

START FORM HERE

changing global order or  
Anarchy?



The recent blatant military aggression in Middle east ~~Has seriously breached or compromised~~ principles of UN charter. The basic principles of territorial integrity, sovereignty, and non intervention that ~~Diametrically opposed~~ highlighted the concept of Nation-state have been ~~grossly~~ ignored and torn apart. International organizations that were institutionalized on the premise that cooperation rather than ~~dominance~~ would dictate the world politics have been ~~delegitimized~~ by their pioneers. US, the sole superpower after balkanization of USSR, ~~propelled~~ 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 (~~free~~ 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 third world while exploiting power disparity to achieve its hegemonic ambitions. The transgressions under the veil of GWOT culminated into invading

Plz write short sentences to make unself more clear



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 ~~serve the interests of the United States~~  
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 ~~engaging in the wars and~~ ~~interventions~~  
framed by itself will ~~delegitimize~~ its actions,  
rupture the world order, and the rising powers,  
like China, would exploit the increasing rift lines  
and overthrow the global, liberal, American order.  
Will it require hegemonic violence, war as  
mentioned in power transition model or it will  
be a peaceful transition ~~as~~ the end of cold war?  
Although wars are ~~similar to~~ rationalized by security  
analysts, the risks of a nuclear world war and  
the costs of it are unimaginable. ~~Thus, it is~~  
~~clearly evident that the world is not at present~~  
at present dodged a hegemonic full scale war.  
However, it ~~will~~ <sup>will</sup> be imminent that the current toothless  
International system ~~will~~ <sup>will</sup> be completely ~~blown~~ <sup>blown</sup> off, and  
the transitioning system might see a multipolar world  
and a new hegemon may 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

New government

The current political setup 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 strain to their personal political careers if unpopular decisions are successfully exploited by the political rivals. Corresponding to this, the current setup of a coalition government has proved to be a hindrance to the parliament and media houses. They (coalition partners) are well aware of ground realities as unsympathetic to them. Clinging onto enriched 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 executive level decisions for long-term reformation can never be met with this setup in power. New governments seldom shake the policy inertia.

Avoid this weak expression

Ur first paragraph is more assertive