



Explanation of Theoretical Basics of Analysis of the World Order

Alireza Rezaei¹

¹ Department of International Relations, Islamic Azad University, Hamedan Branch,
Hamedan, Iran

Received: 25 July 2019 ; Accepted: 20 Sep 2019

Abstract:

International Relations Science has been developed to find an answer to the order puzzle. The most important subject of processing theories of this field of study is providing an order paradigm between actors of the international system area. This paper aims at determining theories of international relations pertaining to order issue in the post-cold war international system. It seems that the field of international relations is confronted with too many paradigms for an explanation of its subject (order) because of the evolution of its functional framework i.e. international system. Therefore, in reply to reasons of disorders and order issues, some important strategies like balance-driven order, institution-based order, idea-based order, and justice-based order are presented, all of which are described. By the end, it has been tried to present appropriate paradigm indices of order in the current international system.

Keywords: International System, World System, Balance-Driven Order, Institution-Based Order, Idea-Based Order, Justice-Based Order

Introduction

In the researches on politics and international relations, the order has been and also is one of the oldest and the most controversial subject. The problem of political order inside the societies, at least in theory, is solved somehow. Although the indisputable fact that there are several and different actors, together with the undoubted reality of action and reaction between the actors in the international area, has brought up the international order as one of the main worries of the international relations theories. Therefore, the subject of in-

ternational relations theory, solving or organizing international relations are under the light of order problem. Then all responses of international relations theories are seeking a solution for the order problem. International order is governing of arrangements among states in order to meet the current demand of order in the main emphasized areas. In other words, international order is a paradigm of international activities which protects the main targets of the States' society. In definition of international order, generic sense of this concept is observed opposing politicians'

*Corresponding Author's Email: IR.Alirezarezaei@gmail.com

– like the U.S.A. presidents- use of this concept. They use this concept toward explaining some policies which are circulated by them. Also, some researchers use the concept to describe the special foreign policy of some governmental politicians. Although international order isn't a one-dimension phenomenon, any approach of arrangements among states mightn't be defined as international order and the matter is based on the present demand of order in the following main areas:

- Political-Military Balancing of Power;
- The Efficiency of International Institutions in governing global affairs (Governance-orientation);
- Increase in ideas' portion in making anti-anarchic culture;
- The Effort of Economical Forces of World Capitalism Toward Social Welfare and Development of all Countries;

Because of evolution in the functional framework i.e. international system, the "International Relations" field of study encounters a great number of paradigms to explain its subject i.e. order and its organizing part. International Relations theories in response to disorder reasons and order problems have presented the following strategies: realists, who are known as the main minds of international relations, have presented their response in one concept of "Balance". Realists believe that order in the international system will occur through balancing (in its different forms; power balancing, hard balancing, soft balancing, threat balancing, etc.). The relation between "Balance and Order" will be considered in the next parts titled "Balance-Based Order". Liberalists are focused on "Organizations" in the presentation of the strategy for establishing the international order. Liberalists believe that we may achieve

the international order through a special type of official or non-official international or domestic organizations. Organizations that may replace combat to achieve power by encouraging cooperation based behavior. Also the relation between "Organizations and Order" will be brought up titled "Institution-Based Order". Constructionists, depending upon "Ideas" in explaining the order problem, rely on the social aspect of the order and it's creating fact. From constructionists' viewpoint, the international system is a community in which the States' loyalty to norms and common rules in different areas is the main term of their participation in this system. For this reason, they put spiritual power at the same level of importance of material power in International Relations. The relation between "Ideas and Order" forms a topic that will be considered under the title of "Idea-Based Order". The International political economy approach is based on the matter that the world's economy and international political system may not be analyzed separately. Therefore, they bring up the concept of "Justice" in their analysis of order, in explaining the order problem from the triple strategy of international political economy. For this reason, we select this concept to explain the viewpoint of different strategies of international political economy and consider it under title of "Justice-Based Order". With this introduction, we analyze the four above mentioned pictures of the order problem in the international system in the next part and at the end appropriate paradigm indices of explaining the order problem in the international system.

Balance-Based Order

From the viewpoint of realists about international relations, the power balance is the main basis of inter-countries relations and the

most basic policy rule. In international policy, the power balance is considered as an intermediate way between international order and disorder. The determinant principle of balance-based policy is the priority claimed by power relations between territory States. Balance function depends on politicians' art so that other political considerations could be pursuant to power considerations at all times. One principle has been considered as a prevailing method of protecting order in the anarchic world from the 17th century and renaissance up to now. This principle is called "Balance of Power". Therefore, the importance of balance manifests itself in thinking about international order in the form of several thought and action aspects of international relations in the past 200 years. Neorealist believe that international anarchic status causes protest of other countries against an autocrat. As weak countries may not be assured that more powerful countries don't use their higher capabilities in an unpleasant manner, so they try to find ways to constrain the powerful countries' function and this aim will be achieved through the improvement of military capabilities and establishment of defensive unions. Sometimes the allies start war to displace the power balance for themselves (Walt, 2003, p.190). The traditional theory of power balance encountered with some criticisms among them this concept is confusing from the viewpoint of semantics and "it is uncertain and undetermined because there is no reliable way to measure, evaluate, and compare the power; it is unreal because the States try to compensate their uncertainty by targeting superiority (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff, 1997, p.70). In other words, ambiguity of power balance is resulted from the fact that we don't know which affairs establish the balance. When there is power balance, how the power is di-

vided between States. This theory defines international system actors as solid units and the balancing States may not be considered separately. The received criticism about the traditional theory of power balance caused some scientists of international relations like Stephen Walt to reproduce the theory of power balance in the international relations titled "Threat Balance". He believes that the States not only establish power balance to confront with power but also to confront with an evident threat. Therefore "Balance of Threat" is brought up instead of the theory of power balance (Rengger, 2007, p.105). Stephen Walt acknowledging desirability of theory of power balance in the current international system, believes that threats which result to establish balance and union between two parties should be considered sufficiently. Walt believes that these threats follow Aggregate Power, Proximity, Offensive Capability, and Offensive Intentions (Walt, 2003, p.200). Although its inability to distinct between power and threat is the main weak point of this theory. On the other hand, theory of threat balance is more useful in the international multi-polar system than a one-polar world. Because the more the power is centralized in the international system, the more risk of threat estimation might be based on the competent State thorough assessment of that State capability. One-polarity of the international system will cause to lack of distinction between threat balance and power balance (Vasquez and Elman, 2003, p. 16).

Some scientists of international relations like Robert Pape, T.V. Paul, etc. reproduced the theory of power balance in international relations titled "Soft Balancing". These thinkers called the traditional theory of power balance as "Hard Balancing". The difference between these two definitions goes back to the use of military forces in the establishment

of the balance – in hard balancing- and a lack of its use in soft balancing and taking modern strategies in the establishment of the balance. Hard balancing forms when weak States get the result that they should confront with power and influence of a powerful State. In their opinion, the cost of permitting a predominant power to continue its policies is more than the cost of resisting its unacceptable dominance (Pape, 2005, p. 36).

Indirect and non-military efforts to decrease in the superior power's capabilities and increasing its own power to mitigate dominance of the predominant power are called Soft Balancing. According to Pape, neutralizing function of the conducting State, without direct combat, is the aim of soft balancing. The criterion of soft balancing success is not only laying a policy aside by the superpower but also the presence of more States in the balancing confederation against the superpower will be a good criterion (Paul, 2005, p. 37).

In other words, although soft balancing will not be able to prevent access to the hegemonic power to its special military targets in a short time, it may increase its cost in using its power and also it may decrease the number of probable countries to cooperate with the hegemony in future. Soft balancing tries to cause difficulty for the conducting State or its confederation and takes action through increasing expenses of protecting the present status by Territorial Denial, Entangling Diplomacy, Economic Strengthening,

Signals of Resolve to Balance (Pape, 2005, p. 36-37).

Hedley Bull underlines three functions in relation to power balance functions pertaining to the international order: A- Presence of general power balance throughout the international system may help to prevent the system transformation into a worldwide emperor through the dominance of power over the others. So long as this balance continues, none of the superpowers will be able to establish a worldwide government by relying on force. B- Presence of local power balance helps to protect the independency of the States located in the special regions against absorbing a local superior power or going under its dominance. C- Everywhere there are both general and local balances of power, there is an appropriate condition for taking action by other organizations' international order (like diplomacy, war, international law, superpowers management) depends on which (Bull, 2001, p.94).

Waltz underlining States and superpowers as the main actors in the field of international order and security introduces power balance as a factor of stabilizing international order which, as mentioned above, is resulted from an anarchic international system. Waltz believes that probably bipolar systems suffer from less disorder and outstanding wars than multi-polar systems (Waltz, 1979, p. 118-127). An abstract of balance-based order from the viewpoint of realists is presented in the table1.

Table 1.
Particulars of balance-based order

Reasons of Disorder	Structure of International System	Actors of International System	Process of International System	Nature of International System
Lack of Power Balance	State-Orientation with unequal distribution of power between the States. Non-governmental actors are the States' representatives.	States with unequal capabilities but equal duties.	playing with a sum of zero and structure determination in anarchic conditions	Protection of power balance for existence and security

Source: (Rezaei, 2009, p.94)

Institution-Based Order

Liberal thoughts in international relations went up in the period between two worldwide wars and in the works of idealists who believed that war is an unnecessary and old method of solving differences between States. Finally, liberal theory of institutionalism focused on theories of regional convergence was brought up after the second worldwide war. The theory of regional convergence included functionalism, neo-functionalism, communication and counter-dependency. The above-mentioned theories helped liberalism to reproduce itself as a challenge against realism thoughts especially in the middle of 1980th. From that time up to now, new theories have manifested in international relations literature including the theory of international regimens and theory of neo-liberal institutionalism or neo-liberalism (Deutsch, Keohane, Nay, and others, 1996).

From liberalists' viewpoint, international institutions as one of the most important actors in the field of international order are important like States. These theoreticians believed that international institutions may have an important effect on the cooperation behavior of countries and international order. They acknowledging the independent identity of international institutions in the international policy believe that international institutions,

independent of power sources and countries preferences, determine international results and countries' behavior (Dehghani-Firoozabadi, 1998, p.575). Robert Keohane believes that "liberalism emphasizes the role of institutions established by humans to effect mass decision making of people. Liberalism pays more attention to the importance of changing political approaches than simple and unchangeable structures and believes that at least daily progress in the institutions related to human affairs changes according to human actions and changes of expectations and approaches resulting from this state may have deep effects on the behavior of States" (Keohane, 1989, p. 10-11).

Liberalists propounded the theory of international regimens according to the role of international institutions in the international order. In fact, from liberalists' viewpoint, "the international regimens are a continuation of a discussion of liberal and neoliberal institutionalism. This analysis roots from convergence, counter-dependency and functionalism". (Asgarkhani, 2004, p.72) Regimens are comprehensible concepts in all issues propounded in the international system and act as useful tools to establish cooperation between States. Nowadays, regimens help to set international relations in many activity areas. For this reason, the regimens have various

thematic activities like security, environmental, communication and telecommunication, human rights, economical, etc. areas. Establishment of the regimens is necessary because always there is a risk of neutralizing cooperation-based strategies by competitive strategies in the international anarchic system. Therefore, they aim at preventing competitive strategies that in other cases they are considered as an intellectual response in an anarchic system (Little, 2004, p.706). The idea of Global Governance, toward liberals' theorizing in relation to international institutions and their place in the international order, not more than one decade turned into one of the essential subjects in the study of international relations especially after the cold war. The word "Global Governance" synchronized with allaying cold war was propounded according to globalization learning and organized liberalism. From a politics viewpoint, global governance shows the organization of international politics area through more social and unanimity ways, contrary to the cold war in which competition of two superpowers shadowed on the worldwide institutions and they were governed by specialism and hierarchal order (Barnett, Smith and Duvall, 2005).

This concept has been considered from 3 aspects by thinkers: first, global governance as a phenomenon; from this aspect, global governance supervises on mass actions toward developing international institutions and norms which test in combat with reasons and inappropriate consequences of national and ultra-national issues. Second, global governance as a project; from this aspect, global governance is brought up as the growth of worldwide order (liberal). These thinkers believe that the management of special issues of the world should be looked for in a structure wider than global order. Third, global gover-

nance as a global viewpoint; from this aspect, global governance is brought up as a new analytical attitude (Boli and Tomas, 1999).

Robert Keohane believes that A- Global Governance might be considered as international organizations' activity like the United Nations (the UN) or international financial organizations. B- Global governance might be a background for worldwide governance. C- Global governance is an intellectual paradigm that implicitly emphasizes institutional decisions for globalization management (Keohane, 2001, p.3). From liberal thoughts' aspect, order roots not only from power balance but also from interactions between a lot of layers of governing arrangements, i.e. agreed on rules and norms, institutional regulations and also international regimens (Ghavam, 2005, p.243). International regimens after establishment of cooperation help to the system's order and stability. In other words, in the international system, international regimens are considered as main systems of controlling order. These regimens manifest themselves in different thematic areas and locations of the international system (Ghosemi, 2005, p.139). "International institutions, as regimens, rules, agreements, or organizations help to provide necessary conditions of cooperation. Institutions with rules that explain what is breaching a relation help to each State's to have confidence in that it won't be exploited and would gain an appropriate response to its cooperative movement. The institutions by establishing official mechanisms for supervision and control, empowers the States to inform of the other States' affairs and strengthen this confidence that breach of promise won't be hidden by this way cooperative action will result in a cooperative action. By formalizing these relations, the institutions help to mitigate the rate of underestimating future results for each State

and strengthen expectation of each State pertaining to the continuation of the relation in future". (Hopf, 2007, p.471) A summary of

viewpoints of liberalists in the form of institution-based order is presented in table 2.

Table 2.
Particulars of institution-based order

Reasons of Disorder	Structure of International System	Actors of International System	Process of International System	Nature of International System
Pursuing egoistic personal interests by States and lack of cooperation	Multi-axial with equal distribution of power among States and some of non-governmental actors	International institutions and regions along with the States	playing with a variable sum and structure determination in complexity conditions	development of cooperation in order to provide more welfare

Source: (Rezaei, 2009, p.114)

Idea-Based Order

From the viewpoint of constitutionalists, contrary to views of realists, we don't counter with similar units in the level of international order. We may observe different spectra of States in the current international order. Advanced liberal States like West Europe, North America, and East Asia, post-colonial States in the south like Africa south of Sahara and countries located between these two extremities like Russia, China, India, Brazil, etc. are located in pre-modern, modern and post-modern conditions, so they are not similar units. Therefore we should provide the possibility of promotion of a liberal and law-based international system along with advanced liberal States. The mentioned approach "approaches to liberalism because of paying attention to the role and effect of values and norms on the behavior of States and approaches to the English School because of believing in a type of international community" (Clarck, 2007, p.90). This approach emphasis equally on material and ideational elements of the international reality challenges fixed essence and nature of governmental identity and believes that change and transformation are ordinary properties of in-

ternational politics and State and international system have a relationship based on mutual compatibility. From this aspect, ideational structures and factors including common trusts, beliefs, and values system have a powerful effect on political and social function in step with material structures and factors (Ibid, p.359). Constitutionalists believe that "power, finally, was understood as military capability and interests were understood as intention toward power, security or wealth...but power and interests, and sometimes even institutions, were considered as material factors by neo-realism theories. Whereas we should also mention to the forth factor titled "Ideas" (Wendt, 2006, p.135). On this basis, constitutionalism engages in consideration of this question that how ideas play a role in the development of those material factors. The developmental role of ideas in material factors is an important issue that is mainly ignored by international relations. "Meaning of power and content of interests are mainly according to ideas. Therefore, it is only after detecting and identifying mental conditions of possibility of explanations based on power and interests that we may assess real effects of material factors"

(Ibid, p.140). Wendt's constitutionalism doesn't ignore material forces, in spite of showing effort to denaturalize social types" (Moshirzadeh, 2004, p.122). Constitutionalism considers the scope of ideas or ideational systems as a basis for analyzing the international system which may be generally considered as general global values, lack of which weakens order and even promotes values that may be resulted to disorder and hostility. They believe that if we are interested in the manner of a system composed of several States, we should consider the States' identity certain, because system-based theory may not turn the State to the problem as this work will change the subject and the issue will change from a theory about State to the State theory. As actors have different identities and these identities indicate several interests, it is impossible to predetermine equal interests to all States from outside because power is material, ideational and conversational at the same time. Anarchy results in the problem of order which is a distinct and important problem for international politics. This anarchy may have three structures in macro-level which depends on the type of roles governing the system: friendship, hostility and competition

which result to Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian's structures respectively, because they are based on the other's representations which state itself is defined on that basis (Wendt, 2005, p.380). Constitutionalists believe that Anarchy may have at least 3 distinct cultures (Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian) which are based on different relations of the roles (friendship, hostility and competition). These structures and roles manifest in representations of the States from themselves and the others, but in macro-level these structures and roles obtain logics and attitudes which remain during the time. In the field of internalization of common cultures by the States, cultural features reproduced by force usually show the least stability and those reproduced legally are the most stable features. The high rate of death in Hobbesian culture creates motivation for establishing Lockean's culture and in turn, a continuation of coarseness creates a motivation to move toward Kantian's culture. Based on this view, order necessarily doesn't root from power balance or international institutions, but roots from internal values and principles of the international community of the States. A summary of the Idea-Based Order is presented in table 3.

Table 3.
Particulars of Idea-Based Order

Reasons of Disorder	Structure of International System	Actors of International System	Process of International System	Nature of International System
Lack of Governance of Kantian's Culture	Paying attention to Material and Ideational Structures in the International System, and Strengthening Structure and the Functionary	Emphasizing on Governmental Actors because of their historical importance not their inherent importance, also there is theoretical possibility of absorbing non-governmental actors	Presence of 3 types of Anarchy Structures; Hobbesian Structure (hostility), Lockean's Structure(competition) and Kantian's structure (Friendship)	Interests of the Actors are born by their identity and are learned in the process of interaction. Common cognitive structures as material resources provide necessary meaning for the action.

Source: (Rezaei, 2009, p.94)

Justice-Based Order

International political economics is the junction point of economics and politics or the State and market. If economics follows capital, capital pursues power and these two elements interact with each other in a complicated network. According to triple approaches of international political economics, capitalism acts through both the States and beyond States and for this reason, it is considered as one of the main elements of changing their identity and also establishing order or disorder in the international system. Therefore, the current coordination between interests of the State and capitalism should be considered in the complicated form of their mutual interests in the order problem of the international system. This process, now titled "Economics Globalization", plays an important role in the development of the capitalism system in the worldwide scope. Regardless

this process does change the States' act or not, all the mentioned approaches believe that this process is the origin of some evolutions in the level of the international system, internationalization of economical life along with localization of political life is only one of which (Hathneh, 2005, p.10). There are three main approaches in order to consider and explain the relation of the State and market or politics and economics, in the international political economics, researchers of this field tend to one of which. These three approaches include: Realistic viewpoints in the international political economics, Liberalistic viewpoints in the international political economics, and Marxist viewpoints in the international political economics. A summary of triple approaches viewpoint in the international political economy is presented in table 4.

Table 4.
Comparison of triple approaches of international political economics

The approaches	Realistic international political economic	Liberalistic international political economic	Marxist international political economic
relation between politics and economics	Politics is determinant factor	Economics is independent	Economics is determinant factor
Main actors/level of Analysis	the States	Private companies and entities	Strata
Nature of Economical Relations	Conflictive/ Playing with sum of zero	based on cooperation/paying with positive sum	Conflictive/ Playing with sum of zero
Economical Targets	Power of the State	maximizing individual/social welfare	Interests of Strata
Factor of Globalization	Politics	communication	Capitalism Economics
Nature of Globalization	Globalization doesn't prevent the States to achieve political power. Globalization is governed by the States.	Globalization mitigates power of the States for ultra- and infra-national institutions and entities. Globalization is dominated by ultra-national forces.	Globalization increases power of central States and decreases power of local States. Globalization serves Capitalism system.

Source: (Jackson and Sorenson, 2004, p 231-241)

In the international political economy, in response to what does establish a global order, the main supposition of political economists is that a market predetermines a type of order for its own action; concepts including both force and control based on two parties' consent. The idea of Hegemonic Stability was considered as the basis of order but now it is doubted and recently there are several possible post-hegemonic scenarios in the current literature of international political economics, explanation of which is based on the continuation of two opposed models of a global order which manifest in the form of globalization processes: global mutual dependency and a dispersed world, a process which is named by James Rosenau as Fragmentation. The balance between functional and territorial principles seems to be the main subject in these scenarios, i.e. global mutual economical dependency between non-territorial economical actors in the totally globalized world, against mercantilist politicization and localization of global economics. On this basis, the future global order will form by the way which solves the conflict between these two principles. But the question is that if globalization of economics will result to more welfare in the world or results in increase in inequality in the international system? We can reply that although there are pros and cons for the process of globalization of economics, those States that may provide infrastructures of absorbing capital to development will be successful in this process and vice versa, those who may not equip them

selves by these infrastructures will be remained in the margin. Donny Rodrik believes that "those communities will benefit from integration into the global economy which has internal institutions, manage and control conflicts resulted from economical mutual dependency (Rodrick, 1997, p. 8).

Although the State show difference of opinion in relation to international system rights to determine issues related to internal legitimacy, all of them are unanimous in the matter that an international order which accepts apartheid in one of its constituents doesn't deserve to recognize itself legally. Justice-based order believes that order may be strengthened by the establishment of justice between western and non-western powers but provided that there is a general agreement especially between superpowers about the most appropriate forms of change. On the basis of Justice-based order, although somehow there is an international order which reflects the interests of developing countries, we need more changes before explaining the legitimacy of international order before most of the world's people. Such legitimacy depends on more absorption of non-western elements into international law and encourage radical redistribution of the world's wealth. Therefore, although influence areas of superpowers have helped to the order up to now, they were unjust because they failed to meet claims related to the right of people of developing countries to determine their own fates.

Table 5.
Particulars of Justice-based order

Reasons of Disorder and war	Structure of International System	Actors of International System	Process of International System	Nature of International System
under-development, poverty and unjust relations	Global Capitalism System-based structure	ultra-national companies and global capitalism stratum and the States representing them	International unjust relations between rich and poor, or between center, semi-margin and margin	maximal profiteering

Source: (Rezaei, 2009, p.141)

Conclusion

Explanation of different theories of international relations related to the problem of order leads us to the point that the order depends on the States more than non-governmental actors and people. However, it doesn't deny the position of non-governmental actors in the problem of order in the international system. In consideration of different theories of international relations, it is clear that there are criticisms against any one of these theories. Realists believe that in the balance-based order, the government States are similar units, but this understanding is based on the perception of international structure in which relative capabilities are the only variables; this intuition is misleading. We may observe different spectra of the States in the current international order. Advanced liberal States like West Europe, North America and East Asia, post-colonial States in the south like most of African States or countries located between these two extremities like Russia, China, India, Brazil, etc. are located in pre-modern, modern and post-modern conditions, so they are not similar units. Liberalists, in the institution-based order, believe that if participant States don't observe internal institutions and rules, their commitment toward international institutions and rules will be provisional and arising from

expenses of violations. Therefore, decreasing the power of these institutions reflects a violation of their rules and regulations and their fainting in the international system. Constitutionalists, in the idea-based order, believe that this order is based on liberal values, democratic partnership, clarity, and responsibility which show a weak application in non-liberal States. The theoreticians of international political economy, in the justice-based order, believe that this order is based on free-market forces and it hardly provides total analysis if the States participating in the order don't establish a free market in their internal economy scope.

Therefore, governing of arrangements among states leads up toward this point that international order may not be constrained by power balance, institutions and affairs arrangement network, global capitalism economical paradigm or more or less conflictive complex of ideas and considerable aspects of all 4 theories should be considered in a comprehensive analysis of international order. However, the question is how we can present a general comprehension of the four theories? It is worthy to mention some notes in this regard: A- Neither the States' system nor human communities, but the international order phenomenon is emphasized by international relations. B- International order isn't a one-dimensional phenomenon, but any type

of governing arrangements among states shouldn't be considered as the international order. This issue depends on the current demand of order in the main quadruple areas. C- International order shouldn't be considered certain because the order is an unstable outcome which may be weakened by appearing offensive powers, but it may be changed to meet the current demands. D- Establishment of a stable order beside leading powers, superpower candidates and advanced liberal States, depends on paying attention to main requests of weak and developing States. E- In the explanation of international order phenomenon, comparison with the interior isn't correct because the governing States may form the international order regardless a superior power (the main character of internal order). Anarchy and its relation with order and the possibility of cooperation between actors in the international order are the most pivotal subjects in the international life and theory of international relations. In my opinion, although anarchy should be the starting point in explanation of an appropriate paradigm of international order, this point should be acknowledged that attachment and loyalty to the human community have branded the State and international relations by its civilization mark. Anarchy doesn't mean a lack of order but it means lack of government and dominant power. Therefore, order might occur in anarchic conditions. Deliberating about the following points may help us to present an appropriate paradigm of order in the post-cold war international system:

The 1st Point:

The first point is that there is a radical problem in this relationship and it is so long as the framework of viewpoints and paradigms different from the order is denied by the international order, there may be a firm basis for

legal coarseness, power, dominance, and finally disorder, whenever viewpoints and paradigms different from the order is accepted, in addition to a deconstruction of this structure, we may hope to replace order in the current international system.

The 2nd point:

The role and position of international institutions in the international system should be emphasized more. Also, all countries should try to follow up on their issues according to the mentioned institutions. For this reason, the UN should try to establish positive peace more than negative peace, i.e. the roots and origins of resorting to force and war should be considered in addition to constraining resorting force and it should try to remove them by the participation of all countries.

The 3rd point:

The mere emphasize on the role and position of superpowers in the international order and the role of material power in the international order, don't give us an appropriate comprehension of order. We should underline the role of ideational forces in the international order like constitutionalists and involve developing countries in the international order like international political economics approaches. However, we should believe in distinct between supply and demand of the order among different countries.

The 4th point:

Finally, the mere emphasis on a special aspect of the international order may not be effective. The international order is based on emphasis on the quadruple areas:

- Establishment of the political-military balance of power
- The efficiency of international institutions in governing global af-

- fairs' arrangement (Governance-orientation)
- Increase of ideas portion in making anti-anarchic culture;
 - The effort of economic forces of the world capitalism toward social welfare and just development of all countries.

References

- Asgarkhani, Abomohammad (2004). *International Regimes*. Tehran: Abrar Moaser Tehran Press.
- Barnett, Michael N. Steve Smith and Raymond Duvall (Eds) (2004). *Power in Global Governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boli, J. and Thomas, G. (Eds) (1999). *Constructing World Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bull, Hedley (2001). "Power Balance and International Order". Alireza Tayeb, *Balance of Power Theory*. Tehran: Salam Newspaper Press.
- Clark, Yan (2007). *Globalization and Theory of International Relations*. Faramarz Taghiloo. Tehran: Political and International Studies Dept. Press.
- Dehghani Firoozabadi, Jalal (1998). "Neo-Liberal Institutionalism Theory and International Cooperation", *Foreign Policy Quarterly*. V.12, No.3. Autumn.
- Deutsch, Karl. Keohane, Robert. Nay, Joseph and et. al (1996). *Theories of the International Relations*. 2 Volumes. Vahid Bozorgi. Tehran: University Jihad Press.
- Dougherty, James and Pfaltzgraff, Robert (1997). *Conflictive Theories in the International Relations*. Alireza Tayeb and Vahid Bozorgi. Tehran: Ghomes Press.
- Ghasemi, Farhad (2005). *International Regimens*. Tehran: Mizan Press.
- Ghavam, Abdolali (2005). *International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Tehran: SAMT Press.
- Harrison, Ewan (2004). *The Post-Cold War International System; Strategies, Institutions and Reflexivity*. London; Rutledge.
- Hatneh, Bjorn (2005). "Transitional International Political Economics". Robert Keohane & et.al. *International Political Economics and Globalization*. Hossein Pourahmadi. Tehran: Ghomes Press.
- Hopf, Ted (2007). "Promise of Constructivism School for International Relations". Andrew Linklater. *Neorealism, criticism theory and Constructivism school*. Alireza Tayeb. Tehran: Political and International Studies Dept. Press.
- Jackson, Robert and Sorenson, George (2004). *An Introduction to the International Relations*. Mahdi Zakerian. Tehran: Mizan Press.
- Keohane, R. (2001). "Governance in a Partially Globalize World". *American Political Science Association*. 95(1).
- Keohane, Robert (1989). *International Institutions and State Power*. Boulder: West view press.
- Little, Richard (2004). "International Regimens". John Baylis and Steve Smith. *Globalization of Politics: International Relations in the Modern Era*. Abolghasem Rahchamani and et.al. Tehran: Abrar Maser Tehran Press.
- Moshirzadeh, Homeyra (2004). "Constitutionalism as Meta-theory of International Relations", *Journal of Faculty of Law and Political Science*. No.65, autumn.

- Pape, Robert. A. (2005). "Soft Balancing against the United States". *International Security*. Vol. 30, No.1. Summer.
- Paul, T.V. (2005). "Soft Balancing in the Age of US Primacy". *International Security*. Vol. 30, No.1. Summer.
- Rengger, N.J. (2007). *International Relations, Political Theory and the problem of Order*". Leila Sazegar. Tehran: Political and International Studies Dept. Press.
- Rezaei, Alireza (2009). "Explanation of Challenges of International System after Collapse of the Bipolar Structure". *Dissertation of Ph.D.* Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch of Tehran.
- Rodrick, Dani (1997). "Globalization, Social Conflict and Economic Growth". *Journal of Economic Growth*. December.
- Vasquez, John A. and Elman, Colin (Eds) (2003). *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Walt, Stephan (2003). "Protection of Global Imbalance: the USA Continenence and Foreign Policy". J. John Ikenberry. *The only superpower; the USA Hegemony in the 21st Century*. Azim Fazlipour. Tehran: Abrar Maser Tehran Press
- Walt, Stephan (2005). *Taming America Power*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Addison Worley.
- Wendt, Alexander (2005). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Homeyra Moshirzadeh. Tehran: Political and International Studies Dept. Press.