

(IR) Part II (1)

NOA: (Final Mock)

Q5 what changes you expect in American foreign policy after Trump's reentry in Presidential office and its global implications.

Donald Trump's reentry in the presidential office can bring significant changes in American foreign policy which could be anticipated, reflecting his previous administration's approach and the evolving global landscape.

→ Expected changes and their Potential global implications.

1) American First Policy: Trump's "America First" doctrine would likely return, prioritizing U.S. interests over international commitments. This could lead to a reduction in U.S. participation in multilateral agreements and organizations. For example, during his first term, the U.S. withdrew from the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Iran nuclear deal (JCPOA). A reversion to this policy could strain alliances and diminish the U.S.'s influence in global governance.

2) Trade Relations: Trump's administration was marked by a confrontational trade policy, particularly with China.

A return to power could see the reimplementation of tariffs and trade barriers, which would escalate tensions between the two largest economies. For instance, the trade war initiated by Trump in 2018 led to retaliatory tariffs that affected global supply chains. This could further disrupt international trade and economic stability in various regions.

3)

Military Engagement and Alliances:

Trump often questioned the value of NATO and other alliances, suggesting that allies should bear more of the financial burden. If he were to return, there might be a push for allies to increase their defense spending, which could lead to tensions within NATO. Additionally, a more isolationist stance could result in reduced U.S. military presence in conflict zones, potentially creating power vacuums that other nations, like Russia or China, might exploit.

4).

Middle East Policy: Trump's administration recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital and

broked the Abraham Accords, normalizing relations between Israel and several Arab states. A return to office might see a continuation of pro-Israel policies, which could further alienate Palestinian interests and complicate peace efforts in the region. Additionally, Trump's approach to Iran would likely remain confrontational, potentially leading to increased tensions in the Gulf region.

5)

Climate Change and Global

Health: Under Trump, the U.S. downplayed climate change and withdrew from international health initiatives. A return could hinder global efforts to combat climate change and pandemic preparedness, as the U.S. plays a fragmented global approach to these critical issues, with countries acting unilaterally rather than collaboratively.

6)

Global Perception and Soft Power:

Trump's foreign policy approach often led to a decline in U.S. soft power, as allies and global citizens viewed the U.S. as less reliable. A continuation

of his policies could further diminish U.S. influence in international institutions and among global populations potentially leading to a shift in global power dynamics as countries like China and Russia seek to fill the leadership void.

All in a nutshell, a reentry of Trump into the presidential office could lead to a retrenchment in U.S. foreign policy characterized by unilateralism, a focus on national interests, and a questioning of traditional alliances. The global implications of such shifts could include increased tensions in trade, military engagements, and climate initiatives, potentially reshaping the international order and affecting global stability.

Q7 The latest inclusion in the list of UN's failure is the genocide in Gaza. In consideration of the crises, recommend necessary reforms:

⇒ Tension in Gaza: The ongoing crisis in Gaza, particularly the violence and humanitarian suffering resulting from the Israeli-Palestinian

Conflict, has sparked significant criticism of the United Nations (UN) and its effectiveness in preventing and addressing genocide and mass atrocities.

The situation has led many to label the UN's response as a failure, particularly in light of its foundational mission to promote peace, security, and human rights globally.

1) Pointing the Context:

The situation in Gaza has been marked by repeated escalations of violence, notably during conflicts such as those in 2008-2009, 2012, 2014 and most recently in 2021. The UN has documented numerous instances of civilian casualties, destruction of infrastructure, and widespread displacement. According to a report from UN office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in Gaza, dire humanitarian conditions, exacerbated by blockades and military actions. The UN Human Rights Council has also expressed concerns about potential war crimes and human rights violations committed by both sides.

2) Failures of the UN: during these conflicts.

Critics argue that the UN has failed to effectively intervene in the Gaza crisis due to several factors.

a) Ineffective Peacekeeping:

The UN's peacekeeping missions have often been limited in mandate and scope, lacking the authority to enforce peace or protect civilians actively. For example, the UN Truce Supervision Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) has faced criticism for its inability to prevent hostilities in the region.

b) Political Gridlock: The Security Council's structure, particularly the veto power held by the five permanent members, often leads to paralysis in addressing crises. For instance, the U.S. has frequently vetoed resolutions critical of Israel, undermining collective international efforts to address the humanitarian situation in Gaza.

c) Inadequate Humanitarian Response:

The UN's humanitarian agencies, such as UNRWA (United Nations

Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees), and have struggled with funding shortages and political challenges, limiting their ability to provide essential services to those in need.

3) Recommendation Reforms:

a) Strengthening Mandates: The UN should consider reforming the mandates of peacekeeping missions to include robust measures for protecting civilians and enforcing ceasefires. This could involve clearer rules of engagement and support for rapid response units capable of addressing immediate threats to civilians.

b) Revising the Security Council Structure:

To overcome political gridlock there should be discussions on reforming the UN Security Council, potentially limiting the use of veto power in case of mass atrocities or humanitarian crises. This could facilitate more timely and decisive action in response to situations like the one in Gaza.

c) Enhancing Humanitarian Coordination:

The UN should improve coordination among its various humanitarian agencies, ensuring that resources are allocated effectively and that there is a unified approach to addressing crises. This could involve establishing a dedicated fund for emergency response in conflict zones, ensuring that humanitarian assistance reaches those most in need.

d) Promoting Accountability:

The UN must prioritize accountability for violations of international law, including potential war crimes in Gaza. This could involve supporting independent investigations and ensuring that perpetrators are held accountable, which would serve as a deterrent for future violations.

e) Engaging Regional Actors:

The UN should actively engage regional powers and organizations in finding sustainable solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This could involve facilitating dialogue and negotiations that include voices

From both sides, as well as regional stakeholders. In conclusion, the UN response to the crisis in Gaza highlights significant shortcomings in its ability to prevent and address genocides and mass atrocities. Implementing necessary reforms, such as strengthening peacekeeping mandates, revising the Security Council structure, enhancing humanitarian coordination, promoting accountability and engaging regional actors, could improve the UN's effectiveness in responding to similar crises in the future. These changes would not only address the immediate needs of those affected but also contribute to long-term peace and stability in the region.

Q4. What are the main triggers of revival of multipolar world order? Comment whether it was a reality or a myth.

The revival of a multipolar world order refers to the shift from a unipolar system, dominated by the United

(10)

States, multiple nations a global where
power and influence hold significant

Economic Growth of emerging Powers:

Economic growth of emerging powers
Countries like China, India, Brazil,
and Russia have experienced
significant economic growth in recent
decades. China's rise, in particular,
has been remarkable, as it has
become the second-largest economy
in the world. This economic clout
allows these nations to assert
themselves more on the global
stage, challenging the dominance of
the U.S. and its allies.

2) Shifts in Global Governance:

Institutions such as the BRICS
(Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa)
and the Shanghai Cooperation (SCO)
represent efforts by emerging powers
to create alternative frame
works for global governance. These
organizations aim to promote
cooperation among member states,
often in opposition to western-led
institutions like the IMF and
World Bank.

3) Geo-Political Tension: The resurgence
of geopolitical rivalries, particularly
between the U.S. and China.

has contributed to the multipolarity narrative. Events such as the South China sea disputes, Russia's actions in Ukraine, and tensions in the Middle east highlighted the complexities of international relations and the emergence of multiple centres of power.

Resultantly, the revival of a multipolar world order is increasingly seen as a reality rather than a myth. The evidence of rising powers, changing governance structures, and shifting alliances indicates that the global landscape is becoming more complex and varied. While the U.S. remains a significant player, the influence of other nations is undeniable, suggesting that the future of international relations will be characterized by a multipolar system where multiple countries share power and influence. This perspective is supported by various scholars and analysts in international relations, who argue that the current trends are reshaping the global order in fundamental ways.