Research

World Order: A Brief Analysis from Westphalia to New World Order in the 21st Century

Sujit Kumar Datta1,2*, Tumpa Paul1
1School of Political Science and Public Administration, Shandong University, Qingdao, China
2Department of International Relations, Chittagong University, Chittagong-4331, Bangladesh

Corresponding Author :
Sujit Kumar Datta
Email: dattaircu@gmail.com; Phone: +8615689100063

Published online: 24 Dec 2018

Abstract: This paper will discuss the history and evaluation of world order from Westphalia to new world order. It also explores China’s search for its place in the world, in the midst of global power transitions from the West to the East, from traditional powers to rising powers, and from the U.S. to China. In these relative power shifts, what are China’s challenges? What is its purpose? What is its vision? And what is its fate? The paper argues that, in an increasingly multipolar world where China begins to assert itself and to challenge the existing order, other countries have to cope with a rising China, just as China needs to live with a hegemonic U.S.
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Introduction

The term World order sometimes is used analytically and sometimes as prescriptively. Both usages serve important purposes in grasping the realities of political life on a global level. Firstly, world order as analytically refers to the arrangement of power and authority that provides the framework for the conduct of diplomacy and world politics on a global extent. On the other hand, world order as prescriptively refers to a preferred arrangement of power and authority that is related with the understanding of such kind values like peace, economic growth and equity, human rights, and environmental quality and sustainability etc.¹ Among all theoretical approaches, realists and radicals pay the most attention to the international system of analysis. For realists, the defining characteristic is polarity; for radicals, it is

stratification. Constructivists emphasize on the changes of norms and ideas which shape the world order seeing little differentiation between the international and domestic system and avoiding the importance attached to international system structure. According to international relations (IR), a great power is a state which excels in “size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence”.\(^2\) All these characteristics, also referred as power capabilities, assure a great power the ability to exert its economic, military, political and social influence on a global scale. In International system, the distribution of power capabilities determines the number of great powers and the polarity of world order. The system will be multi-polar if there are more than two great powers, in bipolar system there are two great powers and systems with only one great power are considered unipolar system.

At present the entire world order is undergoing a fundamental revision as multi-polar aligned Great Powers cooperate in reforming the global economic, financial, and political systems, but this is expectedly creating major friction with the unipolar US which doesn’t want to lose its hegemony over International Affairs. The US doesn’t want to be “one among equals” in a 21st-century “Concert of Great Powers”:\(^3\)

**A Historical Overview**

For several centuries, the defining framework for world order has been primarily associated with the Peace of Westphalia negotiated in 1648 at the end of the Thirty Years War, and treated as the beginning of the modern world. This modern world order which geographically derived from the experience of Europe was premised on the emergence of the sovereign, territorial state as the dominant political actor.\(^4\) This statist world order was clearly Eurocentric in its essential nature, conceiving international society on the basis of the relationships between the main European states and viewing the relationship with non-Western political communities as based on hierarchy, with the superior Western states governing subordinated non-Western states. The characteristic form for this hierarchical arrangement was based on colonial empires. During this early period the states which belonged to the international society as full members were autocratic in character.


From an analytical concept world order encompassed both the legal domain of equality and the geopolitical domain of inequality. Though war was considered as an optional instrument of a sovereign state, the state system mainly worked through test of powers associated with the major states. In reality war served a legislative function as there was no reliable peaceful means to achieve adjustments that were needed in view of changing power balances and differing policy priorities. International law emerged over time as a means by which states could stabilize cooperative aspects of international relations such as the exchange of diplomats, maritime safety, communications, and transportation.\(^5\) It also served to legitimate the dominance and exploitation of the weak by the strong through a variety of doctrines and practices that justified intervention, including the broad notion of ‘humanitarian intervention’ used by European powers to protect Christian minorities supposedly jeopardized by the Ottoman Empire or the Western Hemisphere claims posited by the United States by way of the Monroe Doctrine (1823) that came over time to authorize a wide range of interventionary moves.\(^6\)

The autocratic traditions of monarchy which dominated domestic politics in the early centuries of the Westphalia era ended by the influence of the American Revolution specially, the French Revolution and then the world order shifted to focus on internal state or society relations. Mainly the result of American Revolution was political independence from the British Empire and an initial legitimacy of anti-colonial wars of emancipation.\(^7\) This struggle for political and economic independence was followed by the emergence of democracy, proclaimed in its distinctive American, republican form. But France wanted to end this matter at least temporarily. Royal rule, and proclaiming liberty, equality, and fraternity were ‘the rights of man’ now use as human, being the necessary foundation of a legitimate state not only for France but also for any sovereign political community. Throughout the nineteenth century, the interventionary implications of the French Revolution receded, and the primacy of territorial sovereignty was reaffirmed in the law and diplomacy of the full members of international society. Thus *international* trade in slaves might be prohibited, but the practice of slavery was considered a matter of domestic policy, to be respected by anti-slave states.

---


Thus, world order continued to be based on the interplay of core states. However, some classic empires like the Ottoman Empire and China were managed to maintain varying degrees of autonomy. But both were badly penetrated by European powers, as well as by the United States.

After that world order began to shift in new directions in the setting of World War I. United States as a key force defeated Germany in World War I, Woodrow Wilson, the American leader mentioned that realism was responsible for useless bloodshed and that a better way had to be found to deal with relations among sovereign states. To Wilson this meant the outlawry of war, and the establishment of an international organization worked with keeping world peace. His vision of collective security was watered down by realists not only at home but also in Europe and what emerged was a toothless League of Nations that nurtured delusions of a warless world, but lacked the means to challenge aggressor states. The will to do away with war had not then, and has not yet, reached nearly the stage that the reformist resolve to end the international slave trade had achieved by the early nineteenth century. Somewhat more progress has been achieved, but haltingly and inconsistently, with respected to mitigating the cruelty of war, its methods and tactics, by way of a widely upon framework for international humanitarian law.

In that same period Wilson also launched the idea of self-determination of seeming international fluidity after World War I. Wilson had no intention to set forth a radical principle of self-determination that could, if implemented, undermine the established world order that included the overseas colonial empires of the European powers. Lenin, particularly, saw the main sphere of application for self-determination to be in the colonized countries of the non-Western world. After all, the Soviet Union had no colonies to lose, and it fit Communist ideology to affirm the struggle of the oppressed and exploited. The colonial powers fought hard to maintain their empires, and there was reluctance by the United States to support what came to be called Third World Nationalism because of its strategic and civilization identifications with the Eurocentric core. At the same time, the Soviet Union turned inward, and concentrated on the rivalry between European powers that eventuated in World War II. On the other side of the global policy agenda, the normative ideas generated by the French Revolution were eclipsed by the intensity of nationalist identities, and the ties

---


between peoples and states. This feature of world order was most prominently raised by the rise of Nazism, and the subsequent Holocaust directed against Jews and others. It was evident that even the liberal democracies were not prepared to intervene protectively to prevent abuse even of such an extreme character. In this sense, self-determination, to the extent that it was expressive of world order, became aligned with principles of non-intervention rather than with humanistic ideas of solidarity, intervening to secure the rights of persons and peoples.

World War II brought many previous symbols of world order into renewed arguments. The failed efforts of the League of Nations revived by the United Nations Charter which made a firmed assault on the right of a state to pay flexible wars. This revival was coupled with treating German and Japanese leaders who were viewed as responsible for initiating World War II as 'war criminals,' at the Nuremberg and Tokyo war crimes tribunals. It was also reinforced by the widespread perception that future wars would be a human catastrophe without winners and losers, a view that gained credibility due to the incredible destructive harm done by the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Even though the United Nations Charter prohibited all uses of force except in cases of strict self-defense but it granted the five permanent members of the Security Council a veto power that effectively exempted them from accountability to these restrictive UN guidelines. Also, the prohibition of force was supposed to be coordinated with the establishment of a functioning mechanism of collective security administrated by the Security Council but this mechanism was never activated. That’s why states have argued that their right of self-defense can be exercised on the basis of their shifting security interests regardless of what the textual language of the UN Charter seems to require. As with the League, the impulse to outlaw and criminalize aggressive war ends up with a half-hearted gesture as the political will is lacking in the main states to transfer the needed authority and capabilities to an international institution. The Westphalian approach to war among major states holds, which rests on ideas of deterrence and prudence. Given the apocalyptic character of nuclear weaponry, and the increasing costs of warfare, there are many reasons for political leaders to avoid large-scale wars of the traditional kind involving sovereign states.

---


It would be a mistaken perception to suppose that states are never under any conditions prepared to give up their sovereign prerogatives. For instance, major governments have pushed hard to create regional and global trading regimes that require reliance on international procedures and regimes that have the authority to override national lawmaking processes. This dynamic of internationalization is perhaps most ambitiously evident in some of the arrangements associated with the European Union. It is also manifest in relation to the operations of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and especially the World Trade Organization. The latter has far reaching dispute settlement authority that can impinge very significantly on the domain of national autonomy with respect to economic policy. It is with respect to the war/peace subject-matter, and related issues of accountability of leaders, that the strict Westphalian logic of sovereignty remains most descriptive of world order. The colonial powers of Europe were greatly weakened by the effect of World War II. In this sense it created opportunities for several varieties of Third World nationalism to push forward their claims, and push they did. With the two now dominant states, the United States and the Soviet Union not being colonial powers in the accepted sense, the geopolitical climate turned became less and less favorable to colonialism and more and more sympathetic nationalist tendencies and an affirmed right of self-determination.

**Bipolar World Order**

Bipolarity is a system of world order in which the majority of global economic, military and cultural influence is held between two states. The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union which dominated the second half of the twentieth century is the classic matter of a bipolar world. The notion of bipolarity has momentous implications for world order. The conflict is unavoidable in bipolar world system because two rival powers cannot remain in equilibrium indefinitely and one has to surpass the other. In this point, during the periods of bipolarity, global order is not stable and warfare appears to be necessary for the resolution of rivalry between two superpowers. From this point of view a bipolar world can be described as one that is in “dynamic equilibrium,” where the two sides are equal in power.

---


but one may achieve a higher power for a short time before the other matches that power again to re-establish the balance.¹⁴
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The bipolar world system was developed after the Second World War. This system continued to formally insist upon the recognition of the absolute sovereignty of all states, the principle on which the United Nations was organized and carried on the work of the League of Nations. However, in practice, two centers of global decision-making appeared in the world – the U.S. and the USSR. But the U.S. and the USSR were two alternative political-economic systems like for U.S. its global capitalism and global socialism for USSR. Thus this strategic bipolarity was founded as ideological and philosophical dualism like liberalism against Marxism. Morgenthau believed that bipolarity was “a mechanism that contains in itself the potentialities for unheard-of good as well as for unprecedented evil.”¹⁵

The bipolar world was based on the symmetric comparability of the economic and military-strategic parity potential of the American and Soviet warring camps. At the same time, no other country affiliated with a particular camp remotely had the cumulative power to compare to that of Moscow or Washington.¹⁶ In the bipolar world, there was also the third force – the Non-Aligned Movement. It consisted of some Third World countries that refused to make an unequivocal choice in favor of either capitalism or socialism, and that instead preferred to maneuver between the global antagonistic interests of the U.S. and the USSR. In some cases it seems like a few succeeded but the possibility of non-alignment it assumed the existence of two poles which in a varying degree balanced each other. Moreover, these "non-aligned


countries” were in no way able to create a “third pole” owing to the main parameters of the superpowers, the fragmented and unconsolidated nature of Non-Aligned Movement members, and also because of the lack of any joint general socio-economic platform. That time the whole world was divided into the capitalist West considered as the first world, the socialist east as the second world, and “the rest” as the Third World. Besides, “all the others” in every sense represented the world periphery where the interests of the superpowers occasionally appeared. The probability of conflict was all even between the superpowers themselves but ruled out due to parity specifically in the guarantee of mutual assured nuclear destruction.

At last when the Soviet economy had stagnated following their participation in the arms race with the USA and also as a result of declining oil prices in the 1980s, the long term Cold War ended finally. A later attempt to introduce a market economy failed, the power of the communist party was undermined, East European countries declared independence, the Warsaw Pact dissolved, and finally the world saw the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. In 1991, the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev resigned and that incident marked as the end of the bipolar era in world politics.

**Unipolar World Order**

The power structure where one superpower dominates alone can be described as unipolarity. The end of the Cold War meant that the previous decades’ superpower rivalry now had ended. There was no longer the “traditional” East vs. West conflict, at least not the way it had been earlier in the 20th century. The bipolar international system transformed in unipolarity with the end of Cold War and collapse and termination of the USSR. After that the USA emerged as the only superpower. The power of a state is not balanced and controlled by the other states in a unipolar world system and this inequality allows the hegemony of the international system to influence and shape the rest of the world. After 1989 the US has been considered the militarily, economically and technologically leading country of the world (Brooks and Wohlfirth), a lonely superpower “able to impose its will on another countries”

---


and, in some cases such as the 2003 war to Iraq waged without the United Nations (UN) Security Council consensus, to act outside the laws of the international community.¹⁹

![Image of Unipolar World Order](image)

However, this unbalanced predominance has been promoted and reinforced by some factors. For many years the security of the US is assured by her favorable geographic position while other states like China, Russia and the European countries are land powers surrounded by potential enemies. But the US is isolated and too far away from its potential threats. That’s the reason no country in the last 70 years tried to attack American soil and this geographical security of US is strengthened by an unchallengeable military power.²⁰ According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), in 2017 US military spending accounted for more than 40 per cent of the world total. US military capabilities assure it a strong sea and air power and allow it to projects its force globally, enabling it to hit a target everywhere at every time.²¹

However, the concept of hegemony does not only imply geographical security and military preponderance but also influence and cultural hegemony too. During the Cold War as a great power and as a lonely superpower for last 20 years, the USA played a key role in the architecture of the new world order. From an economic point of view, the US laid the foundations of the global liberal economic order long before the unipolar era, supporting the Britton Woods system, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which was replaced in 1994 by the World Trade Organization, and indirectly controlling some international


financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Almost 17% of the total votes of the IMF controlled and by the USA and also it is the largest shareholder in the World Bank, leading to the tradition that the President of the World Bank has always been a US citizen nominated by the US President, while the President of the IMF has always been a European.\textsuperscript{22}

Moreover, the USA also tried to shape and protect the world order politically. During the Cold War, American power supported anticommunist governments and guerrillas in order to contrast the spread of the socialist values, supplying for example arms to non-state groups in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia and Nicaragua through its regional allies. Similarly, after the USSR collapse the democratic peace theory with its assertion that two democracies do not go to war each other became the rationale behind US promotion and support of accountable liberal democracies all over the world. This unequal distribution of power and the implicit recognition of the US hegemony resulted in a world characterized by no wars among the major states and the lowest number of interstate armed conflicts of the last 50 years (Uppsala Conflict Data Program). Conversely, the US unipolar world has been characterized by the highest number of intrastate conflicts most of these erupted in the aftermath of the USSR dissolution. Nevertheless, the intrastate and regional character of these conflicts hardly constituted a potential danger for US hegemony, or a threat for the polarity and the stability of the world order.

**Multi-Polar World Order**

In the international system if there are a number of influential actors then a balance-of-power or multi-polar system is formed. The important norms of the system are clear to each of the state actors in a multi-polar system. But in classical balance of power, the actors are exclusively states and there should be at least five of them. Sometimes the balance of power system become unstable if any actor doesn’t follow the norms properly.\textsuperscript{23} When alliances are formed, they are formed for a specific purpose, have a short duration, and shift according to advantage rather than ideology.

Multi-polarity denotes the fundamental power structure in an international system dominated by several large powers, and is characterized by antagonism between these. The multi-polar


world differs from the classical Westphalian system by the fact that it does not recognize the separate nation-state, legally and formally sovereign, to have the status of a full-fledged pole.\textsuperscript{24} This means that the number of poles in a multi-polar world should be substantially less than the number of recognized nation-states. The vast majority of these states are not able today to provide for their own security or prosperity in the face of a theoretically possible conflict with the current hegemony the U.S. Therefore, they are politically and economically dependent on an external authority. Being dependent, they cannot be the centers of a truly independent and sovereign will concern the global issues of the world order.

Multi-polarity is not a system of international relations that insists upon the legal equality of nation-states as the actual, factual state of affairs. This is only a facade of a very different picture of the world based on a real, rather than nominal, balance of forces and strategic capabilities. During the 20\textsuperscript{th} century multi-polar international systems resulted in instability and led to two world wars in less than 50 years.\textsuperscript{25} The balance of power and the system of alliances of the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century was swept away by the assassination of Franz Ferdinand of Austria in 1914. That event triggered World War I, a global conflict that caused the death of more than 15 million people in less than five years. After few decades, the multi-polar world emerged by World War I with a new system of alliances and the multilateral body of the League of Nations was not able to tame the totalitarian aspirations of Hitler. The German invasion of Poland in 1939 triggered World War II, the deadliest conflict of the history which resulted in millions of deaths and in the holocaust. Since the end of the World War II the


\textsuperscript{25}Smith, David. \textit{The dragon and the elephant: China, India and the new world order}. Profile Books, 2010.
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The world has never been multi-polar again, nevertheless these historical accounts seem to indicate how multi-polarity often created an unstable and unpredictable world, characterized by shifting alliances and by the aspiration of the rising powers to change the balance of power and create a new order.

The multi-polar forces in the world are working to replace the US-led international order with a diversified array of multiple stakeholders in order to bring balance to International Affairs. Importantly, they seek to do this through progressively reforming international institutions such as the UN, IMF, World Bank, and others, as well as creating their own counterparts to some of them like the BRICS New Development Bank or outright forming entirely new and unprecedented organizations like the SCO.26 One of the latest proposals has been to broaden the BRICS format through what has now been called the “BRICS-Plus” strategy, which essentially seeks to have each of the five member states encourage multilateral cooperation between each other’s respective regional integration organizations.

21st Century’s New World Order
In international relations theory, the term "New World Order" refers to a new period of history evidencing a dramatic change in world political thought and the balance of power. However, in conspiracy theory, the term "New World Order" refers to the advent of a cryptoclastic or authoritarian world government. In the book “World Order” Henry Kissinger argues that the world is at its greatest peril when the international order is moving from one system to another.27 “Restraints disappear, and the field is open to the most expansive claims and the most implacable actors,” he writes. “Chaos follows until a new system of order is established.” It’s a sobering warning. The notion of a sole surviving superpower has also fared poorly. Power is the ability to get or take what you want. By this standard, China and Russia rank as important powers. Indeed, the very term “superpower” may be misleading or obsolete. The United States cannot get everything it wants simply by dispatching troops to hot spots. After World War II, the United States stumbled upon a global strategy. It would protect its allies militarily while hoping that peace would promote prosperous, stable and democratic societies. Communism’s psychological and political appeal would be rejected.

---


Despite many setbacks, the strategy generally succeeded. Europe and Japan rebuilt; the Soviet Union failed; communism was discredited.

The international order is now in a state of flux for many reasons. Starting with China and Russia, many countries resent the United States’ leadership role. Many Americans have also tired of it. New technologies specially e-commerce, cyber-warfare are further redistributing power and influence. As the twenty-first century moves out of its first decade, American supremacy continues to generate intense debate about the nature, quality and sustainability of US power. At the same time, significant developments in four rising powers - China, Russia, India and the European Union – have provoked analysts to ask whether multi-polarity is a realistic prospect.

The prospects of a great power rivalry are particularly strong in East Asia, a region characterized by weak regional alliances and institutions, in which the economic rise of some actors could indeed represent a serious source of instability in the near future. The decline of the US and the rise of China could for example undermine the Asian balance of power and bring to light the old rivalry between China and Japan (Shambaugh). A strong rising China armed with middle range missiles could be perceived as threatening by Japan, worried that its historical American ally could not defend it because of US high involvement in other corners of the globe. The stability of the region appears even more difficult to achieve considering that the concept of balance of power requires shared common values and similar cultural understanding, requisites that are not present between the two major powers of the Asia Pacific region, China and Japan (Friedberg).

Both for Washington and the American public, China is certainly the enemy of choice. For building a regional military, China, a visible rising power, has been putting more money ever. On the other hand, India has been portrayed as the third pole of the multi-polar world in 2050 (Virmani; Gupta). Yet its constant rise could undermine Asian stability and, for example, worsen Indian relations with its neighbor Pakistan. Moreover, the scarcity of natural resources in a world that is consuming and demanding a high quantity of them could have several implications on global security and stability (Dannreuther; Kenny; Laverett and Bader).

In this framework, the rise of Russia, a country which exports large quantities of oil and gas, controls the European provisions of energy and has had high increases in military expenditure in the last decade could represent another potential source of instability for the future world order. Russia has increased military spending by 16 per cent in real terms since 2008, including a 9.3 per cent increase in 2011 (Background Paper on Military Expenditures 5).
Before 2008, it had increased its military expenditure by 160 per cent in a decade, (SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook 2008* 199), accounting for 86 per cent of the total increase of 162 per cent in military expenditure of Eastern Europe, the region of the world with the highest increment in military expenditure from 1998 to 2007 (SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook 2008* 177). Moreover, the control of the gas prices in Europe and the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Central and Western Europe have already been causes of tension between Russia and the West. The possibility to exploit and supply a large amount of natural resources, the growth of its military power and divergences with the US in some foreign policy issues, such as the Iranian nuclear program or the status of Kosovo, indicate that the stability of the future multi-polar world could be seriously undermined by a resurgent Russia (Arbatov; Goldman; Trenin; Wallandel).

A return to multi-polarity will therefore imply more instability among great powers. But great power rivalry will not be the only source of possible instability for the future multi-polar world. The current distribution of power allows not only great powers but also middle, small powers and non-state actors to have military capabilities that could threaten the global security. In particular, the presence of nuclear weapons constitutes a further reason of concern and implies that the future world could carry not only the potential instability of multi-polarity and great powers rivalry, but also the dangers entailed in nuclear proliferation. The future multi-polar world will thus be potentially more unstable than all the other multi-polar periods history has experienced until nowadays: for the first time in history, the world could become both multi-polar and nuclear.

**China’s Uprising as a superpower in the New World Order**

The 19th century belonged to the British. The 20th century belonged to the United States. But the 21st century belongs to China," -- Jim Rogers, Hedge fund manager. For China its big population is one of the greatest natural resources on the planet. And its citizens are becoming more educated, diligent, aspiring and comprise nearly a quarter of the world's population.28 As a result the combination of China's massive size and rapid modernization is creating the framework for an emerging superpower. However, China's growing economy is not only gaining international prestige but also its confidence has soared as it continues to be the world's fastest growing economy for the past three decades.

---

In the current anarchic world, The United States acts as the global hegemony. However, China’s recent rise to power has lead international relations experts, Ikenberry, Mearsheimer, Subramanian, and Friedberg, to predict an upcoming power shift in the international system. China’s increasing control over the Asia-Pacific region has threatened U.S. power. According to Waltz, the realism paradigm interprets the anarchic structure of the international community, as a constant power struggle. Although each country may be different, to survive, they must all strive for power. Under the liberalism paradigm, the system is still anarchical but cooperation may be achieved by shared norms, and aligned political and economical interests. Nevertheless, because of the desire for power, and other accompanying issues such as threats to security, and differences in political views, the U.S. and China will engage in future military conflict. A brief background of the international distribution of power will be helpful in understanding the premises for the realist argument. Currently, our world resides in a unipolar world, with U.S. as the global hegemony.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF), the most prestigious international financial institution in the world, has rated China’s ranking to number one economic superpower in the world — surpassing those of the United States based upon the purchasing power parity of GDP indicator (gross domestic product). Following are some strategies which make China’s economic, political, social development faster than any other countries and leading China towards the path of new superpower in this 21st century.

Table 1: Chinese strategies to be a Superpower

| 1. Leadership                  | 6. Population Policy               |
| 2. International Trade Orientation | 7. Unique Features Of China’s Society and Polity |
| 3. Growth Rate Performance     | 8. Poverty Reduction               |
| 5. Renewable Energy            |                                    |

However, if China wants to enjoy the benefits of regional or even global hegemony in the twenty-first century, it will have to prove itself ready to accept the responsibilities of leadership. On the other hand two parallel geopolitical narratives have dominated the twenty-first century so far: the relative decline of the United States since the end of the post-Cold War period; and the rise of China as an economic, political, and military power.29

Conclusion

The global scenario, witnessed several transformations within the states and their international relations. This trend was primarily absent in the period between the end of World War II and the Cold War, where only dual polarity prevailed. The 21st century saw the onset of a different political scenario with the rise of emerging economies like Brazil, China, and India in the game of Super-power along with Russia. After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1991, the world order was significantly unipolar with the US acting as the sole hegemony of the international order. But the onset of twenty-first century witnessed rise of some noteworthy trends. The 21st century witnessed the rise of China as the hegemony of not only Asia but of the entire World Order and challenging US to be the sole superpower and decision-maker in the international system. With the continuous development of countries in their various sectors of hard and soft power leads to a multi-polar world order. Co-existence of multi-polar world with the combination of both East and West is what the 21st century world order is heading to. So, from the above discussion it is very clear that the present world order is going through a multi-polar world system where not only some great powers influencing the world order but also some International organizations like EU, WTO, BRICS and some fast growing developing countries working altogether.
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