

PART-II

Question 2

The collapse of the Berlin wall (1989) signaled the end of the bipolar world order. In its wake, two preeminent scholars offered contrasting visions of the future. Francis Fukuyama envisioned a world converging toward a singular ideological destination, while Samuel Huntington predicted a world diverging into fragmented cultural conflicts. These theories continue to serve as a principle lens through which post cold-war geopolitics are analyzed.

The end of history (Francis Fukuyama 1992)

1) Definition and theoretical roots

Fukuyama's thesis is rooted in Hegelian-Marxist teleology - the idea that history is a linear, purposeful process of evolution. He argued that the struggle between ideologies (Monarchy, Fascism, Communism) had reached its "end" because Liberal Democracy and Free-Market Capitalism emerged as the final, most rational form of human government.

2) Application of IR Theory - Liberalism

=> The democratic Peace Theory

Fukuyama applies the liberal premise that as more states become democratic, the frequency of war decreases.

=> Economic Interdependence

He posits that the globalization of markets would replace military competitions with economic calculations.

⇒ Universalism

The theory assumes Western values (human rights, rule of law) are universal aspirations that will eventually be adopted globally.

The clash of civilizations (Samuel Huntington (1993-96))

1) Definition and theoretical roots

In direct response to Fukuyama, Huntington argued that while the "age of ideology" had ended, history had not. Instead, the world had reverted to a "normal" state of cultural conflict. He famously asserted, "The fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or economic, it will be cultural."

2) Application of IR Theory: Realism and Constructivism

⇒ Civilization Fault Lines

Huntington identified eight major civilizations (Western, Sinic, Islamic, Hindu, Orthodox, etc.) and argued that "fault lines" between them would become the battlefields of the future.

⇒ Modernization vs. Westernization

He argued that states can modernize (gain technology/wealth) without westernizing (adopting Western values), leading to a "rejection of the west" by the "Rest."

⇒ Identity Politics

He utilized a constructivist lense to show how Identity-rooted in religion and history - is more immutable than political affiliation.

Comparison and Contrast

Features	The End of History	The Clash of Civilization
- Main driver	Political/Economic ideology	Culture/Religion.
- Global direction	Convergence (Universalism)	Divergence (Pluralism)
- Nature of conflict	Decreasing (Boredom)	Increasing (Fault line wars).
- Core actor	The individual/The state	The Civilization.
- Primary Theme	Optimism/Liberal Triumphalism.	Pessimism/Cultural Realism.

Global developments: Complements and Contradictions

1) Complements (Evidence Supporting the theory)

⇒ For Fukuyama: The expansion of the EU and the initial "Waves of Democratization" in Eastern Europe and Latin America in 1990s supported the idea of global democratic consensus.

⇒ For Huntington: The 9/11 attacks and the subsequent "War on Terror" are often cited as the ultimate proof of a West vs. Islam clash. Similarly, the Russia-Ukraine War (Orthodox vs. West) and the rise of China (Sinic challenge to Western hegemony) fit his model of civilizational friction.

2) Contradictions (Evidence challenging the Theories)

⇒ **Against Fukuyama**: The rise of Authoritarian Capitalism (China, Vietnam) proves that market success does not require liberal democracy. Furthermore, "Democratic Backsliding" in the West and 2008 Financial Crisis weakened the "finality" of his model.

⇒ **Against Huntington**: Most modern conflicts occur within civilizations (e.g., Sunni-Shia rivalry in the Middle East, on intra-Western disputes) rather than between them. Critics argue that he homogenized complex cultures into monolithic blocks.

Conclusion

While Fukuyama captured the euphoria of the 1990s, Huntington better anticipated the identity-driven anxieties of the 21st century. However, neither theory is absolute. The contemporary world is a hybrid. We see a "clash of civilizations" at the cultural level, even as the "end of history" persists through the global adoption of the capitalist economic system.

Question 7

The ongoing conflict, particularly the devastating war in Gaza (2023-2025) and its lingering aftermath in 2026, represents a critical juncture in contemporary history. It has transcended bilateral boundaries to become a

Litmus test for international law, regional stability, and the strategic resilience of non-aligned states like Pakistan.

Theoretical Framework: Constructivism

1) Definition

⇒ Constructivism: posits that international relations are shaped not just by material power (military/economy) but by shared ideas, identities, and social norms. It emphasizes that "anarchy is what states make of it."

2) Application to the conflict

⇒ Identity-Driven conflict.

The struggle is fundamentally over competing identities (Zionism vs. Palestinian Nationalism) and religious narratives regarding the same sacred geography.

⇒ Global norms

The conflict has exposed the "double standards" of the rule-based order. For many, the western response has constructed a narrative that prioritizes Israeli security over Palestinian human rights, leading to a "normative crisis" in the Global south.

Impact on Middle-East Security

The conflict has fundamentally altered the "New Middle East" envisioned during the early 2020s.

1) Death of the economic peace.

The Abraham Accords have stalled. Normalization between Israel and Saudi Arabia - once seen as imminent - is now contingent on a credible path to a Palestinian State.

2) Regional spillover

The brief Israel-Iran War of 2025 and ongoing maritime disruptions in the Red Sea by the Houthis demonstrate that the conflict is no longer "contained".

3) Weakening of the 'Axis of Resistance'

While Israel has militarily degraded Hamas and Hezbollah, it has positioned itself as the primary destabilizer, leading to a pragmatic ~~rapprochement~~ rapprochement between former rivals like Saudi-Arabia and Iran to counter Israeli hegemony.

Impact on the Global Geopolitical Order

The conflict serves as a catalyst for a transition toward a Multipolar World.

1) UN Paralysis

Frequent US vetoes in the UNSC and the Israel's 2025 ban on UNRWA have eroded the legitimacy of the United Nations.

2) The rise of the "Global South"

Led by South Africa's ICJ case and supported by China and Russia, the global south has used the conflict to challenge Western moral authority.

3) US Strategic Overextension

The US's "offshore balancer" role is under strain as it balances support for Israel with its interests in Ukraine and the Indo-Pacific.

Challenges and opportunities for Pakistan's Foreign Policy

Challenges

- 1) **The diplomatic tightrope**: Pakistan faces pressure from the US and Gulf allies to participate in the Gaza stabilization force (ISF) in 2026. Coordinating with Israeli forces, even indirectly, risks a massive domestic backlash.
- 2) **Economic vulnerability**: As an energy-importer, any escalation at the Strait of Hormuz directly threatens Pakistan's fragile economic recovery.
- 3) **The Kashmir Parallel**: Pakistan's moral stance on Kashmir is intrinsically linked to its stance on Palestine. Any perceived compromise on the latter weakens its case on the former.

Opportunities

- 1) **Regional Security Provider**: Pakistan's calibrated military performance (as seen in the 2024-2025 border tensions) has reframed it as a "security provider" for Gulf states who no longer trust Western guarantees alone.
- 2) **Strategic autonomy**: By aligning with the OIC and China, Pakistan can resist "bloc politics" and promote a multilateral solution, enhancing its status in the Global South.

Conclusion

The Israel - Palestine conflict is no longer a peripheral issue; it is a central pillar of the 21st century geopolitical shift. For Pakistan, the path forward requires "Strategic Realism," upholding its principled support for a two-states solution while leveraging its military and diplomatic weight to remain relevant in a rapidly changing Middle-Eastern Architecture.