

5 "Climate change is the defining issue of our time." — United Nations

The Paris Climate Agreement was adopted in 2015 by 196 countries to limit global temperature rise to well below 2°C , preferable 1.5°C , compared to pre-industrial levels. The agreement depends on collective responsibility, especially of major emitters. The decision of former US President Donald Trump to withdraw from the agreement (announced in 2017, effective in November 2020) raised serious concerns for the future of global climate efforts.

Importance of the United States:

The United States plays a central role in climate governance because:

- it is the second-largest emitter of CO_2 , responsible for about 13-15% of global emission.
- Historically, it is the largest cumulative emitter of greenhouse gases.
- it has strong financial, technological, and political influence.

Under the Paris Agreement, the US had pledged to reduce emission by 26-28% below 2005 levels by 2025 and contribute to the \$100 billion per year climate

finance goal for developing countries-

Negative Impacts of US Withdrawal-

1 Weakening of Global Momentum:

The US withdrawal reduced moral pressure on other countries. Research showed that global emission reduction efforts slowed during this period, and trust in climate cooperation weakened-

2 Climate Finance Gap:

The US promised \$ 3 billion to the Green Climate Fund but delivered only \$ 1 billion before withdrawal. This created serious funding shortages for climate adaptation projects in vulnerable countries like Bangladesh and small island states-

3 Rise in Climate Skepticism:

Trump openly called climate change a "hoax", despite NASA and IPCC confirming that global temperature has already increased by about 1.1°C since the late 19th century. This weakened public belief in science in some regions-

Global Response in the Absence of US Leadership-

Despite the withdrawal, global climate action continued. The European Union strengthened its leadership role through the European Green Deal, committing to climate neutrality by 2025. China also reaffirmed its climate ambitions, accounting for nearly 30 percent of global emissions and pledging to peak emissions before 2030 and achieve carbon neutrality by 2060. Additionally, within the United States itself, states, cities, and corporations continued supporting Paris goals, with over 3,000 non-federal actors joining initiatives that pledged continued climate action.

Critical Evaluation of the Paris Framework
Trump's decision exposed structural weakness in the Paris Climate Agreement - The agreement is based on voluntary national commitments rather than legally binding obligations, making it vulnerable to domestic political changes in powerful states. However, the continued participation of other countries and non-state actors demonstrated that climate action is increasingly driven by economic benefits and survival needs rather than political leadership alone. The rapid expansion of renewable energy

green jobs globally further supported this shifts-

Future of Climate Change Efforts:

In the long run, the absence of US leadership risks slowing climate progress and increasing the cost of inaction. According to the IPCC, failure to limit warming to 1.5°C could expose around 680 million people to coastal flooding by 2025 and increase the frequency of extreme weather. While global efforts can continue without the US, achieving climate goals become more difficult and fragmented-

Conclusion:

In conclusion, Trump's withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement weakened global efforts against climate change by reducing leadership, trust, and financial support. However, it did not halt global climate action. Other states, international organization, and non-state actors stepped in to fill the leadership gap, showing that climate change is a shared global responsibility. Nevertheless, effective and timely climate action ultimately requires the active participation of major emitters, stronger international commitments, and consistent political will.

8 Introduction:

"States have no permanent friends or enemies, only permanent interests"-

On 17 September 2025, during a state visit by Pakistani Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan signed a formal mutual defence treaty - the Strategic Mutual Defence Agreement (SMDA) - at the Al-Yamamah place in Riyadh. Under this treaty, both countries commit that "any aggression against one shall be considered an aggression against both". The pact institutionalises decades-old informal cooperation into a binding defence framework.

Observer call this pact a "historic and landmark" development - marking the most upgrade in Pak-Saudi military relations in decades.

Causes of the defence Pact:

1. Long-Standing Historical and Military Ties:

The first major cause is the longstanding history of close military cooperation b/w the two countries. Since 1960s, Pakistan has provided military training, advisory support, and development of troops to Saudi Arabia. Over the decades, Pakistan has trained more than

8,200 Saudi armed forces personnel and held numerous joint military exercises-

2 Regional Security Uncertainty and Changing Strategic Environment:

Another cause is rapidly shifting security environment in the Middle East and Gulf. The pact comes at a time of heightened regional tensions, including recent Israeli military actions (e.g. attacks on Qatar) and broader instability-

For Saudi Arabia, this pact reduce reliance on traditional external guarantors and diversifies its defence partnership-

For Pakistan, this environment offers an opportunity to strengthen its strategic relevance beyond South Asia, making itself indispensable to Gulf security architecture-

3 Strategic and Geopolitical Rebalancing by Saudi Arabia:

The pact also reflects Saudi Arabia's shift towards a more autonomous and multi-aligned defence strategy, reducing over-dependence on a single global power. By forging ties with Pakistan - a nuclear-armed Muslim-majority state with a large military - Saudi Arabia achieves a strategic hedge. For Pakistan, this enhances its geopolitical

role and influence in the Islamic world.

Implications of the Pact:

1. **Shifting Regional Balance:** Creates a powerful new security bloc, challenging existing power structure in West Asia and South Asia.
2. **Enhanced Deterrence:** Formalizes the "aggression against one is aggression against both" principle, creating stronger joint deterrence.
3. **Nuclear Ambiguity:** Introduces strategic ambiguity regarding nuclear response, potentially creating a deterrent effect, though its nuclear dimension remains unclear.
4. **Geopolitical Realignment:** Signals a move towards more modular, layered alliances, potentially evolving into an "Arab NATO".
5. **Economic Integration:** Offers potential for deeper economic ties (fintech, investment) if implemented effectively, beyond just security.

Conclusion:

The significance of the agreement may primarily be symbolic, with both Islamabad and Riyadh signaling to allies and adversaries - it does solidify and deepen the long-standing defence

cooperation b/w the two countries, without extending a nuclear umbrella - In addition, the Pak-Saudi Agreement will enhance Pakistan's influence in the region as well as signal to India that Pakistan's alliances are solidifying and diversifying - it undercuts India's influence in the Gulf, complicates dynamic in the region, and makes New Delhi anxious.

For Saudi Arabia timing of the Agreement is often linked to regional instability and the need to diversify security partnerships - Some "countries across the region may view the Saudi-Pakistan pact as a hedge against over-dependence on great powers" -