## The concept of tolerance

Life



## **Relativity in World Powers**

There are many necessities needed to become a hyperpower, but Amy Chua says that the most important is tolerance. Certain countries have became world powers without tolerance, but Amy Chua argues that tolerance is the main contributor to a quick rise and a deadly fall for countries. Starting from 550 BC, tolerance was the reason that small countries became world-controlling hyperpowers. Amy Chua also argued that tolerance had to be relative to the surrounding countries. Relative tolerance strengthened Amy Chua's argument by adding a new level of complexity to the necessities of being a hyperpower, adding explanation to competition, and redefining the best way to rise to a hyperpower.

Relativity created complexity by making both regular people and leaders reevaluate how much tolerance hyperpowers need to use. Once we establish that tolerance is relative, we can also start applying the same concept to other important traits of both civilization and world-dominant powers.

Technology also has to be relative to surrounding and competing countries. Having one, small piece of technology that, for example, doubles the speed of agriculture will take countries far ahead of their competitors. This means that countries have to evaluate their competition, learn and take as much as possible, technology and politically, and then try to improve on the areas that other countries are weak because those areas can only be weak for a country if surrounding countries have better utilization of an important area. That is, if a single country existed that shared the same technology, military, etc. it cannot be considered "weak" or "strong" in such areas because they have nothing to compare to. The more countries we add, the more leaders

https://assignbuster.com/the-concept-of-tolerance/

have to consider the weaknesses of other countries and the more considerations there must be with controlling a budget while trying to evolve in the world economy. Relativity in Chua's arguments creates more complexity, but it also adds more competition.

Competition is the underlying cause for countries wanting to, and consequently becoming, hyperpowers. Persia found it's way up to a hyperpower through competition with other nearby kingdoms of Achaemenid and other countries. Because power in areas is relative, there is more competition in each of the areas. Competition is the fuel for change, we make new technology, get more military power, and give out more tolerance because of the need to be a hyperpower and to expand. The more areas that exist that are relative from country to country, the more competition we have, which leads to a number of important results. First of all, there is a stronger division and separation of labor, and the more countries want to prosper in huge advancements in technology and political understanding the more they need professionals, which makes governments focus more and more money towards the best of professional areas, which in turn creates more competition inside all of the divisions of labor which creates even more job openings and better employment rate and education. A good example would be how in Persia, as the empire expanded, to create palaces only the best were picked to weave and do the stone work. The more the best work for the leaders, the more job openings there is in the areas before them. As a result, we hit an endless cycle of more jobs and more improvement, just from competition.

Complexity because of the amount of new considerations needed to be made creates another very important result: it redefines exactly how we view hyperpowers and how to become a world dominant power. No longer is it possible to narrow down the cause of an economic increase of a country to simply " more democracy and more tolerance", instead we must consider the surrounding competition. A country may have great tolerance and other necessities to become a hyper power, but the surrounding countries might simply be too strong and too ahead. The Aztecs might have had control of central America, but in the end they just didn't have enough to compete with Northern and Southern America, and going over an ocean to try to contest other continents simply is too far-stretched. This means that there is much more luck involved based on where the society is located and how smart the surrounding societies are.

The concept of tolerance being relative strengthened Amy Chua's argument by adding a new level of complexity to the necessities of being a hyperpower, adding explanation to competition, and redefining the best way to rise to a hyperpower. Many countries may have a near perfect standing for potential to becoming a world power or a hyperpower. But if they are surrounded by other countries that have a power that is relatively stronger then it will be much harder to rise up. The concept of relative tolerance will continue to create tension, problems, and new ideas for countries in the far future.