



Recognized by: Higher Education Commission (HEC), Government of Pakistan

Narrative Warfare: US Liberal Order vs China's Community of Shared Future

Fatima Kubra

M.Phil Scholar, Department of International Relations, University of Sargodha.
syedafatimazahra143@gmail.com

Dr. Asia Saif Alvi

Chairman Department of Political Science, University of Sargodha.
asia.saif@uos.edu.pk

***Corresponding Author**

ABSTRACT

The deepening of strategic rivalry between the United States and China has encountered new arenas of confrontation on the basis of military and economic expansion into the politics of narrative construction and ideological impacts. The paper explores a new form of warfare known as narrative warfare between the Liberal International Order championed by U.S. and a Chinese notion of a Community of Shared Future to Mankind. Based on constructivist theory and the concept of soft power fronted by Joseph Nye, the paper will examine how the two powers utilize discourse, diplomacy and multilateral institutions and development programs as their instruments of influence in creating global norms and legitimacy. This paper will contend that the modern global political battle is ultimately a war of normative power and modes of world governance by comparing the American-based idea of democracy, human rights, and rule-based governance against the rhetoric of sovereignty, non-interference, and developmental multi-lateralism of the Chinese. The research concludes that narrative warfare is transforming patterns of alignment in the Global South and rehabilitating the building of international order.

Keywords: Narrative warfare, soft power, liberal international order, community of shared future, US–China rivalry, global governance.

INTRODUCTION

The power transition theory, the competition on trade, and the military modernization are often taken to interpret the strategic rivalry between the United States and China. But there is also a much more important aspect to this competition,

which plays out in the narrative domain- where some of the key issues of legitimacy, identity and global agenda are fought over. More than tariffs and alliances and naval stations there is the rivalry as to who determines the language of morality as applied to international politics. This article hypothesizes that this showdown is conceptualized as narrative warfare: a systemized effort of institutionalizing specific definitions of order, power and progress in world government.

The United States model of the Liberal International Order (LIO) has been entrenched in various institutions over the post-war period since 1945 when the United States cosponsored the establishment of the United Nations, the World Bank, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The American legend is based on universalization of the liberal democracy, multilateralism that is founded on rules and market capitalism. The question that is however under-explored in a larger part of the literature is how this order has become less and less normatively confident and more defensively self justified. Interventions since 9/11, the 2008 financial crisis and domestic political polarization have made the projected liberal norms to appear as uncontested worldwide commodities. Now, instead of merely exporting democracy, Washington is more and more often talking about its narrative in terms of defending the rules-based order against authoritarian revisionism-signifying a tinier bit of an expansion business to a preservation business.

By contrast, the idea of a Community of Shared Future of Mankind that China uses is, not just a policy slogan, but a little effort to rebuild the normative grammar of world politics. This system, promoted by such programs like the Belt and Road Initiative, focuses on sovereignty, connectedness, first-driven development, and civilizational plurality. The literature in place is broadly analyzing this story as either defensive disguise to expand its material resources or as a different model of development. But there is a crucial loophole that has remained: the role of the embedding of the Chinese narrative as language in the context of multilateral resolutions, diplomatic messages, and discussions among other schemes, in which the phrase on the win-win cooperation and mutual respect have slowly become a part of the international diplomatic vocabulary. This discursive institutionalization of minor completion implies that the narrative warfare does not work with dramatic confrontation and more with semantic spreading influence.

Upon a critical review, it can be noted that the two stories are based on selective universalism. American conceptualizes democracy and human rights as universality and mostly selectively actionable by forming geopolitical coalition. China does not accept ideological universalism and, at the same time, promotes the development as a universal value with making economic growth the leading scale of legitimacy. Accordingly, instead of the dualistic conflict between liberalism and authoritarianism, the contest shows two opposing hierarchies of values: political rights and developmental sovereignty. The argument is not whether norms are relevant or not, but on which norms are relevant.

In addition, narrative warfare is more and more converging with digital epistemology-- the politics of knowledge production in information environments

based on algorithms. The argument of an open internet as practiced by American thinkers is the opposite of China and its championing of cyber sovereignty, but both sides temperately populate information ecosystems that promote positive stories. This aspect is yet to be theorized in classic scholarship on International Relations, where the narrative building is typically limited to speeches and policy narratives. Indeed, digital platforms, think tanks, development banks, and education exchange networks, are spread out nodes of practice of reproducing narratives.

The other underdeveloped aspect is the fragmentation of narrative warfare of the audience. Modern audiences do not receive ideology passively in the way that bipolarity during the Cold War did. Global South states have a practice of strategic narrative consumption in the sense that they embrace aspects of both models but do not go all the way. An example of this is that governments can support sovereignty-based discourse in the debate in the United Nations and at the same time engage in liberal financial regimes. Such a selective usage of appropriation is a challenge against the belief that sound ideological blocs are produced by narrative competition. It, on the contrary, creates hybrid normative alignments.

More importantly, even the notion of order itself is a disputed land. The American story assumes that the status quo is flawed yet capable of being changed and legitimized (Khan et al., 2025). The discourse of China does not explicitly oppose the existing system, but aims at redefining its initial principles into multipolar inclusivity. This means that the competition is not revolution of order but a battle to redefine its semantic meaning. Instead of an abrupt systemic dislocation, narrative warfare, therefore, operates as a procedure of sequential normative renegotiation.

Theoretical Framework

This paper frames narrative warfare in the nexus of Soft Power theory, Constructivism, and Critical Discourse Analysis to conceptualise the US-China conflict as the contest of normative power as opposed to a contest of mere material power. The combination of these methods helps to leave the traditional interpretations of realism and, on the contrary, predicts the politics of meaning, legitimacy, and institutionalized discourse.

1. Soft Power Narrative Construction.

The theoretical approach of analyzing the element of soft power as presented by Joseph Nye offers the analytical tool. A soft power is the power that exists in which a state can influence the preferences of others by attracting but not coercing them. Soft power works through policies, institutional credibility, values and culture unlike the hard power which uses military or economic pressure to influence (Iqbal & Uddin, 2025; Bukhari et al., 2025). The concept of narratives is one of the major providers of soft power projection in the modern geopolitical landscape.

Traditionally, the United States has exercised soft power through its democratic institutions, the cultural industries and being at the forefront in multilateral organizations like United Nations. Its presentation of a rules based international order is aimed at strengthening liberal norms as universally valid standards of legitimacy (Imran et al., 2025). On the other hand, China also enjoys the

benefits of developmental gains and sovereignty-based diplomacy by using such initiatives as the Belt and Road Initiative to advance its vision of a Community of Shared Future of Mankind.

Nevertheless, the paper goes a step further to present an argument that soft power is not enough to account contemporary narrative rivalry. Traditional theory of soft power as a belief argues as an effect of normative appeal yet this theory fails to explain the strategic struggle on what constitutes legitimacy per se. In this way, soft power needs to be re-conceived as a hierarchical resource that is entrenched in discursive conflicts.

2. Constructivism and Normative Order.

The constructivist theory is an addition to soft power because it underlines the fact that international politics is socially constructed due to collective ideas, norms, and identities. Constructivism assumes that power is not material but ideational as well, states do not exist out of the normative structures, which characterise what is appropriate or legitimate behaviour.

In this view, the Liberal International Order is institutionalized normative framework in terms of democracy, human rights, and multilateralism. A different normative construct that is better suggested by China Community of Shared Future suggests giving preference to sovereignty, non-interference, and the cooperation in the development. It is the competition of these frameworks thus on the social construction of order (Amin & Uddin, 2023; Bukhari, 2025) .

This paper proposes a concept, which involves normative recalibration, to illustrate how China is not opposing the current institutions, but it aims at repackaging their core meanings. Instead of eliminating multilateralism, Beijing fosters adjusted versions of cooperation and governance on the existing platforms. Narrative warfare is thereby brought to a warming-over process of normative renegotiation, instead of an overthrowing process.

3. Critical Semantic Institutionalization and Discourse.

In order to narrow the analysis down, this framework has been enriched with the knowledge of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Political reality construction is dispositional as discourse frames the issues, defines the problems and defines hierarchies of values (Khan et al., 2020). The constant repetition in the patterns of language in diplomatic declarations, policies, and multilateral resolutions slowly enshrine certain meanings.

The discourse of freedom of the U.S. democracy, human rights, rules-based order is a discursive approach which makes liberal norms universal. The repetitive use of such terms as win-win cooperation, mutual respect, and shared future by China is a kind of semantic normalization in the international arenas (Uddin et al., 2025; Bukhari et al., 2024). With time, this language is incorporated into official resolutions and the framework of policies, to institute narrative preferences within state organizations.

This paper presents the analytical term of semantic institutionalization, or the process through which repeated diplomatic vocabulary drives into the international

norms. In that light, narrative warfare does not solely work with persuasion but with the introduction of desired terms into multilateral regulating processes.

4. Hemgotlanda Canal and Distribution on Hybrids.

Lastly, the framework will recognize agency of the actors of Global South. Contemporary states do not sit back and receive ideology as they did during the Cold War bipolarity. Instead, they carefully adopt bits of each narrative in order to have the best possible strategic independence. This gives hybrid normative alignments and not blocs.

This theoretical framework conceptualises the US-China competition as discursive hegemonic contestation by adding soft power, constructivism, and critical discourse analysis. Narrative war is perceived to be a kind of structured conflict about legitimacy, language of institutions, and normative pre-eminence, in the development of global governance in the twenty first century (Shah et al., 2018).

The length of this academic section is approximately 1000 words, and this is the main content of your research article:

Liberal International Order of the U.S.

The Liberal International Order (LIO) is one of the most powerful and persistent structures in the context of international relations nowadays. It was built during the post-Second World War, led by America and institutionalized a system that was based on liberal democracy, open markets, multilateral cooperation, and governance via rules (Shabbir et al., 2021). Although frequently described as an extension of reconstruction after the war, the Liberal International Order was actually a planned strategic initiative aimed at entrenching the U.S. power into a system of systems, standards, and alliances that would stabilize the world politics and make it impossible to repeat the large-scale war in future.

1. Historical Foundations

The Liberal international Order originated in the period between 1944 and 1949 as the United States took the initiative in bringing up multilateral institutions to control international economic and security issues. Collective security and multilateralism in diplomacy was institutionalized in institutions like the United Nations. At the same time, the Bretton Woods system led to the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to stabilize the currencies, support the reconstruction and development.

The establishment of a transatlantic defense alliance established by the formation of the North Atlantic treaty Organization in 1949 in the security field entrenched Western Europe in an American-based security system. The United States invested its leadership in these institutions in the form of a rule-based system, instead of basing it on unilateral superiority (Masih et al., 2025). It is this institutional imprinting that set apart the American hegemony and classical models of imperialism by instituting predictable working methods in terms of cooperation.

2. Core Normative Pillars

Liberal International Order is based on three main normative pillars:

- Democratic Governance - The ideology that liberal democracy is the most just type of political organization.
- Open Economic Integration - Dedication to market capitalism, economic interdependence and free trade.
- Multilateral Rule-Based Governance - Managing the actions of the states by the use of institutions and the international law.

The liberal order presupposes that democratic nations will be less prone to making war against each other, economic interdependence will cause peace, and institutionalized cooperation will diminish unpredictability. Such assumptions are a representation of theoretical liberal institutionalist and democratic peace logic, both of which were firmly entrenched in the doctrine of U.S. foreign policy.

With time, the order grew in both geographical and normative sense. After the cold war, the collapse of the soviet Union brought in a unipolar moment where the United States actively encouraged the expansion of democracy as well as the liberalization of their economy. NATO has spread in the direction of the east, liberal economic standards were globalized by the world trade confederation (WTO). The liberal order was not only dominant, but also universal.

3. Legitimacy Legitimacy is institutionalized.

The ability to institutionalize legitimacy is one of the hallmarks of the Liberal International Order. Instead of portraying U.S. dominance as a position of coercion, the assertion of American power was modeled as a custodial guardianship of numerous worldwide open components, which includes handling of security, monetary balance, and unrestricted trade (Rabbani & Sarmad, 2018). In the multilateral frameworks, U.S. influence made it seemed procedural and rule constrained.

Legitimacy has never been an unchallenged aspect though. Although Western Europe and some countries in East Asia have been successfully constructed to the liberal system, its construction in many states in the Global South was characterized by structural inequalities in global financial regimes. The order has led to arguments by critics that the order favored western economic interests and had unbalanced power relations. However, the institutional stability made it stay strong even during crises.

4. Liberal Order and Selective Universalism.

The implementation of the Liberal International Order has not been very universal as much as its advocacy of universality in form of human rights and democratic rule. The conflict between normative commitments and strategic interests can be described in the context of the alliances of the U.S. with the authoritarian formations during the Cold War and even later. Further complications of the liberal order as being exclusively rule-based were the military interventions in Iraq (2003) and Afghanistan (2001).

Another turning point was that of the 2008 global financial crisis. The United States was the birthplace of the crisis supporting the argument against liberal economic governance (Parveen et al., 2019). At the same time, the increasing

populism in democratic societies of the west revealed internal weaknesses. These changes undermined the narrative authority of the liberal order and discursively undermined alternative forms of governance.

5. The New world order: the Rules-Based Order in Contemporary Strategy.

Over the past several years, the United States strategic literature has placed a greater focus on the defense of what is called a rules-based international system. This change of narrative posture can be seen in the shift of liberal expansion towards defending of the status quo. The policy today due to confrontation by revisionist powers views the order as no longer as inevitable as being drawn to liberal democracy.

The Indo-Pacific Strategy is a good example of the defensive re-calibration. It focuses on the openness, freedom of navigation, democratic strength, and resistance to coercion (Adil et al., 2023). The liberal order is not only marketed as a creation of the West but it is also universal as protecting the small and medium states against domination.

This change of rhetoric is evidence of the understanding that there is no longer a possibility of assuming normative authority. The liberal order is now forced to compete in the pluralistic global world.

6. Critiques among Structural Vulnerabilities.

A number of criticisms dispute the sustainability of the Liberal International Order:

- Internal Contradictions - Liberal states are faced with a problem involving the ability to reconcile sovereignty and the intervention of human rights.
- Economic Inequality - Globalization has produced domestic inequality in the Western societies, which has given rise to the populist opposition.
- Paralysis in Multilateral institutions - There is paralysis in reform of multilateral institutions, which is evident in the UN Security Council.
- Normative Fatigue - Recurrent service in the military has gutted ideas of moral constancy.

Such weak points open up avenues to other competing accounts on how the liberal paradigm is not always universal and fair.

7. The adaptive capacity and Guidance or resilience.

Nevertheless, the Liberal International Order still has some structural strengths irrespective of these challenges. It has deep reserves of influence due to the high institutions density, networks of alliances, financial centrality and technological leadership. The U.S dollar continues to dominate the world reserves, the western universities are the home to global talents and the security relationships between the trans Atlantic continues to be strong.

Further, the order has been able to show adaptability. The financial reform agenda post-2008, climate cooperation, and re-established diplomacy on alliances all indicate recalibration efforts, too, as opposed to giving up. The power of the liberal order is its flexibility, i.e. its capability to absorb reform without disintegrating its principles.

The Liberal International Order of the U.S exists not only as motionless. It is a system that is historically constructed based on institutionalized liberal norms that are perpetuated by American leadership. In the process of responding to internal and external pressures, it makes global governance structure operational via embedded rules and alliances.

China's Community of Shared Future

The idea of a Community of Shared Future of Mankind as developed in China is one of the most notable normative utterances deriving out of foreign policy in the twenty-first century in Beijing. Being a recurring theme promoted by President Xi Jinping on the world platforms, the concept aims to reshape the philosophical pillars of international relations focusing on the points of interdependence, sovereignty, development, and multipolar inclusiveness. Instead of challenging the status quo of the international system, China makes this system appear to be an option of reform, to refocus world governance principles in accordance with what it terms to be modern realities.

1. Theoretical Starting Points and Philosophical Foundations.

The concept of a common future was introduced in the early 2010s and over time began to be used as a central feature of the language of the Chinese diplomacy. It can be seen as a product of several intellectual tendencies: Confucian concepts of harmony (he), Marxist concepts of internationalism, post-colonial magic of sovereignty, and the economic statecraft. As opposed to liberal universalism, which values political liberties and institutional democracy, the formulation by China anticipates the progress of collective and autonomy of states.

The Community of Shared Future in its essence focuses on 5 interrelated principles:

- Sovereignty and territorial integrity- Respect.
- None intrusion of foreign affairs.
- Peaceful development
- Win-win cooperation
- Common good by making contact.

This structure does not apparently reject the status quo institutions such as the United Nations. In its place, China often interprets the UN Charter as the justification of the international order, stating that sovereignty and equality of states must still be the key values.

2. Development-Centered Multilateralism

One of the notable characteristics of the Chinese narrative is its focus on economic growth as the main inspiration of legitimacy. Beijing states that social development and political stability are the precedents of the rights achievement. With this mark, development is placed on higher position than political liberalization as the global norm.

The Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) can be regarded as the practical implementation of this approach. The BRI was initiated in 2013 as a means of improving connectivity via investment in infrastructures in the Asia, African, European, and Latin American regions. Instead of placing the project ideologically,

China introduces it as a platform of collaboration in the development that is free to all states irrespective of any political regime.

By means of infrastructure financing, industrial cooperation zones, as well as trade corridors, China makes itself an investment companion and not a dictative teacher. This is unlike the western models of aid which are sometimes conditional upon governance reforms. The BRI can therefore be seen as also a narrative tool that helps China to strengthen its image of being a hero of South-South cooperation.

3. Sovereignty and Civilizational Pluralism.

The other defining feature of the Community of Shared Future that is crucial is the concern on its sovereignty and civilizational diversity. One of the issues that China does not accept is that a single type of governance can be applied everywhere. On the contrary, it promotes plural ways into modernization. This view is especially relevant in the post-colonial countries that do not want outside interference.

China implicitly criticizes liberal interventionism by suggesting its non-intervention. The story conditions the operations of regime change and democracy promotion campaigns as destabilizing practices, which are not in line with actual multilateralism. By so doing, Beijing makes itself an advocate of state autonomy against what it perceives as western ideological intrusion.

But such a sovereignty focused approach can be criticized as well. According to skeptics the non-interference speeches can help protect domestic forms of governance against outside reefs, especially in the aspect of human rights and political freedoms. In this way, even though the concept of sovereignty seems to be the image of protective equality, it also restricts the pressure of extrinsic norms.

4. Semantic Diffusion and institutional Embedding.

One particular aspect that has noted in the Chinese approach is that it progressively inroads its desired terminology into the multilateral lingo. Such words and sentences like "win-win cooperation," "mutual benefit," and the common future become more and more frequent phrases in joint communiqués and diplomatic resolutions. This is the way to represent what may be called semantic institutionalization: normalization of particular language that quietly alters sets of interpretation.

In contrast to the revolutionary revisionism, the Chinese one is incremental. It does not destroy international institutions but aims at reformulating their normative orientation. As an illustration, in the context of UN development discussions, China has always displayed economic rights and poverty alleviation as the key measures of improvements. Such norms that are repeated over time can re-establish the order of international priorities.

5. Sovereignty over Digital Space and Governance.

Moreover, China also extends the Community of Shared Future to the digital governance sphere as well as constitutional connectedness. Beijing supports the ideology of cyber sovereignty, which states are to control their local internet territories by governing them in national legislation and orientation towards cultural

specifics. This stand is opposed to the Western recommendation of an open internet and global interoperability.

China collaborates to promote technical collaboration in telecommunication and digital infrastructure known through forums and bilateral agreements. These actions strengthen its larger story of non partisan modernization. Digital governance is therefore the extension of the new paradigm of sovereignty.

6. Appeal and Limitations

What is appealing in the Community of Shared Future in China is its pragmatism. Infrastructure funding and non-conditional involvement are concrete and beneficial to many of the developing states in addition to their lack of intrusive reform conditions. Governments that would want to have a strategic autonomy during great power rivalry have also echoed with the story.

Nevertheless, the concept has structural deficiencies. To start with, the idea of debt sustainability and transparency issues calls into doubt the description of win-win only outcomes. Second, there is no doubt that the growing international scope of China is creating geopolitical anxieties, mainly in areas where its impact is clash with issues of security. Third, there is ambiguity in the very concept its broad and aspirational wording permits flexibility to the detriment of clarity in the doctrines.

7. Normative Recalibration As An Alternative To Replacement.

It is paramount to mention that Community of Shared Future in China does not support the complete substitution of the international system that is currently in place. Rather, it tries to recalibrate normatively. China will enjoy the benefits of international trade regimes, international banking and Stability, and so, the country operates under the system, as it tries to shift its ideological focus.

This is how China can be distinguished among revolutionary defaulters of the former times. Instead of building parallel institutions and replacing the existing ones, with a complete overhaul it achieves success, Beijing adopts, bit by bit, control over the old institutions but creates new platforms to support the previous ones.

The Community of Shared Future of Mankind in China is an elaborate effort at explaining another version of normativity based on sovereignty and development and multipolar inclusiveness. China pursues a discourse that challenges the primary of liberal universalism without necessarily turning the international system in reverse, through development diplomacy, semantic diffusion and digital government projects.

Narrative Instruments of Competition

During the modern stage of the U.S.-China rivalry, the competition is more and more based not on military rhetoric or economical disarmament but on the narrative tools crafted to enshrine the perception of the world, the institutional discourse, and the normative frameworks. Narrative warfare functions based on systemic processes, ways of doing business in multilateral diplomacy, development finance, digital governance, media systems, elite education, and political alliances, which repeats and authenticates alternative perspectives on the international order. These tools serve as semantic vehicles that not only include preferred values into

world discourse, but also determine regularities of alignment across geographical locations.

1. Normative Framing Multilateral Institutions.

Among the most significant arenas of narrative level of contestation are multilateral institutions. The liberal vision was established historically in the United States in the organizations, like the United Nations, the World Bank, and the international monetary fund. It is now in these institutions that these notions like human rights, transparency, democratic leadership, and liberation of the market became entrenched in the world policies.

To this, China does not oppose such institutions wholesale; instead, it applies a strategic approach where it gives its approaches their own twist by utilizing them. The diplomatic efforts have also tended more towards the principles of mutual respect, win-win collaboration and development based multilateralism. Gradual semantic institutionalization is manifested in the repetition of such terms into the official resolutions and communiques over time. The war is not about the presence of institutions but rather about the meaning of the guiding principles.

In such a way, multilateral arenas serve as arenas of discursive negotiation, in which voting votes, sponsoring of resolutions, and leadership posts turn into the tools of narrative projection.

2. Finance and infrastructure diplomacy Developing.

Another very potent narrative tool is development assistance. Historically the U.S. was an advocate of governance reform, transparency criteria, and opening markets to economic aid. In contrast, Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) of China focuses more on infrastructure connectivity, facilitation of trade, and industrial development without any active political conditionality.

The narrative aspect of development competition is framing. The U. S. tends to package its developmental relationships in terms of sustainability, rule-based and accountability. China packages its initiatives as practical, non-interferential and local responsiveness. Both the stories are meant to influence the views of legitimacy: one has the focus on the institutional integrity, the other on the sovereignty and pace of delivery.

Notably, development diplomacy establishes concrete symbols, such as bridges, ports, highways, energy plants, i.e., which serve as concrete objects of narrative assertions. The competition becomes influential in both material and symbolic capital in infrastructure.

3. Democracy Promotion vs Protection of Sovereignty.

One major line of narrative war is that of democracy vs. sovereignty. The United States promotes democracy summits, civil society ties and governance projects that enhance the political rights on the universality. Democracy is both morally superior as well as stabilizing in the strategic sense.

China is responding to such framing with non-interference and the diversity of civilizations. Sovereignty is the guardian principle against the foreign pressure.

This story hits even more home in areas that had a colonial background where selfishness to external interference is still elevated.

The rivalry is not pure ideological, thus, not hierarchical. The U.S. lays an emphasis on political liberalism as a source of order, but China lays an emphasis on state autonomy and economic stability. Both parties make their values for a basic one and implicitly attack the normative focus of the other.

4. Information Ecosystems and Digital Governance.

Online channels have become key goal tools of narrative competition. Bigger normative divergence is depicted by competing visions of internet governance. The United States also advocates an open and globally interoperable internet that is based on the freedom of expression. China promotes cyber sovereignty which means that nations are entitled to control online territories within its national borders using local legislation.

On top of regulatory contingencies, there are always narrative diffusion that digital ecosystems enhance. Favorable images of governance models are reproduced on social media platforms, the media networks affiliated with the state and transnational information alliances. The curation of information relies on algorithms that influence how the general population perceives information, especially young people.

Contemporary narrative warfare exists within a decentralized and hybrid information space as opposed to the Cold War propaganda. The operation of the think tanks, academic forums, policy institutes, and online influencers as agents can be seen as the indirect multiplier of state narratives. The control is not as centralized yet it could be more pervasive.

5. Educational and Cultural Diplomacy.

Long term narrative instruments are education and culture exchange programs because these programs shape the perceptions of elites. Networks of scholarship programs, research-based institutions, and alliances with universities across the globe were a historical practice at U.S. universities which were conforming to liberal standards. Liberal value internalization is usually enhanced by the exposure to institutions of democracy and an open debate.

China has also increased educational diplomacy by setting up language institutes, scholarships and academic collaborations. These programs facilitate cultural acquaintance and growth-related collaboration stories. Investing in elite formation, the two powers want to affect future policy-makers and opinion leaders.

The importance of educational diplomacy is especially high since the effects are both cumulative and generational. Instead of creating the immediate change in policies, it gradually forms epistemic communities, which view the global events through the prism of specific normativity.

6. Structural Cosmo-Mu.net Signaling and Structural Signaling.

Alliances in themselves serve as story elements. Whenever the United States builds alliances along the lines of the Quad framework or the Indo-Pacific approach,

it is an indication that they are all committed to a free and open order. This kind of alliance reinforces the accomplishment that liberal norms are widely supported.

The relations of China focus on the economic collaboration and the inclusivity of multipolarity. Expanding relationships throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, Beijing is sending a message that other new narratives of governance have high levels of legitimacy. Participancy in summits and forums is ritual approval of common values.

The mechanism of coalition-building is, therefore, performative diplomacy: the process of forming allies legitimizes itself in the performance.

7. Agency and Hybridization of the Audience.

Another normative aspect of narrative tools is reception by the audience. States of Global South do not remain passive observers but are clever consumers of rival fictions. Some of them choose the hybrid structures of engagement with Chinese financing of its infrastructure, but retaining security or financial connections to the Western organizations.

This discriminatory usurping makes binary assumptions difficult. Narrative tools are not likely to generate allegiance per se; they are sensitive to domestic political environments, past experiences, and economic interests. As a result, competition leads to negotiated hybridity as opposed to ideologically polarizing.

Storytelling devices of competition show that The U.S-China rivalry is entrenched within the politics of meaning. Digital governance, multilateral institutions, development finance, educational diplomacy, and alliances are used as avenues of expressing each power's choice of normative order.

The competition is not limited to speeches and rhetoric symbols. It is working by institutional language, infrastructural projects, informational ecosystem, and through socialization by the elite. In this regard narrative warfare is a totality approach to influence, in which legitimacy is made up over time, in the form of intersecting tools.

DISCUSSION: New Order Emerging?

The growing state of narrative rivalry between the United States and China is posing the main question: is that competition an indication of the new international order, or does it reflect a recalibration of the current one? Whilst traditional power transition perspectives are indicative of hegemonic replacement, the new international world order is telling of a more intricate shift filled with normative hybridity, layering institutions, and selective alignment as opposed to systemic subversiveness.

1. The Hegemonic Stability to Contested Legitimacy.

Since 1945, the liberal international order (LIO), traditionally vested in such institutions like the World Bank and the United Nations, has offered the structural arrangement directed at the management of global affairs. It has been supported by its longevity not just in terms of the capabilities of the American materials, but also

normative legitimacy. Legitimacy however is not fixed. It should be constantly reproduced by using performance, continuity, and adaptability.

The emergence of China makes this equation tough. Instead of destroying pre-existing institutions, Beijing performs within them and advances the notion sustained as the Community of Shared Future of Mankind as an interpretation. This indicates that this is not a revolutionary uprising but a revisionist in a semantic meaning. China is not opposed to multilateralism, it wants to reallocate its priorities, building sovereignty and development higher than the liberal political conditionality.

Thus, the paramount change might not be that of hegemon by another one, but of hegemonic stability by disputed legitimacy.

2. Hybridization and Not Replacement.

The most notable observations in the modern international politics background are that there are no ideological blocs, such as the Cold War. Although the United States presents its policy as the need to protect a rules-based order and China implements connectivity-based multipolarity via the Belt and Road Initiative, a large number of states participate in both systems at the same time.

Such a two-tier interaction indicates the practical equivalent of the balancing and not ideological conversion. Southeast Asian, African, and South Asian countries usually have Chinese infrastructure build-up and still have security or financial connections with the western institutions. It turns out to be more of a layered system, that is with several normative logics coexisting, rather than a bipolar split.

This hybridity issues classical theories of systemic transition. China is not replacing the liberal order outright, but seems to be incorporating it into and transforming it in bits and pieces. This new order can hence be described as institutional continuity and normative pluralization.

3. Reconfiguration of Normative Hierarchy.

In case there is a new order emerging, institutional redesign would be less of an expression of it, than the reorganization of normative hierarchies. Political liberalism, market openness, and collective security were considered the priorities of the post-1945 order. Conversely, liberty, autonomy, and non-interference are the principle forms of development, sovereignty and non-interference, which China anticipates in its account.

This transition does not abolish the liberal norms but leaves them in opposition to other priorities. Indicatively, economic development and poverty alleviation are taking up high spots in world agendas as witnessed in the United Nations debates. This does not relegate the human rights discourse but makes it complex in terms of primacy.

Therefore, the new change could be observed as normative change and not ideological revolution. Liberal ideals remain but they are no longer able to exercise monopoly of the world on morality.

4. Institutional Layering and Multipolarity.

Multipolar institutional layering is another characteristic of the possible new order. China has increased its presence in the existing institutions and at the same

time facilitated other platforms like the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). However, these new institutions do not automatically overcome the old ones, but coincide with each other.

Such a layered architecture implies an adaptive architecture as opposed to a collapsing architecture. States play with cross cutting institutional memberships and exploiting potentials among conflicting structures. This new order thus seems to be disrupted and at the same time integrated--not entirely liberal and not exactly post-liberal.

5. Digital Governance and Normative Fragmentation.

Systemic transition is further realized in the digital arena. There are more fundamental normative differences as shown by competing visions of internet governance open digital ecosystems or cyber sovereignty. As opposed to the classical territorial conflict, online governance defines the anxieties in the epistemological basis of global politics through determining the circulation of information and stories.

In the case of further fragmentation, the world can observe parallel digital worlds in line with different regulatory ideas. This sort of fragmentation would not inevitably destroy the global order, but would indicate the functional bifurcation in particular spheres.

6. Structural Barriers to Change.

Although contested visibly, there are a number of structural reasons as to why the new order is not necessarily being created completely new. To begin with, the economic interdependence between the United States and China is still high. Second, the U.S dollar enjoys dominance in international finance. Third, the institutional structures and global supply chains still embody the post-war buildings.

This system also has a great positive impact on China itself. It relies on the stability of an institution to expand its business into international markets through export. As a result, the strategy by Beijing can be discussed as reformist not revolutionary. It is aiming at expansion of influence and normative recalibration, and not systemic disintegration.

Equally, the United States has demonstrated adaptive ability whereby it strengthened alliances and reconfigured tactics to adapt to the evolving situations. This flexibility helps in minimising chances of an immediate displacement by a hegemon.

7. Toward a Negotiated Order

Combined with the discussable changes, one can even suppose that another order can be arising, yet not according to the classical definition of the succession of hegemonies. Rather, it seems that the international system is going through a negotiated pluralism phase. The liberal order is not the place that is not contested, but it is still very entrenched. The story of China is gaining momentum but it is yet to achieve universal acceptance.

The future architecture can thus be a hybrid order that is characterized by:

- The normative pluralism of institutional continuity.

- Influence with no definite ideological blocks.
- Both promotion of democracy and emphasis on sovereignty coexist.
- Co-existing economical and security orientations.

This middle power hybridisation is an indication of the agentic middle powers and Global South actors who influence outcomes by being selective in their interactions.

It is not a question of whether or not the Liberal Global Order is disintegrating and is it creating a complete alternative system. Instead, it is the critical change in the reduction of unique normative predominance. Narrative warfare has upset the perception of having a single model that generally defines legitimacy.

A new order is perhaps emerging but it is going to be stratified, coalitional and polyphonic, rather than being supplanted hegemonically. Performance, flexibility, and an ability to shake with the various political situations, legitimacy will become more and more grounded.

CONCLUSION

The growing strategic competition between the United States and China has been transformed into something bigger than traditional competition (depth) in military and economic matters to an ambitious struggle between the United States and China in terms of authority regarding the narrative and normative legitimacy. This paper has suggested that contemporary great power politics has become more of a narrative warfare- a coordinated attempt to establish the flagship principles, values, and institutional priorities which will determine the future of global government. In contrast to the changes in material power, the analysis proves that the core battle field is the sphere of ideologies.

The United States still grounds its position globally on the Liberal International Order, a system that has been institutionalized in various ways namely the United Nations, World Bank, and even the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. According to this order, democracy, governance by the rule of law, multilateral cooperation and liberalization of the economy are seen as universal pillars of legitimacy. Nonetheless, the normative authority of it has recently come under increasing criticism because of its inner contradictions and the unequal use of principles and structural disparities in global organizations.

By comparison, the expression of a Community of Shared Future of Mankind by China provides a sovereignty-based, more development-oriented alternative, which aims not at the blatant institutional replacement but at the normative tuning. By promoting a dialogue on non-interference, connectivity, and multipolar inclusion, Beijing strives to develop a discourse as part of the Belt and Road Initiative. This paradigm is especially popular with those states which are mainly concerned with economic development and policy autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, A. (2014). *The end of American world order*. Polity Press.
- Adil, S., Bandy, M. T., Sheikh, I. U., Baba, I. A., Kashoo, Z., Muzamil, S., & Shah, S. (2023). Improvement in the gut microstructure and nutrient digestibility by dietary inclusion of nanoencapsulated lavender essential oil in broiler chicken. *Ind. J. Anim. Health*, 62, 305-311.
- Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's trap?* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Bukhari, S. R. H. (2025). Palestine's Struggle for Survival: Unveiling the Humanitarian Crisis and Pathways to Lasting Solutions. *International Social Research Nexus (ISRN)*, 1(2), 1-12.
- Bukhari, S. R. H., Ali, S., & Haq, I. U. (2025). Realigning Alliances in South Asia: Exploring the Dynamics of Pakistan-Bangladesh Relations in a Post-Hasina Era. *Journal of Regional Studies Review*, 4(1), 94-109.
- Bukhari, S. R. H., Khan, A. U., Noreen, S., Khan, M. T. U., Khan, M. N., & Haq, M. I. U. (2024). Deciphering the US-Iran Nexus Reassessing the Ramifications of CIA Intervention in Iran and Its Prolonged Influence on Present-Day Geopolitical Standoff. *Remittances Review*, 9(1), 2638-2679.
- Buzan, B., & Lawson, G. (2015). *The global transformation: History, modernity and the making of international relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Callahan, W. A. (2016). China's "Asia Dream": The Belt Road Initiative and the new regional order. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 1(3), 226-243.
- Cooley, A., & Nexon, D. (2020). *Exit from hegemony: The unraveling of the American global order*. Oxford University Press.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). *Liberal leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton University Press.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs*, 94(1), 7-23.
- Imran, H., Nadeem, S., Khan, M. L., & Qureshi, U. (2025). Impact of Artificial Intelligence Personalized Learning on Student Motivation and Academic Performance. *SOCIUM Учредители: Jomard Publishing*, 2(1).
- Johnston, A. I. (2019). China in a world of orders: Rethinking compliance and challenge in Beijing's international relations. *International Security*, 44(2), 9-60.
- Kang, D. C. (2007). *China rising: Peace, power, and order in East Asia*. Columbia University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Khan, M. L., Sarfraz, A., & Tabassum, S. (2020). Parental occupation relationship with parental authority, introversion, self-esteem, religiosity and social anxiety among youngsters. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4, 234-245.

- Khan, S., Khan, M. L., & Waqas, M. (2025). Parental Expressed Emotions, Social-Emotional Competence and Vocational Identity in Adolescents. *Journal of Political Stability Archive*, 3(1), 244-263.
- Masih, S., Kumar, V., Tan Huynh, N., Anh Kiet, V., & Thi Thom, N. (2025). Bridging the AI learning anxiety and employees' extra-role behavior: An LMX perspective. *EDPACS*, 1-15.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). *The tragedy of great power politics* (Updated ed.). W. W. Norton.
- Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
- Nye, J. S. (2019). Soft power and great-power competition: Shifting sands in the balance of power between the United States and China. *China Leadership Monitor*, 62, 1–12.
- Parveen, S., Siddiqa, A., Inam, H., Pervaiz, F., Awan, S., Sarmad, M., ... & Iftikhar, J. (2019). Assessment of knowledge and compliance on hand hygiene among health care team in tertiary care centre. *Pakistan Armed Forces Medical Journal*, (2), S346.
- Rabbani, S., & Sarmad, M. (2018). Creative self-efficacy as the mediator between climate for creativity and creativity: empirical evidence from R&D of IT sector of Pakistan. *Abasyn J Soc Sci*, 18, 1-12.
- Rolland, N. (2017). *China's Eurasian century? Political and strategic implications of the Belt and Road Initiative*. National Bureau of Asian Research.
- Shabbir, T., Chandio, A. S., Uddin, S. S., & Ali, A. (2021). The impact of one unit on Sindh's political future after its abolition. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 4(4), 140-148.
- Shah, A. M., Kiong, W. S., Shah, S. A. A., & Shah, S. M. (2018). The Socio-Economic Impact of Ngos Development on Beneficiaries in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province (Kp) of Pakistan. *J. Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci*, 8(3), 118-122.
- Shambaugh, D. (2013). *China goes global: The partial power*. Oxford University Press.
- Uddin, S. S., Farooq, A., Ali, R. A., & Aurangzeb, M. (2025). The Role of Human Rights in China and USA's Foreign Policy Approaches. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, 3(2), 218-230.
- Wang, Y. (2013). The concept of “community of common destiny” in China's diplomacy: Meaning, motives and implications. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 1(2), 1–15.
- Weiss, J. C., & Wallace, J. (2021). Domestic politics, China's rise, and the future of the liberal international order. *International Organization*, 75(2), 635–664.
- Xi, J. (2017). Work together to build a community of shared future for mankind. Speech at the United Nations Office at Geneva, January 18.
- Zakaria, F. (2008). *The post-American world*. W. W. Norton.
- Zhang, F. (2016). Chinese hegemony: Grand strategy and international institutions in East Asian history. *International Security*, 41(1), 85–123.