The purpose of this research is to integrate present day international relations with the empirical knowledge of war in order to theorize future world conflicts. First, examining a general history of empires and hegemonies will serve as a basis of understanding present day international relations. Furthermore, it will address technological advances which evolve communications, war, and peacekeeping operations. Lastly, this research will conclude with theories on how international powers could possibly utilize technological advances in warfare, peacekeeping operations, and communications in the future.
EMPIRES vs. HEGEMONIES

There is a drastic difference between the political structure of an empire and that of a hegemony. The history of empires and hegemonies also varies dependent on the political structure itself. It is imperative to define these two terms before delving into the research.

According to historian, Professor Paul Schroeder:

- Empire means political control exercised by one organized political unit over another unit separate from and alien to it. Many factors enter into empire—economics, technology, ideology, religion, above all military strategy and weaponry—but the essential core is political: the possession of final authority by one entity over the vital political decisions of another. This need not mean direct rule exercised by formal occupation and administration; most empires involve informal, indirect rule. But real empire requires that effective final authority, and states can enjoy various forms of superiority or even domination over others without being empires.¹

Furthermore, empires tend to use coercion, through force and/or intimidation. Throughout human history, there have been many empires. These empires have dominated regions that encompass many of the nation-states that are around today. Still, the Roman Empire, Persian Empire, Qin Dynasty, Russian Empire, among many others, have met their demise as they struggled for more power.

The Medo-Persian empire is considered the most powerful of the ancient empires. At the height of its power, during the reign of Darius I the Great, the empire controlled more than 2.9 million square miles (7.5 million square kilometers) of land and spanned three continents: Asia, Africa and Europe. Its control extending eastward into India and reached westward to Greece. Its capitals were Persepolis and Susa, with its kings sometimes residing in Babylon. It is estimated that in 480 B.C. the empire had 50 million people living until its control. This huge amount was roughly
44% of the world's population at the time - making Persia the largest empire by population percentage(1).

After this vast empire met its demise by Alexander the Great, it arose again under the Parthian and Sassanid empires, post-Islamic empires, up to modern day Iran. An empire rises ... an empire falls. As Schroeder explains, "Recurrently throughout modern history leading powers have at critical junctures chosen empire over hegemony, and thereby triggered large-scale disorder and war. In some instances, the choice was conscious and demonstrable, in many others less clear-cut and more debatable. Nonetheless, the historian can point to repeated instances over the last five centuries where leader and powers, having the option between empire and hegemony, chose the path of empire, and thereby ruined themselves and the system."³

In contrast, the political structure of a hegemony primarily differs from an empire on the notion of the political power having final authority. Also, a hegemony is not a political unit that rules over another unit that is "separate and alien to it." The Online Etymology Dictionary defines the term "hegemony", "(1560s)from Greek hegemonia "leadership, a leading the way, a going first;" also "the authority or sovereignty of one city-state over a number of others," as Athens in Attica, Thebes in Boeotia; from hegeimon "leader," from hegeisthai "to lead," perhaps originally "to track down," from PIE *sag-eyo-, from root *sag- "to seek out, track down, trace". Originally of predominance of one city state or another in Greek history; in reference to modern situations from 1860, at first of Prussia in relation to other German states.⁴ This leadership, and authority is commonly utilized to influence others to develop similarly in order to create a stable,
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international relationship. Presently, as the hegemonic power, the United States seeks to produce democracy and capitalism; which focus on human rights and free trade.

Another interesting explanation of a hegemonic power is illustrated by Italian Marxist Gramsci in 1971, as "the supremacy of a social group manifest(ing) itself in two ways, as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership'" and "the 'normal' exercise of hegemony on the now classical terrain of the parliamentary regime is characterized by the combination of force and consent, which balance each other reciprocally, without force predominating excessively over consent."\(^5\)

In addition, addressing the Theory of Hegemonic Stability (HST) is imperative for this research. HST is based on the idea that the international system can only remain stable if there is a single dominant state that regulates the interactions of other states in the system. The hegemonic power must have the power, will and commitment to enforce the rules. It must also be perceived as mutually beneficial to the major states. The capability rests upon three attributes: a large, growing economy; dominance in a leading technological or economic sector; and political power backed up by projective military.\(^6\) The Ruth C. Lawson Professor of International Politics from Mount Holyoke College, Vincent Ferraro cites four nation-states that have been hegemonic powers: Portugal, Holland, Britain (at two points in history); and of course, the United States (to present day). After World War II, when the United States was recognized as the hegemonic power by its Western allies, international stability has relied upon U.S. dominance. Therefore states that threaten the stability of the western hegemonic power also


fulminate global stability. It is essential that the United States continues to play the predominant international role that it does today for many years to come.

As technology is rapidly expanding, one of the most important areas that U.S. involvement is necessary is communications. "The United States technological assets—including its leadership in piloting social networking and rapid communications—give it an advantage, but the Internet also will continue to boost the power of nonstate actors. In most cases, US power will need to be enhanced through relevant outside networks, friends, and affiliates that can coalesce on any particular issue. Leadership will be a function of position, enmeshment, diplomatic skill, and constructive demeanor."  

Furthermore, future global stabilization requires the U.S. to advance developments in other facets of technology (weaponry, transportation, etc.), as it will be crucial for defense and peacekeeping operations, as well. With the strengthening of international law, and success of the United Nations (U.N.), the U.S. would have the capability of assuring such stability. This would constitute the U.S., enshrined in democracy; as not only one of the beneficiaries of global stability, but also a body politic that exemplifies durability over time.
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EVOLUTION:

U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS, MODERN-DAY

WARFARE & ADVANCED WEAPONRY

U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS & UAVs

The work of the United Nations reaches every corner of the globe. Although best known for peacekeeping, peacebuilding, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance, there are many other ways the United Nations and its System (specialized agencies, funds and programs) affect our lives and make the world a better place. The Organization works on a broad range of fundamental issues, from sustainable development, environment and refugees protection, disaster relief, counter terrorism, disarmament and non-proliferation, to promoting democracy, human rights, gender equality and the advancement of women, governance, economic and social development and international health, clearing landmines, expanding food production, and more, in order to achieve its goals and coordinate efforts for a safer world for this and future generations.
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The use of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAVs) surveillance has been very successful for western countries. In recent peacekeeping operations, the U.N. has began executing missions with the use of UAVs for surveillance. The U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations has deployed UAVs with the purpose of surveillance over several African countries.

Additionally, Kasaija Phillip Apuuli’s article entitled The Use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (Drones) in United Nations Peacekeeping: The Case of the Democratic Republic of Congo, on the American Society of International Law's website explains, "1999, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution expressing concern that the latest information technologies and means of telecommunication " can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security, and may adversely affect the security of states." In other words, there is no telling what exactly could result in the constant manipulation of technology, and if it can be programmed, it can be hacked.

Furthermore, in regards to the future of information technology, Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds suggests, "process power and data storage are becoming almost free; networks and the cloud will provide global access and pervasive services; social media and cybersecurity will be large new markets."
MODERN-DAY WARFARE AND ADVANCED WEAPONRY

War is not a thing of the past, but the order in which it is conducted is. A pivotal evolution in modern warfare is the shift from standing armies to asymmetric warfare. As Jack S. Levy writes in chapter two (International Sources of Interstate and Intrastate War) of *Leashing the Dogs War*, "Rebel groups often cannot match the state in organization and advanced weaponry, and consequently resort to different tactics, including guerilla war and terrorism, long the "weapons of the weak." Instead of confronting state armies directly, they target civilians in an attempt to weaken morale, demonstrate that a state cannot protect its citizens, and induce a shift in loyalties(19).”

This shift along with the advanced weaponry of the modern day creates an entirely new battlefield. War is quickly transiting from a physical altercation among humans to a highly technologically orchestrated combat between machinery. “The reality is that the human location “ in the loop” is already becoming, as retired Army colonel Thomas Adams notes, that of “a supervisor who serves in a fail-safe capacity in the event of a system malfunction.” Even then, he thinks the speed, confusion, and information overload of modern-day war will soon move the whole process outside of “human space.” He describes how the coming weapons “will be too fast, too small, too numerous, and will create an environment too complex for humans to direct.”
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As Adams concludes, the various new technologies “are rapidly taking us to a place where we may not want to go, but probably are unable to avoid.”¹⁴

Another crucial factor in modern-day warfare is the psychological effects of the operators of drones. United States drone operators sit in control stations in parts of Florida, and Nevada while they aim missiles at enemies on the other side of the world. Mary O'Connell emphasizes that the:

- Rules governing appropriate resort to missiles and bombs are well established in international law. More study is needed with respect to the psychological effects of distance killing without risk of losing an operator. The ease of killing with drones should be considered in developing the rules of engagement for such operations. Thought must be given to leaders’ willingness to resort to military force in situations of no risk to pilots. It should be remembered that while drone operators may not be at risk, intelligence personnel and people who maintain drones on the ground may be in considerable danger. Additionally, anecdotal information indicates drone operators are seeing much more of the destruction that they cause thanks to the ability of drones to stay at an attack site and send back clear video footage. The toll on drone operators needs consideration as well.¹⁵

In an interview conducted by GQ magazine, former drone operator, Brandon Bryant recounted his experience. Bryant explained that after he fired a Hellfire missile which struck three men in Afghanistan, "The smoke clears, and there's pieces of the two guys around the crater. And there's this guy over
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here, and he's missing his right leg above his knee," Bryant continues, "He's holding it, and he's rolling around, and the blood is squirting out of his leg, and it's hitting the ground, and it's hot. His blood is hot," Bryant says. "But when it hits the ground, it starts to cool off; the pool cools fast. It took him a long time to die. I just watched him. I watched him become the same color as the ground he was lying on." Bryant was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and he quit his job in 2011.\textsuperscript{17} There have also been many efforts to impose laws regarding management, and allocation of drones and WMD. Future appropriations regarding the operation of drones from long distance control, and the psychological affects is essential to combat enemies.

\textsuperscript{18}There are also many new spy drones that are under development, according to Aviation Week & Space Technology. Sharon Weinberger, a writer for the New York Post explains, "The RQ-180 is designed to fly very high, for a very long time (perhaps as long as 24 hours). According to Aviation Week, it has a 130-foot wing span and a “cranked kite” stealthy design that would allow it to slip past enemy radar. Chances are it will only be used for surveillance, not attack, though it could carry out an electronic attack.\textsuperscript{19}

Also, in the very near future, militaries will be able to use similar technologies that ipads, and cell phones possess with apps which control a variety of drones. As Spencer Ackerman suggests, "The first such company is California-based DreamHammer. DreamHammer has developed software that can operate numerous robots from the same tablet or laptop. Known as Ballista and first reported by Kashmir Hill at *Forbes*, it’s a layer that sits on top of the proprietary software governing Predators, Global Hawks, and the rest of the military’s robotic aviary, using application programming interfaces, or APIs." These devices will make it easier for drone operators to control various technologies at the same time, which will decrease the number of operators overall.

The need for space drones that cannot eliminate other space drones, or satellites that are designed to pick up information from enemies will be an important factor in the advancement of weaponry. For example, the X-37B Orbital Test Vehicle (OTV) has the ability to complete missions that can last up to one year. It also has hypersonic aerodynamic handling. This spy drone, satellite and space shuttle has the potential to carry a
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chip in the payload bay, which would turn the X-37B into a space weapon. Similarly, it could be used for reconnaissance missions (i.e. locate other satellites and snip wires undetected).

On the ground, intelligence agencies are exponentially increasing communication abilities as well. "As a result of this "expanding array of theater airborne and other sensor networks," as a 2007 Department of Defense report puts it, the Pentagon is attempting to expand its worldwide communication network, known as the Global Information Grid, to handle yottabyte ($10^{24}$ bytes) of data."22

To prove successful in future warfare, it is essential for states to further their technological capabilities, and world leaders are very much aware of this point. Conflict in the recent past illustrates what, most assuredly will occur if both parties are not prepared. For example, in the conflicts of Kuwait, Serbia, as well as Iraq, "Advanced communications allowed generals to exercise detailed and instant control over the developing battle and to respond quickly to developments. The speed, power, and accuracy of the weapons employed enabled them to be carefully targeted so as to destroy vital objectives without inflicting unnecessary casualties on civilian populations(220-221)."23 When opponents do not possess the necessary technologies to counter attacks, in most cases they are completely helpless.

---

INTEGRATING INTERSTATE RELATIONS, EMPIRICAL KNOWLEDGE OF WAR & TECHNOLOGY:
THEORIES OF FUTURE CONFLICTS

"Wars not make one great."

~ Yoda, The Empire Strikes Back (1980)

THE EMPIRES STRICK BACK: IRAN, RUSSIA & CHINA

Proclaimed part the axis of evil by former president of the United States, George W. Bush, Iran has been one of concern for democratic nation-states. Once the empire of Persia, Iran is one of the oldest regions in human history, dating back to 4000 BCE. As Trita Parsi explains on ForeignPolicy.com:

- Iran is understandably hesitant about reaching out to the United States. Iran's leadership has been burned by past efforts to explore areas of strategic and tactical collaboration with the United States. Tehran provided extensive military, intelligence, and political support to the U.S. military in 2001 during the campaign to oust the Taliban. Iran's help, according to former President George W. Bush's special envoy to Afghanistan Amb. Jim Dobbins, was decisive. But once Iran's help was deemed no longer necessary, Bush included Tehran in the infamous Axis of Evil speech. Washington wasn't interested in a new relationship with the Iranians(Pivot to Persia).24

---
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In Parsi’s article *Pivot to Persia*, "Obama said, "(Iranians) are strategic, and they’re not impulsive. They have a worldview, and they see their interests, and they respond to costs and benefits.... They are a large, powerful country that sees itself as an important player on the world stage, and I do not think has a suicide wish, and can respond to incentives." One recent milestone for the United States, was the Joint Plan of Action. Although it has not yet been put in effect, it is a short term freeze on Iran’s nuclear program. As Obama mentioned above, the agreement between the two states is economic relief in exchange for halting the Iranian nuclear program. The pact is one of the first agreements between the U.S. and Iran in over thirty-some years, and shows slight promise. The United States and Iran have had a history of tension, and conflict. Yet still as Iranian foreign minister, Mohammed Javad Zarif stated in a recent YouTube video, “To those who continue to believe that sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table, I can only say that pressure has been tried for the past eight years, in fact for the past 35 years,” he said, as he strolled on a campus in Tehran, looking very much like the

---
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urbane professor he was until last spring. “It didn’t bring the Iranian people to kneel in submission. And it will not now, nor in the future.”

As the hegemonic power, the United States has attempted to deal with Iran concerning many issues, but due to Iran's lack of willingness to cooperate, the two nations clash. Iran's main objective is to be recognized as a stabilizing force, but it will not be able to reach its goal if it continuously challenges the United States. As the Office of the Director of National Intelligence's *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds* explains "Potential Black Swans That Would Cause The Greatest Disruptive Impact": Nuclear powers such as Russia and Pakistan and potential aspirants such as Iran and North Korea see nuclear weapons as compensation for other political and security weaknesses, heightening the risk of their use. The chance of non state actors conducting a cyber attack-or using WMD-also is increasing. For example, Hezbollah, an Iranian terrorist organization based in Lebanon that predominantly counters Israeli desires has the potential to further expand operations throughout the world. As noted on the Council on Foreign Relations website:

- The U.S State Department designated Hezbollah a Foreign Terrorist Organization in October 1997, and believes the group operates terrorist cells in Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In 2010, the Obama administration described Hezbollah as "the most technically capable terrorist group in the world." With Iranian sponsorship, "Hezbollah's terrorist activity has reached a tempo unseen since the 1990s," said a 2013 State
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Department fact sheet. Several major terrorist operations across the globe have been attributed to Hezbollah or its affiliates, though the group disputes involvement in many.²⁹

This particular terrorist organization also has the ability to use cyber technologies against enemies. As the proliferation of cyber weapons expands, it will become much easier for such organizations to hack, and attack state securities; leaving them vulnerable. Hezbollah is also thought to possess thousands of rockets; including the AT-14 Kornet, Fajr-3,5; Zelzal and even some surface to air missile systems.³¹

As wars have become less about casualties, shifting to economic and financial devastation, utilizing smaller groups, or cells in conflict is also increasing. Ward Carroll explains that, "a 2002 CIA report warned a number of terrorist groups are beginning to plan

attacks on western computer networks. The report went on to say that al-Qaeda and Hezbollah were becoming more adept at using the internet and computer technologies. In more recent reports they name Sunni extremists Hezbollah and Aleph as groups believed to be developing cyber terrorism plans. For terrorist groups, cyber weapons are cheap, easy to acquire and difficult to detect or track and are quickly becoming a common weapon in their arsenal.”

Such states (i.e. Iran, North Korea, Russia, and China) have the highest potential to hire terrorist organizations. In correlation, the current clandestine cyber war between Iran and the United States illustrates the capabilities that these states, and terrorist organizations possess. Iran has became

---
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the new Nazi regime, and its determination to rid the world of Jews is equally met by its desire for global domination.

34 In addition, Iran (as well as North Korea) have a habit of hiding ground activity, and they know when to do so because the Russians and Chinese use communications to inform the two states. Ariel Cohen precautions the Obama administration regarding Russia's military modernization by stating:

- The most important step that the Obama Administration can take in light of Russia’s growing military power is to increase intelligence gathering on Russian military modernization and strategic and tactical goals, programs, and plans. The Administration should also pay closer attention to the dynamics of Russian technical–military cooperation with other countries (arms and military-technology sales); maintain the U.S. military budget at 4 percent of gross domestic product (GDP); continue U.S. military modernization, including the nuclear arsenal and missile defense; and expand military cooperation with NATO allies and partners, especially those in the former Soviet Union.35


U.S. global surveillance is a necessary tool for intelligence services. Expansion of U.S. satellite coverage; rivaling the technological advances of Russia, Iran, and China; and bolstering the U.N.'s early warning and conflict management strategies, are three important measures that must take place.

Another future international opponent of U.S. hegemonic power, China, was once a vast empire, also possesses the capabilities and the desire to rise to great global power. China has built advanced destroyers, large numbers of missile-armed diesel submarines, and its first aircraft carrier, all backed up by shore-based combat aircraft and anti-ship missiles able to strike hundreds of miles out to sea. A game-changer, according to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence's *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds*, in regards to the "Potential For Increased Conflict": Three different baskets of risks could conspire to increase the chances of an outbreak of interstate conflict: changing calculations of key players-particularly China, India, and Russia; increasing contention over resource issues; and a wider spectrum of more accessible instruments of war. With the potential for increased proliferation and growing concerns about nuclear security, risks are growing that future wars in South Asia and the Middle East would risk inclusion of a nuclear deterrent.36

Iran, Russia, and China have a goal of building their empires back up, and with a little help from their North Korean friend, feel keen in doing so. All four states have a perception that the current leadership of the United States is too weak to counter such actions directly. The United States must maintain global dominance in order for such conspiring foes to act on any form of aggression towards western powers. *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds* suggests,
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"how the United States' international role evolves during the next 15-20 years-a big uncertainty-and whether the US will be able to work with new partners to reinvent the international system will be among the most important variables in the future shape of global order. Although the United States' (and the West's) relative decline vis-a-vis the rising states is inevitable, its future role in the international system is much harder to project: the degree to which the US continues to dominate the international system could vary widely.\textsuperscript{37}

Lastly, this analysis provides only potential outcomes. Due to the lengthy research that has been conducted, and concluding that democracy is fundamental for global stabilization; U.S. hegemonic influence paves the way. Although the future is unwritten, man is well-versed in what becomes of an empire. War is not a thing of the past, but technological advancements and peacekeeping operations combined may adapt brilliantly, and will be an essential deterrent to all-out war.