INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
RECENT TRENDS IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
https://www.doi.org/10.59256/ijrtmr.20260603002
May-June 2026, Vol 6(03), 09-15.
ISSN No: 2583-0368

The Architecture of Peace: Transitioning from 'Words of War' to 'Dharmic Diplomacy': A Comparative Analysis of Ancient Indian Ethics and Modern Geopolitical Rhetoric

Dr. Noojilla Srinivas[1], Dr. Babjee Pothuraju[2]
[1] *Lecturer in English, Government College (Autonomous), Rajamahendravaram, Andhra Pradesh, India.*
[2] *Lecturer in Political Science, Government College (Autonomous), Rajamahendravaram, Andhra Pradesh., India.*

OPEN ACCESS
Article Citation:
Dr. Noojilla Srinivas[1], Dr. Babjee Pothuraju[2], "The Architecture of Peace: Transitioning from 'Words of War' to 'Dharmic Diplomacy': A Comparative Analysis of Ancient Indian Ethics and Modern Geopolitical Rhetoric", International Journal of Recent Trends in Multidisciplinary Research, May-June 2026, Vol 6(03), 09-15.

©2026 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Published by 5th Dimension Research Publication

Abstract: The 21st century geopolitical landscape is currently defined by a "Rhetorical Crisis," where the individual temperaments of 'superpower' leaders have transitioned from strategic diplomacy to "Rhetorical Brutalism." This study posits that physical warfare is the kinetic manifestation of a prior systemic failure in leadership communication. By analyzing tensions prevailing in the Central Asia, in the months of March and April 2026, regarding the Strait of Hormuz and the escalatory language directed at sovereign States, the paper identifies a dangerous shift toward personal vilification over principled disagreement. The research introduces a Stewardship Model of diplomacy, synthesized from the ancient Indian ethical framework of "Vāk-Tapas" (Austerity of Speech) found in the Bhagavad Gita and the "Adharma-Doer Separation" principle from the Ramayana. This model is contrasted with the "unpalatable" and "cheap" rhetoric of modern autocratic styles that treat the global majority, consisting of 200+ independent nations, as pawns rather than sovereign partners. By integrating Western classical logic with Eastern "Dharmic" restraint, the study identifies a significant gap in current International Relations (IR) literature regarding the neuro-psychological impact of leadership temperament. The paper concludes by proposing a formal "International Leadership & Communicative Ethics (ILCE)" syllabus for the United Nations, asserting that global security is fundamentally dependent on a "Linguistic Reset" that restores the Vachan (Word) as the anchor of international trust.

Key Words: Dharmic Diplomacy; Vāk-Tapas (Austerity of Speech); Geopolitical Rhetoric; Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam; Conflict De-escalation; International Leadership Ethics; Vishwaguru Paradigm; Rhetorical Responsibility.

1. Introduction

The Crisis of the Global Tongue

1.1 The Anatomy of Rhetorical Brutalism

In the classical Westphalian tradition, diplomacy functioned as a "buffer of ambiguity," where language was used to navigate the razor's edge between sovereign interests and collective peace. However, the first quarter of the 21st century has ushered in an era of "Rhetorical Brutalism." Unlike the "Strategic Restraint" of the Cold War era, modern statecraft is creasingly defined by raw, unmediated, and dehumanizing language, a phenomenon accelerated by the disintermediation of traditional diplomatic channels.

The "Word" of a leader is no longer a tool for negotiation; it has become a kinetic catalyst. When a superpower leader employs "cheap" or "uninspiring" rhetoric, it is not merely a domestic political maneuver. In an interconnected global economy, such language acts as a biological pollutant, triggering a "Systemic Stress Response" across 200+ sovereign nations.

1.2 The Paradox of Connectivity: Individual Temperament as a Global Risk

We live in an age of unprecedented digital connectivity; yet this very infrastructure has created a dangerous paradox. Instead of fostering a "Global Village" based on mutual respect, it has empowered the "Individual Temperament" of a few autocratic Heads of State to override institutional diplomacy.

i. **The Minority Dictatorship**: The global majority, consisting of independent nations across the Global South and Europe, finds itself "hostage" to the unpalatable requirements of a handful of leaders.
ii. **The 'Slave-Colony' Archetype**: Modern superpower rhetoric often reflects an outdated mindset that treats independent states as "slaves or colonies" rather than sovereign partners. This "Autocratic Attitude" assumes that a leader's private ego is a valid basis for public international policy.

1.3 The 'Unpalatable End' and the Burnt Bridge

A foundational principle of both Sun Tzu's Art of War and the Indian Niti Shastras is the ethical and strategic provision of a "Golden Bridge" for an opponent to retreat with dignity.

- **The Theoretical Failure:** Personal vilification such as labelling an opponent as "evil," "crazy," or "insignificant" effectively "burns the bridge."
- **The 2026 Hormuz Crisis:** The recent escalatory threats regarding the Strait of Hormuz serve as a poignant case study. When a leader declares that "Allah only has to save Iran" or threatens to destroy total civilian infrastructure, the conflict shifts from a policy dispute to a theological and existential struggle. In such a "War of Words," neither party can afford to retreat without total humiliation, leading to an "Unpalatable End" that destroys the global commons.

1.4 Research Objectives and the 'Linguistic Reset'

This paper identifies a critical "Literature Gap" in International Relations: the failure to acknowledge the Neuro-Psychological impact of leadership language on conflict escalation. The primary objective of this study is to advocate for a "Linguistic Reset" based on the Dharmic Model of stewardship. By restoring the Vachan (the sanctity of the Word) as the anchor of international trust, the study aims to provide a roadmap for moving global leadership from "Personal Criticism" toward "Principled Opposition."

2. Literature Review – Mapping the Discourse Gap

The current academic discourse on international conflict is historically dominated by Western-centric paradigms. To establish the "Red Thread" of this research, we must identify where existing theories fail to account for the Linguistic Temperament of the leader as a primary driver of kinetic warfare.

2.1 Western Realism vs. Constructivism: The Missing Tongue

Traditional Political Realism (Mearsheimer, 2001; Waltz, 1979) operates on the "Black Box" theory of the State, assuming that nations act solely based on power-seeking and structural survival. In this view, the "individual temperament" or the "cheap rhetoric" of a Head of State is dismissed as mere domestic posturing.

Conversely, Constructivism (Wendt, 1992) argues that international relations are "socially constructed" through identities and norms. However, even within Constructivism, there is significant literature gap regarding how the specific quality of speech - the aesthetic and ethical dignity of the leader's tongue - acts as a psychological trigger for existential fear in an adversary. Modern scholars have yet to categorize "Rhetorical Brutalism" as a formal breach of international security norms.

2.2 The Indian School of IR: Beyond Kautilyan Realism

Recent scholarship has seen a "Turn to the East," with the Indian School of International Relations gaining traction (Behera, 2021). However, most researchers focus heavily on Kautilya's Arthashastra (The Science of Material Gain), emphasizing Sāma, Dāna, Bheda, and Danda (Persuasion, Bribery, Division, and Punishment).

This paper identifies a secondary gap: the relative neglect of the Epic and Vedic models of Restraint. While Kautilya provides the "Hardware" of statecraft, the Ramayana and the Bhagavad Gita provide the "Software", the Internal Governance of the Leader. Current IR literature lacks a framework that integrates the Vedic concept of Kshatriya Dharma (The Duty of the Protector) with modern diplomatic communication.

2.3 Neuro-Linguistics and the 'Fear-Response' in Statecraft

Emerging research in Neuro-Diplomacy (Hussain et al., 2026) suggests that aggressive leadership rhetoric activates the amygdala of the opposing population, creating a collective "Survival Response."

- **The Problem of Dehumanization:** When a leader uses "uninspiring" and "autocratic" language, labeling an entire nation as "slaves" or calling for their "destruction by Allah", it bypasses logical negotiation and triggers a neurological "No-Exit" trap.
- **The Gap:** There is no formal study linking the Austerity of Speech (*Vāk*-Tapas) to the stabilization of global politics and the prevention of the "unpalatable end" of diplomacy.

2.4 Filling the Gap: The 'Dharmic' Synthesis

This research fills a major scholarly void by proposing that Linguistic Dignity is not a "soft" skill, but a "hard" security asset. By moving beyond the "Superpower Ego" and the "Slave-Colony" mindset, we introduce a Stewardship Model that synthesizes Aristotelian Ethos with the Indian Vachan (The Sacred Word). This paper moves the focus from what is being said (policy) to how it is being said (temperament), establishing a new frontier in Ethico-Linguistic Diplomacy.

3. The Neuro-Psychology of Leadership Temperament – The 'No-Exit' Trap

This section explores the bridge between ancient intuition and modern behavioural science, arguing that leadership rhetoric is not merely "talk"—it is a biological and psychological intervention in the global body politic.

3.1 Rhetoric as a Kinetic Catalyst: The Amygdala Hijack

In cognitive psychology, the "Amygdala Hijack" refers to an immediate, overwhelming emotional response that bypasses the rational frontal cortex. When a superpower leader employs "Rhetorical Brutalism", using phrases like "total destruction" or "Allah only has to save you", they are not engaging in policy debate; they are triggering a collective Survival Response in the target population.

- **The 'No-Exit' Psychological Trap:** Research in Neuro-Diplomacy (Hussain, 2026) suggests that when an adversary is personally vilified or dehumanized, their neurological capacity for compromise is paralyzed. If a leader calls an opponent "insignificant" or a "slave," the opponent's brain categorizes the threat as existential.
- **The Result:** Negotiation becomes impossible because any concession is perceived as "Total Humiliation" rather than "Strategic Compromise." This leads directly to the "Unpalatable End", a kinetic war that neither side truly desired but both felt "rhetorically cornered" into fighting.

3.2 The 'Slave-Colony' Archetype vs. Sovereign Dignity

The "Autocratic Attitude" often observed in superpower rhetoric stems from an archaic Master-Slave Archetype (Hegel, 1807). By speaking to 200+ independent nations as if they were "colonies" or "pawns," leaders trigger a deep-seated psychological resistance rooted in the history of decolonization.

- **The Sovereignty Reflex:** Every independent nation possesses a "Sovereign Ego." When a superpower leader dismisses this dignity through "cheap" or "uninspiring" language, it creates a "Transnational Trauma" that unites smaller nations against the aggressor, leading to global instability and the collapse of the "Rules-Based Order."

3.3 The 'Dignified Exit' Theory: The Necessity of the Golden Bridge

Psychological safety is a prerequisite for diplomatic breakthroughs. The "Golden Bridge", a term we borrow from Sun Tzu but ground in Conflict Transformation Theory, is the linguistic space that allows an opponent to "save face" while retreating.

- **Linguistic Architecture:** A "Dharmic" leader understands that to win the peace, one must allow the opponent to remain a "Dignified Adversary" rather than a "Demoralized Victim."
- **The Failure of Modernity:** The 2026 Hormuz Crisis demonstrates a total collapse of this architecture. By moving from territorial claims to theological insults, the rhetoric removes the "Golden Bridge," ensuring that the only remaining path is a "scorched-earth" kinetic escalation.

4. Case Study – The Contemporary Decay (April 2026)

This section provides a clinical analysis of real-time geopolitical events, serving as the empirical "proof of concept" for the dangers of Rhetorical Brutalism. By examining the current standoff in the Persian Gulf, we observe how a breakdown in linguistic temperament directly mirrors a breakdown in global security.

4.1 The Hormuz Crisis: From Policy to Theology

In April 2026, the dispute over the Strait of Hormuz transitioned from a maritime sovereignty issue into a high-stakes "War of Words." The rhetoric employed by the Western superpower, specifically the declaration that "Allah only has to save Iran" marks a significant departure from secular diplomatic norms.

- **The Theological Offensive:** By invoking the name of the Divine in a threatening context, the rhetoric moves the conflict from the realm of International Law to the realm of Existential Absolutism.
- **The Infrastructure of Terror:** Threats to "destroy all infrastructure" target not just a military apparatus, but the lifeblood of a sovereign nation. In "Dharmic" terms, this is a violation of *Loka-Samgraha* (Global Welfare). It signals to the 200+ nations of the United Nations that their own civilian infrastructure is only as safe as the "temperament" of the superpower head allows.

4.2 The Russia-Ukraine Stalemate: The Cost of Personal Vilification

The ongoing conflict in Eastern Europe between Russia and Ukraine provides further evidence of the "No-Exit" trap.

- **The Linguistic Wall:** When global leaders label their counterparts as "war criminals" or "thugs" in the early stages of a conflict, they effectively remove themselves as potential mediators.

- **The Deadlock:** Because the "War of Words" has been so personal and "cheap," neither side can sit at a negotiation table without appearing to validate a "criminal." The lack of *Mridu-Bhasha* (Gentle/Civil Speech) has ensured that the "unpalatable end", a war of attrition, remains the only trajectory.

4.3 The 'Slave-Colony' Fallacy in the 21st Century

The case studies reveal a recurring "Autocratic Attitude" where superpowers speak as if independent nations are "slaves or colonies."

- **The Global South Perspective:** For the majority of the world's nations, such rhetoric triggers historical trauma. When a leader dismisses the sovereignty of another with "uninspiring" language, they lose the moral authority (Ethos) required to lead the "Rules-Based Order."
- **The Strategic Failure:** As a result, we see a "Rhetorical Realignment," where nations gravitate toward the Vishwaguru Paradigm—seeking a "Bridge-Builder" like India, whose language remains "Straight, Clear, and Polite" even in the face of provocation.

5. The 'Dharmic' Framework – Vāk-Tapas & Maryāda

This section presents the philosophical core of the paper, offering the "Dharmic" alternative to the current "Rhetorical Brutalism." We move from a critique of the "Superpower Ego" to a model of Stewardship rooted in ancient Indian ethico-linguistic traditions.

5.1 *Vāk-Tapas*: The Triple Filter of Leadership (*Bhagavad Gītā* 17.15)

The concept of *Vāk-Tapas* (Austerity of Speech) is not merely a personal virtue but a functional requirement for global stability. The Bhagavad Gītā defines the speech of a "Sāttvic" (harmonious) leader through three rigorous filters:

"Anudvega-karam vākyam satyam priya-hitam cha yat |
Svādhyāyābhyasanam chaiva vāṅ-mayam tapa uchyate ||"

- **Anudvega-karam (Non-Agitating):** A leader's word must not cause Udvega (unnecessary distress or panic) in the global "body politic." Modern threats regarding the destruction of civilian infrastructure are a direct violation of this filter, as they agitate the security of the 200+ sovereign nations.
- **Satyam (Truth/Consistency):** In international law, "Truth" is synonymous with Reliability. When leaders "do not stick to the words they have earlier given," the "Vachan" (the sanctity of the promise) is broken, leading to a "Trust Deficit" that no treaty can bridge.
- **Priya-Hitam (Pleasant and Beneficial):** Speech must be Priya (civil and dignified) and Hitam (aligned with the global welfare, Loka-Samgraha). "Cheap" or "uninspiring" language may win domestic social media engagements, but it fails the Hitam of the global collective.

5.2 The Rāma-Model: Separating 'Adharma' from the 'Vyakti'

The Rāmāyaṇa provides a masterclass in Principled Opposition without Personal Vilification.

- **The Vali Logic:** When Rāma intervenes in the conflict between the brothers Vali and Sugriva, he critiques Vali's Adharma (unethical conduct) with surgical precision. However, he never demeans Vali's status as a king or his inherent dignity. This allows for the subsequent integration of Vali's son, Angada, into the coalition, a "Golden Bridge" that prevents long-term vendettas.
- **The Rāmavaṇa Deathbed Protocol:** Perhaps the most "inspiring" lesson for modern diplomacy is Rāma's instruction to Lakshmana as the adversary, Rāvaṇa, lay dying. Rāma recognized that despite his "unpalatable" deeds, Rāvaṇa was a scholar of the Vedas and a master of statecraft.
- **The Application:** In a "Dharmic" framework, one opposes the Policy but respects the Personhood. If modern superpowers adopted this "Maryāda" (Boundary of Conduct), they would not find themselves in "No-Exit" traps where they have called their opponents "thugs" or "criminals" so often that negotiation becomes a political suicide.

5.3 The 'Vachan' Standard: Restoring Consistency as International Law

The Indian epic tradition emphasizes: "*Raghukul rīti sadā chali āyī, prān jāye par vachan na jāyī*" (The tradition of the Raghu clan: life may depart, but a promise must be kept).

- **The Sovereignty of the Word:** For the 200+ nations of the world, a superpower's "Word" is the only currency of peace. When rhetoric becomes volatile and impulsive (the "Autocratic Attitude"), the currency is devalued.
- **The Goal:** We argue for a return to Linguistic Consistency, where a leader's speech is "Straight, Clear, and Polite," serving as a stable foundation for the "Rules-Based Order" rather than an unpredictable trigger for war.

6. Modern Successors & The 'Vishwaguru' Paradigm

This section bridges ancient ethics with modern historical breakthroughs, demonstrating that the "*Dharmic*" approach to communication is not an idealistic relic, but a proven tool for national liberation and global mediation.

6.1 The Apostles of Restraint: Gandhi and Mandela

The 20th century provided two towering examples of leaders who defeated "Superpower Egos" not through superior firepower, but through superior Linguistic Integrity.

- **Mahatma Gandhi's 'Dear Friend' Approach:** M.K. Gandhi's correspondence with British authorities, including his famous letters to the Viceroy, serves as a masterclass in *Mridu-Bhasha* (Gentle Speech). He attacked the System of Colonialism with "Straight and Clear" logic, yet he never devalued the Personhood of the Englishman. By refusing to use "cheap" or "uninspiring" insults, he maintained the moral high ground (Ethos), making it psychologically impossible for the British to justify continued oppression.
- **Nelson Mandela and the Language of Ubuntu:** Nelson Mandela's genius lay in his decision to learn Afrikaans, the language of his oppressors, while in prison. He understood that to move from a "Slave-Colony" mindset to a "Rainbow Nation," he had to use the "Bridge of Respect." By applying the philosophy of Ubuntu ("I am because we are"), he ensured that the transition from Apartheid was not an "unpalatable end" of racial war, but a "Dignified Start" for a new Republic.

6.2 The 'Sevak' Identity and the Vishwaguru Paradigm

In the contemporary era, India's diplomatic posture offers a functional alternative to the "Autocratic Attitude" of Western superpowers.

- **From 'Supreme' to '*Sevak*' (Servant):** The transition from a "Supreme Leader" complex to the identity of a *Pradhan Sevak* (Chief Servant) fundamentally alters the tone of international communication. A "*Sevak*" speaks from a position of Stewardship, not Ownership. This is why India is able to maintain a "Friendly Dialogue" with Russia, Iran, and the USA simultaneously - it speaks the language of *Loka Hitam* (Global Benefit) rather than Ego.
- **The Bridge-Builder for the 200:** While superpowers threaten to "destroy infrastructure" or blockade sea routes, the *Vishwaguru* (Global Teacher/Guide) model focuses on *Vāk-Shuddhi* (Purification of Speech). India acts as a "Communicative Buffer" for the 200+ nations of the UN, ensuring that the "War of Words" between giants does not crush the sovereignty of the many.

6.3 Environmental Stewardship: Samastha Loka vs. the 'Exit Culture'

- The "Autocratic Temperament" is most visible in the "Exit Culture", where superpowers leave global climate or nuclear pacts based on individual whims.
- **Universal Welfare:** In contrast, the Dharmic approach treats the Earth as *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* (The World is One Family). Environmental communication in this paradigm is not a "bargain" but a "*Vachan*" (A Sacred Promise). By sticking to the "Word" given at Paris or Glasgow, a *Dharmic* leader protects the *Samastha Loka* (Universal Welfare), proving that "Supreme Leadership" is defined by the consistency of one's commitment to the future.

7. Proposal for a Global 'Vāk-Shuddhi' Initiative

To transition from "Rhetorical Brutalism" to "Dharmic Diplomacy," the international community requires more than moral appeals; it needs an institutionalized framework for Communicative Reform. This section proposes a formal mechanism within the United Nations to safeguard the global atmosphere from the "unpalatable" temperaments of superpower heads.

7.1 Institutionalizing Rhetorical Responsibility

We propose that the UN Charter be expanded to include a "Code of Dignified Discourse." Just as "Chemical Warfare" is prohibited by international treaty, "Linguistic Warfare"—the systematic dehumanization of sovereign peoples—must be recognized as a precursor to kinetic aggression.

- The Doctrine of Non-Agitation (Anudvega): The UN should establish "Rhetorical Safe Zones" where the use of theological threats (e.g., "Allah only has to save you") or threats against civilian infrastructure are met with formal Linguistic Censure.
- Protecting the 200: This initiative empowers the "Global Majority" to collectively reject the "Cheap and Uninspiring" rhetoric of any superpower that threatens the security of the collective "Global Family" (Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam).

7.2 The ILCE Syllabus: International Leadership & Communicative Ethics

The cornerstone of this initiative is a mandatory capacity-building programme for diplomats and Heads of State. The ILCE Syllabus bridges the gap between Eastern restraint and Western logic.

Module	Core Philosophy	Primary Source	Practical Skillset
I. Eastern Restraint	Vāk-Tapas & Maryāda	Bhagavad Gītā, Rāmāyaṇa	Mastery of Anudvega (Non-Agitation) and Vachan (Consistency).
II. Western Logic	Ethos, Pathos, Logos	Aristotle's Rhetoric, Cicero	Constructing arguments based on moral authority and objective truth.

III. Civic Equanimity	Ataraxia & Stoicism	Marcus Aurelius, Seneca	Responding to diplomatic insults with "Sweet Communication" (Mridu-Bhasha).
IV. Strategic Peace	The "Golden Bridge"	Sun Tzu's Art of War	Designing "Dignified Exits" to prevent "No-Exit" traps and "Unpalatable Ends."

7.3 The 'Vishwaguru' as a Global Ombudsman

India, as a "Friend to All," is uniquely positioned to lead this initiative. By hosting "Leadership Temperament Retreats" based on the Samatvam (Equanimity) principles of the Gītā, India can guide the transition from an "Autocratic Attitude" to a Stewardship Model. This is not a religious imposition, but a Survival Necessity for a nuclear-armed world where a single "unpalatable" word can trigger a thousand missiles.

8. Conclusion – The Survival of the Tongue

8.1 Synthesis of Findings

This research has demonstrated that the physical conflicts of the 21st century—from the scorched-earth attrition in Eastern Europe to the theological brinkmanship in the Persian Gulf—are not merely disputes over territory or resources. They are the "gross manifestations" of a "subtle failure" in leadership communication.

The transition from a "Strategic Dialogue" to "Rhetorical Brutalism" has created a global "No-Exit" trap. When superpower heads employ "cheap," "uninspiring," and "unpalatable" language, they burn the "Golden Bridge" necessary for peace. We have shown that the "Autocratic Attitude" of a few, which treats 200+ independent nations as "slaves or colonies," is the primary agitator of the modern "Trust Deficit."

8.2 The Sovereignty of the Word

The "Dharmic" alternative is not a utopian fantasy but a historical and psychological necessity. By applying the Vāk-Tapas (Austerity of Speech) framework, global leaders can restore the Vachan (the sanctity of the Word).

- The Rāma-Model proves that one can oppose Adharma (wrong deeds) without demeaning the Vyakti (the person).
- The Gandhi-Mandela Praxis proves that "Sweet and Straight" communication can dismantle empires and heal racial divides.
- The Vishwaguru Paradigm offers a "Stewardship Model" where the leader acts as a Pradhan Sevak (Chief Servant), ensuring the welfare of the Samastha Loka (Universal Welfare).

8.3 Final Vision: A Linguistic Reset

The "War of Words" must end where it began: in the heart and tongue of the leader. To save the "Global Family" (Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam) from an "unpalatable end," the world must adopt a new standard of Rhetorical Responsibility.

The next generation of leaders must be trained not in the art of the "insult," but in the "Austerity of Speech." We must move from Personal Criticism to Principled Opposition. In an age of nuclear weapons and hyper-connectivity, the survival of the human species may ultimately depend on a very ancient lesson: "Power resides in the sword, but Authority resides in the Word."

References

I. Classical & Foundational Texts

1. Aristotle. (4th Century BC). The Art of Rhetoric (W. R. Roberts, Trans.). Modern Library.
2. Aurelius, M. (180 AD). Meditations (G. Hays, Trans.). Modern Library (2002).
3. Cicero, M. T. (55 BC). De Oratore (On the Orator) (J. S. Watson, Trans.). Harvard University Press (1942).
4. Srimad Bhagavad Gītā. Chapter 17, Verse 15: The Yoga of the Threefold Faith (E. Easwaran, Trans.). Nilgiri Press (2007).
5. Sun Tzu. (5th Century BC). The Art of War (L. Giles, Trans.). British Museum (1910).
6. Valmiki. (n.d.). The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki: Yuddha Kānda (The Book of War) (R. P. Goldman & S. J. Sutherland Goldman, Trans.). Princeton University Press (2017).

II. Modern Books & Academic Journals

7. Behera, N. C. (2021). Globalization, philanthropy, and civil society: Toward an Indian school of International Relations. International Studies Review, 23(4), 1620–1645.
8. Gandhi, M. K. (1927). An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth. Navajivan Publishing House.
9. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.
10. Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). The phenomenology of spirit (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford University Press (1977).
11. Hussain, S. (2026). The neuro-diplomatic pulse: Language as a kinetic force in global conflicts. Peace & Conflict Review, 18(1), 45–62.
12. Mandela, N. (1994). Long walk to freedom. Little, Brown & Co. Mathew, S. (2026). Can 'Dharma Diplomacy' offer a solution to the war of words? The Statesman: Global Affairs Edition.
13. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. W. W. Norton & Company.
14. Noojilla, S. (2026a). Campus survival communication: An Open Educational Resource (OER) for global practice. Government College (Autonomous) Press.
15. Tutu, D. (1999). No future without forgiveness. Image Doubleday.

III. Official Documents & Contemporary Reports

16. Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391–425.

17. Al Jazeera. (2026, April 5). Theological threats and maritime law: Analyzing the 2026 Hormuz crisis. [News Report].
18. Ministry of External Affairs, India. (2026, April 6). Official transcript: Press briefing on the necessity of rhetorical restraint in the Persian Gulf. Government of India.
19. Trump, D. J. (2026, April 5). On Iranian infrastructure and global security. [Social Media Post]. Truth Social.
20. United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations and statute of the International Court of Justice. UN Department of Public Information.