

GREAT NATIONS WIN WITHOUT FIGHTING.

1. INTRODUCTION:

21st century's "winning" imperative:
Mutual coexistence, shared prosperity.

2. REDEFINING "WIN" IN CONTEMPORARY REALITY:

Globalization, complex interdependencies,
shared future, futility of War

3. TWISTING ARMS VERSUS TWISTING MINDS:

- i- Hard power versus soft power
- ii- The case of American Overseas invasions and humiliating exits
- iii- The case of Chinese ascendance deploying economic 'weapons'

4. HISTORICAL SUCCESSSES OF PEACEFUL AND INTELLECTUAL FORCES:

- i- Jinnah's Pakistan Movement solely relied over political strategy than armed conflict.
- ii- Mandela's Weapon of Education to dismantle apartheid in South Africa.

5. FROM EAST TO WEST: NATIONS AND THEIR "WINNING" STRATEGIES

- i- European Unification and economic integration (EU)
- ii- Southeast Asian nations fostering regional stability (ASEAN)

6. LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE:

- i- A need for South Asian integration, for mutual success intensify economic links

7. CONCLUSION:

Yet another key principle of Sun Tzu's "Art of War" upholds that the supreme strategy to win a war is to "subdue your enemy without fighting". His centuries old maxim appears ever-relevant on how to be a great, 'winning' nation in today's world of complex interdependencies. The success of any nation is no longer attributed to military might, take Soviet Union disintegration as a striking example. Great nations rather prioritize peaceful resolutions, internal prosperity and global cooperation over military domination to secure leading positions in the world. Today's winning nations are predominantly deploying soft coercive tools, ranging from economic diplomacy to cultural integration; consider peaceful rise

of China at global arena. Furthermore, the unforgettable horrors of world wars and unfortunate accumulation of destructive weapons, capable of wiping out humanity in seconds, compels rational and sane nations to choose victory without fighting. Besides, History reflects instances where nations succeed without direct combat, achieved victory through intellectual and peaceful forces, take Pakistan's independence movement against colonialism and majoritarianism. Against the backdrop of modern interdependence reality and sheer scale of destruction once 'fight' initiated, convincing your opponent not to fight you is invariably a better alternative than engaging in combat.

Over the past few decades, humanity has made significant material and intellectual progress, countering Hobbesian state of nature which was characterized as 'war of all against all... life would be nasty, brutish.. and short'. Nevertheless, the realization of mutual respect and coexistence was essentially an outcome of horrors of ^{the} world wars; large-scale atrocities, and heavy casualties. However, undoubtedly 'modern' men have experienced one of the longest periods of relative peace in history. This modern reality has also redefined the dynamics of power and domination. The concept of national prestige and success has evolved beyond traditional notions of military might. Economic development, industrial and technological advancements and globalization has made fates of nations deeply intertwined. Nations are now judged by their ability to foster cooperation, promote economic growth and contribute to a stable international order.

A prime example of the paradigm shift is the European Union. Bilateral conflicts and mistrust were ^{not only} overthrown by mutual economic and political integration but also enabled European nations to emerge as globally influential and powerful entity.

Against this notion of fading utility of military power, Joseph Nye's concept of "soft power" gained momentum in post cold war era. Nye suggested a pathway for United States to ensure global influence and hegemony through cultural, ideological, and institutional appeal rather than coercive force. However, within a period of decade American soft power lost its effectiveness through resorting kinetic measures of coercion. First it invaded Iraq and then Afghanistan expecting absolute victory attributing its military might. However, the reality of humiliating exit from Afghanistan after twenty years and without significant achievements depicts how force in traditional meaning stands obsolete. On the other hand, China has successfully revitalized Nye's conception. Exploiting the vacuum, China has emerged as an appealing great nation which shares global acceptance and good-will. Chinese have shifted global power dynamics in their favor by deploying soft-power, extending economic influence and cultural integration over military coercion to attain long-term and sustainable success. Winning 'hearts and minds' over twisting arms and legs, China global outreach and influence today extends over 130 countries, across continents.

Moreover, history is abundant of examples where intellectual, moral, and politically peaceful forces and leaderships have achieved profound victory, often more effectively than military force. One of the most notable examples is Quaid-e-Azam M. Ali Jinnah's leadership in creation of Pakistan. Throughout his political journey he remained adamant to avoiding brute and sticking to the power of intellect and moral conviction over violence. Similarly, in South Africa, Nelson Mandela's weapon of choice was not armed resistance, but education, dialogue, and a firm commitment to justice and equality. His leadership inspired a non-violent movement that eventually dismantled apartheid regime, leading to an establishment of democratic South Africa. These success highlight the enduring relevance of non-violent strategies in achieving lasting peace, reinforcing the idea that true power lies not in force, but in strength of ideas and principles.