

Multipolarity: Promoting Peace or fueling war

Outlines:

- ① Introduction
- ② Understanding the meaning of multipolar order
- ③ Multipolarity intensifies power struggle among states
 - ① Disturb balance of power and reorder the regional calculus
 - ② Power struggle at the expense of weaker states leads to security dilemma
 - ③ Anarchic system diverts the attention of leaders to defense budget
- ④ Morality: the First Casualty of multipolar world
 - ① Moral grammar is redefined
 - ② Interests of multiple states are associated with the human lives
 - ③ Destruction of infrastructure becomes virtue
- ⑤ Socio-economic impacts of Multipolar world
 - ① Political and social polarization
 - ② Exploitation of marginalized groups by powerful states
- ⑥ Multipolar order means multiple ways to achieve interests
 - ① Emergence of proxy wars
 - ② Cyber warfare to manipulate state narrative
- ⑦ Conclusion

Introduction :

While the rise of multipolarity shakes the foundation of hegemon through the tectonic shift of alliances, it expands its influence at the expense of the weaker one by reordering the actors in its orbit. Such transition in the international hierarchical system disturbs the balance of power. At the same time, it maximizes the quest for power either by power maximization or by bandwagoning. In this scenario, states choose not only their ideological bloc, but they also securitize themselves against the infiltration of stronger. In multipolar system, it becomes difficult to align with the interests of the powerful; thus, confrontation becomes inevitable. As a result, states increase their potential to avert such threats, which leads to security dilemma. Another important aspect of multipolar world is the manufactured morality. Leaders divert their resources to meet the interests of powerful states, neglecting the socio-economic welfare of the country while also fueling the resentment of marginalized segments. Meanwhile, these deprived

groups are supported by foreign powers to engage their enemies by thwarting their rise. Hence, proxy wars and cyber warfare become means to achieve the socio-political polarization as ends. Nevertheless, multipolarity is multipronged phenomena that brings more instability than equality to international anarchic system.

Multipolarity fragments the centre of power, while it is considered that multipolar system posits an inclusive world governance, it should also be remembered that it brings the clash-of-interests phenomenon into play. Because, when a super-power controls the vertical hierarchy, it brings more stability, even the bipolar system poses less harm to international community. In the words of Kenneth Waltz, by maintaining the ~~blo~~ stability, global powers are actually arranging themselves and their influence. Thus, historical evidences suggest that multipolar system envisages ~~the~~ formation of multiple alliances. Regional pacts and alliances have resulted two world wars. Thus, this becomes challenging to control multiple powerfubs

in times of crisis. Similarly, powerful states also indicate their capability to defend their interest. It reduces harmony when their interest diverge. In short, in absence of central government, the behaviour of states becomes hard to regulate under the auspices of international or global league.

So, in such circumstances the disturbance in the regional balance of power shakes the foundation of stability. Powerful becomes the defender of status Quo while gaining the support of regional states through popular narrative. The weaker states are left with two options: to become spectator or flatter. In both scenarios, the status Quo narrative affect the interest of the weaker. Under the relative gains phenomenon, the policy reformation of the weaker states demands diversification in foreign reliance while the gravitational pull of the hegemon keeps it within its orbit. Thus, geopolitical calculus is shaped in accordance with will of the global elites. However, in such

situation, the elites of weaker states also share ideology. This makes clear the theoretical framework of dependency theory, where the leaders of core-and-periphery defend each others position. Nevertheless, interests and narrative become foundational element in shaping regional perception and regional balance of power.

However, leaders often face criticism for their policies at home and abroad. If any policy diverge with the interests of another nation, the leader will face international criticism. However, if the national interest of a country is threatened the domestic opposition plays their role. In regional politics, the matter often revolves around security and alliance, which is often met with reciprocity. For example, the thaw in Pakistan-US relations ~~was~~ necessitated a cooperation between India and China. This manifests the diversification in times of peace and crisis, which is only possible in multipolar world. Although, it seems appealing the regional cooperation fosters peace, it brings conflict with other

poles of power. Therefore, India's cooperation will be seen as defiance at the American sides; and defiance was met with punishment of the hegemon: tariffs on India.

Subsequently, when states realize that diversification becomes the urgent necessity for the preservation of their national interests, they resort to increase their budget for that particular field. If a state approaches regional architecture as security-centric, the budget for defense will drain the economic resources. The ultimate goal for that state would be increase their deterrence. To scholars, like Kenneth Waltz, these are structural implications. The unit of international system was compelled to reciprocate and increase its power for defense. However, Mearsheimer, the architect of offensive realism, sees that the act of power maximization was balancing its rival state. Thus, multipolar system dragged the units into armaments. As a consequence of matter, the ~~unit~~ compliance with institutional rules — UN, CTBT, NPT — would be reduced.

However, Schelling and Fareed Zakaria - the scholars of strategic realism and neo-classical realism - view that leaders are central in translating the structural realities into their actions. A security-centric states has two options: to maximize power or to bandwagon, but the phenomenon of self-help pushes leaders to opt for former one. Such kind of thinking is often embedded into the strategic culture. At the same time, multipolarity further reinforces the idea of power projection. That is why, Morgenthau ignores morality while introducing the concept of political morality, which is more consequentialist in its nature. In short, multipolar world re-writes the guidelines of foreign policy for security-centric states, where leaders choose the best alternatives among the choices.

Following the principle of self-help or power-maximization, leaders ignore the normative aspects of international system. That is the reason that Machiavelli warns princes of ignoring the cunning

of fox while adopting the bravery of lion. Machiavellie suggested that normative aspects keep the prestige alive. For instance, Italy, Germany, and France supported Israel in recent genocidal war, but at the same time extending recognition to the state of Palestine. As a result, they translate hypocrisy as their strength while keeping their international image intact. In multipolar world morality is redefined in accordance to the interests of hegemon. In other words, the Israel's killing of innocent masses reflects death of morality in multipolar world.

Furthermore, in achieving their interests, states often target infrastructure in pretext of terrorist hide outs. This is another implication of multipolar world, where destruction is seen as virtue and resistance to the evil. The narrative, disseminated by few and accepted by many, retains its relevance in the social structure of a country. A recent clash of American Navy within the territorial waters of Venezuela and Argentina doesn't show that

narcotic gangs are targeted; instead, it signals Argentina to revoke its soyabean trade with China. The underlying reason is simple: a threat to the interests of US, giving rise to another pole of power in the region is unacceptable to the hegemon. Therefore, rise of multipolarity brings clashes because hegemon never like horizontal relations in the region.

In this similar vein, the units of the structure do not operate superficially, they impact the domestic socio-political order within the countries. Recent struggle to reap more benefits from semiconductor has increased competition between powers on the one hand. On the other, it raises inflation, causing political polarization due to slow economic growth. For Italy which has to pay more 203% of debt of GDP in debt only. Similarly, India has doubled its debt in recent years due to increased imports from China worth \$113.8 Billion. The struggle to dominate its rivals has led many states to ignore the needs of their

people. According to the economist, living standard in Europe, Japan, and the US is expected to be affected by stagflation. Hence, more protests are observed throughout the years against their government's priorities.

The cohesion of society is fragmented when foreign powers exploits the marginalized segment of the weaker states. For example, in a regional quest for hegemony, India is actively supporting BLA - a US designated terrorists group - to thwart the rise of China while, at the same time, affect the economy of ~~pol~~ Pakistan. Such implications are brought by the phenomenon of rising multipolarity. The results are far beyond forbearance of a country; because, it challenges the national integration and widens the trust-deficit between society and institutions. In other words, the structural effects on society drains the productive workforce - youth, by being radicalized by foreign propaganda - and the economic resources of the country.

To add fuels to the fire, multiple ways are devised by powerful states to achieve their interests. For example, aiding their proxies and manipulating the perception of people through cyber channels are other dimensions, which cannot be ignored. States often counter proxy proxies by taking kinetic actions. As a result of collateral damage, it fractures the social unity while state lose its narrative by maintaining law and order. Similarly, countering cyber-warfare is often seen suppression of dissenting voices. The institutional arrangements imposed by the great powers, thus, release their indices and outlooks, placing each country in hierarchical order. That specific order represents ranking of a country, the more a state aligns with their interests, the higher the ranking of that state. Such collusion grapple smaller states with policy confusion and fragmented society. Thus, multipolarity causes more harm than cure to the hierarchical structure of the world.

To conclude with the famous saying of Thucydides, "the stronger do what they want and weaker suffer what they must." So, the structure is anarchical ~~and~~ but hierarchical where vertical relations more or less stabilizes the order of the structure. However, a horizontal relations among the actors poses more threats of fueling war, as the case may be seen in the world of empires or primitive ages. Thus, stability lies not merely in multipolar; instead uni-multipolar world.

Marks: _____ out of 100.

Sir! kindly suggest me

what to add

what to avoid

Thank you for your
kind words.

Regards.