

Longin Pastusiak
Vistula University, Warsaw

The Need to Build a Peaceful New World Order

Summary

Peace is more than just the absence of war or other hostilities. It is also law and order within each country or international community. It is a state of security or order within a given community (within a country, region or the global scale).

This essay is an appeal to create a new peaceful world order in the 21st century.

Thanks to the end of the Cold War we have a new Europe, we have a new world but we do not have a new peaceful world. Today, at the beginning of the 21st century, we face the dilemma: order or anarchy? Will we sink in the abyss of chaos or will we be able to create the desired peaceful international order?

It is a fact that the end of the Cold War, of rivalry and confrontation between the West and the East or, more precisely, between the United States and the Soviet Union, did not to make the world either more stable or more secure. On the contrary, it is often said that the end of the Cold War has created more instability, more security challenges and more sources of international and domestic conflicts. On the other hand, it must be admitted that it has also created extraordinary opportunities for solving many problems resulting from the tension inherent to a bipolar world system. The sense of “fear and hope”, prevalent during the Cold War period, has been replaced by the sense of “hope and fear”.

The article presents various proposals to create a new world order.

Key words: world order, peaceful world, international security, regional security, sources of instability.

JEL codes: F5

For me as a political scientist, peace is more than just the absence of war or other hostilities. It is also law and order within each country or international community. It is the state of security or order within a given community (within a country, region or global scale).

This essay is an appeal to create a new peaceful world order in the 21st century.

Thanks to the end of the Cold War we have a new Europe, we have a new world but do not have a new peaceful world. Today, at the beginning of the 21st century, we face the dilemma: order or anarchy? Will we sink in the abyss of chaos or will we be able to create the desired peaceful international order? If I use such strong words to present this alternative, it is only to encourage everyone to seek a solution to Henry Kissinger’s diagnosis stating that “today’s world is in a state of revolutionary disarray”.

It is the fact that the end of the Cold War, of rivalry and confrontation between the West and the East or, more precisely, between the United States and the Soviet Union, did nothing to make the world either more stable or more secure. On the contrary, it is often said that the end of the Cold War has created more instability, more security challenges and more sources of international or domestic conflicts. On the other hand, it must be admitted that it has also created extraordinary opportunities for solving many problems resulting from the tension inherent to a bipolar world system. The sense of “fear and hope”, prevalent during the Cold War period, has been replaced by the sense of “hope and fear”.

When the renowned American political scientist Francis Fukuyama called the end of the Cold War “the end of history”, nobody initially thought of challenging that definition. It soon became clear, however, that instead of “the end of history” we were actually dealing with “a return to history”, that is a revival of traditional, historical sources of tension and international conflict. That trend is ironically called “return to the future”.

The article consists of two parts: a diagnosis – assessment of challenges and threats facing the contemporary world and a therapy – the need to establish a new world order. Because of the scarcity of space I shall only present a brief overview of the diagnosis and the therapy.

Nationalism seems to be growing rather than waning in the contemporary world. Instead of the “global village” we have multitudes of villages on our globe. They are familiar with one another and they demonstrate their mutual prejudices, thus increasing the risk of conflict. Territorial claims keep reappearing in various places. Centrifugal tendencies are taking on a renewed importance in multi-ethnic and multi-religious states. The international trade in narcotics and terrorism are thriving: AIDS, SARS, Ebola and possibly other epidemics hitherto unknown to mankind are spreading.

The world is destabilised by a growing number of ecological threats such as ozone layer destruction, greenhouse effect, acid rain, air and maritime pollution, forest depletion, agricultural land erosion, etc. The exhaustion of non-renewable raw materials intensifies the rivalry for access thereto between their principal consumers.

There is a growing threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, of fissile materials, falling into the wrong hands weapons and of mass destruction becoming available not only to a larger number of countries but also to terrorist organisations. More and more countries are capable of launching missiles farther and farther away.

State borders are becoming increasingly permeable, which in combination with instability or absence or economic prospects in poor countries give an impetus to migration processes. They, in turn, are a source of fear, prejudice and ethnic conflict in other countries. Various types of religious fundamentalism, fanaticism, dissention and bias are on the rise and are becoming the source of domestic and international conflict.

These conflict-generating occurrences are accompanied by contradictions in the world economy and international trade. The gap between rich and poor countries is widening, pro-

tectionism is flourishing, debt is mounting, and economic dependencies are deepening. None of these factors contribute to political stability.

Conflict-generating occurrences and processes are taking place in the international environment that is marked with a growing diffusion of power between states and its transfer from national to transnational governments and multinational corporations.

It is possible that the diagnosis I have presented here is overly pessimistic. After all, both the international community and individual states are not idle and try to counter these threats. They are indeed taking certain countermeasures and instruments of state power such as military force. The fact remains that the international community has not yet been able to establish a new world order following the end of the Cold War and disappearance of the bipolar world system.

In the past few hundred years of the European history, international orders were established as an aftermath of great wars. For example, after the Thirty Years War, the Treaties of Westphalia signed in 1648 established a new order in Europe based on the principle of political balance. The Napoleonic Wars ended with the Congress of Vienna, the World War One – with the Treaty of Versailles and the World War Two – with the European order negotiated at Yalta and Potsdam. That order has already disintegrated to a large extent. Keeping in step with historical regularity, a new world order should have been established after the Cold War, this time not by way of revolution but evolution and peaceful initiatives.

The notion of “world order” is not new. Politicians – and not only them – have been using the notion of world order for a long time and for various purposes. The Irish archbishop Richard Trench said in 1846 that “there exists a nobler world order than that in which we live and move today”. Hitler wanted to impose “Die Neue Ordnung” on Europe. Before the Democratic Party convention of 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was thinking about using the term “new order” instead of “new deal” when he launched the famous New Deal policy.

The term “new international order” was used by Mikhail Gorbachev in a speech delivered on 7 December 1988, to the UN General Assembly, when he announced deep cuts in the Soviet military potential. He stressed at that time that the “continuing world progress is possible only by striving to achieve a universal consensus that will embrace all mankind, aimed at achieving a new world order”. Somewhat earlier, in September 1988, Deng Xiaoping also appealed for establishment of a new international order based on five well-known principles of peaceful coexistence.

Among contemporary politicians who have most often referred to the need for a new world order was President George Bush Senior. In the period between the summer of 1990 and March 1991, George Bush Senior used the term “new world order” in his pronouncements as many as 43 times.

At a press conference on 30 August 1990, George Bush Senior stated that “everybody can put their hopes in the establishment of a new world order”. One month later, in a speech delivered to the UN General Assembly, when George Bush proclaimed himself in favour of a uni-

versal ban of chemical weapons and of a greater effort to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. “It is up to us whether we will leave these murky machines behind in the murky ages where they belong”– said the president. Bush announced that he would aim at creating a historic movement for a “new world order and long era of peace”.

In September 1990, at a joint session of both houses of the U.S. Congress, President Bush explained in some more detail what he understood by the term “new world order”. It would be a world “freer from the terrorist threat, more just and safer for peace”. “It will mean”, said the president, “an era in which all nations of the world, East and West, North and South, will prosper and live in harmony”.

None of the objectives of the new world order listed by George Bush were new. They were a reflection of goals set out, for example, in the UN Charter or in the CSCE Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

In the State of the Union Address delivered in the early 1991, Bush gave the term the meaning that symbolised international cooperation against aggression. He called on the international community to “make good on the old promise to create a new world order in which brutality will not be rewarded and aggression will meet with collective resistance”.

When speaking of a new world order, the Bush Administration stressed the need to reinforce mechanism that would prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and allow to resolve local conflicts by way of a stronger multilateral (e.g. within the UN) or bilateral cooperation (e.g. between Russia and the United States).

Even though George Bush Senior has often used the term “new world order” in his pronouncements, he has never given a detailed concept and never put on the table concrete operational proposals.

Today the term “new world order” has two meanings: (1) it is an empirical description of the emerging world situation, and (2) it is a normative vision of the possibility of shaping the international community after the Cold War.

In descriptive terms, the new world order means defining long-term economic, technological, military as well as socio-political trends that will decide the shape of future international relations. It also covers all dramatic transformations that are taking place as a result of the end of the Cold War, disintegration of the bipolar world system and unprecedented cooperation rather than confrontation between recent ideological adversaries. The term “new world order” also covers the emerging international system and the need to create a new balance of power as well as new structures.

In normative terms the “new world order” refers to means and objectives promoted in different countries with a view to creating a peaceful, stable and prosperous post-Cold War world.

An important role in the new global order should be played by the United Nations – reformed and adapted to the new world balance of power, and to new challenges and threats.

The new world order must be equipped with an affective instrument in the form of international military force. That force must constitute a reliable deterrent to any potential aggressor who might think of using his army as a tool of pursuing political objectives.

Americans believe that the most effective way of ensuring world peace and stability is by way of a universal introduction of liberal free-market capitalism. George Bush Senior often stressed the importance of the IMF and World Bank in shaping the new global order. Summit meetings of the group of the most industrialised countries (G-8) have replaced the old superpower summit conferences.

The new world order also means a greater role of diplomacy and diplomatic techniques of international conflict resolution. It means shifting the emphasis from military to diplomatic methods. Arms reduction issues will continue to be an important component of the new world order agenda.

“Stability” is very often cited as a desired feature of the new world order. The new order is seen as a way of providing the world with more stability and security against upheaval. But how to do it? Democratisation and the growing struggle for sovereignty in various parts of the world have to date contributed more to a rise of tension and explosion of conflicts, more often internal than international (as in Yugoslavia, the former Soviet Union, Africa, etc.) than to stabilising the situation. World stability must be simply treated as a desired long-term goal. In a shorter period, we must concentrate on constructing organisational mechanisms and tools meant to prevent new expressions of aggression.

If a global security system cannot be established then we should aim at establishing regional security systems. At present, we only have one Euro-Atlantic security system based on NATO. But even that system does not cover the entire Europe. Other continents such as Asia, Africa or Latin America, which, after all, are more unstable than Europe, have not established any effective security structures at all. Taking the direction toward the establishment of regional security and cooperation systems seems to be a desirable and feasible mid-term objective.

Independently from the ultimate shape that the new world order will assume, the United States is in possession of the largest number of assets among all countries: largest economy, most formidable military, technological and financial potential, as well as strongest political, ideological and cultural influence. The budget and trade deficits as well as domestic tensions are factors that certainly restrict U.S. foreign involvement, but no other country matches the United States in terms of the superpower status. Although the United States possesses the so-called “soft” and “hard” power, the role of the United States in international balance of power is now gradually relatively declining.

I have the impressions that current politicians are so busy with day-to-day affairs that they forgot about the need to create a new world order for future generations. Meanwhile, this ambitious task is waiting for a person or a country that will be able to raise it in intellectual and political terms, and give it an international dimension. Indeed, the issue is live and

urgent. It lies in the interest of the international community to create a model of international order that the world would try to attain in a consistent and upheaval-free manner.

But the new world order, I would like to stress, must not be a creation of just one superpower, regardless of how strong it is at a given moment in history.

Obviously, the question comes to mind who should and is able to take on and rise in political and intellectual terms, the difficult task of creating the new world order. Under democratic principles, which formally govern international relations, that task should be taken up by all players present on the world political stage. However, it is obvious that the qualitative weight of individual states differs greatly from one to another.

Recently, the attention of the world public opinion was focused on the status of trans-Atlantic relations. Both Europe and the United States could play a leading role in establishing a new international order. “America stands out by its dynamism and fervour. Europe is rich in historical experience. To share the burden of challenges that must be taken up, the world needs both America and Europe united in a new Euro-Atlantic partnership” – said the former French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin.

The most concrete and comprehensive concept of new world order is products of Chinese thinking and Chinese-Russian diplomacy. Let me just mention for example the Russian-Chinese Joint Declaration on the Multipolar World and the Formation of a New International Order dated 23 April 1997. Another document was the Beijing Declaration adopted at the end of the Fifth Ministerial Conference of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) calling for an improvement of the international system and order. This document is dated 20 July 2012.

But the most ambitious and the most detailed document concerning new world order is the China-Russia Joint Statement on 21st Century World Order. This document was signed on 1st July 2005 by President Hu Jintao and President Vladimir Putin.

In 12 elaborated points, this document outlines basic principles on which the 21st century world order should be based. It should be based on universally recognised principles and norms of international law and “fair and regional world order”.

It stresses the need to reform and strengthen the United Nations, improving its efficiency in dealing with new challenges and threats. The international issues should be solved through dialogue and consultations on the basis of multilateralism.

The Joint Statement of China and Russia says that “human rights are universal” and countries should “respect the human rights and basic freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights”. “The histories and traditions of multi-ethnic countries must be respected” – stresses the China-Russia Joint Statement.

The diversity of cultures and civilizations in the world should become the basis for mutual enrichment rather than mutual conflict.

China and Russia clearly stated that establishment of security cooperation mechanism should take into account the interests of all parties and it should not be imposed by the most powerful ones.

I just mentioned only a few of the ideas presented in this China-Russia Joint Statement on the 21st Century World Order. The document ends with an appeal in which the “two sides call on countries in the world to engage in extensive dialogue in the issue of the international order of the 21st century. To a great extent, the future of the world, the progress of mankind and the ability to deal with challenges and threats depended on outcome of this dialogue”.

I only regret that this important document about building a harmonious world has never been a subject of effective negotiations on international forum.

The world order constitutes a type of contract concluded between international players – and not only between the most powerful ones – for the purpose of working out the principles and structures that would ensure a long-term global stability for all. However, as we can observe, building a new world order structure is not an easy process. Still, that process is indispensable if the world does not wish to sink in the abyss of chaos or unipolar hegemony.

The world has changed in the last two decades faster and deeper than in the entire period between 1945 and 1989.

Today we know that the old world order has broken down and is disappearing and that the new world order is only now beginning to emerge. May it emerge as soon as possible, before mankind goes through a series of regional upheavals and local catastrophes resulting from global threats?

The end the Cold War and breakdown of the so-called “real socialism” provided an opportunity to create a new and better world order. However, that order is emerging very slowly, too slowly. Time will not work in favour of the new order if it is not accompanied by a harmonised international effort. Today it is not enough to think and to dream about a better, peaceful, more predictable, and more secure world. Today, we must act. Act locally but think globally.

References

- Cohen R., Sanger D.E., Weisman S.R. (2004), *Bush's Record: Pushing a New Order for World*, "International Herald Tribune", 13.10.
- For Global New Deal (2009), *Global Progressive Forum*, Brussels, December.
- Holmes K.R., Pines B. (1991), *George Bush's New World Order: Two Assessments*, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.
- Malendowski W. (2004), *Nowy Ład Międzynarodowy*, (w:) Malendowski W., Mojsiewicz Cz. (red.), *Stosunki Międzynarodowe*, Ada 2, Wrocław.
- The New World Order (1991), "New York Times Magazine", 17.02.

Potrzeba stworzenia nowego ładu światowego

Streszczenie

Trwały pokój jest czymś więcej niż brak wojny czy innych konfliktów. Jest to pokojowy ład zarówno wewnątrz kraju, jak i wewnątrz społeczności międzynarodowej. Jest to bezpieczeństwo zarówno regionalne, jak i globalne.

Niniejszy artykuł jest apelem o stworzenie nowego pokojowego ładu światowego w XXI wieku.

Dzięki zakończeniu zimnej wojny mamy nową Europę, mamy nowy świat, ale ciągle nie mamy nowego ładu światowego. Dziś, na początku XXI stulecia, stoimy przed dylematem: ład światowy czy anarchia? Czy pograżamy się w chaosie czy też stworzymy pożądany ład międzynarodowy?

Zakończenie zimnej wojny, rywalizacji między Wschodem i Zachodem, a ściślej rzecz biorąc między Stanami Zjednoczonymi a Związkiem Radzieckim, nie uczyniły świata bardziej bezpiecznym i bardziej stabilnym. Mówi się nawet, że zakończenie zimnej wojny stworzyło nowe źródła niestabilności, nowe zagrożenia oraz konflikty, przede wszystkim o charakterze wewnętrznym. Z drugiej strony trzeba przyznać, że powstały szanse rozwiązania wielu problemów i napięć, które istniały w dwubiegunowym świecie. Tak jak w okresie zimnej wojny dominowało poczucie „obawy i nadziei”, tak obecnie zastąpiło je uczucie „nadziei i obawy”.

W artykule przedstawiono różne propozycje stworzenia nowego ładu światowego.

Słowa kluczowe: ład światowy, pokój światowy, bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe, bezpieczeństwo regionalne, źródła niestabilności.

Kody JEL: F5

Artykuł nadesłany do redakcji w marcu 2015 roku.

© All rights reserved

Afiliacja:

prof. dr hab. Longin Pastusiak
Akademia Finansów i Biznesu Vistula
ul. Stokłosa 3
02-787 Warszawa
tel.: 22 457 23 00
e-mail: ism@vistula.edu.pl