

THE RISE OF AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE 21st CENTURY AND THE WORLD ORDER

Sajjad Hussain* & Azhar Ahmad**

Abstract

Globally authoritarianism is on the rise, while it seems growth of the liberal world order has halted and may be reversed. Some of the major countries like the United States, China, Russia and India show a rise in authoritarian practices in the form of assertive foreign policies, increasing nationalist trends interlinked with intolerance for immigrants and minorities, intolerance for freedom of speech and free press, and hostility towards liberal world order and international organizations. The contemporary rise in authoritarianism is influencing the world order, and it can have lasting impacts on the international political order; therefore, it is imperative that the major powers in the world take initiatives that can guarantee mutual coexistence. The norms governing the roles, and responsibilities of international organizations must be revised to play a role in ensuring justice at the international level and do not become mere tools in the hands of stronger states.

Keywords: Authoritarianism, World Order, Liberal Democracy, Fukuyama, Foreign Policy, Cold War

Introduction

Authoritarianism has existed in one way or the other in the world since antiquity. However, the rise of authoritarian states in world politics was evident during the interwar years (between the two World Wars). The rise of Kamal Atatürk in Turkey, Francisco Franco in Spain, António de Oliveira Salazar in Portugal, Benito Mussolini in Italy, Chiang Kai-shek in China, Adolf Hitler in Germany, and Joseph Stalin in the USSR was a clear manifestation of the rise of authoritarian regimes at the global level. Though some of these states later became totalitarian, they definitely showed authoritarian tendencies in the early years of their rise. Even the liberal democracies like the Great Britain, the United States, and France

* PhD Scholar at Bahria University, Islamabad. Email : aasim1982@gmail.com

** Associate Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bahria University, Islamabad. Email : azhar.buic@bahria.edu.pk

had a certain liking for authoritarian models. Winston Churchill, while congratulating Mussolini on his ascendancy to power, had said: "If I had been an Italian, I am sure I should have been wholeheartedly with you from the start to the finish in your triumphant struggle."¹ While a US diplomat in Eastern Europe, George Kennan, after observing the rise of authoritarian regimes in Europe had said, "Benevolent despotism had greater possibilities for good than liberal democracy. US should walk down the road which leads through constitutional change to the authoritarian state."² This rise in authoritarianism, however, could not sustain a peaceful world order, and therefore, World War II erupted that resulted in the death of around 50 to 60 million people.

The period after the World War II relatively favoured the rise of liberal democracies. However, there were countries that maintained their authoritarian setup. The most dominant was the USSR, but there were also countries like Chile and Iran that were not in the Soviet bloc but kept their authoritarian setups.

The second major wave of authoritarianism was observed in the 1960s. It was much lower in intensity as compared to the wave during the interwar years, and it was marked with military coups. The countries that became part of this wave included: Greece, Nigeria, Indonesia, South Korea, and the countries in Latin America. However, this wave could not survive long, as in the 1970s an anti-authoritarian wave overshadowed the world politics. More than 30 authoritarian states in the 1970s and 1980s collapsed, and it was perceived as the triumph of liberal democracy. It was the same time when intellectuals like Huntington talked about 'Democracy's Third Wave' referring to the third wave in the rise of liberal democracy.³

This wave was then followed by the disintegration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1991, which further supported the notion that liberal democracy had triumphed. The disintegration of USSR not only marked the end of the Cold War, it also left a vacuum as far as diversity in political thought is concerned since the international political order was highly overshadowed by the Cold War. Political leaders and analysts strived to fill this vacuum through their own perception of events and realities. For many intellectuals, it was the triumph of liberal democracy and for some, like Fukuyama, it was the *End of History*.⁴ For some time, this proclamation held true as certain states, like the Central

¹ David Motadel, "Waves of Authoritarianism," *History Today*, November 9, 2016, <https://www.historytoday.com/waves-authoritarianism>.

² Ibid.

³ Samuel P. Huntington, "Democracy's Third Wave," *Journal of Democracy* 2, no. 2, (Spring 1991): 12-34.

⁴ Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, no. 16, (Summer 1989): 3-18.

Asian and East European states, after separation from the USSR, started their journey towards a democratic setup, with the support of the US. Nevertheless, not all of these countries were able to form truly democratic setups.

At the international level, though proclaimed otherwise by Fukuyama, the liberal values and the liberal world order started facing serious hindrances. Particularly, after the beginning of the 21st century, the journey towards liberal democracy and a liberal world order slowed down; now some major powers in the world are even back-tracking, showing their inclination towards authoritarian regimes. As Robert Kagan puts it, "Today there are signs all around us that the jungle is growing back. Where once many hoped that all the nations and peoples of the world would converge on a common path of liberal democratic capitalist development, we now see authoritarianism surviving if not thriving."⁵

Even countries like the US and UK that have always stood for liberal values, have stopped support for internationalization of the liberal world order. Salvatore Babones argues that liberalism is in retreat in its traditional bastions - US and UK - more than anywhere else.⁶ The US after the election of President Donald Trump and the UK after Brexit clearly manifested that they do not support liberal democracy in the strict sense of the term, and these countries are currently even favoring policies that can easily be termed as authoritarian.

On the other hand there is China, which has always been authoritarian as far as its political system is concerned. Francis Fukuyama had proclaimed that after the downfall of USSR, free-market economy had married liberal democracy, and the marriage would prevail in international politics.⁷ Nevertheless, the case of China showed the exact opposite. It has adopted free market economy as its economic system and the 'marriage' seems to be working for China, rising as the second largest economy of the world. Russia, India and Turkey are also showing their rise as important players in the international world order. These are the countries that have strong influence in Asia and the Middle East. However, it is vital to note that they also seem inclined towards authoritarianism. Russia under Putin, India under Modi and Turkey under Erdogan have clearly shown the rise of authoritarian traits.

Thus, globally authoritarianism is on the rise, and 'Democracy's Third Wave' has halted and may be reversed. Now that some of the major countries in the world are moving towards authoritarianism, it is bound to have an impact on overall international politics and international

⁵ Robert Kagan, *The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2018), 13.

⁶ Salvatore Babones, *The New Authoritarianism: Trump, Populism, and the Tyranny of Experts* (Cambridge: Policy Press, 2018), 11.

⁷ Ibid.

relations. The international world order is likely to be influenced, and the role of world powers, international organizations, and international systems may as well change. Some instances are already evident – the recent trade war between China and US, the rising tensions in South Asia because of Indian policies towards Muslims, the changing dynamics in the Middle East because of the role of Russia and Turkey, the changing nature of European politics after Brexit and the nature of Russia's relations with the US and Europe. Therefore, it is important to see how the rise of authoritarianism is going to influence the world order and what roles states like US, China, Russia, India, and Turkey are going to play in it.

Meanwhile, the number of states manifesting the retreat of liberal democracy seems to be on the rise. The report 'Freedom in the World 2019' by *Freedom House* revealed that there has been a decline in political rights and civil liberties in states around the world for the last 13 years. In 2018, "a total of 68 countries suffered net declines in political rights and civil liberties, with only 50 registering gains."⁸ At the same time, Democracy Index 2019 shows that 54 countries, with 35.6 per cent of the total world population, have authoritarian regimes; while only 22 countries, with 5.7 per cent of the total world population, have full democracies.⁹ The Index also shows that in 2019, the overall conditions of democracy deteriorated as compared to 2018 and an overall decline in liberal democracy for four consecutive years. Thus, there are clear indications that globally authoritarianism is on the rise.

The current rise in authoritarianism is marked with certain attributes, like the centrality of an authoritarian personality as compared to democratic institutions, the discouragement of pluralism, hatred for immigrants and minorities, intolerance for freedom of speech, isolationist economic policies, indifference towards liberal world order or the growth and responsibilities of international organizations. These attributes are bound to influence the international world order and the international relations. It is, therefore, imperative to understand the nature of global rise in authoritarianism and to see how it may impact the world order. Previously, the rise of authoritarianism during the interwar years resulted in aggressive foreign policies by different states, which ultimately culminated in World War II. Therefore, it is vital to study whether the modern wave of authoritarianism can lead to possible clashes and conflicts at the international level.

This study does not refer to authoritarianism with a negative connotation, but rather tries to understand it as per the practices that are

⁸ Freedom House, "Democracy in Retreat: Freedom in the World 2019," December 12, 2019, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2019>.

⁹ The Economic Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2019," January 21, 2020, <https://www.eiu.com/topic/demo>.

carried out by political actors in a particular setting, in order to have a better understanding of it. Moreover, it also does not see authoritarianism as absence of elections or lack of transparency in the electoral process, rather it discusses the rise of authoritarianism in established democracies like the United States or India, although both these states have regular elections, and there are not many doubts as far as quality of elections in these countries are concerned. However, this study goes beyond the framework mentioned above, as it tries to see how the rise in authoritarianism is bound to influence international relations and the world order and the role of different states therein. On the other hand, it also remains in the same framework as far as understanding authoritarianism 'below or beyond the state' is concerned, particularly in understanding the practices related to international organizations.

This study sees in what ways there has been a rise in authoritarian practices at the international level and how this rise is going to influence the international order. For this purpose, it identifies authoritarian states on the basis of the following attributes: assertive foreign policies, increasing nationalist practices and intolerance for immigrants and minorities, intolerance for freedom of speech and free press, and hostility towards liberal world order and international organizations. The four attributes are defined in this study as below:

1. Assertive foreign policies include policies that are aggressive in nature and strive to assert dominance on other political actors through military or other means.
2. Nationalist practices are the practices that tend to favour a particular national identity so that it can acquire power and dominance over other nations/identities. Intolerance for immigrants and minorities refers to practices that tend to violate the basic human rights (as per the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and as per the national constitutions) of the minorities or immigrants.
3. Intolerance for freedom of speech and free press implies practices that are aimed at restricting the right of political actors to raise their voice freely, and that strive to influence the media, either through favour or force, to benefit a particular political actor.
4. Hostility towards the liberal world order and international organizations includes practices that do not emphasize on the promulgation of liberal democracy along with free-market economy throughout the world, rather these are the practices that favour economic isolationism and may even promote governmental control over economic affairs. Moreover, such practices also undermine the role and the rules of the international organizations, and international treaties or agreements.

Keeping the above definitions in consideration, the study carries out a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of four cases: United States, Russia, China, and India.

The Rise in Authoritarian Practices

An enumeration and identification of authoritarian practices within the four countries in this study are given below. For each state, the observed authoritarian practices that fall under the four attributes determined in our methodology are given, and for each country a summary is also given at the end. The section, therefore, provides an objective discussion of the findings of this study.

United States Assertive Foreign Policies

United States, as the sole super power in the international political order after the Cold War, has pursued an assertive foreign policy. Especially, after the dawn of the 21st century, these policies have become very evident and can be clearly identified. For the last five years, the US military spending has been increasing. In 2019, US military spending was around \$904.3 billion, while in 2020, it is estimated to be \$935.8 billion.¹⁰ These spending are the largest in the world. Moreover, the US has a busy military engagement around the world: it has around 800 military bases in different parts of the world; while, only in Middle East it has stationed around 60,000 to 70,000 troops.¹¹ These numbers show the assertive nature of US foreign policy.

Since the dawn of the 21st century, the US has been involved in two major wars. First, on October 7, 2001, as a repercussion of 9/11 attacks, the US officially launched Operation Enduring Freedom against Afghanistan, as the ruling Taliban in Afghanistan had sheltered Osama Bin Laden, the Al-Qaeda leader that was involved in 9/11 attacks.

Second, the US launched Operation Iraqi Freedom in March 2003, without the consent of United Nations, on the pretext that Iraq possessed Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). According to statistics given by the Watson Institute, over 801,000 people including 335,000 civilians, have died as a result of direct war-related violence and 21 million people have become refugees or been displaced as a result of the War against

¹⁰ Kimberly Amadeo, "US Military Budget, Its Components, Challenges and Growth," *The Balance*, March 3, 2020, <https://www.thebalance.com/u-s-military-budget-components-challenges-growth-3306320>.

¹¹ Rashaan Ayesha, "Where U.S. Troops and Military Assets are Deployed in Middle East," *Axios*, January 8, 2020, <https://www.axios.com/where-us-troops-deployed-middle-east-5e96fdb2-c7ba-4f26-90b4-7bf452f83847.html>.

Terrorism that has cost US \$6.4 trillion.¹² The numbers clearly show how the basic human rights like the rights to life and security of millions of people have been violated by a war that has been inflicted on the people against the norms of the liberal world order.

At the same time, the US approach towards the Middle East (ME) has been assertive as well. The US has been pursuing its security strategy in the ME primarily through its military bases in different countries. The US has adopted an aggressive policy towards Iran as well. In May 2018, it opted out of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) that was signed between Iran and the P5+1 in July 2015. The result of this move has been escalation in assertiveness by both Iran and the US. In one of such instances, a US air strike targeted Qassem Soleimani, Iran's Quds Force chief, and the deputy commander of Iraq's Popular Mobilization Forces (PMF), Mahdi al-Muhandis.¹³

Meanwhile, the US stationed around 500 troops in Syria to fight the Islamic State (ISIS). Though Trump claimed in September 2019 that the US would withdraw troops from Syria, the commander of US Central Command, Gen. Kenneth McKenzie stated in November 2019 that he did not receive any orders of reduction in troops.¹⁴

At the same time, the US has been stepping up military activity in South China Sea. In March and April 2018, the US sent the aircraft carriers USS Carl Vinson and USS Theodore Roosevelt to Vietnam, and South China Sea respectively.¹⁵ From May 2017, the US has been conducting freedom of navigation operations (FONOPs) every two months in South China Sea region.¹⁶ All these initiatives show that the US has been assertive in its foreign policy.

Increasing Nationalist Practices and Intolerance for Minorities and Immigrants

¹² "Estimate of US War on Terror Spending," *Watson Institute*, November 13, 2019, <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/figures/2019/budgetary-costs-post-911-wars-through-fy2020-64-trillion>.

¹³ "Iraqi TV: Iranian Military Commander General Soleimani Killed in Baghdad Strike," *CNBC*, January 2, 2020, <https://www.cnbc.com/2020/01/03/iranian-military-commander-qassim-soleimani-killed-in-baghdad-strike-iraqi-tv.html>.

¹⁴ Lara Seligman, "No 'End Date' for U.S. Troops in Syria," *Foreign Policy*, November 25, 2019, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/11/25/no-end-date-for-u-s-troops-in-syria/>.

¹⁵ "U.S. Says Completes Second Aircraft Carrier Visit to Vietnam," *Reuters*, March 11, 2020, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-vietnam-usa/u-s-says-completes-second-aircraft-carrier-visit-to-vietnam-idUSKBN20Y0F3>.

¹⁶ Ankit Panda, "China Condemns US FONOP near Mischief Reef in the South China Sea," *The Diplomat*, March 25, 2020, <https://thediplomat.com/2018/03/china-condemns-us-fonop-near-mischief-reef-in-the-south-china-sea/>.

Nationalist practices and intolerance for minorities and immigrants is on the rise in the US, particularly after the election of Donald Trump as president. Trump administration, soon after being sworn in, started efforts to get a travel ban approved, especially for the Muslims. A third version of this travel ban was formally imposed on September 2017, which was against Libyan, Iranian, Somalian, Syrian, and Yemeni nationals.

Since 2017, the Trump administration has been pursuing a denaturalization campaign, which may lead to a policy initiative to search for inconsistencies in the applications of naturalized citizens, strip them of their citizenship and even deport them. In June 2018, the US attorney general, Jeff Sessions announced that the migrants in US who were victims of 'private' crimes in their home countries, could not qualify as refugees anymore, which is against the international asylum law, and even liberal values.¹⁷ Jeff Sessions also announced in spring 2018 that the US had a "zero tolerance" policy, threatening that anyone illegally crossing the southern border would be prosecuted.¹⁸

For several countries like Sudan, Honduras, Haiti, and El Salvador, the Trump administration has sought to abolish the Temporary Protected Status (TPS); however, it is being opposed by a court so far and therefore, could not be implemented.¹⁹ If implemented, it would be another US immigration policy against the international law.

Moreover, intolerance for minorities has also come to the forefront through discrimination and violence against African Americans, particularly by certain law enforcement personnel. For example, the killing of George Floyd after a white police officer knelt on his neck drew attention of the people towards persistent targeting of African Americans in the country, and increased their support for Black Lives Matter movement.²⁰ The movement was founded online in 2013 by Alicia Garza, Patrisse Khan-Cullors, and Opal Tometi to protest the death of an unarmed black teenager, Trayvon Martin, by George Zimmerman in February 2012.²¹

Intolerance for Freedom of Speech and Manipulation of Information

¹⁷ Ted Hesson and Josh Gerstein, "Sessions Moves to Block Asylum for Most Victims of Domestic, Gang Violence," *Politico*, June 11, 2019, <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/06/11/jeff-sessions-asylum-standards-domestic-violence-614158>.

¹⁸ Priyanka Bogani, "A Guide to Some Major Trump Administration Immigration Policies," *Frontline*, October 22, 2019, <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/a-guide-to-some-major-trump-administration-immigration-policies/>.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Britannica, "Black Lives Matter," September 3, 2020, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Black-Lives-Matter>.

²¹ Ibid.

There have been policies by the US government that indicate the intolerance for freedom of speech and manipulation of information. During early days of his administration in 2017, President Trump, during a press conference, stopped a CNN reporter from asking a question and called the media outlet 'fake news'.²²

In February 2017, President Trump posted several anti-media tweets such as: "The fake news media is going crazy with their conspiracy theories and blind hatred. @MSNBC & @CNN are unwatchable. @foxandfriends is great!" and "The FAKE NEWS media (failing @nytimes, @NBCNews, @ABC, @CBS, @CNN) is not my enemy, it is the enemy of the American People!"²³

On May 9, 2018, President Trump, in a tweet, threatened to "take away credentials" of the reporters who wrote news that depicted him negatively.²⁴ Meanwhile, in a tweet on March 26, 2020, in addition to calling news outlets fake news, he termed the journalists "corrupt" because of their criticism on Trump's response to COVID-19 cases in the United States.²⁵

Hostility towards Liberal World Order and International Organizations

The US has been showing signs of hostility towards the liberal world order and international organizations. As mentioned above, US discredited a United Nations' resolution and attacked Iraq. The United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, said that the US-led war on Iraq was not supported by the UN and, therefore it was illegal as per the UN charter.²⁶ This US move made it clear to the international community that the super power could disregard the United Nations as and when suitable and pursue its own decisions without the consent of the international body. Later, the claim by US intelligence that Saddam Hussein had reconstituted his nuclear weapons programme, he had biological weapons and mobile biological weapon production facilities, that he had stockpiled and was producing chemical weapons etc., proved incorrect.

In 2019, the US began a formal process to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, an international agreement that ensured that all

²² Emily Bell, "At White House Press Conferences, No Questions Allowed," *The Atlantic*, January 13, 2019, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/01/donald-trump-continues-to-call-the-media-fake-news/579670/>.

²³ *Trump Twitter Archive*, March 23, 2020, <http://www.trumptwitterarchive.com/archive>.

²⁴ Trump Twitter Archive.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ "Iraq War Illegal, Says Anan," *BBC*, September 8, 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3661134.stm.

countries would take initiatives to control climate change.²⁷ US' withdrawal from the agreement weakened the agreement and negatively influenced the international commitment to control climate change. This move by the US showed further hostility towards the liberal world order, which regarded climate change as a real issue.

In June 2018, the US announced its withdrawal from the UN Human Rights Council after it accused the body of bias against US ally Israel, and failure to hold human rights abusers accountable.²⁸ In the same way, the US's withdrawal from JCPOA, mentioned above, also disregarded an important multilateral agreement and the liberal commitment to resolve conflicts through peaceful means. It also disregarded the international organizations like United Nations and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as the agreement was endorsed by them.

Trump reiterated his familiar theme in the UN General Assembly 2019 as, "The future does not belong to the globalists. The future belongs to the patriots."²⁹ The recent decision by the Trump administration to withhold funds from WHO in the midst of corona crisis is another example of the country's total disrespect for international organizations and the existing world order.

The rise of authoritarian practices in the US is unprecedented. Its foreign policy seems to be getting aggressive, as its military expenditure shows a rising trend. Its military presence throughout the world in the form of military bases also seems consistent. Moreover, the nature of its presence in the Middle East and South China Sea is aggressive and militaristic. As far as the discrimination against minorities and the rise of nationalist sentiments are concerned, a considerable rise has been observed in such practices, especially after the election of President Trump. There have been legislations and policy initiatives that have discouraged minorities, particularly Muslims, to enter the US or have citizenship rights. The environment for the minorities has further deteriorated particularly after the violence and unjust killing of African Americans by the police in the country. Surprisingly, freedom of speech in the US is under threat as the US President Trump himself has launched a campaign of calling reportage by certain media outlets as fake news and trying to control them by alleging that they are against the people and the

²⁷ Michael D. Shear, "Trump Will Withdraw U.S. From Paris Climate Agreement," *The New York Times*, June 1, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/01/climate/trump-paris-climate-agreement.html>.

²⁸ Laura Koran, "US leaving UN Human Rights Council -- 'A Cesspool of Political Bias,'" *CNN*, June 20, 2018, <https://edition.cnn.com/2018/06/19/politics/haley-pompeo-human-rights-bias/index.html>.

²⁹ The White House, "Remarks by President Trump to the 74th Session of the United Nations General Assembly," Accessed April 22, 2020, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-74th-session-united-nations-general-assembly/>.

country. Meanwhile, the liberal world order that the US used to lead is being orphaned as the US is withdrawing from international obligations and agreements.

Russia's Growing Assertiveness

Russia is considered as one of the top countries among authoritarian regimes. Freedom House categorizes it as 'Not Free' with an overall score of 20³⁰, while Democracy Index 2019 ranks it as 134th country with an overall score of only 3.11.³¹ Its foreign policy initiatives are mostly considered assertive, and under President Vladimir Putin, these policies seem to have intensified in assertiveness. In 2018, Russia's defense spending was around 4 percent of its GDP.³²

In August 2007, Russia sent out an expedition in the Arctic, which was to expand territorial claims in the North Pole.³³ In January 2008, Russia carried out once more Soviet-era Atlantic navy exercises in neutral waters of the Biscay Bay, displaying resurgent military might.³⁴ While in August of the same year, there was an escalation between Georgia and Russia as Russia supported separatist forces in South Ossetia; Georgian forces were driven back from the region by Russia.³⁵

Russia started interference in the Middle East in September 2015, and carried out the first air strike in Syria against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in the same month. Today, Russia is an ally of Iran in the ME and has been pursuing an aggressive foreign policy in the region.

Russian involvement in Central Asia has been security dominated as well. It has military bases in the region and strives to pursue cooperation and dominance through agreements that are militaristic in nature, like the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). In 2019, in its military base in Tajikistan, Russia deployed anti-aircraft missile system

³⁰ Freedom House, "Countries and Territories," Accessed February 4, 2020, <https://freedomhouse.org/countries/freedom-world/scores>.

³¹ The Economic Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2019."

³² The World Bank, "Military Expenditure (% of GDP)," *Data*, Accessed February 1, 2020. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS?most_recent_year_desc=false.

³³ Tom Parfitt, "Russia Plants Flag on North Pole Seabed," *The Guardian*, August 2, 2007, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/aug/02/russia.arctic>.

³⁴ Guy Faulconbridge, "Russia Bombers to Test-fire Missiles in Atlantic," *Reuters*, January 22, 2008, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-spain-flights/russia-bombers-to-test-fire-missiles-in-atlantic-idUSL2235954320080122>.

³⁵ Michael Schwirtz, Anne Barnard, and C.J. Chivers, "Russia and Georgia Clash Over Separatist Region," *The New York Times*, August 8, 2008, <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/09/world/europe/09georgia.html>.

(S-300), and in Kyrgyzstan it deployed unmanned aerial vehicles.³⁶ The moves clearly show Russian assertive foreign policy towards Afghanistan where US forces are stationed and towards China that borders Tajikistan.

Increasing Nationalist Practices and Intolerance for Minorities and Immigrants

Russian intolerance towards the Chechens has always been evident. In March 2005, Aslan Maskhadov, the leader of the Chechen separatist movement, was killed in a Russian attack.³⁷ Meanwhile, since his second term in office, President Vladimir Putin has been propagating a new nationalist narrative, wherein he calls Russia a “state civilization” with “distinct cultural identity, not only a sovereign power”, which shares a common religion and ethnicity.³⁸

From February to May 2014, Russian forces, with the support of pro-Moscow president Viktor Yanukovich, took over Crimea, which later, through a referendum, decided to join Russia. Putin, after the annexation of Crimea, justified it as an act to strengthen Russian state; it was also significant to note that he referred to Russian people as an ethnic entity – “*rusскиinarod*”.³⁹

Intolerance for Freedom of Speech and Manipulation of Information

Russia under Putin has been intolerant to freedom of speech and has taken strict steps to manipulate information. Gazprom, the Russian state-owned gas company, in 2000, took control of NTV, which was the key asset of Gusinsky who had failed to repay a Gazprom loan, because he had been asked to repay it before its due time.⁴⁰ Later in the same year, another investor Boris Berezovsky was forced to give up the control of Russian Public Television (ORT).⁴¹ Before the 2008 election, REN TV practiced independent editorial policy; however, it was taken over by

³⁶ Warsaw Institute, “Russia Strengthens Its Military Bases in Central Asia,” February 14, 2020, <https://warsawinstitute.org/russia-strengthens-military-bases-central-asia/>.

³⁷ Nick Paton Walsh, “Chechen Rebel Leader Killed in Russian Assault,” *The Guardian*, March 9, 2005, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/mar/09/chechnya.russia1>.

³⁸ Aron Friedberg, *The Authoritarian Challenge: China, Russia and the Threat to the Liberal International Order*, (The Sasakawa Peace Foundation, 2017), 28.

³⁹ Pål Kolstø and Helge Blakkisrud, *The New Russian Nationalism: Imperialism, Ethnicity and Authoritarianism 2000–15* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2016), 18.

⁴⁰ Sophie Lambroschini, “Russia: Journalists Defend Joining Berezovsky’s ORT Trust,” *Radio Free Europe*, September 9, 2000, <https://www.rferl.org/a/1094745.html>.

⁴¹ Sophie Lambroschini, “Russia: Prosecutors Charge Media-MOST Magnate Gusinsky.”

National Media Group (NMG), a pro-Putin company, which resulted in a change of policy favourable to Putin and his party.⁴²

Russian Television (RT) is believed to be largely sponsored by the government and is used to promulgate Russian 'propaganda' internationally. RT's statistics show that it reaches more than 600 million viewers, and it is among YouTube's most popular news channels, with a budget of more than US\$ 300 million.⁴³

Hostility towards Liberal World Order and International Organizations

Russia has not been partial to the liberal world order and has sought to cause division among European nations. It has been exerting influence in the Baltic states of Estonia and Latvia by leveraging the Russian-speaking minorities in these countries; it also seems ready to use military force in these states following the episode in Ukraine.⁴⁴ Moreover, Russia has been striving to counter the EU and NATO initiatives in Southeastern Europe, particularly in Romania and Moldova.⁴⁵ Such initiatives clearly show Russian hostility towards the EU and NATO.

In November 2009, President Putin suspended Russia's participation in Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) treaty which limited the deployment of heavy military equipment in Europe.⁴⁶ In August 2016, Russia banned international organizations like Media Development Investment Fund (MDIF) and International Republican Institute (IRI) from functioning in Russia.⁴⁷

Russia is an authoritarian state, with an assertive foreign policy. It spends a considerable part of its budget on military expenditures. It strives to regain the military might it used to have during the Soviet era. Particularly, under Putin, Russia has kept on asserting itself in Central Asian countries, Eastern Europe and the Middle East. In Central Asia, it has

⁴² Jill Dougherty, "How the Media Became One of Putin's Most Powerful Weapons," *The Atlantic*, April 21, 2015, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive>.

⁴³ Larry Diamond, March F. Plattner and Christopher Walker, *Authoritarianism Goes Global: The Challenge to Democracy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 179.

⁴⁴ Raphael S. Cohen and Andrew Radin, *Russia's Hostile Measures in Europe: Understanding the Threat* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019) https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1793.html.

⁴⁵ Raphael S. Cohen and Andrew Radin, *Russia's Hostile Measures in Europe: Understanding the Threat*.

⁴⁶ "Putin Signs Law Suspending CFE Treaty," *Radio Free Europe*, November 30, 2007. <https://www.rferl.org/a/1079211.html>.

⁴⁷ Anastasia Ovsyannikova, "Russia Bans More International Organizations," *Human Rights Watch*, August 22, 2016, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/08/22/russia-bans-more-international-organizations>.

established military bases and seems ready to thwart any sort of dominance from the US and China. While in the Middle East it has sent troops as well to support the fight against the forces supported by the US.

China's Assertive Foreign Policy

Since the dawn of the 21st century, China's assertive policies have become evident. Chinese president Hu Jintao, in 2003, brought under discussion the "Malacca Dilemma" suggesting that it was imperative for China to acquire blue-water capabilities. In 2009, Chinese Communist Party's Politburo Standing Committee approved working on Varyag, a former Soviet aircraft carrier, for operationalization and induction in the PLA Navy.⁴⁸

In June 2001, China undertook a simulation exercise of an invasion of Taiwan as a response to Taiwanese forces' test of capability to defend the island against a Chinese missile attack.⁴⁹ Moreover, in 2007, China cautioned US energy companies to abolish joint cooperation with Vietnam, particularly the ones in South China Sea (SCS).⁵⁰ In May 2009, China submitted its 'nine-dash line' map to the United Nations Commission, regarding the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS); ultimately, China increased Chinese paramilitary personnel' numbers and patrols in the SCS.⁵¹ It also increased the number of Chinese military exercises in the sea.

In May 2014, tensions between China and Vietnam escalated after the collision of their ships in South China Sea.⁵² Additionally, in October 2015, China confronted the US after its naval ship sailed near the artificial reefs that were being built by China in disputed Spratly Islands in the SCS.⁵³

Increasing Nationalist Practices and Intolerance for Minorities and Immigrants

⁴⁸ Rush Doshi, "Hu's to Blame for China's Foreign Assertiveness?" *Brookings*, January 22, 2019, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/hu-to-blame-for-chinas-foreign-assertiveness/>.

⁴⁹ David Shambaugh, *Modernizing Chinese Military: Progress, Problems, and Prospects* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 102-103.

⁵⁰ Kalus Heinrich Raditio, *Understanding China's Behaviour in the South China Sea: A Defensive Realist Perspective* (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 4.

⁵¹ Kalus Heinrich Raditio, *Understanding China's Behaviour in the South China Sea: a Defensive Realist Perspective*.

⁵² Li Zoe, "China, Vietnam, Philippines Collide Amid Escalating South China Sea Tensions," *CNN*, May 9, 2014, <https://edition.cnn.com/2014/05/08/world/asia/south-china-sea-drilling/index.html>.

⁵³ Gordon Lubold, Adam Entous, and Jeremy Page, "U.S. Navy Tests China over Sea Claims," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 27, 2015, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-says-it-warned-u-s-warship-in-south-china-sea-1445928223>.

In mid-2003, a controversial anti-subversion bill was passed in Hong Kong, which was opposed by approximately 500,000 people who marched on the streets of Hong Kong⁵⁴ – the protests made the Chinese government shelve the bill. Meanwhile, in March 2005, a new law was passed on Taiwan that called for non-peaceful means against any Taipei intention to declare independence from mainland China.⁵⁵

Western media has also accused China of addressing the Uighur issue with force. According to BBC, in 2011, seven Uighurs were killed by Chinese police after they were suspected of being behind the Horan and Kashgar attacks.⁵⁶ While on September 23, 2014, IlhamTohti, the Uighur rights activist, was jailed for life in Xinjiang region.⁵⁷ He had criticized the Chinese government for not providing complete autonomous status to Uighurs.

On October 18, 2017, during the 19th CPC's National Congress, Chinese president Xi Jinping said in his speech, "The Chinese nation has stood up, grown rich, and is becoming strong... with the historic mission to realize the Chinese Dream of national rejuvenation."⁵⁸ The speech highlighted Xi's intention of revitalizing Chinese nationalism and providing the narrative for its future ambitions.

Intolerance for Freedom of Speech and Manipulation of Information

There have been practices supported by Chinese authorities that depict intolerance for freedom of speech and show manipulation of information. Google, in March 2010, as a response to the alleged cyber-attacks on the email accounts of Chinese human rights activists, ended its compliance with Chinese internet censorship and redirected searches through Hong Kong.⁵⁹ The Chinese government passed a new cyber security law in 2017 that gave it more control over the data processed by foreign and domestic firms.⁶⁰ Moreover, in December 2015, it passed a

⁵⁴ "Huge Protests Fill HK Streets," *CNN*, July 2, 2003, <https://edition.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/asiapcf/east/07/01/hk.protest/>

⁵⁵ "What Behind the China-Taiwan Divide?" *BBC*, January 2, 2019, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world->

⁵⁶ "China Profile – Timeline," *BBC*, July 29, 2019, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-13017882>.

⁵⁷ "Why is There Tension Between China and the Uighurs?" *BBC*, September 26, 2014, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-26414014>.

⁵⁸ "Full text of Xi Jinping's report at 19th CPC National Congress," *China Daily*, November 4, 2017, https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/19thcpcongress/2017-11/04/content_34115212.htm.

⁵⁹ "China Condemns Decision by Google to Lift Censorship," *BBC*, March 23, 2010, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8582233.stm>.

⁶⁰ Jack Wagner, "China's Cybersecurity Law: What You Need to Know," *The Diplomat*, June 1, 2017, <https://thediplomat.com/2017/06/chinas-cybersecurity-law-what-you-need-to-know/>.

counter-terrorism law, which required the firms dealing in technology to provide assistance in the decryption of information.⁶¹ In a February 19, 2016 speech, Xi directed state media outlets to “speak for the Party’s will and its propositions and protect the Party’s authority and unity.”⁶²

Hostility towards Liberal World Order and International Organizations

It may be a surprise for some but China is actually the one championing the cause that used to be espoused by the liberal world order. China seems to be filling the space that is being left by the United States. It has increased aid to other countries; it has made commitment to safeguard the status and authority of the UN, and to firmly follow climate change initiatives; and it also pursues the intention of global development and financial stability through its Belt and Road Initiative.⁶³ Moreover, the key multilateral institutions that China supports include Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), New Development Bank (NDB), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralisation Agreement (CMIM), and Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP).⁶⁴

The findings about China show that it has been increasing its assertiveness in foreign policy with its rise in the economic sphere. Particularly, it has been trying to exert itself within the South China Sea, particularly to counter the rising threats posed by the US. As far as increasing nationalist practices are concerned, China seems motivated to promote Chinese traditions and culture; however, it has shown certain intolerance towards minorities, especially towards Uighurs. In the domain of freedom of expression, China seems reluctant to follow the liberal tradition. It has strong control over its media, and the freedom of expression as promulgated by the liberal world order does not exist in China. China, however, seems to be following the liberal tradition of bringing the world together, albeit in its own ways - by creating and supporting multilateral and international initiatives in its own capacity.

⁶¹ Ben Blanchard, “China Passes Controversial Counter-terrorism Law,” *Reuters*, December 28, 2015, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-security/china-passes>.

⁶² Edward Wong, “Xi Jinping’s News Alert: Chinese Media Must Serve the Party,” *The New York Times*, February 23, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/23/world/asia/china-media-policy-xi-jinping.html>.

⁶³ Matthew D. Stephen and David Skidmore, “The AIIB in the Liberal International Order,” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 12, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 61–91. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/poy021>.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

India's Assertiveness in Foreign Policy

Under Prime Minister Narendra Modi, India seems to be following a more assertive foreign policy. Since 2010, Indian defence spending is on the rise. India's defence expenditure rose from US\$ 66,578 million in 2018 from US\$ 64,559 million in 2017.⁶⁵ On February 1st 2020, Indian finance minister presented a defence budget of US\$ 66.9 billion for the year 2020-21 showing a growth of 9.4 per cent.⁶⁶ This is at a time when India's economy is showing a downward trend. India (at par with Saudi Arabia) currently ranks third after the US and China with respect to Defence spending.

India's assertive foreign policy has mostly been targeted at Pakistan. In February 2019, India claimed to have carried out a 'surgical strike' in Pakistan against alleged militant hideouts in Pakistan. The claim was denied by Pakistan and also not substantiated by independent security analysts. India has also repeatedly violated the Line of Control (LoC) between the two countries killing innocent civilians across the border. Such moves by India are largely termed by the international community as highly aggressive, which could lead to a full-fledged war. However, India has continued its assertive foreign policy towards Pakistan.

Increasing Nationalist Practices and Intolerance for Minorities and Immigrants

The nationalistic practices and intolerance for minorities is on the rise in India. Since the rise of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a variety of nationalistic practices have become prevalent in India that seem to be inspired by Hindutva, which is a Hindu nationalist political ideology propagating that India belongs to Hindus only. BJP's parent organization – the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sang (RSS) – has been known as the staunchest supporter of this ideology and has even turned to violence to pursue it.

Indian Prime Minister Modi was an RSS activist in his youth. Currently, as the leader of India and the BJP, he has started taking initiatives to further promote Hindutva ideology. As a result of backing of Hindutva ideology by BJP, particularly during its last two terms in government, intolerance and violence against the minorities seem to have multiplied. Lynching of Muslims has seen considerable rise. Human Rights Watch (HRW) revealed that between May 2015 to December 2018, 280 people were injured in attacks that were meant to protect cows, while 44

⁶⁵ Trading Economics, "India Military Expenditure," March 2020, <https://tradingeconomics.com/india/military-expenditure>.

⁶⁶ Laxman Kumar Bahera, "India's Defence Budget 2020-21," *Manohar Parrikar Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*, February 4, 2020, <https://idsa.in/issuebrief/india-def-budget-2020-21-lkbehera-040220>.

people, including 36 Muslims, were killed.⁶⁷ Most of these lynchings have been carried out in public, and some have been filmed as well, but there has hardly been any action by the BJP government. *Freedom in the World 2020* report recently highlighted: "The Indian government has taken its Hindu nationalist agenda to a new level with a succession of policies that abrogate the rights of different segments of its Muslim population, threatening the democratic future of a country long seen as a potential bulwark of freedom in Asia and the world."⁶⁸

On August 5, 2019, BJP revoked Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, which ended the autonomous status of Jammu and Kashmir without the involvement of the region's political leadership. Thus, the decision was not welcomed in Jammu and Kashmir, certain other parts of the country, and neighbouring Pakistan. In India, the move led to widespread protests. However, the Indian government responded by sending thousands of additional troops to the region, shut down telecommunication and internet services, arrested political leaders and human rights activists, banned journalists from visiting the area, and overall, imposed a crippling curfew.

In December 2019, Indian parliament passed The Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) that allowed Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Christian, Jain and Parsi emigrants from Pakistan, Afghanistan and Bangladesh to apply for citizenship in India only after having to live or work in India for six years. However, Muslims were excluded from the Act which has given rise to country-wide and international protests. The protestors consider it a discrimination against Muslims and an attack on the secular nature of the Indian state. In February 2020, riots erupted in New Delhi after the protests on CAA intensified. The riots targeted Muslims and around 52 people were killed.⁶⁹ Recently, the spread of COVID-19 has also been used as an excuse to further persecute the Muslims.

Intolerance for Freedom of Speech and Manipulation of Information

In order to control growing discontent among the people because of Modi government's exclusionary policies towards minorities, particularly Muslims, there have been efforts to control freedom of speech

⁶⁷ Human Rights Watch, "Violent Cow Protection in India," February 18, 2019, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/02/18/violent-cow-protection-india/vigilante-groups-attack-minorities>.

⁶⁸ Sarah Repucci, "A Leaderless Struggle for Democracy," *Freedom House*, Accessed February 23, 2020, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2020/leaderless-struggle-democracy>.

⁶⁹ Human Rights Watch, "Shoot the Traitors: Discrimination against Muslims Under India's New Citizenship Policy," February 20, 2020, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2020/04/09/shoot-traitors/discrimination-against-muslims-under-indias-new-citizenship-policy>.

and a need to manipulate information by the Indian authorities. The recent global press freedom index showed India declining further by two places to be ranked 142th out of 180 countries.⁷⁰ The index also highlighted that at least six journalists were killed in India in 2018 because of their professional duties. It also alleged that the attacks against journalists increased by the BJP's supporters before and during the general elections of 2019.

Moreover, there has been a systematic and coordinated hate campaign on social media against the journalists or activists, such as Arundhati Roy, who oppose Hindutva ideology. The *Reporters Without Borders* report said: "The campaigns are particularly virulent when the targets are women. The emergence of a #MeToo movement in the media in 2018 has lifted the veil on many cases of harassment and sexual assault to which women reporters have been subjected."⁷¹

After ending the autonomous status of Jammu and Kashmir, the Indian authorities started clamping down on freedom of speech, and strove to control the flow of information. At least three journalists were arrested by the Indian authorities in the valley, including Qazi Shibli - a website editor.⁷² Moreover, there were many cases wherein the journalists were beaten by the police, while the distribution of newspapers could not be made possible because of strict curfew in the region. Thus, there seems to be a coordinated and systematic effort underway in India to undermine freedom of speech and manipulate information for the benefit of the ruling elite.

Hostility towards the Liberal World Order and International Organizations

India embraced the liberal world order lead by the United States; however, it has been reluctant to follow the ethical responsibilities towards certain international organizations. For example, it has not been following the Universal Declaration of the Human Rights as far as its policies in Jammu and Kashmir and towards the Muslims are concerned. These policies have already been discussed above.

Another Indian hostility has been evident towards the regional association: South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). In April 2018, New Delhi announced that it was difficult to proceed with the

⁷⁰ Reporters Without Borders, "India," Accessed February 23, 2020, <https://rsf.org/en/india>.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Freedom House, "Indian Kashmir," Accessed September 4, 2020, <https://freedomhouse.org/country/indian-kashmir/freedom-world/2020>.

SAARC initiative under the circumstances prevalent at the time.⁷³ SAARC has practically been ineffective due to the intransigent attitude of India. India has experienced considerable rise in authoritarian practices, especially under Modi governments. Its foreign policy has turned assertive as it has kept on increasing its spending on military capabilities. Its foreign policy towards Pakistan, in particular, has raised concerns about the stability in the region. At the same time, the Indian state has been pursuing strong Hindu nationalistic ideology – Hindutva – which promotes discrimination against the rights of minorities, especially of the Muslim population. The same ideology seems dominant in India's changed stance on Kashmir that has initiated violence against Kashmiris and suppression of their rights. Modi government has also contracted the space for freedom of speech and basic human rights, with strict measures against journalists and flow of information. As far as the liberal world order and international organizations are concerned, India seems to be undermining the rules of responsible conduct.

Conclusion & Way Forward

The data mentioned above clearly shows that there has been a rise in authoritarian tendencies in international politics. The liberal world order seems to be changing from pursuing democratic norms in combination with free market economy to authoritarian political order with free market economy. All the determinants of the authoritarian practices – assertive foreign policies, increasing nationalistic practices and intolerance for minorities and immigrants, intolerance for freedom of speech and manipulation of information, and hostility towards liberal world order and international organizations – seem to be gaining strength in all the four cases.

However, the study does not imply that all the four cases discussed above show rise in authoritarian practices relevant to all the four determinants, but rather they show such rise in varying degrees in each determinant.

The overall picture, however, shows that there is a rise in authoritarian practices by different political actors at the national and international levels since the dawn of the 21st century and that seems to be influencing the liberal world order.

Where Can Authoritarianism Lead and What Can the World Do?

⁷³ "Not Possible to Go Ahead with SAARC Under Present Circumstance: India," *Economic Times*, April 7, 2018, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/not-possible-to-go-ahead-with-saarc-under-present-circumstances-india/articleshow/63659156.cms?from=mdr>.

The rise of authoritarian practices at the national and international level point to a changing world order since the beginning of the 21st century; however, it is also vital to see how the changing world order may shape international politics. With the rise of assertive foreign policies and nationalistic tendencies, there can be a rise in the status of nation-states once again in the international political arena. Moreover, such a rise, with the diminishing authorities and roles of international organizations, may point towards increasing conflicts among nations that are being controlled by their subjective perceptions and interests instead of being controlled and regulated by standardized international norms. The world in such a scenario may move towards multi-polarity, and certain differences may turn into armed conflicts.

American and Russian assertive policies in the Middle East have resulted in a complex situation. Recent escalation between the US and Iran can easily turn into another war that can entangle many nations. Moreover, the situation in South China Sea can also give rise to clashes between China and the United States. Indian assertive policies towards Pakistan could easily turn into a full-fledged war, even a nuclear war. This current rise in authoritarianism can lead to multiple clashes at multiple fronts with each one having the potential to turn into a full-fledged war.

For the United States that has been leading the liberal democratic world order, it is a testing time. It must not let the world believe that the liberal democratic values that it has been promulgating over decades were only empty slogans. For that to happen, it must support the international organizations and international agreements instead of parting ways with them. Though it may be facing the challenge of a multi-polar world order, with the rise of states like China, Russia, Brazil, Turkey and India, it must not fall in the trap of negative competition and deny them their due share of dominance. Striving to counter others through assertive foreign policies and nationalistic fervour can only lead to war and disorder, not a smooth transition to a better world order. Thus, the US has the option to keep on playing a dominant role within the new world order or undermine it altogether and play the role of a solitary power.

China, on the other hand, seems determined to excel with its authoritarian political system and capitalist economic structure. Its rise has made it believe that it can substitute the US in the new world order determined by its own terms and conditions. However, it is essential that China must not fall in the quagmire of overconfidence that every rising power has to face through its evolution. It needs to make sure to keep on cooperating with others in the economic sphere to the best of its ability, and must not fall in the reckless competition of military adventurism that can only bring violence and conflict to the world. Though it has to face competition with the countries like the US and Russia that have strong military power, it does not have to follow the same route as history

showed that military competition between the US and Soviet Union ultimately resulted in disintegration of one of them.

In the changing world order, though Russia has been doing well in cooperation with China, it must never get overambitious regarding its role and position. Cooperation with China may work for it, but if it decides to get into competition with China, it may face myriad problems. Moreover, it must also keep its objective conditions under consideration in its balance of power struggle with the US. Strict authoritarian practices without economic achievements cannot ensure a strong position in the international political scenario, neither can it guarantee internal stability.

For India, it is too early to practice authoritarianism. Instead of indulging in a balance of power struggle with China through assertive foreign policies, backed by a mere assurance of support by the US, it must strive to pursue cooperation and ensure its own economic stability. Authoritarian practices at home against the Muslims in particular cannot help India in achieving a strong position among the states of the world, rather it would fan the divide among people at home and the neighbouring Muslim countries may take advantage of the same to further invigorate instability.

Thus, for the countries studied here in particular and for the world in general, it is vital to scrutinize their policies regarding international undertakings. The rise in authoritarian practices may benefit the states for their internal matters, but they may generate clashes and disputes at the international level; therefore, it is imperative that the states gauge their practices in the light of the international political order as well, and take initiatives that can ensure mutual coexistence and cooperation.

So, the states of the world need to keep such practices in check and take initiatives to safeguard and even amend the norms governing the roles, responsibilities and authorities of international organizations, so that they are able to play an independent and significant role in ensuring justice at the international level. It is vital that they have the authority to implement their decisions and make states and international actors pursue them. On the other hand, it is also essential that international organizations do not become tools in the hands of the more powerful states.

