

Maddy Rudden
 Professor Kurrp
 Political Science 100
 29 April 2024

World Order Essay

The rise and growth of the BRICS mainly recognize the rise of major new power distributions. BRICS stands for the five countries Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa has had an important impact on global politics in a short time. Understanding the effects involves a consideration of the viewpoints from global order and the international relations theory. In the past, Western nations, mainly the United States and their close allies, have exercised their power in global politics, establishing international organizations, and agreements representing their interests and beliefs. However, the ongoing development of the BRICS countries decreases the Western-centric system but adds new factors and ideas into international relations. According to world order theory, the rise of previously lower governments such as the BRICS calls into question the current power systems of global leadership and management. The past and more traditional "powerhouses", for example, the United States, China, and some of the European countries. "World government would involve much more than co-operation between nations. It would be an entity with state-like characteristics, backed by a body of laws. The European Union has already set up a continental government for 27 countries, which could be a model. The EU has a supreme court, a currency, thousands of pages of law, a large civil service and the ability to deploy military force" (Rachman). Rachman mentions the EU and how it's the closest thing to a global government. However, traditional theories about international relations focus more on the details of the relationships.

While world order is studied by, looking at the bigger picture of how nations interact with one another. They also help our understanding of the reasons behind nations' actions and how international groups affect those actions. "Market-oriented groups were recognized as having a crucial impact and reach. They became an increasingly integral part of solutions either promulgated or actually undertaken by the United Nations and many of its member states" (Weiss 263). Weiss explains how groups, for example, the United Nations, help maintain global stability. They may want to maintain their power by maintaining accepted standards and values that are favorable and will be beneficial to the interests of the nation. With this, they could be very unwilling to give up the control of world organizations and leadership processes for making decisions. This could potentially lead to tensions and conflicts with the rising nations.

On the other hand, international relations theory gives information on how the growth of the BRICS countries could end up in the development of new rules and standards in international politics and relations. Realist theories argue that when these newly independent and developed countries gain power and express their interests in the global arena, they might challenge the already current systems of power. Along with could work to come up with and develop new laws that better reflect what they want and their interest. This might end up in a more divided world order, this could have the power split more evenly among several main actors. While encouraging compromise and discussion between the differing interests and goals.

Researchers such as Lamy, Masker, and Weiss have looked into the importance and value of international governance structures for solving global issues. The growth of new actors, especially those from the BRICS nations, wants changes to the global governance systems that guarantee that they are included and are represented. This might mean creating new policies and

structures to better fit and meet the growing nations' interests. While it also addresses the current global concerns and conflicts. But on the other hand, Fukuyama and Huntington give different perspectives about the future of international politics. According to Fukuyama, democracy is the ideal type of government, and most nations will eventually transition to democracy. Fukuyama's "End of History" thesis argues that the rise of liberal democracy marks the turning point of humanity's ideological growth, which might give rise to a reminder of present-day liberal laws. "What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of postwar history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (Fukuyama 2). Fukuyama stated that liberal democracy has shown strength against other ideologies because of its focus on individual rights, and the maintenance of the rule of law. "They are far more fundamental than differences among political ideologies and political regimes. Differences do not necessarily mean conflict, and conflict does not necessarily mean violence. Over the centuries, however, differences among civilizations have generated the most prolonged and the most violent conflicts. Second, the world is becoming a smaller place. The interactions between peoples of different civilizations are increasing; these increasing interactions intensify civilization consciousness and awareness of differences between civilizations and commonalities within civilizations" (Huntington 25).

In contrast, Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations" theory predicts cultural conflicts and the development of new dividing lines in international relations and global politics, focusing on the importance of new laws to deal with tensions and conflicts. Overall, while it is important for newer and fresh power to spread, even if it might immediately test the existing world political laws and beliefs. They could also provide a chance for the development of a more fair and balanced world order. Whether the outcome is in support of the prior rules or the development of new rules, this will be impacted by government relationships and discussions controlled by the wide range of interests, values, and balance of power.

According to civilizational theory, the world has been divided into several civilizations based on cultural, religious, or political similarities. "**Civilizational differences are real**, due to history, language, culture, tradition, and, most importantly, religion. These differences are the product of centuries. They will not disappear soon. And populism rewards leaders who promote these differences" (Module 5.7.2). Each civilization has its own identity, values, and method of life. Civilizational theory believes that conflicts and tensions between different civilizations are important factors in world politics and international relations. "Mostly civilizational conflict serves domestic political purposes, as it does in this poster from Switzerland, but it *always has international implications*" (Module 5.7.3). They can impact relationships between countries or influence international affairs in various ways. According to Huntington, these conflicts have deep roots in human nature and will likely continue as long as civilizations exist. "Huntington's conclusion: the rise of civilization conflict is due to trends in economics and shifting identity" (Module 5.7.3). Other international relations writings and theories, like as realism, acknowledge the importance of cultural and personal identity in impacting conflicts. The reading by Huntington and some of the other course reading authors support that civilizational conflict cannot be avoided completely. So, even if a conflict seems local or domestic, it can still have broader implications on the global stage. This perspective stresses the importance of understanding the differences and relations between civilizations when creating the global order.

In addition, effective conflict prevention and resolution methods play an important role in limiting risks that come with or that are related to civilizational conflict. Investing in things like

systems for early warnings, negotiation efforts, and trying to enforce peace can help to address concerns and resolve some of the problems before they become more serious. These methods tend to encourage peace and stability in the long run by trying to resolve the main causes of conflict and then encouraging peace. Dialogue and diplomacy are very important parts of solving international issues, and trying to keep peace within international relations. It's one of the important ways of solving civilizational problems. Having methods for regularly talking to each other, and negotiation between nations can help promote understanding and trust. **“Civilizations are more connected.** Religion increasingly substitutes as a basis for identity, transcending national boundaries and uniting people across borders, strengthening a shared sense of civilization” (Module 5.7.3). Diplomacy strategies focused on negotiation and peaceful resolution of differences are important when preventing tensions from developing into full-blown conflicts. However misunderstandings can be easily resolved, and agreement determined through helpful discussions and conversations between nations. This would reduce the chances of conflict happening.

In recent years, the rise of nationalism, populism, and the trend towards "great man" rule has challenged the idea of the "End of History" proposed by Fukuyama. The world might not be on the course to accept the "Western-style democracy", as its final government system. "end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government. This is not to say that there will no longer be events to fill the pages of Foreign Affairs's yearly summaries of international relations, for the victory of liberalism has occurred primarily in the realm of ideas or consciousness and is as yet incomplete in the real or material world" (Fukuyama, 2). He thinks that Western-style democracy, where people have a say in how they're governed, this is the best and final way for countries to run themselves. Nationalism and populism often favor the strong leaders who value their country's interests. Instead of working together with other nations. This challenges the idea that all countries should work for democracy and equality, and peaceful relationships between other nations. By pointing out the cultural and identity differences, these events and movements had a chance to divide countries. Instead of everyone agreeing on the values of democracy, people could end up split because of where they're from and or because of their beliefs.

Nationalism and populism are shaking things up on the global stage. Nationalism is all about putting your country first before anything. On a smaller scale, it can be compared to supporting your favorite sports team at an event. You'd be very proud of your country's culture, history, traditions, and views. Also, you'd want to try and maintain them. On the other hand, populism is when a politician claims to be fighting for everyday people against those who are rich and powerful. "Two cataclysmic world wars in this century have been spawned by the nationalism of the developed world in various guises, and if those passions have been muted to a certain extent in postwar Europe, they are still extremely powerful in the Third World. Nationalism has been a threat to liberalism historically in Germany, and continues to be one in isolated parts of "post-historical" Europe like Northern Ireland" (Fukuyama, 14). They might also promise simple solutions to some difficult problems, for example, they would fix all of the problems if we were to elect them into office. Both nationalism and populism may provoke powerful feelings that impact how countries are governed and run. But this could also lead to a divide and conflict if these problems aren't handled correctly.

Events may cause the world to become more and more divided. Leaders of the nationalist and populist movements usually want to go it alone, and have little to confidence in international

organizations or groups. This could make it more difficult for countries to work together on big problems and conflicts. If nations put the interests of their own nations before what is best for everyone, it could end up in things like international conflicts or maybe even wars. More rulers in power could result from the growth of "strongman" leaders."IF WE ADMIT for the moment that the fascist and communist challenges to liberalism are dead, are there any other ideological competitors left? Or put another way, are there contradictions in liberal society beyond that of class that are not resolvable? Two possibilities suggest themselves, those of religion and nation" (Fukuyama, 14). These leaders challenge and oppose the idea that liberal democracy is the ideal kind of government. This is by accumulating power in their interests and trying to limit political disagreements. In situations where these people are in the positions of power, this may end up resulting in change, instability, and risk.

The world is changing as a result of the rise of new and powerful nations like the BRICS. To fully understand this, you need to look at how the countries interact with each other and how they make the laws. But up until now, Western nations have taken control of the international field, but countries like South Africa, Brazil, Russia, India, and China have begun to gain ground and sup. The traditional view has been challenged by this change. These challenges come from these changes, mostly in the places of nationalism and ethnic identity. Conflicts involving and impacting multiple nations might be caused by people's strong opinions and beliefs about their culture or origins. It's important to avoid these conflicts, and to try and find more peaceful solutions to these problems and conflicts. Different perspectives on the best way to govern a nation often are quite important. Liberal democracy, where all citizens have a voice in their government, is considered by some as the ideal form of government. "the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government." (Fukuyama, 2). Others, on the other hand, believe that their nation should come first and that they require a powerful leader to set things right. "all human behavior in the material world, and hence all human history, is rooted in a prior state of consciousness," (Fukuyama, 4). These changes want people to reconsider how humanity works and come up with ideas to improve relationships with one another. Maintaining that every person's voice is heard and valued on an international scale is more important than simply deciding who is in charge.