THE CONCEPT OF WORLD ORDER

Study of ‘world order’ is a new concept in the realm of international relations. The discipline of international relations study and analyse the political, social, economic, cultural and other possible aspects of interactions and relations between and among the states. ‘World order’ is a politico-philosophical concept, related to the nature and objectives of human life, which is observed and analysed in the context of international relations. As a segment of international relations, world order deals with “the maintenance of peace in the world and to the establishment of a condition in which wars do not pose a threat to the survival of civilisation and mankind.”

Being a poly-semantic phrase, ‘world order’ has various meanings. Bull defines ‘world order’ as “patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary goals of social life among mankind as a whole.” The term not only indicates towards the complex nature of Post-Westphalian world, but according to Hayward R. Alker, Tahir Amin, Thomas J. Biersteker, and Takashi Inoguchi, this concept is also “amorphous, ambiguous, elusive, and therefore, difficult to operationalize. It has been described as ‘status quoist’ and an exercise in self-legitimation.” Human beings and states are the basic units and indispensable part of world order, which “constitute a complex network of human beings on the one hand and of sovereign states on the other. Both are rooted in the past, function in the present and are driven by the images of the future,” and “they emanate from the attributes of the actors as evident from their paradigms,
principles, conceptualisation of the reality, policies, institutions and structures.”

There are many world orders based on different ideas and ideologies overlapping and existing simultaneously. Therefore composition of “acting units need not be states. Indeed, ethnics, nations, firms, parties, interest groups, class or status groups, armies, churches, communities, states, and empires can be units of a world order.”

Besides, world order is an analysis of inalienable and indispensable aspects of human life in the global context, as “it is a product of ideas and ideologies pertaining to different aspects of life- politics, economic, commerce, ecology and culture.” Moreover, it can be defined as “totality of norms, procedures and institutional entities shaping and patterning international society at any point of time. Put simply, it has a goal, a structural arrangement and a belief system all of which are isomorphically linked with views on human nature,” and refers to the “world of our making.”

Scientific and technological development and increased sphere of human interaction has widened the scope of world order and more inclusive and comprehensive than the sphere of ‘international order’. The basic unit of study under ‘international order’ is nation states whereas world order focuses on the ideas and ideologies governing human life. ‘International order’ focuses on study of activities, distribution of power, structures, functioning and nature of international political system, from political and military perspective, whereas ‘world order’ focuses on political as well as economic, social, cultural and other aspects of human activities. The geographical units of study under ‘international
order’ is basically activities of two nations, sub-regional, regional and continental level, but ‘world order’ examines not only sub-regional, regional and continental level, but multi-continental and global perspective also.

A multi-dimensional definition of world order on the basis of the study of international relations and world affairs has been given by Falk as “that focuses on the manner in which mankind can significantly reduce the likelihood of international violence and create minimally acceptable conditions of worldwide economic well-being, social justice, ecological stability, and participation in decision-making processes.” Galtung defines ideal world order, which “integrates the actor-oriented values (personal growth, socio-economic growth, diversity, equality, and social justice) and structure-oriented goals (equity, solidarity, autonomy and participation) through the reduction of relevant power differentials.”

Hence the concept of ‘world order’ not only deals with the issues of international relations, but also focuses on the problems ‘between man and man, and between man and nature.’ Concentrating on the problems of human society, it seeks the solution of problems of war and violence, unequal distribution and concentration of economic wealth, social injustice, environmental imbalance and alienation of human being from themselves, society and mankind. Therefore ‘world order’ can be considered as a system of geo-polity based socio-historical entities, identifiable as international or world actors and their inter-relationships in the complex social and natural environment of world.
THE CRISIS OF ORDER IN ‘DISORDERED’ WORLD

Historically, social life of human being was started as member of tribe. In the beginning of systematic social life, the means of transport and communications were negligible and the development of science and technology was in its earlier stage, so the meaning and scope of the world order was very limited. But the limited vision of world order was very broad in the context of human relations with nature. There was a very cordial relation between human beings and nature in the earlier stages of human society.

Emergence of religion inculcated the values i.e. love, truth, non-violence, humanity and harmony in the personal and social spheres of human being. Gradually the small sized, self-reliant, politically perimeterised units came into existence, which were visualised as their ‘own world’ and world order. With the advent of process of civilisation, increasing population and limited resources led to struggle among these political units. Various wars were fought due to the inherited malevolency, greed, enmity and outrage in human nature. The idea of ‘Empire’ emerged to solve such type of disputes between these small political units under the umbrella of empire. This was the nature of world order in the ancient period of human history.

Inventions due to the development of science and technology not only changed the human life but also changed the nature of the concept of world order in the medieval period. This development enlarged the nature and scope of the world order as into imperial orders; it geographically extended to the other continents of the world. For example, British world order intervened in social,
political, economic and religious spheres of its colonies and started the inhuman exploitation as part of ‘Whiteman’s burden’. As a result of materially rich and politically powerful states era of colonialism and imperialism became a reality. Under the colonial yoke, on the pretext to civilise the uncivilised, the imperial powers justified the killings and enslaving of millions of people in African and Asian continents. They were the arbiters in their perception of world order to “distinguish right from wrong and to impose their will by force on all those who were ‘wrong’ as determined by them. They wanted the peace of the burial ground.”¹² The world order was based on force and the human society of the colonies was bound to live under this forced peace and whims of the imperialists. These people were declared uncivilised, backward and savage, because they were not agree with the world order perception of imperial powers. Hence, “the great civilisations like, Indians and Chinese were branded as traditional, unchanging and fossilised requiring ‘modernisation’ under the aegis of the civilised imperial powers.”¹³

The nineteenth century era of imperialism was challenged in the first half of the 20th century from within and outside. Initiation of First World War, along with the establishment and failure of League of Nations, and communist revolution in Russia challenged the world order dominated by Europe. Though a new kind of world order started emerging in the form of Soviet socialism, but sudden eruption of Second World War stopped the process of change. Nuclear holocaust at Hiroshima and Nagasaki raised the question mark on the functioning, control and decision process of sovereign nation-states.
Two world wars, followed by cold war between the then superpowers led the world towards division and fragmentation on rival ideological basis. During cold-war era, major wars were replaced by hundreds of mini-wars. In the post-cold war era, the relevance of only agency to maintain world order, i.e., United Nations has been question marked. Therefore it has been rightly observed that “at this juncture, even the maintenance of peace through the UNO is not only being questioned, but the very relevance of the international organisation is also being challenged.”

Post-cold war global structure not only led to the primacy of economic factors but assigned secondary role to political factors. Even Brettonwoods institutions were used by European countries and United States of America for their vested interests. Initiation of process of globalisation further enhanced their hegemony and dominance in the global system. As a result, substantive issues like peace, equality, economic prosperity, environment and arms control are also determined by them in a unipolar world.

Today, billions of dollars are being spent by different countries on arms race to keep themselves safe. On the contrary, billions of people are deprived of food, clothes and shelter, the very basic needs of human being. Besides this, problems of “human rights, economic trade, militarisation of space, North-South gap, radical ideologies, lacking education, health problems, mass starvation and failed or failing states” are haunting the individual, society, state and global level. Richard Falk has highlighted the following problems at global level i.e., “stern world poverty affecting more than one billion human beings, non-availability of
basic human rights to socially and culturally vulnerable groups, the relentless use of force and unabated threat of war as an instrument of politics at various levels, and problem of environmental degradation along with the lack of transnational democratic accountability."\textsuperscript{16}

Therefore in the light of existing problems in present world order, it is significant to analyse and evaluate the existing causes and to seek possible solutions. Before analysing Gandhian alternative, it becomes essential to evaluate the existing world order models studies. Broadly speaking, presently four world order approaches, i.e. liberal, marxist, functional and realist, are being evaluated to understand the contemporary realities.

**LIBERAL APPROACH**

Liberal approach focuses on individual freedom, open market economy, and democratic, accountable and welfare government. Individual freedom is considered as a pre-requisite condition for peaceful world order. It provides individual with opportunities along with options to realise one’s true self. But, for liberalists, freedom of an individual is meaningless until and unless that is actualised in economic field. So for them open market economy is also a desired condition for peaceful world. This kind of individual freedom and open market economy pre-suppose a democratic and accountable government, which must be welfare oriented so that justice may be established in society and peace could be realised in its substantive sense.

The scope of liberalism in international sphere was augmented due to John Locke’s theory of ‘rights to property, life and liberty’, the idealistic strand of liberalism of Mill and Green,
French revolution’s ideas of ‘liberty, equality and fraternity’ and enriched by liberal philosophers like Woodrow Wilson, Norman Angell and Michael Doyle. Besides, more recently liberal thinker Kant considered war a problem for humanity and presented a plan for ‘perpetual peace’ based on ‘transformation of individual consciousness, ‘spirit of commerce’ which is ‘incompatible with war’, republican constitutionalism and a federal contract between states to abolish war’, thus paved the way of forming international organisations in world order.

Two World Wars edified mutual cooperation and understanding among the democratic welfare states, as the basic tenets to attain peaceful world order. Liberal approach got prominence with the victory of Second World War as it has been successful in the establishment of political order in the form of United Nations along with an economic order in the form of Brettonwoods institutions. Apart from this, constitutional and federal government, separation of powers, decentralisation, individual rights and a system of open and competitive elections are the indispensable values of liberal approach of world order.

Liberal approach believes that human nature is not brute or savage; rather it is essentially ‘good’. The welfare of other people of society is an inherited value of the personality of human being. Liberal approach gave importance to application of reason and rationality and emphasised on economic freedom for a just and peaceful world it recognised the existence and importance of non-state actors (Non-Governmental Organisations, Government Organisations, Multi-national corporations and Trans-national
companies) in international relations, and focuses on curtailing wars and promoting peace.

According to liberal approach the problems of war and international anarchy are not preordained. For liberalism, problems of war and violence are the products of evil institutions; therefore the reformation of existing institutions or forming of new institutions can pave the way towards establishment of peaceful world. It envisaged the reorganisation of international society and its important role in dismantlement of war producing institutions in the world. It wanted to reform the world institutions on the basis of their liberal values. Peace and welfare of the people are the core values of the process of reformation. Another important assumption of the liberal approach is the possibility of global cooperation in international relations.

It rejected the security and military power centric attitude of realism rather it focussed on trade and commercial activities in international relations. It concentrates on free market economy and promotes free trade under liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation. It emphasises on promotion of trade and commerce to promote cordial relations among nations in world. Liberal identified that the real nature of modern world is based on complex interdependence, which leads to development of various sources and channels among the states and later it can become a source to pacify the existing disputes in world politics.

In twenty-first century, multiple changes in the global scenario produced many challenges for the liberal approach. Liberal approach is excessively economic and materialistic and neglects the importance of moral values in the functioning of world. It does not
support the demand to reform the universal organisation and economic institutions as their present structure and functioning is more compatible with liberal economies. Financial crisis, increasing inequality and poverty in the various parts of the world has raised question marks on the liberal approach. Global terrorism, communal disharmony and fragile states emerged as major security threats to the world. Apart from these shortcomings, liberal approach did not focus on peace, social and communal harmony, non-violence and disarmament in requisite terms. Thus these evidential limitations of liberal world order approach lead to explore other possible alternative approaches and models.

**MARXIST APPROACH**

Marxist approach is based on historical materialism, represents economy as the base structure and the social, cultural, moral, legal and political aspects of the society as the superstructures, however realists and liberalists focus on Westphalian state as most important factor in world order. Marxist approach of world order depicts the state (key actor of nation-state system) as “nothing more than a machine for the oppression of one class by another”\(^{17}\) and simply a product of society at a “certain stage of evolution.”\(^{18}\) In ‘Communist Manifesto’, Marx analysed class as the basic unit rather than state in international scenario, thus it observes the society and world as a place of class struggle between the bourgeoisie (haves) class and the proletariat (haves-not) class. On the basis of this idea, Lenin divided the world into two groups, the oppressor (haves) states and the oppressed (haves-not) states. He considered the necessity of state only in a capitalist society where it engenders class antagonisms.
Marxists approach of world order refutes the role of international organisations and international cooperation in present world order as these are tools to safeguard and promote the interests of capitalist and imperialist states. Lenin even considered their democracy as “an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another.” It criticises the democratic states based on capitalist economy, for being a tool of exploitation in the hands of rich and capitalists class, thus negates the democracy and calls for ‘dictatorship of the poor, workers, and proletariat’ class. Therefore the ideal state for marxists is no state at all, because every state or government is only “organised power of one class to oppress other.”

In this approach, everyone has to work according to one’s ability and will be paid accordingly. Hence in the state of communism, no unnecessary accumulation of money or property or wealth will take place. The only remedy for change will be the replacement of capitalism through socialistic practice. As Marx rightly observed that, “if capitalism is at the root of all world conflict it should be overthrown before any enduring peace can be established and it should be overthrown by socialism.”

According to the marxist analysis, the present world order is based on inequality and exploitation under the rule of capitalists, thus paves the way of ‘violent revolution’ by the proletariat to change the existing world order. The proletariat or the labour class will be the messenger to bring out the requisite change in the present world order. At individual level, the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie leads to emancipation and spreads ‘class consciousness’ among the proletariat or worker class.
irrespective of their nationalities. Under the ‘vanguard’ of communist party the ‘class consciousness’ or ‘fraternity among the proletariat or labour class’ is likely to bring the required changes in the present world order.

The ‘violent revolution’ ensures the dictatorship of proletariat, which is the first step towards socialism and later it moves towards communism, where state and class will wither away. Hence it is aimed at complete obliteration of state from world, because if state exists anywhere in the world, then classes are bound to exist and which may pose a threat towards the achievement a ‘classless and stateless world society.’ Thus marxist approach of world order aims for establishment of one-class or uniform classless society in the world. The establishment of communism as a system and guiding force of the human society is the ultimate goal of marxism, by abolishing inequality and exploitation. This approach aims at the establishment world society based on cooperation and consensus.

Based on the basic tenets of marxism and under the major influence of Lenin, in 1950s, dependency theory emerged in the contrast to that of modernisation theory. It refuted their claims of getting benefits from free trade and foreign investments. Exponents of dependency theory argued that free trade; foreign investments and international market relations are in favour of development of unequal relations between the developed and underdeveloped countries. This neo-marxist perspective identified the ‘world divided into centre and periphery’. Centre is consisting of industrialised and developed nations and periphery is as primary producers or underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin
America. Core nations exploit the peripheral nations as the terms of trade are unequal and in favour of former due to their technological and industrial advancements.

Furthermore in 1974, having rejected the notion of ‘third world’, sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein presented a ‘world system’ theory based on ‘social system’. He claimed that there is only one world based on a complex network of economic exchange relationships, and called it as ‘world-economy’ or ‘world-system.’ Moreover he interpreted the world economy as capitalist or market economy, divided in three broad categories, i.e., Core, Semi-periphery and Periphery nations. Nations under core category are strong, democratic, welfare state, exporters of the manufactured goods, importers of the raw materials and controlling the international commerce and accumulate surplus as capital from this unequal trade with semi-periphery and peripheries. The nations at semi-peripheries produce manufactured goods but do not get benefit from international trade to the same extent as the core and have limited access to international banking in comparison to the core. Whereas the nations at periphery, lack the strong central governments, exports raw materials to the core and semi-periphery, imports the manufactured goods and face coercive labour practices. The inter-relation among the three categories is based on pattern of exploitation. In this process core exploits the semi-periphery and periphery, whereas semi-periphery exploits the periphery.

The marxist approach of world order thus highlighted the present state of disorder, inequality and exploitation in the international scenario. It underlined the importance of the economic factors and drew attention towards the differences and problems
between capital and labour. It revealed the ideological camouflage of the western democratic and welfare states. But it over-emphasises the role of economic factors and neglects the role of social, legal, political aspects of human society. Besides, the relations between nations are not only limited up to economic exploitation; rather cooperation among states also exists. It undermines the state as a basic unit of analysing world order and attempts to establish class as basic unit, thus neglects the most important actor of the international relations.

Apart from this, there are not two classes in the world or human society is not as simple as envisaged by marxists, but is a complex human network in existence. The strategy to change the existing world order and establish a ‘classless stateless world society’ is based on only violence, thus not acceptable in the context of humanity. Despite its theoretical contribution, marxists approach of world order suffers from several major drawbacks as it did not focus on peace, social relations, disarmament, but neglected role of non-violence, humanity, international organisations and cooperation among the states. Hence being a partial view to comprehend world order, it becomes inevitable to explore other potential approaches and modal to understand the world order in a comprehensive way.

**FUNCTIONAL APPROACH**

Functional approach of world order focuses on the social and economic functions rather than political functions of the international organisations. The basic supposition of the functional approach is that the nation states can interact and build amicable relations among themselves through economic, social and technical
cooperation. These activities can lead to establishment of a peaceful world in a gradual manner which is likely to prevent danger of possible wars. Functional approach identified nationalism and international anarchy as the main causes behind the division of the world community into rival units. These rivalries resulted into numerous wars in the past including two world wars. Therefore it opposes the nationalism and promotes mutual cooperation, joint social and economic functions through international organisations.

The approach was enshrined in the writing of L. T. Hobhouse and G. Wallas which was further developed by David Mitrany during the Second World War. Losses occurred in First World War and the collapse of League of Nations forced Mitrany to focus his study to explore “working of a possible new international system rather than with its ethics.” He analysed the constitutional-political approach and concluded that the approach emphasises on the individual manifestation of power, therefore he aptly remarked that “the functional approach emphasises the common index of the needs. Since many such needs cut across national boundaries, a beginning could be made by providing joint government to them.” This approach also denies the main ingredients of realist approach i.e. power politics and national sovereignty and represents the alternative view for the world order based on cooperation. He opined that in reality, war is the result of social and economic maladjustments in the human society. The functional approach focuses on solving the basic human problems that are root cause of war. He was in favour of a functionalist approach which would gradually “supersede the importance of borders through a natural
growth of common activities and common administrative agencies.”

According to functional approach, the existing state system based on sovereignty is hurdle to achieve the solution of global human problems i.e. poverty, diseases, economic insecurity, ill-health, illiteracy and social injustice. It undermines the sovereignty of nation-states and seeks the loyalty transfer of the citizens from nation state to a higher supra-national authority, which Mitrany calls it ‘a new benevolent internationalism’. He argues that the final outcome of economic and technical activities among nations is a world federation. Functional approach perceives the existence of world community or a world society as a prerequisite for “world government.” Therefore it requires the replacement of the existed nation-states system with a firmly developed system of functional international agencies which seek the gradual transfer of functions and authority between states and the international bodies to reduce the problem of war.

Various international and regional institutions and agencies like United Nations Organisation, World Health Organisation and International Atomic Energy Agency etc. are engaged through their activities to promote peace and prosperity in the world. These international institutions and agencies have functional responsibilities in managing those problems which need consensus to cooperate. Besides, these international entities are assuming attributes of nation-states with constant transfer of functions and authority from states to agencies. Establishment of European Union is a successful experiment of this approach.
The neo-functional approach developed by Ernest Haas. He was very much inspired by the increasing cooperation among various countries. Only difference among them is that neo-functionalism sought to create new states through the integration of existing states to face the problem of world peace. Neo-functionalism highlighted the importance of regional integration among the states instead of global integration through international organisations as envisaged by functionalism. It believed ‘spill-over’ effect of social and economic activities and cooperation can lead to solve the political problems of the world. It also highlighted the importance of political activities in world scenario, which was underestimated by the functionalists.

Thus the functional approach of world order attempted to highlight the importance of social and economic activities to develop cooperation in the world. However it neglected the importance of political activities as it ignores political framework as an instrumentality to resolve the problem. The functional institutions can be of supportive or subordinate to the political sphere. Besides, national sovereignty and peoples’ sentiments towards their national identity cannot be underestimated. This approach does not deal directly with the problem of war and conflicts in international scenario as it is silent over the coordination mechanism of these international institutions.

REALIST APPROACH

Realist approach is based on power politics or ‘realpolitik’ and acknowledges rational state as the most important actor or finds its traces in “statism” in the international politics. Realist approach of world order opposes the basic idealist approach of
international politics which believes in gentle human nature, morality, peaceful relations and interdependence among states, importance of democracy and international law norms, and international cooperation. Idealism focuses on ‘what ought to be’ in world order whereas realism concentrates on ‘what is’. It believes that conflict in domestic and world politics is evident as the basic human nature is selfish, power-seeker, self-centered and self-interested. It believes that state is unique amalgam of the human beings, thus follows the basic human nature, seeks power and acts accordingly in the international scenario.

Among classical realists, Thucydides identified the problem of world as unequality of power among states. Machiavelli, considered the survival and security of the state most important. Hobbes was the first modern political philosopher, who described international relations as anarchical. ‘State of nature’ of Hobbes, shows that individuals would prefer to live under a supreme power than live in a world without order. In twentieth century, after discarding the liberalism and idealism, E.H. Carr recognised existence of opposing interests of the state and absence of powerful international regulatory agency as the main causes of conflicts in world.

Morgenthau presented six principles of realism based on human nature. These principles are as (i) ‘Politics is grounded in unchangeable laws of human nature (ii) National interests in terms of survival are supreme and defined in centrality of power (iii) Power and interest are universally valid concept but changeable according to circumstances (iv) Private morality and political ethics are based on national interests (v) Action of a particular nation
may be different from the accepted universal moral laws and (vi) Analysis of political activity is in the sphere of the political realism.

As a result he recognised world order as a hierarchical society of sovereign states, where every state considers national security or survival as its core value. The fulfilment of national interests is core objective and “self-help”\(^{27}\) is the guiding principle to achieve that goals. According to the strategy of ‘balance of power’ is considered as basic framework to deal such world order. Therefore regular check on the increasing power of their rival states remains as basic modus operandi to maintain peace. Despite accepting the existence and importance of ethics in world, it neglects the role of morality and ethical values in world order.

Later, Kenneth N. Waltz reformulated and expanded realism to neo-realism or structural realism. In neo-realist view, structure of international system is more important than any single state or a group of states. The problem is the anarchy and the absence of central controlling authority in world. Unlike realism, it recognises the existence of non-state actors and international organisations. Apart from this, neo-liberalism neglects the role of wisdom, intelligence and experiences of decision-makers. In realist approach of world order “the emphasis is on the preservation of the state system through balance of power and the reciprocal and responsible behaviour that balance of power tends to suggest.”\(^{28}\) It clearly shows an “intrinsic hegemonic tenor.”\(^{29}\)

Thus, realism considers world as in anarchical world order and power as determining factor of behaviour of a state. Besides, it unnecessarily emphasises on possession of military power and on
national interest, which led to immense criticism as Stanley Hoffmann accused it of ‘power monism’. Apart from this, it depicts only negative aspects of human nature and ignored positive features of human personality. Determining state as main actor in world, realism discards the important role played by international organisations. It also neglects the importance of peace, justice, social equity and human virtue. In the present age of globalisation, when importance of civil society, international economic institutions and foreign direct investment is increasing, realism still emphasises on territorial security, whereas today security is not limited to boundaries but expanded to human sphere i.e., health, education and other amenities. Thus, realist approach represents only a partial view of world order, as it neglects the role of social, economic and political factors. Hence it becomes inevitable to explore the available approaches or models to understand the working of present international system.

‘PREFERRED’ WORLD ORDER

Historically, since man came to know about the geographical boundaries of the nation-states, he tried to envisage the establishing of a unified world based on values of peace, equality, justice, harmony and fraternity. The issue of establishment of peaceful and equitable world order has found place in religious and philosophical framework of different civilisations and cultures.

Two world wars in the twentieth century have brought the issues of peace, equality and justice at the center-stage of the international relations. Emergence of various social, political, cultural, ethnic, and economic problems along with the incapability of UNO to resolve these problems put question marks on its
working as an organisation to establish world peace. These problems continue to work as menace and imminent danger for the human society even today. Therefore various attempts have been done by the numerous scholars to circumscribe the scope of world order based on issues of “disarmament, arms control, world government, establishment and maintenance of peace, causes and characteristics of wars, economic and social development in the world community.”

Clarence K. Streit, proposed ‘federal union of democracies against the axis powers’ called “Union Now.” Streit envisaged the federation of founder democracies to have joint military force more than fascist group to deter war. Similar efforts made towards the establishment of world order have also been made which are described as

Attempts done to establish peaceful world order after Second World War.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Movement/Organisation</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Place of Initiative</th>
<th>Nature of Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>United World Federation Movement</td>
<td>World Organisation to Prevent War</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Open for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>World Movement</td>
<td>World Federal Government</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>USA and Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-51</td>
<td>Chicago Committee’s Preliminary Draft of a World Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution for the World, Strong World Govt. with Check and Balance</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Scholars and Students of University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite different intellectual efforts by scholars from various streams, no approach yielded the desired framework to ensure peace and equity in world. All the approaches for the establishment of peace during the cold war era proved futile attempts to pave the roadmap for peaceful and just world order. Numerous mechanisms enshrined through these approaches in the form of “Power Politics (Balance of Power), Deterrence (WM Destruction), Disarmament (PTBT, NPT, and CTBT), Collective Security (League of Nations and United Nations Organisation), Class Conflict (Marxism) Structural-Functionalism etc. have failed to achieve the desired ends.” Therefore the various approaches for the preferred world covered the multi-dimensions aspects of human life. As Mishra points out, “Thus the current debate on world order has five basic orientations: political, economic, sociological, geographical (environmentalist) and holistic. These orientations emanate from the way scholarly disciplines work but as stated earlier they are not exclusive of each other.”

**WORLD ORDER MODEL PROJECT**

Issues of peace and development led to the establishment of World order Model Project (WOMP), initiated by World Law Fund, New York in 1968. The motive of this project was to promote world peace and prevent war to save humanity and to introduce new ways of development. Concentrating on the representation from all the regions of world, an effort was made to develop an analytical value based framework to make world society a better place to live. WOMP was considered as an ideal vision for the new world order, focussed on developing a “transnational framework of world order values, thinking, and action.” The focus of WOMP was to bring
out the “representative statements of world order positions; the shape of a preferred world and the tactics and strategies of transition; from different ideological, regional, development, cultural and personal perspectives.”

The original WOMP scientists were the leading figures of world-level institutes. The list includes the “Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (New Delhi, India), Max-Planck (Sternberg, Germany), Inter-University Centre of Post-Graduate Studies (Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia), Center of International Studies (Princeton University, U.S.A.), Centre for East Asian Studies (McGill University, Montreal, Canada).” Pertinently, “the essence of WOMP for global reform involves shifts in political consciousness (value change), mobilisation of energies for action (active politics) and the transformation of structures (building the preferred world order of the future).”

These intellectual efforts were focussed on developing blueprints for a ‘preferred world order’ for future. Clark-Sohn had paved the way for WOMP as Mendlovitz “liked to formally acknowledge debt to the book written by Greenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn… as instructional model and as a source of research hypothesis.” At initial stage, three world order values “(i) peace, (ii) social and economic well-being, and (iii) human dignity, were visualised by the scholars associated with WOMP and the fourth value envisaged and included by Falk was (iv) Environmental Quality.” Later Saul H. Mendlovitz, the founding director of the World Order Models Project added fifth value as ‘global citizenship’ gradually converted into ‘positive identity’. After several meetings and great debates, the five core values finalised by
WOMP were “(i) peace, (ii) economic well-being, (iii) social justice, (iv) ecological stability, and (v) positive identity”\textsuperscript{41} to sort out five major problems of humankind i.e. “(i) war, (ii) poverty, (iii) social injustice, (iv) environment decay, and (v) alienation.”\textsuperscript{42}

Later in a meeting of scholars under WOMP, held at New York in 2011, participants included seven specific topics in project. These topics are:

(a) Biogenetics and the impacts of emerging technologies on family and social life, as well as political, economic, and cultural structures.

(b) Adequate governance and appropriate democratic participation in all contexts, ranging from local through national to regional and global interactions.

(c) Poverty throughout the globe; hyper-capitalism; how to make the international economic system more equitable and inclusive.

(d) The role of religious traditions in fomenting violence or encouraging tolerance, compassion, and peace.

(e) State terrorism and non-state terrorism (properly identified) and antidotes to these behaviours.

(f) Imperialism in all its forms, and the distinction between imperial globality and cosmopolitan globality.

(g) The meaning and manifestations of global or cosmopolitan citizenship, informed by human rights.

Thus the scholars associated with project, have broadened the scope of WOMP aiming at to change the global scenario of contemporary current world to a just and peaceful world order.
To implement this scheme “each author was asked to present a comprehensive report on problems and possible solutions of contemporary world order system. The time frame set for this scholarly attempt was 1990’s. the scope of the study was augmented by including “world institutions, transnational actors, international organization, functional activities, regional arrangements, the nation-state, sub-national movements, local communities, and individuals.”

The notions of the studies under WOMP and other approaches of world order were, however not decided or categorised in any particular ideological direction. However the scholars under World Law Fund were of the opinion to make the study multi-cultural, multi-dimensional, multi-representative and comprehensive. This was rather pragmatic approach, as ideological perception binds the thoughts in a superficial scope, thus put limits on the expansion and extension of ideas. But for the academic convenience, however the world order models can be categorised into two broad categories: western and non-western models. In the western category, models by Clark-Sohn and Richard Falk can be incorporated and the works of Rajni Kothari and Chinese model can be studied under the non-western category.

**WESTERN PERSPECTIVE:**

(a) **CLARK-SOHN WORLD ORDER MODEL**

In 1958, Greenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, in their famous book presented their preferred world order model. Earlier to them the then president of America, Eisenhower in 1956 asserted that "there can be no peace without law.” Confirming Eisenhower statement, Clark-Sohn presented a comprehensive model “to
transform the present international system into a new world order through disarmament under some measures of enforceable world law.” Proposal of Clark-Sohn is comprehensive in the sense that “it attempts to deal with the root causes of war as well as the arms race; offers checks, balances, inducements, and limitations that would make the plan acceptable to all; and suggests specific modifications to the charter.” Focussing on the importance of international law in international relations, the both observed that the laws of a world authority i.e. United Nations must be “applicable to all nations and all individuals in the world” through the enforcement of such rules, peace can be maintained in the world.

United Nations is aimed at the establishment of durable peace, security, international cooperation and development among nation-states in the world. But due to its limitations, the duo proposed a ‘Revised United Nations Charter’ for the better functioning of the body. The focus of revised UN charter is to resolve all international disputes through the use of peaceful means such as, inquiry, negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, mediation, judicial settlement, etc. Besides, amendment in the UN charter in 1973, they proposed an additional ‘World Security and Development Organization’ to supplement the functions of present UN system.

Concentrating on the required reforms in the United Nations, Clark-Sohn model proposed that voting in the General Assembly should be based on nation's population. Besides, United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) should be given sufficient powers to maintain peace and enforce the disarmament process. In the light of
partiality, inequality, shortcomings and inefficiency shown by Security Council in several matters, Clark-Sohn proposed an Executive Council to replace this organ, and there should be no veto power to any state, irrespective of its size, power and economy. Clark-Sohn suggested that the four largest nations i.e. China, India, USSR, and USA should be permanent members in that proposed body. This new council, according to them should act in more democratic manner and be responsible to General Assembly. Clark and Sohn envisaged the enlarged role and greater responsibilities to Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

They seem to be worried about the constant increase in the quality and quantity of modern arms as it has made the world more vulnerable to conflicts and wars. Accumulation of large quality of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) by the powerful states has made the situation grimmer. Development of nuclear weapons, excessive expenditure on arms production increased exports of these weapons by the developed countries made Clark-Sohn to propose the target to achieve ‘complete disarmament’ in the next twelve years. In their view, “general and complete disarmament is one of the essential pre-conditions for world peace and stability.”

The model seeks the gradual elimination of military power by the countries, one by one through an effective system of world law to establish peaceful world order.

Keeping the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament necessary for establishing world peace, the plan proposes for establishing a Nuclear Energy Authority and a permanent ban on the production of nuclear weapons. To operationalise the process,
“General Assembly will have the final responsibility for the enforcement of the disarmament process and the maintenance of peace.”\textsuperscript{49} For this purpose it should be invested with adequate powers to that end.

The objective of complete disarmament of all nations can take place in such a way that it must be "accomplished in a simultaneous and proportionate manner by carefully verified stages and subject to a well-organized system of inspection."\textsuperscript{50} After achieving the goal of disarmament, a World Police Force can be constituted as the only military force in the world under the direction and control of the General Assembly. This world police force may be equipped with modern weapons to protect every nation and their people from any external aggression.

Besides this, Clark-Sohn envisioned of a contingent of reserve peace force by eliminating national militaries after the objective of disarmament is achieved. This force will function under the civilian authority of the Executive Council and ultimately the General Assembly along with certain safeguards. No nation will be allowed to take control of it. Equipped with the most modern weapons, the force would have volunteers between 300,000 to 600,000 for emergency.

Clark–Sohn model visualised establishment of ‘World Conciliation Board’. Disputes of non-legal nature can be brought to this board for reaching a considerable voluntary acquiesce or would be referred to the World Equity Tribunal for solution. The decision given by the board and tribunal can be made binding for both parties by the provisions enacted by the General Assembly.
The International Court of Justice (ICJ) was visualised to solve the disputes among the nations, thus helping in maintaining peace and preventing war. Clark-Sohn proposal is also in favour for empowerment of the world court. In their view, the ICJ can be strengthened by providing compulsory jurisdiction on all the cases approached to it by the General Assembly. The court be given decisive powers to resolve disputes over treaties, international agreements, and relating to interpretation of charter. Envisaging the environmental problems in sixties, Clark and Sohn proposed to set up a ‘United Nations Environmental Protection Authority’. The environmental authority would coordinate the different environmental programs running under the aegis of United Nations. Besides it has to do the task of data collection, monitoring and assessing issues related to this phenomenon.

Thus, Clark-Sohn model is aimed at to reform structure and functioning of the existing United Nations. Application of the world law to bring change in the existing world order was their main concern. In their view, strengthening of role of United Nations Economic and Social Council, empowerment of International Court of Justice, establishment of ‘World Conciliation Board’ and ‘United Nations Environmental Protection Authority’ and stage-wise disarmament efforts can establish a peaceful world order.

(b) **RICHARD A. FALK MODEL**

Richard Falk based his ‘preferred world order model’ on the broad outlines of western liberalism perspective. Falk has serious concern about the problems of existing world order as “increasing population, dangers of destructive war, environmental degradation
and ecological imbalance, suppression, and inhuman conditions of living for a large section of society. Besides the “human and material resources of the planet are wasted and depleted in a short-sighted way, and at increasing rates. Technologies are not adequately managed to assure planetary and human benefit.”

Keeping the goal of reforming world order in the context, Falk emphasises on the urgent need for a general universal consensus for realising preferred world. He envisaged a “world government” based on “substantial centralisation of political powers and authority combined with a drastic reduction in the status and capability of state actors.” This world government will function through a “World Assembly.” This world assembly would “set world standards and render binding decisions.”

Simultaneously preferring the decentralised polity, he wanted to initiate from change in the orientation of world leadership. He was of the opinion that, “Without substantially changing the orientation of these leadership groups (governmental and non-governmental) there is no realistic hope either for adjustment (except in a post-catastrophic period) to the hazards of the present world order or for use of the opportunities for transition and reform.”

To improve from such conditions he envisaged four WOMP goals, i.e., “peace, social and economic well-being, human dignity, and environmental quality” to be realised. According to Falk these can be attained through a scheme in three phases in a scheduled time-frame. This scheme has to be implemented in next three decades by highlighting issues of (i) The decade of consciousness raising (1970s); (ii) The decade of mobilization (1980s); and (iii)
The decade of transformation (1990s). In this schematic process, Falk’s conception of world order reform “concentrates upon a search for political, social, and economic arrangements that will achieve these four goals.”

Recognising the importance about the existence and development of international organisations, Falk showed keen interest and faith in these organisations, i.e. United Nations Organisation, International Court of Justice, World Health Organisation (WHO) and other international agencies in his preferred world order model. He ardently recommended constituting some new world level organisations i.e. “World Political Party”59, Peace-Making Academy, and “Survival Universities”60 in his model. He proposed to provide more strength to these organisations for promoting human and social welfare, promoting human rights and environmental protection. In his model there will be “International Peace Force”61 along with a “World Police Force.”62 The latter is to “act as police force not as an army, in the states where human rights are violated”63. The ‘early warning’ procedures will be adopted against the leaders, who threatens peace.

An equitable “World Economic System”64 would also be established to control and regulate the world economy, with the motive to promote equality and eradicate poverty. Besides, he recommended for the establishment of a world council for monetary and taxations and it would be authorised for imposing and collecting revenue from the individuals to meet the expenditure of world government. Highlighting the urgent need of disarmament, particularly in the context of nuclear arms, Falk intends “No First
Use Proposal”65 as this policy would help “denuclearize the world and establish a measure of reciprocity in arms-control initiatives between nuclear and non-nuclear countries.”66

NON WESTERN PERSPECTIVE:
(a) RAJNI KOTHARI MODEL

In the continuing legacy of liberal perception of ‘preferred world order’, Rajni Kothari, an Indian scholar gave a non-western “perspective on man and his future and on world issues.”67 Kothari focussed his attention on formulating peaceful, just and equitable world order. He finds inequality as main cause of instability and lack of peace in the existing world order. Kothari identified the world into two divisions, based on availability of resources in the concerned states. He found that few nation-states are “over-developed and the majority of nation-states are under-undeveloped.”68 The difference between over-developed and under-developed states is the root-cause of the problems of the world.

The existing inequality between the rich and the poor permit the developed countries to possess the resources of the world more. This leads to generate more inequality, disorder, de-resourcement and exploitation of the poor countries. Consequently, it leads to spawn hostility, antagonism and rancorous relations among the nation-states in political sphere and existence of these malevolent sentiments among the nation-states encumbers the way of establishing peace.

Kothari viewed that, “as long as the less powerful and poorer nations of the world remain disunited and fall prey to the manoeuvres of big-power politics,69 the world cannot be changed. Therefore, he focused on the equilibrium of power between the less
powerful and empowered states. He added further that the disunity among the poor states may allow the big and rich states to exploit them or use them as pawn in their power politics game. Hence, he was in favour of development of firm unity of third world countries to restructure the world politics. To simplify the complex world affairs Kothari considered the political reorganisation of the world very essential. This would create geographical integration of small states into bigger one, which may eliminate the major problems like border disputes etc.

Besides, Kothari envisaged that “preferred world order would be for between twenty and twenty-five political units of the world community,” instead of “present more than 150 of highly unequal size and potential for economic and political power” and these units would be almost equal in terms of size, population and natural resources to “ensure a measure of equality and respect for each other’s integrity while still retaining considerable diversity in culture, politics, and social development.” Therefore he visualised, “the smaller numbers of nations or federations (communities) of nations, each large in size and strong enough to be self-reliant, so that progress towards the twin conditions of autonomy and equality becomes possible.”

The present world is facing gross inequalities in production and distribution of technical, natural and economic resources, therefore Kothari suggested the establishment of international functional authorities to fulfill the technical and welfare needs of the world, based on available world level structures “in health, communications, aviation- but extending much further with a view to eliminating gross inequalities in access to technology, in means
of production, and in the relationship between land and living beings.”

The military pacts and organisations pose danger to the peace and order in the world. Therefore, Kothari recommended establishment of a “world security system” to restrain regional military pacts sponsored by the big powers. The money saved through this process should be transferred to vulnerable region to minimise the conditions of violence. Apart from this, the regional and world-level specialised agencies should be established for “resource planning, development of energy resources, ecology, and population and migration policies.”

To protect human rights and upheld standards of justice, a set of institutions should be set up. Various institutions “at the regional and multi-regional levels with preventive and promotional functions, should be constituted to neutralise economic and political structures that prevent autonomy and self-reliance among the various parts of the world.”

In his preferred world order model, Kothari focused on relinquishment of political monopoly and hegemonic tendencies of superpowers to establish peace in world. Superpowers of the world should not interfere in the domestic matters of developing countries. The involvement of superpowers in the regional disputes exacerbates the existing worse conditions and turns it into international problem. Moreover he recognised complete disarmament of the world as essential condition for establishment of world peace. He emphasised on “non-proliferation of arms technology, ending arms race, abolition of arms and particularly of nuclear weapons for establishment of peaceful world order.”
For the realisation of ‘preferred world order’, he further emphasised on the “development and inculcation of preferred values at the domestic and global level.” Concentrating on development of an ethical aptitude for the solution of problems of individual and world, he opined that, “Alongside the value of autonomy, non-violence, justice, and participation, there is a need to ensure a larger ethic of behaviour that we may call the ethic of self-control.”

To transform the existing world order, Kothari focused on “two broad strategies i.e. transcontinental solidarity and regional cooperation” for “socio-economic solidarity among the third world countries”, “process of consolidation” for instituting multi-polarity and a “greater coordination of policies among the third world states in United Nations and other international agencies.” Kothari centred his focus on reforms in the structure and functioning of UN organs and agencies. He was of the view that various United Nations’ specialised agencies, which are providing good services, should be continued and strengthened. He further favoured Economic and Social Council to act as ‘principal executive organ’ for carrying out the “functions of social and economic development and reduction of world disparities.”

Focussing on decentralisation and federalisation, he proposed for reforming the existing General Assembly into “World Parliamentary Assembly” which is to function as a platform to discuss the numerous problems facing by “different regions as well as the world as a whole, articulating legitimate demands of different regional and cross regional social groups, and generally promoting greater understanding of diverse points of view.” In
UNGA, the state governments send their official representatives to share the views on world arena, whereas Kothari insists that world assembly “should consist of representatives from various national legislatures”$^{88}$ including the representatives from the opposition and Non- Government Organisations too for enlarging the scope and perspective of it.

In his views, centralisation of power and resources is the root cause of unrest in international relations. Therefore he was not in the favour of any centralised world organisation or world government as they are likely to promote monopolistic tendencies. Rather he was in favour of decentralisation as "the world has already learned at great cost that all such designs become insufferable leviathans in disguise."$^{89}$ Therefore he observed the view that “regional cooperation and region based federations will provide a step towards emergence of world federal institutions”$^{90}$ to ensure non-accumulation or non-centralisation of powers.

(b) CHINESE WORLD ORDER MODEL

Traditional Chinese world order model perception was based on Confucian ideas of peace and harmony in a hierarchical and anti-egalitarian social order and Chinese cultural supremacy of “Sino-centralism.”$^{91}$ China portrayed itself as the center of the world and ‘Tianxia’, meaning ‘all under heaven’ and thus defined the world order as an aspect of its ‘universal middle kingship’. Zhongguo, the one of the older names of China represents the self-imposed image as ‘the central country’ or the ‘Middle Kingdom’ or as the centre of both heavenly forces and the earthly order, however limited to the geographical boundaries of world known to it.
‘Tianxia’ inculcated a different vision of universality that was immensely different from the idea of ‘empire’ as is taken in the context of Roman empire, but related to different dynasties which were limited within the large geographical region under Chinese influence. Power intermingled with culture was the important facet of traditional order, as tributary system and effective diplomatic discourse can prevail only under the powerful and culturally legitimate empire. The tribute system confirmed the supremacy of Chinese (Han) civilisation and Manchus and Mangols were quickly sinicised under the superiority of Chinese civilisation. This acceptance of Chinese supremacy expanded over the known world to China. Based on superiority and hierarchy, Chinese world order did not recognise the western tenets of sovereignty and nation-states, but got legitimacy, order and unity by the acceptance of ‘Son of Heaven’ by the countries under ‘Tianxia’.

Later with the passage of time and with the emergence of many local and regional powers and unrest, the Chinese empire became weak, and “the Chinese perception of the world had little effect on the course of events. The ultimate fact is the fact of power.” Pertinently enough, “no armies marched out of the traditional Middle Kingdom lands.” In the course of time, the perception of Chinese world order model transformed when with the “beginning of opium war, western imperialist invasions in China broke down this Sino-centric world order and replaced it with an unequal treaty regime.”

After revolution in 1949, under Mao, Chinese world order model perception adopted Marxism- Leninism with modifications. World especially under the umbrella of erstwhile Soviet Union, or
the second world has been shown the way by the basic tenets of Marxism. Under Mao, China followed the Marxism, but with certain alterations, according to the social, political and economic environment of the country. Present perception of Chinese world order model is unique concoction of Marxism-Leninism, Maoism, nationalism, sovereignty, civil-military relations and increased globalised economic requirements.

Emergence of different opinions and interpretations of Marxism between Soviet Union and China led Beijing to adopt different perception of world order. Even one of the main confrontations of it has been with Moscow “is that true Marxism-Leninism has found its haven in Peking.”95 Fairbank opined that “Six decades of change in the nineteenth century and six in the twentieth have destroyed China’s inherited order and created an unprecedentedly new one.”96 With almost same tenets as Marxism ideology, however Chinese world order model have some inherited differences, as the domestic conditions of China did not allow it to follow Marxism in absolute manner. China is considered more nationalist and communist than Soviet Union. China offered aid to the liberation movements of the people of various countries, but did not forward itself to achieve the world revolution by itself as was perceived by the communism.

Adopting five principles of peaceful co-existence and keeping aloof China from the existing western value-led world order, it focuses on strengthening of three strands: “a balanced and restraining multi-polar system; a rule based global market economy; and a world of modern, rational and secular civilisations.”97 In a similar way to Marxism, the Chinese world
order model seeks complete elimination of aggression and exploitation along with “three mountains’ i.e. imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic-capitalism.”

It not only opposed the hegemonic “superpower club and ‘Brettonwoods institutions’, but placed itself firmly in the ranks of the third world.” It acknowledges political and economic independence of third world countries and supports their right to ascertain their own pattern of social and economic systems and enjoying “sovereignty over their own resources and control over foreign and transnational capital within their own countries, with self-reliance and mutual cooperation among the third world countries.” Development pattern adopted by China reveals conceptual traits of preferred model as “(i) social justice based on freedom from exploitation, with human relations of egalitarianism, cooperation, and respect for work. (ii) economic welfare for all in a society of abundance, with special attention to raising the level of life of marginalised groups (such as women and national minorities) and regions that have been resource-poor or historically oppressed. (iii) maximum cultural and aesthetic fulfilment. This includes full popular participation in the production of culture. (iv) an esthetical and ecologically sound environment. This value is not posed against growth but as part of development, fulfilling the same purpose of service to the people as growth.” Therefore despite being influenced by the marxist ideology, it has its own different features according to the need of the Chinese people and land.

So far, many attempts have been made to produce the solutions of the different problems of the world order by several
scholars of international relations. Many ideal and ideology based models were introduced to make the world better for human beings. But the major problems, of the world are still posing danger and problem and remained unanswered. The problem of violence, poverty, hunger, gender disparity and exploitation, social and racial inequality are still affecting the human race. Much is needed to be done to establish a world benevolent for all.

Therefore after analysing the existing approaches and various models of world order, few shortcomings may be highlighted. Most of these are partial in nature and not meant to solve the basic problems of mankind rather try to bring solutions for superficial problems. Liberalist ideology in the realm of western capitalist governments got the chances to pertain the liberal values and marxist ideology found its stake in erstwhile USSR, China and other states. But ideological conflicts, lack of neutrality and mutual suspicion between two dominant ideologies destined for the failure of marxist and liberalist approach. Power-monism and forced peace of realistic approach proved determined its failure to solve the world problems amicably.

Clark-Sohn, Richard Falk’s, and Rajni Kothari’s models, however, tried to address the problems of world in more sophisticated way; but the solutions recommended by them, are not feasible and practical. These models are highly centralised on making of new institutions and institutional reforms. All these approaches and models did not focus on the basic need, which is transformation of individual. Therefore these approaches and models did not focus on peace, economic equality, social and
communal harmony, gender sensitisation, non-violence and disarmament in requisite manner.

Having discussed various approaches and models for ideal and preferred world order, the need of a relevant and comprehensive model of world order is desirable in present scenario. Gandhi has a vision for the human being; his ideas are for the transformation of individual, society and the whole world. Despite not getting a chance to run any state as per Gandhian values, Gandhian ideas have the capability to change the world. Hence the Gandhian world order model may be the comprehensive, ideal and preferred one to create for world based on social justice, economic equality, communal harmony and compassion, achieved through cooperative and non-violent means.
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