

Make your sentences more meaningful by writing in a simple

IS WAR INEVITABLE IN A WORLD OF COMPETING INTERESTS?

OUTLINE

1- Introduction

- Competing interests can be different in nature
- Competing interests create a realist environment and pitches nations against each other
- This makes war an inevitable reality despite modern resolution mechanisms

2- Different kinds of competing interests that eventually lead to war

3- War's inevitability amidst competing interests

3.1 Irrendist claims over a territory spark armed clashes

↳ Pakistan and India engaging in multiple wars over Kashmir

↳ Armenia and Azerbaijan heightened conflict

3.2 Competing sides within a religion
stirs an engaging responsibility to finish
the other side

↳ The bloody 30 war between Catholics
and Protestants

↳ The contemporary Shia-Sunni bloc of
Iran and K.S.A engaged in war.

3.3 Thirst for regional hegemony results in
deployment of troops and preparation
of war

↳ Strings of Pearls vs Diamond
Necklace

3.4 Economic competition translates into
show of military poweress leading to
war

↳ Military build up in South China
Sea

3.5 Ideological differences ignite the need
for containment

↳ Cold War theatre.

3.6 Civil wars are a prime example of
competing interests resulting in war

↳ 1971 war post competing interests for the Government of Pakistan.

3.7 Competing interests trigger egos of individuals and push them to go beyond fair practices

↳ Netanyahu's genocide for the Greater Israel.

4- Refuting the claim that modern world can sustain competing interests without war

4.1 Opponents claim that institutions ensure a collaborative world

Rebuttal: International institutions haven't been able to resolve any major war points that arise due to competing interests.

↳ UN hasn't resolved the Kashmir dispute

4.2 Economic competition is the new reality instead of battle grounds

Rebuttal: Even in the contemporary world, economic competition leads to military build up.

↳ Military build up in the South
China Sea followed by Naval
Exercises.

5- Conclusion

- Competing interests are bound to result in war. ✓
- The solution is complementing interests. ✓

Give synthesis or way forward for your claim

Add more number of arguments

Competition and competing interests drive a wedge between people and nations. Eyeing to achieve any target or superiority in any area tends to bring out egoistic tendencies. All other elements become secondary and succeeding in that particular endeavour becomes the ultimate goal. This reality is embodied by many nations and empires throughout history. Unfortunately, despite dispute resolution mechanisms, the phenomenon still prevails.

Competing interests could be varying in nature; however conquering the foot of one particular side becomes the aim, hence war becomes inevitable when there are competing interests. War's idea originates from establishing a superior position in case of competing interests. The competition ideologies drove the world into the cold war. Assumption of being the flagbearers of a certain religion ensues the same. Other forms of competition that lead to conflict are the race for global and regional hegemony. Involved nations resort to armed skirmishes and military buildup. However, the resolve to compete over an area of land, with multiple irrenditist claims also makes the claimants go to any lengths in order to secure

what is the result. In recent times, the world also sees economic competition shaping itself to become a cause for defence expansion ultimately resulting in war. The current global facade of liberalism makes many believe against the inevitability of war, but despite economic ties and advent of institutions, the element of war prevails. Competition is bound to increase an environment of war, which makes war inevitable in the presence of competing interests.

Competing interests can be many. In current global scenario, avenues of competition have increased. Being ahead in terms of technology, modern economy are just few of the new additions. Different ideologies and ensuring their spread is a very important competing paradigm as it establishes the position in world order. Competition also overpowers religious spheres of influence where different sects compete for the dominant position through war. Geographical differences serve as the age old arena of competing

interests. The phenomenon also spreads to the obvious aim for hegemony whether it be regional or global.

The areas of competing interests are immense. War becomes an unfortunate consequence of these. The next section of the essay will highlight the increased chances of war amidst situations of competing interests.

Irridentist claims over a territory by two nations are a manifestation of competing interests that spark war. Irridentism is a situation whereby two nations opt a piece of land with similar zeal and enthusiasm. Such is the case of India and Pakistan in the Kashmir dispute and this has resulted in multiple wars between the two states. Eyes on the same prize often manufactures such situation. The Azerbaijan - Armenia conflict is again a similar situation, displaying that similar claims over a certain territory create war.

Two sides within a religion also come across varied competing interests, creating a bitter rivalry and leading to war. Different sects of a religion feel like they are the rightful followers, the element of religion also sparks a burning passion within the public to compete for ideological dominance. In the 17th century, Europe saw its bloodiest thirty year war because of the rivalry between Catholics and Protestants. In modern day, Iran and Saudi Arab are doing the same whilst engaging different countries into the war. What ever the ulterior motive may be, however both claim that they are fighting to keep the flag of Islam in safe hands. Even though this fight still prevails, it has been present ever since the formal spread of Islam. Hence it is evident that religious competing interests have resulted in wars quite often.

Thirst for regional hegemony also opens up multiple avenues of competition. Competing interests of this kind often lead to military engagement. The Indo-China dynamic has always

been present in Asia. The competition for regional hegemony has led these countries to war in the past and even today the tensions continue. China's positioning of String of Pearls to quite literally surround India, has pushed India to start a similar endeavour with the name Diamond necklace. Both these chain of ports are basically naval installations for military buildup, if any party tries to take lead. Competing interests in the form of regional hegemony also eventually lead to war because the balance of power is often short lived.

Even though competing interests have now evolved; economic growth is given importance, but even that translates into military buildup. Economic competition does not only involve economic attacks, instead 5th generation warfare is practiced whereby multiple targets are hit, which involves military as well. Despite advent of soft threats, power still resort to military buildup and attacks. Increased military installations and practices in the South China Sea show the inevitability of war even during

a differently natured competing interest. The Sino West tensions have had nothing to do with military but their conflict has translated into preparation for war. China also aims to make the strongest army worldwide by 2050. This displays the eventuality of and international competing relationship turning into war.

Like economic competition; ideological competition has nothing directly linked to need of war, however, ideological differences ignite the need for containment. The ideological difference between USA and USSR engulfed the entire world in the cold war theatre.

Even though both countries were on the similar side in the world wars; post world war world presented them with competing interests of ideological expansion and becoming drivers of the world order. Hence both engaged in the cold war; taking countless lives, damaging multiple economies and causing many social problems. The cold war explains how ideological competing interests can

lead to one of the deadliest wars.

Civil wars also emerge due to competing interests of citizens in a country. The 1971 war emerged due to non alignment of East Pakistani citizens with the West Pakistani elite.

A belief regarding subjugation of power surfaced. Initially protests and negotiations took place but ultimately war became inevitable. It is believed the resistance stems from conflict of interest, the party being resisted against solemnly hands over the desired power. Eventually the result is war as it is the ultimate physical solution to decide the outcome of competing interests.

Divergence of opinion and competition also triggers ego's of people in power. Competing interests triggers ego's to go to any lengths in order to achieve their desired outcome.

Such is the example of Benjamin Netanyahu's greater Israel plan. The ownership rights of Jerusalem have been a long standing issue. The Muslims and Jews both believe the place to be their holy site along with Christians. The

current scenario of the area is all out war and mass genocide by the Israeli army. United States blatantly refuses to vote for immediate ceasefire in the UN, because of its support for Israel.

Ceasefire and two state solution is rejected because the Israel of today wants complete control of Jerusalem and the formation of greater Israel. The game of competing interests hardly ever reaches a consensual compromise, instead, it ignites heightened ego to achieve it all through war.

There are multiple competing interests that involve entities around the world. In most cases the unhealthy competition and the aim to defy self interest pushes actors to war for a final decision. Despite this reality some still claim that the modern world can sustain competing interests without war. The next section of the essay will address these claims.

Opponents claim that institutions in the modern world ensure collaboration, however

international institutions have not been able to do so. The rationale behind the creation of international institutions was essentially ensuring peace. League of Nations was an organization formed for similar reasons after the first destructive world war. The United Nations, its improved forms, aims to do the same. Liberal academia also suggests the role of institutions in stopping war. However the reality is strikingly different; these institutions have not been able to resolve any wars erupting out of competing interests, nor have they been able to actively solve the discourse around it. UN hasn't been able to mitigate the situation in Kashmir, despite the military build up and chance of Kashmir presents. There have already been multiple wars on the issue of Kashmir with a looming threat of another. Hence, the advent of institutions has not been able to avoid war in under circumstances of competing interests.

It is also argued that economic competition is the new reality not battle grounds, however in reality, economic competition also

leads to military buildup. Even though contemporary times have economy as the forerunner of any state or government, but the defacto deterrence and use of military is still widespread. USA and China have an ongoing trade war which should be confined to conflicting interests in the economic zone. The military buildup in the South China sea followed by Naval exercises of both reveals the inevitability of war in the midst of any competing interest.

In conclusion, it can be seen that competing interests are bound to result in war. War is seen as the ultimate tool to achieve any interest with existing contenders. Show of force and physical fight are perceived to eventually determine the victor. The solution is increasing ~~competing~~ complementing interests between states for collaboration. Parties are bound to encourage each other if its' win favours all others as well and not the vice versa.

Concluding paragraph should be more comprehensive