CHAPTER - 1

MODERN WARFARE
The chapter aims at discussing the causes and problems of warfare in general. For, it is not possible to explore methods of eliminating war without understanding its nature. As Quincy Wright observes, war to be abolished must be understood, to be understood, it must be studied.

War, in its literal meaning is fighting, for, "fighting is the only effective principle in the manifold activities generally designated as war". War is a feature of human behaviour. It has been constant in human affairs since the earliest societies. In fact, the two have grown together. The difference has only been in terms of origin. Possibly, conflict started immediately after the arrival of 'Third Man' after Adam and Eve. The history of mankind has been largely influenced by war where urges of rage, aggression, fear, clash of interest are the most obvious reasons of war.

In primitive age, men and animals either fought between themselves or with others for almost the same things, that is, food, territory, females. Their primary concern.

---

* War is a word derived from the Anglo-Saxon word 'werre'. 'Werre' further owes its origin to an old high German word 'werre' which means confusion, discord and strife. War, therefore, is nothing but a strife, discord or act of fighting. (The Oxford English Dictionary, Vol. XII, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1933), pp. 79-82.  
however, has been food for their existence. The search was for the hunted and not the hunter and so they faced protective problem: it meant non-survival of the unfittest.

To start with, war was an adventure. Men were unarmed and so hands, feet and teeth were their sole weapons. Stones, fire, bones and wood came to be used as weapons followed by the hammer, the spade and the axe. With these innovations, the need for effective weapons was felt. With the advent of war, the evolution of the art of warfare started. The taming of the horse and the sword placed the rider in a very dominant position. The warfare was revolutionised. But the object of the war continued to be the same i.e. the destruction of the enemy compelling his submission.²

According to Marshal-de Saxe, "War is a science covered with darkness, in the midst of which one does not walk with an assured step ... All the sciences have principles, but that of war as yet has none".³ For Clausewitz, "War is nothing but a duel on larger scale".⁴

² Ibid., p. 236.
⁴ Clausewitz, op. cit., p. 75.
Quincy Wright defined war as "a violent contact of distinct but similar entities".5 According to Oppenheim, "war is a contention between two or more states through their armed forces for the purpose of overpowering each other and imposing such conditions of peace as the victor pleases".6 Thus, the purpose of war remains to compel the opponent to submit or to make him incapable of resistance. Violence is simply the use of force and a mean to achieve a defined aim. War is, therefore, a mean and never an end. Violence is rooted in the object of war. For, war is a contention — an act of violence with the help of armed forces. The use of force by a single state, does not amount to war. Force used by a single state can be regarded as the reason for the outbreak of war, but never war. Once the other side responds in the like manner, it turns into war.

Until the advent of the atomic weapons, war was supposed to be normal course of statecraft or as Clausewitz has said, "an instrument of national policy".7 This meant that war was one of the means employed by a state for the fulfilment of its policy objective. Quincy Wright observes,

7. Clausewitz, op. cit., p. 87.
that as a promoter of national interest and shaping up of relations among the nations, war has also contributed to the evolution of the modern nation state, to the development and spread of modern civilization, maintenance of an international system of independent nations and also means for maintaining stability among nations. 8

However, the changed character of the modern warfare has overshadowed this aspect of the effect of war on human civilization.

The present world is more conflictful, violent and destructive than in the past. It has been observed, since the past century and a half, that there is an upward climb in the number of conflicts. Quincy Wright’s monumental analysis dealt with some 278 major wars from the war of Roses to the close of World War II. 9 In the post 1945 period, a total of 160 armed conflicts have taken place. 10 In 80’s alone 22 wars have been fought which are more than any previous decade in modern military history. Most of these wars have taken place in third world countries of Asia and Africa in which at least 20 million people have been killed. 11

This is not withstanding the phenomenal growth of nuclear weapons, near saturation in sophistication reached in conventional weapons and currently marrying of the two weapon system which is threatening the world peace.

The Second Vatican Council in May 1983 evaluated the nature of Modern Warfare in the following words: "the whole human race faces a moment of supreme crisis in its advance towards maturity. This is embodied in the threat which nuclear weapons pose for the world and much that we hold dear in the world, threat to human society which is without precedent".  

In the beginning of eighteenth century, war continued to remain a special preserve of elites only. But, with the passage of time, the method and technique of waging it changed and gradual development in science and technology and the advancement in means of communications made it an affair of nations.

French Revolution drastically changed the system of war and put forward the concept of 'Nations in Arms'. And the primary aim of war became, as Clausewitz said, the overthrow of the foe.  

became the universal phenomenon for national defence. In this context, Quincy Wright remarked, "where formerly one per cent of population was large enough to mobilise, now over ten per cent can be mobilised." Mechanisation, automation and militarization of population are responsible for this trend. It means the involvement of entire population in the war-effort either by joining army or by supporting war through other services like production and supply. Man behind the machine became more important. It was fully accepted that for successful conduct of war whole-hearted support of population was necessary and to achieve the aim of war, all resources of nation were to be mobilised.

This outstanding characteristic enlarged the scope of war to the larger areas of the world and increased the number of participants. In the list of 278 wars, from 1450 to 1930, the average number of participants in war of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were 2.4 and in the following centuries 2.6, 3.7, 3.2 and 5.0.

This reveals that apart from the nineteenth century in which there were a large number of imperial and civil wars, the trend was towards an increase in the

---

15. Ibid., pp. 226, 625-647.
number of participants. Further, conventional armour (tanks, armoured cars, armoured personnel carrier, etc.) started replacing cavalry in land warfare. And on ocean, iron cladstream ships made the ancient sails of line obsolete. Smokeless gun powder and experiments with the refuelling gave fire power an upper hand and range. Accuracy and rate of firearms were gradually increased.

However, wars during this period remained mostly the concern of soldiers but the citizens in one way or the other also became involved in the wars. The concept of 'Nations at War', was justified by the American Civil War (1861-65). A nation's ability to manufacture and supply its fighting forces with armament and food became more important than men in uniform. Emergence of this trend made the war total and fully modern.

From 1914 the invention of aeroplanes added to the totality of war and this was further enhanced by the start of strategic bombing. Civilians, centres of administration, transportation, communication and production became the favourite sites for dive bombers. In total wars the main objective is to cripple the enemy's will to fight. In military operations, the difference between the armed forces and civilians remain no more. This marked a change in the character of war. Each nation tried to achieve air
superiority to give final blow. Clausewitz aptly remarked that in modern war there is no limit except the energy and enthusiasm of the government and its subjects.  

16. According to Cyril Falls, "Total war in the absolute would involve fighting without any restrictions, even those of prudence and self-interest".  

17. These developments encouraged aggression by Japan, Italy and Germany after 1930. Similarly, dissatisfaction with the political results of World War I, resentment at the self-centered economic policies of the democracies, serious deterioration of the middle classes, and the spread of revolutionary ideologies engendered by the costs of war and widespread unemployment flowing from the great depression of 1929 provided motives for aggressions, but if collective security had been better organized and the airplane and tank had not been invented, the prospects would hardly have been sufficiently encouraging to induce action. As it was, the initial success of Japan in Manchuria and the failure of the disarmament conference alarmed the Soviets into rapid rearmament and encouraged Italy and Germany to do likewise, especially in the air. Initially, failure of the democracies to support the treaty structure when Germany began to rearm and reoccupied the Rhineland in violation of international obligations.

encouraged Germany, Italy and Japan to consort together and to continue aggression in weak areas, utilizing aviation with rapid success, while all phases of the national life were organised for total war.\textsuperscript{18}

Thus, the combined progress of science and industry which started with the Industrial Revolution changed the nature of war. In this context, "In 1942 and 1945 during World War II, 6700 people and 42,800 tons of supplies were taken by the air into the very heart of the enemy occupied countries of the Europe.\textsuperscript{19} On the other side, development of submarines and sea-mines tried to achieve the same aim in sea warfare. It was to challenge the movements of all those ships that supported enemy directly or indirectly in war. Complete blockade was practised to starve the enemy population.

In land operations, with the invention of tank, it has become easy to cross obstacles. Tanks now form the most important weapons of the modern war. Infantry

\textsuperscript{18} Hans Speier and Alfred Kahler, \textit{War in Our Time}, (New York : W.W. Norton & Co., 1939), p. 43.

and artillery work together to achieve the goal. They are also given air support wherever it is possible as a part of co-ordinated action. In this context, the invention, development and the procurement of latest weapons, the provision of transport and the quick movement of forces as a result of the development in the means of communication, the conversion of policies into military objectives, the strategy of campaigns and tactics of battles, sieges, blockades or air raids (Blitzkrieg) have led to the birth of modern warfare as to the totality of war.

Now there are no marquess of queensbury rules in today's warfare. It includes nuclear even biological and chemical weaponry. These extremely lethal weapons can be used both to produce immediate casualties and heavy destruction. In this regard, after the midnight outburst of 'Small Boy' and 'Fat Man' in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we have seen tremendous growth in nuclear weapons. From Kiloton to Megatons, from Megaton to

* In chemical warfare another element is 'Yellow Rain' which according to U.S. accusations is a crude extract of Fusarium, Mycotoxius alleged to have been used in Laos, Kampuchea and even Afghanistan. (David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf (eds.) Reassessing Arms Control, (New Delhi : MacMillan, 1985), p. 129.
thousand Megatons or we might call the 'Gigaton' - a thousand fold jumps. And it still remain an imbecility to place complete reliance on it since there is the familiar phrase, "The megaton bomb is now unlikely to be used".  

The fact is that the giant bombs have grown beyond being instruments of warfare and have become psychological weapons - a means of striking terror for the whole world population. The mere possession of such weapons paralyzes nations and drastically alters the whole basis of global politics.

On top of all this, a military arms race in nuclear and conventional weapons is an important feature of relations among nations today. Much of the nineteenth century, like the twentieth was in Oswald Spengler's words, "a time of 'war without war', a war of overbidding in equipment and preparedness a war of figures and tempo and techniques".  

In this context, the sharp aggravation of confrontation processes accompanied by the impetuous

arms build up at a global scale is turning into the most dangerous reality of present day development. It is not only making the society most tension ridden but also slows down the social progress as a whole and exerts a particularly negative influence on the social and economic development of the developing countries. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the current military spending is estimated at $1000 billions. This is approximately a 30 fold increase over the spending in the inter-war period.

The past few years events reveal that as the global arms race accelerates, it tends to involve developing countries more and more in the general militarisation process by promoting mini arms races. As had been mentioned earlier about the proliferating conflicts in such countries after the Second World War, there has also been a sharp rise in military spending in developing countries. For instance, military spending

by developing countries, has increased by 9 per cent beginning from 1970 ($27.86 billion dollars) to the start of 1982 ($125 billion). Although this militarization by the developing countries has been regarded not much of a threat by some military researchers emphasizing their share in the world's spending on military purposes and not building up of nuclear arms. According to Palme Commission report, the developing countries accounted for one-fourth of the total arms expenditure. The report estimated that total military spending in 1982 was over $600 billion - more than the entire income of 1900 million people living in the 50 poorest countries. The report also refers to the new armament programme and trends toward a nuclear arms race - a new danger of military competition in Asia.

Nonetheless, the current small spending on the defence items by these countries is definitely high taking into account their priorities, where economic development should take precedence over defence matters which take the major share of the exchequer. Secondly, the improvement and modernization of conventional arms, those being


24. Ibid.
the actual fighting weapons are narrowly inching towards the near nuclear destructive capability, e.g. during the Arab-Israel war of 1973, it took only a few days to destroy by 'conventional arms', what it took weeks to destroy during major operations in World War II.

Of late, the financial and destructive cost of Iran-Iraq, Lebanon and Civil war in Afghanistan have been equally staggering. Further, the enormous efforts invested in the nuclear build up acts, in fact, as a stimulant to armament. The strategy of nuclear deterrence is thus not a static but a dynamic endeavour from an initial posture of dissuasion, and minimum deterrence, the doctrine has evolved to advance nuclear warfighting, 'escalation dominance', enhanced and extended deterrence and in general, 'nuclear utilization theories' (NUT). Nuclear deterrence is turning the arms race into constant preparation for actually waging nuclear war. Based on the maintenance of a 'balance of terror', nuclear deterrence tends to sustain a system of threat and intimidation in international relations. It also exerts on pernicious influence on the internal life of nations.

Besides generating enemy images thereby legitimising the race of armament and increased military expenditure.

Since the 1950's the number of nuclear powers has trebled. This also includes those non-nuclear countries which are currently known to have acquired nuclear capabilities. These quasi nuclear states such as India, Pakistan, Israel, Brazil, Argentina and South Africa are likely to pursue their deterrence doctrines amidst a changing international and domestic scene.

Moreover, close to the possession of nuclear weapons are mostly those countries that nurture aggressive plans to their neighbours. Thus, if these countries ever obtain nuclear arms it would have catastrophic consequences for all nations. Since each nuclear state then would constitute as an independent decision making centre and given a chance endeavour for more violent courses of action.

The assumption that the guardians of nuclear weapons will behave in a rational way has become doubtful.

as it is not an absolute policy even among the most powerful. There is a likelihood of increase in nuclear brinkmanship. It has been estimated that apart from the one time actual use of nuclear bomb in a last great war when nuclear monopoly rested with the United States, there has been 41 incidents of coercive nuclear diplomacy or nuclear blackmailing between 1946 and 1982.27

As many as 28 of these incidents related to crisis and situations that had occurred in Southern Asia Pacific region.28 It is in this background that several countries in Asia are making efforts to acquire nuclear technology.


* Incidents of Threat of Employment of Nuclear Forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Iran (US)</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. US aircraft shot down by Yugoslavia (US) November, 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inauguration of President in Uruguay (US) February, 1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security of Berlin (US) April, 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Korean War : To compel Chinese Acceptance of a Ceasefire (US) April/May 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Security of Japan/South Korea (US) August, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Guemoy (US)</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Suez Crisis (US)</td>
<td>October, 1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnote (contd.)

16. Suez crisis to compel withdrawal of British and French troops from Suez (USSR). October, 1956

17. In connection with the Berlin Crisis (USSR). 1957/1958

18. Political Crisis in Lebanon (US) July, 1958

19. Political Crisis in Jordan (US) July, 1958

20. China-Taiwan Conflict; Guemoy and Matsu (US) July, 1958


22. Laos (US) June, 1961


24. Berlin Crisis (USSR) 1961


27. Withdrawal of US missiles from Turkey (US) April, 1963

28. Confrontation between Indonesian and Malaysia (UK) April, 1963

29. In connection with China's nuclear weapon programme (USSR) 1964

30. To compel the termination of Israel’s offensive on the Golan Heights (USSR) June, 1967

31. Pueblo seized by North Korea (US) 1968

32. Vietnam : Siege of the Sa i h (US) 1968

33. To compel termination of China initiated incidents on the Sino-Soviet border (USSR) 1969

34. Vietnam War (US) 1969 - 1972

35. Indo-Pak War-1971 (US) December, 1971

36. Bangladesh War (US) December, 1971

37. Vietnam Negotiations (US) 1972

38. Arab-Israeli War (US) October, 1973

39. In connection with the Middle East War (USSR) October, 1973

40. Security of Iran (US) May, 1982

41. South Atlantic War (US) May, 1982

Note: (1) Against Soviet Union
(2) Sailing of USS Enterprise to Bay of Bengal.

Sources: Data based on Barry Blechman (Force without war and other documents); Daniel Elsberg; Interview with New York Conservation Press, 1980; Richard Nixon, Interview in Time Magazine July 29, 1985.

28. Ibid.
Consequently, the problem of nuclear weapon threat in the region with its implication on the global scale has to be assessed in this environment: whether nuclear war occurs or not, certainly it is wrong to assume that nuclear deterrence has kept the war away or international system has become more stable with nuclear weapon either. Rather the nuclear deterrence has not eliminated but has heightened the psychological influence and irrational behaviour that in the past have led to war. It has been basically due to the efforts to enhance the deterrence credibility by constantly developing new weapons which in fact have exacerbated already dangerous security conditions and stimulated the arms competition.

For instance, during the past decades of declining international security for which the developed countries including the two super powers are largely responsible, the United States has enormously increased its destructive capability and the sophistication of its arsenals. The Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) may appear differently for its civilian application but in practice it is not a departure from the war fighting traditions. If such a force is deployed in conjunction with the Minuteman 101,

MX and Trident D-5 Missiles, with Stealth bombers and cruise missiles, and with antishubmarine warfare it will move the United States a step closer to war fighting posture. The goal of such a strategic doctrine has always been to enable the United States to challenge its adversary—politically and militarily.

Not even this, the military and Industrial Complex (MIC) of U.S.A. is even bolstering the military capability of its allies also. Unmindful of the implications, the politically motivated arms sale can result in the region's intensification of arms race as all countries are likely to seek powerful weapons from different developed countries. Their antagonists would indeed ask for similar support from the other power blocs.

Thankfully, however, such arsenals are restricted to conventional arms only. But the cost of such supplies, the developing and low developing countries pay in terms of frequent and indecisive wars and successive militarisation resulting in economic disruptions, population displacement, ecological disturbance, famine and disease. It cannot be claimed that the increase in the number of

30. Ibid., p. 439.
conflicts in the third world is caused directly by the flow of weapons from the industrialized world since there are many other contributing factors. Nonetheless, recourse to armed conflict as a means of resolving dispute indeed gets facilitated by the readily available supply of major weapon system. For instance, the cause of Arab-Israel war, the Indo-Pak wars, the late Gulf war of attrition had been, apart from politico-topographical differences, was the easy supply of weapons by the developed countries.

In this context, the frequent supply of new weapon system (NWS) to Pakistan has always served as a destabilizing factor in the politics of South Asia. Even though the reason of this attitude has been the 'bully on the block' image of India as perceived by its neighbours but then any painful experience of the wars the two nations had in the past has only mounted the tension rather than helped in solving their outstanding disputes. This equally is applicable to other warring nations since the modern wars are becoming quite indecisive for the various strings attached to them. Further, catching up of the new offensive force by different countries also serve as a major cause of modern war. The nature of governments has also been providing sound base for war, fighting conditions although
the dimension and intensities of such wars have varied globally. In the case of developed countries including the two super powers, it has been basically for the show of strength that the hi-tech war industry has been allowed to proliferate besides the actual use of force. The overt sale of such munition is, however, conditioned to suit the nation's policy which in any way works not independent from the principle of boosting indigenous power strength and reigning high in international politics. Unfortunately, the implications of such policies are never kept in view. It is only the third world countries where the illiteracy, poverty, population growth, low technology, untapped resources and immature leadership that the nature of governments has often been seen riding on unstable conditions. According to 'billiard ball model' theory subscribing to international politics, it has been said that the larger states determine the behaviour of smaller states and it has dominated the power politics of the third world nations to date, thereby allowing very few new states to establish a legitimate political order.  

* Since 1939 the United States and Soviet Union have made the actual use of force nearly fifteen times. These are those involving the USSR and Finland (1939), Poland (1944–45), Yugoslavia (1946–50), Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968) and Kabul 1989); and those involving the US and North Korea (1950), India–China (1954), Lebanon (1958), Cuba (1961), Vietnam (1961), the Dominican Republic (1965) and Libya (1986). See F.S. Northedge (ed.). The Use of Force in International Relations (London, Faber & Faber Limited, 1974), p. 36.

also in such countries the ruling elite which is in quite often cases the minority elite appears to decide the destinies of other component nationalities within the political subsystem. Re-creating ethnic conflicts throughout the third world have always influenced major power policies towards a favourable status-quo and altered the self perceived security strategies, most often without a concern for local political cultures and their realities. The growing importance of international inter-dependence hardly seems to have influenced previous images and the might of military superiority has superseded political solutions to political problems.

Further, the existence of such powerful weapons in a modern state especially in the third world countries are creating tremendous difficulties in the functioning of governments and the relations between state and the people or between various groups and communities in a state. For such weapons are available to individuals or leaders of groups who use them indiscriminately to intimidate or harass the opponents. The situation makes the functioning of a democratic system difficult. A neighbouring state can encourage or nurse terrorism in a state by supplying sophisticated arms to the terrorist groups and thereby weaken it by keeping its armed police or army busy with
the terrorist groups or by creating conditions of its
dismemberment. According to George Shults, the former
American Secretary of State ... a nation which supports
terrorist or subversive attacks against another state,
or which supports or encourages terrorist planning and
other activities within its own territory, amounts to
an ongoing armed aggression against the other state
under international law.32

However, there is another dimension of the role
of force in international affairs which, perhaps, is
likely to create increasing insecurity in future. This
pertains to the use of force without war or the use of
armed forces as a political instrument without resort
to violence.33 This, in fact, is appearing as the
preferred option in exercising influence in inter-
national affairs especially by the developed industrial
state of the West on the developing countries. The
phenomenon indeed may well be termed as coercive politics
since it moves traditional gun-boat diplomacy to a higher
plan of international affairs and the level of potential

32. Abraham, D. Sofaer, 'Terrorism and the Law',
Foreign Affairs, Vol. 64, No. 5, Summer, 1986,
pp. 901-22.

33. Jasjit Singh, 'Insecurity of Developing Nations,
Especially Small States', Strategic Analysis, Vol. XI,
No. 6, September 1987, p. 663.
violence closer to use of force with war. In this context, the two super powers alone have resorted to the demonstrative use of force without war on more than 426 occasions between 1945 and 1982. The most recent and dramatic instance is the U.S. Air strikes on Tripoli and Benghazi in Libya on April 15, 1986.  

In fact, the state system itself generates violence, terrorism or war as each state is engaged in constant competition with other states in increasing its power by any means. It is an interminable war of one state against all by other means. During the 18th and 19th centuries, the liberals in Europe held the hope that war would end with the end of an autocratic state. In other words, they believed that the establishment of democratic government in all states was the only solution to the problem of war. But the subsequent century belied all such hopes. There is some justification in Tolstoy's and Gandhi's opposition to the state system itself. It is argued that state being rooted in violence, it cannot create conditions for a non-violent society. If it relies on its armed forces or police to keep its hold over its own people, it can use the same means in settling disputes with other states.

34. Ibid.
Nevertheless, the present state system cannot be removed immediately or in a foreseeable future. But its compulsive elements can be reduced. Gandhi, too did not visualise the complete end of the state system. This was only an ideal or rather a criterion for judging the extent of the reliance of state on violence or compulsion for attaining the goals of society. Undoubtedly, there will be less chances of war if all states rely more on peaceful means for resolving their domestic problems. But we have to explore methods and strategies suitable to the existing conditions.