



International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw,
Poland 00-773
+48 226 0 227 03
editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

ARTICLE TITLE

THE NEW WORLD ORDER AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE
FUTURE OF NATIONS

ARTICLE INFO

Mourad Belkaid Abdi, Abdellah Abdellaoui. (2025) The New World Order and Its Implications for The Future of Nations. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(45). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(45).2025.3255

DOI

[https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1\(45\).2025.3255](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1(45).2025.3255)

RECEIVED

22 January 2025

ACCEPTED

24 February 2025

PUBLISHED

20 March 2025

LICENSE



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

© The author(s) 2025.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

THE NEW WORLD ORDER AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF NATIONS

Mourad Belkaid Abdi

University of Oran2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria

ORCID ID: 0009-0005-3757-6665

Abdellah Abdellaoui

University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria.

Human Sciences Research Unit for Philosophical Social and Humanistic Studies

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-2299-9088

ABSTRACT

The New World Order emerged as an inevitable consequence of the post-Cold War era, which ended with the collapse of the Eastern Bloc represented by the Soviet Union. In response, the United States sought an alternative focus—namely, the fight against terrorism. To achieve its strategic interests, the U.S. adopted the New World Order, officially declared by former President George H.W. Bush during his war on terrorism, which he initiated with the invasion of Iraq. The U.S. prioritized its national security above all else, often at the expense of state sovereignty, by imposing conditional protection under the pretext of democracy and human rights. This approach enabled the U.S. to dominate the world and its institutions, particularly with Israel situated at the heart of the Middle East, where America exerts global influence in the name of protecting peace and ensuring maritime security.

KEYWORDS

New World Order, National Security, Conditional Protection, Democracy, Middle East

CITATION

Mourad Belkaid Abdi, Abdellah Abdellaoui. (2025) The New World Order and Its Implications for The Future of Nations. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(45). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(45).2025.3255

COPYRIGHT

© **The author(s) 2025**. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1. Introduction:

The contemporary world is rife with significant events related to the practices of major global powers in regions of influence and international conflicts. These conflicts arise from the clash of interests and differing regional and international visions, particularly in the Third World, which is rich in resources of great economic and vital importance for fueling the global economy—especially Africa and the Arab world. The United States, which dominates the world as the sole superpower after the collapse of the Soviet Union, still faces competition from European powers, the Russian Federation (as the Soviet Union's successor), and China. However, China's competition with the U.S. is primarily economic. Meanwhile, the Arab and African roles remain marginal, as these regions serve as arenas for international conflicts, particularly due to Israel's presence in the Arab heartland and the competing influence of Iran. Following the Soviet Union's collapse in 1989, the U.S. emerged as a dominant global power, which prompted it to adopt a new world order reflecting its security and military strategy.

Research Problem:

This study examines the nature of the New World Order within the framework of the state as a political and sovereign entity and its impact on international variables, military and economic alliances among conflicting nations, and the growing resistance from Third World countries within international forums. To address this issue, we pose the following questions:

- What is the concept of the New World Order, and what is its functional structure?
- How can the foundations of the state be preserved amid new international transformations?
- Is there real resistance to curbing Western hegemony over the world by targeting its various interests?

Research Hypotheses:

- The New World Order is a comprehensive system based on imposing global policies dictated by the dominant economic and political powers.
- The recent global transformations have had a profound impact on resisting Western and American hegemony over the world.

2. The Concept of the New World Order and International Transformations:**2.1 Definition of the New World Order:**

The collapse of the Soviet Union, the main competitor of the United States, marked the official end of the Cold War. However, the process did not stop there; the U.S. sought to establish a new global policy under its leadership. This led to the emergence of a new idea advocating the necessity of an advanced network of communication and information technologies, underpinned by values that promote democracy and human rights—essentially, globalization. This development had a significant impact on the principle of sovereignty, as countries began to align themselves with The New World Order does not entail relinquishing a significant portion of national sovereignty¹. Rather, it is about creating a policy of international and military balances to shape the contours of the world's military doctrine. The new international law governing the global community is now based on explicit consensus through international treaties or implicit consensus through customary international law. This new international system assumes that these legal rules should reflect the common interests of its entities, although it only adheres to international law in form². This highlights the dangers of the New World Order on the future of international relations and the disruption of international protection mechanisms, leading to the subordination of certain states to others, thereby granting the latter greater control.

Accordingly, the New World Order can be defined as follows: While the international system refers to the interaction of world states within a comprehensive framework, the New World Order encompasses interactions between various entities, not just states, making it broader in scope than the international system. Anwar Malik defines it as a political, economic, and strategic structure within which units and patterns of relations are organized. It also involves conflicts, confrontations, development processes, social progress, and modernization. Since 1945, two major powers have emerged within this structure—Europe and the United States.³ The European continent comprises multiple states with shared interests and values, which contributed to the emergence and expansion of the European Union, allowing it to dominate the global economy and energy sectors. Meanwhile, the United States maintains control over the overall global economy.

As a result, the world is compelled to acknowledge U.S. hegemony over the New World Order. Many states have adjusted their sovereignty to align with U.S. policies, even at the expense of their national sovereignty. This influence extends to international organizations such as the United Nations, which must work to issue the necessary resolutions to legitimize the desires and objectives of the United States, even if these desires and objectives conflict with international legal principles⁴. The fundamental purpose of global systems is to control nations and their resources. Even within the Soviet Union, the bureaucratic military authority established by Lenin and Trotsky after assuming power in October 1917 evolved in a manner similar to the network of industrial, material, and commercial relations that became concentrated in the upper echelons of American society⁵. Thus, economics and politics are deeply interconnected in ensuring global dominance.

¹ Omar Abu Bakr Ahmed Bakhshab, *State Sovereignty in Light of International Developments: An Analytical Study*, Legal Journal, Issue 3, p. 332.

² *Ibid.*, p. n.

³ Jamil Abu Al-Abbas Bakri, *The Future of the New World Order Between the Reality of Globalization and Mega-Imperialist Domination in the Thought of Mahdi Mohamed El-Manjra*, no further information available, p. 235.

⁴ Omar Abu Bakr Ahmed, *Sovereignty and the State in Light of International Developments: An Analytical Study*, *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁵ Noam Chomsky, *The Old and New World Order*, Nahdat Misr for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, translated by Atef Moatamed Abdel Hamid, 1st ed., March 2007, p. 10.

2.2 International Transformations and Their Relationship to the New World Order:

The term "New World Order" entered the legal and political discourse in mid-1989, following a shift in the global political culture. The term was first used by U.S. President George H.W. Bush after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. He introduced the concept before Congress in September 1990. The collapse of the Berlin Wall in December 1989 marked the end of both the new and old orders¹. The aspiration to establish a New World Order was a shared vision among the world's major powers, driven by their desire to control global affairs under various pretexts, such as national security. This was precisely what George H.W. Bush sought to promote in the post-Cold War world in 1990, laying the foundations for the international order under U.S. leadership.

3. Implications of the New World Order

3.1 Various Scenarios of the New World Order:

Scenario One: A Unipolar World Dominated by the United States

The United States seeks to maintain its hegemony in military, economic, political, and cultural spheres within this scenario. Major powers such as China, Russia, the European Union, and India, despite having the capability and desire to challenge the U.S.-led international system, have not yet posed a direct confrontation. However, regional threats persist from countries like Iran and Indonesia, in addition to ethnic conflicts, scattered crises, and humanitarian disasters in developing regions.

U.S. military bases worldwide reflect its strategic deterrence philosophy, aimed at preventing regional states—especially Iran, Russia, and North Korea—from altering global policies. According to the American leftist thinker Noam Chomsky, after the Soviet Union's disappearance from the global stage, the U.S. adopted new competitive measures in international relations without losing its strategic direction². However, U.S. wars around the world have become a significant threat to global security.

Scenario Two: Democratic Peace

This scenario envisions a future where liberal democracy, freedom, and open markets develop to the extent that all major global powers—including Europe, India, China, Russia, and Brazil—become institutionalized within a liberal democratic framework³. Only fragmented regions, particularly the poorest parts of developing countries, remain excluded from democratic governance.

This creates a clear paradox, dividing the world into a free, liberal-democratic sphere and another reactionary, radical sphere. The latter becomes a battleground for Western interventionist and exploitative policies under the guise of protecting human rights, spreading democracy, and combating terrorism. The U.S. strategy in this scenario is to avoid direct large-scale wars while promoting democracy globally by 2025.

It is evident that Ukraine is now a victim of U.S.-Russian agreements, serving as a test case for this vision of democratic peace.

Scenario Three: The Emergence of a Major Competitor

In this scenario, by 2025, certain unstable regions in the so-called "democratic peace world" will persist—particularly in northern Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa, and parts of South Asia. This is not a new geographic reality, but what is significant is the emergence of a key competitor to the United States.

This competitor, resembling the first scenario's global divisions, possesses significant nuclear and strategic capabilities, along with additional military, space, and technological resources. The most notable example of such a competitor is the China-Russia alliance (2015-2018), which aimed to undermine U.S. global influence and its allies⁴. Both Russia and China, as prominent nuclear states, have engaged in numerous military and economic interventions worldwide, particularly targeting underdeveloped regions in Africa, North Africa, and Asia, to mobilize support against the United States.

However, their main weakness lies in their lack of a strategic framework for promoting democracy in the developing world. Their approach to international relations does not emphasize values and ethics in the same way the U.S. does, which Washington effectively exploits to attract developing nations to its sphere of influence.

As Noam Chomsky notes, "If we consider the ethical obligation to intervene in the internal affairs of states under the pretext of humanitarian reasons, it is a highly significant issue. Many analysts critically

¹ Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri et al., *Scenarios of the New World Order*, Jordan Media Institute, December 2020, p. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³ Noam Chomsky, *The New World Order and the Old World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴ Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri et al., *Scenarios of the New World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 3.

examine the reversed image of America's role in the world in terms of its positioning, influence, and institutional foundations."¹

Ultimately, the world continues to suffer under the weight of these strategic interventions, which have become a tool for major powers to impose their policies on different regions, whether through economic or cultural means.

Scenario Four: Multipolar Competition

Global multipolar competition revolves around two major continents with varying capacities to challenge the United States. In this scenario, the world witnesses three major players—the U.S. and two emerging powers—each striving to form alliances and coalitions to counterbalance the influence of the other two. This results in a global system characterized by shifting defensive alliances, where smaller but influential nations are enticed or coerced into aligning with one of these power blocs.²

Today's world is increasingly defined by **regional and international alliances**. Russia, for instance, has been working to expand its influence across Asia and Africa, exploiting the political fractures between Arab nations and their former colonial rulers—especially in Africa, where military coups in Mali and Burkina Faso have challenged French and American interests. These countries have demonstrated a willingness to cooperate with Russia, which seeks to establish a foothold in the region. Similarly, even within NATO, European nations have begun reevaluating their stance on America's presence in global affairs.

Meanwhile, China is leveraging its **economic influence** to build strong alliances across Africa as a counterweight to U.S. dominance. This has led the American leftist thinker **Noam Chomsky** to describe the new world order as a **structured global opportunity**. He argues that while the **form of global dominance has evolved, its essence remains unchanged**—only the number of key players has increased.

The U.S. remains committed to its **strategy of maintaining economic and political control** over vulnerable nations, ensuring that struggling economies remain dependent on Washington and its allies. While **Britain** openly seeks to reclaim some of its colonial territories, the **United States adopts a more subtle approach, presenting itself as a moral authority while ruthlessly crushing opposition**. This aligns with the doctrine of "**Wilsonian Idealism**," named after **Woodrow Wilson**, a major proponent of military interventionism and imperialist suppression.³

Historically, major powers have always sought to **legalize their global influence** through international law. Their **top strategic priority** is maintaining their sphere of influence worldwide, including the exploitation of resources in states that require external protection and stability. **Europe, for example, has been kept under U.S. control through a security framework that resembles a mafia-style protection scheme**. Washington has effectively **sold "security" to Western nations**, extracting enormous financial gains from Europe (led by Germany), Japan, and the oil-rich Gulf states.

This has allowed the U.S. to **retain dominance over the global economic system**, securing its position as a superpower. As **Chomsky**⁴ observes, **America's ability to maintain this system was evident during the Gulf War**, which it navigated with remarkable success. The ongoing war in **Ukraine** serves as another example—America has poured billions of dollars into military aid, rallying NATO support to keep Russia preoccupied and prevent it from advancing its strategic ambitions in Eastern Europe.

Scenario Five: Transnational Networks and Chaos

This scenario concerns the border network, which is a story of a moderately dystopian world and presents a stranger vision of future space in 2025. In this framework, the national government allocates a significant portion of its power to transnational actors, most of whom experience a faster way than national and governmental bureaucracy, using the internet to coordinate their activities globally.⁵

Democracy is promoted according to American standards, conditioned on cooperation to prevent what America calls chaos around the world and replace it with unannounced creative chaos⁶. As the political affairs correspondent for The New York Times under former President George H.W. Bush, Thomas Friedman, says:

"If political borders between sovereign states are not respected, chaos will engulf the world."⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, p. n.

² Noam Chomsky, *The New and Old World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³ Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri, *Scenarios of the New World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴ Noam Chomsky, *Failed States: The Abuse of Power and the Assault on Democracy*, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, n.d., 2007, pp. 126, 136.

⁵ Noam Chomsky, *The New World Order and the Old World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁶ Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri, *Scenarios of the New World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁷ Noam Chomsky, *The New World Order and the Old World Order*, *Ibid.*, p. 20.

At first glance, we think that Thomas Friedman's statement is natural and logical, and we agree with him. However, after scrutinizing his statement, we find that what is meant by sovereign states are those that have strength and power. As Noam Chomsky says, we might think the matter concerns countries like Panama, Lebanon, or Nicaragua, but Friedman clarifies that the issue is deeper than that when he says:

"America's victory in the Cold War was a victory for a set of political and economic principles based on democracy and the free market. Ultimately, the world will understand that the free market is the future, a future in which America represents the safety valve and the model to be followed."¹

This means that the issue is related to a commercial market regarding the acquisition of weak countries, as their freedom is not available. It is a political slave market. America does not consider poor countries as sovereign entities but rather as its backyard, which must be conditionally protected by marketing Western democracy to them in exchange for aid and money while simultaneously extracting their underground wealth to protect the American Federal Reserve's reserves.

Within the framework of the fifth scenario, there is an assumption that part of the national government's authority is available to transnational actors worldwide, including multinational corporations, transnational criminal organizations, terrorist networks, and groups that have a special status in the fields of peace, social justice, and even ethnicity. America claims to be the protector of the world and peace due to the weapons and strategy it possesses. When Max Boot, Noam Chomsky's colleague at the Council on Foreign Relations, was asked why the United States is allowed to spend huge amounts on weapons while preventing China from doing so, Boot simply answered:

"Because we ensure world security, protect our allies, keep vital navigation routes open, and lead the war on terror, while China threatens others and can ignite an arms race, which is something the United States cannot even imagine."

That is America's vision for other major countries like China, let alone weaker countries.² Max Boot sees America's maritime navigation polishing as that no one except a lunatic conspiracy theorist would dare to claim that the United States controls maritime navigation routes to serve American foreign policy objectives, which barely benefit everyone, or that most of the world sees Washington as the most prominent threat to world peace.³

The truth is that America strategically practices political and democratic blackmail around the world in a way that enables it to play well on the global security card and employs countries for its national interests. When Israeli settlements spread in the region in an attempt to annex desirable parts of the land to Israel, it was at the expense of American taxpayers. If about fifty thousand people, according to estimates, were affected, that burden falls on the taxpayers,⁴ making the American interior indirectly contribute to American administration practices and support Israel with weapons generously. It is generated that :

1. The United States maintains control through shifting strategies: whether through direct military intervention, economic coercion, or transnational networks, America adapts its approach to retain dominance.

2. Democracy as a political tool: The U.S. selectively promotes Western democracy as a means of control rather than a universal value.

3. Economic exploitation under the guise of aid: Weak nations receive "protection" and financial support in exchange for political and economic dependence on the West.

4. Weaponized global security: The U.S. dominates alliances (such as NATO), global trade routes, and financial institutions to shape the world order in its favor.

5. The rise of non-state actors: The future will be shaped not just by nation-states but also by multinational corporations, criminal syndicates, and ideological movements operating beyond traditional government structures.

Ultimately, this fifth scenario suggests that global power struggles will increasingly rely on hybrid warfare, where economic, digital, and ideological battles replace traditional military conflicts.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. n.

² Noam Chomsky, *Failed States*, *Ibid.*, p. 182.

³ *Ibid.*, p. n.

⁴ Noam Chomsky, *Power and Terror: Roots in American Culture*, translated by Ibrahim Yahya Al-Shihabi, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, Syria, 1st ed., 1424 AH / 2003 AD, p. n.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Reflections of the New World Order

At the beginning of the 21st century, protests erupted across most parts of the world with a political nature, such as the protests of the Workers' Justice Movement in Los Angeles, USA, in their pursuit of social and economic equality. These protests extended to the Farmers' Movement in Tunisia and the Farmers' Movement in China. Political protests spread worldwide, driven by taxes that were being paid and exploited for wars instead of social security. Similarly, the major protest movement of the Egyptian people in February 2011 and other simultaneous movements in different countries ultimately led to practical analysis between rulers and citizens due to "dissatisfaction."¹ Naturally, this was a consequence of the practices of the American administration and the governments allied with it worldwide, which rely on American rent-seeking policies. This situation reflects the pace of global changes and transformations resulting from the repercussions of the new world order and its impact on the stability of the modern state.

All achievements made in the past 50 years equal what was achieved throughout the entire history of human life since its inception. Politics and other aspects of human life cannot remain stable nor keep up with these dynamics, as the fundamental elements of human life indicate that "time and space" have intertwined, manifesting in a process known as globalization. Awareness spread rapidly with the advancement of communication technologies, expanding the scope of comparison in human thought. In this context, the era of the "superman" inevitably² comes to an end—the "blue man" symbolizing American dominance over the world. Awareness has spread among peoples about the dangers of the new world order led by the United States. With the development of media, which has exposed the truth, and the rise of digital media and internet communication, the boundaries of knowledge have surpassed even nanotechnology.

If the United States or any other country can no longer become a global superpower based on the principle of permitted sovereignty in light of increased knowledge³, this makes resistance to the American project feasible. It also necessitates the formation of multipolar global alliances to counter American imperialist expansion.

4.2 The Future of the World Under American Hegemony

It is clear that the future of the contemporary world will be shaped by confronting both democratic capitalism led by the United States and authoritarian capitalism backed by China. The most important point for any state is to work on strengthening trust among different social classes and nations. Democracy will not be a mere formality but will become substantive⁴, meaning that the fundamental principle of life, dynamism, and democratic reliability lies in social cohesion policies—economic work, social justice, non-interference in the affairs of other states, and respect for their sovereignty. This highlights the necessity of exposing the exploitative Western society that takes advantage of the resources of the Third World.

From this perspective, the international community is dealing with modern approaches to political protests. Although these approaches have identified characteristics that distinguish them from traditional protests⁵, in developing regions, people in various countries still tend to acquire resources according to their knowledge. "Judging people" tends to involve managing societal affairs, yet people without leaders, and leaders without a community, cannot effectively manage societal affairs.

On another level, emerging powers such as China, India, and others weaken American hegemony. However, in the end, it is the United States that will manage the process of energy reduction and become the composite force that maintains its central position in an attempt to protect democratic capitalism. This capitalist approach, which emerged from Western bourgeois liberal revolutions due to its historical context, will have specific characteristics compared to China's economic growth and its increasing military and political power at regional and international levels. Political and cultural authoritarian structures stem from the historical life of ancient civilizations. Therefore, China is expected to lead authoritarian global capitalism in the future⁶, which implies the decline of the United States due to the exhaustion of its economic power and China's ongoing development.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. n.

² *Ibid.*, p. n.

³ Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri et al., *Ibid.*, p. n.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. n.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. n.

5. Conclusions:

In conclusion, and as an answer to the research problem, the new world order is merely a new facade for capitalist domination over the world—politically, economically, and militarily—led by the United States, which has drained the world's resources. The preservation of state foundations and respect for sovereignty can be achieved through strengthening economies, enhancing military structures, and reassessing relations with the West in a way that serves national interests and those of neighboring countries. Resistance to American expansion must be pursued through the establishment of strong blocs, particularly economic and military alliances involving multipolar powers such as Russia and China. Additionally, expanding the BRICS countries and emphasizing military capabilities are necessary to counter NATO and the United States.

The key findings are as follows:

- The new world order is an inevitable result of changes in international politics following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, leaving the United States as the sole global power.
- U.S. global policies revolve around forming international alliances to maintain control over the resources of developing and Third World countries, serving Western capitalist interests while projecting military and political power.
- Global national security is based on conditional protection, exporting democracy and peace under the pretense of Western capitalist superiority and power.
- The new world order has divided the world into two camps: liberal democracy and radical dictatorship. The United States has exploited this situation to advance its limitless interests worldwide.
- Changing the rules of the global system relies on emerging economies, particularly China, which seeks to claim a global position and replace the United States as the leading power.

The future lies in developing nations that are rapidly strengthening their economies and security to counter U.S. and Israeli influence.

REFERENCES

1. Noam Chomsky, *Failed States: The Abuse of Power and the Assault on Democracy*, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, n.d., 2007, p. 126.
2. Noam Chomsky, *Power and Terror: Roots of American Culture*, translated by Ibrahim Yahya Al-Shihabi, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, Syria, 1st ed., 1424 AH / 2003 AD.
3. Noam Chomsky, *The Old and New World Order*, Nahdat Misr for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, translated by Atef Moatamed Abdel Hamid, 1st ed., March 2007.
4. Omar Abu Bakr Ahmed Bakhshab, *State Sovereignty in Light of International Developments: An Analytical Study*, *Legal Journal*, Issue 3.
5. Abu Al-Abbas Bakri Jamil, *The Future of the New World Order Between the Reality of Globalization and Mega-Imperialist Domination in the Thought of Mahdi Mohamed El-Manjra*, no further information available.
6. Mohamed Abdullah Khamis Al-Yakhri et al., *Scenarios of the New World Order*, Jordan Media Institute, December 2020.
7. Thomas Volgy, Leta Cott, and others, *The Future of the New World Order*, National Center for Translation, translated by Atef Moatamed and Ezzat Zayan, 1st ed., 2011.