

The Rise of the East

Urmi Ray

Assistant Professor Women's Christian College Philosophy Department

Guest Faculty at University of Calcutta, India

Abstract

In this 70th year of anniversary of Sino-Indian Diplomatic Relation, instead of friendship we find an outbreak of dispute. Samuel Huntington had already forecasted that a shift in power from West to East was evident. This prediction came to be true. China is now ruling the world. Thus does it becoming tyrannical, so much so that it wants to devastate the whole world through a biological warfare? Whose solution would only be found with China, and we have to take their help to save our lives thereby escalating their wealth. In the process our resources become weak, then at that threshold they come in the forefront literally to fight a war against us with arms and armaments. What should be our response? Well, violence only leads to more of it. Thus a dialogue or a negotiation is the best way to know what they want. But if they deny such pacific cooperation then war would perhaps be our last resort to save ourselves.

KEYWORDS: 70th Sino-Indian anniversary, economic war, justice, dialogue or counter-terrorism

During the Cold War the world was found to be in two poles, the U.S and Europe on one side and Russia on the other representing Capitalism and Communism respectively. But during post-cold war the world was found into different parts. The liberalists took it on a positive note as they saw a way of cultural exchange through such diversities. The Realists state that due to such differences clash is evident. At this juncture Samuel P. Huntington states that this clash is due to superiority of culture or civilization of one, over others; the two bold competitors being the West (the liberalists) and the East (the Conservatives).

The first World War was fought to establish Democracy, the second World War was fought to establish Capitalism.

In today's world a constant striving is found to establish one's own identity in terms of culture. During this time people attempt to answer the most basic question, humans can face: who we are? And they answer it in a traditional way by giving reference to the things that mean most to them. People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs and institutions. They identify with cultural groups, tribes, communities, nations and at the broadest level civilizations. People use politics not to just advance their interests but also to define their identity. We know who we are only when we know who we are not and often when we know whom we are against.

- In his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* Samuel P. Huntington discussed about five major issues¹.

First, he said Modernization does not mean Westernization.

Second, balance of power, shifts gradually from the West to the East (Asian Civilizations) in terms of scientific inventions, economy, military and political strength.

Third, a civilization based world order is emerging. Societies share cultural affinities, cooperate with each other, effort to shift societies from one civilization to another is unsuccessful; and countries group themselves around the lead or core states of their civilization.

Fourth, West's universalistic pretensions increasingly came into conflicts with other civilizations, most seriously with Islam and Confucianism.

Finally, the survival of the West depends on them, accepting their own civilization as unique and not universal. Avoidance of global war of civilizations depends on World leaders accepting and cooperating to maintain the multicivilizational character of global politics.

This may be termed as a new World where local politics is the politics of ethnicity; whereas global politics is the politics of civilizations.

The rivalry of super powers is replaced by the clash of civilizations.

Huntington further states that tribal wars and ethnic conflicts occur within civilizations. Violence between states and groups from different civilizations, however carries with it the potential for escalation as other states and groups from these civilizations rally to the support of their "kin- countries"².

Therefore, the bloody clash of clans in Somalia poses no threat of broader conflict. Again the bloody clash of tribes in Rawanda has consequences for Uganda,

Zaire and Brundi but not much further.

Jacques Delors agreed that

future conflicts will be sparked by cultural factors rather than economies or ideology. And the most dangerous cultural conflicts are those along the fault lines between civilizations.

People separated by ideology but united by culture come together as the two Germanys did one being Capitalist and another Communist; two Koreas and several Chinas are beginning to—where both have sectional absolutist rule and democratic rule respectively.

But in spite of such ideological differences they join hands on the basis of their cultural commonality.

Since civilizations are cultural and not political entities, they do not as such maintain order, establish justice, collect taxes, fight wars, negotiate treaties or do any of the other things which governments do.

United States 'was' the centre of power in the world for a long time and hence for a long time a unipolar political and economic power play was found in the world, thus seemed an imbalance in power--even before European entry, most analysis foresees a Chinese entry into a major power position thereafter.

The West had been lagging behind the others, for several hundred years. China under Tang, Sung and Ming dynasties, the Islamic world from 8th to 12th centuries far surpassed Europe (the West) in wealth, territory, military power, artistic-literary and scientific achievement³.

In the latter part of the 19th century, however renewed Western imperialism extended Western rule over all of Africa, consolidated Western control in the subcontinent and elsewhere in Asia and by early 20th century subjected virtually the entire Middle East except for Turkey to direct or indirect Western control.

But finally in the 20th century West's power had been noticed to gradually shift.

Let us now attempt to see why such decline of West is being noticed and how China is gaining prominence in the world scenario.

In the West we find increase of antisocial behaviour such as drug use, violence, family decay, illegitimacy—that is, a moral decay overall. Whereas the East rises as it follows its roots; harping upon its value system giving rise to strong discipline. As a result of social and ethical decay a decline in West's "Social Capital" is also noticed. On the other hand, by rigorous disciplinary training the East gains scientific skills to its excellence producing and distributing thereby several products to the world strengthening its capital through such a powerful trade. Again decreasing commitment to learning and intellectual activity manifested in the U.S; lower level scholastic achievements.

But the question now arises would this not mean a dictatorial shift of power from West to East?

Against the backdrop of Samuel P. Huntington's book, we find a power shift from U.S to China and in today's date this is no more a mere theory but comes to be a true prediction of the author. In the clash of civilizations due to maintained ethnicity and orthodoxy the East gains more strength than the West.

We have witnessed the suppressed ones justifying their vindications for violence against the West in the name of Jihad⁴ and now it is the turn of the Oriental world or Pan Asian world to show its power strategies to break free from the fetters of West.

War has now taken a different shade. Previously war was based on weapons which took the form of nuclear combat, thereafter biological and now economic. China has shown gradual growth in its economy passing through stages from People's Republic of China to Communism thereafter Maoism (where peasants were the proletariats) until it became socialist in nature. They made rural population join urban industries. They profited largely from global economy through the growth of Chinese colonies such as Hong Kong, Taiwan and Macau which were captured and ruled by the West. The different multinational companies have invested hugely to contribute a lot in Chinese economy. Their absolutist ruling structure had also made them more powerful in work and discipline too. Moreover their rise is sharply found after privatisation of public properties. The prominence of China is being noticed in different fields today. With their scientific skills they produce commodities which can be bought at a reasonable price; and such commodities replace the others of a higher price produced by the rest of the world. Thus its elevation of GDP and its position in the World Stock Market is no doubt commendable. U.S had been in number one position in wealth and power so far amongst all first world countries. And more or less each and every part of the world is somehow dependent on U.S. But now a shift is noticed; such dependence is now found upon China by the rest of the world for its upcoming excellences in inventions. But power as we have always seen in history leads to tyranny, and inventions mostly acted as boon but sometimes also as curse. Such an invention by the upcoming world power has led to devastation to the rest of the world. Corona virus spread or biological warfare—what do we call it? Or do we see it as a Communist War by Communist China destroying the suppressors of the entire world—by diminishing their wealth and economy? But what about the Proletariats who are also dying in such a war? Perhaps they would call it a collateral damage—as their number is small compared to the fatality rate of the so-called Bourgeoisie. Is this what Samuel P. Huntington termed as⁵ ‘Rise of East’ or as the clash between ‘East versus West’ in his book? But instead of equality once again power struggle is leading to exploitation; or would they call it justice to the underprivileged in the words of John Rawls?

China has also proposed to use their currency in world wide trade; in which case U.S dollar might lose its worth.

Huntington said that such a civilizational war would only be found across *varying* civilizations. Would Eastern orthodox nations like us be spared in this war then? Again the question arises is it really to celebrate their identity through their culture and ethnicity or to topple the existing power to become all powerful in the world; are they performing such deeds?

We are all hoping that very soon medical science would be able to fight back this virus, but the question remains what treatment should be given to them who initiated such a havoc nuisance across the planet? Does power not lead to corruption? Do we not witness only history repeating itself?

In this 70th anniversary of Sino-Indian Diplomatic relation, we find not only economic rise of China through what we may term as economic terrorism created out of a biological warfare whose fatality can be curbed perhaps depending upon China's production of medication and vaccines, but over and above that a traditional warfare is seen amongst the two nations. Is it due to the fact that India--being East joins hand with Western powers?

But however powerful a nation wants to be overriding the others, war can never be the way out. As this would be a continuous process which would never see an end. We all know that violence only begets violence.

Last but not the least a fair war has some rules and regulations in war ethics. It should have characteristics such as Self Determination, Legitimate authority, it should be the last resort, should have a right intention, probability of success and proportionality between its means and its ends. All these characteristics together comprise the *Jus Ad Bellum*, or the conditions of a Just war as mentioned by St. Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica*. But at this moment the war that China has indulged into is in a way *clandestine*, which does not constitute of a fair traditional warfare. Clandestine methods are also used in Guerrilla warfare but such is not aimed at the innocent mass living on this earth. Any war is wedged against its proper target group or against its party at dispute. Killing the non-combatant, non-military, innocent, civilian is a form of terrorism and not war. And this is what China is doing to the rest of the world to sweep off the others completely using a virus as their instrument—finally making us economically and other resource wise weak and thereafter attacking us at the war frontline with arms and armament. The consequence is, any way we would be eradicated if not by getting killed in war but by the virus being operated by them on us. Perhaps to end this or to reciprocate to them counter war or counter terrorism or any kind of insurgency is not desirable. As it would only lead to more and more of killing. The parties at dispute should sit for reconciliation at a dialogue to talk out what they want from each other. As shown by the Jainas and the Buddhists, how *Ahimsa* can be *diplomatic ways out* to devastating situations. If no peaceful cooperation or solution are found from their end then *war by us as reciprocation of self defense* can be used as the last resort.

References

1. Huntington; Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World order. Simon and Schuster: 1996: New York, U.S. P.20
2. Ibid; P.28
3. Ibid; P.50
4. Ibid; P.212
5. Ibid; P.322