

Topic: Great Nations win without fighting

1) Introduction

- a) Hook
- b) General Statement
- c) Thesis.

2) How Great Nations win without fighting

- a) Strategic Diplomacy and negotiations.
- b) Economic Dominance
- c) Cultural Influence
- d) Avoiding Military conquest

3) Case Studies

- a) Case study of "State of Madina" and "Conquest of Makkah"
- b) Case study of "Cold War".

4) Theoretical perspective

- a) Barry Buzan's concept of security in 21st Century
- b) Globalization and view point of Liberals.

5) Conclusion

At the end on the Cold War, the advisor of Soviet leader, Gorbachev, in an address said that; "Today we are going to do a terrible thing to the US, We are going to deprive America of an enemy."

Throughout the history of mankind, dominance and power is achieved through war. But this is just one side of the picture; the annals of history of the Great Nations contends that 'Greatest' was achieved through avoiding conflicts and wars.

Battles and fights can surely guarantee territorial integrity, influence and sovereignty of a nation, but the path to achieve the top position in the tier of nations is through avoiding the war. Hence, this can be debated through sheer evidence that "Great nations win without fighting". Now the question arises; How? Great Nations

win by virtue of diplomacy and negotiations; by exerting their economic dominance; through their culture influence and surely by avoiding military conquest. These arguments can be supported by the case studies of "Conquest of Makkah" and "Cold War." Furthermore, the concept of security in the 21st century and Liberals perspective give another nuance to this debate.

First of all, strategic diplomacy and negotiations are the major tools employed by Great Nations to achieve their goals. Diplomacy, according to Harold Nicholson, is a the management of International Relations through negotiations. Nations States uses their diplomats and envoys to secure peace and their national interests. Their political as well as non-political objectives are achieved

through persuasion, rewards and sometimes non-violent punishments i.e. sanctions and ending diplomatic ties. This use of diplomacy has multipronged benefits; first, the nation doesn't have to use force, second, the hatred and animosity that emanates by the use of force is avoided. So, the other nation never takes the first nation as their enemy. The 1962 Cuban missile crisis best fits here. Alan Brinkley in his book, "The Unfinished Nation", argues that it was diplomacy and negotiation between the US and the USSR that prevented war, and the history proves that the US - the Great Nation - won without engaging in battle. Thus, it can be advocated that strategic diplomacy and negotiations are used by Great Nations to without fighting.

Second of all, Great nations win by using their economic dominance on other nations.

Great nations like the US, China, more precisely, Great powers, exert their influence and dominance on the middle powers by giving them funds, loans and grants. In this way, the middle powers come under their thumb and never resort to war against them. Moreover, the middle powers fear that if they start a conflict with the Great powers their economic aid would be withdrawn and they will eventually collapse both economically and militarily.

This argument is further supported by the "Mercantilists" theory of International political economy. Karen A. Mingst in her book, "Essential of International relations", gives the example of China, the

emerging power, in this regard, She asserts that because China has invested so much in the capitalists economy of the US, US will never resort to war with China. Can't this be deduced from this argument of Koren's that the Great Nation - China - has won without fighting. So, it can be concluded that Great nations use their economic dominance to win without fighting.

Third of all, Great Nations use their cultural influence, social norms and values to win without fighting. Joseph Nye, a political science scholar, coined a term "Softpower" for these intangible sources of power. He argues that 'Great Nations use their cultural influence and value to obtain the outcomes they want. Using

this soft power the nations develop cultural ties with ~~the~~ other nation. Resultantly, both the nations feel like they are kind of same and going to war against one another is against their cultural values and norms. In addition to this, these nations also develop a sense of "Internationalism" between them, which can be taken as a form of alliance between them, further strengthening their power. Joshua Goldstein, in his book "International relations", ~~gives~~ gives example of European Union and the political, economic and cultural ties between the US and Canada in this regard. So, it can be asserted that "Great nations" win by using their cultural influence without fighting with other nations.