

Multipolarity: Promoting Peace or Fueling War?

Outline:

1. Introduction:

Multipolarity is the contradiction between different ideologies. The balance between contrasting ideologies is usually very fragile and the tolerance is limited, eventually fueling war against each other.

2. A glance on multipolarity in fueling war

3. Multipolarity, primary cause of war:

i. Historical development of governments through wars between monarchy, theocracy, and popular sovereignty.
Case in point: History of Europe.

ii. A glance at historical Religious Wars.

Case in point: Crusades.

iii. Contemporary war for governance
Structure: Globalism v.s. Regionalism
v.s. Nationalism.

Case in point, U.N., rising blocs: SCO, BRICS; and Brexit.

iv. War for dominance between multipolar states.

Case in point: Cold war between U.S. and USSR

v. The current trade war between eagle and panda.

Case in point: U.S. - China trade war.

vi. Wars for economic structure's hegemony between different states.

Case in point: Capitalism v.s. Communism

vii. Cultural multipolarity fuels war, creates US v.s. them mentality.

Case in point: Rise in White Supremacists: hatred and attacks on different ethnicities.

viii. A hidden war between "tradition" and "progress" in society.

Case in point: apathy for traditions by progressive minds fuel agitation within communities.

ix. The environmental question: ^{environmental} ~~sustainable~~ ^{protection} ~~development~~ v.s. economic development.

Case in point: Environment's material v.s. intrinsic value.

4. Can multipolarity promote peace?

P.T.O.

i. Charter of Madina: caused a brief peace followed by war.

Case in point: Jews expulsion from Madina and the Battle of Hunain.

ii. Globalisation: a facade of peace between multipolar groups

Case in point: Rise in hate speech and discrimination:

5.

Conclusion

Human beings, ~~since~~ ^{from} their inception when they hid in caves from terrestrial animals for their survival to the contemporary period in which their high-rise buildings touch the clouds, have become masters of all the other living organisms ^{and} have fought indefinite numbers of wars; Most of the wars, if not all, are fought on the basis of multipolarity!

Multipolarity is the contrast of ideologies on a single thing between different people. The balance between these contrasting ideologies is very delicate, as one always tries to dominate the other, and the tolerance between them is limited, eventually fueling war against each other. The human history has witnessed great number of wars on the basis of contrasting ideologies. The wars of European states against each other or the conflicts between different religions in the form of crusades or the current trade war between the United States and China demonstrates this crucial fact that whenever multipolarity arises, it fuels wars. Because there is an innate tendency among human beings of dominance, ~~and~~ not only of themselves but also of their ideologies.

Hegel, in the 19th century, also gave a similar political philosophy that whenever a "thesis" and an "anti-thesis" arise, they will amalgamate to form a "synthesis" because

one, in the presence of other, becomes insecure and instable.

Before the establishment of agrarian societies, humanity lived in packs. With the rise of concept of private property and land ownership, during agricultural revolution, the society became instable because it got divided into owners and slaves, multipoles. This multipolarity derived the history of humanity through a perpetual state of war between the owners and the slaves. As "Karl Marx" has said, "The history of hitherto human existence is the history of war between the bourgeois and the proletariat." This war transitioned into Monarchy versus popular sovereignty and to the contemporary democracy versus dictatorship. The common factor in all the wars humanity have fought is the factor of contradiction between ideologies, and for the domination of one over the other, one fuels war against the other. This depicts that multipolarity is inherently unstable and to achieve stability, it fuels wars.

Multipolarity is the primary cause of war because of human's nature of ^{historical} dominance over the others. Take for instance, the wars fought between the European states for thirty years, or current ideological, social, or economic war, all of them have the common factor of multipolarity.

The contemporary forms of government owe their existence to the wars between different forms of government, namely, monarchy, theocracy, and early democracy. Since the establishment of civilizations, monarchy was a common institution among them. It was later challenged and replaced by theocracy and feudal system after the signing of "Magna Carta". The theocracy and the feudal lords were eventually replaced by earlier forms of democracy and popular sovereignty. Each of this replacement was accompanied by deadly battles and purges that drained extensive amount of human blood. For instance, in Europe, the "Magna Carta" constrained the institution of monarchy while the "thirty years war" and "protestant reformation" paved the way for the rise of democratic institutions. This depicts that multipolarity is instable and fuels wars, and the existence of contemporary forms of government is due to the wars fought between different forms of government.

Furthermore, the ^{historical} religious wars also emboldens the fact that multipolarity fuels wars. The religious wars, namely the crusades, ^{were} fought between the muslims and the christians for the possession of Jerusalem, a land holy to both. The primary reason of these crusades was the possession of the holyland, while the secondary reason was to inflict damage to other religious ideology and spread one's own ideology. The Christians were very successful in their expedition against

the muslims; Not only did they conquered Jerusalem but also the spreaded across the Middle East. In the case of muslims, they were successful after the third crusade and became a very strong force that they challenged and conquered parts of Europe, the christian's stronghold. These religious wars can be very clearly linked to the fact that multipolarity fuels wars, even in the preachers of peace.

Moreover, in the contemporary world, uncertainty has risen regarding the governance structure with the rise of multipolar states. Globalisation is day by day becoming an outdated concept. Regionalism and Nationalism are challenging the current global structures and powers. The rise of powerful states such as China and Russia are tinging the western bloc structures with their own structures. Organisations like "Shanghai Cooperative Organisation" and BRICS, an alliance of southern nations, are a replacement of the Bretten Wood Institutions such as United Nations, International Monetary fund, and World Bank. This rise has agitated and aggravated the western bloc countries and has made the eastern bloc, their adversary. Moreover, nationalism has also superceded the regional interest because of the power dynamics; Votes like "Brexit" show how national ambitions challenge regional structures. This clearly shows how the

rise of regionalism and nationalism have challenged globalism and the western bloc leading to combatative ambitions among the latter.

Going on, cold war between the United States and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic is the primary example of 'multipolarity fueling war'. After the fall of Hitler and the end of World War II, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were the only two states with immense power. As multipolarity fuels incensation, ~~they~~ both started to fight a silent war in almost all the fields, such as, space exploration, agricultural development, ~~influencing other nations~~ and technological advancement. They also fought indirect wars, proxy wars, in Vietnam and Korea. The reason for all this agitation was a simple fact that humans by nature know only one principle and that is dominance over the other; human nature can never tolerate an equal but different ideology. The end result of the cold war was the triumph of the United States and the end of the U.S.S.R. This demonstrates that even partners of World War II, will resort to war against each other when the question of a multipolar world arises. The cold war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. is a principle example of multipolarity fueling war.

In addition, the current trade war between the United States and China ~~etc~~ echoes the principle of multipolarity fueling war. According to the "Thucydides trap", a established power will ensure all the strategies to constrain a rising power. The

U.S. has been ambitiously taking all the vital steps since late 20th century to constrain China, but despite all its measures, China has risen and has become an established world power in economy and military. The U.S. has now imposed harsh tariffs of upto 150% to damage China's economy. Moreover, the U.S. is also harming ~~the~~ China's military industry by cutting off its chip imports. These desperate steps taken by the U.S. bolsters the fact that with only one "Leviathan", the society can live in peace, and with the rise of many sovereigns chaos ensue. The current tariff war between the U.S. and China emboldens the fact that multipolarity fuels chaos.

Similarly, the economic war between Capitalism and Communism echoes the principle of multipolarity fueling war. Capitalism and Communism are economic models that have fought war in the 19th century. The former was practiced by the western bloc countries while the latter was followed by the eastern bloc, mainly the U.S.S.R. and China. These both economic models fueled war against each other by inflicting damage to one another. Capitalism believed in the individual ownership of property while communism believed that state has the only right to own property to spread equality ~~among~~ and distribute resources equally among the society. The ideological differences between both economic models fueled war leading to the rise of

Capitalism and the fall of Communism. "Francis Fukuyama" in his book: "End of History and the last Man" entails the whole economic war between both models. ~~at say~~ This demonstrates that multipolarity even in economic models leads to war.

Likewise, Cultural multipolarity spreads hatred, discrimination, and fuels wars. In diverse societies, although cooperation and tolerance exist to some extent, there is always a group that tries to dominate over other cultures by spreading hatred and discrimination towards them, and by imposing forcefully their culture over the others. This discrimination and forceful imposition of one's culture over the others' ^{culture} fuel war, significantly leading to chaos and instability within the society. The rise of "White Supremacists" especially in the U.S. and U.K. demonstrates this harmful trend; they attack, online and offline, different ethnicities, cultures, and people of different backgrounds. This trend is also true in countries where one cultural ^{group} dominates; The dominant cultural group squashes its culture forcefully over the other minor groups. The above discussion makes the fact relevant that even cultural multipolarity fuels war.

In the similar vein, technological advancements have stratified societies into traditionalists and progressivists, fueling agitation between both because of their multipolar nature. Technological innovations have made humans rational and sensible; they have started questioning the validity of certain

traditions. While the conservatives find these questions impudent and an attack on their centuries old beliefs. Also, the apathy of progressive minds for traditions fuel disunity within communities. Conservatives find this apathy as an ~~ex~~ existential threat to their traditions and beliefs. This stratifies society and fuels aggression within groups. One major and significant reason for the rise of "extremist Hindutva ideology" in India is spread of secularism that challenged ~~the~~ religious ideologies, primarily ~~the~~ Hinduism. The "Hindutva" bloc found it concerning and unleashed a war against secularism, evident from the current situation of India. This confirms that human progress and rationality have stratified the society between conservatives and modernists leading to war because of their multipolar nature.

In addition, the division on environmental protection and exploitation for economic development has polarised the world fueling aggressiveness of one over other. Environmental protectionists demand for sustainable development and a halt to environmental exploitation so that the process of climate change can be thwarted, and the world remains habitable for the future generations; On the contrary, the materialists view environment as a mode for human development, and they justify its unlimited exploitation for economic advancements. This polarisation between ~~the~~

both has lead to an aggressive approach over one another, in ^{the} form of protests and attacks. Greta Thunberg's ^{aggressive} protest in front of ^{the} Swedish parliament is an example of environmentally stratified aggression. So and so, the Swedish government's use of force to curb her legal right of protest ~~for~~ implies the use of aggression of the other side. This portrays how polarisation on environment's protection or exploitation is fueling aggression.

While it has been immensely argued that multipolarity fuels war, the question arises whether multipolarity can promote peace or not. The answer is simple: multipolarity can only promote tentative peace and not permanent peace because it is inherently unstable and the delicate balance is too fragile to maintain. Permanent peace can only be ensured with one "Leviathan" or one "Sovereign" or one "entity" dominating the system.

Charter of Madina, the first constitutional document of human civilization, ensured peace between Muslims, Christians, and Jews of Madina, but eventually Jews were expelled from this contract because of their pudent opposition of Muslims. This document has been highlighted and hailed for promoting peace among multipolars living collectively within a society. It is, no doubt, true that this document brought the necessary peace among the groups residing in Madina, but it is also true that the peace only lasted for a temporary period eventually leading to expulsion of the Jews

from Madina and a war with them. The aforementioned arguments made it crystal clear that contrasting ideologies eventually clash leading to war, and multipolarity is inherently unstable. The same happened in the case of Madina in which Jews despite having a peace pact with Muslims, supported their enemies in the battle of "Khandag," and "Khyber". Their clashing ideologies and the instinct within Jews to dominate Muslims led them to take such harsh steps. This proves all the discussion done beforehand that conflicting, contrasting, and contradicting polars will eventually lead to war, no matter however they are bound with peace.

In addition, globalisation has also been hailed as a significant measure in promoting peace between ^{states} ~~multipolars~~. (by multipolars) ——— =

It has created interdependence of states over one another by integrating them economically, politically, and socially. However, this ascription is partially correct and totally biased towards powerful states that created this system. Because, globalisation has entrenched the interests of powerful states within weaker, resources rich states by manipulating global institutions. Moreover, It has led to significant resent among the weaker states who are now moving toward regional ~~was~~ organisations to counter ~~global~~ powerful nation's ambitions. If globalisation was successful in promoting peace, why are states actively joining regional organisations? The answer is crystal clear that

When global governance framework was implemented, U.S. was the most powerful state, and ~~used~~^{it} these institutions as per ~~its~~^{their} wishes; however, when multipolars like China and Russia rose, global institutions lost much of their charm because of the inherent competition for dominance between multipolar ideologies which eventually fuels war.

In Conclusion, multipolarity is the contradiction of ideologies that eventually fuels war because of ~~the~~^{its} limited tolerance and a delicate balance, very hard to maintain, between these ideologies. Most of the wars humanity have fought are because of this principle of multipolarity. ~~Human's~~^{Men's} innate nature of dominating over others led them to battlegrounds, eventually; On a glance at human history, wars ^{seem to} remain common between multipolars, only the battle grounds changed: political, religious, social, economic, or environmental.

Suggestion for Improvement.

1. The first part of the report is very good. It contains a lot of information and is well written. However, it is a bit long and some of the details are not necessary. It would be better to focus on the main points and keep it concise.

2. The second part of the report is also good, but it is a bit repetitive. Some of the points are repeated several times. It would be better to combine these points and make them more concise.

3. The third part of the report is very good. It contains a lot of information and is well written. However, it is a bit long and some of the details are not necessary. It would be better to focus on the main points and keep it concise.

4. The fourth part of the report is also good, but it is a bit repetitive. Some of the points are repeated several times. It would be better to combine these points and make them more concise.

5. The fifth part of the report is very good. It contains a lot of information and is well written. However, it is a bit long and some of the details are not necessary. It would be better to focus on the main points and keep it concise.

6. The sixth part of the report is also good, but it is a bit repetitive. Some of the points are repeated several times. It would be better to combine these points and make them more concise.

7. The seventh part of the report is very good. It contains a lot of information and is well written. However, it is a bit long and some of the details are not necessary. It would be better to focus on the main points and keep it concise.

8. The eighth part of the report is also good, but it is a bit repetitive. Some of the points are repeated several times. It would be better to combine these points and make them more concise.

9. The ninth part of the report is very good. It contains a lot of information and is well written. However, it is a bit long and some of the details are not necessary. It would be better to focus on the main points and keep it concise.

10. The tenth part of the report is also good, but it is a bit repetitive. Some of the points are repeated several times. It would be better to combine these points and make them more concise.