

Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

**THE ONTOLOGICAL STATUS AND GNOSEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION  
OF THE CONCEPT OF A NEW WORLD ORDER**

**Nurmuradov Diyorbek Abdurashidovich**

Researcher, Tashkent State University of Economics

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the ontological status and gnoseological interpretation of the concept of the "new world order." The paper examines the concept's emergence, essence, and philosophical-methodological foundations, as well as its place in contemporary international relations theory. The approaches of the schools of realism, liberalism, and constructivism to this concept are comparatively analyzed and evaluated in terms of ontological existence and cognitive possibilities. The article places particular emphasis on the status of the new world order as an objective reality and on the epistemological limits of its scientific understanding.

**Keywords:** new world order, ontology, gnoseology, international relations, realism, liberalism, constructivism, epistemology, geopolitics, multipolarity.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The contemporary international relations system has entered a period of sharp and contradictory transformations. The end of the bipolar world order, the acceleration of globalization, and the emergence of new geopolitical centers introduced the concept of a "new world order" into scholarly discourse and made it a pressing object of research. At the same time, profound philosophical debates around this concept persist: should it be recognized as a real existent phenomenon or regarded merely as the product of political discourse? Can it serve as a legitimate object of scientific inquiry, and what are the limits of our ability to comprehend it?

To address these problems, ontological and gnoseological approaches are necessary because they clarify the concept's status of existence and the possibilities of knowing it. Ontology—as a branch of philosophy that studies the general structure of being—allows analysis of the objective foundations of the new world order. Gnoseology (epistemology), in turn, specifies methods and limits for knowing, understanding, and evaluating that order.

A synthesis of these two approaches enables a more complete and profound scientific analysis of the concept of the new world order. From this perspective, the relevance of the present article stems largely from the need to examine the ontological and gnoseological dimensions of the concept systematically and separately—an area insufficiently treated in contemporary political philosophy.

The aim of the research is to determine the ontological status of the "new world order" concept and to analyze its gnoseological interpretation. Based on this goal, the following tasks were set: to investigate the philosophical-historical roots of the concept; to examine its ontological interpretation within principal theoretical paradigms; to identify gnoseological methods and limits for understanding the new world order; and to



Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

comparatively analyze how Eastern and Western philosophical traditions approach the concept.

**II. PHILOSOPHICAL-HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE CONCEPT** The notion of "world order" has existed in political philosophy since antiquity and can be traced from Plato's ideas about the structure of the polis to the universal order teachings of Xunzi and Confucius. However, the specific scientific concept of a "new" world order was formed within modern international relations theory, particularly during the second half of the twentieth century.

The Westphalian system (1648) established the principle of state sovereignty as the foundation of the international relations system. Subsequently, the Congress of Vienna (1815) and the Versailles system (1919) emerged as institutional forms of international order. Finally, the Yalta–Potsdam system (1945–1991) established the bipolar world order.

In the early 1990s, following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Western politicians—most notably U.S. President George H. W. Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher—brought the idea of a new world order into political circulation. In their interpretation, the concept implied a unipolar world order to be built upon democratic values and liberal economic relations.

From a philosophical standpoint, the concept bears a double meaning: it functions both as an ontological category that reflects the structure of reality and as a methodological instrument of knowledge. Thus, the "new world order" is not a purely political slogan; it deserves treatment as an object of philosophical research.

### **III. ONTOLOGICAL STATUS: LEVEL AND NATURE OF EXISTENCE**

3.1. Ontology and international relations Ontology is a fundamental branch of philosophy that studies the general structure, forms, and principles of existence. In international relations theory, ontological questions take the form: Do non-state entities (international organizations, transnational corporations, civil society) possess independent existence? Are international structures objectively real or merely analytical constructs?

Answers to these questions are necessary for determining the ontological status of the new world order. Three main ontological positions can be considered: realist ontology (primacy of material existence), idealist ontology (independent existence of ideas and structures), and social constructivism (social reality is intersubjectively produced).

3.2. The realist school: ontology of power and structure Classical realism (Thucydides, Machiavelli, Morgenthau) and neorealism (Waltz) regard the state as the primary object and define the international system as anarchic. Within this paradigm, the ontological foundation of a new world order comprises: power relations that are real and objective; states that act rationally to pursue their interests; and an international structure that objectively exists as anarchy without a central authority.

For neorealist K. Waltz, the international system has clear objective bases: it is constituted by the distribution of capabilities. From this perspective, a new world order—whether unipolar, bipolar, or multipolar—reflects the objective condition of power



Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

balance. Thus, in realism, the new world order is treated ontologically as an objectively existing structure.

3.3. The liberal school: ontology of institutions and norms Liberal international relations theory (Kant, Locke, Keynes, Nye) recognizes the independent ontological status of international institutions, norms, and rules. From this perspective, a new world order is characterized not only by power relations but also by a system of international legal norms, organizations, and regulatory frameworks.

Liberal institutionalism (Keohane, Nye) emphasizes that interdependence and institutions shape the nature and structure of international relations. In this view, the ontological foundation of the new world order is less material power than a network of institutions and norms. Organizations such as the UN, WTO, and NATO are not merely political devices; they are real social ontological subjects.

3.4. Constructivist ontology: primacy of ideas and identities Constructivism (Alexander Wendt, Nicholas Onuf) constructs a fundamentally different ontology for international relations. Wendt's famous claim—"anarchy is what states make of it"—posits that the nature of the international system is constituted by the interactions and shared ideas of states themselves.

According to this approach, the new world order is not an objective deterministic structure; it is continuously produced through the discourse, practices, and identifications of states, international organizations, and other actors. Order depends more on ideas, values, and normative systems than on material power. Thus, constructivism views the new world order as a social construction whose ontology is relative and dynamic.

**IV. GNOSEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION: LIMITS AND METHODS OF KNOWING** 4.1. Gnoseology and its significance Gnoseology (epistemology) studies the theory of knowledge and asks: What are the sources of knowledge? What are the criteria of truth? Are there objective limits to knowing? In international relations theory, gnoseological questions generate serious disagreements between theoretical paradigms.

Different epistemological approaches are applied to study the new world order: positivism (empirical observation and verification), post-positivism (interpretation and deconstruction), critical theory (revealing hidden power relations), and poststructuralism (centrality of discourse and language). Each approach produces different types of knowledge about the new world order.

4.2. Positivist gnoseology and its limits Positivist epistemology demands empirical observation, quantitative analysis, and hypothesis testing to study the new world order. This approach analyzes order using measurable indicators such as military capabilities, economic statistics, numbers of treaty commitments, and distributions of political regimes.

However, this gnoseological approach faces significant limitations. First, the changing and complex nature of the international system resists full empirical verification. Second, actors' intentions, cultural factors, and ideational structures are difficult to measure. Third, observers themselves perceive reality through theoretical paradigms and value-laden lenses, which hinders claims to objectivity.



Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

4.3. Post-positivism and critical epistemology Post-positivist gnoseology challenges positivism's claims to objectivity. Critical theorists like R. Cox and Andrew Linklater argue that knowledge production is never neutral: it is always tied to particular interests, social positions, and power relations.

From this perspective, the concept of the "new world order" is itself a political instrument. Narratives promoted by Western states have functioned to legitimize existing power asymmetries and to bolster global hegemony. Thus, gnoseological analysis of this concept must account for its discursive and ideological dimensions.

4.4. The contribution of Eastern philosophical traditions to epistemology Eastern intellectual traditions—especially Islamic philosophy and Confucianism—approach the problem of knowledge in ways that differ from Western epistemologies in several important respects. Thinkers such as Avicenna (Ibn Sina) and Al-Farabi emphasized that knowledge can be attained not only through empirical observation but also through rational deliberation and spiritual insight. Such perspectives can be applied to the study of the modern international system.

The Confucian school considers order and harmony as the basis of social relations. From this angle, understanding a new world order requires not only attention to the balance of power and interests but also frameworks that incorporate mutual respect, moral responsibility, and cultural plurality. In this sense, Eastern epistemologies can enrich understanding of the new world order and free it from monolinear Western interpretations.

**V. CONTEMPORARY ONTOLOGICAL DEPICTION OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER** In the twenty-first century, the ontological structure of the new world order can be characterized by several fundamental features.

First, the growing tendency toward multipolarity. The rise of BRICS countries and powers such as China, India, Russia, and Brazil indicates a move away from a unipolar model. This objective redistribution of power suggests that the ontological structure of the new world order is changing.

Second, the structural impact of technological change. Artificial intelligence, cyberspace, big data, and space technologies are becoming new sources of power that reshape the ontological foundations of the international system. The new order is now determined not only by military and economic might but also by information-technological superiority.

Third, the ontological necessity of shared global challenges. Climate change, pandemics, nuclear proliferation, and transnational terrorism require collective responses. This objective necessity acts as an ontological factor that strengthens cooperation within the new world order.

Fourth, the crisis of normative order. Violations of international law, paralysis of the UN Security Council, and unilateral military actions have delivered serious blows to the liberal international order's narrative. This indicates that the new world order remains in a transitional and as yet not definitively formed state.



Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

**VI. UNDERSTANDING THE NEW WORLD ORDER IN THE CONTEXT OF UZBEKISTAN** The foreign policy philosophy of the Republic of Uzbekistan perceives the new world order through its own ontological and gnoseological prism. The principle of multi-vector diplomacy—maintaining balanced relations with major powers and neighboring countries—reflects a pragmatic understanding of the complex, multipolar character of the new world order.

President Shavkat Mirziyoyev's advocacy of "constructive and practical diplomacy" bears gnoseological significance: it recommends understanding the concept not through purely ideological prisms but through national interests and regional cooperation. Uzbekistan's active role in Central Asian integration shapes the region's ontological order.

At the same time, for Uzbekistan, gnoseological study of the new world order enables harmonizing national development strategies with the global context. The synthesis of national scientific priorities with Islamic and modern political-philosophical traditions constitutes promising directions for an Uzbek school of thought on understanding the new world order.

**VII. CONCLUSION** The ontological status and gnoseological interpretation of the concept of the new world order constitute tightly interwoven philosophical problems. The realist paradigm treats this order as an objective structure of power relations and emphasizes its material foundations; liberalism recognizes the independent ontological status of institutions and norms; constructivism regards order as a reality socially produced through ideas, identifications, and discourse.

From a gnoseological perspective, there are distinct limits to knowing the new world order: the observer's paradigmatic position, the socio-political context of knowledge production, the constraints of empirical measurement, and the complex, multidimensional nature of the system. Acknowledging these limits is a condition of objective scientific inquiry.

In contemporary circumstances, fully understanding the new world order requires synthesizing Western and Eastern epistemologies, integrating material and ideational factors, and harmonizing normative and empirical approaches. Uzbekistan can make a worthy contribution to this process by leveraging its unique geopolitical position, rich philosophical heritage, and pragmatic foreign policy.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the new world order is not merely a political formula but a complex ontological reality that defines the conditions of contemporary human existence and a dynamic set of gnoseological efforts aimed at comprehending it. Therefore, its study must remain a continuous and priority task for scholarship.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Waltz, K. Theory of International Politics. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1979. 251 p.
2. Wendt, A. Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 429 p.



Date: 1<sup>st</sup> April-2026

3. Keohane, R., Nye, J. Power and Interdependence. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977. 273 p.
4. Cox, R. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory // Millennium: Journal of International Studies. 1981. Vol. 10. No. 2. P. 126–155.
5. Morgenthau, H. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: Knopf, 1948. 489 p.
6. Huntington, S. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996. 368 p.
7. Fukuyama, F. The End of History and the Last Man. New York: Free Press, 1992. 418 p.
8. Al-Farabi. The Virtuous City (Fozil odamlar shahri). Tashkent: Abdulla Qodiriy National Heritage Publishing House, 1993. 224 p.
9. Mirziyoyev, S.M. The Strategy of the New Uzbekistan. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2021. 464 p.
10. Karimov, I.A. Uzbekistan Striving into the 21st Century. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1999. 340 p.
11. Nye, J. The Future of Power. New York: PublicAffairs, 2011. 300 p.
12. Onuf, N. World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989. 341 p.
13. Ikenberry, G.J. After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. 293 p.
14. Buzan, B., Wæver, O., De Wilde, J. Security: A New Framework for Analysis. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998. 239 p.
15. Mearsheimer, J. The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018. 328 p.

