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QUESTION: IS THERE A MANIFESTATION OF ORDER OR DISORDER IN THE PRESENT WORLD ORDER? ANALYZE LOGICALLY AND IN LINE WITH GLOBAL REALITIES

The process of globalization with its increased international economic interdependence has decreased the room for maneuver for national governance. Therefore, “world order” means a system of structures sustained by various rules and norms regulating international economic and political cooperation and transactions. A world Order and its structures are shaped according to the values and belief systems of the dominant powers as well as of the short-term and long term security interests of the dominant actors.

However, the contemporary global order is widely said to be in crisis. Scholars have argued that the present global order, which has its origins in the post-war world, rests on three foundational ordering principles: national sovereignty, economic liberalism and inclusive, rule-based multilateralism. These principles stipulate general rules of conduct, but leave considerable scope for contestation and renegotiation of specific norms and agreements. Thus, the global order is a dynamic construct in which crises and contestations can occur without undermining the order as such. Only if one or more of the foundational principles are systematically violated, can we speak of a demise of the order. Today’s world is politically, economically and technologically more complex than when the institutional pillars of the current order were founded in the 1940s and 1950s. Thus, this has led to dispute, and change. On balance, however, what we witness in this modern times is not so much a profound or definitive crisis of the existing order, but rather it is ongoing transformation into a broader, more inclusive system of global governance, reflecting the need to accommodate new actors and problems.

Meanwhile, since 1945, the United States has pursued its global interests through creating and maintaining international economic institutions, bilateral and regional security organizations, and liberal political norms; these ordering mechanisms are often collectively referred to as the international order. In recent years, rising powers have begun to challenge aspects of this order.

Also the United State took the lead together with Great Britain in creating major pillars of the post-war order including the Bretton Woods institutions, the United Nations, and the GATT, it cooperated with other less powerful states to institutionalize the use of force, and stood aside from other pillars such as the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Washington remained aloof from important UN agencies such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and for some period also, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and has traditionally declined to sponsor multilateral cooperation to uphold liberal values in regard to displacement of people and freedom of movement. During the 1990s and 2000s, the Bush and Clinton Administrations rejected pending international security agreements, including the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty, and the Conventions banning landmines and cluster munitions, and ignored United Nations Security Council misgivings about invading Iraq. Finally, when it has come to expanding multilateral cooperation on environmental protection, sustainable development and human rights, leadership has often rested with countries other than the United State. Since the 1950s, states such as the ‘Asian dragons’, the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) or Nigeria and Algeria have sought membership in international organizations, and have played an increasingly active role in global decision-making fora. Regional organizations have prospered. Therefore, America’s involvement in the global institutional infrastructure has been both fractional and conditional for many decades, whereas new states have been integrated deeper into the system. Thus, we do not consider declining United State hegemony a fundamental challenge to the contemporary global order. However, some scholars are concerned that Trump’s vocal agenda of putting ‘America first’ presents a radical diminution in United State support for economic liberalism and multilateralism. While not wishing to dismiss the challenge of growing nationalism, we think it is too soon to tell. The Trump Administration has pulled out of major international agreements, including the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Human Rights Council. Yet withdrawals from international agreements are not unique to Trump. Nixon on the other hand closed the Gold Window in 1971, Carter terminated the 1955 defense pact with Taiwan in 1979, and President George W. Bush withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty in 2001, unsigned the Rome Treaty establishing the International Criminal Court in 2002, and withdrew from the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations in 2005. There is a long list of multilateral treaties which the United State has signed during the post-war period, but never ratified. Thus, America’s record of withdrawing from multilateral cooperation pre-dates Trump but has not fundamentally destabilized the global order. More so, the United State has not always been the key sponsor of international agreements. While some multilateral treaties remain blocked at the negotiation stage, issues such as climate change, depletion of natural resources, transnational corruption and terrorism are being addressed through new global agreements even if they sometimes proceed without United State participation. These developments reaffirm and expand basic multilateral principles.