Dorota Miłoszewska

Royal Academy of Business and Diplomacy in Wrocław

The New World Order as a political form of globalisation. Educational challenges in the context of global changes

ABSTRACT

The process of globalisation poses global challenges, both new or already existing. There exist global threats of intense power interactions. Each act of creation of World Order is accompanied by predicaments, as there are multiple interests and numerous exclusive aspirations, all of which need to be overcome in order to shape a foundation for a secure Global Order. Thus, teachers' responsibility for the transmission of knowledge about the world after the bipolar rivalry between the Soviet Union and the USA is of utmost importance in school education. Undoubtedly, teachers' expertise is meant to shape pupils' further choices and lifestyles.

Key words: *The New World Order*, globalisation, education; social studies; global changes (threats, megatrends)

The article presents one of the most important conceptions after the Cold War – *The New World Order*. This conception is a part of the subject matter related to the international political relations and modern problems connected with globalisation. The World after the Cold War became sophisticated, full of new challenges and threats. At the beginning of the 1990s, there was

a necessity to renew the definition of the *International World Order* and scratch its structure – so that after the period of rivalry between the two blocks to create one International Order and not to allow the state non-balance. The answer to these demands was an impulsive discussion, which took place in the international arena, and went on on for the whole decade of the 1990s. researchers, representing varied environments (scientists, journalists, and politicians) from different theoretical specializations in charge of international policies took part in the discussion. Their opinions and conceptions were represented in a variety of forms – from monographies to articles in prestigious periodicals, interviews and columns in the press (Kissinger, 1996, pp. 250–262; Malendowski, 2000, p. 589).

The main aim of the article is a deep analysis of the conception of the *New World Order* and also to demonstrate that it is directly related, not only to students' knowledge at the tertiary level studying a course of: International Political Relations, but also to teaching all education-level pupils. The problem with defining the *New International Order* is included the subject of History and Social Studies, as well as in International Political Relations. Addressing the questions of what Order after the Cold War should be established and what problems exist for the International Order after the bipolar period, can certainly constitute an interesting subject within the area of international affairs and for everyone who wishes to widen their learning horizons about the most important global matters. This is why pupils' (students') knowledge should be developed by teachers at each educational level. Thus, teacher's responsibility for the transmission of knowledge about the world after the bipolar rivalry between the Soviet Union and the USA constitutes a significant component in further education. This responsibility, undoubtedly, together with reliable knowledge expertise of the educational personnel, is meant to shape students' further life and professional choices, as well as their attitudes and lifestyles.

THE WORLD AFTER THE *COLD WAR* – A NECESSITY TO DEFINE THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Together with the termination of the bipolar world, there arrived a new set of problems, which for the most part had not been predicted beforehand. Instead of providing peace, it brought about new, more dangerous problems and

uncertain future (Wysota, 2006, pp. 43–44). In the period of the Cold War, the main area of international interest was focused around the rivalry between the two blocks (worlds): The West (mostly represented by the USA) and the East (based on the power of the Soviet Union). This mutual rivalry was in particular determined by nuclear deterrence (Jean, 2003, p. 24; Kennan, 1967, p. 304). The term “deterrence” means that each side of the conflict abstains from the use of military power. Only if one block had used a military power, the other one would have had to take a military action too (Kennan, 2007, p. 14). The Cold War was built on the conception of “deterrence”, which characterised the US policy towards the world of Communism (Ash, 2005, p. 14; Kennan, 2007, pp. 14–15). The US victory, understood as the upper hand of the Western ideas and prevention of Soviet expansive tendencies, had provided building new relations among all the entities in the international arena and creating *the New World Order*, based on stability and safety (Cox, 2008, p. 160). The USA’s victory meant the victory of liberalism and democracy (Lipset, 2008, p. 44). If the main winner was America, which had defeated Communism, so it was sure that *the New World Order* would be built, predominantly, by the United States of America. The American power has a significant influence on the stability of the International Order and as such, it prevents multiple threats (Ferguson, 2004, p. 2; Kristol, Kagan and the Project for the New American Century, 2004, pp. 126–127; Nye, 2013, pp. 3–7).

From ancient history to modernity, honourable and ambitious strategists and later international affairs analysts, established rules and legal norms to build the International Order based on mutual respect and co-operation among all the members of this great international political system (Kuźniar, 2005, pp. 16–17). However, teething problems related to the creation of any new World Order must be taken into consideration. There exist plenty of interests, not necessarily identical and a multitude of exclusive aspirations, all of which need to be overcome in order to shape a basis for the global Order and not to allow the emergence of any additional threats, also in the worst scenario – international chaos among all the participants of the international community (Cooper, 2005, pp. 83–91). It is hard and demanding to combine many aims of all the members of this Order. As a result, one creates constant safety in the world based on transnational structures (Beck, Grande, 2009, pp. 112–113).

THE MEGATRENDS OF THE 20TH AND THE 21ST CENTURIES

The need to establish a *New International Order* consisting of nations or other entities, as well as transnational structures, is connected with global threats following the Cold War. These problems are rooted in the process of Globalisation, not present during the bipolar rivalry. The World after almost 50 years' struggle between The East and The West became devoid of other global changes and clarity, becoming complicated in the wake of new dangerous challenges, not only connected with the US-Soviet competition (Jean, 2003, p. 24). The unprecedented technology development and the process of Globalisation made international affairs more sophisticated than ever before (Frankowski, 2005, p. 541). No one can say whether the processes of Globalisation and Globalism are right or wrong. Globalisation was phased with unusual power interaction, mostly in the fields of: economy, politics, religion, architecture, sociology and science (Pietraś, 2007, pp. 574–576; Zieliński, 2001, p. 151). Globalism, understood as interrelations and some widespread values among all the members of the international community, made Globalization develop more than ever before (Łopuszański, 2012). Collective missions, peaceful coexistence and stability bring all entities (governmental and non-governmental) into understanding of mutual co-operation for more safety in the Global Order (Barnett, 2008, pp. 190–194; Cooper, 2005, pp. 38–50).

The World was erected by global challenges, new or already existing on the globe. These are global threats of intense power interactions, i.e. megatrends of the 20th and the 21st centuries. The name is “megatrends”, because these problems have existed all the time in international affairs. Also, they have constant and universal attributes (Nassbit, 1982). The term “megatrends” was first used by an American international affairs analyst, John Naisbitt in the 1980s. He firstly defined these threats by means of this term and then popularised it on a large scale (Nassbit, 1982, pp. 16–19). These are problems of all the humankind. It is optimistic that in modern times the entire international community pays more attention to solving them or just minimising their adverse consequences, such as:

- 1) destruction of humankind by means of nuclear weapons. It is a peace and war problem;
- 2) protection of the environment and exhaustion of natural reserves. This is an ecological (ecopolitical) problem;
- 3) accelerated exhaustion of energy and oil resources;

- 4) global demographic explosion. This is a demographic impediment;
- 5) combating starvation;
- 6) widening of the gulf between rich and developing countries;
- 7) international terrorism and internal safety threats;
- 8) universality of western values and attempts to bring them to other cultures. This problem can often bring about new threats like: asymmetrical conflicts and predicaments with autocratic nations, which fail to comply with American values;
- 9) shaping *the New International Order* after the Cold War.

Here, we can often see two exclusive concepts of this Order: a civilisation paradigm: “the clash of civilisations” and a liberal paradigm: “the end of history”. The first realistic vision instigated internal and external conflicts between civilizations and within civilisations (Huntington, 2003. For more see: Michałowska, 2005, pp. 174–195; Migalski, 2007, pp. 137–160; Miłoszewska, 2008, pp. 309–318). The second vision is more optimistic and its principle is rooted in the conviction there are so many conflicts and wars in the world that things can only become better. The international community resigns from total wars (like World War I and II) and establishes a liberal Order, more safety and less threat for democracy in a stable world (Fukuyama, 1996. For more see: Huntington, 1991, pp. 24–42; Jean, 2003, pp. 257). International affairs entities affect the functioning of this world, deciding what to choose: military rivalry or peaceful co-existence (Kagan, 2008, pp. 3–19; Mojsiewicz, 2000, p. 228; Nye, 2009, pp. 63–92).

These are the global problems of the modern time, after the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the process of Globalisation they all influence international affairs and exert global impact, working like a “butterfly effect”, i.e. one threat (change) affects all the system (Pietraś, 2007, pp. 573–574). This is why mutual cooperation to stabilise the International Order is so important. All the entities of the international community can only collectively solve and overcome the described difficulties.

NEW WORLD ORDER SCENARIOS AFTER THE COLD WAR

Analysing *the New World Order* in the 21st century, it is important to see its four schemes. This Global Order is based on certain balance relations, conver-

gence of national standpoints, as well as law and international systems of regulations. The following are proposals of visions for the International Order after the Cold War:

HEGEMONIC POWER ORDER

In this vision, the main principle is based on the USA and its exclusive ability to dominate and build the New Order. This world power, with its own attributes of power and success, having won the Cold War, should create the Global Order and at the same time be its guarantor and protector (for more about the unique attributes of the American power see: Miłoszewska, 2010 and all publications by Joseph S. Nye Jr.).

The USA, thanks to its exceptional and alluring power structure is obliged to build a stable World, in which all entities would feel less threatened by hesitations and perturbations in the balance of power. In this aspect, the USA has been chosen to be a “guide” for the rest of the international community. Also, this power assumes extensive responsibility for the other entities. The USA is attempting to shape a type of *Pax Universalis*, whose Order is based on peace and harmony, so that no one from the international community feels omitted, wronged or worse. The main task for the American ally is to support this power in its global aspirations, as thanks to them all the globe will become more stable, devoid of the danger of chaos in the international area (Jean, 2003, p. 287). In this scenario, American business is a global business of each participating entity. The US role is unique and this is why this superpower sometimes appears to come across as arrogant and selfish. This Order is based on American own business and objectives, supported by entities that are eager to cooperate in coalition. At this level, the US Nation, with its positive attitude, assumes a leading role, that is complemented by other nations, i.e. other states.

This vision is not meant to demonstrate clear conscience. This is not supposed to be like only one power has enormous strength, but rather this scenario has one superpower as a “creator” which brings safety and stabilisation. This system is also based on other entities (represented by the majority of states), which are “moderators” in this World Order. These nations are regional and sector rivals for other entities and also, naturally, for the USA and its hegemony. This scheme of building *The New International Order* is not pos-

sible, as it is difficult to create something in separation, without assistance from the international community. A lone power cannot react to extensive threats (such as the earlier aforementioned problems of globalisation) (Cooper, 2005, pp. 37–50; Nye, 2011, p. xvii).

HIERARCHIC POWER ORDER

This scheme is based on multilateral politics, understood as mutual actions and everything that is concerned with free initiative of each nation of this Order. This scenario consists of one dominant power (maybe one or several states) and subordinate nations (which are less powerful in the realm of international politics). A fundamental element of this *New Order* is a general agreement of all its entities to universal values and objectives of this system. This conception is related to global responsibilities of each nation. Each of them in its own way is a guarantor of a stable world. This Order is also based on inequality of its entities. There are richer and more powerful, as well as poorer and less influential states, whose range of interaction is, in most cases, limited. The phenomenon is known in foreign affairs as “dependency theory”: where poor southern nations depend on the rich North (Aleksy, 2005, pp. 589–590). These mutual dependencies (North–South) are decisive in the Global Order structure and as such, they determine the initiative potential of all global entities of this system. The poor south constitutes an influence zone of rich states, a situation which leads to exploitation (interview with I. Wallerstein, 2012, p. 20). This scheme of the *New World Order* is related to the aforementioned conception of “the clash of civilisations”, based on a poly-civilisation, which will predominately select competition over cooperation (Huntington, 2003, pp. 15–21; Kłodkowski, 2005, pp. 19–20). Also, in this hierarchical global system there are conceptions involving many countries, coexisting in a concerto of great powers (*The New Pentarchy*, *Pax Nipponica* or *Pax Consortis*), trying to cooperate and stabilise the Global Order (for more on these scenarios see: Malendowski, 2000, p. 591).

Analysing the Hierarchic Power Order and all that is addressed in this article, it is possible to indicate at one superpower, functioning as the main nation in this system, and other states, whose purpose is to assist the main one. These mutual relations are presented in the figure.

Fig. 1. Multipolar International Order

Source: own study.

The figure depicts one superpower, i.e. the USA and other states, which exert power over their regional borders. At the lowest level of the ladder there are continental powers, which once lost their imperial splendor and partial attributes of power. Examples of such nations are Russia or Japan, which are dominant in their own regions, but do not have as much power as panregional global powers. This hierarchic Order is also based on decisions undertaken in multilateral initiatives and respect for international regulations (Brzeziński, 2012, p. 185).

TRANSNATIONAL STRUCTURE ORDER

This Order is based on the conception of collective security, which is one of visions that secures safety and maintains peace. This conception was dominant after World War I and II and also during the Cold War. The scheme of *the New World Order* is based on common and universal organisation of nations, with a mission to maintain security of all entities of this Order and to prevent wars, guaranting a multi-faceted international contract (Zięba, 2006, p. 77). The first universal organisation of nations after World War I was the League of Nations (for more see: *Słownik pojęć...*). Because of its ineffectiveness and impossibil-

ity to prevent World War II, a new organization came into existence: the United Nations (for more see: Symonides, 2006, pp. 20–41; 64–77), with its primary goal, recorded in its Charter, being international safety and peace-keeping (see: The UN Charter, art. 1, par.1). Thus, the main essence of the UN mission is mutual cooperation within all participating states. All the nations of this organisation are active in formalised mode of operation, discussing and solving the most important cases related to the International Order. In this structure, global security is the highest “good” of all nations. Also, power is connected to all states that are willing to react in unison to the most serious threats to International Order (Zięba, 2006, pp. 77–78).

The UN is rather effective, depending on member states and their will to act. Besides its initiatives and continuous development, in many cases it is unable to introduce peace and cope with global conflicts (Zięba, 2006, pp. 93–94). This transnational organisation appears to be an oligarchic association of victorious states after World War II. It means that each decision depends on this nature of this association, where other nations may feel being omitted (for more see: Młynarski, 2004, pp. 335–337).

Regardless of the future of the United Nations, its contribution to the development of international affairs is significant. Thanks to it, a type universalisation of a new culture of the international life among all entities is instituted. The nations try to obey rules imposed by this organization. The UN still plays a certain role in the processes of stabilisation of the International Order (Makarewicz, 2006, pp. 786–787).

SELF-REGULATORY ORDER

This scenario is based on a denial of *the New World Order* in political affairs, especially after the Cold War. Its supporters maintain that the mutual relations among all entities in the global arena are so complicated and unpredictable that these nations alone create stability and peace. They need not be helped, in particular, by an organization or a hierarchy of nations. There is no point in creating any Order or its guardians, as these Global Order models are only conceptions of wishes and assumptions in the face of global threats. Thus, they are all based on a “loosely tied” consensus. Sometimes, these mutual relations are developed and sometimes they are broken. Peace in in-

ternational affairs depends only on relationships among all states and their integration within it. Only the nations alone decide about the International Order and its stability.

This model of longing for Order is optimistic. Its main assumption is based on harmony among all states on the international stage, especially after the Cold World. For international affairs analysts, this period should pose on threat, as the main winner of the bipolar rivalry was democracy. After the period permeated with mutual skirmishes, democracy was meant to be developed in order to stabilise international affairs. However, the future became much more sophisticated and peace has been difficult to achieve. Even though, the proportion of democratic states, with free market economy, has been increasing, it is hard to claim a victory of the democratic system in the world that is seen as a “Global Village”, as referred to by F. Fukuyama (Fukuyama, 1996; Huntington, 1991, pp. 29–42). This model of building the International Order is at least probable in practice. It is a result of mutual rivalry among all the international entities, deepening mutual differences and devoid of a referee, understood as a “protector” of this *New Order*. Only nations can decide between competition and cooperation, the choice being a delicate matter in practice.

Having thoroughly analysed all the 4 models of the *New World Order*, the hierarchic scenario appears to be the most plausible, being a multilateral Order with the USA as an active supporter. This *New Order*, based on American hegemony and its imperial power and ability to counteract multiple threats for international affairs, has been and will be a valid option.

Fig. 2. The Objectives of the International Order
Source: study based on: Zyblikiewicz 2005, p. 111.

Figure 2 depicts the main aspirations of each nation to protect the World Peace Order for all four scenarios.

According to all of the visions of the International Order, these presented rules should be important and abiding for each international entity.

GLOBAL EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGES POSED BEFORE TEACHERS

Teachers, at each educational level, are like “mentors” who direct students/pupils onto correct paths of further education. From primary school to higher education, pupils choose their academic interests in the wake of the influence of experienced teachers, who are able to transfer their own knowledge to their pupils, so that they are willing to develop the right abilities and select suitable educational paths. Every good teacher’s challenge should be to develop knowledge and pass on it to pupils in a way that widens their interests (Legowicz, 1975, p. 8). They can show pupils further paths and also develop their knowledge in an appropriate manner. Young people, especially at the beginning of their lives, often do not know what school/university to choose. This is why, in the cases, responsible teachers can help develop pupils’ interests and accordingly direct them (*Edukacja historyczna...*, 2009, pp. 7–8). It is difficult to find a “mentor” teacher like this on one’s educational path. Also, it is a complicated case because of the nature of modern times, where there is little time for deeper insights into pupils’ educational paths (Derbis, 1993, pp. 13–20). Parents often have no time (or not enough time) to see everything that is connected with their childrens’ education. Frequently, it is the school that educates young people and decides about their further choices. Teacher’s responsibility (challenge) is twofold. On the one hand, they feel responsible for their pupils’ knowledge and their choices of educational paths. On the other hand, they are also responsible for the children’s parents, who often shed their responsibility and blame teachers for their children’s inaccurate educational choices (Legowicz, 1975, pp. 20–40). In addition, in the fast-changing world and the challenges resulting from the megatrends of the 21st century, teachers assume great responsibility for their pupils’ education (Zacłona, 2007, pp. 7–21). They attempt to respond to these global problems by means of active dialogues with pupils. Sometimes, it is excessively complicated and demands high expert skills (*Edukacja historyczna...*, 2009, pp. 9–10).

Education in humanities begins from primary school. On this level, young people obtain basic knowledge about, e.g. history, which is then widened at the secondary level and in the course of higher education, according to their choice of the course of study. At this level, historical knowledge focuses on the time framework from Antiquity to the Cold War (*Rozporządzenie...*, 2014, pp. 30–35; *Edukacja historyczna...*, 2009, pp. 35–35; 43–46). History teachers often merely describe the bipolar rivalry, preferring deeper scrutiny of World War II and its consequences for the Global Order after this period. As a consequence, pupils have only general information, being able to distinguish the most important historical periods, with some knowledge of their content. They can analyse and interpret this knowledge and solve problems contained in the subject (*Rozporządzenie...*, 2014, pp. 30–35; *Edukacja historyczna...*, 2009, pp. 47; 67). However, in all basic history curricula (primary and secondary), there is less knowledge about modern political affairs and global difficulties after the Cold War. Modern history dilemmas are further developed during such courses as: Political Science, International Affairs or International Security, where the main history curriculum features less knowledge about modern history. Secondary school graduates who want to enrol into universities or choose other directions according to their own interests, should possess basic knowledge about history following the Cold War, which is a part of modern life, because of the problems of Globalisation and the Global Order are important historical phenomena. These issues should be discussed more deeply during history lessons and teachers should be interested in depth analyses of this knowledge (*Rozporządzenie...*, p. 30).

The same situation is with the subject: Social Studies, in whose basic curriculum the main information about global threats to the International Order is missing (*Edukacja historyczna...*, 2009, pp. 81; 93). The curriculum contains only content related the Polish political system and its democratic transformation. Knowledge collected in relation to Poland fails to include a deeper analysis of the Global Order and international affairs. It is important to possess basic information about the nation we live in, but talking about one state as if it was separated from the rest, does not provide a comprehensive insight into reality. Teachers should pay more attention to foreign countries and international affairs, because it is from this global community that global problems are born (lack of communication, conflicts etc.) It is only during their higher education when students find out about these important affairs, whereas some insight into the realm should be provided much earlier.

Thus, proper teacher training influences pupils' education in a meaningful way. The main objective of teacher's work on each level of education is to direct and develop young people's knowledge and skills. Supporting and understanding pupils, especially in modern times, is a big challenge posed before experienced teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

Knowledge about international affairs and politics is meaningful for pupils at each level of education. A distinction among basic terms related to Globalisation with its problems and the International Order scenarios, is significant and should be developed throughout the whole spectrum of educational levels, i.e. from primary to tertiary. At the primary and secondary level, teachers should develop pupils' knowledge during classes of History and Social Studies. At the tertiary level, it should be done during lectures and classes: Politics and International Affairs. Indeed, at the primary and secondary level, young people obtain and develop knowledge that is so useful later. This learning influences pupils' skills and will later be conducive to the creation of their own interests (Klasińska, 2011, pp. 142–150).

In light of the above, the principal objective of the teaching profession will be to interest pupils of all levels in the disciplines of: History and Social Studies, accompanied by:

- 1) widened knowledge from modern history, especially about the bipolar rivalry and the World after the Cold War;
- 2) basic information about the process of Globalisation and the accompanying problems;
- 3) elementary information about international affairs, global threats and global communities;
- 4) primary knowledge about the most important conceptions of the Post-Cold War era;
- 5) explanations of some basic ideas (terms) in the modern 20th–21st century, like globalism, megatrends etc;
- 6) fundamental learning about global politics and the attributes of power. Pupils should be familiar with at least rudimentary information about the policy of each state (powers in the region).

All these objectives, which constitute simultaneous challenges, can improve and widen pupils' knowledge in a significant way. This is why, the role of experienced teachers is to develop pupils' interests, help them choose suitable courses of studies and influence the course of their lives. In the ever-faster changing reality, the main challenge is to react to global changes and to support pupils in choosing optimal educational paths.

REFERENCES:

- ALEKSY, A. (2005), *Teoria systemu światowego Immanuela Wallersteina oraz jej znaczenie dla teorii stosunków międzynarodowych*, in: *Porządek międzynarodowy u progu XXI wieku*, R. Kuźniar (ed.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
- ASH, G.T. (2005), *Wolny świat. Dlaczego kryzys Zachodu jest szansą naszych czasów*, Znak, Kraków.
- BARNETT, M. (2008), *Duties beyond borders*, in: *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Smith S., Hadfield A., Dunne T. (eds.), Oxford University Press, New York.
- BECK, U., GRANDE, E. (2009), *Europa kosmopolityczna. Społeczeństwo i polityka w drugiej nowoczesności*, Scholar, Warszawa.
- BRZEZIŃSKI, Z. (2012), *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*, Basic Books, New York.
- COOPER, R. (2005), *Pękanie granic. Porządek i chaos w XXI wieku*, Media Rodzina, Poznań.
- COX, M. (2008), *Od zimnej wojny do wojny z terroryzmem*, in: *Globalizacja polityki światowej. Wprowadzenie do stosunków międzynarodowych*, J. Baylis, S. Smith, (eds.), Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.
- DERBIS, R. (1993), *Skala do badania poczucia odpowiedzialności*, WSP, Częstochowa.
- EDUKACJA historyczna i obywatelska w szkole podstawowej, gimnazjum i liceum, in: *Podstawa programowa z komentarzami*, Warszawa 2009, vol. 4, <http://www.bc.ore.edu.pl/Content/228/Tom+4+Edukacja+historyczna+i+obywatelska+w+szkole+podstawowej%2C+gimnazjum+i+liceum.pdf> (10.02.2016).
- FERGUSON, N. (2004), *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*, Penguin Books, New York 2004.
- FRANKOWSKI, P. (2005), *Świat pozimnowojenny w świetle teorii chaosu*, in: *Porządek międzynarodowy u progu XXI w.*, R. Kuźniar (ed.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
- FUKUYAMA, F. (1996), *Koniec historii*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań.

- HUNTINGTON, P.S. (1991), *Religion and the Third Wave*, „National Interest”, June.
- HUNTINGTON, P.S. (2003), *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego*, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA, Warszawa.
- JEAN, C. (2003), *Geopolityka*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.
- KAGAN, R. (2008), *The Return of History and the End of Dreams*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- KENNAN, F.G. (1967), *Memoris 1925–1950*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- KISSINGER, H. (1996), *Dyplomacja*, Philip Wilson, Warszawa.
- KLASIŃSKA, B. (2011), *Kształtowanie zainteresowań uczniów wyzwaniem współczesnej i przyszłej edukacji*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Małopolskiej Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomicznej w Tarnowie”, no.1, vol. 18.
- KŁODKOWSKI, P. (2005), *O pęknięciu wewnątrz cywilizacji. Ideologiczny spór między modernistami a fundamentalistami w islamie i hinduizmie w XX i na początku XXI wieku*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG, Warszawa.
- KRISTOL, W., KAGAN, R. AND THE PROJECT FOR THE NEW AMERICAN CENTURY (2004), *Benevolent Global Hegemony*, in: G. Dorriin, *Imperial Designs. Neoconservatism and the New Pax Americana*, Routledge, NewYork–London.
- KUŹNIAR, R. (2005), *Polityka i siła. Studia strategiczne – zarys problematyki*, Scholar, Warszawa.
- LEGOWICZ, J. (1975), *O nauczycielu. Filozofia nauczania i wychowania*. Warszawa 1975.
- LIPSET, M.S. (2008), *Wyjątkowość amerykańska – broń obosieczna*, WAI PWarszawa.
- ŁOPUSZAŃSKI, J. (2012), *Globalizacja i globalizm*, „Nasz Dziennik” 30 IV–1 V 2012, no. 101, <http://www.bibula.com/?p=56151> (03.02.2016).
- MAKAREWICZ, A. (2006), *Bezpieczeństwo człowieka oraz solidarność międzynarodowa: cel i podstawa nowego ładu światowego*, in: *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych. Bilans i perspektywy*, J. Symonides (ed.), Scholar, Warszawa.
- MALENDOWSKI, W. (2000), *Nowy ład międzynarodowy*, in: *Stosunki międzynarodowe*, W. Malendowski, Cz. Mojsiewicz (eds.), atla2, Wrocław.
- MICHAŁOWSKA, G. (2005), *Porządek międzynarodowy w perspektywie paradygmatu cywilizacyjnego*, in: *Porządek międzynarodowy u progu XXI wieku*, R. Kuźniar (ed.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
- MIGALSKI, M. (2007), *Zderzenie z Huntingtonem*, „Studia Polityczne”, no. 19.
- MIŁOSZEWSKA, D. (2010), *Trójpłaszczyznowa szachownica. Segmentacja „Wielkiej Polityki” w rozważaniach Josepha Nye’a*, Instytut Geopolityki, Warszawa.
- MIŁOSZEWSKA, D. (2008), *Zderzenie cywilizacji – mit czy rzeczywistość?*, in: *Świat współczesny. Wyzwania, zagrożenia i współzależności w procesie budowy Nowego Porządku Międzynarodowego*, W. Malendowski (ed.), INPiD UAM, Poznań.

- MŁYNARSKI, A. (2004), *Europa wobec amerykańskiego unilateralizmu*, „Rocznik Politologiczny”, no. 2.
- MOJSIEWICZ, CZ. (2000), *Problemy globalne ludzkości*, in: *Stosunki międzynarodowe*, W. Malendowski, Cz. Mojsiewicz (eds.), atla2, Wrocław.
- NAISSBIT, J. (1982), *Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives*, Warner books, New York.
- NYE, S.J.Jr. (2009), *Konflikty międzynarodowe. Wprowadzenie do teorii i historii*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- NYE, S.J.Jr. (2013), *Presidential Leadership and the Creation of the American Era*, Princeton University Press, Princeton–New Jersey.
- NYE, S.J.Jr. (2011), *The Future of Power*, Public Affairs, New York.
- PIETRAŚ, M. (2007), *Procesy globalizacji*, in: *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, M. Pietraś (ed.), Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin.
- ROZPORZĄDZENIE Ministra Edukacji Narodowej z dnia 30 maja 2014 r. zmieniające rozporządzenie w sprawie podstawy programowej wychowania przedszkolnego oraz kształcenia ogólnego w poszczególnych typach szkół, <http://dokumenty.rcl.gov.pl/D2014000080301.pdf> (20.02.2016).
- SŁOWNIK pojęć i organizacji międzynarodowych, http://www.stosunkimiedzynarodowe.info/haslo,Liga_Narodow (21.02.2016).
- SYMONIDES, J. (2006), *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych: geneza, podstawa, cele i zasady funkcjonowania, struktura, organy główne i pomocnicze, system Narodów Zjednoczonych*, in: *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych. Bilans i perspektywy*, J. Symonides (ed.), Scholar, Warszawa.
- THE UNO CARD, http://www.hfhrpol.waw.pl/pliki/Karta_Narodow_Zjednoczonych.pdf (21.02.2016).
- WYSOTA, B. (2006), *Współczesne konflikty zbrojne*, in: *Spory – konflikty zbrojne – terroryzm. Dysfunkcjonalne czynniki współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*, W. Malendowski (ed.), INPiD UAM, Poznań.
- WYWIAD z I. Wallersteinem (2012), *Koniec świata Ameryki*, „Gazeta Wyborcza” 28–29 VII.
- ZACŁONA, Z. (2007), *Nauczyciel w rzeczywistości globalnej i lokalnej*, *Teacher in the global and local reality*, PWSZ, Nowy Sącz.
- ZIELIŃSKI, A. (2001), *O globalizacji sceptycznie*, „Przegląd Europejski”, no. 2.
- ZIĘBA, R. (2006), *System bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego ONZ – akcje w razie zagrożenia i naruszenia pokoju*, in: *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych. Bilans i perspektywy*, J. Symonides (ed.), Scholar, Warszawa.
- ZYBLIKIEWICZ, W.L. (2005), *Struktura i ewolucja systemu międzynarodowego*, in: E. Cziomer, W.L. Zyblikiewicz, *Zarys współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*, PWN, Warszawa.