

A Layered Analysis of Change in the Current International Order

Jafar Naghdi¹

Receipt Date: 2024/04/14

Date of Acceptance: 2024/09/30

Abstract

This research seeks to identify change within the current international order. To this end, the framework of "Causal Layered Analysis" (CLA) was employed, which, based on the type of change, is categorized into four layers: the litany, systemic, discursive, and mythic. The research method is mixed (qualitative and quantitative). Through library research and the use of an expert panel, the relevant indicators for change in all four layers were identified, and their level of importance within each layer was determined via a questionnaire. A purposively selected statistical population of 25 individuals completed the questionnaire. The results indicate that out of 69 identified indicators, 40 are in the litany layer, 14 in the systemic layer, 7 in the discursive layer, and 8 in the mythic layer. Furthermore, the systemic or structural layer, with an average of 4.863, received the highest mean score from respondents in the Friedman test. The prioritization of indicators also reveals that the indicator "the emergence of influential supra/sub-national actors affecting the structure of the international system" in the litany layer, the indicator "inefficiency of established regional and international institutions in the systematic management of global issues and affairs" in the systemic layer, the indicator "increased emphasis on justice-orientation in the procedures, approaches, discourses, and actions of international relations actors" in the discursive layer, and the indicator "the emergence of a self-aware and resistant human confronting coercion" in the discursive layer are considered the most significant indicators of change in the current international order.

Keywords: Change, International Order, International Structure, Actors, Causal Layered Analysis (CLA).

¹. Assistant Professor of International Relations, National Defense University,
Email: j.n2077@gmail.com

Introduction

Change is a fundamental concept in international relations. The literature of international relations posits three types of change: change as replacement, change as addition, and change as transformation. The change from the bipolar order of the Cold War era to the uni-multipolar order following the collapse of the Soviet Union is of the first type; the change in the nature of global actors, such as new sub/transnational actors alongside the agency of the state, is of the second type; and the change in the functions of actors and concepts, for instance, the role of the monarch¹ in the modern era compared to ancient times, is of the third type. Alongside understanding the type of change, recognizing its indicators can also be useful. There are three types of change indicators in international relations that are highly effective in understanding change: Trends, such as the growth or decline of the global population, global trade, membership in international institutions, the global communications network, the decline of state sovereignty, and the emergence of new actors. Major Events, such as the Congress of Vienna (1815), the Treaty of Versailles (1919), the end of World War II (1945), the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War (1991), and the attack on the Twin Towers (2001).

Major Technological and Social Innovations, such as the development of nuclear weapons, the microelectronics revolution, and artificial intelligence (Holsti, 1998: 2-9).

It is acknowledged by scholars and theorists of international relations that the new global order differs from the old order in all its dimensions and aspects. For instance, one can refer to the ideas and theories of thinkers such as John Ikenberry, Robert Gilpin, and Fareed Zakaria within the realist tradition, and Francis Fukuyama, James Rosenau, and Joseph Nye within the liberal tradition, all of whom share a consensus on the certainty of change occurring in the international order (Chegenizadeh, 2013: 72-78). The emergence of new actors, new issues, new technologies, new concepts, new institutions, new practices, and new discourses all signify the presence of change in the international order (Ravanbod, Kooliaei, and Haghighi, 2022: 337), and this change can be categorized into various layers and dimensions. In fact, without classifying the layers of change,

¹.During the 18th and 19th centuries, the monarch possessed the function of governance and exercised supreme power in the domestic politics of countries. However, today, in nations such as Japan, the Scandinavian region, and the United Kingdom, the monarch has lost this sovereign function and has been transformed into a symbol of national cohesion and identity.

understanding the nature of change in the international order is not feasible. Therefore, this research seeks to answer the following two questions: What are the most significant changes in the current international order across the four layers of litany, systemic, discursive, and mythic? Which changes within each of the four layers—litany, systemic, discursive, and mythic—hold greater importance and priority?

Layered analysis makes it possible to conduct a proper assessment of the future of change in the current international order and the nature of its trajectory. It also demonstrates that it is not merely the appearance of changes, but their depth and underlying essence that enables an understanding of change. Consequently, the research problem involves the simultaneous and comprehensive recognition of the various layers of change currently taking place within the international order.

Theoretical Foundations

A - Definition of Concepts

(1) Change: Change in the international system is understood in two aspects: firstly, as a structural transformation and the trend towards multipolarity of the international order, which is referred to as systemic change; and secondly, as an evolution in the nature of the actors who play a role on the international stage, which is called system change (Gilpin, 1981: 18-22).

(2) Order: Order signifies the arrangements for managing affairs in the interactions among a group of states, encompassing fundamental rules, principles, and institutions. Within this definition, the formation and continuity of orders are not contingent upon the formation and continuity of a normative agreement among member states; rather, they can be based on minimal relations between states, coercion, or a balance of power. Accordingly, three categories of order can be distinguished: balance of power-based, hegemonic, and institutionalized (Ikenberry, 2008: 28).

(3) International Order: A pattern of international activity that preserves the primary objectives of the community of states and is based on the following: establishing a political-military balance of power; the efficacy of international institutions in managing global affairs; increasing the role of ideas in creating an anti-anarchic culture; and the efforts of global capitalist economic forces in fostering prosperity and progress for all countries (Rezaei, 2009: 172-173).

(4) Transitional Order: A period between the existing order and the consolidated future order. This order encompasses a system comprised of new political actors who, through coordinated actions, strive to achieve the desired order (Zolfaghari & Ahmadi-Nejad, 2023: 11).

B - Research Background

(1) Hashemi (2008), in "Long-Term Changes in International Relations," attempts to answer the question of how the cause and nature of change can be explained from the perspectives of different IR approaches, namely realism, pluralism, structuralism, and historical sociology? This article notes that what all approaches agree upon is the principle of the existence of the phenomenon of change and its perpetual nature. However, regarding the cause of change, there are different viewpoints: some consider internal causes effective, some external causes, and others believe a combination of internal and external factors contribute to the occurrence of change.

(2) Holsti (1998), in "The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory," addressed these questions: How has change in international relations been conceptualized by IR theories? Furthermore, which fundamental institutions of international politics have changed, and which have not? In answering the first question, by examining the concept of change in theories such as realism and liberalism, he identified indicators of change across three dimensions—trends, major events, and major technological and social innovations—to better understand change. In answering the second question, while distinguishing between fundamental and procedural institutions, he considered change possible and probable in both. According to Holsti, fundamental institutions include sovereignty, the state, territoriality, and international law. Procedural institutions include diplomacy, trade, war, conflict management, and governance. Changes to varying degrees are observable in both types of institutions.

(3) Gilpin (1981), in "War and Change in World Politics," while referring to the principle of "change and continuity" as the foundational element shaping international relations, argues that the occurrence of major wars creates the conditions for change in international politics. He mentions two kinds of change in the international order: "systemic change," which means the multipolarization of the international order, and "system change," which signifies a transformation in the nature of the actors who engage in action on the international stage.

(4) Zakaria (2008), in the article "The Future of American Power," while pointing to the rise of other powers as the third tectonic shift since the 15th century, argues that the "post-American era" has arrived. The characteristic of this era is not the decline of America, but rather the rise of other actors, a phenomenon most observable in the economic sphere because money and economic capability are not easily convertible into military capability. Zakaria acknowledges that "we have entered a globalized world where America's options have become limited."

In the aforementioned background literature, the perspective on the issue of change in the international order has been holistic, avoiding a layered and classified approach to the subject. However, the present research has endeavored to examine it within the framework of a coherent, multi-layered analysis. It highlights for policymakers that change in the international order is profoundly deep and fundamental, requiring measures and strategies appropriate to each layer. Therefore, this aspect highlights the innovative contribution of the present research.

C. Theoretical Framework

Change in the International Order from the Perspective of Historical Realism

K. J. Holsti is one of the theorists who, with a historical perspective, sought to formulate a theoretical framework for the problem of change in international relations after the end of the Cold War. The reason for selecting this theoretical framework for the present article is the correspondence between his investigations and the layered analysis of change in the current international order, which is used as the analytical method in this article. Indeed, the examination of trends, major events, and technological revolutions evident in Holsti's analysis has significant overlap with the litany, structural, discursive, and metaphorical layers. From Holsti's perspective, change can be examined in three aspects:

(1) Change as Replacement: This type of change refers to fundamental shifts in the context, structure, and important procedures occurring after the end of the Cold War and coinciding with the entry into the era of globalization in the third millennium. According to Fukuyama and Mueller, peace has replaced war. Huntington sees a clash of civilizations replacing inter-state wars. Singer and Kaplan consider the chaos arising from armed conflicts in the Third World as replacing the relative stability of the Cold War period.

(2) Change as Addition: Also referred to as "dialectical change," this suggests that the old and new orders do not replace each other but rather coexist, which increases the "complexity" of issues and concepts. For example, while realist patterns such as the stag hunt, security dilemma, and prisoner's dilemma govern relations between actors like India and Pakistan or the US and North Korea in one part of the world, cooperative patterns such as pluralistic security communities and global civil society are evident in relations between actors like Canada and the US and the European Union in another. These seemingly contradictory patterns coexisting in a single world indicate that the principle of change is acceptable, but this does not mean the new order simply replaces the old; rather, the two exhibit a form of coexistence.

(3) Change as Transformation: This change refers to new patterns that have emerged from old ones. In effect, a replacement occurs within the order where remnants and the logic of the previous order are preserved. In this type of change, the ideas, practices, and norms of the previous order are maintained, but the function of the order changes. An example of this is the monarchical-based order which remains today in Scandinavian countries, Japan, and to some extent in England, but its function has changed from exercising absolute sovereignty to symbolism and national identity (Holsti, 1998: 7-9).

Furthermore, according to Holsti, alongside the aspects of change, one can enumerate the following indicators of change in the international order:

(1) Trends: Indicators of change in the realm of trends include population growth trends, the trend of increasing climate change globally, the trend of increasing membership in the United Nations, the trend of rapid growth in mass communication networks, the trend of increasing volume of international trade, the trend of growing travel worldwide, the trend of rapid capital movement globally, and the trend of high growth in non-governmental organizations.

(2) Major Events: Alongside trends, one can point to the occurrence of major events that signal change and indicate a break in history and a lack of continuity. According to Martin Wight, the Treaty of Versailles was the final victory of revolutionary France's Europe over the Holy Alliance, which is referred to as a major event (Wight, 1978: 85). Ian Clark also cites the start of WWI (1914), the end of WWI (1919), the start of WWII (1939), the end of WWII (1945), and the events leading to the collapse of the Soviet Union (1989-1991) as major events (Clark, 1997: 25).

(3) Major Technological and Social Innovations: It seems that what has accelerated trends and led to the occurrence of major events is the emergence of innovations in the field of technology. After the end of WWII, one can identify two revolutions in technology from which the ensuing international order originated: 1) The "Nuclear Revolution," which led to nearly 50 years of close competition between the two superpowers at the level of nuclear deterrence, and 2) The "Microelectronics Revolution," which led to the emergence of phenomena such as globalization, the global village, the borderless world, and the erosion of state sovereignty (Holsti, 1998: 6-7).

Methodology

The present study, in terms of type, is mixed-method with an exploratory approach. Through the study of library and internet resources and the use of an expert panel, the desired indicators regarding change in the current international order were identified. For the initial identification of indicators, the author, by studying over 60 books and articles in the subject area of the research, extracted the indicators not merely as headlines but using an inferential approach. In the second step, the indicators were placed into the four layers: litany, structural, discursive, and mythic. In the third step, the author presented the initial classification to the experts to solicit their opinions on the matter; thus, the initial classification was reviewed, modified, and ultimately confirmed by the experts. Due to the specialized nature of layered analysis and its application in the research, and to familiarize the experts with this method, a several-page summary of the most important topics of this method and its application was provided to the experts so they could offer their opinions. After the confirmation of the indicators in their respective layers by the experts, the fourth step involved the preparation of a questionnaire by the author based on determining the importance level of each indicator within its respective layer. This was done using a Likert scale framework, and the questionnaire was distributed to the experts for completion. In the fifth and final step, the experts' responses in the questionnaires were aggregated and analyzed using SPSS software, with the software output indicating the most important indicators in each layer.

The experts surveyed in this research included executive officials, faculty members, and specialists in this field. They held Master's or Ph.D. degrees, had a minimum of 10 years of work experience at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the National Defense University, and the University of

Tehran, and a targeted sample of 25 individuals was selected. This group was chosen as the statistical population because they possessed the necessary characteristics due to their service background and sufficient theoretical knowledge. Therefore, the sample size was a complete census and aligned with the intended statistical population. The educational status and service background of the sample population are detailed in the following tables.

Table (1): Educational Status of the Sample Population

Educational Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Doctorate	15	60%
Master's	10	40%
Total	25	100%

Table (2): Professional Experience of the Sample Population

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
30 and above	5	20%
20-30	10	40%
10-20	10	40%
Total	25	100%

In addition to the research method, it is necessary to refer to the research analysis method known as Causal Layered Analysis (CLA), which was introduced by Sohail Inayatullah, a thinker of Pakistani origin. Causal Layered Analysis is a highly desirable method for classifying different perspectives and considerations about the future. CLA, as a method, does not mean predicting the future but rather seeks to create transformative spaces for generating alternative futures (Inayatullah, 2016: 29). Causal Layered Analysis consists of four levels:

(1) The Litany Level: This is the most apparent and visible level, requiring little analytical capability, and its assumptions are rarely questioned. The litany level is the surface appearance of a problem, issue, event, trend, or anything that can be a subject of research in futures studies (Ebrahimi Kushali, Goodarzi, & Nazemi Ardakani, 2022: 35).

(2) The Systemic or Structural Level: Analysis of the causes of existing realities in various political, economic, social, technological, etc., domains is conducted at this level, which is most commonly used in academic

research. The role and function of the state are often analyzed at this level (Fouzi & Mahmoudi Kia, 2020: 130). This level deals with the most immediate and superficial causes of an event or phenomenon.

(3) The Worldview or Discursive Level: A more root-cause and deeper analysis of phenomena in the humanities is conducted at this level. The aim of this level is to uncover the fundamental paradigms and values that create the litany and attempt to legitimize it. The fundamental question at this level is how worldviews and discourses construct social realities at the litany and systemic levels. This level has four parts: The first part concerns stakeholders, meaning the interests of actors, organizations, and institutions. The second part relates to ideology and deep-seated positions about the current state of the world and the state that ought to be, such as neo-Marxism, sustainable development, and liberal democracy. The third part concerns civilizations, presented through Islamic, Western, and Confucian worldviews. The fourth part is epistemic and discusses major paradigm shifts like modernism and postmodernism (Inayatullah, 2016: 30).

(4) The Metaphor or Myth Level: This level involves deep stories, historical myths, and linguistic metaphors. The unconscious and often emotional dimensions of a problem or challenge are analyzed at this level. The language used here is not specific but relates more to visual imagery and written/oral culture. This level is a step back to address the underlying assumptions of the future under discussion. For example, perspectives on the future in different global identities stem from existing proverbs in this context: the Arabic proverb "Trust in God, but tie your camel's knee" compared to the Western view that "The future is like a throw of dice" demonstrates the difference between two identities and cultures. Therefore, it can be said that metaphor and myth, by providing a foundational understanding, reveal deeper civilizational foundations of the future and elevate the understanding of the future beyond the ordinary (Ibid., 2016: 31-32).

By way of analogy, Causal Layered Analysis is like an iceberg. Its peak is the litany level, representing the apparent social, political, economic, etc., reality visible above the water, indicating the agency of the subject. However, the other levels—pertaining to the causes of events (systemic), the attitudes and discourses shaping the fact (worldview), and the imagery and metaphor associated with the reality (myth/metaphor)—lie beneath the water's surface and are not visible. It is the researcher's understanding and insight that helps to illuminate them.

Analysis of Findings

To analyze the data, a descriptive analysis is first presented. Statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, variance, etc., are provided and examined. Subsequently, tests for comparing means are used, including the One-Sample T-test (in parametric statistics) and the Friedman test (in non-parametric statistics). The tests are conducted at a 5% significance level.

Results of Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for each layer are presented in Table Number (3). As observed, the systemic or structural layer, with a mean of 4.863, has the highest average. The highest standard deviation and variance, at 0.383 and 0.147 respectively, belong to the litany or apparent layer, and the highest range of variations also pertains to this same layer. All layers show high averages relative to the level of semantic appropriateness, indicating the high mean scores given by the respondents.

Table (3): Descriptive Statistics by Analytical Layer

Layers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Range	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Litany or Apparent Layer	821/4	383/0	147/0	56/1	44/3	5
Systemic or Structural Layer	863/4	330/0	109/0	29/1	71/3	5
Worldview or Discursive Layer	840/4	381	145	43/1	57/3	5
Metaphor or Mythic Layer	840/4	351/0	123/0	38/1	63/3	5

Results of Descriptive Statistics

Results of the One-Sample T-Test

The one-sample T-test is a statistical method used to evaluate whether the mean of a single sample differs significantly from a known or hypothesized population mean. To perform the one-sample T-test, the t-statistic is calculated by taking the difference between the sample mean and the hypothesized population mean, dividing it by the standard error of the sample mean, and then comparing the result to a critical value from the t-distribution or using a p-value to assess the level of significance. If the calculated t-statistic exceeds the critical value or yields a small p-value

(usually less than 0.05), it indicates a statistically significant difference between the sample mean and the hypothesized population mean, providing evidence for researchers to reject the null hypothesis, which states that there is no difference. The One-Sample T-test is used to test a hypothesis concerning the mean of a population. Here, μ represents the population mean, and X is a value hypothesized by the researcher. The test hypotheses are as follows:

Relationship 1 $H_0: \mu \leq X$

Relationship 2 $H_1: \mu > X$

In this case, if the sig value is smaller than the significance level (alpha), the mean is considered significant. This test is two-tailed, meaning it tests for significance both when the test statistic is greater than the midpoint and when it is smaller. It is necessary to note that the assumption of normality should also be checked for the variable. Given that the variations of 5 ordinal variables were questioned in this questionnaire, the arithmetic mean of these 5 variables was used to assess the assumption of the overall positive effect of changes. The mean of the ordinal variable was assumed to be 3, which represents the upper limit of the respondents' opinions. Finally, the conclusion from the survey is presented. Table (4), concerning the significance level of the components of the Litany or Apparent Layer based on the One-Sample T-test, shows that all indicators became significant at the 99% level in the measurement of the t-statistic value ($\mu \leq 3$). Therefore, given the confidence level of the test and the obtained significance value, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that all indicators in the Litany layer account for a substantial degree of change in the current international order.

Table (4): Significance Level of Components in the Litany or Apparent Layer Based on the One-Sample T-Test

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Emergence of influential supra/sub-national actors affecting the structure of the international system	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Gradual shift of the power center from Western Europe and North America to Asia	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Increasing diversity in scope and number of regional and international crises on the global stage	28/342	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Growing failure of major global powers in managing and resolving regional and international crises compared to the Cold War era	12/680	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000
	Transformation in the nature of alliances; from strategic alliances to operational – short-term coalitions	14/735	24	0/000	4/760	1/760	1/513	2/007
	Change in the role of global actors; from hegemonic interventionism to the role of offshore balancing	9/506	24	0/000	4/560	1/560	1/221	1/899
	Emergence of influential non-Western institutions such as BRICS as future competitors to established order institutions	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Emergence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization as a balancing tool for Russia and China against NATO as the security arm of the Western bloc	24/000	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/755	2/085

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Relative decline of traditional influential actors in international politics compared to the Cold War era	21/378	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/699	2/061
	Decrease in America's relative advantage in the global economy	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Predominance of the 'resistance' approach as part of the security policy of various actors against the US and the capitalist system	15/588	24	0/000	4/800	1/800	1/562	2/038
	Occurrence of the microelectronics revolution in the field of global communications and information technology	15/588	24	0/000	4/800	1/800	1/562	2/038
	Growth of militarization indicators in the foreign policy of international actors through an increase in the share of defense budgets in countries' GDP	12/680	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000
	Dispersion of power among various actors in international politics through the increased role of network power versus hierarchical power	21/378	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/699	2/061
	Increase in global communications process of information globalization	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Strengthening of groups and currents escaping the center against the hegemony of the global capitalist system	21/378	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/699	2/061
	Increase in proxy wars and expansion of destabilizing forces in the regional security environment	28/342	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Change in the role of regional actors (from passive to active) alongside changes in the role of global actors	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Increasingly prominent role of terrorist and criminal organizations in global insecurity	10/830	24	0/000	4/640	1/640	1/327	1/953
	Increase in the number of democracies in the world and democratization processes in countries' policymaking	8/277	24	0/000	4/440	1/440	1/081	1/799
	Emergence of signs of a post-Western order in global politics with features such as the rise of new non-Western powers and new issues	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Increase in ethnic-racial conflicts in regions alongside an increase in civilizational-historical conflicts at the global level	15/588	24	0/000	4/800	1/800	1/562	2/038

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Increase in the number of authoritarian leaders in the political systems of non-Western states as an element countering the current established order	14/013	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/467	1/973
	Prominent position of emerging powers and institutions arising from the alliance of these powers in global economy and politics	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Use of epidemics by state actors as a tool to impose their power on rival actors	9/239	24	0/000	4/520	1/520	1/180	1/860
	Rise of nationalism, racism, and xenophobia within states alongside increased global connections from globalization (localism alongside globalism)	21/378	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/699	2/061
	Growing demand from developing countries for the establishment of a justice-oriented order as an alternative to the power-oriented order	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Decline of American unilateralism in world politics and the structural inefficacy of US hegemony in the international system	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
		28/342	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Use of concepts like (preemptive and preventive action) by major powers to legitimize their interventions in weak countries	28/342	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Entry of technology as a formative element in international relations, both in theory and practice	19/468	24	0/000	4/840	1/840	1/645	2/035
	Formation of a bloc or pole of counter-hegemonic countries centered around Iran against the West	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Rise of China as a challenger actor against the US-centric hegemonic order	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Emergence of an independent global civil society as a variable influencing global security	24/588	24	0/000	4/840	1/840	1/686	1/994
	Increasing prominence of the issue of sustainable development for societies in achieving global security and peace	9/239	24	0/000	4/520	1/520	1/180	1/860
	Increasing prominence of the role of women's participation in achieving global peace and security	6/395	24	0/000	4/240	1/240	0/840	1/640

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Litany or Apparent Layer	Emergence of the Islamic world as a civilizational-cultural pole, and to a lesser extent an economic-military pole, in the future of international politics	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Transformation in the nature, dimensions, and outcomes of wars influenced by technological developments and its impact on the position of actors in the international system	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Increase in systemic crisis or disorder resulting from the entry of challenging and destabilizing elements and actors into the international environment	12/680	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000
	Increasing internationalization of capital and lack of complete control of the economy by national governments	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Increasing global demands for change in the structure and rules of the UN Security Council, particularly the veto power	11/500	24	0/000	4/840	1/840	1/510	2/170

Table (5) concerning the significance level of the components of the systemic or structural layer, based on the one-sample T-test, indicates that all indicators were found to be significant at the 99% confidence level in the measurement of the t-statistic value ($\mu \leq 3$). Therefore, given the confidence level of the test and the obtained significance value, the null hypothesis is rejected. This demonstrates that all indicators in the systemic or structural layer account for a substantial degree of change in the current international order.

Table (5): Significance Level of Components in the Systemic or Structural Layer Based on the One-Sample T-Test

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Systemic or Structural Layer	Inefficacy of established regional and international institutions in the systematic management of global issues and affairs	49/00 0	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Erosion of the national sovereignty of states and institutions derived from the Westphalian order	49/00 0	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Increase in binding rules of international law against states violating international norms and ethical principles	10/47 4	24	0/000	4/600	1/600	1/285	1/915
	Increased agency of actors stemming from normative-identity patterns instead of material-interest patterns	28/34 2	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Growing prominence of the role of social and evolutionary processes and practices affecting the agency of actors	34/67 1	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Increased importance of the position of regional	34/67 1	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	institutions in global power equations among superpowers							
	Growing trend of regionalism in various parts of the world alongside globalization	28/34 2	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Increased role of global public opinion in the policymaking of national governments	12/16 7	24	0/000	4/680	1/680	1/395	1/965
	Shift of the global security agenda away from purely military issues and increased role of non-military issues in this area	18/00 0	24	0/000	4/800	1/800	1/594	2/006
	Growing prominence of critical and revisionist patterns against dominant Western patterns based on maintaining the status quo	49/00 0	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Effective role-playing of domestic policy components in various dimensions on the foreign policy decision-making of states	34/67 1	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Shift from a uni-multipolar order towards a decentralized multipolar order in international politics	12/68 0	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000
	Failure of powers to universalize and give comprehensiveness to the	49/00 0	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	regime of weapons of mass destruction disarmament							
	Shift from the international system (state-centric) towards the international community (society-centric) and ultimately the global society (individual-centric) as the model governing structural changes in international relations	34/67 1	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034

Table (6) concerning the significance level of the components of the worldview or discursive layer, based on the one-sample T-test, indicates that all indicators were found to be significant at the 99% confidence level in the measurement of the t-statistic value ($\mu \leq 3$). Therefore, given the confidence level of the test and the obtained significance value, the null hypothesis is rejected. This demonstrates that all indicators in the worldview or discursive layer account for a substantial degree of change in the current international order.

Table (6): Significance Level of Components in the Worldview or Discursive Layer
Based on the One-Sample T-Test

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Worldview or Discursive Layer	Increased emphasis on justice-orientation in the procedures, approaches, discourses, and actions of	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	international relations actors							
	Confrontation between traditionalist thought and modernism within the framework of radical anti-modernity groups and currents versus Western states	12/680	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000
	Emergence of Eastern discourses, including Confucianism and Islam, as counter-discourses to the dominant Western liberal democracy	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Increasingly prominent role of religion and faith in global politics and international arena equations	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034
	Emergence of political Islam as a centralizing and emancipatory force against the dominant Western liberal discourse	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Shift in the security paradigm; from state security to human security	10/830	24	0/000	4/640	1/640	1/327	1/953
	Transformation in the nature of the	12/680	24	0/000	4/720	1/720	1/440	2/000

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	discourse of power; from a discourse of coercion to a discourse of persuasion							

Table (7) concerning the significance level of the components of the metaphor or mythic layer, based on the one-sample T-test, indicates that all indicators were found to be significant at the 99% confidence level in the measurement of the t-statistic value ($\mu \leq 3$). Therefore, given the confidence level of the test and the obtained significance value, the null hypothesis is rejected. This demonstrates that all indicators in the metaphor or mythic layer account for a substantial degree of change in the current international order.

Table (7): Significance Level of Components in the Metaphor or Mythic Layer Based on the One-Sample T-Test

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Metaphor or Mythic Layer	Emergence of the self-aware and resistant human confronting coercion	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Realization of the "global citizen" idea, encompassing shared global ideas and ideals (as opposed to national ones)	19/468	24	0/000	4/840	1/840	1/645	2/035
	Increasing influence of the myth of the perpetual war	34/671	24	0/000	4/920	1/920	1/806	2/034

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	t-Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level (p-value)	Mean	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	between good and evil on global political and security equations							
	Growing prominence of messianism and apocalyptic views in the strategic decision-making of global power leaders	28/342	24	0/000	4/880	1/880	1/743	2/017
	Increased application of the idea of ethics in policymaking and interactions of international actors	10/474	24	0/000	4/600	1/600	1/285	1/915
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order	49/000	24	0/000	4/960	1/960	1/877	2/043
	Transformation of the "political animal" metaphor and its gradual decline due to the multiplicity of the individual's role in politics	10/474	24	0/000	4/600	1/600	1/285	1/915

Results of the Friedman Test

The Friedman test is a non-parametric statistical method used to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between the means of three or more related groups. In the Friedman test, each group is ranked separately within each of the related samples, and then the mean rank for each group is calculated. The test statistic is based on the differences between these mean ranks and is compared to a chi-square distribution. If the calculated test statistic exceeds the critical value, it indicates that there is a significant difference between the groups. At this stage, the prioritization of indicators affecting change in the current international order, from the experts' perspective, was conducted using the Friedman test in SPSS software. The statistical results for the components of the Litany or Apparent Layer, based on the Friedman test, are presented in Table Number (8). The overall rank of each indicator, based on the respondents' opinions, according to the mean rank obtained from the Friedman test, is provided in the table. Based on the results, the effective indicators in this layer for change in the current international order have been prioritized by the experts.

Table (8): Statistical Results of the Components of the Litany or Apparent Layer Based on the Friedman Test

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
Litany or Apparent Layer	Increasing diversity in scope and number of regional and international crises on the global stage	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	12
	Gradual shift of the power center from Western Europe and North America to Asia	25	92/4	28/0	4	5	48/22	12
	Increasing diversity in scope and number of regional and international crises on the global stage	25	88/4	33/0	4	5	84/21	17
	Growing failure of major global powers in managing and resolving regional and	25	72/4	68/0	3	5	38/19	32

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	international crises compared to the Cold War era							
	Transformation in the nature of alliances; from strategic alliances to operational – short-term coalitions	25	76/4	60/0	3	5	78/19	31
	Change in the role of global actors; from hegemonic interventionism to the role of offshore balancing	25	56/4	82/0	3	5	5/17	37
	Emergence of influential non-Western institutions such as BRICS as future competitors to established order institutions	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Emergence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization as a balancing tool for Russia and China against NATO as the security arm of the Western bloc	25	92/4	40/0	3	5	22/22	16
	Relative decline of traditional influential actors in international politics compared to the Cold War era	25	88/4	44/0	3	5	68/21	22
	Decrease in America's relative advantage in the global economy	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Predominance of the 'resistance' approach as part of the security policy of various actors against the US and the capitalist system	25	8/4	58/0	3	5	48/20	1
	Occurrence of the microelectronics revolution in the field of global communications and information technology	25	8/4	58/0	3	5	48/20	1
	Growth of militarization indicators in the foreign policy of international actors through	25	72/4	68/0	3	5	38/19	32

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	an increase in the share of defense budgets in countries' GDP							
	Dispersion of power among various actors in international politics through the increased role of network power versus hierarchical power	25	88/4	44/0	3	5	68/21	22
	Increase in global communications resulting from the process of information globalization	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Strengthening of groups and currents escaping the center against the hegemony of the global capitalist system	25	88/4	44/0	3	5	68/21	22
	Increase in proxy wars and expansion of destabilizing forces in the regional security environment	25	88/4	33/0	4	5	84/21	17
	Change in the role of regional actors (from passive to active) alongside changes in the role of global actors	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Increasingly prominent role of terrorist and criminal organizations in global insecurity	25	64/4	76/0	3	5	42/18	36
	Increase in the number of democracies in the world and democratization processes in countries' policymaking	25	44/4	87/0	3	5	8/15	40
	Emergence of signs of a post-Western order in global politics with features such as the rise of new non-Western powers and new issues	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Increase in ethnic-racial conflicts in regions alongside an increase in civilizational-	25	8/4	58/0	3	5	48/20	28

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	historical conflicts at the global level							
	Increase in the number of authoritarian leaders in the political systems of non-Western states as an element countering the current established order	25	72/4	61/0	3	5	06/19	35
	Prominent position of emerging powers and institutions arising from the alliance of these powers in global economy and politics	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Use of epidemics by state actors as a tool to impose their power on rival actors	25	52/4	82/0	3	5	7/16	38
	Rise of nationalism, racism, and xenophobia within states alongside increased global connections from globalization (localism alongside globalism)	25	88/4	44/0	3	5	68/21	22
	Growing demand from developing countries for the establishment of a justice-oriented order as an alternative to the power-oriented order	25	92/4	28/0	4	5	48/22	12
	Decline of American unilateralism in world politics and the structural inefficacy of US hegemony in the international system	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Increasing prominence of environmental and health threats to global security	25	88/4	33/0	4	5	84/21	17
	Use of concepts like (preemptive and preventive action) by major powers to legitimize their interventions in weak countries	25	88/4	33/0	4	5	84/21	17

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	Entry of technology as a formative element in international relations, both in theory and practice	25	84/4	47/0	3	5	04/21	27
	Formation of a bloc or pole of counter-hegemonic countries centered around Iran against the West	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Rise of China as a challenger actor against the US-centric hegemonic order	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Emergence of an independent global civil society as a variable influencing global security	25	84/4	37/0	4	5	14/21	26
	Increasing prominence of the issue of sustainable development for societies in achieving global security and peace	25	52/4	82/0	3	5	7/16	38
	Increasing prominence of the role of women's participation in achieving global peace and security	25	24/4	97/0	3	5	04/14	41
	Emergence of the Islamic world as a civilizational-cultural pole, and to a lesser extent an economic-military pole, in the future of international politics	25	96/4	20/0	4	5	02/23	1
	Transformation in the nature, dimensions, and outcomes of wars influenced by technological developments and its impact on the position of actors in the international system	25	92/4	28/0	4	5	48/22	12
	Increase in systemic crisis or disorder resulting from the entry of challenging and	25	72/4	68/0	3	5	38/19	32

Layer of Change in International Order Indicators	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	destabilizing elements and actors into the international environment							
	Increasing internationalization of capital and lack of complete control of the economy by national governments	25	92/4	28/0	4	5	48/22	12
	Increasing global demands for change in the structure and rules of the UN Security Council, particularly the veto power	25	84/4	80/0	1	5	8/21	21

The statistical results for the components of the Worldview or Discursive Layer based on the Friedman test are presented in Table (10). The table provides the total rank of each indicator based on the respondents' opinions, according to the mean rank obtained from the Friedman test. Based on the results, the effective indicators in this layer for change in the current international order have been prioritized by the experts.

Table (9): Summary of Statistical Results for Components of the Systemic or Structural Layer Based on the Friedman Test

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
Systemic or Structural Layer	Inefficacy of established regional and international institutions in the systematic management of global issues and affairs	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	8/04	1
	Erosion of the national sovereignty of states and institutions derived from the Westphalian order	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	8/04	1
	Increase in binding rules of international law against states	25	4/6	0/76	3	5	6/1	14

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	violating international norms and ethical principles							
	Increased agency of actors stemming from normative-identity patterns instead of material-interest patterns	25	4/88	0/33	4	5	7/6	9
	Growing prominence of the role of social and evolutionary processes and practices affecting the agency of actors	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	7/82	5
	Increased importance of the position of regional institutions in global power equations among superpowers	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	7/82	5
	Growing trend of regionalism in various parts of the world alongside globalization	25	4/88	0/33	4	5	7/6	9
	Increased role of global public opinion in the policymaking of national governments	25	4/68	0/69	3	5	6/46	13
	Shift of the global security agenda away from purely military issues and increased role of non-military issues in this area	25	4/8	0/50	3	5	7/06	11
	Growing prominence of critical and revisionist patterns against dominant Western patterns based on maintaining the status quo	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	8/04	1
	Effective role-playing of domestic policy components in various dimensions on the foreign policy decision-making of states	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	7/82	5
	Shift from a uni-multipolar order towards a decentralized multipolar order in international politics	25	4/72	0/68	3	5	6/74	12
	Failure of powers to universalize and give comprehensiveness to the regime of weapons of mass destruction disarmament	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	8/04	1
	Shift from the international system (state-centric) towards the international community (society-centric) and ultimately the global	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	7/82	5

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	society (individual-centric) as the model governing structural changes in international relations							

Table (6): Significance Level of Components in the Worldview or Discursive Layer Based on the One-Sample T-Test The statistical results for the components of the Worldview or Discursive Layer based on the Friedman test are presented in Table (10) . The table provides the total rank of each indicator based on the respondents' opinions, according to the mean rank obtained from the Friedman test. Based on the results, the effective indicators in this layer for change in the current international order have been prioritized by the experts.

Table (10): Summary of Statistical Results for the Components of the Worldview or Discursive Layer Based on the Friedman Test

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
Worldview or Discursive Layer	Increased emphasis on justice-orientation in the procedures, approaches, discourses, and actions of international relations actors	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/28	1
	Confrontation between traditionalist thought and modernism within the framework of radical anti-modernity groups and currents versus Western states	25	4/72	0/68	3	5	3/72	5
	Emergence of Eastern discourses, including Confucianism and Islam, as counter-discourses to the dominant Western liberal democracy	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/28	1
	Increasingly prominent role of religion and faith in global politics and international arena equations	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	4/2	4

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	Emergence of political Islam as a centralizing and emancipatory force against the dominant Western liberal discourse	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/28	1
	Shift in the security paradigm; from state security to human security	25	4/64	0/76	3	5	3/52	7
	Transformation in the nature of the discourse of power; from a discourse of coercion to a discourse of persuasion	25	4/72	0/68	3	5	3/72	5

The statistical results for the components of the Metaphor or Mythic Layer based on the Friedman test are presented in Table (11). The total rank of each indicator, based on the mean rank obtained from the Friedman test and according to the respondents' opinions, has been provided. Based on the results, the influential indicators in this layer for change in the current international order have been prioritized by the experts.

Table (11): Summary of Statistical Results for Components of the Metaphor or Mythic Layer Based on the Friedman Test

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
Metaphor or Mythic Layer	Emergence of the self-aware and resistant human confronting coercion	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/86	1
	Realization of the "global citizen" idea, encompassing shared global ideas and ideals (as opposed to national ones)	25	4/84	0/47	3	5	4/46	6
	Increasing influence of the myth of the perpetual war between good and evil on global political and security equations	25	4/92	0/28	4	5	4/74	4
	Growing prominence of messianism and apocalyptic views in the strategic	25	4/88	0/33	4	5	4/62	5

Layer of Change in the International Order	Indicator	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean Rank	Total Rank
	decision-making of global power leaders							
	Increased application of the idea of ethics in policymaking and interactions of international actors	25	4/6	0/76	3	5	3/8	7
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/86	1
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order	25	4/96	0/20	4	5	4/86	1
	Transformation of the "political animal" metaphor and its gradual decline due to the multiplicity of the individual's role in politics	25	4/6	0/76	3	5	3/8	7

Table (12) shows the prioritization of the key indicators for each layer based on the Friedman test.

Table (12): Prioritization of Key Indicators for Each Layer Based on the Friedman Test

Layer of Change in the International Order	indicator
Litany or Apparent Layer	Emergence of influential supra/sub-national actors affecting the structure of the international system
	Emergence of influential non-Western institutions such as BRICS as future competitors to established order institutions
	Decrease in America's relative advantage in the global economy
	Increase in global communications resulting from the process of information globalization
	Change in the role of regional actors (from passive to active) alongside changes in the role of global actors
	Emergence of signs of a post-Western order in global politics with features such as the rise of new non-Western powers and new issues

Layer of Change in the International Order	indicator
	Prominent position of emerging powers and institutions arising from the alliance of these powers in global economy and politics
	Decline of American unilateralism in world politics and the structural inefficacy of US hegemony in the international system
	Formation of a bloc or pole of counter-hegemonic countries centered around Iran against the West
	Rise of China as a challenger actor against the US-centric hegemonic order
	Emergence of the Islamic world as a civilizational-cultural pole, and to a lesser extent an economic-military pole, in the future of international politics
Systemic or Structural Layer	Inefficacy of established regional and international institutions in the systematic management of global issues and affairs
	Erosion of the national sovereignty of states and institutions derived from the Westphalian order
	Growing prominence of critical and revisionist patterns against dominant Western patterns based on maintaining the status quo
	Failure of powers to universalize and give comprehensiveness to the regime of weapons of mass destruction disarmament
Worldview or Discursive Layer	Increased emphasis on justice-orientation in the procedures, approaches, discourses, and actions of international relations actors
	Emergence of Eastern discourses, including Confucianism and Islam, as counter-discourses to the dominant Western liberal democracy
	Emergence of political Islam as a centralizing and emancipatory force against the dominant Western liberal discourse
Metaphor or Mythic Layer	Emergence of the self-aware and resistant human confronting coercion
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order
	Increased use of the "lone superpower" metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order

Table (13) shows the ranking of indicators using the Friedman test. Although the mean rank for the systemic or structural layer shows the highest value (4.863), the difference between the indicators is not substantial, and nearly all of them fall within a similar range. The significance level resulting from each test for every layer also indicates that all layers are significant at the 95% confidence level, and there is no significant difference between this layer and the others in identifying change in the current international order. In other words, it can be said that, from the experts' perspective, all layers hold equal importance.

Table (13): Ranking of Indicators Using the Friedman Test

Indicator	Mean Rank	Ranking	Number	Chi-squared	Degrees of Freedom	sig
Litany or Apparent Layer	821/4	Third:	25	233/202	40	001/0
Systemic or Structural Layer	863/4	First:	25	876/55	13	001/0
Worldview or Discursive Layer	840/4	Second:	25	091/25	6	001/0
Metaphor or Mythic Layer	840/4	Second:	25	957/37	7	001/0

Conclusion and Suggestions

Order is one of the most important subjects and concepts in international relations, about which various theories and schools of thought have expressed their views regarding the nature, causes, and dimensions of its change. The transition from the old to the new order in international relations depends on the degree of change in its nature and dimensions. This research sought to better understand this issue by examining change in the current international order across four layers and by prioritizing the most important issues within each layer. In response to the first research question, an effort was made to identify changes in the current international order through various indicators across the four layers, with each indicator being scored by experts. Consequently, 40 indicators were identified in the Litany or Apparent Layer, 14 in the Systemic or Structural Layer, 7 in the Worldview or Discursive Layer, and 8 in the Metaphor or Mythic Layer. In response to the second research question, based on the scores given, the most important indicators in each layer were prioritized using the Friedman test. The results are as follows:

In the Litany or Apparent Layer , the top three indicators are:

- "The emergence of influential supra/sub-national actors affecting the structure of the international system."
- "The emergence of influential non-Western institutions such as BRICS as future competitors to the institutions of the established order."
- "The decrease in America's relative advantage in the global economy."

In the Systemic or Structural Layer , the top three indicators are:

- "The inefficacy of established regional and international institutions in the systematic management of global issues and affairs."
- "The erosion of the national sovereignty of states and institutions derived from the Westphalian order."
- "The growing prominence of critical and revisionist patterns against dominant Western patterns based on maintaining the status quo."

In the Worldview or Discursive Layer , the top three indicators are:

- "The increased emphasis on justice-orientation in the procedures, approaches, discourses, and actions of international relations actors."
- "The emergence of Eastern discourses, including Confucianism and Islam, as counter-discourses to the dominant Western liberal democracy."
- "The emergence of political Islam as a centralizing and emancipatory force against the dominant Western liberal discourse."

In the Metaphor or Mythic Layer , the top three indicators are:

- "The emergence of the self-aware and resistant human confronting coercion."
- "The increased use of the 'lone superpower' metaphor to define America's position in the emerging global order."
- "The increased use of the 'rogue superpower' concept to define America's policies in the emerging global order."

These were introduced as the most significant indicators within their respective layers.

Suggestions

Executive Recommendations

(1) Critiquing the hegemonic approaches and practices of the United States worldwide as a factor instigating current wars and injustices; (2) Activating the country's economic diplomacy to join nations advocating for the elimination of the US dollar in international trade transactions, aiming to reduce American economic power; (3) Forming coalitions with global and regional institutions and powers aligned with the Islamic Republic of Iran and possessing the capacity to shape trends in the future international order, such as BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation; (4) Highlighting the Axis of Resistance as an influential current in the future international order with the capacity for confrontational opposition to the hegemonic system; (5) Emphasizing the Islamic Republic of Iran's alignment with non-governmental actors and movements that are anti-hegemony and influential on future global power trends. (6) Seriously criticizing the structure of the United Nations Security Council as a so-called institution for maintaining international peace and security, given its passive approach to human rights violations in regional and international conflicts and disputes, including the war in Gaza.

Research Recommendations

- (1) Conducting research in the field of trend analysis of changes in the international order, the future of global power, and the challenges and opportunities for the Islamic Republic of Iran in the future international order;
- (2) Conducting research on the types of roles influential institutions within the Islamic Republic can play in the future global power structure, including, for example, the role-playing of the armed forces, the role-playing of the economic institutions of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the role-playing of security and intelligence institutions, the role-playing of social and cultural institutions, etc.

References

Persian References

1. Ebrahimi Kushali, H., Goodarzi, G., & Nazemi Ardakani, M. (2022). *A Layered Analysis of the Issues Facing the New Islamic Civilization*. Research on the Civilizational Discourse of the Islamic Revolution, 2(4), .32-57
https://sjs.isri.ac.ir/article_169054_cac9d2ab0295df203223f4d3e263b438.pdf
2. Chegenizadeh, G. (2013). *Iran, the Islamic World, and Change in the Geometry of International Power*. Quarterly of Strategic Political Research, 2(7), .69-92
3. https://qpss.atu.ac.ir/article_2245_7b7dfc1b60d7662c65fb03958eff0584.pdf
4. Rezaei, A. (2009). The Idea-Oriented Order: *The United States' Model of Order in the Post-Cold War International System*. Political and International Research Quarterly, Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e-Rey Branch, 1(3), .171-196
5. <https://sanad.iau.ir/journal/pir/Article/559644?jid=559644>
6. Ravanbod, A., Kooliaei, H., & Haghighi, A. (2022). *Effective Drivers on the Structure of the International System Using the ISM Model*. National Security Quarterly, 12(44), .333-360
7. https://ns.sndu.ac.ir/article_2133_0c6a8469aae439fd10049627e04eae17.pdf
8. Zolfaghari, M., & Ahmadi-Nejad, H. (2023). *The Transitional Order in the Intellectual Framework of the Supreme Leader (May His Shadow Endure)*. National Security Quarterly, 13(50), .9-40
9. https://ns.sndu.ac.ir/article_2780_34bf8fa0366c738847aa136aca28b1f0.pdf
10. Inayatullah, S. (2016). *Causal Layered Analysis: Theory and Case Studies of an Integrated and Transformative Futures Studies Methodology* (Volume 1: Collection of Articles) (M. Manzavi, Trans.). Tehran: Institute for Defense Education and Research, Center for Defense Science and Technology Futures Studies. (Original work published earlier).
11. Fouzi, Y., & Mahmoudi Kia, M. (2020). *Challenges and Strategies of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Confronting the Human Rights Norms of the International System Based on*

the Causal Layered Analysis Method. Majlis and Rahbord Quarterly, 27(101), .123-143

<https://ensani.ir/file/download/article/1594614195-9428-101-5.pdf>

12. Hashemi, S. M. (2008). *Changes in International Relations*. Scientific-Research Quarterly of History, 3(8), .143-156
<https://ensani.ir/file/download/article/20100915154051-31.pdf>

English References

1. Clark, Ian (1997), *Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20 century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Gilpin, Robert.(1981), *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Holsti, K.J (1998) The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory, *Institute of International Relations The University of British Columbia*, Working Paper No.26. 1-24.
4. <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/46511/WP26.pdf>
5. Ikenberry, G. J. (2008), The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive? *Foreign Affairs*, 87 (1), 1-9.
6. <http://www.rochelleterman.com/ir/sites/default/files/Duncan%202008.pdf>
7. Wight, Martin (1978). *Power Politics*. Eds. Hedley Bull and Carsten Holbraad. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
8. Zakaria, Fareed. (2008), "The Future of American Power", *Foreign Affairs*, 87 (1), 18-43.

