

# The concept of new world order and america as its star exponent

[Politics](#)



Although everyone has heard of the catchy phrase, I think very few people know what the “ new world order” stands for. Depending on who you talk to, definitions range from type of government structure to economic policy to leadership role in international affairs. It seems to me that the new world order has never been defined in concrete terms. Therefore, it has become a catch all expression which encompasses many different ideas. I think the slogan is society’s attempt to classify a wide range of recent events. Change seems to be the underlying factor that links all these ideas together.

I believe the U. S. will continue to hold the world leadership role. I agreed with the point brought up in Chapter One, Selection One (p. 19) by John Makin. Basically he said that the U. S. still has great absolute power even though power measured relative to other countries has seemed to decline. There was a power vacuum following World War II, so it seems logical that in the 50 or so years since then power would become more equally distributed. The fact that Japan and Germany have recovered from almost complete ruin doesn’t mean that the U. S. is headed down a path of inevitable destruction. The citizens of the United States enjoy a very high standard of living and many freedoms that citizens elsewhere can only dream of. In Chapter One, Selection One, (p. 20) Alfred Balk points out various statistics which support this conclusion. The United States excels in high technology competitiveness, leads in research and development spending, and has a gross national product of \$220 billion.

As Samuel Huntington explains, (p. 22) the United States has unmatched power in three critical areas: multidimensional strength, influence based on “ structural position”, and the fact that there is no other dominant power likely <https://assignbuster.com/the-concept-of-new-world-order-and-america-as-its-star-exponent/>

to emerge. Another important factor the U. S. has on its side is “ an appeal beyond its borders”. This appeal has been almost impossible to duplicate elsewhere which only increases its popularity.

Because I believe the U. S. will remain the world leader, I also believe it will influence world affairs much as it has recently. Other countries have come to depend on the U. S. making the first move. Most of them lack the military and economic strength the U. S. possesses so it seems logical that the U. S. would take control. I also believe America should maintain an active role in international affairs. By lending a hand where help is needed the U. S. not only helps that area, but also stands to gain some advantages. I don't see a problem with America benefitting from providing aid to other nations. It would not make sense to use our resources and not reap some of the associated benefits. I don't succumb to the argument that we need to focus our resources on domestic problems such as poverty, child abuse, etc. These are immensely difficult issues to solve. We could focus all the resources in the world on these problems and I don't think we could ever devise a sustainable solution.

It is my opinion that the new world order will be shaped by a combination of factors. Military force will continue to play a major role because an ability to provide defense will be key to maintaining power. The country with the most fire power and the resources to mobilize that power will almost always have a very good chance of winning any battle. Economics will also contribute something to the equation. A strong economy in terms of capital, natural resources, and labor can help a country choose its destiny. Money has and

will continue to be a key element in achieving and maintaining power. Technology will become increasingly influential as a factor in the next century. Whoever is on the cutting edge of technology can strengthen their economic and military position. Those that fail to keep abreast of the latest technological advances will be left behind. I don't think we can focus on just one factor because the world does not function on one factor alone. Other factors we aren't even aware of could replace the ones I've mentioned.

I have mixed feelings about the impact the ending of the Cold War will have. I didn't agree with the selection by Joshua Muravchik (p. 154) which stated the world will become one huge democracy. I also don't think the U. S. should spread democracy to countries that don't want it. I agreed with Doyle McManus and Robin Wright's opinion (p. 162) that some countries aren't suited for democracy because of cultural differences. In order for a democracy to succeed, a country must have people who are willing to become involved, informed, and educated about the process. John Mearsheimer's opinion (p. 178) that world wide conflict will not decrease as a result of the end of the Cold War also appealed to me. I agreed with his claim that war will never become obsolete. Ending the tension between the United States and the former Soviet Union hasn't suppressed skirmishes around the world. Civil wars in Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Somalia are proof of this.

I think the UN has its foundations in a noble idea, yet its methods render it powerless. How can an organization offer peacekeeping actions when its members can't interfere directly in the situations it is attempting to stop? In order to be an effective force, the UN will have to stop straddling the middle

ground and choose a side to defend. Perhaps the mission statement needs to be revised to allow effective operations to occur. I think one of the main flaws hindering the UN is the organization's struggle to maintain a totally impartial involvement in world affairs. So far this has only resulted in missions that are never quite completed as they were intended.

NATO should still be kept intact even though the communist regime in the former Soviet Union has collapsed. Communism is still alive and well in other areas so it is foolish to believe the world will never have to deal with its unwanted spread again. Since we can't predict the future, I don't think it is wise to place such a limiting definition on world organizations. I think the mission statement of NATO should also be altered so that the organization's purpose is to defend against ALL unwanted advances of any kind towards ANY nation. With broader mission statements these organizations can adapt to rapidly changing world events without always having to reassess their current position.