International Journal of Social, Political and Economic Research

Historical Perspectives of War, Conflict, and Intervention and their Transformation in the Twenty-First Century

Ekaterine Lomia

Ph.D. Candidate, Caucasus International University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Orcid Number: 0000-0002-3525-6730

E-mail: eka_lomia@yahoo.com

Abstract

Throughout the historic development, conflicts have constantly existed in all the countries of the world and every level of society. Civilization's perpetual struggle for freedom, independence, justice, and self-determination has many times grown into a direct or indirect confrontation between the opposing sides. However, World War I and World War II were one of the major transformative events in the history of the twentieth century, which resulted in the deaths of millions of humans and numerous destructive consequences. Furthermore, the wars and their results have fundamentally changed the World Order in post-war Europe and the US. The article aims at providing a better understanding of the phenomenon of war, conflict, and intervention. It also seeks to examine their place in contemporary international relations of today. In particular, the article has aimed to analyze a historical overview of the social, political, and cultural conflicts and studies, how it has been transformed in a modern era of the twenty-first century. The paper is concluded by highlighting the major principles of the UN on war and intervention since the organization is "Based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members". The norms of the Helsinki Final Act and Just War Theory are also highlighted in the context. This study has been prepared as a result of examining articles and books written by many authors who have influential opinions in the field of wars, conflicts, and interventions. The article is particularly helpful to those scholars interested in peace and conflict studies.

Keywords: War, conflict, intervention, sovereignty, the United Nations.

Introduction

Since ancient times, the states embroiled in numerous bloody wars caused by hegemonic, territorial, imperialist, religious, and ethnic reasons. Reconciliation and peacebuilding, establishing non-violent cooperation between the states, and avoiding the devastating phenomenon of the war, have long been and remained one of the major challenges for humankind.

Following the first early state-formations emerged into existence, power has become the most fundamental and utterly decisive mechanism of survival in international affairs. While small states are struggling to maintain their independence and national identity, in the wild world of politics, where according to Hans Morgenthau (1965), "the law of a jungle" applies, there is no space for morality. The greatest political players are using every possible tool to widely spread hegemonic ambitions over the weaker states, obtain the power and thus, achieve their political ends.

Realism, also known as political realism, is one of the most dominant theories of international relations which explains the reasons for war, conflict, and intervention in international affairs. When we examine the policies of the superpowers in the post-World War II era, we observe that realist policies are preferred to liberalism and idealism. The school of thought in realism was established in the post-World War II era; however, it is widely associated with the ancient Greek studies, particularly, in the works of Thucydides who allows a more sophisticated analysis of the conception of power and its place in the anarchic international system. Unlike idealism and liberalism, which underline the idea of cooperation in international relations, realism stresses a competitive and confrontational side of human nature and highlights the "Throughout historic time, regardless of social, economic, and political conditions, states have met each other in the contests of power" (Morgenthau 1965: 33).

Characterization of War, Conflict, and Intervention

First and foremost, one should distinguish the difference between military intervention and war since the political nature of the intervention and war differs greatly. The most extreme form of violence is a war, defined as a mutual conflict, which aims at changing the inner policy of a country or to totally destroy it; whilst intervention is a comparatively less extreme form of violence, which also changes the intrinsic political equilibrium of another country.

The political nature of the intervention has constantly been changing from time to time, depending on the specific historical period of time. For instance, the intervention had been occurring moderately rarely following the Westphalia treaty in Europe, which was a series of peace treaties signed in October 1648 in the Westphalian towns of Osnabrück and Münster. The treaty has marked the end of the thirty years war in the Roman Empire. As distinct from that, during the "Cold War" ("Cold War" term was first used by Bernand Baruch in 1947, to describe extremely tense relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, indicating the geopolitical tension between the powers, and lasted until the disintegration of the USSR in 1991) the frequency of intervention had immensely increased. As it is stated by Silverstone, intervention is commonly defined as interference in the territory or domestic affairs of another country with military force, typically in a way that compromises a sovereign government's control over its territory and population (Silverstone, 2011).

According to Ortega, a military intervention that uses armed force is a violent political action, which brings a significant change in a government's policy. In most circumstances, it is getting extremely complex to differentiate military intervention from other distinct forms of violence, such as aggression, colonialism, etc. Ortega, emphasizes the significance of the imperialistic pattern of intervention, in other words, that is a hegemonic intervention, which aims at making a strong influence or absolute domination over the targeted state to diminish its future growth and development (Ortega, 2001: 10-13). In support of Ortega's hypothesis, MacFarlane argues that the actors of conflict and intervention may as well use political and economic tools to reach their political ends. Organization of American States (OAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and the general assembly of the United Nations (the UN) play a dominant role in promoting the value of sovereignty among the member states on an international scale. Therefore, the mentioned organizations strictly forbid any sign of intervention on which they promptly react to. According to the UN General Assembly Declaration adopted in 1965 "No state had a right to intervene, directly or indirectly in the internal or external affairs of another state". In addition to the aforementioned, in the Declaration, it is rigorously highlighted that the armed intervention equals the same as severe aggression (MacFarlane, 2002: 35).

Contemporary international law is absolutely inconsistent with the intervention as stated by a specialist on Russian foreign policy professor;

> There is no place in contemporary international law for a right of intervention (…) the Court can only regard the alleged right of intervention as the manifestation of a policy of force which cannot find a place in international law. As regards the notion of self-help the Court is only unable to accept it: between independent states, respect for territorial sovereignty is an essential foundation for international relations. (MacFarlane, 2002: 36)

Ultimately, from a political point of view, intervention is a political action directed to changing the structural functioning elements of another country.

According to Griffiths; war is defined as a "Particular sort of state activity carried out by organized and identifiable military forces, employing lethal weapons, directed against the armed forces of one or more adversaries" (Griffiths, 2009: 841).

Inspection of the literature reveals the following incomplete list of war terms; total war and limited war, cold war and hot war, world war and local war, uncontrolled and controlled war, accidental war and premeditated war, nuclear and conventional war, undeclared and declared war, aggressive, defensive and offensive war, revolutionary war, social war, political war, imperialist war, psychological war, guerrilla war, and strategic war (Dennen, 1980: 1). Creveld shares Clausewitz's theory of the war. On the other side according to some scholars, the mentioned ideology emphasizes the American philosophy of the war as "Organized violence to achieve political ends" (Metz & Cuccia, 2011: 2).

Hoffman also accepts Clausewitz's hypothesis and believes that crucial principles of the conflicts lie on the political, social-cultural, and economic bases (Hoffmann F. G., 2007). The scholar argues that legal and ethical aspects also play one of the most dominant roles in a war. According to him, the war has historical roots from the ancient Roman Empire and is defined as "organized violence" which comprises ethics and legal elements (Metz & Cuccia, 2011: 7).

"Cold War" has been one of the hardest periods in the history of the world. Today, scholars argue whether the nature of the war has changed following the end of the "Cold War" or not and if it did, in what ways. Traditionalists, as distinct from the radicals, argue that the war has a continuous character. According to them, even the main feature of the war has altered lately, its fundamental basis remained unchanged (Metz & Cuccia, 2011: 1).

Conflict is defined as inappropriate actions of specific political groups which can be resolved either by violent or non-violent ways. One of the political theorists, Professor John W. Burton differentiates the so-called negotiable and deep-seated conflicts. In the book

Contemporary Conflict Resolution, some writers state that; the former could be solved utilizing negotiation and peaceful cooperation, whilst the latter is generally inclined to have a more complicated nature that could only be settled by eradicating the main underlying factors of the conflict itself. The main concept of the conflict could be divided into armed conflict, violent conflict, and contemporary conflict (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

As highlighted by McCaffrey, sovereignty is a concept that provides order and stability in international relations since sovereign states are viewed as equal, regardless of comparative size or wealth (McCaffrey, Shelton, & Cerone, 2010: 10). Some policy writers argue the issue as;

> Sovereignty is the exclusive right to exercise supreme political authority over a defined territory (land, airspace, and certain maritime areas such as the territorial sea) and the people on that territory. No other people can have formal political authority within the state. Therefore, sovereignty is closely associated with the concept of political independence (Beckman & Butte, 2013: 2).

Thus, from the mentioned standpoint to entry into the sovereign country's territory, using armed force is a prima facie in international law and international relations. (Prima facie is a Latin expression which means "at first sight" or "at first appearance". In other words, Prima Facie is something that is accepted as correct until proved otherwise (Advanced Cambridge dictionary, edited in 2008).

Thus, sovereign countries have full jurisdiction to protect their people and territory from outside aggression. Since sovereignty is directly associated with the term protection, therefore, sovereign states assume responsibility to protect their people from war, intervention, starvation, rape, etc.

In addition to the above-mentioned, since states are the major actors of international relations and without states, there would no international relations exist, thus, sovereignty shapes the principal element of the world political system in the twenty-first century. Some scholars deeply believe that the idea of the war is old-fashioned in the twenty-first century and the nature of a contemporary war has undergone a significant transformation in a modern era of globalization. The terminology "hybrid" has appeared in the international relations lexicon to convey the idea that there is a considerable difference between the wars of the past and those of the present.

As highlighted by Hoffman, the hybrid was is a "Range of different modes of warfare, including conventional capabilities, irregular tactics, and formations, terrorist acts, indiscriminate violence, coercion, and criminal disorder" (Hoffmann, 2007: 8). Hoffman suggested that hybrid war is a form of conflict that emerged in the immediate aftermath of the end of the "Cold War" and argued that it is a "Sophisticated campaigns that combine low-level conventional and special operations; offensive cyber and space actions; psychological operations that use social and traditional media to influence popular perception and international opinion" (International Institute of Strategic Studies, 2015).

As suggested by some writers, the hybrid war can be explained as a combination of conventional and unconventional techniques and equipment, which are used by powers to achieve synergistic strategic effects.

From a broader perspective, using the methods of hybrid warfare became much more sophisticated following the Civil Wars in Syria and Ukraine, after which the theory has attracted worldwide attention and has become a subject of considerable debate among the political scholars, particularly after the work of the Russian General Valery Gerasimov has been published in 2013. According to him, in contemporary political affairs the war has enormously changed its classic nature with 'Non-military means of achieving political and strategic goals which have grown, and, in many cases, they have exceeded the power of weapons in their effectiveness'. Thus, modern military strategy is more focused "On the direction of the broad use of political, economic, informational, humanitarian, and other nonmilitary measures – applied in coordination with the protest potential of the population with consequences "comparable with the consequences of any real war" (Military Review, 2016: 24).

Fundamental principles of Just War Theory, UN and Helsinki Final act on War and Intervention

"Just war theory" is an internationally recognized set of principles that determines the morality and justification of the war. The war itself has its own rules and regulations that every sovereign country is obliged to respect.

"Just war theory" is divided into two main principles, "Jus ad Bellum" and "Jus in Bello" principles. "Jus ad Bellum" defines the fundamental norms of the war and it has to be consulted before the states engage in a war to determine whether it is just war or not; whilst "Jus in Bello"

is a set of laws, which defined the special regulations about how the war is conducted (Sussmann, 2013: 429). The main concept of the "Jus ad Bellum" lies under the article, which states that; all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations (Article 2/4 of the UN Charter, 1945).

"Jus ad Bellum" Principles are based on six main conditions of just war theory, which are as follows:

Condition 1. (Just Cause): According to condition one, innocent civilians must be protected from the violent aggressor, which means that the state should apply to all the possible measures to avoid and protect its citizens from the direct "war damages".

Condition 2. (Right Authority): According to condition two, the war can solely be recognized legally, in case it is declared by the proper authorities such as the head of the state (that is the supreme commander-in chef), or the supreme legislature. In a concrete circumstance, when the war has an aggressive rather than a defensive character, the case shall be sanctioned by the UN Security Council.

Condition 3. (Right Intention): According to condition three, the states have the right to enter the war only if they have the right intention to do so. Therefore, any other circumstances that oppose the mentioned are impermissible. Wars, based on revenge, nationalism, imperialism, natural recourses, etc. are prohibited.

Condition 4. (Last Resort): Denotes that all the essential measures must have to be taken to peacefully resolve the conflict before the opposing sides start direct armed hostilities.

Condition 5. (High Probability of Success): Ensures the right of the high probability of success. According to the mentioned point of "Jus ad Bellum" theory, each state is obliged to recognize the pros and cons of the war before engaging in it.

Condition 6. (Proportionality): Ensures the right to estimate the proportionality of gain and loss of the war. In other words, the state is only permissible to begin a war if the legal authority of the country recognizes that "The benefits to be gain in war is proportionate or even larger than its costs" (Estrella, 2012: 6); (Douglas, 2003: 530,531); (Lacewing, 2010: 1).

"Jus in Bello" Principles are based on two main rules of international just war theory:

Condition 1. (Discrimination principle): Regulates the protection of the peaceful population in war as well as ensures their medical protection. According to the mentioned

principle, it is vigorously forbidden to use weapons of mass destruction, that is, nuclear, chemical, and biological equipment in war (Douglas, 2015: 531).

Condition 2. (Proportionality Principle): Simply expresses the main rule of "Jus in Bello" principle, and underlines the fact that more than appropriate force must not have to be used in war (Douglas, 2015: 531).

The United Nations (UN) is an organization created on June 26, 1945. The principal mission of the UN is to maintain international peace, safety, and security. The organization is dedicated to creating an international order based on the principles of universal justice and stability and aims at peacefully solving the political issues among the member states. Article 2/1 of the UN Charter clearly defines the following: "The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members (Charter of the United Nations, 1945). As highlighted in the article 2/4 of the UN Charter: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations", whilst the article 2/7 of the UN Charter strictly prohibits the intervention "within the domestic justification of any state" (Charter of the United Nations, 1945).

The Helsinki Final Act was an agreement signed on August 1, 1975, at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in Helsinki, Finland. 35 nations including the US, Canada, the USSR, and the European states signed the agreement with the common aim of improving the US-USSR relations during the "Cold War". Among the four groupings or baskets, the significance of territorial integrity; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in international affairs; refraining from the threat or use of force; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and co-operation among states were also underlined in a document.

According to Helsinki Final Act, the common purpose of the participating states is to "Promote better relations among themselves and ensuring conditions in which their people can live in true and lasting peace free from any threat to or attempt against their security" (Helsinki Final Act, 1975).

Georgian scholar E. Khvichia in his work "Optimalism-National Globalism" stresses that for the peaceful and harmonic coexistence between the states, functional, and not geopolitical redistribution of areas of influence should take place. According to him, the mentioned is practically impossible without the reorganization of the UN. Khvichia argues that it is of primary

significance to establish a four-chamber ruling system at the global level, which will largely contribute to developing harmonic relationships between the nations.

Khvichia argued that it is now possible to predict the behavior of one civilization (a fully self-regulated system) that has never been described before in the scientific field.

This is a functional, not geopolitical division, according to which the four-chambered institutes should be initiated and world Governance should be adapted with the four classes of Mania:

1. Class of Mania of Form - Regulatory-Legalization Institute;

2. Class of Mania of Overcoming - Institute of Stabilization;

3. Class of Mania of Relaxation - The Institute of global market regulation in global civilization;

4. Class of Mania of Ruling - Institute of civilization representation before the Members of Civilization.

The reasons for the ineffectiveness of the United Nations (as the only legitimate institution in the world) are the results of these factors being ignored. Thus, the effectiveness of the UN cannot be achieved without its reorganization by the above-mentioned system (Khvichia, 2007).

Conclusion

Non-intervention and peaceful coexistence between the states remain one of the biggest challenges of the 21st century. Since sovereign states have unlimited jurisdiction over all the people within their territorial limits, every state is under a moral obligation to respect the norms of international law and to maximum avoid interfering in the domestic affairs of another sovereign country, respectively.

The UN strictly emphasizes the high significance of sovereign independence and territorial integrity of the countries and vigorously forbids the member states to act against the fundamental principles of the Charter. Therefore, states have a full right to choose and develop their political, social, and cultural priorities themselves, including the rights of political and social independence. States have a right to live in long-lasting peace, both within their territory and with the rest of the world.

It is worth noting that the organization was initially created to prevent international conflicts and protect the countries from another war and its destructive consequences. The detonation of atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 has shown the

civilized world that it was of utterly significance to design a universal system of collective defense for the future survival of mankind. However, the nuclear weapon also established a new World Order in global political affairs and widely developed the idea that it would mark an ending point of large-scale international wars since the nuclear states would avoid using their devastating military capacities.

It could also be argued that the UN has achieved significant success in avoiding global conflicts after the end of the World War II, though, the organization faced serious challenges to peacefully resolve an increasing number of intrastate conflicts which have many times grew into severe Civil Wars on almost all the continents of the world in the second half of the twentieth century, including the war in the Balkans, Rwandan genocide, Civil Wars in Sudan, Colombian conflicts, etc.

9/11 events, and the rise of terrorist groups-Al-Qaeda and Islamic State, have fundamentally changed the world's perception and hopes over the long-lasting peace. Along with the growing number of terrorist attacks in different parts of the world, at the beginning of the new millennium, President George W. Bush engaged in a war in Iraq and Afghanistan and Barack Obama began NATO-led military intervention in Libya later on. On the other side of the globe, Vladimir Putin's rise to power ignited Russian imperialist ambitions over again in the post-USSR space, resulted in Russia's military intervention in Georgia in 2008 and the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula of Ukraine by the great power in 2014.

Oppressive regimes, aging dictatorships, high level of corruption, and extremely low standards of living resulted in the series of anti-government protests in Arab countries in the early 2010s which culminated with not only huge economic and geopolitical crises in the Arab countries and Europe but also lave left countries more at danger of engaging in conflicts.

Ongoing Civil War in Ukraine and Syria, the conflict between Afghan state and Taliban in Afghanistan, frozen conflicts in the South Caucasus, conflicts between Israel and Palestine, India and Pakistan and many others prove that the whole world is a conflict in the twenty-first century. Taking into consideration the fact that the clashes of interests among the great powers are constantly growing in tension, it is hard to predict the positive development of the events in the foreseeable future.

World War I was caused by the hegemonic military policy of the world's biggest multinational empires that have historically been prone to colonialism, expansionism, and

militarism. Though it culminated with the dissolution of the greatest empires, including the Russian Empire, Ottoman Empire, German and Austria-Hungary empires, however, deeply-embedded nationalism, racism, chauvinism, and antisemitism in the post-imperial Germany, grew into the World War II in 1939-1945, resulted in the most devastating consequences in the human history.

From today's perspective, the great powers, including the permanent members of the Security Council of the UN: The United States, the Russian Federation, France, China, and the United Kingdom should undertake the major role of preventing wars and conflicts through increased negotiations and constant communication. They should establish a unique approach in the international system in which democratic states unanimously respect the common values and interests of each other. As long as the world's greatest powers act for the benefit of their national interests only, long-lasting peace in the world will never be achieved.

Works Cited

Beckman, R., & Butte, D. (2013). *Introduction to International Law*. International Law Students Association.

Dennen, J. V. (1980). "On War: Concepts, Definitions, Data: A Review of the Macroquantitative Research Literature up to 1980". Prepared for the course.

Douglas, M. (2003). "Changing the Rules: Just War Theory in the Twenty-First Century". *Saga Journals*, 529-545.

Estrella, I. A. (2012). "On the Ethics of War". *KRITIKE Volume Six Number One*, 67-84.

Fukuyama, F. (1989). "The End of History? "*The National Interest*, 1-18.

Griffiths, M. (2009). *Encyclopedia of International Relations and Global Politics.* London New York: Routledge Publisher.

Hoffmann, F. G. (2007). *Conflict in the 21 Century, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.* Arlington: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.

Khvichia, E. (2007). *Optimalism (National Globalism).* Retrieved from noosphereinstitutegeorgia.blogspot.com: http://noosphereinstitutegeorgia.blogspot.com/p/optimalism-national-globalism.html

MacFarlane, N. S. (2002). *Intervention in Contemporary World Politics*. London: Oxford University Press.

McCaffrey, S., Shelton, D., & Cerone, J. (2010). *Public International Law:Cases, problems, and Texts*.

Metz, S., & Cuccia, P. R. (2011). *Defining War for the Twenty-first Century Conference report.* Strategic Studies Institute.

Morgenthau, H. (1965). *Politics Among Nations.* New York: Knopf.

Ortega, M. (2001). "Military Invention and the European Union". *European Union Vol 45*.

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2011). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Silverstone, S. (2011). *Invention and Use of Force*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sussmann, N. (2013). "Can Just War Theory Delegitimate Terrorism?" *European Journal of Political Theory*, 425-446.