

Peer Review

Review of: "Digital Security for a Nonviolent Defence System"

Matthew J. Flynn¹

1. War Studies, Marine Corps University, Quantico Station, United States

Does non-violence mean peace? And, is digital defense non-violence?

Also, related to answers to these questions, the argument appears to compartmentalize domains; digital realities lead to information warfare, and that circulates best among cyberspace/social media realities, augmenting or dwarfing existing channels of communication. Any information war becomes paramount and produces a standalone battlefield divorced from the physical reality of war? Or only integration across domains matters, and war continues to be dominant, even violent? In sum, little changes in the new age?

Integration and cross-domain considerations all point to 'systems', repeated frequently in the paper. What are systems, and can your definition better make the point that ... what, balance, harmony, oscillation, all of these considerations matter a great deal. The world can get to better collective security if, what, civilians are more in charge, keeping military actors and thinking in check? This civ-mil imbalance has finally come to where civilians dictate the terms, a long progression arrived at only given technological developments?

Essentially, the paper argues, or can argue, that peace must be included in any discussion of what war is. To argue that war matters most in terms of state/government actions, well, this paper refutes that notion; it is but a notion. I would make this difference the key significance of the paper.

In this light, the paper calls for the atomization of the international community, i.e., shared power among small nations and corporations that enjoy standing along the lines of more powerful nations? One can assume non-violence gets the world to more peace; is that not the aim?

This paper works best when social defense is best explained as where it is now and what technology is doing to it. A better review of key literature would help in this regard. Nonviolent, community resistance

should not be considered war, but something else, and something thwarting war? Or it is resistance, nonviolent, but very much war? The paper sets up this worthwhile question/issue, and the answer is ... ?

Key literature is hard to pin down: Civ-mil literature, writing related to cyber realities, analysis addressing how to stop authoritarianism, i.e., a better-informed population will blunt this tendency, something social media has revealed as a questionable premise? Best to state that there is a need to cast a wide net and make clear the paper is getting this evaluation started. The need to go down this path [the paper makes this clear] is best served by now seeking the key literature [that comes next in another...book?].

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.