihad. Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him) stated that the highest Jihad is against oneself. The best Jihad is controlling ones’ own desires, emotions of anger, jealousy, hatred and revenge. To do this, is not easy that is why it is a Jihad. It is a struggle. It means developing a strong will power and disciplining the mind and body for a more noble cause and effort. Jihad means controlling ones’ own lower, animalistic base desires (the ‘nafs’) and thereby unveiling the true inner spirit of compassion, mercy, love, selflessness and kindness for all humanity. The true test of character comes when a victim does not take revenge when in position of strength. For example, Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him) was persecuted and forced to flee from the land of his birth. He came back victorious after 10 years, in those moments of victory, he was the superpower of Arabia and he could have taken revenge from all his enemies but he didn’t. He declared the day of victory as the day of forgiveness. He performed Jihad of the highest order, when he forgave his enemies. Prophet Jesus (Peace Be upon Him) performed Jihad when he prayed to Allah (SWT) to forgive his enemies “for they know not what they do”. Prophet Jesus (Peace Be upon Him) did not pray for revenge. He controlled his inner desire (‘nafs’) for revenge. Mahatma Gandhi performed Jihad when he exercised self-control, non-violence
and embarked on peaceful resistance against the British army. In addition to the
types of Jihad described, even looking after your parents is a Jihad. For Muslims,
to be kind, merciful and respectful to parents is a duty of the highest form even
more rewarding than being a martyr in a battle.

A Man came to the Prophet (Peace Be upon Him) asking his
permission to take part in Jihad. The Prophet (Peace Be upon Him)
asked him, “Are your parents alive?” He replied in the affirm, alive.
The Prophet (Peace Be upon Him) said to him, “Then exert yourself
in their service”. (Bukhari and Khan, 1996: 4.248)

Furthermore, for women, the best form of Jihad is to perform the Hajj. The
pilgrimage of Hajj is a journey full of hardships and requires much tolerance on the
part of one who embarks on this journey.

**Holy War:**

Warfare is one type of Jihad because it is also a form of striving. However,
fighting and warfare in Islam are allowed only in very exceptional and extreme
circumstances. When all avenues of discussion, negotiation and communication
fail then only warfare is allowed.

The Holy Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him) said: “The best
fighting (Jihad) in the path of Allah is (to speak) a word of justice to
an oppressive ruler”. (Ahmad Hasan and Abu Dawud, 2000: 4330)

In two main instances, a Muslim is allowed to take up arms, firstly, against
an oppressive government; secondly, in self-defense, provided that the decision has
been made by a group of consensus of leading Ulema’s (Scholars and Jurists). In
this case striving, against an oppressor, is known as Jihad. It does not matter who
the oppressor is – all Muslims have a duty to fight all forms of oppression,
discrimination and slavery whether it is social, economical or political. If a Muslim
is oppressing a Muslim and non-Muslims, then all Muslims must perform Jihad
against the Muslim ruler to fight on behalf of the silent masses. If a Jewish
government is oppressing its citizens, then it is duty of Muslims to perform Jihad against the oppressor. If a Christian government, a Hindu government, a communist government, or any other government is oppressing its citizens, the Muslims are duty bound to assist and free the victims of oppression. In self-defense, a Muslim is allowed to take up arms but for the sake of defense only, once the defense is over, it must be stopped.

**Islamic rules of Warfare:**

When all other measures fail, war is the last resort. In the extreme scenario when war is inevitable, then Muslims are duty bound to follow very strict conditions and rules of conduct of warfare which have been commanded by Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him) in various authentic Hadith, such as:

The Prophet (Peace Be upon Him) said: “I advise you 10 things: Do not kill women or children or aged, infirm person. Do not cut down fruit bearing trees. Do not destroy an inhabited place. Do not slaughter sheep or camels except for food. Do not burn bees and do not scatter them. Do not steal from the booty and do not be cowardly.” (Yahya (R.A.), Al Muwatta, 21.10)

1) Before any war began, irrefutable facts and evidence must be presented. No one can act on hearsay and suspicion. Justice and fair play are necessary preconditions because human lives are at stake: if someone kills an innocent person without cause, it is as if he has killed the whole of humanity. If someone saves a human life, it is as if he has saved the whole of humanity.

2) The war should be confined to the battlefield: soldier against soldier.

3) Any civilian who is not involved in the battle like woman, child, elderly man or any ordinary man, should not be harmed in any way; thus, there is no concept of hostages or terrorist attacks on innocent civilians in Islam.

4) The environment, fruit bearing trees, water, house, animal, any living being and livestock or essential supplies cannot be harmed or damaged in any way.
5) Torture of prisoners is forbidden. In fact, The Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him) encouraged his followers to treat the captives with compassion; kindness even feed them, before they eat.

6) A war must only be waged for the sake of Allah; it must not be done for any material gain e.g. capturing land for territory, wealth, oil or gold.

A man said: “Apostle of Allah, a man wishes to take part in Jihad in Allah’s path desiring some worldly advantage? The Prophet (Peace Be upon Him) said, “He will have no reward.” (Ahmad, 2000: 2510)

7) A war cannot be waged on another nation to force them to accept Islam, because Allah clearly commands in The Quran “there is no compulsion in religion.” Islam is the fastest growing religion in the world, not because of threats or warfare, but simply through the tools of logic, common sense and reason.

8) War must be terminated as soon as the opposite party relents, continuation of the war, to extract sadistic revenge is totally forbidden.

9) Arrogance is forbidden and usurping the rights of the defeated nation by making life difficult for them is not allowed.

This is called ‘Holy War’ a war that is conducted with the highest morality, ethics and a code of conduct of behavior. Muslims are fully aware that all their actions will be judged one day by Allah, the one and only, who will judge all humanity. This is the Day of accountability where every action of every person will be displayed. Every Muslim must follow the codes of conduct laid down in the Quran and shown by Prophet Mohamed (Peace Be upon Him).

**Concept of War in Hinduism:**

Hinduism is tolerant and a religion of peace and brotherhood. It seems as if there are two sides of Hinduism. One talks of pacifism (Sarve Bhavanthu
Sukhinaha – May all sentient beings live in peace) and the other talks of war (Arise Arjuna, Fight for the sake of Dharma). The codes of Dharmayuddha (the Hindu concept of war) were followed by almost all Hindu warriors from the ancient to the medieval age. It must be said that Dharmayuddha is radically different from the modern war.

The ancient Hindus viewed war as a means to protect Dharma (religion) and resorted to war only as a last resort when all efforts to secure peace failed. Dharmayuddha is more a code of chivalry. It entails that women, children, weak and infirm should not be attacked. No subterfuge is employed, no backstabbing and no fight during the night. It was more of a tournament where warriors displayed their strength.

There is no concept of holy war in Buddhism. Killing is breaking a key moral percept in Buddhism. One is strictly forbidden to kill another person in the name of religion, a religious leader or whatever religious pretext or worldly excuse.

After discussing the concept of holy war in Christianity, Islam and Hinduism, it is also necessary to discuss then what unholy war is in brief. The following discussion will unfold the meaning of Unholy War.

**Unholy War:**

In contrast to holy war is unholy war, which does not follow the code of conduct and behavior in the war. The following points will help to clarify the concept of unholy war.

1) The gassing of Jewish civilians by Germans in the Holocaust in the Second World War was unholy and unethical.
2) The use of nuclear bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was unholy and unethical, since it killed many innocent civilians; its effects on the population and the destruction of the environment are still felt today and for generations to come.

3) The hoarding of wealth by a few industrial nations who live in opulent luxury, while millions in Africa, India, Pakistan, South America and other parts of the world are living in abject poverty is regarded as unholy and unethical.

4) The use of Agent Orange by America, on Vietnam, is unholy. Agent Orange is carcinogenic and mutagenic and has not only affected humans, but has also destroyed the environment for decades.

5) America used 80,000 tones (80 million kilograms) of cluster bombs, without discriminating between civilian and non-civilian targets in Iraq. This is unholy and not ethical. More than 1 million innocent civilians lost their lives. Buildings, land, dams, electrical power stations, schools and hospitals were destroyed.

6) More than 5000 children under the age of 5 years are dying every month since 1991 in Iraq because America used depleted Uranium (outlawed internationally).

7) The ethnic cleansing and slaughter of Muslims in Bosnia is unholy and unethical.

8) The kamikaze attack on the World Trade Center where innocent civilians died in the planes and on land is unholy and unethical.

9) Destroying the homes of Palestinians with bulldozers or Apache Attack Helicopters killing and torturing thousands of Palestinians, who are fighting for their freedom and their land, which was unlawfully usurped from them, is unholy and unethical.
10) The action of an armed Israeli soldier who shot 6 years old 
Palestinian child in the head is unholy and unethical.

11) The unlawful underwater testing of nuclear weapons is unholy and 
unethical, as it destroys millions of marine life and damages the oceans of 
the world.

12) Suicide bomb attack on public places is unholy and unethical.

There is only one God. We are all the children of Prophet Adam (Peace Be 
upon Him). One should not condemn a nation or a religion because of the actions 
of the few misguided people. One should conduct his affair with justice, 
compassion, dignity, respect and mutual tolerance for all humanity, black or white, 
great or small, Muslim or non-Muslims. We are one family. We are one humanity. 
We need a new world order based on the respect, dignity, compassion and love for 
all humanity.

**Changing Concept of War in Different Periods and War Writing:**

War is as old as human existence. It is mentioned in the holy books like 
Bible, Quran etc. War writing is important for many purposes. Though it cannot 
stop future war, it will keep the record. People will read these books and will think 
many times if they have to go to war. War Writing is a source of enhanced literary 
insight. Certain literary movements and genres cannot be understood without 
reference to conflict – epic and the war of antiquity, romanticism and French 
Revolution, modernism and the First World War. War reverberates through 
literature. Ernest Hemingway wrote in a letter to F. Scott Fitzgerald, war is “best 
subject”, as it “groups the maximum of material and speeds up the action and bring 
out all sort of stuff that normally you have to wait a lifetime to get”. (Hemingway, 
ed. Barker, 1981: 176) Wars and writing about wars, function like the literary
canon: influence works and backgrounds. Its omission is both inevitable and intriguing. This section of the chapter will focus on the war in different ages and war writing chronologically from classical age to present age.

**War Writing in the Classical Period:**

The most important text of Greco-Roman literary culture is *The Iliad* (c.750 BCE). It is a poem of battle, and warfare, which was part of political and civic life in antiquity. The prevalence of war as a theme in classical literature is therefore unremarkable. Equally unsurprising is the impact of classical war literature upon subsequent writing. The writers of classical antiquity were amongst the first to grapple with the problem of how to depict war and its effects. This was not just a moral problem but also formal and technical. Reference to the antique may just impart an important material to the contemporary writers. Ancient war literature is a capacious category. Just as war was difficult to avoid in the ancient world, in the same way its depiction was difficult to avoid. War cropped up across the diverse literary activity of Greece and Rome.

Virgil’s poem, the *Aeneid* (late First Century BCE) about Rome is the best known and perhaps the only one that can rival *The Iliad* in terms of its post-classical influence. The epic of the Neronian era concerning the conflict between Julius Caesar and Pompous Magnus in the first century BCE works out with unparalleled thoroughness the notion, later influential, of war as visual entertainment. (Leigh, 1997: 234-46) Epic martial poetry is particularly interesting for our purpose because it addresses, from the beginning of the Greco-Roman tradition, the importance of the artist in memorializing deeds of valor and how, subject matter contributes to literary prestige. A refusal to epic could mean a refusal to warfare or vice versa. Classical epic is significant to later military
literature because of the formal features by which it organizes its narrative. From Homer downwards, it tackles the problem of how to reconcile the scale of martial operations with the immediacy of human experience.

War was present in lyric and elegiac poetry of the ancient world. Earlier exponent of these genre were Archilochus, Tyrtaeus (seventh century BCE) and Alcaeus (late seventh and early sixth century BCE). The different classical genres of Poetry, offered various expressive possibilities to subsequent war literature. The impact of ancient historiography was more direct, from the beginning; history writing of the ancient world had a strong association with war writing. Tacitus wrote in second century CE about the reign of Tiberius, he laments that he offers nothing to compare with the subject matter of those who had written about the earlier deeds of the Roman People who described huge wars, the sacks of cities, the routing and capture of kings. Therefore, classical war literature is a great help for the contemporary writer. The military writing of the Greco-Roman world developed formal structures and motif upon which subsequent writers have often drawn. The classical world continues to provide a useful foil for contemporary theme and preoccupations.

**War Writing in the Medieval Period:**

From the early Middle Ages to the fifteenth century war was a powerful and enduring cultural force in the medieval west, it played an important role in the imaginative literature of the period. War was constant in England. Anglo-Saxon England was devastated by the raids of the Vikings, and finally conquered by the Normans. From 1294 until 1485, from the reign of Edward I to Henry VII, England was almost constantly at war with France and its ally Scotland. The Hundred Years War (1377-1453) and The Wars of Roses (1455-87) demonstrate the prevalence of violence in this period. The Battle of Towton (1461), the largest battle ever fought
on British soil, in which some 28,000 men died. Early medieval battles were fought with mixture of cavalry and infantry and relatively with small number of warriors. With the development of new technology, the figure of the mounted warrior came to dominate the medieval military world. In the fourteenth century, war changed its character again, as the power of infantry war recognized, much larger armies were employed and battles become bloodier. The use of gunpowder grew more widespread and the canon was developed marking the difference between the battle of Agincourt (1415) and the Siege of Orleans (1428-29). The French Victory oat Castillon and Mehned II conquered the city of Constantinople. These two battles of 1453 marked the end of the medieval warfare.

It was medieval literature that shaped the ideals of warfare. In the Anglo-Saxon period, war was both fundamental to the heroic mode and a realistic concern. The writings attributed to King Alfred and his circle was necessarily colored by the repeated warfare that marked his reign and frequently conveyed nostalgia for the golden age of peace. Writers were keenly aware of the prominence of war in biblical history, episodes of which were retold in sermon and rewritten in poems such as *Old English Genesis and Exodus* (late seventh century) and *Judith* (early tenth century (Aquinas, c.1270, 2.2). *Beowulf* contrasts monstrous and human enemies, moral battle and feud, heroism and societal disorder, and ultimately questions the ideals of a society that defines itself through heroic battle. Warfare in religious poetry can take up the triumphant theme of victory of good over evil. Thus, in *The Dream of the Rood* (Seventh century), Christ becomes the glorious warrior as he willingly climbs upon the cross to defeat death, and return with his glorious armies, liberated from hell on the Day of Judgment. Old English poetry does not mask the grief, loss, and tragedy it brings. Anglo-Saxon writing also looks towards celestial rewards that endure beyond...
fleeting early glory. Post-conquest literature also follows the same tradition. In the works of Chaucer and Malory, the matter of legendary history both classical and Arthurian, proves individual heroism and preserves nationhood. The earliest (French) romances retold classical epics maintaining war as a central theme. Thebes, Troy and the exploits of Alexander offered popular story matter throughout the Middle Ages.

**War Writing in the Early Modern Period:**

Professional soldiers, men volunteers, or noblemen from the very elite of Europe’s aristocracy, and the early modern war writers mustered whatever rhetorical muscle they could in order to shape their military memories, experiences of battle, or views on strategy into a persuasive whole. Demand for war writing grew throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and publishers increasingly cared more for the vivid account of battle. Eyewitness accounts were more valued. Francis Bacon in his essay *For the True Greatness of Kingdoms and States* (1612) noted, “A just, and Honorable War, is the true Exercise”. ‘In contrast with the twentieth century, very few early modern recorders of war saw their goal as discrediting war or its aura of glory’. (Kiernan, ed.1985: 55) Like Bacon, there were many others who accepted Machiavelli’s notorious statement in *The Prince* (1513, Published 1532) that a ruler should have no other objective or concern than the theory and practice of war. Machiavelli also published a book *Art of Warfare* in 1521, which glorifies war. There were few champions of pacifism or quietism with the notable exception of the influential humanist Erasmus. In essays such as *Dulce bellum inexpertis* (War is Sweet to Those Who Know It Not) (1515), Erasmus dared to speak out against the cherished idea of holy war, pointing out that devil, not God had invented the art of war and that Christian warfare was essentially spiritual and metaphorical.
Unlike many of her courtiers and advisors, Elizabeth hated the expense and danger of war and resisted it wherever possible—a legacy taken up after 1603 by James I. Edmund Spenser offered provocative and ambitious image of military life in the region of Elizabeth in *The Faerie Queene* (published 1590-1596). Greville’s sonnet *Sequence Caelica* (1633) accuses war as sin in blood and wrong liberty. Shakespeare drew on “Art of War” books like *Titus Andronicus* (c.1592), *Coriolanus* (1608), *Julius Caesar* (1599), *Troilus and Cressida* (1602), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) and Shakespeare’s ten history plays recorded early modern warfare.

War shook England, Wales, and Scotland from 1642 to 1648, with theater shut down by parliament in England, it was left to poetry and prose to capture war and keep the records. As Civil War divided England and Wales, poets on both sides of the conflict began to adopt their writing to changed conditions. A greater poetic record of the effect of war is found among the poems of Abraham Cowley’s *Pastime* (1643). Henry Vaughan’s most profound scriptural meditation on Christian warfare came in the second edition of *Silex* (1655). Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1658-63) and *Paradise Regained* (1673) are great records of war.

**War Writing in the Romantic Period:**

Most of the major writers of this period in Great Britain and Ireland, ranging from Swift to Austen, from Pope to Barbauld, address the topic of war, either directly or indirectly. This is apparent in Roger Lonsdale’s *New Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (1984). M. John Cardwell has noted the importance of an “explosion” of such literature “ballads, ephemeral verse, prose satire and prints” – in shaping of public opinion during the Seven Years War (1756-63), while Detty T. Bennett located 1,360 texts for her edition of the war poetry of the French revolutionary and Napoleonic War (1793-1815). (Cardwell, 2004: 51) Britain’s
conflict is pervasive in text, such as Defoe’s *Memoirs of a Cavalier* (1720) and Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726 -1735). War was an unavoidable presence in literature because it was an inescapable fact for Britain in the eighteenth century. Britain had established itself as a global power by 1815. There were many battles in the eighteenth century William Black in his book notes 194 major battles.

John Philip’s “*Blenheim: A poem*”, published in 1705, is notable for its graphic depictions of the horror of battle, a response to the heroic euphemisms of Joseph Addison’s *The Campaign* (1705):

> Surprising slaughter; on each side they fly  
> By chains connext, and with destructive sweep  
> Behead whole Troops at once; the hairy scalps…  
> Disploding murd’rous Bowels, Fragments of steel  
> And stones, and glass, and nitrous grain adust.  
> (Philips, 1720: 4041)

The plight of the old soldier or the destitute widow was a persistent theme in the “submerged” tradition of war poetry and popular ballads in the poems of 1790s such as Robert Merry’s *The Wounded Soldier* (1795). Laurence Stern’s *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy Gentleman* was published during Seven Years War. Robert Southey, William Wordsworth, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge all produced antiwar poetry and they were polemic in their radical youth in the 1790s. Samuel Taylor in *Fears in Solitude* (1798) claimed that war had become an entertainment and commodity “all read of war the best amusement for our morning meal!” stimulating an unhealthy, even savage bellicosity based on ignorance of war’s reality.

**War Writing in the Victorian Period:**

There was a stiff competition among imperialist superpowers of the period like Britain, France, Russia and others. The wars in which Britain engaged in the
nineteenth century ranged in location from India to Southern Africa, from Crimea to France. Victory in the Battle of Waterloo (1815), the culmination of the war against Napoleonic France (1803-15) gave essential stability to Victorian Britain. Victorian war literature is generically varied, ranging from adventure stories to poetry to historical novels to works for children. Patriotic and imperial impulses jostle with antiwar sentiments, often within the oeuvre of a single writer. Rudyard Kipling’s *The White Man’s Burden* (1899) may seem supportive of Empire, but *Recessional* (1897) expresses anxiety about national triumphalism. The Muscular Christianity movement produced in the mid-century, the figure of Christian hero, a character who combined physical excellence with Christian virtues and was not averse to fighting Charles Kingsley’s *Two Years Ago* (1857) and Thomas Hughes’s *Tom Brown at Oxford* (1861) are best examples of it. James Philip Bailey’s *The Age: A Colloqual Satire* (1858), Sir Henry Newbolt’s *Vitai Lampada* (1897), Kipling’s poems like *Fuzzy-Wuzzy* (1890) and *Gunga Din* (1892) show the glory of war and heroism of soldiers. In the later nineteenth century, the muscular Christian hero was replaced by a hyper-masculine imperial adventurer; for example, protagonist of King Solomon’s *Mines* (1885). G. R. Gleig’s fictional memoir *The Subaltern* (1825), caused two new subgenres of British Fiction: the Naval Novel and Military Novel. The naval novel is associated chiefly with Captain Frederick Marryat, author of *Frank Mildmay* (1829), *The King’s Own* (1830), *Peter Simple* (1834) and others. The military novel is associated chiefly with Charles Lever’s *The Confessions of Harry Lorrequer* (1839), *Charles O’Malley* (1841) and *Jack Hinton* (1842). Thomas Hardy referred Napoleonic Wars in his works like *The Trumpet-Major* (1880), *Wessex Poems* (1898), and *The Dynasts* (1904-8).
The Crimean saw the beginning of modern war correspondence, with William Howard Russell sending vivid eyewitnesses dispatched to the London Times. Photography was introduced to the theater of war for the first time; the public back home could see as well as read about, the reality of conflict. Initially there was enthusiastic support for the war. Earnest Charles Jones’s *The Battle Day and other poems* (1855) are positive in their treatment to conflict. However, disillusionment was broken, due to the public’s unprecedented access to the reality of war. Alfred Lord Tennyson’s *The Charge of the Light Brigade* appreciates war whereas *Maud* (1861) shows antiwar sentiments.

First War of Independence of India is often referred as “India’s Mutiny”. There were many literary responses to Indian Mutiny like Christina Rossetti’s *In the Round Tower at Jhansi* (1862), Tennyson’s *Havelock* (1858) and *The Defense of Lucknow* (1879). Plays about mutiny include George Lawrence’s *Maurice Dering* (1864), Henry Kingsley’s *Stretton* (1869), and Philip Meadows Taylor’s *Seeta* (1872). The British invaded Nululand in 1879 and occupied Egypt in 1882. Literary productions of this include G.A. Henry’s *The Young Colonists* (1885), *The Strange Case of Falconer Thring* (1902) and other works. The two Boar Wars took place in 1880-81 and 1899-1902. E.W. Hornung’s *The Black Mask* (1901), Rider Haggard’s *Jess* (1887), Olive Schreiner’s Powerful antiwar allegory *Trooper Peter Halkett of Mashonaland* (1897), Thomas Hardy’s poems *Past and Present* (1901) etc. are the literary production of Boar War. Some women war writers also emerged in the Victorian period like Quid (Maria L. Rame) her work was *Under Two Flags* (1867) and Elizabeth Barrett Browning’s *The Romaunt of the page* (1840).
War Writing during the First World War:

The First World War was much greater than any other previous war in human cost and in geographical scope. It is often described as the world’s first industrial war. European newspapers, which were reporting of the First World War, were full of lies, half-truths and propaganda – alongside much that was true. Very often, it was impossible to tell the difference, official government announcements and army dispatches were no more reliable. It took some time for the shocking reality of the worst of the war experience to be known to European civilian and that knowledge came in part, through literature. This is the reason why the literature of the First World War remains so important, for both historians and literary critics. The First World War literature include combatants memoirs and fiction; memoirs by nurses and other civilian participants; popular, patriotic, and propagandistic writings; pacifist writings; and civilian experiences about the war. T.S. Eliot’s iconic modernist poem *The Waste Land* (1922) is in part a bitter commentary upon a war that left much of European civilization in ruins.

Owen, Sassoon, Rosenberg, Read, Aldington, Blunden, Robert Grave, Lewis and many other writers served in the armed forces. Holtby and Brittain served as nurse in the war. Radcliffe hall, Rudyard Kipling, J.M. Barric, Arnold Bennett, John Galsworthy etc. helped and actively supported the war. A number of writers greeted the outbreak of war with patriotic excitement whereas other poets found dirt, suffering and despair. Writers who were pacifist or opposed the war include Vernon Lee (*Satan the Waster*-1920), Rose Macauly (*Non-combatants and Others*-1916), Rose Allatini (*Despised and Rejected*-1917), Leonard Woolf, Bertrand Russell, and George Bernard Shaw etc. Other young, idealistic soldiers wrote in praise of war in the early days of the conflict; many changed their views in the light of their service. Erich Maria Remarque’s *All Quiet on the Western Front*
(Westen Nichts Neues) (1929) for example is a classic of the First World War literature. An earlier book of war was Under Fire (Le Fau) (1916) by Henry Barbusse. Some British memoirs and novels by servicemen appeared shortly after the armistice: A.P.Herbert’s The Secret Battle (1919); Arthur Jenkin’s A Tank Driver’s Experiences (1922); R.H. Mottram’s The Spanish Farm Tragedy (1924-26); R.C. Sherriff’s play Journey’s End (1928); Richard Aldinton’s Death of Hero (1929), Robert Grave’s Goodbye to All That (1929); etc. Many women also wrote books about war, based on their own and other’s experiences, as Enid Bagnold’s A Diary Without dates (1918), Mary Borden’s The Forbidden Zone (1929), Irene Rothbones’s We That Were Young (1932) and many other works.

After the war many soldiers found themselves unemployed, impoverished, with little support and recognition. Many were troubled by long-term effects of war injuries. Thousands of soldiers were traumatized by the war. They suffered long-term mental illness known at that time as “Shell Shock” or “War Neurosis”. Both soldiers and civilian wrote about the terrible effects of war trauma. Wilfred Owen asks:

Who are these? Why sit they here in twilight?
Wherefore rock they, purgatorial shadows
Drooping tongue from jaws that slob their relish,
Baring teeth that leer like skulls’ teeth wicked? …
These are men whose minds the dead have ravished.
(Owen, Mental Cases: 1918)

One of the most notable novels on trauma is Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway (1925). Generation gap is one of the things most remembered about British literature of the First World War, it continues to speak to young people called to serve in combat and to all those who opposed war. Some writers returned to the subject in the late twentieth century e.g. Pat Barker’s Regeneration Trilogy (1991-95), Sebastian Faulks’s Birdsongs (1994) and Robert Edric’s In Desolate
Heaven (1997). Bulden, Gurey, Edward Thomson and many others drew a long tradition of pastoral to try to describe the devastation of the First World War. They mourn the land and use it to remember, to bear witness to the often-unspeakable effects of the war upon human beings. They try to articulate the trauma of industrial warfare, raising questions, which are still pertinent.

**War Writing during the Second World War:**

The Second World War was more destructive because it was more advance technologically and vast geographically. It was claimed that the literature of the Second World War would only repeat that of the First World War. This literature is still being written sixty years on, and its contents and forms are still being determined. Vera Britain and Stephen Spender were civilians, their writing from wartime London has moral and historical authority, it describes a good deal about the heterogeneity of the literary record of the Second World War, and variety of possibilities of reading it. British literature of the Second World War made no rhetorical or political fuss about being a war literature. The home front, with its bomb damage, blackout, queues, evacuees, civil defense, and Home Guard voluntarism dominates the writing of the period, and scenes of combat take second place.

The invasion and occupation of Germany presented writers with, moral and political dilemmas, as well as with the drama of service and combat. Jack Aistrop, John Prebble (historian), Colin Mainnes (novelist), John Bayley (critic), and Kingsley Amis all produced nuanced fictional account of English servicemen abroad, negotiating a way between the victor’s swank and lust for loot and the need to acknowledge the terrors of the different wartime experiences by liberated European and occupied Axis populations. Many contributed to visions of national
unity, few writers imagined what life in wartime Europe would have been like. The literary records of this time are alternately laconic about the horrors of war and talk about the potential for turning swords in plowshares. The literary production of the Second World War includes the following works: James Hanley’s *No Directions* (1943), Angus Calder’s *The People’s War* (1969), Dahl’s *A Piece of Cake* (1945) and *Death of an Old Man* (1945), Dan Billany’s *The Trap* (1950), Philip Larkin’s *Jill* (1946) Graham Green’s *Ministry of Fear* (1943) and *The End of the Affair* (1951) Henry Green’s *Caught* (1943), Sidney Keye’s *Two offices of a Sentry* (1942), Hohn Prebbles’s *Where the Sea Breaks* (1944) and many other works.

**War Writing during the Cold War and the War on Terror:**

The Cold War was characterized by its dazzling technology, much of which was spun off from weapons research. The computer network, the telecommunication satellite, GPS navigation, and most notably the jet airliner, ‘a symbol of indigenous mobility and zest, and of the galaxy of glittering destinations’, (Amis, 2008: 6) were all derived from the military industrial complex. The cold war was in a special sense an intelligence conflict. Indeed the main topics of this war were offices, the conflicts’ secrets contained in boxes, cabinets, and folders. These themes were present in Kingsley Amis’s *The James Bond Dossier* (1965) and *Colonel Sun* (1968), Adam Hunt’s *The Berlin Memorandum* (1965), Forsyth’s *The Odessa File* (1972), Len Dighton’s *The Ipcress File* (1962), Graham Green’s *The Human Factor* (1978) and Norman Mailer’s *Harlot’s Ghost* (1991). Michael Denning suggests, ‘The spy novel is in a sense the war novel of the Cold War’. (Denning, 1978: 92)

The central geographical conceit of *Nineteen Eighty – Four* (1949), probably the first novel of the Cold War, sees the world divided up into the land masses of
Eurasia, Eastasia, and Oceania, each constantly at war with the other as Orwell described the Cold War largely depended on “severance” to maintain the balance of power. Don DeLillo busted open the bunker mentalities of the Cold War world in *Underworld* (1997). The work of Thomas Pynchon, John Barth, and DeLillo involves not so much an elaboration of character, but an immersion in complex situations and labyrinthine plots, which entail the surveillance of many people simultaneously across a network. Samuel Beckett grew into a writer in the resistance and further developed his voice through the Cold War, his fictions following its deepest shapes, contained in darkened rooms and filthy cells, leading ghostly existences on the margins. Paul Virilio concluded: ‘Terrorists were the first to have waged an information war; the explosion only existed because it was simultaneously coupled to a multimedia explosion’. (Virilio and Lortringer, 2008: 174) It is terrorists’ modification of branded technologies that scars most, Boeing airliners become intercontinental ballistic missiles; and, in subsequent jihadist plots against airspaces. The theme of terrorist attack occurred in the work of Jonathan Safran Foer’s *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* (2005), DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007) etc. Other novelists have drawn in ever-increasing circles, the ramifications of the “War on Terror” which spread, in the weeks after 9/11, encompassing the ancient desert of Afghanistan, the madrasahs of Pakistan and palaces of Iraq. Now, and forever, the “war on terror” as it seems, an information war, whose scrolling pages howl away across cyberspaces to the crack of doom.

**War Novel:**

A novel which deals with the theme of war and its consequences in which primary action takes place in a battlefield or in home front i.e. in a domestic setting where characters are preoccupied with the preparations for or recovery from war is known as War Novel. Sometimes it is also referred as military fiction. However,
This genre got popularity in nineteenth and twentieth century, its main root lies in the epic poetry of the classical and medieval periods. Homer’s *The Iliad*, Virgil’s *The Aeneid*, the Old English poem *Beowulf* and different versions of King Arthur’s legends give ample description of war, bravery, bloodshed and destruction. All these epics were concerned with preserving the history and mythology of conflicts between different societies and presents collective memory of people. Other important influences on the war novel included the tragedies of such dramatists as Euripides, Seneca the Younger, Christopher Marlow and Shakespeare. Shakespeare’s historical dramas provided a model for how the history, tactics, ethics and behavior of the war could be combined in an essential fictional framework.

Romances and Satires of Early Modern Europe also helped to create a background later for war novel, to mention Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* and Miguel de Cervantes’s *Don Quixote* and other works. These works contain elements of military heroism and folly that influenced the later development of war novels; as far as imagery and symbolism are concerned its root lies in Dante’s depiction of Hell in *The Inferno*, the Apocalypse as depicted in the *Book of Revelation* and John Milton’s account of the war in Heaven in *Paradise Lost*. As other form of prose diction novel began to develop, with it War Novel also developed its modern form although most of the novels were Picaresque Satires in which the soldier was rakish rather that a realistic figure. In the nineteenth century war novels become predominant. Victorian war novels varied ranging from historical novel to novels of heroism, antiwar, patriotic and imperial works such as Stendhal’s *The Charterhouse of Parma*, featuring the Battle of Waterloo. Leo Tolstoy’s *War and Peace* is about the Napoleonic Wars in Russia and Stephen Cran’s *The Red Badge of Courage* is about American Civil War which established
the conventions of the modern war novel as it has come down to us today. There are many other novels, which are already discussed in the earlier section. Changing concept of war in different periods, depict realistic picture of major battles; visceral scenes of wartime horrors and atrocities and significant insights into the nature of heroism, cowardice, and morality in wartime. Lot of war literature was produced during this century including novels, poetry, prose, pamphlets, memories, biographies and letters. In the late nineteenth century and in the twentieth, the war novel entered the realm of popular fiction through the adventurous war novels of Ralph Cannor, G.A. Henry, Rudyard Kipling and many other writers. These latter novelists emphasized the heroic and patriotic aspects of war. They were the last war novelists to write with blunt imperialist or romantic mindset, in the wake of the post-industrial wars and genocides of the twentieth century.

The First World War produced a number of war novels by writers who themselves were directly or indirectly involved in the war. Most influential early war novel was *Le Feu (Under Fire)*, 1916 by the French novelist and soldier Henri Barbusse. Barbusse in his novel openly criticized nationalist dogma and military incompetence. This novel initiated the antiwar movement in literature that flourished in post-war period. People’s illusions were shattered about nationalism, bravery and masculinity. Post war period produced vast range of war novels, including “home front” novels such as Rebecca West’s *The Return of the Soldier*. It is about a shell-shocked soldier’s difficult reintegration into British society. John Dos Passos’s *Three Soldiers*, is one of a relatively small American novels about the First World War. In the post First World War period many novels were not war novels in the conventional sense, but they featured characters whose psychological trauma and alienation from society stemmed directly from wartime experiences. Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* is the best example in which a key subplot
concerns the tortuous descent of a young veteran, Septimus Warren Smith, towards insanity and suicide.

Post war period saw the boom of “war novels” because the people who served in war as a soldier, nurse, ambulance driver and many others who have undergone painful experiences of war were ready to write openly and critically about their war experiences. Laurence Stallings wrote, one of the first autobiographical war novels Plumes in 1924. Erich M. Remarque’s Im Westen nichts Neues (All Quiet on the Western Front) was published in 1929. It was massive worldwide bestseller not only for its brutally realistic account of the horrors of trench warfare but from the perspective of a German infantryman. This novel is considered as classic of the First World War literature. Straitis Myrivili’s Greek novel Life in the Tomb (1930) is equally shocking in its account of the horrors of trench warfare. There were many other successful war novels like Ernest Hemingway’s A Farewell to Arms, William March’s Company K, Richard Aldington’s Death of a Hero, Arnold Zeweig’s Der Streit un den Sergeanten Grischa(The case of Sergeant Grischa) and many other novels which criticize war bitterly. After the First World War, the popularity and demand, for historical novels increased significantly. It became one of the popular genres of literature. The turn of 20th and 21st centuries saw yet another resurgence of interest in novel of the First World War. Pat Barker’s Trilogy: Regeneration, The Eye in the Door and Ghost Road certainly illustrated the ongoing fascination with the “war to end wars”.

As the British, French and German produced great number of war novels in the First World War, in the same way Americans produced great number of novels in the Second World War, there was war in the air, on the sea and on the land. The Second World War gave rise to a new prosperity in contemporary war novels. Among the most successful American war novels were Herman Wouk’s The Caine
Mutiny, James Jones’s *From Here to Eternity*, and Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the later novels set in the Spanish Civil War. Post Second World War period also produced great number of war novels like Joseph Heller’s Satirical *Catch-22*, Thomas Pynchon’s *Gravity’s Rainbow*, Norman Mailer’s *The Naked and the Dead*, Irwin Shaw’s *The Young Lions*, James Jones’s *The Thin Red Line* and many others. In the post war period Holocaust novel also developed parallel with war novel. These novels depicted destruction and slaughter on a mass scale, such as A.M. Klein’s *The Second Scroll*, Primo Levi’s *If this is a Man* and *If not Now, When?* and William Styron’s *Sophie’s Choice*. Immediately after the Second World War was the Korean War (1950-53), Richard Hooker’s novel *MASH*: A Novel about Three Army Doctors was a black comedy set in Korea during war. Canadian Herbert Fairlie Wood’s *The Private War of Jacket Coates* also depicts the pictures of Korean War.

After the Second World War, the greatest number of novelists were attracted towards Vietnam War and their writing deals with Vietnam War such as Graham Greene’s *The Quiet American*, Tim O’Brien’s *The Things They Carried*, Bao Ninh’s *The Sorrow of War* and many other novels. W.G. Sebald’s *Austerlitz* depicts a postmodern inquiry into the German’s struggle to come to terms with its troubled past. The Cold War’s literary production was Kingsley Amis’s *The James Bond Dossier* (1965) and *Colonel Sun* (1964), Don DeLillo’s *Underworld* (1997).

The post 9/11 literary world has produced a few war novels that address current events in the war on Terrorism. Example of such novels are Chris Cleave’s *Incendiary* (2005), John le Carre’s *Absolute Friends* (2004), Jay McInerney’s *The Good Life* (2006), Jonathan Safran Foer’s *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* (2005), and DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007).
Barker’s view about War:

The concept of war has been changing from ancient period to the modern period; it also differs from person to person. Some people think war as a noble art while others hate war. The subject of war can be traced from Homer’s *Iliad* to the modern writers. From ancient period, writers tried their level best to represent war in literature. Twentieth century was full of wars such as the First World War, the Second World War, Korean War, Vietnam War, Gulf War and now War on Terrorism. Due to these wars, ample number of war literature was produced. Among these war novels, novels written on the First World War are still considered to be great as compared to other war novels. The best example is British novelist Pat Barker who re-imagines First World War from a contemporary perspective. With her Psychological and anthropological approach she has redefined the war novel and applied a modern approach to the historical material.

A number of novels have been written on the First World War. Almost all the writers dealt with theme of battlefield, soldiers’ suffering, physical destruction, economical destruction, environmental destruction etc. but no writer has dealt with theme of psychological destruction of mind in detail. Pat Barker is the only writer who has dealt with such a theme. She could do it because of her thorough study and research in the field of war. She has deliberately avoided physical description of battlefield, which is a common theme for other writers; instead, she has chosen new perspectives to write about war. She reconstructs war novel from modern and psychological perspective. She rewrites the past in the new context. It gains its meaning purely from its references to historical figures like Siegfried Sassoon, Wilfred Owen, Robert Grave, William River and texts written about the First World War like Sassoon’s declaration statements, Owen’s poems etc.

Barker’s novels are not for weak hearted people because she chooses to explore often taboo and challenging subjects such as prostitution, homosexuality, child rape, mental illness, pacifism, war and murder by minors. Her shocking, palpable detail of the First World War and the mental as well as physical distress caused by close proximity to danger and death impresses the readers and the critics. From her text, we not only learn more about how the human psyche reacts
under pressure, but also more about ourselves. Pat Barker’s first four novels drew considerable critical acclaim but she establishes her reputation as an international writer with the publication of *Regeneration Trilogy*. Barker has consistently explored ideas of communities and individuals under stress whether in late twentieth century urban centers or in the trenches, war hospitals, and sanatoriums of the First World War. Reviewers have tended to split Barker’s Writing into two distinct periods – 1982 to 1991 and 1991 till date – reinforced by the belief that her attention to gender shifts dramatically from women to men in these periods. Barker explores the extent to which violence, casual and socially sanctioned (war) affects individuals. Barker is a contemporary novelist for whom the present and the future are founded on the past. In the *Trilogy*, it is the psychological chaos of war that interests Barker most of all, through victims of ‘Shell Shock or neurasthenia and attendant conditions relating to the representation of memory and soldiers’ experiences out there’, issues that came back into public consciousness with the Gulf War. Barker reinforces the articulation of those who have been traditionally rendered silent and deemed inarticulate. Barker is fascinated by the problems of communication. She explores the failure of communication in her famous *Trilogy* via stammering and mute soldiers can be traced back to her earliest work. Though some of the texts of Barker are set in the First World War period, it does not prevent her works from providing a basis for understanding traumas in present and wishing to prevent traumas in the future.

Her earlier four novels focus on working class women, victim of poverty and violence, factory workers and prostitutes. However, her great success lies with *Regeneration Trilogy*, which is largely been associated with a move away from feminism, ‘to male protagonists, a favoring of the masculine spheres of pub, battle field, hospital or government, and leaning towards the epic rather than domestic scale’. (Tolly, 2000: 59). The *Regeneration Trilogy* (1991-95), *Another World*
(1998), *Border Crossing* (2001), *Double Vision* (2003) and *Life Class*, all focus primarily on male protagonists, one can say that Barker is no longer just a feminist, but she has achieved ‘Double status as a feminist and mainstream writer’. (Tolly, 2000: 60) You could almost be forgiven for thinking that there are two Pat Barkers – one writes contemporary feminist novels set in working class areas of northern England (her first four novels), and the other about the devastating psychological damage sustained by soldiers fighting the First World War. Therefore, as the title of the thesis suggests, only Barker’s latter war novels have been considered. Barker follows up 70 years later on much of the same territory as of Virgina Woolf, but expands issues of patriarchal power, the effects of trauma and the huge social and gender changes that began with the First World War. More in-depth analyses of war and its contexts are made possible by Barker’s broader canvas, the Trilogy: *Regeneration*, *The Eye in the Door*, and *The Ghost Road* that incorporate historical characters and documents and emphasizes a variety of soldiers in treatment. Barker examines how the public face of the war creates intense conflict and trauma for soldiers because there is no way to reconcile the demands of duty with the horrific effects of war on the psyche.

Pat Barker is one of the major war novelists. Her works are closely related with war, since she incorporates many features of war novels in her fiction. This study attempts a detailed sequential analysis of Barker’s fiction in the light of the psychological techniques. It is felt that such an analysis will help justify Barker’s methods, which have baffled both the readers and the critics and heighten the appreciation and understanding of her works. It may as well give insights into certain aspects of Barker’s personality.

The study, therefore, has five more chapters. Chapter second focuses on psychological terms “Shell Shock”, War Neurosis, Psychoanalysis, and Mental illness. Then, *Regeneration*, the major war novel is analyzed critically from
psychological perspective. Major themes of the novel like atrocity of war, homosexuality, mental illness, pacifism, muscularity, parenthood, regeneration, love between men and internal struggle of war have been brought out and analyzed thoroughly.

Chapter third examines, how Barker blurs the distinction between facts and fiction and focuses on her next two novels *The Eye in the Door* and *The Ghost Road*. She blends real characters, Sassoon, Owen, Grave and River with the fictitious character Billy Prior. *The Eye in the Door* represents the story not just of one man suffering from the trauma of war, but a generation condemned to the unending slaughter, and all the agony of class and gender. *The Ghost Road* is about a group of shell-shocked soldiers in the First World War who were treated by Dr William Rivers at Craighckhart War Hospital. William Rivers, the protagonist of this novel himself undergoes the process of regeneration as his illusion about war is shattered and he develops antiwar feelings. Here, Barker blends Rivers’s earlier anthropological experience with psychological treatment.

Chapter fourth traces post war experience of soldiers and civilians. Barker’s next novels *Another World* and *Border Crossing* have been analyzed in this chapter. *Another World* represents the trauma of war and burden of past in present, the strong hold of the First World War on present and how the veterans suffer mentally even after 80 years. *Border Crossing* also focuses on post war period in which Barker continues her exploration of the psychological process, Rivers and Prior, Helen and Geordie and in this novel Tom and Danny. Barker unsettles the reader, allowing the causes and cures to remain ambivalent, while pursuing the way in which they affect each of us.

Chapter fifth analyses Barker’s next two novels, *Double Vision* and *Life Class*. In these novels, Barker shows how atrocities of war overshadow the lives of civilians. Through Stephan, a war correspondent and a war photographer Ben,
Barker provides raw material of war and leaves to the readers to decide and interpret this particular situation, violence and war, good versus evil, justice and so on. Her latest novel *Life Class* portraiture the picture of destruction through art. Barker is concerned with how one gives voice to trauma that extends its battlefield into the individual and collective psyche, across divisions of public and private.

Chapter sixth is the conclusion of the issues discussed in the preceding chapters.