

Tyga Golden

POSC 1020

SEC 006

8 October 2024

Analysis 5

War has gone through many changes throughout history, leading to conflicts being categorized into three main types: interstate wars, civil wars, and guerrilla wars. Each type of conflict contains their own unique characteristics. Interstate wars involve conflicts between two or more states, usually over territorial disputes, political power, or economic interests. Civil wars happen within a single country, often starting from strong ideological differences or struggles for power among factions. An example of this would be the U.S. Civil War. Guerrilla wars are characterized by irregular combatants who use unconventional tactics to fight a more powerful enemy. This often leads to long conflicts that can destabilize regions. Understanding these categories is essential for analyzing war and its impact on global relations.

To understand why wars occur, it is crucial to understand the bargaining model of war. This model suggests that wars happen when countries fail to reach an agreement over their disputes, which can be frustrating because of how many conflicts can be avoided through negotiation. There are three main reasons for this failure to bargain. These reasons are, incomplete information, commitment problems, and indivisibility. Incomplete information means that states often don't fully understand each other's capabilities or resolve, leading to miscalculations that can raise tensions. Commitment problems happen when states doubt each other's willingness to follow their agreements, especially in conflicts that have been going on throughout history. Finally, Indivisibility refers to situations where the conflicting parties find it impossible to negotiate over certain issues, making it hard to compromise.

An example that highlights these bargaining failures is the conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. This long-standing dispute highlights how incomplete information can raise tensions. Both nations often misjudge each other's military capabilities and resolve, leading to an arms race and military posturing that could spiral out of control. For example, after the 1947 partition, both countries claimed Kashmir, resulting in multiple wars and ongoing conflicts. Each side sees the control of Kashmir as critical to its national identity, which further complicates the negotiation process. There are also commitment problems here, as historical grievances have created an extremely strong

mistrust between the two countries. Each side is fearing that the other will break any agreement between them, which contributes to the ongoing conflict.

Indivisibility is perhaps the biggest challenge within the Kashmir conflict. India and Pakistan both view the territory as integral to their national narratives. On one hand, to India, Kashmir represents its secular identity. On the other, Pakistan sees it as a symbol of Muslim autonomy. Because of these strong emotional ties, it is very hard for both sides to reach any sort of compromise. This makes it harder to reach a peaceful resolution, causing more regional instability and creating more threats to global security.

In addition to understanding war through the lens of bargaining, it is important to consider the role of weapons of mass destruction in global security. WMDs include nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, that are different from conventional weapons in their ability to cause mass casualties and destruction. Conventional weapons are designed for specific military engagements, while WMDs can destroy cities and cause long-term damage to the environment, making their implications for global security much more severe.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is a key piece of international law that aims to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The treaty has four key provisions: preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear states, promoting peaceful uses of nuclear energy, facilitating international inspections to ensure compliance, and advancing global disarmament efforts. Although the NPT is important, it is hard to enforce the treaty with the lack of trust between countries.

The ethics of war is explained through *just war theory*, which helps to evaluate whether it is morally acceptable to go to war (*jus ad bellum*) and the war should be conducted (*jus in bello*). *Jus ad bellum* helps to determine when it is justifiable to go to war, such as having a just cause, or being authorized by a legitimate authority. On the other hand, *jus in bello* outlines the conduct of the actual war, emphasizing the need to minimize harm to civilians and use proportionate force.

The criteria for *jus ad bellum* include just cause, legitimate authority, right intention, probability of success, and proportionality. Just cause ensures that war is waged for the right moral reasons, such as self-defense or protecting human rights. Legitimate authority should be declared by recognized governing bodies, ensuring that decisions are made fairly and transparently. Right intention emphasizes the importance of motives of the war. The goal should be to achieve peace and justice instead of pursuing personal or national gain. The probability of success weighs whether or not the anticipated benefits of going to war

outweigh the potential costs, while proportionality demands that the response be appropriate for the initial aggression.

It is also important to highlight the challenge terrorism poses to existing laws of war in modern war. Terrorism is hard to regulate within international law because terrorists often operate outside of state boundaries. Unlike traditional combatants, terrorists often target civilians and use strategies that blur the lines between combatants and non-combatants, making it harder to apply the established legal norms.

One of the main issues with addressing terrorism with international law is that terrorist organizations are decentralized. They often operate across nations, making it hard for a single country to hold them accountable or effectively fight against them. The tactics that they use, such as suicide bombings and guerilla warfare, also differ from conventional military engagements, makes it harder to apply established laws governing warfare. The use of fear as a weapon makes this worse, as it creates an environment where traditional laws may not properly address the actual conflict.

In conclusion, war is extremely complicated but essential to understand. The three types of war each show different challenges and ideas that shape international relations. The bargaining model of war show the complexities of negotiating and the bargaining failures that can lead to more conflict, as shown in the example of India and Pakistan's Kashmir dispute. The role of weapons of mass destruction and the ethical considerations in just war theory help to expand our understanding of global security challenges. Lastly, terrorism creates unique obstacles for international law, causing us to reevaluate how we respond to threats. By using these theories and concepts, we can better understand the motivation behind the actions of countries their impact on global stability.

References

Ganguly, Sumit, and Kanti Bajpai. "India and the Crisis in Kashmir." *Asian Survey*, vol. 34, no. 5, 1994, pp. 401–16. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2645054>. Accessed 9 Oct. 2024.

Mohan, A. (1992). The historical roots of the Kashmir conflict. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 15(4), 283–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10576109208435908>