

The Role of Soft Power in Great Power Rivalries: Challenges, Solutions, and Strategies, Focus on International Relations Theories

Moh'd Kassim Badru

University of International Business and Economics, School of International Relations, NO:10 Huixin East Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100029 China.

ABSTRACT

The rebirth of major power competition has led to a significant transformation in the global order. This study digs into the complex nature of this occurrence, examining its underlying reasons, displays, and possible outcomes in deferent angle. By utilizing a comparative analysis of realist, liberal, constructivist, and critical theoretical perspectives, the paper aims to shed light on the theoretical foundations of the current geopolitical dynamics. By critically assessing these theories, this paper highlights major obstacles to global stability, such as the escalation of arms races, the decline of multilateral institutions, and the increased threat of interstate conflicts and misunderstanding. Furthermore, this paper explores potential ways for collaboration and conflict resolution, drawing on insights from a variety of theoretical frameworks together with existing and current example from different conflicting countries. Marxism and Feminism are also highly shown in this paper which mostly focus on discussing their views toward GPC. In essence, this paper tries to develop our comprehension of major power competition and guide the formulation of efficient strategies to mitigate its destabilizing impacts.

Keywords. Great power Competition, International Relations Theories, Geopolitics, Global Order, Conflict management

Introduction

It is amazing and impressive when dealing with **INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ISSUES**, this is due to the fact that, we are critically discussing some issues concerning our contemporary world. One of the issues that face global discussion today is the issue of the concept of “Great Power Competition” in other word we can call it as a “reshaping of the world order”. Indeed, people always differ on how they see things mentally and practically. This article therefore is going to critically discuss the issue of Great Power Competition, challenges and solutions focusing on different international relation theories, with reflects with its relevant in this modern world.

To properly prepare for our debate, let us first define the concept of GPC. Simply refers situation in which the superpower countries, such as the United States, China, and Russia, compete to be the champions and sit on top of the hill. These instances of such countries strive for influence and domination on a worldwide scale; rivalry may be evident in different domains, such as economic, military, technical, and even cultural,

as emphasized by Robert Gilpin¹ (in Art, R. J., & Jervis, R. (1991) p.28). Global diplomatic relations have always been characterized by rivalry among important states. This, referred to as Great Power Competition (GPC), signifies the ongoing fight between great countries for influence and wealth.

The possible consequences of this growing GPC are broad, posing significant challenges to the international system. The greatest urgent concern is the possibility of increased military tensions throughout the world. The (2017) research from the Stokes and Waterman² reveals a disturbing pattern of military modernization efforts by the United States, raising fears about an unintentional or miscalculation clash. Furthermore, GPC can cause economic instability as countries affiliate with opposing blocs and employ trade policies. The recent trade war between the United States and China offers as an evident example of the potential economic disruptions caused by GPC.

It is quite interesting, because the notion of Great Power Competition has received fresh significance in recent years due to various aspects. As an example, consider China's rise: China's fast economic expansion and military modernization are viewed as a possible threat to the US-led global order. Why are we saying so? easy because actual nations tend to enhance their power and resist attempts to limit it, resulting in conflict. This shows that the acts of each state to collect more and more power, cause conflict between the states, and so security dilemma in this world, as Mearsheimer (2003) argues "the security dilemma is a central feature of international politics, where one state's effort to enhance its security can threaten other"³ This is also maintained by neoliberalists, who claim that the root of conflict is because of the international anarchy system, in which when a state seeks more and more power, it becomes a danger to another state, which in turn collects more power, resulting in conflict and war between the two.

Returning to a more realistic perspective, we may use the Second World War as an example, when Germany, led by Adolph Hitler, battled to gain more power by expanding its dominance over almost half of Europe. This move posed a threat to other powers, including Britain, France, and their allies, who opted to go to war with Germany. This remarkable occasion not only wasted the life of more than sixty million people, but also affected the affairs of nearly everyone who are participants in the global system. Ikenberry (2019) provides a good description of this term when examining historical instances, such as the post-World War I and World War II orders, to show how various strategies for re-establishing order can result in differing degrees of success or failure. He said that "The historical experiences of post-war orders provide valuable lessons for contemporary efforts to rebuild order in a changing world."⁴

Also, the example of rising of Russia's Resurgence, Russia's confidence on the world stage, including its invasion of Crimea, has raised concerns about its intentions. We all witnessed what is happening now in Ukraine, innocent people die all most every day, others facing life difficulties, flee from their own country to an unknown place, suffering from hunger, cities destruction, disease and other which mostly build revenge situation in the coming generations, this situation leads to make this world in danger in the coming days. The best solution of this controversial situation is put in our mind the wisdom perspective as mentioned by Keohane and Joseph (1977) when differentiate between hard power (military and economic coercion) and soft power (influence through attraction and persuasion). They argue that in a world of

¹ Art, R. J., & Jervis, R. (1991). *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB09910435>

² Stokes, D., & Waterman, K. (2017). Security leverage, structural power and US strategy in east Asia. *International Affairs*, 93(5), 1039–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix100>

³ Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Updated Edition). W. W. Norton & Company.

⁴ Ikenberry, G. J. (2019). *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*, New Edition. Princeton University Press.

interdependence, soft power becomes increasingly, important especially in this current and difficult interstate conflicts⁵

To be very honest, the current state of affairs involves "Shifting Power Dynamics." It is believed that in the near future, the US will lose ground to a more multipolar world that includes nations like China, India, Brazil, Russia, North and South Korea, and others (Mushida et al., 2024)⁶. It is true that this unstable state of global security is mostly driven by the introduction and growth of innovative technological gadgets from several perspectives. However, when disagreements and regional conflicts escalate—the Gaza war, for instance, has already escalated to Lebanon—state cooperation is becoming increasingly important, and the use of international institutions is becoming increasingly crucial. Yet, we are unsure of whether the fight won't get over that point. In his work, Keohane (1984) highlights the function of international organizations in promoting state-to-state collaboration. According to Keohane, institutions that offer frameworks for negotiation and dispute resolution might lessen the anarchic aspects of the international system. He makes the case that, "even in a world without a dominant power, international institutions are crucial for facilitating cooperation among states."⁷

Moreover, Great Power Competition in this contemporary world is influenced by different aspects like economic competition. The increasing of trade between countries, increasing of foreign aid, and increasing of interconnection make this great power competition unpredictable among the nations and this situation leads to the dangerous situation even to the terrorist groups who may develop their weapons and make more dangerous situation in different parts of the world, example the weapons that possessed by Hamas and Hezbollah threaten the whole parts or area of East Asia.

In addition to that, the increasing of tensions among big power nations that can make a suspicious between them, and make the source of un trust to each other, this is very correct to realists like one great realist scholar Thomas Hobbes said that when two men desire the same thing (being more powerful than another), nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies and they will destroy one another⁸. In the coming days, the USA and Russia can be a good example of this situations.

Theoretical Frameworks

Core Tenets of Realism: Anarchy, Self-Interest, and Balance of Power

Realism offers a lens through which Great Power Competition (GPC) can be comprehended as an almost inevitable outcome of the fundamental principles mentioned above. The absence of a dominant state and the prioritization of self-interest establish a system inherently inclined towards rivalry and discord. States, in their pursuit of security and power, inevitably clash with other states harboring similar aspirations, leading to various manifestations of competition such as military escalations, economic rivalries, and diplomatic plans. Kenneth Waltz, another leading realist thinker, emphasizes this point by saying that all countries search for their interest and therefore the pursuit of security is the dominant goal in world politics" (2009, p:126)⁹

⁵ Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye Jr. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company

⁶ Mushinda, et al (2024) *From Rising to Superpower: pragmatism and community of a shared future for Mankind in Chinese foreign policy*. *Open Journal of Political Science*. Vol.14.No2 <https://script.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=132828>

⁷ Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

⁸ Jackson, R. & Sorescen, G. (2005), *Introduction to International Relation: Theories and Approaches*, 3rd ed, Sterling Publishing Private Ltd, Delhi

⁹ Waltz, K. N. (2009). *Theory of International Politics*. Waveland Press. (p. 126)

Realists perceive the ongoing GPC, notably the US-China rivalry, as a classic illustration of this phenomenon. The swift economic and military ascendancy of China is perceived by the US as a direct challenge to its global hegemony. This perceived challenge initiates a competition for security, prompting both states to heavily invest in their military capabilities and strive to extend their influence in pivotal regions. The 2020 US Department of Defense report on China explicitly acknowledges this rivalry, highlighting that China's expanding their military power.

But an emphasis on security can also result in a situation known as a security dilemma, in which steps made by one state to fortify its security are viewed as a threat by another, setting off a chain reaction of distrust and possibly even military escalation as emphasized by Mearsheimer (2001). For instance, China views the US decision to set up a missile defense system in South Korea as a threat to national security. As a result, China is exerting pressure on the US to enhance its own military might, which the US may interpret as a threat, resulting in mistrust and higher security tensions.

Realists posit that GPC transcends mere competition for economic supremacy or geopolitical sway, evolving into a struggle for survival in a world devoid of a central authority ensuring security. Mearsheimer underscores this notion by asserting that "Great powers are persistently preoccupied with their relative power capacities due to existing in a realm of anarchy, where survival stands as the paramount objective." This incessant pursuit of relative power may engender a cycle of distrust and suspicion, heightening the likelihood of unintended escalation and potential conflict (Mearsheimer, 2001)¹⁰

The GPC Challenges: Potential for War and Limited Cooperation

The realist viewpoint regarding GPC underscores numerous important obstacles to global peace and stability. It involves the constant threat of warfare. Within a chaotic system driven by self-interest and suspicion, errors in judgment and unintended incidents have the potential to quickly evolve into large-scale conflicts. According to Mearsheimer, "Great-power wars are likely to occur whenever a powerful revisionist state emerges and challenges the status quo established by a satisfied state"¹¹. In the realm of GPC, this implies the risk of conflict if a rising power such as China endeavors to contest the US-led international order in a manner perceived as menacing by the US. Moreover, the security predicament inherent in GPC can fuel a "spiral of armament," where nations continuously boost military expenditures and innovate new weaponry systems, thereby further straining relations and heightening the likelihood of unintentional conflict. Similarly, Tomas Hobbes contends that when two men desire the same thing (being more powerful than another), nevertheless they can not both enjoy, they become enemies and they will destroy one another¹²

Another significant obstacle is the restricted potential for collaboration among rival powers. Collaboration to them is limited, Realists contend that states are primarily focused on enhancing their own power and security, a goal that frequently clashes with the interests of their opponents. This emphasis on self-interest complicates the establishment of continuing cooperative deals or agreements, particularly on matters where power dynamics are crucial. For example, collaboration on global issues like pandemics and climate change, may become progressively challenging as GPC escalates, as states may prioritize their individual strategic concerns over collective actions.

¹⁰ Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W. W. Norton & Company. (p. 50)

¹¹ *ibid*

¹² Jackson, R. & Sorescen G. (2005), *Introduction to International Relation: Theories and Approaches*, 3rd ed, Sterling Publishing Private ltd, Delhi

Collective peace and security is another significant factor that influences international relations. In the global arena, this has also grown to be a significant problem. The creation of a wide coalition by the majority of significant players in an international system with the aim of working together to thwart aggression by any party is referred to as collective security. Emmanuel Kant, who suggested the creation of a global federation (league) of nations, provided the impetus for this strategy. The majority of states may band together to punish an aggressive state, defending both the interests of all countries as a whole and the right to self-determination of smaller states who were all too readily used as hostages in big power struggles. Some scholars criticise the collective idea since it is biased.

Realist Solutions for GPC: Balancing Power and Maintaining Strength

Within this setting emerges Great Power Competition (GPC), where major powers engage in a struggle for influence and dominance. While the realist viewpoint portrays a bleak outlook on GPC, it also presents potential solutions to reduce its adverse effects. This article delves into two fundamental realist approaches: upholding a strong military and forming alliances to establish a power equilibrium.

Maintaining a Strong Military Capabilities

Realists argue that a formidable military is fundamental to national security in a world without a central authority. John Mearsheimer asserts, "The most crucial capability a state can possess is military strength"¹³. A powerful military acts as a deterrent to potential aggression and enables states to assert their power in the pursuit of their national objectives. In the context of GPC, maintaining a military force that is superior or at least comparable to that of adversaries becomes essential. This necessitates substantial military expenditures, investment in advanced armaments, and a well-trained and well-equipped military. The paper states clearly that in order to offset China's growing military might, "credible military deterrence" is required. In a similar vein, China's massive military modernisation initiatives, as reported in, show its pragmatic recognition of the value of a formidable armed force in the face of prospective US rivalry (SIPRI study, 2021). However, concentrating only on military matters may result in an arms race and escalating hostilities. Some traditional theories of international relations, such liberalism and realism, are criticised by Qin (2018) for using states as the main analytical units. He believes that these ideas ignore the dynamic nature of international connections and the importance of relationships.

Forming Alliances

Another vital realist approach to addressing GPC involves the establishment of alliances. In a world without a central authority, states aim to enhance their position by aligning with others who share similar interests. Kenneth Waltz (1977) argued that "States create alliances to counterbalance the most dominant state or coalition of states" Alliances can offer collective security by deterring aggression and enhancing military capabilities. For example, US and other European nations support Ukrainian in military on platform basis of alliance. While Russia also finds allied countries like China and Iran. Moreover, alliances can promote economic collaboration and present a unified stance on global issues.

Additionally, the network of alliances maintained by the US, including NATO and the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD), exemplifies this realist tactic. These alliances are designed to counter the expanding influence of China in the Asia-Pacific region. Likewise, China's deepening ties with nations

¹³ Mearsheimer, John J. "Why Leaders Lie: The Truth About Lying Between States."

like Russia and Iran and some Arabic countries can be interpreted as an effort to establish a counterforce to US-led alliances. However, the formation of alliances can also lead to rigid coalitions and complicate the management of regional disputes and conflicts. The current Gaza conflict between Israel and Hamas is a good example, where some countries try to support or oppose either side.

GPC Through a Liberal Lens: Cooperation, Trade, and International Law

On the side of liberals, Liberal international relations (IR) theory provides an alternative outlook compared to earlier mentioned Realism, liberal stress on cooperation and the coexistence of peaceful in an interconnected global scene. Therefore, the fundamental principles of Liberalism revolve around cooperation, interdependence, interconnected, and the significance of institutions. Contrary to Realism, Liberalism suggests that states are not isolated entities but rather increasingly dependent on each other in trade, finance, and environmental issues. This interconnectedness helps to raise a mutual interest between the nations, in keeping peace and stability around the world as some scholars insist. For example, some scholar argue that states are highly incentivized to collaborate to tackle collective action challenges and achieve outcomes that benefit all parties. This can be done through cooperations among states.

As it is well understood, the idea of cooperation stands at the core of Liberalism. This involves the state participation in international cooperation. In many cases, it is the state which determines the international relation due to its involvement in the global interstate integration. It is the state which represents the national interests in the international community. For example, a state undergoes international relation and diplomatic missions through several embassies all over the world. There are hundreds of foreign diplomatic offices in every state Liberals argue that states can overcome their differences and pursue common goals through negotiation, open communication and discussion like A.U., EU., ASEAN, EAC, NATO, ECOWAS indeed has facilitating cooperation by setting different norms, guidelines, and mechanisms for resolving problems¹⁴. However, sometime this can be limited in term of practice.

Liberals approach Great Power Competition (GPC) with cautious optimism. While they recognize the competitive nature among states, Liberals believe that such competition can be effectively managed through cooperation and mutual benefits with international regulations Zurn (2018), Liberals predict a scenario where team work can result in mutually beneficial for all involved member states.

A fundamental aspect of Liberalism is Trade liberalization, for instance, most liberals claim that promoting trade development encourages economic interdependence, which in turn acts as a warning to disputes and raises peaceful situation. It is fact that, enhanced trade relationships, exemplified by the accomplishments of the European Union, can establish a "security community" where states are disinclined to resort to warfare due to the economic effects involved between the actors. Moreover, international law is believed as a vital instrument in managing GPC. Liberals assert that an international order based on rules, enforced by entities such as the UN, can aid in preventing conflicts and ensuring peaceful competition, however, there are some limitations of this notion. For example, the on-going war between Israel and Hamas in Gaza, and Russian-Ukrainian war are two typical challenges for liberalism, where there is a situation of failure of UN to stop the ongoing war.

¹⁴ John Ruggie, a prominent liberal theorist, these institutions "aid in socializing states to engage in cooperative patterns and restrict their actions"

Liberalism's Challenges: Free-Riders and the Rise of Nationalism

It is stated that, even with the necessity of working together to address the global issue of free riders, it is unlikely that free riders can be controlled and the common good can be provided at the worldwide level under anarchy. Because it is simpler to supply communal goods to small groups than to big ones. A single member's defection (free riding) in a small group is more difficult to conceal, more detrimental to the group's total welfare, and simpler to discipline. It is one of the reasons industrialised nations in the G7 (Group of Seven) meet frequently in an attempt to coordinate their economic strategies rather than depending only on organisations like the World Bank or WTO, which each have over 100 member states. However, whether for the sake of global well-being, nations must work together to compel contributions to common goods, no matter how big or small is.

While Liberalism offers a positive attitude, it also acknowledges significant challenges. One key challenge is the "free-rider problem,"¹⁵. This can lead to a weakening of institutions and a breakdown of cooperation. For example, some states may be tempted to violate trade agreements or ignore international environmental regulations to gain a short-term economic advantage, undermining the effectiveness of these institutions.

Additionally, other major challenge facing Liberalism is the rise of nationalism and protectionist ideas. For example, nationalist leaders can order national interests over international cooperation, which may result of difficult to maintain a stable and cooperative global order. This difficulty is aptly illustrated by the US decision to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade deal. Furthermore, the persistence of the conflict between Israel and both Hamas and Hezbollah stems from the dedication and assertiveness of their leaders.

Despite the above challenges, Liberalism suggests possible solutions for GPC through strengthening international institutions. Liberals believe for increasing funding and authority for institutions such as the UN and the WTO to ensure they can enforce international law and effectively can fight against global challenges. For example, Ikenberry (2019) emphasizes the establishment and maintaining order by saying that "Institutions are the frameworks through which states can manage their interactions and mitigate the anarchic nature of the international system."

Additionally, promoting open trade and economic interdependence are seen as crucial tools for developing cooperation and modifying GPC. Liberal approaches promote for negotiating and implementing free-trade agreements and promoting global economic integration which bring mutual interests that reduce conflict.

GPC Through a Constructivism lens: Ideas, Norms, and the Construction of World Politics

Constructivism offers a distinct viewpoint on foreign policy. Constructivism's central tenet is the influence of ideas, norms, and social structures on global behaviour, in contrast to liberalism's emphasis on interdependence and realism's emphasis on material power. According to Alexander Wendt (1999), "states are not billiard balls bouncing around in an anarchic system; they are socially constructed actors pursuing interests and identities defined within a specific intersubjective framework". This foundation is built on accepted standards and concepts that lead to a knowledge of how states see the world and can communicate with one another.

In other words, Constructivists believe that international reality is socially constructed, which mean that, the way states perceive the world and their place within it is shaped by shared norms and ideas. These

¹⁵ a situation where states benefit from the rules and institutions of international cooperation without fully contributing to their maintenance

ideas and norms are not fixed set but grow over time through interaction among different societies. For instance, the universal norm of the concept of human right has emerged through historical struggles but still influencing how states interact with their citizens and each other. Katzenstein (1996) explores how different cultural contexts affect the way states perceive threats and formulate security policies, he emphasizes that "The identities of states are constructed through social interactions and are crucial in determining their security policies."¹⁶

Great Power Competition (GPC), through a constructivist lens, is not only about solid capabilities but also about the contestation of ideas and norms. States therefore try to compete for influence so that to promote their own set of values and norms as the dominant basis for international relations¹⁷. For example, the US, as a champion of human rights, and liberal democracy may seek to promote these norms as a way to counter the rise of China, which emphasizes a more state-centric model of governance as mentioned earlier.

Constructivists, on the other hand, stress the value of common norms in promoting collaboration; this is applicable even in GPC. For instance, the basis for managing rivalry and averting conflict among nations may be established by the presence of common ground based on agreed norms and values. For example, in the midst of their fierce ideological rivalry, the Soviet Union and the US established a channel of communication and adhered to specific nuclear weapons usage guidelines during the Cold War, which helped to maintain stability for a long time.

The GPC Challenges: Clashes of Civilizations and Normative Change

Indeed, the Constructivism recognizes important challenges to managing GPC in a competing ideas and norms in the world. One major challenge is the potential for "clashes of civilizations,". This makes a fundamentally differences between societies, and different value systems and worldviews lead to conflict and increasing of misunderstandings.

Another challenge lies in the difficulty of changing established norms. According to constructivists, Normative change, is a slow and contested process, requiring sustained discussion and engagement. For example, efforts to establish a global human rights norm face challenges from states with different religious, political traditions and cultural differences. This makes it difficult to establish common ground on sensitive issues within GPC. For example, the terrorism terminology today is likely accompanied with the Islamic believes, while there are some other terrorists who are not Muslim, example, some representative members of the United Nation now consider Israel as a terrorist state due to the practicing of genocide within Gaza.

Constructivist Solutions for GPC: Promoting Discussions and Fostering Shared Values

It is fact that, Constructivism offers solutions to address the challenges of GPC and promote cooperation. For instance, one key solution is promoting discussions and communication between competing states. By fostering open communication among competing states and actively engaging in discussions in different viewpoints, states can build trust, identify areas of common ground, and develop new norms for managing GPC peacefully, and identifying the Area of differences so that to put more effort to solve in peaceful manner with less or no destructions. This is why some countries like China call for Russia and Ukrainian leaders to sit and negotiate in round table so that the conflict or war become end.

¹⁶ Katzenstein, P.J (1996). The culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics. New York

¹⁷ *ibid*

Furthermore, cultivating a feeling of global community via the promotion of shared values is another essential remedy. This may be accomplished by enforcing cultural initiatives, educational exchanges, and group initiatives aimed at tackling global issues like pandemics, illnesses, and climate change. By emphasising common interests and fostering a feeling of shared responsibility, it is possible to contribute to the social construction of international reality. This will encourage collaboration and group action by encouraging discourse. As a result, in the face of Great Power Competition, an international order driven by norms and more cooperative will be built.

Beyond Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism: Alternative IR Perspectives on GPC

Before concluding, While Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism offer main frameworks for understanding international relations, some other theoretical perspectives also give us the light on Great Power Competition (GPC). Here, the briefly explanation of the contributions of Marxism and Feminism to understanding GPC in this contemporary world.

Marxism and GPC: A Focus on Class and Material Exploitation

Marxism argues that international relations are fundamentally shaped by class struggle and the pursuit of economic advantage. For example, David Harvey view GPC as a competition between capitalist states for access to resources, markets, and cheap labor Harvey (2006). from this situation, Marxists claim, leads to exploitation of developing countries by powerful states and increase of global inequality. In the context of today's GPC, Marxists might analyze the China-US competition on the light of economic competition, with each state competing for dominance in global resource and trade performance. For example, the US is planning to increase the Tax 100% on Chinese electronic cars which imported to US. This is done purposely to abolish China.

Challenges and Solutions: From a Marxist perspective, the structures of capitalism that increase competition and exploitation stand as a key challenge to addressing GPC. Marx, Karl. (2007)¹⁸ The possible solutions of this challenge are to involve promoting a more equitable global economic order, challenging the dominant of powerful states, and fostering international solidarity among working classes across borders. This will help if not totally avoid exploitation but reduce of exploitation level.

Feminism and GPC: Gender, Power, and Militarization

Feminist IR theories as its name suggest, challenge traditional power dynamics like realism and try to highlight some gendered nature of international politics. Feminist scholars argue that GPC is often masculinized, prioritizing military power and security while neglecting the human costs of conflict and the disproportionate impact of war on women. Feminists also critique the role of powerful states such as Russia and USA in perpetuating gender inequalities within and between countries. This article insist that, if the ongoing conflicts and wars in different parts and regions, and the top leaders were females, indeed from the mortality of innocent women and children, this ongoing wars will be already stopped.

Challenges and Solutions

Feminist approaches highlight the need for a more inclusive of women in different international events. They also understanding of GPC that considers the perspectives of women and marginalized groups.

¹⁸ Marx, Karl. 2007. *Das Kapital*. Miami, FL: Synergy International of the Americas. (English version,)

Potential solutions involve promoting dialogue and diplomacy over military solutions, prioritizing human security over state security, and addressing the gendered consequences of GPC.

Limitations of IR Theory in changing World

Though they have drawbacks, theories of international relations (IR) offer useful frameworks for examining great power competition (GPC). They frequently oversimplify the actions of the state by emphasising rational people motivated by economic, political, or self-interest. GPC is complicated and encompasses multiple variables, including cultural disputes, historical settings, and ideological discrepancies. Conventional theories of international relations concentrate on the capacities of states, such as their economic might and military prowess, but the modern world is defined by information warfare, technical breakthroughs, and the rise of non-state players. Extremist groups and multinational companies are examples of non-state players that have a big influence on GPC dynamics. Moreover, because human behaviour is unpredictable and the global system is always changing, IR theories are unable to forecast GPC outcomes. Thus, realising how the various aspects interact, the fluidity of power, and the influence of non-state players are essential for a more thorough comprehension of GPC in practice.

Conclusion

From the above discussion, this article conclude that IR theories may be used addressing the current situation on global politics, hence; the mentioned IR theories is indeed help to shape the international relations between the states where else powerful states can share the same opportunities among them, and the less power state may engaged in different discussions and cooperations between them and between the power states so as to achieve global peace through Global Power Competitions. For example, we found that Realism offers and highlighting the ever-present risk of conflict and limited possible for cooperation. However, it also proposes solutions like maintaining a strong military capability and forming alliances to achieve a balance of power. These strategies will help to maintain international stability.

However, Liberalism offers a hopeful vision for managing GPC through institutions and cooperation. While acknowledging different challenges like free-riders and nationalism, Liberals believe for promoting trade, strengthening international institutions, and obeying to international law to promote a peaceful global environment. Constructivism in other side, offers a valuable lens for understanding difficult terms like ideas, norms, and power dynamics within GPC. They emphasize and highlighting position of promoting dialogue, promotion shared values, and working towards a more cooperative power Competition.

However, while Marxist and Feminist perspectives are less well-known than Realism, Liberalism, or Constructivism, they nevertheless provide insightful analysis toward GPC. These theories provide light on the class, gender, and economic exploitation dynamics that influence rivalry between powerful nations, offering a more comprehensive explanation of these dynamics. A more just and equitable international system that goes beyond the conventional power politics of GPC is demanded by their criticisms and answers. Though the existence of all realism theories offers helpful guidance on how to handle this complex matter, there are still a lot of disputes, miscommunications between states, and ongoing wars in Sudan, Israel, Russia, Palestine, and other regions of the world.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, Wendt (1999). "Social Theory of International Politics." Cambridge University Press

2. Art, R. J., & Jervis, R. (1991). *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB09910435>
3. Cynthia. Enloe (1990) "Bananas, Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics." University of California Press,
4. David. Harvey (2006)"The New Imperialism." Oxford University Press.
5. Huntington, Samuel P. (1996) "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order." Simon and Schuster
6. Ikenberry, G. J. (2019). *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*, New Edition. Princeton University Press.
7. Jackson, R. & Sorescen, G. (2005), *Introduction to International Relation: Theories and Approaches*, 3rd ed, Sterling Publishing Private ltd, Delhi
8. Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press
9. Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye Jr. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company
10. Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
11. Marx, Karl. 2007. *Das Kapital*. Miami, FL: Synergy International of the Americas. (English version, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/index.htm>.)
12. Mearsheimer, John J. "Why Leaders Lie: The Truth About Lying Between States." *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2001, pp. 11–69. [doi.org/10.1162/01622880151137597]
13. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Updated Edition). W. W. Norton & Company.
14. Mushinda, et al (2024) From Rising to Superpower: pragmatism and community of a shared future for Mankind in Chinese foreign policy. *Open Journal of Political Science*. Vol.14.No2 <https://script.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=132828>
15. Moravcsik, Andrew. "The Myth of Relative Gains." *International Organization*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1996, pp. 1–24. doi.org/10.1017/S0020709500000016
16. Qin, Yaqing (2018). *A Relational Theory of World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
17. Robert Gilpin, "The Nature of Political Economy", in Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis eds., *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*, p.28
18. Ruggie, John Gerard. "International Institutions, Transactions, and Systems Change: Interdependence and Embedded Liberalism in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century." *International Organization*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1998, pp. 825– 852
19. US Department of Defense. (2022, February). *Indo-Pacific Strategy Report*. <https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3672121/fact-sheet-department-of-defense-marks-two-year-anniversary-of-the-us-indo-paci/> Accessed on 10/06/2024
20. Stokes, D., & Waterman, K. (2017). Security leverage, structural power and US strategy in east Asia. *International Affairs*, 93(5), 1039–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix100>
21. Waltz, Kenneth Neal. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
22. Waltz, K. N. (2009). *Theory of International Politics*. Waveland Press.
23. Zürn, Michael. (2018). *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.