War

Easton Jarboe

ODU

PHIL 355e

Dr. Hunt

3/28/24

The cyber war between Israel and Iraq is an intense conflict. There is much more than just a war going on in this conflict. War is something that should not be taken lightly and there are several rules that need to be followed in order to have a just war and have legitimate reasons behind it. The amount of civilian casualties in this cyberwar makes it not seem like a war at all and just indiscriminate attacks. Looking into the cyber war between Iraq and Israel it is clear to see they are not following the social contract when it comes to any form of war. Using a contractarian perspective and using the work of Boylan and Toddeo I will display how "war" is just attacking over and over with no real winner. It is a fight without a just cause.

Looking into the work of Michael Boylan it can be clear that this cyberwar is not just a war and Iraq and Israel are not fulfilling the social contract that should have been implemented. There is a heavy emphasis on the way war is no longer traditional since the rise of technology and that is true. When there is a broader scope of how war is done now through things like drone strikes and hacking it is clear to see these do not follow the conventional rules and social contract of war. A good example of how war has changed through history is with the revolutionary war. Originally both sides would march on each other in uniform and they would have a sense of honor for the battle they were fighting. Later on during the war the United States learned from Native Americans to be cunning and hide and sneak up on enemies breaking the tradition of wars were fought. This essentially established a whole new set of rules and that is no different for how war is still evolving now. The way cyber war has been waged does stray further from the path than ever before. There can be a sense of honor in war and fighting for a cause a person believes is right. What I have gleaned from how Israel and Iraq have fought is that there is no honor left and it is a cut throat battle between both sides. Iraq during covid use a cyber attack to affect the water supplies in israel. This did not affect the soldiers they were trying to fight against. This affected

the civilians and by the social contract established in war they should not have been affected by the war just the two opposing sides. This does not support the contractarian way of thinking in the slightest. A war fought between two countries should be left to just the soldiers and nobody else. The purposeful victimization of civilians does nothing but hurt people who do not want to be involved in the war. This does not follow a contractarian belief at all and makes it difficult to go back to one because of the precedent set by attacking civilians and hurting them more than anyone else. It makes retaliation against the other nations civilians seem like a necessity. The phrase " eye for an eye" comes to mind when looking into this war. They are not only hurting themselves through this kind of war but tons of innocent people.

Taddeo brings up a lot of interesting points about the definition of cyberwar. She says that not all cyberwar is necessarily destructive. This makes sense in the scheme of things. When it relates to the Iraq and Israel war it is most certainly destructive. There is also the point of this not being a war unless there is a justified reason for the war to happen and the attacks serve a legitimate purpose. Looking at this from the perspective of contractarianism it makes it a lot easier to see there is no social contract that allows for these indiscriminate attacks; it is all pure water for the other country. On the other hand, countries have the right to defend themselves and their citizens, and these attacks can be seen as necessary action. However, it is crucial that these attacks are targeted and proportional, and that any force used is not used beyond what is necessary for self-defense. In this case there is no self-defense is used at all. There is only retaliation between two enemies. This type of violence is unacceptable and can lead to further escalation of the situation. It is essential that countries act responsibly and with restraint when responding to attacks. It is also important to remember that war is always a last resort and should be avoided whenever possible. A social contract for war would only be necessary when the

people in this situation are not just shooting attacks back and forth with no real purpose. Governments must take measures to prevent wars from happening in the first place, and to protect citizens from violence. They must also strive to promote peaceful and diplomatic solutions whenever possible. Cyber war hurts civilians and is dangerous and governments must work together to develop international laws that govern the use of cyber warfare. They must also invest in education and awareness programs that help citizens understand the importance of peaceful and diplomatic solutions. Finally, governments should invest in measures to protect citizens from the potential harms of cyberwar. It is tragic that civilians got clean water taken away from them. I would call that an attack of terrorism, not a war. A contractarian way of looking at this would be having governments invest in measures to protect citizens from the potential harms of cyberwar. This includes investing in education and awareness programs, protecting citizens from the potential harms of cyberwar, and providing citizens with clean drinking water.

Looking at this conflict between Israel and Iraq this is not a war, only a way to hurt civilians. The work of Toddeo and Boylan clearly displays that This war is unjustified and inhumane, and it is time for us to take a stand against it. We must demand an end to this conflict and work towards ensuring the safety of civilians and people around the world. War is not something that should be taken lightly and the way this conflict has turned out is a great example of this.