

Modern War Technologies and Global Peace and Security

Rufus Aisedion^{[a],*}; Goddy Uwa Osimen^[b]

^[a] Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science, Ambrose Alli University Ekpoma Edo State, Nigeria.

^[b] Department of Political Science & International Relations, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria.

*Corresponding author.

Received 25 June 2023; accepted 19 July 2023

Published online 26 August 2023

Abstract

An attempt was made in this paper to reflect on the transformation of war from 18th-century military engagements on the battlefield to the use of modern technology where wars are fought in decentralized ways from land, air, and sea with devastating impact on peace. The study becomes necessary to unveil how the relics of war with its multiplier effects impact world peace. War is a violent conflict declared by two or more states over resources, occupation of territory, among others, with debilitating consequences on both human and material resources. In the study, three theoretical orientations were used for analysis. These include devil's theory, realists, and the military-industrial complex. Historical analysis was employed as the incidents of wars were past events. The paper uses a qualitative method of data gathering. The findings of the paper revealed that peace is elusive where war is fought. Since people are vulnerable to hunger, diseases, decay infrastructure, among others, it was recommended that disarmament is the option among others if the world would enjoy peace.

Key words: War; Modern; Weapons; Military; Technology; Peace

Aisedion, R., & Osimen, G. U. (2023). Modern War Technologies and Global Peace and Security. *Canadian Social Science*, 19(4), 138-145. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/13051>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13051>

INTRODUCTION

War may sometimes be a necessary evil. But no matter how necessary, it is always an evil, never a good. We will not learn how to live together in peace by killing each other's children. There never was a good war, or a bad peace. – Jimmy Carter

War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and imposes the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to make it and is sometimes regarded as nothing but the continuation of state policy with other means. – Benito Mussolini

War is a state of armed conflict between different countries, or aggression between different people or groups within a country. Modern war is either symmetric (war fought with same military strength by both sides) or asymmetric (war fought by unequal military strength). This often results in guerrilla tactics or terrorist acts. Although majority of the world experiences peace, there are still some places where war continues to erupt. These conflicts have created millions of refugees, consumed trillions of dollars and claimed hundreds of thousands of lives.

War has been part of human societies since the very beginning, resulting in losses of lives on a monumental proportion, the drain of economic development, widespread disease and famine, the ruin of governments, and facilitating the destruction of cultures. Introducing modern technology has re-defined war in recent times. Therefore, war is an official declaration and employment of weapons to kill or maim, resulting in a state of deprivation of human rights, destruction of property and strategic resources, among others, to achieve a purpose. According to Bull (2012, p.178), organised bloodshed is declared by a political entity against each other as war since it is recognized by political entity. The distinction between killings during the war from murder is official, representative, and accountable to the political entity whose agent the warlords are. He notes that bloodshed that is carried out in the name of a political entity is not

a war unless it is directed against another political entity which might be symmetrical or asymmetrical in nature. In the same vein, Clausewitz (1968, p.199) opines that war is a political act, a fundamental governmental tool, an extension of policy-making business, fulfilling the same objectives by other means. This implies that war is armed conflict employed by the government of a state against a government of another or against an insurgent group to achieve political desire of conquering territory or controlling another state's economic resources or quelling the internal or external attack. Today, wars have taken different dimensions, from bows and arrows to more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction resulting from modern war technology.

From this background, it is pertinent to distinguish the different types of war from one another. The first type is inter-state war, defined as violence between two or more independent states. An example of this is the Iraq's Kuwait encroachment in 1990, which stimulated an interstate conflict between the United States and Iraq. Second is intra-state war. This has to do with violence between two or more opposing groups within a single state. The violence could be militias or identity conflicts or inter-communal conflicts between different non-state groups over boundary ownership and control over natural resources. It can also be a conflict between state and non-state actors over control of resources or political power. There is also extra-state war, which is between states and an international terrorist group from outside the states. This war involves fighting by a member of the state system outside its borders against a terrorist group. Next is declared war- a situation in which one side formally proclaims war; and undeclared war- a situation where there are no formal declarations of war before the battle starts. In addition, there is total war, which is when at least one side attempts to marshal all of its nation's population and resources to fasten a perfect victory over its enemy. Also, there exists limited war. This is war that is strictly fought primarily by mobilising only military resources, with implicit and specified objectives. Conventional war, on its part, is fought by professional and ordered armies, while guerrilla war emerges when one side uses small units of combatants instead of large armies, employing military science such as the act of concealing yourself and lying in wait for an attack by surprise and 'hit-and-run' attacks. Added to all these is what may be referred to as the war of conquest, which is when states seek to encroach upon and perhaps take occupation of other territories primarily to gain land or resources. Finally, there is the War of Liberation, which is carried on to free repressed people in order to gain freedom. They may be fought either by subdued people only or in alignment with outside assistance (Pilbeam, 2015, pp.88-89). Taking the identified types of war into consideration, this paper attempts to examine the causes of war, identify the impact

of technology on symmetric and asymmetric warfare, and determine the effect current war technology has on world peace.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Three theories are adopted for this study. These are the devil's theory, the Realist theory of international relations and the military-industrial complex. This devil's theory war tries to modify the human nature interpretation of war, of which Sigmund Freud, Reinhold Niebuhr, Derek Freeman and George Bernard Shaw are the main proponents. As the theory goes, human beings have an innate drive for war, an instinctual aggressive endowment, which makes them to be preoccupied with the struggle for wealth, power and prestige. Obviously this theory is derived from a rather pessimistic view of human nature, which is aptly captured by Shaw (1952, p.145) when he remarked:

I have looked at man's mysterious innovations. And I tell you that in real life, man invents nothing. But in the art of death, he outdoes nature herself. In the art of peace, man is a bungler. Therefore, there is nothing in Man's industrial machinery but his greed and sloth. His heart is in his weapons. Man measures his strength by his destructiveness.

However, the devil's theory suggests that wicked men and not human beings handle war and undermine societal peace. As for this theory, the hostile politicians are the warmongers. It is they who stir up the people, thrust arms into their hands, and marshal them off to war. This is particularly exacerbated by the recent developments in military technology leading to miniaturisation of weapons of war and other instruments of violence. One realises that the evolution of information technology, sophisticated banking systems, and miniaturisation of weapons have given rise to an unprecedented proliferation and dispersal of small arms and light weapons that are easy to carry about (Oboh and Aisedion, 2008, p.80). The assertions from above are clear indications that individual explanations of war found expression in the character and conduct of political leaders. Notably, war instincts are within men's aggressive dispositions and tendencies to cause mayhem and destruction. To buttress this fact, the outbreak of the Second World War is traced to the excessive instinctual drive, mindset, and traits of Adolf Hitler's needs and undue expansion of German territory. This is like other significant leaders like Joseph Stalin. Waltz's opinion accepted the views of classical realists, like Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau, who laid great emphasis on the idea of unchanging human nature. In particular, it is their impression that human nature has an inherent defect and that human beings are naturally aggressive, self-interested, and militant, which ultimately account for war. The anarchical international system is a clue underlying why war is impossible to remove from

the spectrum of human affairs. The state is inexhaustibly self-interested and operating in a system based on self-help because of a lack of centralised authority to maintain international peace and security. Such a state would choose to use force to attain its goals and aspirations after assessing the cost-benefit of going to war. The underlying factor is that conflict occurs because there is no notable authority that will act as police over radical states, so the system is free for all to construct their inordinate desire of direct violence against another state (Pilbeam, 2015, pp.92-94).

The Realists theory explains the role of military power in world politics, where politicians or military leaders choose war to maintain hegemony for national security. From this perspective, their conviction is to gain weapons of mass destruction as the only way to ensure peace in an anarchical system saddled with unhealthy competition for power and incompatible policies and interests. Realists are preoccupied with a permanent tendency to be evil, understanding that the only sustaining collective actor with no recognition of other authority is the state. Realists exert power and control, which are unavoidably pursued by individuals and states anytime, everywhere (Waltz 1979a, p. 117). The above assertion implies that states are only relevant when they can wield power in a lawless system where there is no central authority regulating behaviour, interest, and policies of states. The realist premise that human nature is established on objective laws moderating politics and that the only pillar helping political realism to find its bearing in international politics is power. To the realists, morality does not exist and states do not apply universal moral principles towards each other (Morgenthau 1954, pp.4–10). The Realists' perception is hinged on the international system being anarchic; therefore, states must have the offensive military capability to survive and, which also gives them the leverage to hurt and perhaps destroy each other.

Military-industrial complex refers to a web of individuals and institutions engrossed in the manufacturing of weapons and military technologies. Every military-industrial complex in a country has every intent to uplift political support and keep military spending. U.S. President Eisenhower first used the Military-industrial complex in his Farewell Address on January 17, 1961. Eisenhower admonished that the United States should jealously “oppose the purchase of superfluous power...by embarking on the military-industrial complex”. Eisenhower’s opinion is predicated on the fear that military-industrial complex will further actions that might not be congruent with the interest of the state. It means if allowed to thrive, it could subvert American democracy (Weber, nd, p.1). The interest and preference in most countries and private individuals for domestic suppliers of modern weapons technology have increasingly encouraged mass production and expenditure

for military weapons that would have been used for developmental programmes.

WAR IN THE 21ST CENTURY AND CHANGING ERA OF MILITARY TECHNOLOGY

In the 17th century, war was fought between troops in isolated border areas, remote and far from civilian populations. During this time, warfare was only for the military as they were the body that felt direct pain or death since civilian populations were strictly out of the engagement. The severe and distinguishing factor in this type of war is that the death or survival of the field commander decides the end or victory of the battle. In the commander’s death, every stroke of policy dies with him making his death an irrevocable defeat of his forces and the territory represented. However, with the emergence of modern technologies, in the 19th century · Napoleonic wars, the massive destruction during World War I, the strategic bombing of the cities during World War II, and finally, the nuclear holocaust at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, marked symmetric technological warfare (Momah, 1993, p.3).

During the 17th century, the idea relates to the war of territorial occupation between David and Goliath as buttressed by the Old Testament in the Holy Bible, where the death of Goliath brings to reality the defeat of the entire Philistines army and victory for the Israelites. The war was fought outside civilian populations, time and place were both agreed as the rule of engagement spared civilian populations, but modern technologies has revolutionised war to involve civilians as the main target for victory. For example, the 1st World War and 2nd World War took symmetrical dimensions to prosecute. The United States of America brought civilian casualties to bear in the bombing of Hiroshima, and Nagasaki in 1945, which ended World War II. The rapid technological developments and innovations of weapons appear on the battlefield with elements of symmetrical and asymmetrical capacities, taking various types of uncrewed vehicles mastering ground, air, and sea. Also, robots are used for tasks like exploring and bomb disposal. Most of these actions are remote-controlled by human manipulators. Others include hypersonic weapons (moving at over five times the speed of sound) and invisibility cloaks (the quality of not being perceivable by the eye). However, most modern weapons, such as unmanned drones, have smart precisions that strike specific targets more accurately, instead of killing arbitrarily. For instance, the United States undoubtedly used it against an Iranian warlord, Soleimani, who died along with nine other people in a drone strike near Baghdad airport in Iraq on 3rd January 2020 (BBC News, 2020, p.1). The striker could minimise civilian loss of life. Similarly, unmanned

vehicles can be directed into areas that are too complex and unsafe by human soldiers, and they are known to be cheaper than human-crewed aircraft. Also, robots and unmanned vehicles are more expendable than human soldiers because they have a lower political cost than sacrificing human soldiers. It does not attract media or public upheaval (Pilbeam, 2015, p.98). During President George W. Bush and increasing figures under President Barack Obama, drones were deployed in nations including Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. These were used in both surveillance and combat susceptibility. Although President Barack Obama use of drones was the most controversial during the first five years of his presidency, the death toll was more or less 2,400 people because of drone attacks (Sledge, 2014, p.1). It is pertinent to note that the advance in technology, particularly the use of drones, has made the US government to eradicate several leading Taliban and al-Qaeda commanders' of terrorism for world peace and stability.

THE CAUSES OF SYMMETRIC AND ASYMMETRIC WAR IN INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Modern war is either symmetric or asymmetric. Asymmetric warfare (or asymmetric campaign) is used to explain war between countries or groups whose relative military equipment, strength, strategy or manoeuvres differ significantly. It is a war between a state's conventional army and an insurgency or resistance militias who often have the status of unconventional combatants. For example, the al-Qaeda attack of the United States of America's twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, and the Pentagon is an asymmetric war, waged by a terrorist group. Therefore, asymmetric war describes a conflict in which two unequal belligerents' in resources and strength engage in hostility to exploit each other's means of livelihood or weaknesses. Such engagements often involve strategies and tactics of unconventional warfare, with weaker militants displaying strategies to balance their deficiencies in the quantity or quality of their forces and equipment (Tomes, 2004, p.5). In addition, asymmetric warfare is irregular warfare or hostile combat between a state's military and an irregular, inferior, under-equipped, under-manned but tough and prompted adversary. The term equally refers to guerrilla warfare, insurgency, counterinsurgency, rebellion, terrorism, and counterterrorism. The above description is purely at departure from symmetric warfare where two powers have equal military powers, tactics and resources but differing only in personnel, training, command and execution (Stepanova, 2008, p.1).

Symmetrical warfare is a state of power or major power using conventional forces against one another on the battlefield. Indeed, the lesson unfolded by O'Connellis

obviously got it clear that symmetrical forces often neutralise one another (O'Connell, 1989, p.91). The Iran-Iraq war started when the Iraqis invaded Iran in September 1980. The Iraqi's primary motives were to gain control of the Shatt Al-Arab waterway in the Persian Gulf and to stop the intention of Iran in spreading an Islamic Revolution to Iraq and other Arab states. At the beginning of the hostilities, Iran and Iraq mutually possessed military equipment with the support of the world's two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union (Clark, 2000, p.5). It is very clear that the Persian Gulf War conflict between Iraq and the United States is an example of symmetrical warfare and the revolution in modern military technology. For example, the wars of Afghanistan and Iraq, of Libya, and Syria are symmetrical war between comparable forces (Van Albert and Bruney, (2004, p.1). However, within those wars were asymmetric elements and practices arising from technological development of modern weapons. Asymmetric wars occur when combatants broadly apply hidden terrorist and non-conformist guerrilla warfare manoeuvres and seek to avoid direct military confrontations with the adversaries' massively sophisticated armed forces. Asymmetric war is the type of war between opposing forces, which is practically unequal in military strength and more often than not involves the use of unusual weapons and guerrilla warfare and terrorist attacks. For example, we could liken asymmetric warfare to Guerrilla warfare, between lightly armed enthusiasts and a conventional army. Also, it is that type of war between a country that is capable of using nuclear weapons and a country that cannot use nuclear weapons. Recent conflicts between 1980s and 1990s in the oil-rich Persian Gulf Region have led several people to reflect on the application of technology to warfare. The Iran and Iraq bloody war fought between 1980 and 1988 gave a keen study in symmetrical warfare, pointing to a situation where the two belligerents engaged in a long war with losses of over a million casualties.

Al-Qaeda and similar extremist groups and organisations engaged in violent activities that were truly asymmetrical with the attacks of 9/11 where almost 3,000 people were killed in the United States of America. This has proven instances in which an overwhelmingly weaker actor waged war against an opponent incontrovertibly superior politically, economically and militarily. There are multifaceted reasons for conflict and war to ensue within and among nations. These reasons include: economic and territorial benefits, religious reasons, gaining independence, and waging war in order to pursue civil insurgency and revolution agenda. Leaders instigate most of the wars when they go beyond their boundaries, such as inciting a territorial dispute, attempting to control another country's natural resources or exercising authoritarian power over people. Modern wars now enjoy intentional targeting of civilians to bring the government to its

knees. So many wars that have been fought right from the 19th century till date have hugely had their toll on civilian populations. For instance, the war in Afghanistan has been on but in 2001 the United States invaded Afghanistan to drive out the Taliban. States and non-state actors normally get involved in a war for something and also stop fighting because of something.

In a contemporary war study, Neorealist Kenneth Waltz provided a workable structure for analysing different theories. He contends that the different justifications offered for the causes of war can be categorised under three headings: “inside man, inside the organisation of the separate states, and inside the state system” (Waltz, 2001b, p.12). Waltz categorisations points to how different theories of war capture different explanatory levels that will be examined below:

- i. The individual
- ii. The state
- iii. The international system.

Individual-level

The explanations of war on the individual level examine the qualities, behaviour, Waltz cited by Pilbeam (2015, p.90) warlike and belligerent dispositions of political leaders. For example, the Second World War resulted from Adolf Hitler’s beliefs, postures, charisma, and inordinate territorial expansion. Waltz’s explanation also considered classical realists’ views, like Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau. They believed human beings are naturally belligerent, selfish, and competitive, as the cause of war (Waltz, 2001b, p. 28).

The state-level

Theorists opined that causes of war at the state level result from the internal arrangement of states, including their ideologies (Liberalism and Marxism), forms of government (democratic and authoritarian), and economic systems. The features of some types of state make them open to using war as an instrument of policy. The main concerns of Waltz’s analysis are Liberalism and Marxism. According to him, the spirit of the Liberal view is that non-liberal states are more prone to employing war to attain their goals. This especially means non-democratic regimes, such as autocratic and martial dictatorships, do not observe Liberal tenets like individual rights and free markets. Immanuel Kant, a Liberal philosopher, sets ways of achieving permanent peace (Kant, 1957, p.9). Kant employed the brand republican (liberal state) to depict states based on representative government, which has to do with the consent of the people and the rule of law. He indicates that non-republican states are much more susceptible to wage war. This is because the leaders of republican (or liberal) states need citizens’ opinion for their decisions and the decision to declare war. Since the citizens are the ones who bear most of the brunt of wars, they usually become reluctant to agree to start the

armed conflict. On this note, rulers in non-republican (or non-liberal) states may unilaterally declare war without recourse to or request for the consent of the people before deciding to declare war.

Marxism also has its views regarding how war should be explained. The views of classical Marxists, notably Lenin’s theory of imperialism, viewed the war of 1914–18 as imperialistic on the part of both sides; it was a war for the balkanisation of the world, for the partition and segmentation of settlements, ‘geographical areas of influence of finance capital, among others (Lenin, 1966, pp.7–8). In other words, modern war in the era of advanced capitalism is the consequence of inordinate motives of imperialist states as they turned their attentions abroad to find a new market for their excess goods. This situation leads each of them to divide the world for its own advantage. This culminated in major powers having conflict, resulting in the First World War, as each imperialist state wanted to maximise its access to global markets, take control of colonies’ market environment, and loot other nations. Although Liberal and Marxist theories differ significantly, they have been able to explain, using various perspectives to x-ray, the causes of war. To liberalists, war generates from the internal organisation of the state as opined by Waltz. At the same time, Lenin’s view of Marxist theory as scrambling for foreign markets for their products leads to incompatible interest, leading to the World War I.

The international System Level

At the international level, the reason why war is an indelible characteristic of human affairs is because the international system lacks central authority which regulates the excessive ambitions of states for power and hegemonic tendencies. The fear of imposition by a powerful state over the less powerful has made individual states to resort to self-help and use force to attain its goals when the prospects for success overwhelm the pains of war in achieving desired goals (Waltz, 2001b, p.160). Most notably, because the international system is anarchic, and uses no authority to police states’ misdemeanors, the conclusion is that wars occur because there is nothing to prevent them. War takes place because the international system has no law and any system without law has no sin. Since every state pursues incompatible interests the tendency for war to take place is assured as there is no fixer or arbiter to regulate the dissenting affairs of the states.

MODERN TECHNOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY WARFARE

The impact of technology on symmetric and asymmetric war can be itemised and discussed in seven thematic headings as follows: accuracy of fire, air warfare, counter

air/air superiority, lethality and dispersion, system integration, battle space awareness, decentralised freedom of action (Mbachi, 2009, pp.57-60).

Accuracy of Fire

Introducing various kinds of missile laser-guided weapons, laser target designators, and the development of smart munitions into modern warfare has reduced the size of forces on the battlefield and equally provided a method of combating too fast maneuverable targets. For example, in today's battlefield, 2 to 3 rounds of precision-guided munition (PGM) a "guided weapon meant to destroy a point target and minimize casualty." This includes air- and ship-launched missiles, multiple launched rockets, and guided bombs would achieve the desired effect at the target end, which 300 rounds of conventional artillery rounds used to achieve. Thus, PGMs have drastically reduced the burden of logistics, infrastructure/inventory carrying costs of conventional munitions while improving the accuracy and effectiveness of fire of land forces.

Air Warfare

The conduct of 1991 Gulf war and the 1999 Kosovo conflict saw air power being deployed extensively. There is a U-2 spy plane for reconnaissance. There is SR71 (Blackbird), a successor/augmentor to the U-2 spy plane in the same range. With a speed of cover mach 3 at an altitude of cover 80,000 feet, it can photograph an area of 250,000 sq km in one hour. With this facility, distance is not a barrier for action to be taken against adversaries as area of 250,000 sq km in an hour can be photographed to ruin a target with accurate precision and speed.

Counter Air Superiority

There are F-15 Eagle, F-14 Tomcat, the F16s and 18s from the West and their equivalent or counter from the East such as the MIG-23s, 29 and the SU-24s, and the 30s. By employing all technological innovations in radar, computer and munitions, these fighters are designed to have head-up displays, all-weather, day and night, high thrust to weight ratios looking down, shoot down, and multiple target capabilities. Standing in its class and performing various roles is the Harrier AV-8B of the USAF and UK. The helicopter occupies a special place in close air support and interdiction. The arrays of helicopters include the Apache, Chinook, Cougar, and the Soviet Hinds to mention a few. These aircrafts incorporate the technology of space and ground-based facilities. Commanders on the ground and pilots in the air now have computerized battlefield information for mission accomplishment in the air and land battle.

Lethality and Dispersion

The emergence of weapons like Multiple Rocket Launcher Systems, Dual-Purpose Improved Conventional Munitions (DIPCM), Agini and Pritni missiles' systems has altered warfare. These modern weapons and munitions can produce

a high fire rate and could cause devastating effects due to their increased precision and lethality in firepower. This was evidently demonstrated in the Gulf war, as improvements in the ability of weapons to deliver long-range lethal fires predicated a quantum increase in dispersion.

System Integration

Advances in communication technology, computers, and information system have given rise to improved means of command and control to commanders on the battlefield. During the Gulf War, the use of links between Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) and weapon delivery platforms and the connection between observers and indirect fire systems produced a quantum leap in systems integration. System integration creates force multiplication and gives a high level of precision to the overall force. The modern battlefield has become highly dependent on digital data voice, and video communication, as was evident in the war on Terror carried out by the USA in Afghanistan.

Battle Space Awareness

Modern technologies like command, control, communication, computer, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) have made the contemporary battlefield transparent. The efficacy of the system has major battle-winning factors. Introducing sophisticated electronic night vision equipment like image-intensifiers and movement sensors into modern warfare has made 24-hour combat possible.

Decentralised Freedom of Action

This development enables tactical commanders to quickly grasp battle situations and determine local unit objectives with greater certainty. The battle-winning strategy is a consequence of quick and timely decisions and fast reaction timing to orders at all levels. This means troops at various levels of modern warfare have access to real-time battle space pictures because of innovative technology.

THE EFFECT OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY IN SYMMETRIC AND ASYMMETRIC WAR ON WORLD PEACE

The Soviet encounter in Afghanistan, the abortive Israeli attack on Hezbollah in 2006, and the United States of America's Global War on Terror (GWOT) are remarkable in pointing out that asymmetrical war has overshadowed symmetrical military strategies that are inadequate to meet what has essentially developed into a totally new national and global security threat. Boko Haram insurgents have over the years indulged in asymmetrical covert terrorist and unconventional guerrilla warfare tactics to avoid direct military encounters with Nigeria's vastly armed forces (Long, nd, p.4). Nigeria is experiencing unprecedented asymmetric war as Boko Haram engages

in both terrorist and insurgent operations, leading to wanton killing, arson, bombing of strategic resources, kidnapping of school children, among others. The al-Qaeda for example, is a large multi-national terrorist organisation network that has undertaken terrorist acts in the United States, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. They have also taken part in active organised rebellion operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, where the principal political aim is to change existing government. In the past, asymmetrical organisations majorly focused on sub-national, national and regional political issues, but that has changed in the 1980s because of significant advances and miniaturisation of technology with easy accessibility to transportation, communications and proliferation of weapons.

Asymmetrical warfare is multinational, with a network of organisations in several countries reinforced by modern war technology to defile national border security, with the capability to strike across national boundaries. Therefore, the effect of war is to diminish freedom of expression. Patriotism becomes the order of the day, and those who question the war are seen as traitors, to be silenced and imprisoned. The word peace means the opposite condition to a state of war. This idea is limited in scope as it attracts a major distinction to be made between 'negative' and 'positive' peace. According to (Galtung, 1990, pp.291–305), negative peace refers simply to the absence of violence when parties to the conflict agree to stop using armed hostilities. Galtung further draws a distinction between direct and indirect violence. He sees explicit violence to mean violence in its destruction of targeted people directly, such as killing, torture, or rape. On the contrary, indirect violence is structural, whereby social structures and institutions create inequalities. People die from poverty, hunger, or cultural defects, such as racial or religious prejudices leading to legitimate deaths of particular individuals or groups.

In line with the above, the term peace connotes the absence of war and the absence of structural defects. For example, peace is elusive in a society, where there is infrastructural decay, weak government institutions and inability to provide enabling environments for individuals to sustain their productive capacity (Aluyor and Aisedion, 2014, p.257).

The world is ragged by violent conflict and wars. The escalating conflict and bloodletting violence brought in attendant large-scale destruction, movement of refugees, and chronic security problems for individuals, communities, and states and these are threats to world peace. The bloodletting that ensued with the application of military technology during the Gulf War in 1991 made the avoidable war more horrendous. In Iraq, the U.S. military demonstrated the devastating force of super ordinate military technology and intelligence. The war had a direct impact on peace by excessively harming civilians rather than combatants. During the war, US-led forces detonated 84,200 tons of munitions on Iraq and Kuwait. The ceaseless bombing disproportionately caused significant

harm to Iraq's civilians and infrastructure, including electricity generation, water and sanitation facilities. 110,000 Iraqi civilians, including 70,000 children and 7,000 adults, died because of the health effects of the war (British Medical Association, 2001, pp.4). The possibility of a threat to peace in Iraq and Kuwait was evident as there was a direct application of violence, infrastructural decay, hunger, and the prevalence of health-related death among hundreds of people.

The effect of war modern technology in fighting between Israel and the Palestinian militant group, Hamas, is demonstrated by firing a barrage of rockets at Jerusalem and other major cities in Israel. Israel also responded with devastating airstrikes in the Hamas-controlled Gaza Strip, resulting in hundreds of deaths and widespread property damage. The war recorded over 41,700 fatalities. The Yemeni civil war began in 2015 over claims to control the Yemen government by the Abdrabbuh Mansur Hadi-led Yemeni government and Houthi militants. The ousting of Abdrabbuh Mansour Hadi, provoked Saudi Arabia's intervention, leading a coalition of nine countries from Asia and West Africa to support Hadi. In 2019, the Yemen civil war claimed over 20,000 lives. In 2011, the Syrian Civil war began and registered total fatalities estimated to be around 586,000 people.

The contemporary war has taken symmetric and asymmetric nature but more significantly most wars have taken the asymmetric dimension. For example, and to be more precise, the conflict between the Turkish government and various Kurdish insurgent groups resurfaced in 2015. Kurdish insurgents demanded separation from Turkey to form an independent state, resulting in over 45,000 cumulative fatalities in the conflict. The Somali civil war which began in 1991 grew out of resistance to the military junta led by Siad Barre in the 1980s. Incidentally, the Barre government was overthrown in 1991 making the struggle to take a different dimension. War later ensued as the Federal Government of Somalia attempted to clear up the leftover of the militant groups. The war has consumed about 500,000 lives with a majority civilian population. In 2003, a coalition, led by the United States, invaded Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein's government. United States troops withdrew in 2011 but returned to Iraq in 2014 as insurgency and civil conflict continued. The estimated fatalities are between 650,000 and 2.4 million. In 2019, over 2,000 people were killed. The Libyan civil war between the House of Representatives and the Government of the National Accord began in 2014. The war claimed everywhere from 29,000 to 42,000 lives since its start, with over 2,200 fatalities in 2019 (World Population Review, 2021, p.4).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introducing modern military technology in warfare has played into the hands of terrorist and insurgent

organisations with networks all over the place. Terrorists are so dangerous and callous because their attacks are significantly on civilian populations and destruction of infrastructure needed for socio-political and economic development Wars, both symmetric and asymmetric, have inflicted pain, unbearable hunger, diseases and ultimately decimated both productive and non-productive civilian populations. A country with chronic hunger, widespread diseases, weak political institutions, a high illiteracy rate, and refugees' movement because of war cannot enjoy peace. Wars have seriously affected stability negatively during and after the 1991 Gulf war. This is because there was no separation of the military from the civilian populations. During the war, strategic resources were destroyed at speed-up with precision in delivery. Peace can only return to Iraq and Kuwait when there is a designated programme that will have an economic development that will support the skills and productive capacity of the people. Weapon mongers should realise the potency and the exterminating power inherent in military weapons they sell to desist from further sales. The anarchic nature of the global system encourages war; a central authority needs to be installed to moderate the activities of inordinate leaders fomenting troubles for personal interest. The international community should strictly emphasise disarmament to create a peaceful world. Finally, injustices politically motivated should be actively settled with a win-win approach to limit the propensity of asymmetric wars ravaging all over the place.

REFERENCES

- Aluyor, G. B., & Aisedion, R. (2014). The relevance of peace education curriculum in Nigeria education system. *Apex Journal of General Studies Research*, 2(1), 257.
- Bacevich, A. J. (1994). Preserving the well-bred horse. *The National Interest*.
- BBC News. (2020). *Qasem Soleimani: US kills top Iranian general in Baghdad airstrike*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-50979463>
- British Medical Association. (2001). *The medical profession and human rights: Handbook for a changing agenda* (1). London: BMA, ZED Books.
- Bull, H. (2012). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics* (4th ed., p.178). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clark, R. (2000). *Canadian Forces College Advanced Military Studies Course 3 seminar essay #2 symmetrical warfare and lessons for future war: The case of the Iran-Iraq conflict* (5). Canada: Canadian Department of National Defence.
- Clausewitz, C. (1968). *On war* (A. Rapoport, Ed., 199). Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291-305.
- Kant, I. (1957). *Perpetual peace* (L. W. Black, Trans., 9). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. (Original work published 1795).
- Kupersmith, D. A. (1993). *The failure of third world air power: Iraq and the war with Iran*. Maxwell Air Force Base: Air University Press.
- Lenin, V. I. (1966). *Imperialism: The highest stage of capitalism* (7-8). Moscow: Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1917).
- Long, D. E. (nd). *Countering asymmetrical warfare in the 21st century: A grand strategic vision*.
- Mbachu, O. (2009). *Operations research and Biafran scientists: A study in defence and national security* (pp. 57-60). Kaduna: Medeusa Academic Publishers.
- Momah, S. (1993). *Strategic studies series global strategy from its genesis to the post-cold war era* (p. 3). Lagos: Generation Press Limited.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1954). *The Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (pp. 4-10). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- O'Connell, R. L. (1989). *Of arms and men: A history of wars, weapons and aggression* (p. 91). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Obob, J., & Aisedion, R. (2008). Governance and international terrorism: African experience. *African Journal of Political & Administrative Studies (AJPAS)*, 4(1), 80. Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki: Harris Publication.
- Pilbeam, B. (2015). Reflecting on war and peace. In P. Hough, S. Malik, A. Moran, & B. Pilbeam (Eds.), *International security studies theory and practice* (pp. 88-90). New York: Routledge.
- Shaw, G. B. (1952). *Man and superman* (pp. 145). Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Sledge, M. (2014). The toll of 5 years of drone strikes: 2,400 dead. *Huffington Post*, 1. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/obamadroneprogramanniversary_n_4654825.html, 23 January 26 May, 2020. 7:23am
- Stepanova, E. (2008). *Terrorism in asymmetrical conflict: SIPRI Report 23* (PDF) (pp. 1). Oxford Univ. Press. Retrieved 4-09-2921, 10:36am
- Tomes, R. (Spring, 2004). Relearning Counterinsurgency Warfare (PDF). *Parameters*, 5. Retrieved 4-09-2921, 1:12am
- Van Albert, S. A., & Bruney, P. F. (2004). *Development of a ballistic impact detection system III walter reed army institute of research division of military casualty research silver spring, Maryland 20910* (pp. 1).
- Van Creveld, M. (1992). High technology and the transformation of war, part 1. *RUSI Journal*, October.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979a). *Theory of international politics*. New York: Random House.
- Waltz, K. N. (2001b). *Man, the state, and war: A theoretical analysis, rev. ed.* (pp. 117). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weber, R. N. (nd). *Military-industrial complex* (pp. 1). Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/war/Social-theories> 20-6-2023
- World Population Review. (2021). *Countries currently at war* (pp. 4).