

(V) No truly global "world order" has ever existed. What passes for order in our time was devised in Western Europe nearly four centuries ago at a peace conference in the German region of Westphalia, conducted without the involvement or even the awareness of most other continents or civilizations. A century of sectarian conflict and political upheaval across Central Europe had culminated in the Thirty Years' War of 1618-48—a conflagration in which political and religious disputes commingled, combatants resorted to "total war" against population centers, and nearly a quarter of the population of Central Europe died from combat, disease, or starvation. The exhausted participants met to define a set of arrangements that would stanch the bloodletting. Religious unity had fractured with the survival and spread of Protestantism; political diversity was inherent in the number of autonomous political units that had fought to a draw. So it was that in Europe the conditions of the contemporary world were approximated: a multiplicity of political units, none powerful enough to defeat all others, many adhering to contradictory philosophies and internal practices, in search of neutral rules to regulate their conduct and mitigate conflict.

The Westphalian peace reflected a practical accommodation to reality, not a unique moral insight. It relied on a system of independent states refraining from interference in each other's domestic affairs and checking each other's ambitions through a general equilibrium of power. No single claim to truth or universal rule had prevailed in Europe's contests. Instead, each state was assigned the attribute of sovereign power over its territory. Each would acknowledge the domestic structures and religious vocations of its fellow states as realities and refrain from challenging their existence. With a balance of power now perceived as natural and desirable, the ambitions of rulers would be set in counterpoise against each other, at least in theory curtailing the scope of conflicts. Division and multiplicity, an accident of Europe's history, became the hallmarks of a new system of international order with its own distinct philosophical outlook. In this sense the European effort to end its conflagration shaped and prefigured the modern sensibility: it reserved judgment on the absolute in favor of the practical and ecumenical; it sought to distill order from multiplicity and restraint.

Questions:

1. Suggest a suitable title for the paragraph.
2. What do you understand from the word "World Order"?
3. How has the existing world order emerged?
4. What were the salient features of the westphalian peace?
5. What is the hallmark of a new system of international order?

It emerged through signing the west phalian war Treaty. It was first to order.



Q1 Suggest a suitable title for the paragraph.  
Ans The title of this paragraph is the "Absence of a true world order".

Q:2 What do you understand from the word "World Order"?

Ans The term world order refers to the World system which is based on some stringent rules and regulations. World order is a order which runs the world. It may be unipolar, multipolar or bipolar. It highlights that who will govern the world. *replace this sentence* *don't be straight forward*

Q:3 How has the existing world order emerged?

Ans The existing world order is not a new one. It dates back to the Thirty years war, which ruined the Europe. In Europe, some countries signed an agreement West Phalian *which* that agreement led the foundation of current world order.

Q:4 What were the salient of the Westphalian peace?

Ans The salient features of the Westphalian peace are: States remain independent and no other state has right to meddle in



domestic issues of other state,  
there is no divine authority and  
states are sovereign where no one  
can threaten the sovereignty of state.  
Therefore, all states have equal rights  
in the world.

Q:5 What is the hallmark of a new  
system of international order?

Ans The hallmark of a new system  
of international order is containment,  
policies and division in ideologies. Throughout  
the history, conflicts have ~~been~~ remained  
continued. States are trying to  
maintain their ~~balance~~ of power by  
threatening one another. Therefore,  
the world order is not different  
from ~~what~~ was in Europe during  
Westphalian agreement.

incorrect  
sentence  
makes  
no sense

ans need improvement  
over all ans are correct but there are some basic grammar and  
sentence mistakes

'need improvement 7/20



## Comprehension 2021

Q:1 Why does the doctrine of power set by neo-imperial America deny space to counseling?

Ans The doctrine of power which <sup>is</sup> set by America is Neo-Imperialism. This doctrine denies space to counseling because, America ~~has~~ <sup>and has a strong military</sup> become a hyper power and militarily strong. On no one country is able to challenge its power. So, it avoids ~~to~~ counseling and shows its power to the world. ✓

Q:2 What is the essence of the moral equivalence, whereas war has no moral justification?

The essence of the moral equivalence is ~~to~~ to respect every ~~people~~ <sup>person</sup> protect their lives and rights. In ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> domain of moral equivalence ~~altruism~~ <sup>remains</sup> high. On the other hand, war has no moral justification because, when war starts, none can escape from ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> destruction of ~~lives~~. War never respects the borders, lives



and life right of people. For that reason, moral equivalence and War both ~~terms~~ are opposite terms.

Q:3. Why do countries occupied and under the tutelage of

Countries occupy other countries, when they feel threat ~~from other countries.~~ Sometime, strong states want to become super powers and, that's why they try to suppress weak nation. The tutelage of hyper powers have no peace because it increases violence, civil war, chaos and deprives people of their rights. The worth mentioning example is war on terror in Afghanistan. Therefore, hyperpower brings war and war brings destructions.

Q:4. Arguably Europe and hyper power US are at cross purposes over the concept of war. Are they? why?

Ans Yes, European countries especially Britain P.M Minister Tony Blair suggested a wise counseling before launching war.



Many other countries condemn USA ~~which~~ which increased the hate among people against France in America, because they tried to justify their war as a pre-emptive war.

Q:5 What Tony Blair's meant by wise counsel ; and did it prevail?

Ans. The wise counsel means a discussion among countries on emerging threat when America launch ~~ed~~ attack on Afghanistan it was a hyperpower and did not want to discuss this matter with other countries. The wise counsel ~~prevails~~ prevails ~~only~~ the UN platform but it depends on states own interests.

similar issues as above  
7/20