

Wendelin Ettmayer*

THE REVOLUTION in NON-MILITARY AFFAIRS

Much has been written about the Revolution in Military Affairs, about the future of warfare, about new technological developments concerning the war, about new organizational concepts concerning the military, tactics and strategies. *Foreign Affairs* has devoted a cover story to “Tomorrows Military” (October 2016), “How to make America’s Military Even Better?” and “How to Preserve its Primacy?”

I do not want to comment on those theories and observations; I do not want to question the conclusions, and recommendations of leading soldiers and experts.

Instead, I would like to address the “Revolution in NON-military affairs,” I do not base my observations on military matters, on the new developments in armament or new strategies, but on the social, political and legal environment in which wars take place today. I base my observations on changes concerning education and information about war, as well as on changes concerning the attitude of people regarding the state and government:

- For thousands of years, war has been the central part of everyday life, and people had to accept it;
- For thousands of years, the activities of practically every state were first of all oriented towards the increase of power, mainly through war;
- For thousands of years, it was the greatest honor to go to war and to fight for one’s own country.

However, all these is changing dramatically: people have become more critical, and more defiant. Wars take place in public: people watch the enormous sacrifices caused by wars on television on a daily basis. People follow with critical interest when a country goes to war, and judge to what extent the reasons given for war correspond to reality. Parliaments and the public want to know to what extent the goals proclaimed on the occasion of the outbreak of wars are actually achieved.

With the computer, the mobile phones, and the Internet, a revolution in information and communication has taken place. Social media give everybody the opportunity to share his or her opinion with others and to defy authority. This also affects the attitudes towards military interventions and the use of force.

Another fundamental shift concerns the basic attitudes of people: in former times, for many, war was the force that gave the meaning to the lives of individuals and social groups; the greatness of the states but also

that of individuals was linked to achievements in wars, and on the battlefield. It was to a large extent the development of the welfare state that has changed that attitude: today many people prefer a higher standard of living to military conquest. This view is certainly prevalent in Europe. People have developed a sense of entitlement, and making sacrifices is not part of the modern way of life for most Europeans.

In this new context, other fundamental changes have taken place as well: a military victory does not anymore equal to a political victory. Already way back in the 1950s, the Suez crisis demonstrated that a military defeat can, with the help of international organizations and the support of public opinion, turn out to become a political victory. The revolution in information technologies and the new media have certainly intensified this tendency.

I. The Essence of War in History

All throughout history, war was an integral part of international politics, and an integral part in the daily life of people living under the conditions of insecurity. Society not only accepted to use military force, but it considered a successful military campaign to be making a man “great.” Wars were decided on the battlefield, from Cannae to Stalingrad. The long history of mankind has essentially been a history of war and peace. Already historians of the ancient world, Thucydides, Sallust, Julius Caesar or Josephus Flavius described the strategic goals of conquerors, the fighting spirit of the armies, strategies and tactics, and military techniques. Herodotus, Titus Livy, Xenophon and Polybius shown to us how confrontations and wars can be described from a personal perspective.

We know about the battle of Cannae, which took place in 216 BC during the second Punic wars, and how influential was back then the “asymmetric battle order,” which much later on influenced the Prussian king Frederic II as well as the “Schlieffen Plan.” In recent years, new notions and new ways of analyzing national and international conflicts, new techniques and new strategies have appeared: now we talk about serialization or war, cyber-war and cyber-attacks, asymmetric warfare, and hybrid wars. We read about financial wars, trade wars or media wars. Depending on political priorities, governments wage wars on terror, on drugs or on poverty.

In a similar way, statesmen and philosophers have thought and written about peace and the possibility of peaceful relations among the peoples. Already Cicero has argued that peaceful solutions of conflicts are preferable to a forceful confrontation. The New Testament sees Christ as the “Prince of Peace,” and denounces war and the use of force. St. Paul in his “Letter to the Romans” stipulates the submission to governing authorities: “for there is no authority except that which God has established.” St. Augustin further developed the teaching about the “just war,” which has influenced Western thinking about war to the present day.

The Imperial order of 1495, concerning public peace, which prohibited private warfare allowed in the feudal society can serve as an example that changes in human behavior are possible, even if assiduous efforts are required. It took a long time, until a new thinking concerning the legality of war and the possibility of international peace evolved. In the 17th century, Hugo Grotius developed his thoughts about peace among nations and the legality of wars in his fundamental work *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*. Later in 1795, Immanuel Kant described his vision about "Eternal Peace."

Throughout history, it was legal and an accepted part of politics to wage war. Therefore, it is not surprising that the first steps taken in the 20th century, specifically the actions aimed at condemning or banning war were not very successful. The Covenant of the League of Nations and the Briand-Kellogg Pact (1928) could not prevent the slaughter of the second World War, and the charter of the United Nations, promulgated in 1945, succeeded only in a very limited way to regulate the use of force. Nonetheless, an age old thinking was overturned: wars were declared illegal, and the use of force now was only considered to be legal under certain conditions. If the essence of international order consists in what is decided about the conditions for war and peace, and who decides these conditions, a new international order has evolved after 1945.

If war means to impose one's will upon someone else by force, this has also become much more difficult to achieve after the revolution in education and information technologies. People have become much more defiant, and, as destruction caused by war has become more visible, citizens make their own governments more accountable concerning the matters of war and peace. All in all, the following fundamental changes have taken place:

1. Wars were an integral part of international relations and everyday life - not anymore.

Throughout history, society accepted wars as a normal activity, and wars took place rather frequently. During some centuries, like the 17th and 18th, there were hardly any years of peace. Waging war was legal, wars were considered "the continuation of politics by other means." They were waged in honor of the monarch, who himself ruled by the grace of God. Later on, after the French Revolution, the monarch was replaced by the "national interest," but the wars did not lose their intensity. The soldier and the diplomat, both followed the same logic: years of war were followed by a peace conference, if it did not settle the affairs, new wars were started in order to achieve a new balance of power.

Today, wars are not anymore considered "the continuation of politics by other means," but a failure of politics. Today, there are many international treaties and agreements banning wars and speaking out against the use of

force, like the Briand-Kellogg Pact (1928), the Charter of the United Nations or the Helsinki final act (1975). There are many human rights conventions and treaties, human rights NGOs, and in some cases special war crime tribunals, whose purpose it is to reduce the use of force and to punish military action according to new international humanitarian laws.

2. It was accepted to use military power - not anymore.

Carl von Clausewitz, the great Prussian thinker on strategic affairs, defined war the following way: "waging war means to impose one's will upon someone else by military force." That certainly meant to destroy and to kill, to violate values otherwise recognized under normal circumstances. The largest part of the population, throughout the centuries, was uneducated and was obliged to accept the will of the authorities without questioning the consequences. In the name of "Staatsraison" and *Realpolitik*, wars could be started and even peace treaties implemented without the consent of the people affected. After the revolution in education and information, it has become much harder "to impose one's will by force." Welfare became for many people more important than warfare; the personal well-being more important than the dying on the "field of honor."

Today, wars take place in public, in front of TV-cameras, observed by numerous human right NGOs, and in addition accompanied by parliamentary hearings. In former times, the military force could be fully deployed, to the extent that 90% of all wars were decided on the battlefield. Today, the use of force is restricted, as the general public is watching, the media, human rights organizations and sometimes international organizations, like the United Nations, interfere as well. For this and other reasons, the use of force is restricted to such a degree that wars are only to a limited extent decided on the battlefield. A military victory is not anymore automatically a political victory.

3. Wars were considered something great -- not anymore.

Like many generations before us, in mid-20th century we still learned at school that "*dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*" — "it is sweet and proper to die for one's country." War was something great in history, it was sweet and right to die for the country. It was a great honor to die on the battlefield, the honor of the nation rested upon the shoulders of their soldiers. Throughout history, states were formed and obtained their status on the battlefields: the Austro-Hungarian monarchy gained its status as a great power fighting the Turks. Great Britain became a world power after the Spanish war of Succession. Louis XIV is still considered as France's great King, as his wars gave the country the geographic shape it still has today. Germany was unified by the wars of liberation and unification and the United States fought the war of independence.

Wars certainly influenced the arts and even romantic movements. But most of all: there was a strong conviction that wars could solve problems. And, victorious rulers and generals could decide the fate of the defeated. Many were convinced that fundamental questions had to be decided by war, as it was still the case a hundred years ago at the outbreak of World War I. Wars have always been terrible, but throughout history, they were an accepted part of international relations and everyday life. Most of all, throughout all the centuries, great changes took place through wars. International relations were dominated by a logic of war. Gaining more power, also by means of war, was the main issue in international relations.

Much has changed, especially the attitudes towards war, in some places more than in others, for instance, in Austria and Germany, where the military has lost two world wars, and was accused to have fought for criminal causes. There is a new concept of honor and heroism, words today mostly used in the context with football players and ski champions. In former times, even 10,000 casualties in one single day were considered as "great," and honorable for the country. Today, in many countries, we have developed the zero-casualty mentality; and even the word "war" is often replaced by other notions, like establishing a "no-fly zone," "intervention" or just that we have to "step in." Before the Second World War, in Austria, it was unthinkable to run for public office if one was a draft-dodger. Today, in a country with a general conscription hardly anyone among the elites have gone through the military service.

There is another fundamentally different development compared to former periods: great changes take place without wars. Certainly, the American military has played a great role in developing new technologies, such as the computer, the Internet or the GPS. But, whereas for many centuries, wars were the driving force for changes in international relations, that is not anymore the case today.

If we consider the great changes that have occurred during the last decades: the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the reunification of Germany, the end of apartheid in South Africa. Before that the minorities like the African-Americans in the United States succeeded to emancipate themselves, and by the end of the 20th century globalization became a driving force all over the world. Those changes were not brought about by wars, but by new ideas, the new technologies, and the new information systems, by the power of the braves, for whom the Polish trade union movement *Solidarnosc*, and Nelson Mandela are shining examples. The anti-baby pill, the mobile phone, computers and the Internet demonstrate the power of new technologies. The power of new ideas became evident in the 1968 movement, by the influence of human rights or, on the other side, by the awakening of Islam.

In a complex world, there are many issues which cannot be solved by force. As long as the main question in international relations was, which ruler and which country would be the most powerful, the decision could be

sought on the battlefield. But today, when every issue that plays a role in internal politics also has an international dimension – from economic growth to full employment; from the environment to human rights, from social questions to education – war is hardly a solution any more.

4. It has become more difficult to fight terrorism

The Revolution in NON-military affairs concerns different kinds of warfare, but not to the same extent. As far as the fight against terrorism is concerned, the effect is even the opposite compared to traditional forms of confrontation: someone who is convinced to find heavenly rewards for his bloody engagements is much more willing to risk his life, and does not primarily consider material personal welfare the highest goal to achieve. In the same way, the enormous media coverage of terrorist attacks supports basic intentions of terrorists: to make their destructive deeds known all over and to threaten people as much as possible. And if the respect of human rights makes it more difficult to fight terrorism, terrorists themselves are not bound by any laws or regulations. If the revolution in NON-military affairs has made it more difficult to win wars, the fight against terrorism, on the other hand, has been rendered more difficult by the very same developments.

II. How is War Seen in Today's World?

1. The Diplomatic Revolution in Europe

In Europe we had a "revolution in international affairs," which started with the Council of Europe, founded after WW II in 1949. Europe became a zone of peace. What was the essence of this revolution? Foreign policy in Europe was based on a new legitimacy, followed new goals that were pursued by new means. A new way of thinking concerning **sovereignty**, and international affairs originated.

1.1. New Goals and a New Legitimacy

During the last two generations, essence and form of interstate relations in Europe changed more than in the previous 1000 years. The legitimacy of foreign policy used to be linked with the efforts to increase the power of the state or the monarch. Foreign policy was power politics. In today's Europe the legitimacy of foreign policy of a European country is to increase the welfare of its citizens: the standard of living, the creation of new jobs, to safeguard human rights, to protect the environment, and to promote culture. The welfare state got an international dimension; and the support for the welfare state in Europe is now seen in a mixture of foreign and internal policies. Even more, human and social rights are implemented on a supra-national level.

1.2. New Means in Foreign Policy

Traditional means in foreign policy were *Realpolitik*, *Raison d'Etat*, and War. What did that mean in practice? That meant whatever was useful for the

state could be done by its ruler, even when forbidden for an individual. In the name of the state it was allowed to break treaties, to kill, to destroy. In today's Europe the basis of security is not anymore a balance of power, but the implementation of common values: democracy, human rights, the rule of law. International organizations like the EU, the Council of Europe or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, have to monitor the implementation of those values. The logic of war has been replaced by the logic of values and the logic of well-being. Security in Europe is now based on cooperation. In Europe it has become unthinkable to wage war to promote national interests. If a state violates this principle, it cannot be considered European.

1.3. New Basis for Security

The traditional basis of security has changed in Europe. Traditionally sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs were considered basic principles to safeguard international security, as it was still stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations, and the Helsinki agreement of 1975. Traditionally, foreign policy used to be designed to provide security for the state. Since the founding of the Council of Europe, security in Europe has changed its orientation towards the citizens. Today, the implementation of those common values like human rights, democracy and the rule of law is monitored by supranational institutions. Monitoring by international organizations essentially means that the old principle of non-interference is not valid anymore. The notion of national sovereignty is still often highly praised in Sunday speeches, but has lost much of its practical meaning.

2. The American Exceptionalism

A European style revolution in foreign policy has not taken place in the US. The goal of American foreign policy still is to secure national interests, and to increase the power of the country. Foreign policy is backed by the military, as one scholar said: "Foreign policy without the backing of the military is like a baseball game without a baseball bat."

The eminent American scholar Joseph Nye distinguished between "hard power" and "soft power," in foreign policy, the latter constituting the intelligent use of cultural achievements and new technology to make a country more attractive. This distinction is certainly essential. But European foreign policy has gone a step further: in Europe, foreign policy is not anymore power oriented, but social welfare focused instead. The task of a diplomat in a European country is not anymore the promotion of the power of the state, but the endeavors aimed at "connecting people."

There are certainly also cultural differences between Europe and the US when it comes to national security. In any election campaign, in Austria as well as in the United States, one has to talk about security. But in the United States, a politician who runs for office has to talk about military security; whereas in Austria people want to be told about the improvement of social security, the health care, and their pension funds.

The United States is a land with a mission. Every US administration still insists on national sovereignty, and expresses skeptical views towards international organizations. Americans want to fight for the good and against the evil. George W. Bush was not the first who mentioned an "axis of evil" in the world. Oliver Cromwell, 350 years ago already mobilized against "an axis of evil" in his days, which, according to him, was constituted by the Pope and the Roman Catholic Habsburgs.

In this sense it is only logical that the United States tries to have dominant players, like Microsoft, Google or Facebook in key industries, and to monitor flow of information by through the National Security Agency.

3. The Dialectics of Globalization

The repercussions of globalization concerning security and war can be seen as a dialectic process. Globalization unites people by facilitating and expanding exchange of goods and values, but globalizations also divides. By being included into the worldwide economic systems, countries like China, India or Brazil get stronger and can therefore become more nationalistic. In this sense there are certainly contradictory repercussions concerning power politics, and there is one problem: some forces, like global markets, act worldwide and without limits, whereas political intuitions basically function on a national level. However, one conclusion can be drawn by taking into account the complex structure of globalization: war is hardly anymore a solution in a complex globalized world.

Why are so many wars and civil wars taking place in Africa and other parts of the Third World? There is certainly not one single answer to that question. But one reason is clearly this: all social, economic, political and religious conflicts we experienced in Europe since the French Revolution, many countries in the developing world are confronted with in a single generation, and the logic of war there still dominates political thinking. Less developed countries are less affected by the “revolution in NON-military affairs” than the highly industrialized world.

Radical ideologies have time and again influenced foreign policy as terrorists have been active in different places in many periods of history. But whereas conventional warfare has become more difficult, Islamic terrorism profits from the new social, cultural and technological environment: it has become easier for radicals to connect world-wide, terror-attacks get global attention, and the new media makes recruitment for extremist causes easier.

III. New Dimensions of Security and Power: The Essence of Security and Power Has Changed Dramatically in Recent Decades:

Traditional security used to be viewed up to 90% as military security. In the contemporary affairs the reverse is true: considering to the great challenges of human security in today’s world, military security covers only 10%. The same can be said as far as power is concerned: traditionally, 90% of power exerted on an international level was military power. Today, the power of the brave, the new players, and the new dynamic forces make up 90% of the power. In this sense, 90% of the changes that took place in former times were caused by war, which is responsible of 10% of the new development in today’s world. We can think of globalization, the rise of China, the implosion of the Soviet Union or the unification of Germany. In former times, wars were decided 90% on the battlefield, today that ration would be 10%, which makes it practically impossible to win wars anymore. On the other hand, in the highly connected world, people today are affected up to 90% by the international development, what was not the case in former centuries.

1. New Dimensions of Security

Traditionally, foreign policy has been orientated towards the security of the state, provided by a strong army. Today, foreign policy is, to a very large extent, oriented towards human security, towards the security of the individual citizen. In the 21th century, threats to international security are up to 90% non-military threats. An essential goal of foreign policy has become to guarantee the basic necessities of human life. Many international organizations, countless NGOs, and governments are actively promoting human security. They fight against hunger and disease, initiatives in favor of development, human rights, and a decent standard of living have become an essential part of every foreign policy agenda. Where the basic requirements for human security are not met, from

Ukraine to Venezuela and from the Central African Republic to Thailand, peace and security are in danger, but military intervention is hardly anymore an answer.

The United Nations and many of their agencies like UNCTAD, UNICEF, UNESCO, to name only a few, want to create security through cooperation. To safeguard human security and to promote human rights has become a basic legitimacy of foreign policy. In former times, international relations were mostly about one single issue: military security, hard power, and war. Today countless issues are an essential part of international conferences and international activities. Today there are many dimensions to international security: there is an economic and financial dimension, there is the important role of energy and the environment, there are human rights and education. Most importantly, those new dimensions of human security do not anymore rely on the strength of the military.

2. New Dimensions of Power

In former times, the essence of power was viewed as based on the grace of God or on military power. Today, power should be based on democratic legitimacy. In practice, the legitimacy of a government is linked to its possibility to increase the well-being of the people. For many people it has become more important to increase their standard of living than to increase the military power of their country in order to dominate others. To demonstrate what fundamental changes have taken place, consider the word "great" we use for powerful personalities in history. Alexander the Great as well as Peter the Great or Catherine the Great are considered "Great," because they succeeded to increase power of their respective countries, by conquering and destroying others. Any ruler who would act in similar ways today would not be considered as "Great," instead, the international community would demand that they are brought before the International Criminal Court. In former times, a ruler was powerful if he succeeded to enforce his will upon his subjects. Today, an elected official can exert power if he can attract and convince others. In former times, conquering a country was a legitimate act. Anyone who wants to conquer foreign territory today faces international sanctions, like Saddam Hussein, what he suffered after invading Kuwait in 1990. In former times the state had monopoly on using force. This monopoly has been broken by countless new institutions like the media, NGOs or international corporations. Those new institutions can not only exert power, but also oppose the power of the state.

IV. What Does All This mean in the Context of the “Revolution in NON-military affairs?”

- Will there be no more wars? The abolition of war is not to be expected, as new studies have only recently shown that human aggression is deeply rooted in human nature.
- Will there be no more international conflicts solved by military means? Probably, but only some.

- Can wars still be won? Yes, but because of the new social, political and cultural environment, it has become more difficult.

There are different schools of thought concerning the question to what extent aggressiveness is rooted in human nature. Thomas Hobbes had the strong belief that man was aggressive (*homo homini lupus est*), and would always stay that way. The French political thinker Jean-Jacques Rousseau, on the other hand, underlined the benevolent nature of the primitive being. More recently, in September 2016, the Spanish professor José Maria Gomez published a study, according to which, aggressiveness is deeply rooted in human nature. This theory does not necessarily contradict the ideas put forward by Steven Pinker, who in his bestseller, *The Better Angels of Our Nature* tries to answer the question, why violence has declined in human societies. Apparently, men can be aggressive and try it the same time to tame his aggressiveness. A similar view is expressed by Jeremy Rifkin in his book *The Empathic Society*. Whatever theory may eventually prevail, one thing is certain: the revolution in NON-military affairs has taken place.

*Dr. Wendelin Ettmayer served as Ambassador of Austria in Finland, Canada, and at the Council of Europe.

Author on International Relations;
www.wendelinettmayer.at