

Learning from the Past Paves the way for the future

- 1) Introduction
- 2) History is a blueprint for the future
- 3) Learning from history paves the way for the future
 - A) Suppressing dissent could lead to tyranny of the majority
 - B) Granting autonomy to provinces/states is a pragmatic political solution for diverse nations
 - C) Sense of relative deprivation in certain groups could thwart the process of national integration
 - D) Poverty leads to extremism
 - E) Security obsession breeds expansionism
 - F) Overdependence on foreign aid cripples potential for enhancing industrial base
 - G) Gender equality cannot be achieved without the provision of expansive liberty to both genders

4) Various civilizations have suffered inaction in the face of climate change

4) Conclusion

History is a guide for the future. It tells nations where they have made mistakes, when their trajectory of progress got declined, and factors were responsible for their current ~~circum~~ situation. Moreover, history tells people about their ideals and aspirations. Learning from such a guide provides a blueprint for the future. Nations may learn from their past experiences that suppressing dissent have no benefit in the long-run and could lead to tyranny of the majority. Likewise, nations with diverse groups may learn from history that giving autonomy to provinces/states under a federal structure could inculcate unity in diversity as opposed to rising grievances under a unitary system. In the same manner, relative deprivation of certain groups may lead

to obstructions in the national integration process. Likewise, poverty may lead to several ills, including rise in extremism. Nations may also learn that lack of timely reforms may have a greater cost than taking action at the required time. They may learn that overdependence on foreign aid could cripple the potential of enhancing industrial base. Similarly, inaction regarding enhancing human capital at the expense of security preferences ~~does~~ does not bear good results. Besides, humankind could learn from the past that various civilizations, including Mesopotamian civilization's ~~was~~ destruction was largely due to climate crises. Hence, learning from the past gives people a blueprint for the future.

Nations can learn from the past that suppressing dissent could lead to tyranny of the majority. Nations might have more than one group; each having different identity and worldview. On that basis, each might have different opinions. Past experiences tell that some groups of majority populations do not often take into account opinion of minorities.

For example, Socrates was punished for his outright different opinions. He was forced to drink poisonous liquid from hammar. However, John Stuart Mill argues that the voice of minorities should never be curtailed.

The reason is that in the long-run if their opinions proves wrong they would automatically discard their opinion; in case of their right position the majority will rectify their position.

In summation, their are more benefits

of allowing difference of opinion than curtailing it. Hence, permitting difference of opinion is beneficial for the nation.

Diverse nations can learn from the past that permitting autonomous states/provinces is a better political solution for them. Some nations have diverse ethnic, racial, and religious populations; each having different sizes. History tells us that under a unitary system their grievances are not properly addressed and are underrepresented. For example, people of Scotland carry number of grievances against the government of United Kingdom. On the contrary, America have been highly in tackling the diversity question. They have highly autonomous states under a federal structure. Hence, nations may learn from the past about the most suitable political systems that responds to

their diverse population.

Besides political system, nations can also learn from their past experiences that unjust resource allocation to various region may produce grievances in their respective populations. Recipients of higher share may feel a sense of dominance while the opposite might feel a sense of deprivation. Therefore, resentments against one another thwart the process of national integration. For instance, theory of relative deprivation states that the deprived groups in a nation may opt tendencies that obstruct the process of national integration. For example, Sikhs in the Indian Punjab have a long history of struggle against the state. Amartya Sen in her book "Azadi: Freedom, Fascism, Fiction" states that the people of Punjab feel that they are discriminated against

the Hindu majority in state's policies. Hence, history tells us that relative deprivation of certain groups could inculcate resentment in them against the state.

Apart from relative deprivation, history also tells us that poverty leads to several ill, including extremism. When people are able to work and they don't get proper employment, or if they work and are not able to rise out of poverty, they resort to ideologies, often against the established systems. Dr Ishrat Hussain in his book "Governing the Ungovernable" identifies poverty as one the leading causes of extremism in Pakistan. Hence, history provides a blueprint for the policymakers to reduce poverty levels in order to alleviate extremist tendencies.

Besides, history tells that security obsession breeds expansionist tendencies. When the state's structural machinery is obsessed with making it secure and is not ready to invest in other domains, including investing in human capital, it adopts expansionist tendencies. History witnessed the expansion of Roman empire, among others, they were overly obsessed with expansionism. Ilhan Niaz in his book "Old World Empires" argues that it was easy for Soviet Union to keep expanding its territories than to get stopped owing to its mighty state structure that was overly obsessed with security dimension. Hence, highly active and resource extractive security obsession often leads states to adopt aggressive international posture.

In the same vein, overdependence on foreign aid cripples the potential for enhancing industrial base. When the state's economy get its required supplements in the form of foreign aid, it simply becomes dependent on such ~~an~~ easy solution. It slowly loses its resilience and the potential to generate domestic goods. For example, Pakistan in the initial stages of its independence relied more on its foreign donors rather than enhancing its own capacity to strengthen industrial base. Upon extracting foreign aids, its economy gets exhausted and turns to reflect signs of bankruptcy.