



E-ISSN: 2664-603X
P-ISSN: 2664-6021
IJPSG 2024; 6(2): 20-27
www.journalofpoliticalscience.com
Received: 07-06-2024
Accepted: 11-07-2024

Yousuf Sajjad
MS Journalism, Lecturer,
Bahria University, Karachi,
Pakistan

Three decades after the cold war: Global movements & international system

Yousuf Sajjad

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2024.v6.i2a.354>

Abstract

Three decades after the Cold War's conclusion, the world has witnessed significant global movements that have reshaped political, social, and economic landscapes. The end of the Cold War marked a unipolar era dominated by the United States, driven by anti-authoritarian movements of the late 1980s, early 1990s and after 2000s.

The anti-globalization movement, in the Eastern Europe Color revolutions in former Soviet states and ex-communist Eastern, the Arab Spring activity originated in Tunisia, resulted in the removal of dictators from those nations as well as Egypt, Libya, Yemen, and Syria, but it also sparked protracted hostilities in those nations.

This paper examines the interconnectedness of these movements, their impacts on global politics, and their implications for future resistance against authoritarianism, economic inequality, and social injustice. Through a descriptive and qualitative analysis, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the global movements that have shaped the post-Cold War world.

Keywords: Global movement, Soviet Union, post-cold war era, democracy, united states, cold war politics

Introduction

The Cold War was an adversary that involved the Soviet Union-led Eastern bloc and the United States-led Western bloc that started in 1945 and lasting until 1991 (Radelet, 2015) [17]. Its end marked the beginning of a unipolar world dominated by the United States, known as the post-Cold War era. This unipolar world had been made possible because of the anti-authoritarian movements of the late 1980s, especially the people's power movements against dictatorships in Asia and the eruptions from below against Russian communist under the Warsaw Pact in East Europe (Fearon, 2017) [3].

International relations have been impacted by both the disintegration of Soviet Union and its aftermath in the early 1990s. The Cold War came to an end with the Soviet Union's armed forces removal from Eastern Europe and the Third World, which also made major strides toward addressing numerous Third World conflicts that had grown more protracted during the Cold War and enabled democratization to proceed in many previously dictatorship-ruled states. Interstate conflicts significantly decreased as a result of the détente between superpowers, partly because of their fight over ideologies during the Cold War (Sarotte, 2009) [16].

Conversely, however, after the fall of the "Soviet Empire," some major conflicts that had lain inactive throughout the Cold War began to surface, or resurfaced. Many of these new conflicts have arisen within the borders of the former Soviet Union, including the wars in Chechnya and the dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh between Armenia and Azerbaijan. However, certain wars also started or worsened in a number of nations outside of it, and many Third World crises - like the separatist campaigns in India, Sri Lanka, and Sudan - that the superpowers were not directly involved in during the Cold War continued beyond it (Jones, 2014) [8].

Aside from ethno-political disputes, there have been additional dangers that threaten global security that are, in fact, outside the complete control of major countries, including the Cold War winner, the United States of America. The most prominent ones include fierce rivalry for little resources, terrorism, North-South conflicts, and religious radicalism. Thus, it can be claimed that international relations have experienced simultaneous peace and war since the

Corresponding Author:
Yousuf Sajjad MAIR
MS Journalism, Lecturer,
Bahria University, Karachi,
Pakistan

demise of the Cold War (Kissinger, 2014) ^[10].

Furthermore, the anti-globalization movement resisted capitalism and free trade, questioning the WTO and advocating for domestic industry protection. The post-9/11 era saw the rise of the anti-Iraq War movement, with millions globally protesting the US invasion of Iraq and challenging its justifications. Then the Color revolutions in former Soviet states and Eastern Europe, such as Georgia's Rose Revolution and Ukraine's Orange Revolution, highlighted the ongoing struggle against autocratic regimes. In addition to causing protracted battles in Syria and Yemen, the Arab Spring in Tunisia resulted in the removal of tyrants in Libya, Egypt, Yemen, and Tunisia. The Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement in the United States, driven by police killings of African Americans, highlighted the fight against racial injustice and police brutality (Lischer, 2017) ^[11].

This paper aims to analyze nearly thirty years of the post-Cold War era in terms of both security and turmoil, as well as to examine significant movements and to explore key movements that have emerged in this period, beginning with the pro-democracy uprisings that dismantled dictatorships worldwide, from the Soviet Union's collapse to the overthrow of regimes in the Balkans, South Africa, and Indonesia. In this regard, an outline of the overall traits of the global system will be the first section of the study. A more thorough examination of the post-Cold War world movements, fundamental patterns, and emerging risks in international relations will come next. In summarizing the research, a number of remarks regarding potential future paths for international relations will also be discussed.

Related Work & Methodology

Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative approach to explore and comprehensive understanding of the global movements that have shaped the post-Cold War world. The study will utilize a qualitative research methodology, suitable for exploring complex geopolitical and socio-economic phenomena and interpreting meanings and experiences.

Data collection involves primary and secondary sources, including newspapers, journal articles, internet resources, and official data sources, which are accessed and analyzed to gain insights into the behavior of states, non-state actors in the global movements in Post-Soviet Era. Data collection techniques includes observations, textual and visual analysis to collect relevant information and analyze the data.

Data analysis techniques includes thematic analysis to identify and analyze patterns in the data, content analysis to analyze the content of data sources, and discourse analysis to examine the influences and impacts of global movements and uprisings after cold war era. These techniques helps identify and analyze the underlying themes and patterns in the behavior of great powers and other actors. The study adhere to values of credibility, honesty, reliability, integrity, and research ethics for the entirety of the research endeavor.

The International State System after the Demise of Soviet Union

Primarily speaking from a military/political perspective, the bipolar international system that dominated the Cold War era vanished with the fall of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, giving way to essentially a unipolar system led by the United States.

The core elements of the ideologies of the former adversaries of the United States, particularly USSR and China, have ultimately crumbled or been abandoned because they were hostile to the country. Many nations have sought military assistance from the United States. The finest places to observe the "American Empire" in action are the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and the West Asia as a whole, where US military troops have created a semi-permanent presence and thousands of soldiers are stationed at bases to monitor Iran, Syria, and other "potential enemies" (Gowan and Stedman, 2018) ^[4].

Despite being heavily criticized, there are several important purposes for US military might. It provides protection to weaker states in some regions, including the Persian Gulf, from invasions by their more powerful neighbors. The United States' presence in Asia stabilizes the area, preventing several states from feeling pressured to build up significantly larger armed forces than they already have. Only foreign opponents are kept at bay by US military might in Japan. Indirectly, it shields China and other Asian nations from the potential fallout from a strongly rearmed Japan. Additionally, the military might of the United States organizes military coalitions, both ad hoc and permanent (like NATO) (such as humanitarian missions). The leadership and management of coalition operations frequently depend on American military participation. Other nations frequently follow the United States when it is willing to lead, despite their reluctance. That is not to say, however, that America becomes involved in every significant international crisis. However, it implies that practically any nation using force outside of its borders must consider how the US would respond. (Sanders, 2008) ^[15].

However, the international state system can be viewed as multipolar rather than unipolar from an economic and political standpoint. Although the United States is undoubtedly a major economic force, it is not the only one. Beyond the various nation-states outside these integrations or organizations, significant power centers include the European Union and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) (Harrison, 2004) ^[6]. In actuality, the US insisted on splitting the price of its military actions with other powerful nations or pertinent states as it conducted operations to "stable" the globe in Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places. Thus, the post-Soviet international order, wherein global politics are dominated by at least five big powers, namely the United States, Europe, China, Japan, and Russia, truly depicts a blend of unipolar and multipolar systems.

Basic Developments in International Relations

In the post-Soviet era, the leading states generally want to maintain the status quo, which mostly benefits them. As a result, it is clear that major nations' level of international collaboration rose, as seen by the rise in peace operations. In greater detail, just thirteen peacekeeping forces were established from 1948 and 1978, and no additional forces were established during the ensuing 10 years. However, between May 1988 and October 1993, twenty more forces were organized. There are now 63 UN peacekeeping missions, 18 of which are actively active in the field and comprise 112660 military men and civilian police as of December 2008 (United Nations Peace Operations, 2010) ^[27].

The loss of the veto at the Security Council was the most

obvious indicator of the diminishing ideological conflicts among USA and USSR. During 1945 and 1990, the Security Council's permanent members rejected the following cases: China 3, France 18, the UK 30, the US 69, and the USSR 114. Then, from June 1990 to May 1993, not a single veto was used, not a single veto was exercised. One notable instance was when Russia obstructed a vote intended to fund the peacekeeping troops stationed in Cyprus in May 1993. With this one exception, the Security Council's ability to come to agreements after the Cold War has endured and has been a major factor in the rise in the number of peacekeeping missions (Yılmaz, 2005) ^[36].

The West's victory in the East-West ideological contest has resulted in the spread of Western systems and influences globally, marking another characteristic of the post-Cold War era. For instance, following the conclusion of the Cold War, the US has clearly increased its influence in the Caucasus and the Middle East. In a way, the Gulf Crisis that followed Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 gave the United States a chance to assert its hegemonic authority in the Middle East. In the decades that followed, the absence of a counter-power allowed the United States to exert even more dominance. The United States maintained its hegemony in the area with its military incursion into Afghanistan and assault of Iraq following the September 11, 2001 attacks.

In the past, Russia dominated the Caucasus region. However, the US was able to penetrate this energy-rich zone with the help of certain new allies who were formerly a part of the USSR, including Georgia, Ukraine, and Azerbaijan. Russia undoubtedly opposed American presence in the area, but its power to stop it has been restricted.

Similarly, the once Soviet-dominated region of Eastern Europe became a part of NATO. Initially, Russia attempted to thwart NATO expansion by threatening various measures, such as establishing a counter defense organization. However, it was ultimately persuaded by the "partnership for peace" initiative, which allowed it to maintain many of its advantages in Eastern European nations (US Department of State, 1996) ^[31].

Similarly, the European Union's expansion into Eastern Europe represented the continued supremacy of the West. With the exception of Cyprus and Malta, eight former communist countries primarily joined the European Union during the 2004 expansion. Furthermore, Romania and Bulgaria, two more former communist governments, joined as full members in 2007.

Despite the fact that all of them drive Western supremacy in the post-Soviet era, these influences have produced both security and uncertainty in the world. On the one hand, the rise of Western-inspired organizations and the hegemonic strength of the United States contribute to a reduction in global anarchy and an increase in global stability. However, the expanding supremacy of the West also brought about a lot of opposition and challenges to the West. The majority of responses appear to be occurring in the Islamic world, as though this validates the well-known "clash of civilizations" theory put forth by Samuel P. Huntington (Huntington, 1997) ^[7]. Still, these kinds of responses seem fragmented and weaker at the moment, and therefore they are not close to becoming a significant threat to Western hegemony. However, as will be explored below, anti-Westernism appears to be a major source of fuel for terrorism both in the Muslim world and beyond, which poses an imminent risk to

security in the post-Soviet era.

New Extortions to the International State System

The end of the Cold War undoubtedly increased governments' willingness to cooperate with the UN and other international organizations to settle disputes and maintain international peace, but a number of new dangers have arisen in the post-Cold War era that are in fact outside the complete control of nation-states, even major powers. The occurrence of conflicts within state borders, or intra-national conflicts, is one of the biggest concerns in this regard. Conflicts over political domination, succession, and self-determination are primarily motivated by ethnicity. The global consensus up until the conclusion of the Cold War was that nationalism and ethnicity were outmoded ideas that mostly addressed issues. The global trend appeared to be shifting away from nationalism and toward internationalism on both sides of the Cold War. It became common to discuss the decline of nationalist and ethnic movements due to the prospect of nuclear war, the focus placed on democratization and human rights, economic interdependence, and the progressive acceptance of global ideals.

In contrast to predictions, however, a new wave of ethno-political groups has reemerged not just in many other parts of the world but also in Eastern Europe (particularly the Balkans), Central Asia, Africa, and West Asia. Over 90% of the major armed conflicts recorded in the world in the past year have been intra-national in nature, with wars waged between sovereign countries becoming an increasingly rare exception.

Pro-Democracy Uprisings and Movements

The first conflict of the post-Cold War world that did not involve the Soviet Union was witnessed as the international storm clouds gathering over Iraqi-occupied Kuwait. The 1991 Gulf War gave an easy victory to the west as it kicked Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi military out of Kuwait. The fall of the Soviet Union later that year definitively ended the Cold War and ushered in the post-Cold War era. There have been many movements since then that have captured the imaginations of the public around the world.

As Communism withdrew globally, dictatorships around the world gave way to pro-democracy movements and uprisings throughout the world. The common thread was a demand for democratization and autonomy. Whether it was Yeltsin standing up to the Soviet coup that tried to overthrow Gorbachev government, the Balkan states seceding for their own autonomy, the uprising against Suharto's dictatorship in 1998 there was a pattern of people launching movements against governments that were not elected. The removal of some of these governments was not as violent as Russia, the Balkans or Indonesia. South Africa saw Apartheid turfed out non-violently under Nelson Mandela and Mexico ended the 70-year rule of the PRI party. Pakistanis, despite three dismissals of their elected government by the president, kept returning to the polls to elect governments until General Musharraf's coup ended the possibility of Pakistanis voting their own government back into power.

Anti-Globalization

After the end of the Soviet Union, the resistance against the spread of capitalism and global free trade did not disappear, but it did become increasingly diffuse. This was represented

by the anti WTO movement that saw the spread of opposition to the advent of WTO rules around & quote; the world that would see more and more countries roll back protection for domestic producers. This movement took off in Germany, France and other countries as these nations started talks about deepening the European Union between themselves and their neighbors. It also found traction in India as it opened itself to free trade and in Canada and the United States as they integrated their countries in NAFTA. The biggest uprising against globalization became the 1999 Battle of Seattle, as a WTO meeting attended by President Bill Clinton saw the streets outside descend into chaos and street fights.

Anti-Iraq War Movement

AL-Qaeda assaulted the United States of America on September 11, 2001, in New York City and Washington, DC. The attack which destroyed the World Trade Centre and part of the Pentagon led to the US invading Afghanistan, where Al Qaeda was based, by October 2001. Within months though, the US began to make the case to invade Iraq and began waging a propaganda campaign to that effect.

The world responded with multiple massive anti-war protests, including in America where hundreds of thousands of people gathered to oppose the invasion of Iraq. All of this culminated on February 16, with millions of people protesting in approximately 800 cities around the world to oppose the US drive to war in Iraq. Despite this, the United States government went ahead and invaded Baghdad, overthrowing their government and disbanding Iraq's Army which led to a bloody insurgency in that country. This led to a vicious insurgency, which further increased America's domestic opposition to the war, a phenomenon that was to last until US forces handed control back to Iraq in 2011 and ended the occupation.

Color Revolutions

A number of countries remained autocratic despite the fall of the Soviet Union and the decrease in dictatorships, worldwide. In many countries, where the democratic opposition to dictatorships was in disarray, a mixed version of the previous autocratic regime hung on. This led to color revolutions to dislodge them.

These especially seemed to target governments that the US did not favor or like and were clustered in former Soviet states and ex-communist Eastern European countries. These non-violent actions against authoritarian governments included the movement against Milosevic in 2000, the 2003 Rose Revolution in Georgia, the orange revolution in Ukraine in 2004, The Tulip Revolution or First Kyrgyz Revolution in 2005, the Green Movement in Iran in 2009, the 2019 October revolt in Lebanon, Slipper Revolution in Belarus 2020-2021, Lawyer's Movement in Pakistan during 2007, and Myanmar's Saffron Revolution the same year were against military governments that had ruled their countries for nearly a decade (more in Myanmar case) and led to the restoration of some form of democracy in these countries.

Ukraine's Euro-Maidan uprising in 2014 was the worst example of this, which overthrew their government, led to Russian interventions in their country and set off the Ukrainians civil war in the Donbass region that killed over 11,000 people and continues to rage today. Following the

Arab Spring, the global community where we currently live is still functioning well. The Arab world had no effective democracies outside the violence scarred ones in Lebanon and Iraq. In December 2010, a street vendor named Mohamed Bouazizi in Tunisia set himself on fire in protest to the harassment he faced on the streets, while he was selling his wares. His act of self-immolation led to an uprising in Tunisia against its dictatorship, that spread on the then nascent, social media websites of Twitter and Facebook. These calls for protest then spread to Egypt, Yemen and across the Arab world, where the demand erupted to overthrow the dictatorial governments of their countries. Egypt, Yemen and Tunisia saw their dictator's fall. In Libya, Gaddafi was overthrown and killed by militias protected by a NATO invasion, throwing that country into a civil war. Yemen also fell into a civil war, one that Saudi Arabia, Israel, UK and USA exacerbated by imposing harsh sanctions that lead to famine in -those nations. Syria, however, became the site of a bloody and violent, multi-sided civil war when its dictator Bashar Al-Assad violently suppressed the uprisings against him, leading to a violent conflict that sent millions of Syrians fleeing from their country and drawing in every western and Arab power. Only Tunisia seems to have had a stable and democratic outcome, otherwise most Arab speaking states across the Middle East and North Africa are facing some form of dictatorship; domestic opposition, instability threats of violence or civil war.

Black Lives Matter

The serial killing of African Americans by US police has led to the rise of a resistance movement in the United States called the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement. A constant drumbeat of mobile phone videos, news reports and protest hashtags (Including #BlackLivesMatter) using the names of African-Americans killed by the police lead to a number of uprisings, when the cities of St Louis in 2014 and Baltimore in 2015, rose up in revolt against their own police for killing unarmed black civilians. This laid the groundwork for when George Floyd was killed in Minneapolis in 2020 by Officer Derek Chauvin, it led to riots by the citizens of the city, black and white, against the police. While the police station in Minneapolis was set ablaze, Americans of all races from across Minneapolis and the United States used this opportunity to leave lockdown against the Coronavirus, to protest police violence. In response, the American police violently began beating the protestors in the streets and the world stared in horror at the sight of American protestors being attacked by their own security forces, as they protested those same forces excess. International solidarity was expressed by people, protestors and even governments from around the world, with this anti-racist movement with a focus around the world as well on the combating the racism or colorism present in every country.

Results and Discussion

These trends of intra-state conflicts and movements at the global or regional level appear to be holding. However, the global community cannot be said to have been adequately prepared for this trend. The United Nations, for example, was established to deal with interstate conflicts, which have historically constituted the primary threat to international peace and security. In addition, the fact that internal conflicts take place within state borders has discouraged

major international actors from intervening, either out of legal concern or out of a desire to avoid potential losses. For instance, under the Clinton administration, the US government issued PDD-25 (Presidential Decision Directive-25), which limited the circumstances under which the US could take part in peacekeeping missions conducted by the United Nations. (The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations, 1994). In summary, the global community has tended to stay out of intra-national conflicts unless they truly escalate.

However, these confrontations might be just as severe, expensive, and intense as any in the past. In addition, they need to be handled somehow to keep the world safe and secure. Intra-state disputes may seem local at first, but because of global interdependence and different forms of international support, they can easily take on an international dimension. Indeed, when outside parties offer actors engaged in local struggles bases and/or political, economic, or military support, these conflicts invariably take on a global aspect (Yılmaz, 2007) ^[38].

It is without a doubt true that recognizing the underlying causes of intra-state disputes and using appropriate tactics to put an end to violence and promote peace are necessary for achieving successful management of intra-state conflicts. When trying to contain violent internal conflicts, the international community has, by far, been largely effective in sending peacekeeping forces into such situations. As previously stated, in the post-Soviet era, 50 peacekeeping missions were carried out, 18 of which are still active. Furthermore, thousands of military and civilian peacekeepers have generally been successful in preserving human life and halting the expansion of hostilities. It is not widely known, though, that UN peacekeeping is a "palliative" rather than a "cure." Conflicts are not immediately resolved by peacekeeping troops. That's not why they do that. All they can accomplish is contain the issue for a while so that those with the ability to settle it may work out a settlement without the stench of bloodshed and devastation. The concept of increased peacekeeping, which breeds militarism, is more dubious. Nonviolent alternatives, which take into consideration the variety of multifaceted problems associated with armed conflicts and the people who confront them, should be taken into consideration rather than turning to increasingly militarized solutions - a habit that permeates approaches to conflict resolution at the global level. Hence, appropriate peace building initiatives that support peacekeeping are truly required in intra-state conflicts. Even yet, since the collapse of the Cold War, UN peacekeeping missions have expanded to include a variety of peace building tasks including monitoring, conducting local elections, helping to restore state services, and so forth (Serafino, 2005; Daniel *et al.*, 2008) ^[19, 2].

However, in this regard, the international community's capacity has remained restricted. Growing religious militancy in the post-Cold War era is another danger to peace. It appears that conflicts motivated by religion have largely taken the place of the Cold War's ideological sphere as a significant cause of international strife. Some experts have even argued that the world's divisions are no longer caused by "iron" barriers, but rather by cultural ones, and that religion plays a unique role in stoking tensions between rival civilizations by fostering incompatible and irreconcilable conceptions of identity and commitment. Huntington contends that religion discriminates against

people more severely and completely than ethnicity does.... People who determine their identity through the lens of their ethnicity and religion are inclined to perceive others who are different from them as existing in "us" versus "them" relationship. (Huntington 1993, 40, 45) ^[7].

Huntington's thesis is startling, but it is supported by regimes that readily use the language of cultural clash, such as those in Iran, Sudan, and other Islamic movements throughout West Asia and beyond. An attitude of religious militancy, sometimes referred to as "religious fundamentalism," permeates many of these locations. It frequently involves advocating for aggression towards the oppression and sacrilege that Muslim peoples see to be meted out by the West or those who support it.

Although there hasn't been any explicit mention of violence in interactions between Asia and the West, "civilizational tension" is a common topic of discussion. The majority of Asian nations are no longer as willing as they formerly were to submit to Western cultural preferences when it comes to things like how rights are interpreted or how particular socioeconomic and political structures are created.

Many religious extremists have a strong commitment to using violence directly to further their goals. Numerous widely publicized examples include the murder of two dozen Muslim worshippers in Hebron by a Jewish extremist, the endorsement of violence by Serbian Orthodox and Croatian Catholic Christians during the war in the former Yugoslavia, the September 11 attacks in the USA, and the July 2005 terrorist attacks on the London subway, which claimed the lives of countless innocent people.

In many instances, there is a correlation between violent intolerance motivated by religion and terrorism. Religious fundamentalism actually provides doctrinal support for some of the most deadly terrorist groups in the world today, such as Al-Qaida and Islamic Jihad of Afghanistan. The majority of members of these groups firmly think that using violence directly in behalf of religion is required.

They also believe that they will be rewarded in the hereafter and go straight to paradise if they die in their "holy struggle." This concept eliminates feelings of remorse or dread, which makes murdering and dying considerably simpler (Yılmaz, 2002) ^[35]. The post-Cold War age is witnessing another grave threat to peace: terrorism, whether it is fueled by religious fundamentalism or not. Although there have occasionally been terrorist strikes throughout human history, terrorism really gained prominence following the conclusion of the Cold War, notably in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

The definitions of terrorism as a strategy, an opposition to tyranny and a criminal conduct vary. It goes without saying that the description is dependent upon whose viewpoint is being expressed. The United States Department of Defense defines terrorism as the intentional use or threat of illegal attacks to instill fear, coercing or intimidating governments or societies to achieve goals that are typically political, religious, or ideological (Countering Terrorism, US Department of States). The characteristics of terrorism that are highlighted in definitions differ more throughout countries outside of the United States. For example, the United Nations defined terrorism as an unsettling pattern of recurrent violent acts carried out by covert private, public, or state actors for peculiar, illegal, or political purposes, where the primary targets of the violence are not the direct targets as is the case with assassinations.

However, it should be noted that terrorists often believe that one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter. Terrorists don't think of themselves as bad people. They battle for their beliefs using all means necessary because they consider themselves to be righteous soldiers (Martin, 2006) ^[14]. A terrorist's victim, on the other hand, views the perpetrator as a criminal who has no concern for human life. Irrespective of how it is defined, terrorism has developed as full-fledged significant issue in the post-Soviet era, while it is not exclusive to this time frame.

Terrorists have allegedly carried out incredibly brutal atrocities to advance political, ideological or religious causes throughout the previous thirty years. Political ideology arrays from extreme left to extreme right. For example, the extreme left is made up of organizations like Marxists and Leninists who advocate for a labor revolution headed by revolutionary elites. There are dictatorships on the far right that usually support the union of states. Contrarily, religious fanatics frequently deny the legitimacy of secular authorities and regard as invalid any legal frameworks that do not come from their religious convictions. Additionally, they see industrialization as a destructive force on traditional culture.

Above all, terrorism affects people who are not the direct victims. Terrorists employ acts of violence to highlight their cause to the local populace, the international community, and the government. The terrorists select targets that represent their opposition in order to maximize publicity for their attack. The public's or the government's response to the terrorist act determines its effectiveness, not the act itself. For example, roughly 3000 people were killed in the September 11, 2001 assaults.

Although the citizens of America and the US government were their true targets, humans were the direct casualties. President George W. Bush of the United States declared war on terrorism following this terrorist act, and numerous states backed him (Mahajan, 2002). But combating terrorism is particularly challenging since terrorists do not engage on defined fronts and do not follow the norms of war. Relatively successfully, the US and its allies have overthrown and penalized the Afghan and Iraqi governments that are alleged to have supported terrorist activities. However, it appears that these setbacks will not be enough to put an end to terrorism. Conversely, the US invasions and growing sway over the Middle East and beyond sparked widespread backlash and in fact fueled a number of terrorist groups. Therefore, the threat posed by numerous terrorist organizations is likely to persist in the next years, regardless of how great the military might of the United States of America and its allies may be.

The post-Cold War era also saw a rise of financial hostility between the North and the South. This kind of conflict is not new. It has happened in a global setting previously. However, as ideological conflicts have decreased, it has started to take up a larger portion of the foreign affairs agenda. It is necessary to have some historical context in order to comprehend the larger implications of the current North-South conflict. In the early 1970s, developing countries gathered at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to form the Group of 77, with the goal of advancing their objectives for a New International Economic Order. This goal arose from the 1960s neo-Marxist political economy theory, which claimed that the global economic system was subjecting the

"periphery" - Latin America and other growing nations-to exploitation, poverty, and dependence. The NIEO explicitly called for measures such as technology transfer, price indexing of developing country exports against developed country manufactured exports, price supports for major commodity exports from developing countries, and the negotiated redeployment of certain industries from developed to developing countries. By the 1980s, however, the NIEO agenda at the UN had unraveled due to conflicting interests among developing countries, the inability to replicate OPEC's success with other commodities, and, most critically, the discrediting of its command-based economic theories. The incredible success of South Korea, Taiwan, and other countries that embraced trade liberalization and export-led growth served as proof of this.

Even though the South's WTO remedies currently diverge from the NIEO, the concepts of Northern economic exploitation have become fashionable issues. At Cancun, poor nations demanded compensation and unilateral trade concessions from rich nations instead of price supports for exports and commodities. The breakdown of negotiations along a North-South division was the common theme among the several explanations given for the Cancun debacle. The G-21 was against agricultural subsidies to wealthy nations. The United States and other countries became increasingly irritated with the Less Developed Countries (LDC) for refusing to reduce their exorbitant industrial and farm tariffs (Sevilla, 2003) ^[20]. The dispute between the wealthy advanced economies of the North and the impoverished developing nations of the Southern Hemisphere has reached a new phase since the discussions ended without any apparent resolution. Neo-colonialism, which refers to the financial capitulation of these nations and bears similarities to the conditions prevalent during the colonial era in some ways, is the term used to describe the situation of developing countries' economic dependence on multinational corporations from developed nations. Further layer of injustice is introduced by global issues such as climate change: while the North bears the brunt of the problems, the South bears the brunt of the repercussions of desertification and extreme weather. This also includes a risk to the survival of several small island republics, which will vanish if sea levels rise further higher (Seligson and Passe-Smith, 2003) ^[18].

The fact that there haven't been any armed wars as a result of the North-South economic divide is nevertheless noteworthy. Nonetheless, a lot of detractors attribute the 21st-century terrorism's resurgence to neo-colonialism. Financial integration in the post-Cold War era has given rise to growing anti-globalization movements, but these movements do not seem to be dismantling the historical divisions between the North and the South. Instead, it is the channeling of previous growth patterns-both strong and weak-by economic globalization. More integration occurs between national units already part of the global economy and those that are not; the latter tend to remain that way. Only a very tiny number of nations have been able to escape the world system's low-growth ruts thus far. This dire conclusion has severe ramifications for global political stability. International order may be viewed as fragile to the extent that inequalities and destitution encourage ongoing hostilities between the North and the South.

Last but not least, the fall of the Soviet Union broke the bipolar system, creating power imbalances in some areas

and leading to fights for influence. States that had appeared to be allies or members of the same bloc now competed as rivals in the post-Cold War world. For example, the United States' established supremacy was challenged by the rise of the European Union and Japan as competing centers of power. Undoubtedly, the emergence of China and the Russian Federation as formidable adversaries of the United States are equally noteworthy. In Eurasia, various states and regional integrations are preparing to achieve their goals, each with different ambitions. Nations like Iran and Turkey aspire to become future global powers, while states such as Russia, China, and the European Union seek to maintain their regional dominance with growing aspirations of global influence. Meanwhile, the United States is striving to retain its current position as a global authority. Power disputes are centered on Eurasia, particularly the newly independent states. The United States of America is taking action to maintain and strengthen its ties with some of the states in the region. The three states principally engaged in this conflict are Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan. Conflicts between these governments have often compelled major powers to take advantage of them in order to further their own national interests in the area. In addition, they have suggested cooperation or attempted to follow a path of reconciliation, switching between these approaches according to which best fits their own overarching goals and aspirations for the region as a whole (Simons, 2008) ^[24].

These global movements-particularly the conflicts and uprisings in West Asia-such as the Arab Spring, the Color Revolutions in Eurasia, the Russia-Ukraine crisis, and the Palestine-Israel conflict-represent an essential regional interest for major powers generally and the United States specifically for a number of reasons. Controlling the region means keeping an eye on Iran, halting Russian expansion, holding onto the natural resources of the area, making sure they are transported safely to the global market, and securing ground for the "war against terrorism" (Aslanli, 2008) ^[1].

The United States is still fortifying its foothold in the South Caucasus at this time. Nonetheless, a resurgent Russia is undoubtedly unhappy about the current situation and feels obliged to punish both the states in the region that support American policies and American military deployments there (Kanet, 2007) ^[9]. Russia's willingness to go to great lengths in order to protect its own vital interests in the complex and unstable region is demonstrated by the most recent crisis in Georgia.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Several conclusions may be taken from the preceding analysis, which can be stated as follows, when considering the regional and intra-state disputes that led to the world wide shifts and global movements in the post-Cold War events and the resulting international order in that era:

- A seemingly paradoxical feature of the post-Cold War international system has been its increasing fragmentation and expanding globalization. It's likely that this tendency will continue.
- Major power collaboration is the foundation of the new international order at the level of state-to-state relations. The international state system includes at least five major powers: the United States, Europe, Russia, Japan, and China. It doesn't seem like these powers have any significant competitors. This suggests that these major

powers will wield considerable influence over global politics in the foreseeable future.

- In the medium term, the United States will remain the dominant major power, but its economic and military might will progressively wane. Over time, a few expanding states or mergers will probably approach the might of the United States. Therefore, it is possible that the global framework will become multipolar in the future, however it might take a few decades to get there.
- In the post-Soviet world, international relations have become truly global. Communications are instantaneous, and the global economy functions seamlessly across all continents. A range of issues has emerged that necessitate global cooperation, including nuclear proliferation, environmental challenges, population growth, and economic interdependence.
- Interstate conflicts have decreased along with growing international cooperation, and the significance of "low politics" in international relations has increased. But in the years to come, there will probably be fierce rivalry between the big nations for natural resources, especially energy resources. In this context, disputes over unfair trade practices and worries about dependence on monopolistic or externally concentrated sources of products, services, and innovations continue to be addressed. However, it will appear that the chances of having group laws and regulations rather than just unilateral charges and limitations have improved.
- Even if they are wary of foreign investments, emerging nations are probably going to fare better in the future due to the growth of the global market economy and the quick increase of foreign investments. However, it appears that deeply ingrained North-South disparities will continue to be a possible catalyst for global strife.
- Other than the North-South struggle, the post-Cold War world is threatened by a number of other factors, including terrorism, religious militancy, and ethnically motivated conflicts, all of which are backed by some revisionist powers. These hazards are especially difficult to counter since they are outside the purview of nation-states and necessitate international cooperation. Therefore, the ability of great countries in particular and the global community in general to demonstrate a willingness to work together on these pressing issues will determine the course of the globe.

References

1. Aslanli A. Is the US Increasing Its Power In the Caucasus? *Eurasia Critic*; c2008.
2. Daniel DC, Taft P, Wiharta S. *Peace Operations: Trends, Progress, and Prospects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; c2008. p. 5-6.
3. Fearon JD. Civil War & the Current International System. *Dædalus*. 2017;146(4):18-32. Available from: https://www.amacad.org/sites/default/files/publication/downloads/Fa17_Daedalus_03_Fearon.pdf
4. Gowan R, Stedman SJ. The International Regime for Treating Civil War, 1988-2017. *Dædalus*. 2018;147(1):171-84.
5. Gowan R, Stedman SJ. The International Regime for Treating Civil War; c1988-2017. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322240403_The_International_Regime_for_Treating_Civil_War_1988-2017

6. Harrison E. *The Post-Cold War International System*. New York: Routledge; c2004. p. 200-10.
7. Huntington SP. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone; c1997. p. 50-100.
8. Jones B. *Still Ours to Lead: America, Rising Powers, and the Tension between Rivalry and Restraint*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; c2014. p. 30-100.
9. Kanet RE. *Russia: Re-emerging Great Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; c2007. p. 100-25.
10. Kissinger H. *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History*. New York: Penguin; c2014. p. 205-50.
11. Lischer SK. *The Global Refugee Crisis: Regional Destabilization & Humanitarian Protection*. *Dædalus*. 2017;146(4):85-97.
12. Lischer SK. *The Global Refugee Crisis: Regional Destabilization & Humanitarian Protection*. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48563905>
13. Mahajan R. *The New Crusade: America's War on Terrorism*. New York: Monthly Review Press; c2020. p. 18-30.
14. Martin G. *Understanding Terrorism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; c2006. p. 89-95.
15. Sanders ME. *Alliance Politics in Unipolarity*. Thesis (M.A). Fairfax, VA: George Mason University; c2008. p. 39-50.
16. Sarotte ME. *1989: The Struggle to Create Post-Cold War Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; c2009. p. 96-110.
17. Radelet SC. *The Great Surge: The Ascent of the Developing World*. New York: Simon and Schuster; c2015. p. 46-70.
18. Seligson MA, Passe-Smith JT. *Development and Underdevelopment: The Political Economy of Global Inequality*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner; c2003. p. 39-50.
19. Serafino NM. *Peacekeeping and Related Stability Operations*. New York: Novinka Books; c2005. p. 110-15.
20. Sevilla CR. *The WTO's North-South Conflict: A Dangerous New International Economic Order*. *Natl. Interest*. 2003-04;74(1):121-125.
21. Sevilla CR. *The WTO's North-South Conflict: A Dangerous New International Economic Order*. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42895668>
22. *Significant Ongoing Armed Conflicts*. Infoplease; c2014. Available from: <https://www.infoplease.com/world/conflicts/significant-ongoing-armed-conflicts-2014>
23. *Significant Ongoing Armed Conflicts*. Available from: <https://www.infoplease.com/world/conflicts/significant-ongoing-armed-conflicts-2014>
24. Simons TW. *Eurasia's New Frontiers*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; c2008. p. 30-55.
25. *The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: US Department of US Publication; c1994. p. 492-499.
26. *The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations*. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13533319408413529>
27. *United Nations Peace Operations, Year in Review*; c2010. Available from: <https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/yir2010.pdf>
28. *United Nations Peace Operations, Year in Review*; c2010. Available from: <https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/yir2010.pdf>
29. *United States, Government Accountability Office. Defense Budget*. Washington, DC: US Government Accountability Office; c2008. Available from: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/110th-congress/house-bill/5683>
30. *United States, Government Accountability Office. Defense Budget*. Available from: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/110th-congress/house-bill/5683>
31. *United States, Department of State. North Atlantic Treaty, Partnership for Peace*. Washington, DC: US Department of State; c1996. Available from: https://1997-2001.state.gov/regions/eur/nato_fs-pfp.html
32. *United States, Department of State. North Atlantic Treaty, Partnership for Peace*. Available from: https://1997-2001.state.gov/regions/eur/nato_fs-pfp.html
33. *United States, Department of State. Countering Terrorism*. Washington, DC: US Department of State; c1996. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/countering-terrorism/>
34. *United States, Department of State. Countering Terrorism*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/countering-terrorism/>
35. Yilmaz ME. *Religious Revivalism in the Social Identity Context*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Fairfax, VA: Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University; c2002. p. 46-70.
36. Yilmaz ME. *UN Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. *Int J World Peace*. 2005;22(2):13-18.
37. Yilmaz ME. *UN Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20753484>
38. Yilmaz ME. *Intra-State Conflicts in the Post-Cold War Era*. *Int J World Peace*. 2007;24(4):11-33.
39. Yilmaz ME. *Intra-State Conflicts in the Post-Cold War Era*. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752800>