

In the Name of God, the Most Merciful, the Most Kind



October 03, 2016

'Non-violence is the Greatest Force'

There are many causes I would die for. There is not a single cause I would kill for." This saying by Mahatma Gandhi is in the heart of a movement for non-violence and that is what he spent his life for. Keeping his endeavors for a philosophy and movement based on non-violence, October 02, his birthday, is celebrated as International Day of Non-violence around the world.

United Nations General Assembly designated the day on June 15, 2007 under the resolution A/RES/61/271 to disseminate the message of non-violence, including through education and public awareness". The resolution reaffirms "the universal relevance of the principle of non-violence" and the desire "to secure a culture of peace, tolerance, understanding and non-violence".

The main objectives of the day also include highlighting the importance of non-violence in the world and promote peace and tranquility against violence and war. It is to make the nations of the world believe that they can achieve a better human world through non-violence as Mahatma Gandhi had said, "Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man". Violence has no doubt brought a great deal of misery to human civilization. It won't be an exaggeration to say that humanity would breathe its last in the atmosphere of violence. If love is not provided immediately, no one can stop it from a certain death. Human beings have to love it if they want to see it alive.

The world we are living in can only be conquered through everlasting love and non-violence. Love has the capacity to bind human beings together. Though there are many in the world who are shouting in the favor of violence and antagonism, they are in fact the sadists who clap at the sight of human sufferings, appreciate cruelty and dance with the cries of human hopelessness and can think of no way to extract the humanity out of this dismal and horrible situation. So, they should know that they are also participants in the miserable holocaust of human beings with the weapons of antagonism.

As human beings, compassion and affection should be our distinguishing qualities that may categorize us as the best of the creatures among the existing species. Non-violence should be the most essential part of our nature. It is non-violence alone that can make us look above the pathetic division of human race. Non-violence alone can make us look above the religious extremism, nationalism, sectarianism and racism. History has the lesson that all the human beings have never been able to stand under a single flag.

It is because all the ideologies of the world have divided the human beings into "we and "they". None of them has ever been able to embrace all the human beings alike. That's why followers of one religion and ideology have launched sanguinary wars against the others. Billions of people have been massacred in the pursuit of the same stupidity. It seems that the blood thirsty inclination of human beings have not been satiated yet.

Human beings definitely need to become one and make love and non-violence their guide in the rocky way to a better destination. They must think larger and make humanity proud. They need to see beyond the vicious circles of their cunning egos and join hands together for a peaceful world. They have to throw down the weapons and have smiles on their faces to win the hearts.

They are supposed to teach their children the essential lessons of non-violence so that they may not be caught in the quagmire of hatred. They are to rise in the stature by bowing in front of sympathy and brotherhood. They should paint the world with the colors of bliss, contentment and pleasure, instead of the blood of the human beings. They require keeping in their books the immortal words of invincibility and prosperity, instead of destruction and disorder. It is important for them to be human in the real sense of the word and conquer the world through non-violence, not antagonism.

The day is of immense importance for the people of Afghanistan, as well, as the country has been suffering because of different forms of violence and wars. It is important that the people must realize now that nothing can be achieved through violence.

They have spent decades of their lives pursuing their objectives through violence and what they have achieved is destruction and instability.

Now, they have to value non-violence and peace and make every sort of effort to introduce them in their social and political lives.

To some it may seem impossible but the life, teachings and practices of Mahatma Gandhi clearly shows that it is possible to pursue even the most difficult objectives through non-violence and strong resilience against antagonism, hatred and violence.

Factors to Chinese Economic growth

By Mohammad Zahir Akbari

Why is China Growing So Fast? In 1978, the leader of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), Deng Xiaoping, initiated the open door policy, a free-market economic reform. The reform took two decades to bring China from being a poor and introverted country controlled by the state, to being an open free market economy. The reform included accepting foreign direct investments, allowing for entrepreneurs to start their own businesses, privatizing state-owned enterprises and removing price controls. The free-market reform was the beginning of extreme economic growth. From 1978 to date the economy grew average of 9/10% a year. Unemployment rate decreased to 4% and the literacy levels stands around 95%. In brief, China has reached all the Millennium Goals or is within reach. Now China ranked the world's largest developed economy, this has led to over 700 million people having been lifted out of poverty. The World Bank expects China to be the world's largest economy by 2030, even if growth rates slow down. Beside economic reforms, Deng Xiaoping introduced some social reforms. For instance, People's communes were abolished and jobs, schools and healthcare for rural residents were no longer automatically provided by the state. Urban residents had been paying for their own welfare all along, but now both urban and rural residents had to provide for themselves. The one-child policy was introduced in the late 1970's. The policy only allows married couples to have one child as a measure to stop China's soaring population growth. The policy has been implemented with some extreme methods, like sterilization and fines for those who have more than one child. The policy has since then been relaxed and now allows for those born under the one-child policy to have two children. Minorities are also exempt from the policy and those who have one girl are allowed to have one more child. Curious about why China has done so well, an IMF research team recently examined the sources of that nation's growth and arrived at a surprising conclusion. Although capital accumulation—the growth in the country's stock of capital assets, such as new factories, manufacturing machinery, and communications systems—was important, as were the number of Chinese workers, a sharp, sustained increase in productivity (that is, increased worker efficiency) was the driving force behind the economic boom. Some study shows that the productivity gains accounted for more than 42 percent of China's growth and mostly considered as the most significant source of that growth. This marks a departure from the traditional view of development in which capital investment takes the lead. This jump in productivity originated in the economic reforms begun in 1978. Research on economic development has suggested a significant role for capital investment in economic growth, and a sizable portion of China's recent growth is in fact attributable to capital investment that has made the country more productive. In other words, new machinery, better technology, and more investment in infrastructure have helped to raise output. Despite a huge expenditure of capital, production of goods and services per unit of capital remained about the same. This pronounced lack of capital deepening suggests a constrained role for capital. The labor input—an abundant resource in China—also saw its relative weight in the economy decline. Thus, while capital formation alone accounted for over 65 percent of pre-1978 growth, with labor adding another 17 per-

cent, together they accounted for only 58 percent of the post-1978 boom, a slide of almost 25 percentage points. Productivity increases made up the rest. It turns out that it is higher productivity that has performed this newest economic miracle in China. Chinese productivity increased at an annual rate of around 4 percent during 1978 to date. Analysis of the pre- and post-1978 periods indicates that the market-oriented reforms undertaken by China were critical in creating this productivity boom.

The reforms raised economic efficiency by introducing profit incentives to rural collective enterprises (which are owned by local government but are guided by market principles), family farms, small private businesses, and foreign investors and traders. They also freed many enterprises from constant intervention by state authorities. As a result, the output of state-owned enterprises declined from 56 percent of national output to 40 percent, while the share of collective enterprises rose from 42 to 50 percent and that of private businesses and joint ventures rose from 2 to 10 percent. The profit incentives appear to have had a further positive effect in the private capital market, as factory owners and small producers eager to increase profits (they could keep more of them) devoted more and more of their firms' own revenues to improving business performance.

Why the Productivity Boom? The post-1978 reforms granted greater autonomy to enterprise managers. They became more free to set their own production goals, sell some products in the private market at competitive prices, grant bonuses to good workers and fire bad ones, and retain some portion of the firm's earnings for future investment. The reforms also gave greater room for private ownership of production, and these privately held businesses created jobs, developed much-wanted consumer products, earned important hard currency through foreign trade, paid state taxes, and gave the national economy a flexibility and resiliency that it did not have before.

By welcoming foreign investment, China's open-door policy has added power to the economic transformation. The annual inflows increased from less than 1 percent of total fixed investment in 1979 to 18 percent in recent years. This foreign money has built factories, created jobs, linked China to international markets, and led to important transfers of technology. These trends are especially apparent in the more than one dozen open coastal areas where foreign investors enjoy tax advantages. In addition, economic liberalization has boosted exports—which rose 19 percent. Strong export growth, in turn, appears to have fueled productivity growth in domestic industries.

To sum up, China occupies a unique niche in the world's political economy unprecedented economic performance. Afghanistan needs to extend economic relationship with China and learn from the Chinese experience and draw some general lessons.

By encouraging the growth of rural enterprises and not focusing exclusively on the urban industrial sector, China has successfully moved millions of workers off farms and into factories without creating an urban crisis. In addition, China's open-door policy has spurred foreign direct investment in the country, creating still more jobs and linking the Chinese economy with international markets.

Mohammad Zahir Akbari is the newly emerging writer of the Daily Outlook Afghanistan. He can be reached at mohammadzahirakbari@gmail.com

Saving Europe By Reversing Brexit

By Anatole Kaletsky

Never let a crisis go to waste" has always been one of the European Union's guiding principles. But what about five simultaneous crises? Today, the EU faces what Frans Timmermans, European Commission Vice President, describes as a "multi-crisis": Brexit, refugee flows, fiscal austerity, geopolitical threats from East and South, and "illiberal democracy" in central Europe. Rather than wasting its crises, the EU could be laid to waste by them.

If so, Brexit will be the detonator for that demolition. By legitimizing the concept of an EU breakup, and thus turning a fantasy among political extremists into a realistic option of mainstream politics throughout Europe, Brexit threatens to trigger an irresistible disintegration process. It will also transform economics, by paralyzing the European Central Bank in the next euro crisis: while the ECB can always defeat market speculation, it is powerless against breakup pressures from voters.

The EU therefore urgently needs to put the genie of disintegration back in its bottle. That means persuading Britain to change its mind about Europe, which, according to conventional wisdom on both sides of the English Channel, is impossible. But many "impossible" things are happening in politics nowadays.

The referendum majority on June 23 was much narrower than that in Scotland's 2014 independence referendum, or the negative votes on EU treaties in Ireland, Denmark, and the Netherlands, all of which were subsequently reversed. More important, the 52% who voted for Brexit were sharply divided in their aims, with some prepared to accept economic sacrifice for a "hard Brexit" (total separation from Europe), and others hoping for a "soft Brexit" that would minimize the impact on the UK economy.

According to post-referendum polling, three-quarters of "Leave" voters expect Britain's economy either to strengthen or to be unaffected by Brexit, and 80% believe the government will have more money to spend on public services as a result of their vote. Brexit voters are so optimistic because they were told (most prominently by current Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson) that Britain could "have our cake and eat it" — a new deal that would preserve all of the economic benefits of EU membership with none of the obligations or costs.

When these expectations are disappointed, public opinion will change. Already, 66% of voters say maintaining market access is more important than restricting immigration, if Britain cannot have both. This directly contradicts Prime Minister Theresa May's stated priorities — and probably explains why she refuses to talk about her Brexit strategy.

Because public expectations of an economically innocuous soft Brexit will be impossible to reconcile with the rejection of all EU obligations demanded by the Conservative Party's "hard Brexit" faction, May cannot win. Whichever course she chooses, she will antagonize half her party and a large proportion of Brexit supporters, not to mention the 48% of voters who want to stay in the EU.

Once this backlash starts, plenty of ambitious Conservative politicians whom May purged from government will be eager to exploit it. Already, George Osborne, immediately sacked as Chancellor of the Exchequer when May took office, has thrown down the gauntlet, challenging her democratic mandate: "Brexit won a majority. Hard Brexit did not." Even the weakness of Britain's opposition parties works against May, allow-

ing opponents to plot against her, secure in the knowledge that they cannot lose power.

All this implies that British politics will become very fluid as economic conditions deteriorate and voters start to change their minds. The EU should encourage such second thoughts, which means that it must stop treating Brexit as inevitable and instead offer the possibility of a compromise that would meet British voters' concerns, but only on the condition that Britain remains in the EU.

The obvious way to accomplish this would be to conclude an EU-wide agreement on greater national control over immigration and other symbolic issues related to national sovereignty. Such an agreement need not be seen as a concession to British blackmail if it were extended to all EU countries and presented as a response to public opinion throughout the Union.

By making a virtue of its response to democratic pressures, the EU could regain Europe-wide support. But to send a positive message to voters, European leaders will have to rediscover the knack for pragmatic compromise and inter-governmental bargaining that used to be the hallmark of EU diplomacy.

For starters, defusing both Brexit and the refugee crisis will require some modest changes in immigration and welfare rules. Such reforms, which would be popular in almost all member countries, need not conflict with the EU's founding principles if they preserve the right to work throughout Europe, but return some control over non-economic migration and welfare payments to national governments.

Second, the interaction of the refugee and euro crises demands new fiscal rules. Dealing with immigrants is expensive and should ideally be funded by mutually guaranteed EU bonds. Alternatively, Mediterranean countries must be offered budgetary leeway, in exchange for assuming front-line responsibility for immigration controls.

Third, the need for immigration reform, combined with "illiberal democracy" in Central Europe, calls for changes in EU spending priorities and foreign policy. Poland and other countries will accept restrictions on their citizens' mobility only if offered additional structural funds and stronger security cooperation. Such incentives, in turn, could provide more levers to ensure respect for human rights.

Finally, restoring the EU's democratic legitimacy means ending the institutional tensions between the eurozone and the broader EU. The EU authorities must acknowledge that many member countries will never join the euro, which means abandoning their rhetoric about a "two-speed Europe," with all heading — whether at high or low speed — toward the "ever closer union" that a single currency implies. Instead, the EU must reshape itself into two concentric circles: an inner core committed to deeper integration, and an outer ring whose voters have no interest in a single currency and a shared fiscal space.

Such reforms may seem impossible, but EU disintegration seemed impossible before the Brexit vote. In revolutionary periods, the impossible can become inevitable in a matter of months. This week, former French President Nicolas Sarkozy called unexpectedly for a new European treaty and a second British referendum on its EU membership. In Europe, a revolutionary period has begun. (Courtesy Project Syndicate)

Anatole Kaletsky is Chief Economist and Co-Chairman of Gavekal Dragonomics and the author of Capitalism 4.0, The Birth of a New Economy.



Chairman / Editor-in-Chief: Dr. Hussain Yasa

Vice-Chairman: Kazim Ali Gulzari

Email: outlookafghanistan@gmail.com

Phone: 0093 (799) 005019/777-005019

www.outlookafghanistan.net



The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not reflect the views or opinions of the Daily Outlook Afghanistan.