

START FORM HERE

changing global order or  
Anarchy?



The recent blatant military aggressions in Middle East compromised the international law and principles of UN charter. The basic principles of territorial integrity, sovereignty, and non intervention that highlighted the concept of Nation-state have been pitifully ignored and torn apart. International organizations that were institutionalized on the premise that cooperation rather than duress would dictate the world politics have been delegitimized by their pioneers. US, as the sole superpower after balkanization of USSR, proposed democratic neo-liberal ideology to drive the international relations. Until the disintegration of Soviet, the smaller powers had the option of balancing between the two major poles (~~new~~<sup>free</sup> world and communist space) to protect their national interests. However, contrary to advocates of hegemonic stability theory, US as the sole hegemon without checks by other powers, as multipolarity would have desired, has been compromising the sovereignty of smaller powers. Under the R2P and neo-conservative policies, US in post-cold war era has circumscribed the sovereign equality of others under the shadow of spreading American ideals in the third world while exploiting power disparity to achieve its hegemonic ambitions. The transgressions under the veil of GWOT culminated into invading

## START FORM HERE

9/11 using the threat of WMD as a legitimizing shield. It repeated the similar script while engaging in Syria: Toppling the Libyan regime, bombing Yemen, intimidating Russian resurgence by expanding NATO, and militarization around Taiwan to and in South East Asia to "limit China's rise", are some of the many other coercive tactics, actions and interventions to see things as American interests dictate. Such continued hegemonic interventions are bound to strengthen the opposing voices and expedite the fall of a hegemon. As predicted by world cycle theory, America by transgressing the rules and regulations framed by itself will delegitimize its actions, rupture the world order, and the rising powers, like China, would exploit the increasing fault lines and overthrow the global, liberal, American order. Will it require a hegemonic violent war as mentioned in power transition model or it will be a peaceful transition ~~as~~ the end of cold war? Although wars are <sup>similar to</sup> rationalized by security analysts, the risks of a nuclear world war and the costs of it are unimaginable. Thus, if future can envisage a new system of order, it means we at present dodged a hegemonic full scale war. However, it ~~will~~ is imminent that the current toothless international system <sup>will</sup> ~~has~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~been~~ completely <sup>blown</sup> ~~blown~~ off, and the transitioning system might see a multipolar world ~~and a new hegemon to arise~~.

# SUPPLEMENT

Name of Examination: SSC / HSC Part I - II 20  
Annual/Supplementary

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Paper \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of Examiner \_\_\_\_\_

Seat No. \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of  
Invigilator \_\_\_\_\_

Space for affixing Centre Seal

(To be done within the Circle

Only after submission of the  
Script by the Candidate)



START FORM HERE

Weak governments.

The current political setup is persistently scrutinized, protested, and alleged of rigging 2024 elections; thus, compromising its legitimacy to rule. When governments believe that they lack popular support, enacting harsh while necessary policies becomes unrealistic. The weak governments fear mass agitation and cast straw to personal political careers if unpopular decisions are successfully exploited by the political rivals. Corresponding to that, the current setup of a coalition government does feel the heat beyond parliament and media houses. They (coalition partners) are well aware of ground realities as unsympathetic to them. Clinging onto entrenched elites and power houses in the "deep states" would not last long. For their own parochial interest it would be highly irrational to resort to such misadventures of unpopular policies. It would only help the opposition, working as an ignition point, a spark to a highly inflammable fuel. Thus the cries of reform-based, structural-based, budget forming or executive level decisions for long-term reformation can never be met with this setup in power. Weak governments seldom shake the policy inertia.