

# **WORLD ORDERS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN**

*Dr. Tahir Amin*

## **Introduction**

This paper focuses on three questions: What are the major theoretical debates in International Relations theory in the post-cold war era? (2) How do we define a world order and what different world orders exist in the contemporary world? (3) What are the implications of our theory for Pakistan?

The major arguments of this paper are the following: (a) The notion of a single world order usually dominates both in the discourse of IR theories as well the practice of world politics. Both the scholars and the practitioners of the diplomacy conveniently overlook the fact that the western liberal world order, though dominant at the moment, is only one of the world orders which exists in contemporary multi-cultural, multi-religious and plural world. There exist multiple world orders which are operating at the global scale and they deeply influence both the theory and the practice of international politics.<sup>1</sup> Besides liberal world order, there also exist Sinic, Russian -Slavic, Indic and Islamic orders, to name a few among many other world orders which overlap, interpenetrate and co-exist simultaneously.(b) Pakistan finds itself sandwiched among the conflicting pulls of these competing world orders. If the decision-makers do not show sensitivity to these world orders, there will be grave consequences for Pakistan's integrity and continuing survival. What Pakistan needs is a vision and an appropriate strategy to get out of its dilemmas. The challenge for Pakistan is to produce a viable Islamic democratic model in congruence with the norms of global society.

## **Major Theoretical Debates**

What is the nature of the post-cold war International system? Five paradigms dominated the discourse of IR in the post-cold war

era: “End of History”, “Clash of Civilizations”, “Multipolarity”, “Complex interdependence” and “Coming Anarchy”. Francis Fukuyama termed the post-Cold war era as the “End of History”, thereby meaning that the West had won the cold war and the liberal capitalism had achieved an unabashed victory over other ideologies<sup>2</sup>. He claimed that the world had no other alternative than to pursue the ideals of liberal democracy in political sphere and the principles of market economy in the economic sphere. Huntington, on the other hand, believed that there were many alternatives as the religious and cultural identities were being revived in the post-cold war era. In his view, future world order would be characterized by the clash of civilizations rather than a global society.<sup>3</sup> Fault lines among civilizations, in his opinion, will be the battle lines of the future. John Mearshiemer believed that we were in a state of transition i.e. from unipolarity to multipolarity and the West should selectively encourage nuclear proliferation to maintain their hegemony.<sup>4</sup> Joseph Nye argued that we were heading towards complex interdependence and soft power was more important than hard power.<sup>5</sup> A network of global regimes must be reconstructed by the United States and the western countries to maintain their hegemony. Robert D. Kaplan emphasized the role of environmental factors and the consequent coming anarchy in the world.<sup>6</sup> He thought that the world was moving towards chaos and anarchy as a consequence of mismanagement of environment.

The above five paradigms greatly influenced the global debate about the post- cold war world order. However, all of these paradigms, despite their different assumptions about the world order share certain common features. They are articulated by the American writers who are trying to comprehend the changes in the world order. They are essentially realists who are preoccupied with the maintenance of status quo. They wish to preserve the hegemony of the West, and their explicit goal is to maintain the balance of power in the short run and to establish an institutionalized hegemony in the long run. Furthermore despite their emphasis on cultures and religions, they lack sensitivity and sophistication in the assessment of other cultures. An interpretative understanding of others values is lacking in their work.

## **What Different World Orders Exist?**

We take world orders to be geographically –linked socio-historical entities, identifiable on the basis of patterned regularities discernable among international or world actors, involving their conscious and unconscious relationships with each other and / or with their social and natural environments.<sup>7</sup> The concept of world order is more inclusive than that of “international order”, our acting units need not be nations/states. Indeed, ethnies, nations, firms, parties, interest groups, class, or status groups, armies, churches, communities, states and empires can be units of a world order. World order boundaries do not have to be absolute and mutually exclusive, so we expect to find overlapping, and even interpenetrating orders and smaller possibly regional orders within more encompassing, truly global world orders. World orders are typically multi-dimensional, normative, and cosmological.

It is necessary to understand these multiple world orders hermeneutically because they represent distinctive world views with both compatible as well as incompatible values. The biggest challenge, in my view, which this world faces, is whether we shall move towards the much predicted “Clash of Civilizations” or a global society based on shared values among these contending world orders. Looking at the four major events of contemporary international politics, Indo-US nuclear deal, founding of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Danish Cartoon Controversy and Kyoto Protocols, we analyze the nature of these contending world orders and their complex interactions.

### **Four Puzzles**

The Indo-US nuclear deal (2007), founding of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in 2001, Danish Cartoon Controversy (2005-2006), and Kyoto Protocols (1997) are the four major events of recent international politics which fall within four major domains of IR theory, international political security, international political economy, international political community and International political ecology respectively. Choice of these events is arbitrary but they present interesting puzzles to a student of

IR, which reveal both the contending world orders and their complex interactions.

### **Indo-US nuclear Deal**

The first puzzle is about the Indo-US nuclear deal which was signed between India and the United States in March 2006 and took the world by surprise<sup>8</sup>. Pakistan has been a close ally of the United States through out its history, a principal partner in the war against terrorism and has a vital role in stabilizing the situation in Afghanistan. India, on the other hand, has been a non-aligned country thorough out its history, has not been a front line state in the war against terrorism and has its own ambitions of becoming a global power. The United States not only announced a broad-based strategic partnership aimed at bolstering India's strategic and military capabilities, but also offered close cooperation in nuclear technology and space as well. The nuclear deal signed between India and the United States has enormous global and regional implications. It will help India become a major power in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, thus facilitating an early rise of a multi-polar world and will undermine the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) regime at global level.<sup>9</sup> It will not only weaken the US and European countries's stance against the Iranian nuclear programme but will also give a green signal to other would be powers to aspire for the nuclear capabilities.<sup>10</sup> At the regional level, it will destabilize South Asia by triggering another nuclear and missile race with Pakistan. The India-Pakistan peace-process will be put on hold and the possibility of resolving Kashmir dispute between the two countries will fade away.

A variety of explanations have been offered to understand the motivations of the two states regarding this deal. The most widely held explanation focuses on India's role as a potential counterweight against China in an emerging multi-polar world. Other explanations stress the necessity of building an axis of democratic states-US, EU, Japan and India against the axis of autocracies- Russia, China and Iran. Some scholars believe that the US, though preeminent power at the moment has been in a relative decline and the deal signifies a shift in the international political

security environment. We believe that most of the above explanations contain a significant element of truth but are partial in nature. To a student of world orders, it appears to be a rapprochement between two world orders, Indic and Liberal world orders. The two world orders have joined hands in a broad collaboration against the rival world orders in the backdrop of unfolding multi-cultural, multi-religious and plural world. It is not only the United States but also most of the European Union states, Australia, Israel and Japan which are collaborating with India on the broad-based partnership.

## **SCO**

The founding of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in June 2001 as a successor organization to the Shanghai Five group formed in 1996 is another important development in the contemporary international politics.<sup>11</sup> Its members include China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Its observers include India, Pakistan, Iran and Mongolia. SCO covers one of the largest geographical areas of any regional organization, and its members and observers collectively possess 17.5 percent of the world's proven oil reserves, 47-50 percent of known natural gas reserves and 45 percent of the world's population. Its original objective was to counter the threat of terrorism, separatism and extremism but overtime, its objectives have been broadened to include cooperation in energy, communication, infrastructure and economic matters.

SCO has been regarded by the Western security analysts as the "NATO of the East" aimed at countering western presence in Central Asia while other analysts have considered it as a joint Russian and Chinese effort to maintain status quo in Central Asia.<sup>12</sup> Chinese President Jiang Zemin put forward a definition of the Shanghai spirit in 2001 as "mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, consultation, respect to different civilizations and common prosperity."<sup>13</sup> The SCO charter adopted in June 2002 emphasized "sovereign equality of states and the rejection of hegemony and coercion in international affairs." The Astana summit Declaration of 5<sup>th</sup> July 2005 proclaimed that 'a rational and just world order must

be based upon consolidation of mutual trust and good neighbourly relations upon the establishment of true partnership with no pretence to monopoly and domination in international affairs.”<sup>14</sup>

It will be a mistake to regard SCO as a traditional collective security organization merely aimed at containing the Western influence in Central Asia. In fact, it is a powerful expression of collaboration between the two world orders, Russian-Slavic and Sinic world orders. Both have joined hands to form an alliance based on the non-western values. They wish to demonstrate to the world about the viability of a Eurasian model other than the European Union<sup>15</sup>. They have built anti-terrorist structures, conducted joint military exercises with the member states and have repeatedly reaffirmed their solemn commitment to the principle of non-interference in domestic issues of the member states. However, they have a broader agenda to turn the entire region of the member states into an effective economic grouping like European Union.<sup>16</sup>, However, there has also been an emphasis on non-western values in the context of a non-hegemonic and just multi-polar world.

### **Danish Cartoon Controversy**

On 30th Sept. 2005, the largest newspaper of Denmark Jyllands-Posten published 12 defaming cartoons of the prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him) which triggered world-wide protest against the paper and the government of Denmark for not openly condemning the symbolic vandalizing of the holy icon of the second largest faith in the world after Christianity<sup>17</sup>. The Danish press and the government initially defended the publication of the insulting cartoons by stressing that the freedom of expression was the fundamental value of the Western liberal culture which could not be compromised. Eleven ambassadors from the Muslim countries urgently requested a meeting with the Danish Prime Minister over the issue, but the request was not accepted by the Danish government. By June 2006 violent confrontations erupted through out the world<sup>18</sup>. There were big demonstrations by the Muslims in many major cities of the European countries but the protest was especially very strong and often violent in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iran, Egypt, Syria, India, Sirilanka, Malaysia,

Indonesia, Libya, Nigeria and Somalia. More than 300 people were killed in the riots, Danish embassies were attacked in several countries and Danish goods were boycotted by the Muslim consumers in the Muslim World. The Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) and the Arab League held their meetings to review the situation.<sup>19</sup>

The western press held the Muslims responsible for the violence and blamed that they did not understand the liberal values.<sup>20</sup> The Muslims were portrayed as backward, irrational, fanatics and threat to the democratic values. The Muslim's perspective was that the western press should have respected the religious sensitivities of their minorities. They also felt that they were not only exploited politically and economically as minorities but they were also being insulted culturally as well.<sup>21</sup> The Danish cartoon controversy was truly a clash between the liberal world order and the Islamic world order, reminiscent of the crisis which was triggered when Ayatullah Khomeini had issued a Fatwa (religious decree) against Salman Rushdie on his book *Satanic Verses*. The issue of two clashing set of values, held by the proponents of the two world orders was sharply focused.

### **Kyoto Protocols**

The phenomenon of Global warming has become an issue of grave concern for the world.<sup>22</sup> It is believed by the scientists that the temperature of the world is raising with multi-dimensional consequences for the humanity. Warming of the earth could lead to the rise in the sea level causing floods, changes in weather pattern leading to the crippling of the crops and possibly creating new hazards to the human health<sup>23</sup>. The effect of climate change will also create resource scarcity and a significant increase in world population leading to political instability around the world. Responding to the concern that human activities are increasing concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, most of the nations of the world signed the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. Kyoto Protocol was signed on Dec.11, 1997 in the context of UNFCCC. The Kyoto protocol is an agreement under which industrialized countries will reduce their

collective emissions of greenhouse gases. The goal is to lower overall emission of six greenhouse gases- carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, sulfur hexafluoride, HFCs and PFCs –calculated as an average over the five year period of 2008-2012.<sup>24</sup> The agreement came into force on Feb.16, 2005 following ratification by Russia. A total of 163 countries have ratified the agreement. Notable exceptions include the United States and Australia.

The United States signed the protocol on Nov.12, 1998 but did not ratify the treaty. The Bush Administration disengaged from the treaty in late 2001 claiming that the treaty was “fatally flawed”. It believed that the consequences of the global warming were of dubious nature<sup>25</sup>. Furthermore, the treaty did not bind the developing countries like China and India to reduce their levels of gas emissions. The US has been the biggest polluter of the environment, responsible for 36.1 percent of the gas emissions around the world. Had the US ratified the treaty, it would have to reduce the emission level seven percent below 1990 levels during the commitment period (2008-2012). The US disengagement from the treaty shocked the world and many thought that the Kyoto treaty was dead even before it could go into force. It is heartening the Obama administration has shown a renewed interest in ratifying the treaty however, it has yet to be seen how they proceed to rescue the Kyoto Protocol.

Despite the US refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol, more than 190 nations agreed to be on board. There appears to be a remarkable global consensus among multiple world orders that the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol should be adhered to.

### **Observations**

Why did the US sign a nuclear deal with India but not with Pakistan? Why was the SCO found? Why did the Danish Cartoon Controversy become such a contentious global issue? Why did the Kyoto Protocol go into effect despite the oppositions from the United States? The answer to these puzzles are more comprehensively understood in the context of our theory of multiple

world orders in the backdrop of unfolding multi-cultural, multi-religious and plural world.

These world orders overlap, interpenetrate and coexist simultaneously. Rapprochement between the liberal world order and the Indic world order in the case of Indo-US nuclear deal, collaboration between Sinic and Russia-Slavic world orders in the case of SCO and the near confrontation between the Western liberal world order over the Danish Cartoon controversy and a near multilateral consensus (except the United States) among these contending world orders in the case of Kyoto protocols reveal a complex pattern of interactions.

These world orders are not exclusive because they interpenetrate each other in varying degrees. India, the core state in the Indic world order holds the status of an observer in the SCO. The Danish Cartoon controversy reveals that the Islamic world order deeply penetrates western liberal world order. Infact the Islamic world order, in varying degrees, penetrates in all above world orders, liberal, Indic, Sinic and Russian-Slavic.

In the most above-mentioned world orders, one finds a core state projecting the world view of its respective world order but there is no necessary one to one relationship between a world order and the states. Danish Cartoon crisis shows that Islamic order took most of the Muslim states including Iran by surprise. Consensus on the Kyoto protocol shows that despite the US refusal to ratify the treaty, the EU still strong supports the accord and finds itself closer to Russia than the United States, the core state in the liberal order.

Multiple world orders have both incompatible as well as compatible values. World orders are not like tectonic plates as portrayed by Huntington, which are bound to clash with each other because of incompatible values. Kyoto Protocol suggests that these contending world orders may also evolve a consensus on globally shared norms, thus paving the way for the emergence of a global society. However, there is dire need of a global dialogue among these diverse world orders to evolve a consensus on the globally shared norms.

## **Implications for Pakistan**

What are the implications of our analysis for Pakistan? Pakistan is caught among the conflicting pulls of the competing world orders, liberal, Indic, Islamic, Sinic and Russian-slavic. Each World Order has its own agenda and wishes to transform Pakistan in accordance with its values. However, the nexus between liberal world order and Indic world order is the most ominous for Pakistan. Rapprochement between the two world orders is influencing the international politics of South Asia. For example, Af-Pak strategy recently announced by the Obama Administration symbolizes the Indo-American framework for Pakistan and Afghanistan. It excludes Kashmir which has been the root-cause of the Indo-Pakistan relations, a clear concession to India. It has the potential to push Pakistan towards chaos and instability. The continuing drone attack in Pakistan's tribal areas not only undermine Pakistan's sovereignty and inflict collateral damage but also make the current PPP regime look like a collaborationist regime, thus widening the gulf between state and society, a legacy of Musharraf era. Emphasis on the military surge in Afghanistan appears to be more a continuity of the Bush Administration's policy and possibly a last ditch effort on the part of the Obama Administration to seek a military solution of the Afghan imbroglio. What Afghanistan needs is the process of dialogue and reconciliation where alienated Pushtun majority of Afghanistan is brought back into the political process

Pakistan must not overlook or ignore the potential of Sino-Russian Slavic world order which has become a serious contender to the hegemonic designs of the Western liberal world order. SCO has indeed emerged as a potent regional organization with a broad-based agenda. Pakistan may use this card if the pro-India tilt of the Western liberal world order continues to persist. Keeping in view, the Indo-US nuclear cooperation and a broad-based collaboration with the western world order, Pakistan should try to become the member of SCO with an active role in the organization.

Islamic world order has a special relevance for Pakistan as it may constitute a source of strength for Pakistan rather than weakness in this multi-cultural, multi-religious and plural world. If

Pakistan successfully develops an Islamic democratic model which should be consistent with the norms of the global society, it may be a unique case in the Muslim world. What Pakistan needs is a vision and an appropriate strategy to get out of its dilemmas.

### **Author**

*Dr. Tahir Amin is the Chairman at the Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. His previous positions include Iqbal Chair at Centre for International Studies; University of Cambridge and Director Centre for Asian Studies; Islamabad. He was also the Teaching Associate in University of British Columbia Vancouver, B.C Canada. Dr. Amin has numerous publications in the shape of books and articles on various subjects.*

### **Notes**

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is inspired by a research project on the dialectics of World orders jointly coauthored by Hayward R.Alker, Tahir Amin, Thomas Biersteker and Takashi Inuguchi.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Fukuyam, “The End of History”, *The National Interest* (Summer 1989) and his book, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: The Free Press, 1992)

<sup>3</sup> Samuel P.Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.72,no.3 (Summer 1993) and also his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1996)

<sup>4</sup> John J. Mearsheimer, “Why We Will soon Miss the Cold War”, *The Atlantic Monthly*(August 1990) pp. 35-50 Also his article, “Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War”, *International Security* Vol. 15, no.1, (Summer 1990)

<sup>5</sup> Joseph S Nye Jr., “What New World Order” *Foreign Affairs*,Vol.71, no.2 (Spring 1992)

<sup>6</sup> Robert D.Kaplan, “The Coming Anarchy” *The Atlantic Monthly*( Feb.1994) ppp.44-76

<sup>7</sup> Hayward R.Alker, Tahir Amin, Thomas Biersteker and Takashi Inuguchi, “Twelve World Order Debates Which have Made Our Days” a paper presented at Russian International Studies Association, MGIMO University, Moscow, April 20-21, 2001

<sup>8</sup> See an excellent M.Phil thesis on the Indo-US nuclear deal: Ghazala Yasmin Jalil, “*Indo-US Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan’s Security*” Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 2008

- 
- <sup>9</sup> Adil Sultan Mohammad, “Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Implications on South Asian Security Environment” Henry L. Stimson paper (July, 2006). From Indian perspective see: Rajiv Nayan, “Indo-US Nuclear Deal: The Bill and Apprehensions, IDSA occasional paper no.1 (November, 2006)
- <sup>10</sup> See “Third EU-India-US Dialogue 2008” Proceedings of a Conference organized by the European office of Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung (Brussels: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, July 2008)
- <sup>11</sup> See an M.Phil thesis by Sadia Nasir, “SCO’s Changing Agenda: Challenges and Responses” Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 2007
- <sup>12</sup> Martha Brill Olcott, “The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: Changing the Playing Field in Central Asia” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006
- <sup>13</sup> Alyson J.K. Bailes, Pal Dunay, Pan Guang and Mikhail Troitsky, “The Shanghai Cooperation Organization” *SIPRI Policy paper* no.17, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, May 2007
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid
- <sup>15</sup> Gene Germanovich, “The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: A Threat to American Interests in Central Asia” *China and Eurasian Forum Quarterly* Vol. 6, no. 1 (2008) pp 19-38
- <sup>16</sup> Alyson J K Bailes, “The Shanghai Cooperation Organization and Europe” *China and Eurasia Forum Quarterly*, Vol 5, No.3 (2007) pp 13-18
- <sup>17</sup> Salim Mansur, “Of Danish Cartoons, Muslim Rage and the Bedouin State of Mind” occasional Paper series no. 10 (Washington: Center for Security Policy, May 2006)
- <sup>18</sup> Dr. Graeme Herd, Dr. Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, “Danish Cartoons: A Symptom of Global Insecurity” (Geneva: Geneva Centre For Security Policy, 2006)
- <sup>19</sup> See two contrasting perspectives: Pernille Ammitzboll and Lorenzo Vidino, “After the Danish Cartoon Controversy” *Middle East Quarterly*, 2007) Imam Zaid Shakir “Clash of the Uncivilized: Insight on the Cartoon Controversy” (Zaytuna Institute, 2006)
- <sup>20</sup> Mustafa Hussain, “Harm and Offense through Mass mediation: The Cartoon Controversy and the Danish Press” an unpublished paper (2007)
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid
- <sup>22</sup> Susan R. Fletcher, “Global Climate Change: The Kyoto Protocol” (Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2005); Stephen McGinness, *Climate Change & the Kyoto Protocol* (London: House of Commons Library, 2001)
- <sup>23</sup> Peter Newell, *The Kyoto Protocol and Beyond: The World After 2012*” Human Development Report 2007/2008
- <sup>24</sup> Chad Damro and Pilar Luaces-Mendez, “The Kyoto Protocol’s Emissions Trading System: An EU-US Environmental Flip-Flop (Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, 2003)
- <sup>25</sup> Frank Jotzo, “Developing countries and the Future of the Kyoto Protocol” (Australian National University, 2004)