

**ISIR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISIRJAHSS)**
ISSN: 3048-7463 (Online)
Frequency: Bimonthly
Published By ISIR Publisher
Journal Homepage Link- https://isirpublisher.com/index.php/isirjahss

# Understanding James O. Kievit's Contributions to contemporary defence and strategic studies; Ideas, Influence, and Legacy.

**By**

**Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D[1], Tukura Daudu Fwaje Ph.D[2], Utaji Idi James s[3], Ezikiel Dauda[4],**

[1,2,3,4]Department of Political Science Federal University Wukari, Taraba State Nigeria.

**Article History**

*Received: 08/05/2026*
*Accepted: 27/06/2026*
*Published: 13/07/2026*

**Vol – 3 Issue – 4**

*PP: -19-24*

***Abstract***

*Contemporary defence studies have undergone substantial transformation in response to the complex and multidimensional security challenges that define the twenty-first century security environment. This article examines the scholarly and strategic contributions of James O. Kievit, a United States Army officer and strategist affiliated with the Strategic Studies Institute of the United States Army War College, as a representative figure in this evolving field. Employing a qualitative, analytically oriented methodology grounded in positivist international relations theory, the study situates Kievit's work within the broader theoretical tradition that extends from Clausewitz and Liddell Hart through to contemporary scholarship on asymmetric warfare, information operations, and the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA). The analysis demonstrates that Kievit's conceptual contributions particularly his engagement with information warfare, low-intensity conflict, and military transformation retain significant analytical purchase in addressing contemporary threats including terrorism, cyber warfare, and hybrid conflict. The article identifies both the enduring strengths of Kievit's framework and its limitations in the face of technological and geopolitical developments that postdate its original formulation. It concludes with recommendations for governments, military institutions, and scholars seeking to build upon and extend this intellectual tradition. The article contributes to ongoing debates in contemporary defence studies regarding the relationship between classical strategic theory and the operational demands of modern conflict.*

***Keywords:*** *defence studies, James O. Kievit, information operations, asymmetric warfare, Revolution, Military Affairs*

## INTRODUCTION

It is imperative to understand that, the study of defence and strategy occupies a foundational position within the broader field of political science specifically international relations. Historically, from the Napoleonic era analyses of Carl von Clausewitz to the twentieth-century theorizations of André Beaufre and Basil Liddell Hart, strategic thought has persistently grappled with the relationship between political objectives and the organised application of force (Clausewitz, 1966; Beaufre, 1965; Hart, 1967). The post-Cold War international order, however, has imposed conditions upon strategic analysis that bear little resemblance to the interstate conflicts from which classical theory emerged. The proliferation of non-state actors, the weaponisation of information environments, the emergence of cyber warfare as a domain of strategic competition, and the hybridisation of conventional and unconventional military methods have collectively demanded a fundamental rethinking of both strategic doctrine and the scholarly frameworks that underpin it.

Contemporary defence studies, as an interdisciplinary field bridging military history, international relations theory, security studies, and strategic analysis, has responded to these demands through a sustained process of conceptual innovation. Scholars and practitioners have extended classical theoretical frameworks into new domains while simultaneously developing novel analytical categories suited to the complexities of twenty-first-century conflict. Among the figures who have made significant contributions to this enterprise is James O. Kievit, a United States Army officer and strategist who, working primarily from the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) of the United States Army War College during the 1990s and early 2000s, produced a body of work that addressed some of the most pressing and prescient security questions of the contemporary era.

*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

The research problem motivating this article is the relative underappreciation of Kievit's intellectual contributions within contemporary defence studies scholarship, notwithstanding the persistent relevance of the themes he addressed. The objectives of this study are threefold: first, to situate Kievit's work within the established theoretical traditions of strategic thought; second, to evaluate the analytical purchase of his key conceptual contributions information operations, asymmetric warfare, and military transformation in addressing contemporary security challenges; and third, to identify the strengths, limitations, and contemporary applications of his intellectual framework. The guiding research questions are: (a) What theoretical foundations underpin Kievit's strategic contributions? (b) How do his contributions advance the study and practice of contemporary defence? And (c) What is the enduring relevance of his framework to twenty-first-century security challenges including terrorism, cyber warfare, and hybrid threats?

The article proceeds as follows. The second section offers conceptual clarifications of the key terms employed throughout the analysis. The third section outlines the theoretical framework and applies it to Kievit's contributions. The fourth section addresses the qualitative methodology underpinning the study. The fifth and central section provides a thematic analysis of Kievit's contributions across information warfare, asymmetric conflict, and the RMA, including a critical evaluation of strengths and limitations. The sixth section presents policy-oriented recommendations, and the concluding section synthesises the principal findings and gestures toward future research directions.

## Conceptual Clarification

Analytical rigour requires that the principal concepts deployed in this study be clearly defined and operationalised. Five concepts are foundational to the argument that follows.

**Defence studies**, as understood here, refers to the interdisciplinary academic and applied field concerned with the theory and practice of organised military force in the service of political objectives, encompassing strategy, security policy, military organisation, and the relationship between armed forces and civilian governance (Baylis et al., 2019). It is distinguished from security studies by its more explicit focus on military dimensions of security, though the two fields are substantially overlapping.

**Strategic thought** denotes the systematic intellectual effort to understand and guide the relationship between means and ends in the pursuit of political objectives through or in the shadow of organised violence (Gray, 2010). It encompasses both the theoretical frameworks through which strategists conceptualise conflict and the practical doctrines and concepts that translate theory into operational guidance.

**Information operations** (IO) refers to coordinated actions taken to affect adversary information, information-based processes, information systems, and decision-making, while protecting one's own information and information systems (U.S. Department of Defense, 2012). IO encompasses psychological operations, electronic warfare, deception, computer network operations, and the management of the broader information environment. In Kievit's framework, IO is understood not merely as a tactical tool but as a dimension of strategic competition in its own right.

**Asymmetric warfare** describes armed conflict in which the opposing parties differ substantially in military capability, operational doctrine, or strategic culture, such that the weaker party seeks to exploit vulnerabilities and avoid direct military confrontation with the stronger (Metz & Johnson, 2001). Asymmetric strategies include guerrilla warfare, terrorism, cyber attacks, and information operations all of which have become central features of contemporary conflict.

**The Revolution in Military Affairs** (RMA) refers to a fundamental and rapid change in the character of warfare resulting from the innovative application of new technologies, which, combined with dramatic changes in military doctrine and operational and organisational concepts, fundamentally alters the character and conduct of military operations (Cohen, 1996). The RMA concept gained particular prominence in the 1990s as analysts sought to understand the implications of information technology for military power and strategic competition.

## Theoretical Framework and Application

The theoretical analysis in this article draws upon three interrelated theoretical traditions: Clausewitzian theory, the indirect approach as elaborated by Liddell Hart and Beaufre, and contemporary asymmetric warfare theory. These frameworks are applied directly to Kievit's contributions and linked to the realities of modern conflict.

Clausewitz's (1966) foundational framework rests on the concept of war as a continuation of political intercourse by other means, animated by the interaction of rational policy, chance and probability, and popular passion. This triadic conception of war sometimes rendered as the "remarkable trinity" establishes that war is irreducibly political and therefore must always be evaluated against the political objectives it serves. Applied to Kievit's contributions, the Clausewitzian framework reveals the theoretical coherence of his insistence that information operations and asymmetric strategies be understood and evaluated in political rather than purely military terms. The information environment, in Kievit's conception, is a domain of political contestation as much as military competition, and its management must therefore be governed by the logic of political objectives rather than purely operational considerations.

The indirect approach, elaborated by Liddell Hart (1967) in opposition to the attrition-focused doctrine that had characterised the First World War, holds that the most effective strategic path to the objective is rarely the most direct. By dislocating the adversary's psychological equilibrium, exploiting vulnerabilities, and avoiding costly direct confrontations, the strategist can achieve decisive results with a minimum of effort and loss. Beaufre (1965) extended this logic into the nuclear age, recognising that the

*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

prohibition on direct great-power conflict imposed by mutual assured destruction necessitated reliance on indirect strategies of limited war, deterrence, and subversion. Kievit's work on information operations and asymmetric conflict applies this theoretical tradition to the post-Cold War context, recognising that non-state actors and revisionist states alike have come to rely on indirect approaches precisely because direct military confrontation with the United States and its allies is strategically prohibitive.

Contemporary asymmetric warfare theory, as developed by Metz and Johnson (2001) and others, provides the third theoretical pillar. This literature extends classical strategic thought by providing analytical frameworks specifically suited to the study of conflicts between actors of markedly unequal capability. It highlights the strategic rationality of asymmetric approaches, the vulnerabilities they exploit in stronger adversaries, and the conceptual and institutional challenges they pose for conventionally organised military forces. Kievit's framework is theoretically coherent with and contributes to this literature by providing operationally specific guidance on how to understand and counter asymmetric threats in the information age.

Together, these three theoretical frameworks establish a coherent intellectual context within which Kievit's contributions can be evaluated. They share a common emphasis on the primacy of political objectives, the importance of psychological and informational dimensions of conflict, and the need for strategic flexibility in the face of adaptive adversaries — all themes that are central to Kievit's work.

## Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, analytically oriented research design, drawing primarily on secondary sources. The choice of methodology is appropriate to the study's objectives, which are interpretive and evaluative rather than empirical in the quantitative sense: the aim is to assess the theoretical coherence, analytical purchase, and contemporary relevance of Kievit's contributions rather than to test falsifiable hypotheses.

The research design is structured around a framework of thematic analysis, in which Kievit's contributions are organised into analytically distinct themes information warfare, asymmetric conflict, and the RMA and evaluated against both the theoretical frameworks outlined above and the empirical record of contemporary security challenges. This approach allows for a systematic and comprehensive assessment of Kievit's work while maintaining the flexibility necessary to capture the nuances of his contributions.

Data sources comprise primary strategic texts produced by Kievit and his collaborators, particularly the monograph co-authored with Steven Metz for the SSI (Kievit & Metz, 1994), together with a corpus of secondary scholarly literature drawn from the fields of strategic studies, international relations, and security studies. These secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, and policy documents, selected for their relevance to the themes under analysis and their standing within the scholarly literature.

The analytical method is critical-interpretive: the study does not simply describe or paraphrase Kievit's arguments but subjects them to critical scrutiny, identifying both their strengths and their limitations in light of theoretical developments and empirical evidence that have emerged since their initial formulation. This critical orientation is consistent with the norms of rigorous scholarly analysis and with the objectives of a publication-oriented article.

**Analysis: Kievit's Contribution in the 21st Century**

**Information Warfare and the Battle for Perceptions**

Among Kievit's most analytically significant contributions is his sustained engagement with information operations as a domain of strategic competition. Writing in the early 1990s, at a moment when the information revolution was only beginning to be felt in the military domain, Kievit and Metz (1994) recognised that the transformation of the information environment would fundamentally alter the character of conflict. Their central argument that information superiority would become a decisive factor in determining military and political outcomes has been amply vindicated by subsequent developments.

The theoretical coherence of this argument rests on a Clausewitzian foundation. Clausewitz (1966) recognised that war is fought not only in the physical but in the psychological domain, and that the destruction of the adversary's will to resist is as strategically significant as the destruction of his physical capacity for resistance. Kievit extended this insight into the information age by arguing that the management of the information environment shaping adversary perceptions, protecting one's own information systems, and exploiting adversary informational vulnerabilities constitutes a form of strategic competition that can determine political outcomes independently of conventional military operations.

This argument connects with and anticipates subsequent scholarship. Hoffman's (2006) analysis of terrorism as a communicative strategy, designed to generate fear and influence political behaviour far beyond the immediate targets of violence, illustrates why the battle for perceptions is strategically central rather than peripheral. Crenshaw's (2007) examination of terrorist organisations' deliberate efforts to shape the information environment similarly underscores the prescience of Kievit's framework. More broadly, the role of information operations in contemporary hybrid warfare exemplified by Russian strategic doctrine and practice in Ukraine and elsewhere demonstrates that Kievit's insights are not historical curiosities but living analytical tools.

A critical evaluation of Kievit's information operations framework, however, reveals certain limitations. Writing before the advent of social media, algorithmic information dissemination, and the weaponisation of digital platforms, his analysis does not fully anticipate the decentralised and non-state character of information warfare in the contemporary environment. The rise of disinformation campaigns conducted not by state military establishments but by politically

*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

motivated civilian actors including private companies, ideologically motivated networks, and foreign intelligence services operating through non-military channels represents a domain that his framework addresses only in embryonic terms.

**Asymmetric Conflict and the Challenge of Non-State Actors**

A second major dimension of Kievit's contribution concerns the analysis of asymmetric conflict. His work, produced at a moment when American strategic planners were still largely oriented toward conventional state-on-state conflict, drew analytical attention to the strategic rationality and operational effectiveness of asymmetric approaches. By extending Liddell Hart's (1967) indirect approach concept to the context of post-Cold War low-intensity conflict, Kievit provided a theoretical framework for understanding why non-state actors and weaker states consistently opt for indirect strategies and why those strategies can prove strategically effective against conventionally superior adversaries.

The analytical relevance of this framework has been borne out by the experience of post-9/11 counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, where the United States and its allies discovered that overwhelming conventional military superiority was insufficient to achieve stable political outcomes against adversaries that exploited information environments, local population dynamics, and the political vulnerabilities of democratic publics. Kievit's framework, with its emphasis on the political and informational dimensions of asymmetric conflict, provides tools for understanding these dynamics that were conspicuously absent from the conventional military doctrine that dominated American strategic thinking in the early 2000s.

The connection between asymmetric conflict and the broader structure of the international system is also addressed in Kievit's framework. Kegley and Wittkopf (1999) have noted that the post-Cold War international system is characterised by the complex interaction of state and non-state actors in ways that traditional realist theory with its exclusive focus on states as primary units of analysis (Morgenthau, 1956) was ill-equipped to handle. Kievit's attention to non-state actors and sub-state conflict anticipates this theoretical development and provides an analytically sophisticated bridge between the realist tradition and the more pluralist approaches required by contemporary security realities.

Critically, however, Kievit's asymmetric warfare framework, as produced in the 1990s, did not fully engage with the ideological and transnational dimensions that have come to characterise contemporary non-state actor threats. The jihadist movements that emerged as the dominant non-state threat in the post-9/11 era operate across national boundaries, recruit globally, and generate ideological narratives that resist the purely strategic and operational analysis his framework privileges. The integration of sociological, theological, and anthropological perspectives on radicalisation and violent extremism represents a dimension of contemporary asymmetric conflict that extends beyond the boundaries of Kievit's original framework.

**The Revolution in Military Affairs and Military Transformation**

The third major dimension of Kievit's contribution is his engagement with the Revolution in Military Affairs and its implications for military organisation, doctrine, and strategy. His collaborative work with Metz (1994) was among the first systematic attempts to examine not merely the technological dimensions of the RMA but its broader social, political, and strategic implications. By insisting that the RMA represented a transformation not only in military hardware but in the social and organisational fabric of armed forces, Kievit and Metz anticipated subsequent debates about the relationship between technology, organisation, and strategic effectiveness.

The argument that technological transformation must be accompanied by corresponding changes in doctrine, organisation, and strategic culture has proven to be among the most enduring insights in contemporary defence studies. Cohen's (1996) analysis of the historical relationship between military innovation and organisational adaptation confirms that technological advantage is rarely self-realising: it requires institutional innovation and doctrinal creativity to be strategically effective. Kievit's framework, by insisting on the social and political dimensions of the RMA, provides precisely this broader analytical context.

The contemporary relevance of this contribution is evident in debates about the military applications of artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, and cyber capabilities. As defence establishments worldwide grapple with the strategic implications of these technologies, the conceptual framework established by Kievit and Metz — which insists that technological change must be understood in its social, political, and strategic dimensions — provides a useful analytical template. The challenge of transforming military organisations to exploit new technologies while avoiding the vulnerabilities that transformation itself can create remains as pressing as it was in the 1990s.

A critical limitation of Kievit's RMA analysis, however, is its anchoring in the specific context of American military dominance and the particular technological trajectory of the 1990s. The assumption that information superiority would provide an enduring strategic advantage has been complicated by the diffusion of information technologies to adversaries and by the demonstration in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya that information dominance does not translate automatically into stable political outcomes. The gap between tactical and operational military effectiveness, on one hand, and strategic and political success, on the other, is a dimension that subsequent scholarship has addressed but that Kievit's original framework treats insufficiently.

**Strategic Relevance Today: Terrorism, Cyber Warfare, and Hybrid Threats**

The contemporary strategic landscape is characterised by three overlapping threat categories that are directly relevant to Kievit's analytical framework: terrorism, cyber warfare, and

*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

hybrid threats. In each domain, Kievit's conceptual contributions provide a useful, if partial, analytical point of departure.

In the domain of terrorism, Kievit's emphasis on information operations and the battle for perceptions maps directly onto the communicative logic of contemporary terrorist organisations. Chaliand's (2007) historical survey demonstrates that the use of violence to communicate political messages is not new; what is distinctive about contemporary terrorism is the speed and global reach of information dissemination enabled by digital technology. Kievit's framework, which situates the management of the information environment at the centre of strategic analysis, provides exactly the conceptual tools needed to understand and counter this communicative dimension of contemporary terrorism.

In the domain of cyber warfare, Kievit's engagement with electronic warfare and information systems as domains of strategic competition anticipates, even if it does not fully theorise, the emergence of cyberspace as a contested strategic domain. The use of cyber operations to disrupt critical infrastructure, compromise military command and control, and shape adversary decision-making represents an extension of the information operations logic that Kievit developed, and his framework provides a useful conceptual foundation for the analysis of these contemporary challenges.

In the domain of hybrid warfare, the combination of conventional military force, irregular tactics, information operations, and economic coercion that characterises contemporary Russian and Chinese strategic approaches represents perhaps the most direct vindication of Kievit's analytical prescience. The integrated approach to conflict across multiple domains — kinetic and non-kinetic, military and civilian, information and physical — that hybrid warfare exemplifies is precisely the kind of complex, multidimensional strategic challenge that Kievit's framework was designed to illuminate.

## Recommendations

The preceding analysis generates a set of concrete, policy-oriented recommendations addressed to governments, military institutions, and scholars engaged with contemporary defence studies.

Governments should invest in the development and institutionalisation of comprehensive information operations doctrine that extends beyond the military domain to encompass the full spectrum of governmental activity, including diplomacy, development assistance, and public communications. The battle for perceptions identified by Kievit as central to contemporary conflict is not primarily a military contest; it requires whole-of-government coordination and the integration of capabilities across institutional boundaries. Governments should also develop legal and regulatory frameworks governing the use of information operations in peacetime, crisis, and conflict, ensuring that these powerful tools are employed in accordance with international law and democratic accountability norms.

Military institutions should undertake a systematic reassessment of doctrine, organisation, and training to ensure that the lessons of asymmetric conflict and the RMA identified by Kievit are fully incorporated into operational practice. This includes the development of dedicated information operations capabilities that are integrated into the full spectrum of military planning and operations, rather than treated as adjuncts to conventional military force. Military educational institutions, including war colleges and staff colleges, should incorporate the analysis of information operations, asymmetric conflict, and military transformation into their core curricula, ensuring that future officers are equipped with the conceptual tools necessary to navigate the complex strategic environment of the twenty-first century.

Scholars should undertake a systematic effort to update and extend Kievit's analytical framework in light of the technological and geopolitical developments that have occurred since its original formulation. This includes theorising the strategic implications of social media, artificial intelligence, and autonomous systems for information operations and asymmetric conflict; examining the intersection of cyber warfare and conventional military operations; and developing more refined accounts of the relationship between information superiority and political outcomes. There is also a need for comparative empirical research that systematically examines the effectiveness of information operations across different conflict contexts, adversary types, and political environments.

## Conclusion

This article has examined the scholarly and strategic contributions of James O. Kievit, situating them within the theoretical traditions of contemporary defence studies and evaluating their relevance to the security challenges of the twenty-first century. The analysis has demonstrated that Kievit's work particularly his engagement with information operations, asymmetric conflict, and the Revolution in Military Affairs constitutes a significant intellectual contribution to the field, one that anticipated many of the central preoccupations of contemporary strategic analysis.

By extending the foundational insights of Clausewitz, Liddell Hart, and Beaufre into the new domains of information warfare and low-intensity conflict, Kievit provided analytical tools that retain considerable purchase in understanding contemporary threats including terrorism, cyber warfare, and hybrid conflict. His insistence on the political and psychological dimensions of strategic competition, and his recognition that the information environment constitutes a domain of strategic contestation in its own right, have been amply vindicated by subsequent developments in strategic theory and operational practice.

The analysis has also identified limitations in Kievit's framework that future scholarship should address. These include the insufficient theorisation of decentralised, non-state information warfare; the incomplete engagement with the ideological and transnational dimensions of contemporary non-state actor threats; and the partial treatment of the gap

*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

between information superiority and political outcomes. These limitations do not diminish the significance of Kievit's contributions; rather, they define an agenda for future research that would extend and refine his analytical framework in light of subsequent developments.

Future research should prioritise three directions: first, the systematic empirical examination of information operations effectiveness across different conflict contexts; second, the theoretical integration of social media, artificial intelligence, and autonomous systems into existing frameworks of information warfare analysis; and third, the comparative study of how different states and non-state actors have adapted and applied the principles that Kievit articulated. The security challenges of the twenty-first century make the kind of synthetic, practically oriented strategic analysis that Kievit exemplifies more necessary than ever, and the field of contemporary defence studies would benefit from a renewed engagement with his intellectual legacy.

## References


1. Baylis, J., Wirtz, J. J., & Gray, C. S. (Eds.). (2019). Strategy in the contemporary world: An introduction to strategic studies (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
2. Beaufre, A. (1965). An introduction to strategy. Faber.
3. Chaliand, G. (2007). The history of terrorism: From antiquity to al Qaeda. University of California Press.
4. Clausewitz, C. von. (1966). On war (J. J. Graham, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1832)
5. Cohen, E. A. (1996). A revolution in warfare. Foreign Affairs, 75(2), 37–54.
6. Crenshaw, M. (2007). Terrorism and global security. In C. Crocker, F. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), Leashing the dogs of war: Conflict management in a divided world (pp. 67–90). United States Institute of Peace Press.
7. Diaz-Paniagua, C. F. (2008). Negotiating terrorism: The negotiation dynamics of four UN counter-terrorism treaties 1997–2005 [Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York].
8. Fukuyama, F. (1992). The end of history and the last man. The Free Press.
9. Gray, C. S. (2010). The strategy bridge: Theory for practice. Oxford University Press.
10. Hart, B. H. L. (1967). Strategy: The indirect approach (6th ed.). Faber.
11. Hoffman, B. (2006). Inside terrorism (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press.
12. Huntington, S. P. (1996). The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. Simon & Schuster.
13. Ikenberry, G. J. (2008). The rise of China and the future of the West. Foreign Affairs, 87(1), 23–37.
14. Kegley, C. W., & Wittkopf, E. R. (1999). World politics: Trend and transformation (7th ed.). Worth Publishers.
15. Kievit, J. O., & Metz, S. (1994). The revolution in military affairs and conflict short of war. Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College.
16. Metz, S., & Johnson, D. V. (2001). Asymmetry and U.S. military strategy: Definition, background, and strategic concepts. Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College.
17. Morgenthau, H. J. (1956). Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace (3rd ed.). Alfred A. Knopf.
18. Ojo, O., & Sesay, A. (2002). Concepts in international relations. Classy Prints & Company.
19. Thompson, K. W. (1960). Political realism and the crisis of world politics. Princeton University Press.
20. U.S. Department of Defense. (2012). Information operations (Joint Publication 3-13). https://www.jscs.mil/Doctrine/Joint-Doctrine-Pubs/3-0-Operations-Series/


*Corresponding Author: **Johnkennedy T. Ikyase Ph.D.**

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.