

Defence and offence
are interchangeable terms
in the global arena

Outline

I. Introduction:

Although some optimists believe that modern international law has successfully segregated the terms defence and offence, in reality protectionist policies, pre-emptive strikes, and populist rhetorics have blurred the line between these terminologies.

II. Comprehending 'defence' in the global arena:

- Realist school of thought
- Liberalist school of thought

III. Defining 'offence' through international law:

- Article 2(4)
- Article 51

IV. Why ^{have} defence and offence become interchangeable terms in the global arena?

a) Exacerbation of populist rulers
Case in point: Third tenure of Narendra Modi and second tenure of Donald Trump

b) Global South empowerment driving Western assertiveness
Case in point: CSIS research, named 'Paradigm Shift of America' highlights the aggressive moves of Donald Trump

c) Blurring the line between offence and defence due to technological transformation

Case in point:

Project Maven (US DoD) AI project to analyze drone footage, initially defensive but later used for offensive strikes in Afghanistan.

V. How ^{are} defence and offence ~~are~~ interchangeably used in modern

world?

- a) Pre-emptive strikes : a source of oppression

Case in point: In 2003, America attacked on Iraq, claiming Saddam Hussain possessed weapons of mass destruction: The Bush Doctrine.

- b) Using collective defence mechanisms as a tool of offence

Case in point:

NATO invoked Article 05 in War on Terror (2001 - 2021)

- c) Growing global terrorism by non-state actors, doing offence on the rhetoric of defence

Case in point:

In 2013, Pakistan Ulama Council publicly condemned Al-Qaeda activities, contending that they are mis-interpreting Quranic verses.

- d) Shift. from global interdependency to protectionist policies

Case in point: European Union
'Immigrant Policy 2025' discourages
permanent residence

e) Harnessing nuclear weapons as —
deterrence

Case in point: Pakistan and India
used nuclear weapons as strategic
weapon in 2025 War.

f) Abandonment from climate ^{accords} for economic
defence rationale

Case in point: Donald Trump abandons
from Paris Agreement

VI. Case Studies ^{that} highlight the
interchanged policies for defence
and offence

a) Oppression of Israel on Gaza

The Russia-Ukraine War : A
b) symbol of admonition of self
defence

i. On which grounds, some argue that offence and defence are interchangeably used.

a) Segregated definition of offence and defence in international law

Rebuttal: Global powers are exploiting and mocking international law

b) Growing interdependency due to economic pacts

Rebuttal: Western-Southern divide is the most ^{offensive} ^{weapon} ^{contemporarily} in throughout the history

VIII. Ways to strengthen the boundaries between offence and defence

a) By following UN Charter at its best

b) By redefining the use of mass destruction weapons

c) By fighting collectively against
non-state insurgent groups.

IX. Conclusion

Your points are okay but refine your arguments in such a manner so that you can write them in 3 hours only
Don't bombard your outline with so much points that it become difficult to cover in an essay

Start your essay with strong attention grabber

READ RIGHT
INSTITUTE

BY
SYED TAIMOOR BUKHARI

The contemporary Westphalian world order has emerged on humanitarian grounds, segregating offensive colonial violence with nation state system. This new world order has clearly defined offence and defence in international law.

Unfortunately, in modern times, the segregation between these two has blurred due to populist exacerbation and unhinged technological transformation. For example, recent pre-emptive strikes from world leaders are done on the name of defence, turning to genocide. In addition, collective defence mechanism and protectionist policies, which are established for defence purposes, are now used for underlined offensive aims. Furthermore, terrorists

and non-state actors are also brainwashing the new inductees by saying that "offence is the right path to defend." Moreover, Gazans and Ukrainians are the real time victims of this blurriness between offence and defence. However, a few optimists believe that global interdependence strengthens inter-state relations. In reality, recent developments in global arena falsify this argument. This essay demonstrates how defence and offence are interchangeably used globally.

Before delving into the topic that offence and defence are interchangeable in global arena, it is better to comprehend these terminologies. Although the

definition of defence
changed by the time.
In modern international law,
defence is majorly comprehended
to protect the external
and internal sovereignty of
a state. For that, states
use the tool of deterrence,
deliberation and retaliation. In
fifth world warfare, soft
diplomacy, track-II diplomacy
and digital awareness constitutes
an eminent role in defence
system.

On the contrary, offence
contains altogether different
lexicological definition. According to UN,
offence is used to
exploit someone's fundamental
rights while defence is
to protect their rights. In
international law, Article 2(4)
and Article 51 of UN

Clarify your argument here ...

How has the charter defined the term

Charter successfully segregate the definition of offence and defence. Article 2(4) highlights the rights of combat, non combats and prisoners of war. And Article 51 defines the circumstance in which one state can attack in pre-emptive strike. These laws have comprehended the difference between offence and defence.

Undoubtedly, defence and offence are interchangeably used in global arena. The reason behind this blurriness is the exacerbation of populist leader. In recent elections, nearly 70% of the world population is governed by populist leaders. For example, third tenure of Narindra Modi, Netanyahu and Erdgun, and second

tenure of Donald Trump demonstrate that ~~the~~ global many of the global leaders are populists. Populist leaders use populist rhetorics like Hitler did. In fulfilling these Utopian dreams, they overrule international law, blurring the line between offence and defence. This demonstrates how populist leaders exploit others on the name of defence.

Furthermore, economic, technological and developmental difference between Global West and Global South is decreasing, driving western assertiveness. In recent years, countries like China, Russia, India and Brazil, Singapore, Indonesia and other Asean countries has grown tremendously.

It disturbs the global unipolar world system. To regain their superiority, western countries exploit the global supply chain; for example, European Union's Carbon Tax, named DDO^{was} made for climate protection^{initially}. But it is now ^{used} for trade exploitation. Because of this, countries like Pakistan, cannot export their goods without paying extra taxes. This is ultimately a pitfall in competitive market. This shows the western biasedness beneath their defensive policies.

In addition, world is rapidly transforming in technological domains, blurring the line between offence and defence. State leaders contend that technological

transformations in military are happening to improve defence structure, in reality, these new innovations are using for oppression. For example, US Project Maven is an AI based project, established to analyze drone footage initially, But later it was used for offensive strikes in Afghanistan. This demonstrates that technological transformations indeed has blurred the line between offence and defence.

The real time manifestations of these causes are the following. First, pre-emptive strikes are used as a source of oppression. Although in public forums, states which exploit doctrine of self-defence portray it as a defence mechanism.

case studies highlights

their underlined offensive aims. For example, in 2003, America attacked on Iraq, claiming Saddam Hussain possessed weapons of mass destruction. In reality, there were no WMD weapons there. Chilcot Report 2016 (UK) concluded that the intelligence was either manipulated or exaggerated. This demonstrates how self-defence doctrine exploits innocent ones on

Furthermore, states use collective defence mechanisms as a tool of offence. While these agreements are signed for defence purposes, their practical applications illustrate that defence and offence are interchangeable terms in global arena. For example,

NATO invoked its ^{own} Article
OS law, the Article OS,
in War on Terror. Article
OS of NATO constitutes
its Purpose of
establishment.

This demonstrates
that some defence organizations
revoke their own laws
and participate in offensive
activities.

In addition, terrorist
groups and non-state actors
brainwash their descendents
by saying that "offence is
last resort of defence."
They manipulate them by
spreading disinformation. For
example an 8 year old
boy caught in Islamabad,
who was planning for a
suicide bomb attack. When
government representatives asked
him the reason, he replied

that "I am doing the noblest deed; This leads me towards Jannat". This story was published in Dawn News in 2022.

Because of these types of incidents, Pakistan Ulama Council has condemned these activities contending jihad is different from terrorism. Jihad is for self defence and terrorism is for to oppress. This

proves how non-state actors exploit people on the name of defence.

Meanwhile, global interdependency is started replacing by protectionist policies. Although world leaders promote these protectionist policies by asserting that they are doing it for to promote indigenous industries, in reality, these policies become a weapon against immigrants

and foreign trade. For Example, European Union New Immigrant Policy discourages permanent residence. In addition, they put extra tariffs on exports. They proclaim that these taxes and levies are for climate protection. However, a report of Zurich School of economics posits that the underlined purposes behind these new policies are to manipulate the market. Hence, protectionist policies, are aiming for defence, are creating offence in global arena.

Furthermore, states harness nuclear power to defend themselves in global arena, but in reality, it becomes an exploitative machinery to blackmail and threaten others. While nuclear

mass destruction weapon
usage treaty clearly states
that its usage as a defence
mechanism only, some states
like North Korea, and India
and ~~Pakis~~ use it to
threaten their opponents. In
recent Pakistan - India War,
both countries used nuclear
weapon as a tool of diplomacy.
India attacked on Pakistan
constantly because they knew
that world leaders never
permit Pakistan to use
mass destruction weapons. This
demonstrates how nuclear weapon
use as an offensive tool
in modern world.

In addition, world
leaders withdraw their states
from climate accords. Inil contending
that they are doing
it to . reduce their
economic burden. Resultantly,

SYED TAIMOOR BUKHARI

This step harms the global climate. For Example, President Trump twice withdrew America from Paris Agreement. This leads to significant delays in the 'Vision 2030' of Paris Agreement. This demonstrates how defence and offence are interchangeably used in global arena.

Contemporary world is a perfect example to comprehend the blurriness between defence and offence. Forexample, the Oppression of Israel on Gazans reflects the offence of Israelis. Although the stance of Israel is to protect their people from Hamas attacks, on the contrary, they are doing genocide; an offensive mean to fulfill their

defensive aim. In Israel
Gaza War, almost 50,000
Gazans have died, and
no one knows how
more have to sacrifice

It. In international media,
prime minister Netanyahu ^{has} portrayed
this as "casualties", happening
in self defence. This case
study demonstrates how
offence and defence are
using interchangeably nowadays.

Furthermore, the Russia-
Ukraine war is also a
symbol of admonition of
self defence. Russia attacked
on Ukraine in 2022. Russia
gave the reason of self defence
in international media, but in reality,
Russia has killed thousands
of Ukrainians in this
pre-emptive strike. These
attacks are enough to

prove that modern world
has blurred the line
between offence and defence.

However, still after
all these arguments, a
few optimists believe that
defence and offence are
different from each
other in their theory and
action. In their defence,
they argue that, in international
law, definition of offence and
defence is completely segregated.
Although the international law
defines defence and offence as
two separate phenomenon,
in reality, states are exploiting
international law. These laws
are not implementing in their
true essence. For example,
Amre Donald Trump latest speech
on UN platform demonstrates
that international law is
now the "might is right".

He said, "UNO is only a burden on this world, ~~at~~ In preality, all wars ~~were~~ were stopped by me" When the custodian of UN says this, international law takes back seat. This demonstrates how international law is failed in differentiating between defence and offence in the battleground.

Furthermore, some optimists argue that global interdependency makes a mechanism where all countries are attached with each other, aiming for global defence rather than exploitation of human rights. Although the world trajectory is on a globalized world, economic and social biasedness has been seen by the western

countries. A core-periphery divide has been created in recent years by western states such as America and EU-27. For example, "Make America Great Again" campaign and protectionist policies in America are the evident examples to demonstrate that America is using protectionist policies as a source of offence. This shows how defence and offence are the synonyms of to each other in global arena.

Despite these issues, modern world can be a global family by fulfilling following way forwards. First, All states should follow UN charter theoretically and practically. By doing

this, states can easily differentiate between defence and offence. Furthermore, states should redefine their military policies regarding mass destruction weapons. Because nuclear weapons and (MDW) mass destruction weapons should only be used for defensive purposes. Through this, a distinguished line can be drawn between offence and defence.

In addition, all states should fight collectively against non-state insurgent groups. Contemporarily, due to politico-economic benefits states hesitate to or share their intelligence with each other. For example, according to a documentary made by US

military stated that America knows about terrorist attacks, of held in Islamabad airport in 2015. For strategic benefit, they avoided sharing that information with Pakistan's government.

If all governments sign a charter of humanity to protect the world collectively, it will help in reducing terrorist activities globally.

In conclusion, arguments and case studies prove that defence and offence are interchangeable terms in modern world, happening due to political polarization and technological transformation, exacerbating terrorist activities and extremism in world. Although this bluness is detrimental for

modern world, there is
always a hope. But
a hope only with
words is just a
rhetoric. Therefore, to
segregate defence and
offence in battleground, states
should sign a charter
of humanity and follow
United Nation's Humanitarian
laws. These way forwards
will catalyze the separation
between defence and
offence.
