

Q. No. 1, How does the rise of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations and international organizations, challenge the traditional state-centric forces of International Relations? :

Answer:

1. Introduction

The international system has historically been dominated by state as the central and most legitimate actor. Realist thinkers, drawing from the Westphalian order of 1648, have emphasized sovereignty, power, and military security as the essence of international politics. While, constructivists argue that non-state actors shape global norms, ideas, and identities thereby influencing how states interact and perceive one another. Similarly, liberal theorists challenge the exclusivity of state centrism by recognizing multinational cooperations, NGOs and international institutions as legitimate actors that play an equally significant role in fostering cooperation, creating regimes, and managing interdependence. The 21st century has witnessed the rise of non-state actors, that increasingly influence global politics. This development has challenged the traditional state-centric paradigm by diffusing power, reshaping sovereignty, and broadening the security agenda beyond mere territorial defense.

2. An Overview of Traditional and Non-Traditional Security

Traditional Security

- Rooted in realism
- Military force
- Sovereignty
- Territorial integrity
- State survival
- Balance of power
- Focuses on alliances

Non-Traditional Security

- Post cold war perspective
- Encompasses threats such as terrorism, environmental degradation, cyber warfare.
- Role of NGOs and institutions

3. Importance of Non State Actors in Practice of International Relation Theories

3.1. The Realist School of Thought

Realist considers states as the only legitimate actors in international politics. From this perspective, non state actors are largely seen as proxies of more powerful states rather than independent identities. Organizations such as IMF or WTO are understood as to serve the interest of dominant states, while phenomena like terrorism are considered extensions of interstate conflict. For realist, ultimate authority and decision making still rests firmly with the state.

3.2. The Constructivist School of Thought

Constructivist argue acknowledge the contributions of non-state actors in shaping norms, identities, and social interactions among the states. They recognize NGOs, media, and international institutions can influence relations between states. However, constructivists continue to place the states at center of global politics, arguing that while Non State Actors play a role in shaping the international environment, they do not replace the dominance of state.

3.3 The Liberal School of Thought

Liberals challenge the exclusivity of the state by recognizing non-state actors as equally important players in international relations. They argue that institutions, MNCs, and civil society organizations promote cooperation, manage interdependence, and shape norms of governance. Thus, the liberal school highlights a pluralistic international system where both states and non-state actors are equally significant.

4. The Rise of Non-State Actors: A challenge to Traditional State Centric Forces.

4.1. Individual Non-State Actors Challenging State Supremacy



Influential individuals such as Elon Musk demonstrate the capacity of private wealth and innovation to shape international affairs. Through companies like SpaceX and Starlink, Musk influences communication systems, satellites, technologies, and even space policy—areas traditionally dominated by states. Thus, influential individuals pose a significant challenge to traditional state-centric forces.

4.2. Economic Challenges from organisations Challenging State Sovereignty

The non-state actors such as international financial institutions, exercise enormous influence over states by imposing economic conditionalities and structural reforms. In many cases, these intervention from IMF and World Bank, erode economic sovereignty, by imp as seen in Pakistan, where IMF programs have dictated monetary and fiscal policies.

4.3. Political Pressures from Global Institutions

Non-state actors also shapes the decision making of states. For instance, Pakistan had to pass more than 40 new laws to comply with the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) requirements in order to exit grey list. This shows that how external institutions can override domestic political priorities.

4.4 Media as a driver of Policy Backlash

The role of international media has been critical in shaping state policies. The U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam was significantly accelerated due to negative media portrayal and public backlash. Outlets such as CNN, BBC, or Reuters continue to influence the legitimacy of state and policies at a global level.

4.5. Violent Non-State Actors

• Destabilising the State's Power.

Armed Non State Actors such as Balochistan Liberation Army, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan, and ISIS undermine monopoly of states over violence. Their insurgencies and terrorist attacks destabilize national sovereignty and weaken the writ of governance.

4.6. Mass Movements & Catalysts for the decentralization of State Authority

Mass uprisings have repeatedly reshaped the international politics. The Iranian Revolution of 1979 overthrew a state backed ~~mon~~ monarchy, while the Arab Spring movements toppled governments across the Middle East. Similarly, Bangladesh's Monsoon Revolution became a defining example of how popular mobilization can challenge authoritarian regimes and

serve as a powerful non-state force in influencing state policy and decentralization of authority.

5. Conclusion

The growing role of non state actors highlights a fundamental shift in nature of global politics. While state remain powerful, their monopoly over decision-making and sovereignty has been eroded by economic, political, social, and military influence of non state actors. Realists

continue to stress the primacy of states, but liberals and constructivists demonstrate the power is now diffused across multiple layers of governance.

Multinational corporations, international organizations, media, armed groups and mass movements have become central in shaping world politics, proving that the traditional state-centric paradigm is no longer sufficient. The future of

~~international relations lies in~~

The future of international relations lies in understanding the complex interplay between states and non state actors addressing both traditional and non traditional security challenges.