Chapter 11

ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE THEORY

In the immediate aftermath of 9/11 George Bush commented “They hate our freedoms, our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.” Bin Laden on the other hand saw the attacks as a retribution for years of pain suffered by Muslims at the hands of America. These are two radically opposite accounts of the motivation behind the attacks and each account is slanted and overloaded with heavy ideological overtones, and both are inaccurate in their explanation of conflict, which can be better explained by highlighting the underlying economic and political realities.

But as already pointed out, by 2006 both the protagonists, have veered to impliedly accepting the idea of clash of civilisation and thus have almost, though implicitly, legitimised Huntingtonian framework. Peter L. Berger in the short afterword to his book argues that what Bin Laden and his Al Qaeda are waging is closer to a “political war” against the American presence in the Middle East (and its Arab / Muslim allies) than a “clash of civilizations”. He makes out a case for a political conflict between the West and Al Qaeda and not a case for civilizational war. (1) Similarly, Khurshid has said “Recent world issues, from the surface, seem to support Huntington’s deterministic worldview, but these can be more rationally explained through other, more tangible factors, such as economy, and politics.” (2)

Guo Jiemin has pointed out that “Cultural power is bound to accompany political power. For example, U.S. foreign policy has always included a plan of disseminating U.S. cultural values to the rest of the world, of which exporting the mode of U.S. political development is one of the major elements.”
In the context of clash of civilisations thesis, Sylo Taraku has raised many relevant questions such as “If civilization is universal, who and how does one define it. If it is pluralistic, where do you draw the lines? Does Huntington’s hypothesis say something about the driving forces behind conflict and cooperation in the world? Does really cultural belonging play the decisive role in how states relate to each other? Whether the theory ‘The Clash of Civilizations’ is meaningful when it comes to describing and understanding the state of today’s conflicts in the world after September 11th.” (3)

The lack of cohesive and comprehensive theory on conflict in human society, especially at the inter-group or at the international level and the inability of scholars to provide a grand theory of conflict has led to contending approaches being offered by many scholars but so far none seems to have been able to address the full complexity of human conflict. The many micro and macro theories which have been formulated thus far have been insufficient to explain the conflict in the world and the search for a new paradigms to explain conflict have continued unabated sometimes through a fusion or synthesis of both macro and micro theories and at other times by presenting a novel idea. Though, many of the theories discussed above seem to offer good explanations for conflict, they are in no way comprehensive and this leaves enough room to offer newer explanations for conflict. And in the post 9/11 world, particularly so, because it has been convincingly established by most scholars that Huntington’s thesis does not provide a sufficient, acceptable, comprehensive and scientific explanation about conflict in the world and is more of a motivated endeavour trying to serve a Western agenda.

As most of the theories about conflict and world order have several or some loopholes and as there is no comprehensive theory that can explain appropriately the conflict in human society and human history, and as there is always room to improve, by suggesting new insights or repackaging known facts, a different
thesis is being proposed here as a part of this study. For simplicity and brevity sake, this theory is proposed to be called as The Survival Through Domination (STD) Theory or simply Survival-Domination Theory. This theory arises out of realist, evolutionary, constructionist and knowledge/gnosic viewpoints. This theory also has its corollary which is called Domination Through Knowledge Theory or Knowledge for Power System Theory. This theory, primarily arises out of combination of several perspectives. What is being proposed here is essentially a Power Theory of Conflict which links biology, evolution and knowledge in a harmonious blend. This theory seeks to bring about a synthesis of power perspective with evolutionary perspective on the one hand and the knowledge-construction perspective on the other.

Why do newer and different explanations about conflict continue to emerge? The main reason is that there is a lack of agreement among the scholars about the historic and contemporary views of human conflict. No existing single theory or explanations of conflict accounts for all the vital factors having the bearing on existence and rise of conflict. Instead many different theories emphasizing only certain aspects lead to dichotomy and divisions among the scholars pursuing different approaches thereby thwarting the search for a dominant paradigm to explain conflict in human society. The most contentious issue among the scholars trying to explain conflict concerns the nature of conflict. Is conflict something innate or instinctual? Is it part of human nature and evolutionary apparatus? Is it linked to animal behaviour of humans? In short, is it natural? Or is it the result of learning, nurture or socialization? The question which most occupies the minds of the scholars trying to understand conflict is about motivation for conflict. Is human motivation to wage war or engage in conflicts and violence something that comes from nature or is it something that comes from the learning processes such as socialization and culturation? The dichotomy in approaches has persisted and given that the nature-nurture debate remains
unresolved, irrespective of the occasional claims of the adherents of both camps that the final verdict is out, attempts at synthesizing nature-nurture into a unified theory have been unsuccessful. The result has been that no clear explanation has surfaced to explain conflict in an integrated holistic manner.

It is true that conclusions about conflict in human society cannot be drawn by simply or only basing them on animal behaviour of human beings. There are definite motivational differences between human beings and animals though they both share in the common inheritance of territoriality, sexuality, survival and dominance traits. And while it is also true that both engage in predatory as well as intra-specific conflict, the range and complexity of human conflict is far more complex with a spiraling hierarchy. And this has been endorsed by many scholars like O'Connell. Also the organized and coordinated manner of waging war or mounting an attack shared by both animals and humans differs in humans in its underlying motivation at least to certain degree. In animals it is more in the interest of survival, in humans more in the interest of dominance, territoriality and sexuality being either constants or subordinate. The fact about survival is that it is more dependent on the natural and the fact about dominance is that it is more dependent on the invention. But to see survival as separate from dominance is to completely miss the underlying reality. Survival and dominance cannot be separated and therefore they both share in the natural and the inventive. The difference however is that in case of the animals it is the natural unconscious invention which is more at work and in case of the humans it is the cultural conscious invention which is more at work. But the underlying truth is also that the human cultural conscious invention to dominate is itself grounded in the natural unconscious invention of animals to survive. Hence all talk of the nature-nurture dichotomy with regard to conflict becomes superficial, irrelevant and frivolous. The difficulty arises when conflict is viewed merely in terms of violence or war,. But if conflict is seen as a part of a larger evolutionary enterprise of
survival through dominance, a different interpretation and explanation becomes possible.

The presently proposed theory holds that there are levels of development of domination and in the earliest biosic stage humans engaged in conflict more in terms of animal behaviour and a measure of this natural baggage is bound to persist as long as human beings remain part of the animal world and share animal nature. But this does not mean that the present conflict is a direct or immediate result of animal behaviour of humans. It stems from it but goes much beyond, being aided by the inherent human capacity to invent greater and greater complexity. Thus as a consequence humans engage not only in a wide range of conflicts but also in hierarchical intensity of violence. While it cannot be said with certainty that human beings are inevitably committed to war due to their share in animal nature, the natural process of evolution inevitable binds humans to the struggle for survival through dominance. In this activity, nature and nurture both play their role. Natural tendencies coupled with environmental inputs in the form of socialization, conditioning, organization, planning, and information play an important role. A complex interplay of innate compulsions and free choices lead human groups, communities and nations to engage in conflict and war in a game to survive through domination.

Coming to the question of human motivation for conflict, most scholars hold that human conflict is the result of a variety of motives. But the presently proposed theory challenges this argument. Superficially there may be many motivating factors which cause humans to engage in conflict but there is only a single underlying motivation which compels human beings to engage in conflict with all its inherent expressions of competition and cooperation, and that is the inherent desire to survive through domination. At the most fundamental level there is no difference in motivation for those initiating or ordering the war, the elites,
and those undertaking or fighting the war, the masses. Fundamentally, the motivation for war, arising from willingness to wage war comes from the collective complicity of the elites and the masses. It is simplistic and fallacious to say that wars are either elite driven or mass driven. At a fundamental level the intentions, emotions and interests of both the elites and masses coalesce to provide motivation to engage in war for survival through domination. War, far from being either an elite or mass activity, is a communitarian enterprise in which both the leaders and the masses are conspiratorial collaborators. The connivance between the two is more at the implicit than at the explicit level and is based on the perceived benefits especially in terms of the dominance. The split between the elites and the masses and the resistance to war from the masses emerges when the benefits supposed to accrue from waging a war, namely achievement of domination, do not seem to or actually materialise. The cost-benefit analysis in terms of domination made by the community as a whole determines the fate of a war. While there would always be some groups who would oppose war, especially in the democratic heterogeneous societies, generally on account of contending desires of different communities, the major dominating community ultimately becomes the main determiner of motivation for war.

This also explains why conflict is less of a problem between states as within states. Conflict is not a characteristic of weak states or strong states and does not have its roots so much in the size or military weakness or strength of the states, but in the hegemonic design of communities inhabiting a nation. Given that most nations are heterogeneous it is communities within a state that are mostly involved in conflicts though at times some communities may have been elevated to national community especially in homogeneous states or in states where domination of particular community is writ large. The ideal of each community, especially in heterogeneous societies, is to attain the ideal of a single community nation or a homogeneous nation, because this can help it better wage the struggle
for survival through dominance by employing the institutions and instrumentalities of the state. It is in his desire that the roots of secessionism and terrorism lie. In view of this it is a fallacy to say that there are just wars and unjust wars, though international law and conventions speak of legitimacy of ‘defensive wars’ by aggressed communities and nations and ‘peace-keeping wars’ especially under the aegis of the UN to protect militarily weak ones. All wars, in the ultimate analysis are wars by communities for survival through domination. At times the survival may seem more warranted (and hence the so called ‘defensive wars’) but at most times domination is the main motivation (and hence the wars of ‘offence as best defence’)

The defining element of human conflict is its politics of dominance and this is a natural activity but fostered through nurture, culture and invention. Human beings as a species are innately predisposed to survive through domination. And the level to which this happens in the human beings is unparalleled in entire animal world. In this process of surviving through dominance human beings bring into play both their instinctual-innate biological mechanisms as well as the invented socio-cultural constructs. The survival through domination activity of human species operates simultaneously at both the biosic level as well as the gnosic level. The degree of biosic to gnosic level differs with evolutionary development. In the most primal stage the survival through dominance is invariably and predominantly biosic (biological) but as the human species evolved and became socio-cultural and increasingly rational being the survival through dominance got elevated to the gnosic (cultural) level without of course abandoning the biosic process still underway on account of underlying animal nature of humans.

In essence nature continues to provide a major ingredient of motivation for engaging in conflictive activities (and this is being increasingly borne out by
latest genetic studies), but choice and inventiveness, especially through the development of technology also provides strong motivation to undertake and wage militaristic wars often with catastrophic results. Nature and nurture, (as also inheritance and invention, rationality and irrationality, spirituality and materiality, religion and science, philosophy and technology, intellect and emotion) come together in a potent mix to give rise to explosive wars and violent conflicts. However the dilemma of choosing between mere survival or survival through dominance has a direct bearing on the level and intensity of conflict. Conflict for mere survival is a short term defensive conflict but that is never the ‘end’ of conflict (pun intended). In the ultimate analysis conflict is for survival through dominance and this is a long term offensive goal. It is in this long term offensive conflict for the purpose of achieving survival through dominance (based on religious, ideological, communal, ethnic, racial, class or such other grounds) that most long drawn out conflicts and wars fit.

In such conflicts rationality is at play and conscious choices are made by the warring parties but such wars can and do become extremely dangerous and devastating almost to the point of abandoning rationality. Yet these wars are waged because the urge to survive by dominating, which is an innate urge is too strong to shun for the groups, communities or nations seeking the dominance. These conflicts end either by victory of one or a compromise between those involved. The victory of one leading to dominance sows the seeds of more future vengeance conflicts. A compromised end to a conflict mostly postpones the fight for a future date when the balance of power and strength could tilt. Such wars have been waged and such conflicts are a common place in human history. In these wars irrationality has also operated leading to terrible massacres and genocides but not with totally catastrophic or annihilatory results. The exception to the rule is however the Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) scenario. A MAD conflict is not attractive to any of the parties because it goes against the very
purpose for which wars are fought – to achieve survival through dominance. If a war does not even remotely hold the promise of victory it is a war not worth fighting because not only will there be no possibility of dominance but there will probably be no survival either. Almost fifty years of Cold War characterized by the MAD scenario deterring major war between the big powers capable of waging MAD wars clearly vindicates the thesis proposed here, that conflicts result and wars are waged for survival through dominance. When survival and dominance for the warring parties are not possible wars will not be waged. Humanity could prove this wrong one day but so far it has not done so. The danger stems from the recently formulated dangerous doctrine of limited nuclear wars, which could, and probably will go drastically wrong resulting in a MAD scenario. And if it ever happens, there would be no one to take cognizance of human madness as probably everyone would be consumed in a nuclear annihilation.

In carrying forward the process of survival through dominance, human ingeniousness and inventiveness brought about the development of the other attributes of conflict, namely competition and cooperation. Way back Thomas Schelling had correctly pointed out that conflict, competition and cooperation are inherently interdependent. (4) Competition and cooperation, as in the animal world and the earlier human biosic stage, so also in the later stage of human evolution came to be employed for the same purpose, the purpose of survival through dominance. The human species by this time had graduated from the biosic struggle for survival vis-à-vis other species (interspecies conflict) to a gnosic struggle for survival through dominance vis-à-vis its own kind (intraspecies conflict). The 'modern' human species had made a quantum jump from the predominantly biosic to the largely gnosic, from dependence on the innate and natural to the invented and cultural. The primary input for inventions in the gnosic stage came from knowledge (gnosos) which itself arose from emergence and development of human consciousness, rationality and experience, ably supported
by appropriate evolution of biological apparatus such as a well-developed larynx and an enlarged brain with greater concentration of complex neural networks. The urge to survive and dominate and to survive through domination, especially at the gnosic level, became the determining characteristic of the human species in its latest evolved form. Human conflict, along with its inherent and inseparable components, competition and cooperation, became more pronounced and organized in the human society. The human species set itself on a course to life of conflict in which competition and cooperation played crucial role. Human groups which earlier banded together, through cooperation and competition, for territoriality, sexuality, survival and dominance of a biosic type, now transformed themselves into communities with cultural attributes ranging from different languages, religions, lifestyles, value systems, ideologies and what not for territoriality, sexuality, survival and dominance of a gnosic kind. The age of human intra-species conflict was already upon humankind even before the human species had entered the ages of metals (bronze age) or phases of economy (agriculture) or stages of civilizations (river valley civilizations). Since then the human species has continued to incessantly engage in the game for survival through dominance of its own kind. This struggle goes on and the conflict consequently persists. Can it be ended? Can there be an end to human conflict, and yet ensure the survival of the human species? Can human conflict be separated from future human evolution and development? Will survival of human species be ensured or guaranteed without human beings having to resort to dominance? These and many such questions arise and merit further investigation.

Also the question of survival through domination in the gnosic stage needs detailed investigation. Does the desire of one group to impose its ideas, world view and value system on to others amounts to the same struggle for survival through dominance? The assumption of this theory is that it does. At the cultural stage in human evolutionary history, the survival through dominance enters the
knowledge for power system phase. In the pre-state stage, the political already existed as the ground of human nature, as the fundamental essential of human nature. The origins of the political lay in the fact and dynamics of evolutionary process itself. Therefore the evolutionary process, oriented towards survival through dominance, is essentially of political nature. This political is the covert and hidden ground of which the political state is the overt manifestation. In the evolutionary sequence the covert political predates the overt manifestation of political as the state. The covert political expressed as survival through dominance caused the emergence of the overt political which came to be termed state. The emergence of the political state was to subserve the human cause for survival through dominance and therefore conflict and dominance can never be alienated from state. To hope for a peaceful state, a state sans desire to dominate is not only an antithesis but impossibility. The idea of ‘Peaceful State’ is a myth and to expect state to be symbol of peace is an utopia. State as an overt instrumentality of the covert process of survival through dominance necessarily entails engaging in war and conflicts. Peace, if and when it exists, is either a result of achieved domination or merely an interlude between struggles for dominance. Terming absence of violence as peace amounts to giving an interlude a name. But it is an interlude all the same. Eternal peace is a fallacy. At best there can be a peace of balance of power, which is, to say the least, most precarious peace that can be. Therefore peace interludes however long cannot be used to argue the possibility of permanent peace, because it goes against the very fact and nature of evolution.

Evolution is a dynamic process and dynamism entails conflict. That evolution, which is a slow and long drawn out process, can take place in the absence of conflict, has not yet been proved by anyone beyond doubt. Mostly it is a hope and probably an empty hope. However conflict does not always mean presence of violence or use of physical force. Conflict of ideas is conflict all the same though it may not necessarily lead to violence or war. Cold War was a
conflict but not a violent military engagement by the parties to the conflict. Assertion of possibility of permanent peace in human society amounts to not only a denial of the reality of the political nature of human species but a denial of the evolutionary reality. Peace as a permanent possibility is an impossibility because it is contrary to nature and evolution. But peace as an ideology is tenable. And could be even practiced for a time and as long as people subscribe to it. But this is a utopian desire because absolute peace bereft of conflict with its inherent expressions of cooperation and competition and cooperation for competition is not only unnatural but an impossibility.

Moreover if peace is absence of violence and not absence of conflict, permanent democratic peace is a contradiction in terms because democracy is based on the idea of competition and competition ultimately engenders conflict and conflict in turn has the potential to engender such intense interaction that it can results in the outbreak of violence and war. However, most often conflict with its interaction, even though more intense than that of competition, does not necessarily lead to violence. But in such a conflict where competing groups' goals, objectives, needs or values clash and situation becomes pregnant with aggression, at best there can be precarious peace resulting from balance of power between contending groups, groups struggling to survive through dominance, in an arrangement called democracy, itself created to carry forward the process of evolutionary power struggle in a more controlled fashion. Thus, ironically democracy, which functions on the basis of free competition and smooth transfer of power from one group to another, is the best antidote for self-annihilating and species destroying violent conflicts. Democracy, through the process of alternating shift in power, helps achieve power balance between the contending groups and thereby functions as a channel for conflict mitigation and even temporary conflict resolution between contending groups. When the contending groups fail to gain power through democratic means or work out balance of power through
compromises, democracy fails and open and violent conflict ensues. Therefore democracy is not an antithesis of conflict. Rather it is a clever invention which seeks to reign in conflict by emphasizing cooperation and competition which are placid constituents of conflict.

In reality, cooperation and competition are a prelude to conflict. Cooperation, competition and conflict are not just inherently interdependent as Schelling suggested, but subserve the same purpose of survival through domination. Species survive through groups. Cooperation engenders groups, groups compete for dominance, and conflict arises out of these cooperative collectivities competing for dominance in order to survive and perpetuate themselves. In its most original and primal state cooperation, competition and conflict are aspects of the same evolutionary endeavour to survive through dominance, particularly in the human society. In the game of survival through dominance at times cooperation takes precedence, at times competition. But when mere cooperation and competition fail to ensure survival through dominance open conflict erupts, often extremely violent. This announces the failure of the democracy and the rise of anarchy. But anarchy cannot last for long because some group manages to gain victory through violence and establishes either an authoritarian rule to serve its own interests or re-establishes the order of democracy to restore balance of power between groups, particularly if it is a heterogeneous society.

The presently proposed theory assumes that the ‘Survival through Dominance’ and its corollary ‘Knowledge for Power Systems’ can explain not only why conflicts arise and wars occur in human societies but also explain when or how they occur. This theory can also be useful to understand why there are sometimes long periods of peace and at other times unending conflicts and wars. This theory can also help in explaining why certain human cultures seem to be
completely devoid of wars. But of course such an endeavour has not been undertaken in this study but would follow subsequently.

The main assumption of this theory is that human conflict has its roots in the deepest ground of human nature and that, from there, it stems and branches into myriad manifestations throughout human history, encompassing all human eons, eras and worlds, spiraling ever higher and assuming ever complex forms. This survival through domination, is manifested through an increasing hierarchy of levels of survival and dominance, starting with the most primitive animal behaviour among human beings, making its way through higher levels such as religion, culture, state, ideology, science and technology, the underlying current always being knowledge geared for power. One of the other important assumptions of this theory is that conflict can never be eradicated from human society for simple reason that it is the driving force in evolution and progress. And hence, while this theory accommodates many elements of other theories about conflict, it excludes ideas which are from idealistic perspectives, especially the idea of permanent peace. As a matter of fact, this theory considers such attempts or theories aimed at ensuring peace or peaceful resolution of conflict as themselves ideological (including Gandhism) being involved in the knowledge for power exercise, themselves seeking currency and dominance, though at a much higher level of knowledge for power game play.

Another assumption of this theory is that survival is directly related to domination, that is, in order to survive, it is essential to dominate and domination ensures survival. This theory is based on the assumption that power is central to all conflict and that all conflict is essentially political in nature, political in the sense of desire for power and domination. It believes that conflict is a direct outcome of the underlying power relations among human groups and that knowledge is a tool or a weapon of power. This theory assumes that there is a battle of knowledge
systems, in which increasingly sophisticated knowledge systems are invented and constructed to ensure the triumph of the group which represents and propagates that particular knowledge system. In human society, subtle and sophisticated knowledge systems are continually and consciously developed by different individuals and groups to achieve triumph and currency, a clear case of survival through dominance, albeit at a much subtle level, the level of ideas and knowledge constructs and singularly fashioned for acquisition of power. The subsequent advertising, propagation and imposition of these knowledge systems are but a natural outcome of their desire for greater following, currency and dominance. Lack of response or poor response or redundancy leads to manoeuvring or reformulation and rearranging of existing ideas and knowledge or adopting and borrowing compatible or enhancing ideas or knowledge from others including the competing groups or systems or addition of new insights or new ideas through innovations and inventions to come out with a winning combination of ideas or a system of ideas (formulations) which are coherent, cohesive and logically interrelated and having a greater appeal and offering a promise of greater benefits to its followers and thereby acquiring currency and promise of empowerment to its adherents. Each system of ideas or a knowledge system is constantly modified and recast and keeps evolving into an ever complex, logically coherent construct, with greater appeal and benefits, and, acquiring greater and greater following, currency and domination. Just like inventing democracy, human beings have a long history of engineering socio-political constructions like religion, caste, language, culture, science, nation, and state which have all helped to carry forward the evolutionary process of survival through dominance. In fact, human species has been involved in an elaborate enterprise of political construction of almost entire human reality to ensure its survival and further its development. And hence when groups or nations want to exercise their dominance and their power their other constructs also follow particularly the cultural construct. Hence Guo Jiemin has rightly pointed out that “Cultural power is bound to accompany political
power. For example, U.S. foreign policy has always included a plan of disseminating U.S. cultural values to the rest of the world, of which exporting the mode of U.S. political development is one of the major elements.”

The many knowledge systems of groups and nations, such as religion, culture, ideology, business, science, technology, and so on, each passes through generations of evolutionary products (sub-systems), constantly competing or entering into constant battles, battles for power, currency and supremacy. Each of the knowledge for power systems gives rise to its own unique worldview or Weltenshaung. And the worldviews are specific to each group or a community or a community constituting a homogeneous nation. A civilisation is not a single community with a single worldview but a complex web of overlapping worldviews with a lot of shared commonalities. Therefore this thesis doubts whether Huntington’s civilisations could be considered a category of knowledge for power systems, particularly on account of its ambiguity, incoherence and expansiveness.

This activity of constructing knowledge systems for power is as much true at individual level, as it is at collective or group level. It is very often a joint effort of the elites and the masses belonging to a particularly community or collectivity. The improvement and reformulations of the existing worldview or a declining worldview usually comes from the individual members and reforming or leading elites but these individuals themselves belong to and share the worldview they are trying to improve or reformulate. Thus the group or the community through its unique worldview shapes the individuals and the individuals in turn shape their group or community. They are both involved in the same enterprise of ensuring their survival through dominance. Reformulation ensures continuing relevancy of a worldview, either retaining or expanding its membership, popularity and currency, thereby ensuring the survival of that group, that community and that worldview through dominance. Individuals and groups who do not find the existing worldview useful or acceptable abandon it or rebel against it and either
join another existing competing group, community or worldview, or formulate their own version of the original worldview or a totally new one. Throughout the entire endeavour these individuals and groups are still involved in the same process of ensuring their survival through dominance of their own ideas, their own reformulated or newly invented worldview. Those who are expelled from a group or a community or a worldview do the same thing. Social reality is thus constantly politically reconstructed by talented individuals and groups or communities. Both stand to gain in this inevitable activity. Individual creators (founders of religions, proponents of schools of thoughts, theorists and inventors of the sciences and similar others) achieve name, fame, immortality and even wealth which all provide empowerment. The group or community or the worldview on the other hand gains acceptance, popularity, currency and hence survival through dominance which is also empowerment. Thus the name of the game at the individual as well as community level is Power.

But when this happens at a vast scale giving rise to many communities (along with their elites) with differing worldviews, all trying to gain currency and expansion in order to survive through the domination of their respective worldviews, groups espousing different worldviews come into competition and conflict ensues between the different communities espousing different worldviews. Thus conflict, arising out of the desire for domination which itself entails cooperation, competition, power struggle, arms race and use of force or violence, becomes an inevitable part of the game of survival and though accommodation and compromise may provide temporary reprieves, there really is no end to the phenomenon of conflict in human society. As a consequence all the so-called ‘world orders’ will be characterised by conflict, not necessarily of one particular kind, as Huntington would want us to believe. Conflict will always be the order of the day and the world, and though it may be manifested in several complex ways, it can never be precluded or eradicated. Conflict will be evident in covert and overt activities as well as subtle and obvious expressions. Conflict as an outcome
of survival for dominance process in human society has been, is and will be witnessed in all human social constructions because they are essentially political constructions. Human species has and will carry on the struggle for survival through dominance through its many knowledge for power systems such as religion and science on one hand and ideology and state on the other. Expressed and unexpressed disagreements, open and subtle conflicts and conscious and unconscious attempts at domination, all oriented to ensure survival and perpetuation of different groups and communities, will continue to characterise the future as it has the past. That conflict will be with us as long as we are political beings on a journey of survival through dominance is a fact we cannot deny even if we wish to. It sounds very deterministic but it is only as deterministic as evolution is for evolution underlines past and present human existence and probably will the future unless human beings can somehow break-out of or transcend the evolutionary process which is a naturally political process.

Conclusions

Evidently there are different and even far better ways of explaining conflict in the world than the one proposed by Samuel Huntington. The presently proposed *Survival through Domination and Knowledge for Power System Theory* is one such endeavour.