UPSC MAINS · ANSWER PRACTICE

Essay · Essay

The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy

without fighting.

बिना लड़े ही दुश्मन को परास्त
करना युद्ध की सर्वोच्च कला है।

EXAM YEAR

2025

PAPER

Essay

SUBJECT

Essay

MARKS

125

WORD LIMIT

~1200 words

Answer Hint

Victory need not mean physical destruction; examine strategy, deterrence, diplomacy, intelligence, economic and psychological instruments; distinguish coercion from persuasion and deterrence from aggression; explore the idea through personal conflicts, organisations, domestic governance, international relations and national security; recognise that credible force may sometimes be necessary to make non-violent victory possible; argue that the highest form of strategic success is achieving objectives while minimising human, economic and ecological costs.

Model Answer

Introduction

War is conventionally understood as a contest in which victory is achieved by defeating the adversary through force. Yet the deepest conception of strategy seeks something more fundamental: achieving one's objective without paying the enormous cost of physical conflict. The idea that the supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting, associated with Sun Tzu's strategic thought, shifts attention from battlefield destruction to anticipation, diplomacy, deterrence, intelligence and psychological advantage.

The greatest victory, therefore, may be one in which the adversary's capacity or willingness to fight is neutralised before war becomes necessary.

www.becomeias.com YouTube: becomIAS | Instagram: howtobecomeias

Beyond the Battlefield: The Meaning of Victory

The statement challenges the assumption that victory must involve defeating the enemy militarily.

If a conflict can be resolved through negotiation, deterrence, economic pressure or diplomacy, the objective of security can be achieved without the destruction associated with war.

This reflects a crucial distinction:

War seeks victory through combat; strategy seeks victory with minimum necessary cost.

A commander who destroys an enemy at enormous cost may technically win a battle while producing instability, casualties and long-term hostility. Conversely, a state that prevents conflict through credible deterrence may achieve its security objectives without firing a shot.

Thus, **the quality of victory should be measured not merely by the enemy defeated but also by the destruction avoided.**

Diplomacy as Strategic Power

Diplomacy is perhaps the clearest manifestation of this principle.

Negotiation allows adversaries to identify overlapping interests and construct mutually acceptable arrangements. Treaties, confidence-building measures, mediation and international institutions can prevent disputes from escalating.

The peaceful resolution of the Cold War demonstrates the broader potential of political and diplomatic strategies. The rivalry between major powers did not culminate in direct war between them, despite enormous military confrontation and ideological competition.

Diplomacy does not imply weakness. Effective diplomacy often rests upon **credible capabilities, strategic patience and an understanding of the adversary's interests**.

Deterrence: Winning by Preventing Conflict

Deterrence represents a particularly important interpretation of the statement.

A state may maintain sufficient military capability to convince an adversary that aggression would be too costly. If the adversary chooses not to attack, military force is never actually employed.

The paradox is that **preparedness for war can sometimes prevent war**.

However, deterrence requires credibility. Empty threats are unlikely to influence an adversary's calculations. Responsible deterrence therefore combines capability with clear communication, restraint and predictable strategic behaviour.

Intelligence and Knowledge

Sun Tzu's broader strategic philosophy emphasises knowing oneself and knowing the adversary.

Intelligence can prevent conflict by revealing:

- the adversary's intentions,
- vulnerabilities,
- capabilities,
- constraints,
- likely responses.

Accurate intelligence allows decision-makers to distinguish genuine threats from misunderstandings. It can also facilitate targeted diplomatic engagement before a crisis becomes irreversible.

In the modern age, this includes cyber intelligence, satellite imagery, economic intelligence and information analysis.

Thus, **knowledge can substitute for force when it enables better decisions before conflict begins.**

Psychological and Information Dimensions

Modern conflicts are not limited to physical battlefields. Perception, morale, legitimacy and information have become important strategic resources.

A state that maintains social cohesion and credibility can resist attempts at psychological manipulation. Conversely, misinformation and propaganda may seek to weaken an adversary without conventional military engagement.

However, information power raises ethical concerns. Deliberate disinformation can undermine democratic institutions and social trust. Therefore, strategic effectiveness cannot be separated entirely from ethical responsibility.

BECOME IAS
AI POWERED UPSC PREP

The objective should be to build resilience and credibility rather than normalise deception as an unrestricted instrument of statecraft.

Economic and Technological Power

Economic interdependence has created new instruments of strategic influence.

Trade relationships, sanctions, technology controls, investment restrictions and supply-chain resilience can influence state behaviour without direct military confrontation.

Technological superiority can similarly create deterrence by altering the adversary's strategic calculations.

Yet economic coercion can also impose costs on civilians and third countries. Therefore, its ethical legitimacy depends upon proportionality, clearly defined objectives and attention to humanitarian consequences.

Application to International Relations

The statement has particular relevance to a world where war can produce consequences far beyond the battlefield.

Modern military conflict can cause:

- mass displacement,
- destruction of infrastructure,
- economic disruption,
- environmental damage,
- humanitarian crises,
- long-term political instability.

Nuclear weapons make the consequences even more severe. Under such conditions, preventing conflict becomes not merely a strategic preference but a civilisational imperative.

Institutions such as the United Nations, regional organisations, arbitration mechanisms and diplomatic channels provide avenues for conflict management.

However, international institutions are effective only when states support them and respect agreed mechanisms. Hence, peaceful conflict resolution requires both **institutions and political willingness**.

The Indian Strategic Perspective

BECOME IAS
AI POWERED UPSC PREP

India's strategic tradition contains strong elements of diplomacy, restraint and strategic calculation alongside the recognition of legitimate defence.

The Panchsheel principles, India's emphasis on peaceful coexistence and its participation in multilateral diplomacy reflect the importance of resolving disputes without unnecessary conflict.

At the same time, India's security environment demonstrates that peaceful intentions alone cannot guarantee peace. Credible defence capabilities, border preparedness and strategic partnerships may be necessary to deter aggression.

Therefore, the lesson is not **“never use force”**, but rather **“use force only when necessary and ensure that strategy prevents larger conflict whenever possible.”**

The Ethical Dimension

Subduing an adversary without fighting has a strong ethical foundation because it can minimise suffering.

Every avoided war potentially means:

fewer deaths, fewer displaced families, less destruction, lower economic loss and less ecological damage.

This aligns strategic wisdom with humanitarian ethics.

However, there is an important danger. If “subduing” means domination, coercion or manipulation without regard for the rights of others, the absence of battlefield violence does not automatically make the action ethical.

For example, permanently coercing a weaker state through economic dependence may avoid war but still violate principles of justice and sovereignty.

Therefore, **peaceful strategy should seek sustainable peace rather than merely non-violent domination.**

From International Conflict to Everyday Life

The principle extends beyond warfare.

In personal disputes, winning an argument by humiliating another person may destroy the relationship. A better approach may be to understand interests and find common ground.

In organisations, managers who resolve conflicts through dialogue can avoid strikes, litigation and productivity losses.

In public administration, addressing grievances before they become protests or violent movements reflects preventive governance.

Thus, the broader principle is:

Resolve the cause of conflict before conflict becomes destructive.

When Fighting Becomes Necessary

The statement should not be interpreted as absolute pacifism.

There are situations where an adversary may be unwilling to negotiate and where peaceful means have failed. Aggression, terrorism or imminent threats to civilians may require defensive force.

The ethical challenge is to ensure that force is:

- lawful,
- necessary,
- proportionate,
- discriminating between combatants and civilians,
- directed towards restoring peace rather than perpetuating revenge.

Military strength should therefore function as a **last resort and a means of restoring a stable peace**, not as an end in itself.

The Highest Form of Strategic Leadership

The greatest strategic leader is not necessarily the one who wins the largest battle. It is the one who understands the underlying conflict sufficiently to prevent unnecessary battles from occurring.

Such leadership combines:

foresight to anticipate threats,

intelligence to understand adversaries,

diplomacy to create alternatives,

deterrence to prevent aggression,

economic and technological resilience to reduce vulnerabilities,

ethical restraint to minimise harm,

and **political wisdom** to identify sustainable settlements.

This transforms strategy from the art of destruction into the art of conflict prevention.

Conclusion

“The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting” is ultimately a statement about **the primacy of strategy over brute force**. The objective of war is normally to secure political aims, but if those aims can be achieved through diplomacy, deterrence, intelligence, negotiation or other non-military instruments, unnecessary destruction can be avoided.

The highest form of power is therefore not the capacity to destroy but the capacity to **prevent destruction while safeguarding legitimate interests**.

A mature civilisation should aspire not merely to produce stronger weapons, but to produce wiser leaders capable of ensuring that those weapons need not be used. **The finest victory is one in which peace survives, the adversary's legitimate interests are recognised, and the cost of conflict is avoided without surrendering justice or security.**

BECOME IAS
AI POWERED UPSC PREP