

Q1: UNIPOLAR SYSTEM TO REVIVAL
OF MULTIPOLARITY, FACTORS
AND THEORIES EXPLAINING
DYNAMICS AMONG US-CHINA-
RUSSIA AND OTHER ACTORS:-

(I)

INTRODUCTION:-

The post cold war era marked the emergence of the unipolar international system ^{dominated} by the United States, with unrivaled military, economic, and technological supremacy shaping global politics. Over the past two decades, rising powers like China, a resurgent Russia and increasingly assertive regional actors have begun challenging US dominance, signaling a potential revival of multipolarity.

(II)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
UNIPOLAR SYSTEM:-

The unipolar system was defined by the US hegemony across military, economic, and cultural domains. Its leadership in NATO, the IMF and the other global institutions reinforced liberal international norms. Additionally, American soft power, through culture, technology, and diplomacy, allowed Washington to shape global governance and secure cooperation, solidifying its unchallenged position.

(III)

INDICATORS OF A SHIFT
TOWARDS MULTIPOLARITY:-

1) RISING ECONOMIC POWER:-

China and India's rapid GDP growth, technological innovations, and expanding trade networks have reduced US economic predominance, indicating a shift towards distributed global influence.

2) RESURGENT RUSSIA:-

Russia's assertive foreign policy in Ukraine, military modernization, and strategic partnership with China illustrates its capability to challenge unipolar dominance.

3) REGIONAL POWER

CONSOLIDATION:-

Actors like European Union, Brazil and Turkey increasingly pursue independent policies, demonstrating that global power is diffusing beyond the traditional US centric order.

(IV)

DRIVERS OF THE TRANSITION:-

1) STRATEGIC RIVALRIES:-

Geopolitical competition such as US-China tensions and the Indo-Pacific and Russia-West confrontations

over Ukraine, reflects realist balance behavior, where rising power counters hegemonic dominance to protect security interests.

2) TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETITION:-

Advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI), semiconductors and cyber capabilities are now instruments of strategic power. States controlling critical technologies can project influence and secure economic advantage heightening global competition.

3) NORMATIVE AND

IDEOLOGICAL DIVERGENCES:-

China's authoritarian capitalist model and Russia's nationalist policies contest liberal democratic norms influencing global alignments and fostering a multipolar distribution of influence.

V

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS:-

1) REALISM:-

Realism explains the power transition through security dilemmas and balancing. Rising power like China and Russia build military and economic capabilities to counter US dominance, while the US strengthens alliances and deterrence mechanism.

2) LIBERALISM:-

Despite rivalry, liberalism highlights that economic interdependence and institutions, such as United Nations and World Trade Organization, constrain outright conflict, selective cooperation in multipolar order.

3) CONSTRUCTIVISM:-

Constructivism emphasizes identity, legitimacy and norms. States'

behavior is influenced by historical experiences and self perception, as seen in China and Russia's attempt to challenge Western centric governance models.

VI

STRATEGIC ROLE OF MAJOR ACTORS:-

1) UNITED STATES:-

The US adapt to multipolarity by strengthening NATO, QUAD and AUKUS, and using sanctions, export controls, and technological standards to maintain global influence.

2) CHINA:-

China expands influence through the Belt and Road Initiatives (BRI), military modernization and technological leadership, reflecting a blend of realistic strategic calculation and soft power projection.

3) RUSSIA:-

Russia leverages energy diplomacy, military assertiveness, and strategic partnerships to assert its role as a counter-hegemonic power, particularly in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

4) OTHER MAJOR ACTORS:-

The EU seeks strategic autonomy while promoting normative leadership on climate and trade whereas India and Brazil pursue non-alignment policies balancing engagement with the US, China, Russia.

(VII)

IMPLICATIONS AND PROSPECTS OF MULTIPOLARITY:-

The shift towards multipolarity introduces both challenges and opportunities. Power diffusion encourages coalition building

and negotiation, yet increases the risk of regional conflicts and strategic uncertainty. The emerging global order will require sophisticated diplomacy, balancing competition and interdependence and normative alignment to maintain stability.

(VIII)

CONCLUSION:-

The global system is transitioning from a bipolar US dominated order towards multipolarity shaped by China, Russia, and regional powers. Structural, economic, technological, and normative drivers facilitate this shift while realism, liberalism and constructivism explains different dimensions of emerging power dynamics. Understanding these dynamics is essential for navigating the 21st century world order, where competition coexist with selective cooperation and balance of power is increasingly complex.

Q5: PAKISTAN - AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS, RESURGENCE OF TTP, INCREASING BORDER TENSIONS, REPATRIATIONS, AND INFLUENCE OF EXTERNAL ACTORS.

(I)

INTRODUCTION:-

Pakistan-Afghanistan relations have historically remained fragile due to unresolved border ~~security~~ disputes, security dilemmas and regional power politics. Following the Taliban's return to power in 2021, expectations of the improved bilateral cooperation were quickly undermined by the resurgence of the Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan, escalating border tensions and the stalled repatriation of Afghan refugees. These challenges have been further complicated by the external involvement in Afghanistan, transforming bilateral disputes into broader regional security concerns.

(II)

PERSISTENT CHALLENGES IN PAKISTAN - AFGHANISTAN RELATIONSHIPS:-

1) HISTORICAL TRUST DEFECIT AND STRATEGIC MISTRUST:-

Pakistan-Afghanistan relationships are burdened by the deep rooted trust deficit ~~divers~~ shaped by divergent threat perceptions, contested borders, and past proxy conflicts. From an IR realist perspective both state prioritized security over cooperation reinforcing mutual suspicion and limiting sustained engagement.

(III)

RESURGENCE OF THE TEHREEK - E - TALIBAN PAKISTAN (TTP) :

1) SAFE HAVENS AND CROSS BORDER MILITANCY:-

The TTP's resurgence is closely linked to its operational sanctuaries inside Afghanistan, exploiting porous borders and weak enforcement mechanisms. Pakistan views this as a direct violation of Afghanistan's commitment under international norms of non-interference, intensifying bilateral tensions.

2) TALIBAN'S AMBIGUOUS POLICY TOWARDS TTP:

Despite ideological affinity, the Afghan Taliban claim neutrality towards the TTP, adopting the policy of mediation rather than coercion. This ambiguity reflects constructivist dynamics where shared ideological identities complicate state behavior, undermining Pakistan's counterterrorism objectives.

(IV)

INCREASING BORDER TENSIONS:

1) DISPUTE OVER THE DURAND LINE:-

The Durand Line remains a core irritant with Afghanistan refusing to formally recognize it as an international border. This unresolved territorial dispute fuels realist security dilemmas as both the states militarize border management to assert sovereignty.

2) FREQUENT BORDER CLASHES AND MILITARIZATION:-

Skirmishes at border such as Torkham and Chaman highlight the escalation of the hard security approaches. These confrontations dispute trade mobility and people to people contact, reinforcing conflictual rather than cooperative bilateral interactions.

(V)

STALLED AFGHAN REFUGEE REPATRIATION PROCESS:

1) PROLONGED REFUGEE PRESENCE AND SOCIO ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS:

Pakistan's hosting of the millions of the Afghan refugees for decades has generated economic, social and security pressure. The absence of the stable political and economic framework in Afghanistan discouraged voluntary repatriation, prolonging the crisis.

2) POLITICIZATION OF REFUGEE ISSUE:

The refugee question has increasingly become scrutinized with Pakistan linking repatriation to terrorism concerns. From a securitization theory lens, refugees are framed as security threats, complicating humanitarian cooperation between two states.

(VI)

ROLE OF EXTERNAL INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN:

1) LEGACY OF THE GREAT POWER INTERVENTIONS:

Decades of the US and NATO interventions militarized Afghan societies and weakened state institutions. Their abrupt withdrawal have created a power vacuum, enabling militant groups to reemerge and destabilize Pakistan-Afghanistan relations.

2) REGIONAL POWER COMPETITION:

China, Russia, Iran, and India pursue divergent strategic interest in Afghanistan, transforming it into a theatre of regional competition. This multipolar contestation constrains bilateral problem solving by embedding Pakistan-Afghanistan relations with wider geopolitical rivalry.

(VII)

IMPACTS ON REGIONAL PEACE INITIATIVES:-

1) UNDERMINING OF COUNTER TERRORISM COOPERATION:-

External involvement has fragmented regional counter terrorism framework, limiting intelligence sharing and coordinated actions. Pakistan's security concerns regarding the TTP remain inadequately addressed within the regional peace mechanism.

2) WEAK REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS FRAMEWORK:-

Organizations such as SCO and regional dialogue platforms lack enforcement capacity to manage Afghanistan-centric instability. Liberal institutionalism's promise of cooperation remains unrealized due to competing national interests.

(VIII)

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN AND THE REGION :-

1) ENTRENCHMENT OF REGIONAL SECURITY DILEMMA:-

The interaction of the internal militancy, unresolved borders, refugee crisis, and external interference has entrenched a complex regional security dilemma.

(IX)

CONCLUSION:-

Pak-Afghan relationship remain strained due to resurgence of TTP, unresolved border disputes, and stalled repatriations of Afghan refugees. All of which reinforce security dilemma. Taliban's inability or unwillingness to curb TTP activities has intensified mistrust and border militarization. External involvement, regional power competition and geopolitical rivalries remain uninterested due to competing national interests. All of this undermine regional peace.

**Q4: POST PAHALGAM IMPACTS
ON SECURITY PARADIGM
OF INDIA-PAKISTAN AND
REGIONAL PERCEPTION,
STRATEGIES AND INFLUENCE
ON FOREIGN POLICY:**

(I)

INTRODUCTION:

Post Pahalgam crisis marked another critical episode in the already volatile India-Pakistan security relationships unfolding under the shadow of nuclear deterrence and historical mistrust. While the crisis did not escalate into full scale conflict it reinforced enduring pattern of securitization, coercive signaling and crisis diplomacy. This episode reshaped regional perception of stability and compelled both states to recalibrate their strategies and foreign-policy calculations.

(II)

**IMPACT ON THE
INDIA - PAKISTAN
SECURITY PARADIGM:-**

**1) REINFORCEMENT OF THE
NUCLEAR DETERRENCE STABILITY:-**

The crisis reaffirmed the relevance of the nuclear deterrence in preventing conventional escalation, as both states exercised restraint despite aggressive rhetoric. This aligns with deterrence stability theory where mutual vulnerability constrains military adventurism.

**2) PERSISTENCE OF
SECURITY DILEMMA:-**

India's heightened security posture and Pakistan's defensive signalling reinforced a classic realist security dilemma, where defensive measures by one state are perceived as offensive threats by the other.

(III)

CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND ESCALATION DYNAMICS:-

1) CONTROLLED ESCALATION AND STRATEGIC SIGNALLING:-

The episode demonstrated a preference for limited escalation through diplomatic pressure and media narratives rather than kinetic military action. This reflects India and Pakistan's learning curve from past crises such as Pulwama-Balakot.

2) ROLE OF CRISIS DIPLOMACY:-

Back channel communication and external diplomatic engagement helped prevent miscalculation, highlighting importance of crisis management mechanisms in nuclearized dyad.

(IV)

RESHAPING REGIONAL PERCEPTIONS:-

1) REAFFIRMATION OF SOUTH ASIA AS A VOLATILE NUCLEAR FLASHPOINT:-

Regional and global observers viewed this crisis as evidence that South Asia remains prone to rapid escalation, reinforcing concerns over nuclear risks and strategic instability.

2) PAKISTAN'S CONTINUED CENTRALITY IN INDIA'S SECURITY DISCOURSE:-

The crisis reinforced Pakistan's prominence in India's security narrative, demonstrating that despite broader geopolitical ambitions, India's immediate threat perception remains Pakistan-centric.

(V) STRATEGIC ADJUSTMENT BY INDIA:-

1) EMPHASIS ON DETERRENCE THROUGH PRESSURE:-

India increasingly rely on diplomatic isolation, economic leverage and narrative warfare rather than overt military retaliation, reflecting shift towards coercive diplomacy.

2) ALIGNMENT WITH MAJOR POWERS:-

The episode strengthened India's inclination towards strategic alignment with the US and its partners using international legitimacy to constrain Pakistan's strategic space.

VI STRATEGIC ADJUSTMENT BY PAKISTAN:-

1) FOCUS ON STRATEGIC CONSTRAINTS AND CRISIS CONTAINMENT:-

Pakistan projected restraint to avoid escalation while emphasizing its nuclear posture as responsible, consistent with its long standing strategy of deterrence through denial.

2) RENEWED PUSH FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION:-

The crisis reinforced Pakistan's reliance on the international forums, and external actors to highlight regional instability and counter India's unilateral narratives.

(VI) IMPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN POLICY CALCULATIONS:-

1) INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CAUTION DURING BILATERAL ENGAGEMENT:-

Both states are likely to institutionalize cautious engagement, avoiding direct confrontation while maintaining hardened security posture along the Line of Control.

2) ENTRENCHMENT

OF STATUS QUO RIVALRY:

Rather than transforming relations the post Pahalgaon crisis entrenched a status quo rivalry marked by deterrence stability, episodic crisis and limited diplomatic space.

(VII)

CONCLUSION:

The post Pahalgaon crisis reinforced deterrence stability while exposing the enduring fragility of India-Pakistan security paradigm. It reshaped regional perception by reaffirming South Asia's volatility and compelled both states to refine crisis management and foreign policies.

Q3: FAILURE OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS THROUGH THE LENS OF IR THEORIES AND HOW IS UNO'S MODEL DIFFERENT FROM LON?

(I)

INTRODUCTION:

The League of Nations was the first global attempt at institutionalized collective security, established after World War I to prevent the future conflicts. Despite its normative ambition, the league failed to maintain peace during the interwar period, culminating in the outbreak of World War II. This failure can be critically examined through an IR theoretical lens, while comparison with United Nations reveals both institutional continuity and significant structural divergence.

(II)

FAILURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE:-

1) ABSENCE OF MAJOR POWERS:-

The League suffered from a legitimacy deficit as the key powers such as the United States never joined, while Germany, Japan and Italy later withdrew. From a realist perspective institutions lacking great power participation cannot enforce order on the anarchic international system.

2) WEAK ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM:-

The League possessed no standing military force and relied on voluntary sanctions which proved ineffective towards aggressive states. Realism explains this failure as states prioritized national interest over collective commitment.

3) UNANIMITY RULE

AND INSTITUTIONAL PARALYSIS:-

Decision making require unanimity, allowing even aggressor states to veto action. Liberal institutionalism highlights how flawed institutional design undermined cooperation and rapid crisis response.

4) COLLECTIVE SECURITY

WITHOUT POWER BACKING:-

League's collective security framework lacked credible deterrence because enforcement dependant on the willingness of member states. Without material power, norms alone failed to restrain revisionist states.

(III)

IR THEORETICAL EXPLANATION ON THE LEAGUE'S FAILURE:-

1) REALIST INTERPRETATION:

Realist argue that league ignored power politics and balance of power logic, assuming harmony of interests where none existed. Aggressor states exploited this idealism in pursuit of territorial expansion.

2) LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM'S LIMITS:

While liberalism supports institutions for cooperation the league lacked institutional depth, enforcement capacity and economic integration to sustain peace. Cooperation collapsed when cost outweighed perceived benefits.

3) CONSTRUCTIVIST PERSPECTIVE:

Constructivist highlights weak normative internalization as collective security norms failed to shape

identities. Nationalism and revisionist theories remained dominant over shared international responsibility.

(IV) THE UNITED NATIONS AS A SUCCESSOR INSTITUTION:-

1) INCLUSION OF MAJOR POWERS:-

Unlike the league, UN institutionalized great power participation through the Security Council. This realist accommodation of power enhanced legitimacy and enforcement capacity.

2) STRONGER ENFORCEMENT ARCHITECTURE:-

The UN Charter allows coercive measures, peacekeeping operations and authorization of force. Although imperfect this reflect learning from league's inability to enforce decision.

V

CONTINUITY AND DIVERGENCE IN INSTITUTIONAL MODELS:

1) CONTINUITY IN NORMATIVE GOALS:

Bolton institutions can share commitment to collective security, peaceful dispute resolution and international cooperation. Liberalist ideals remain central to global governance frameworks.

2) DIVERGENCE IN DECISION MAKING STRUCTURES:

The UN's veto based system replaces unanimity with hierarchical authority, prioritizing effectiveness over equality. This reflects a pragmatic fusion of realism and liberal institutionalism.

3) ADAPTATION TO COMPLEX GLOBAL THREATS:

The UN has expanded into peace-building, humanitarian intervention and global governance addressing non-traditional security threats. The institutional evolution contrasts sharply with the League's narrow mandate.

(VI)

CONCLUSION:

The League of Nations failed to maintain peace due to weak enforcement, exclusion of major powers and flawed institutional designs -- failures explained through realist, liberal and constructivist lens. The UN reflects both continuity and normative ambitions and divergence in structural pragmatism particularly through power accommodation and enforcement mechanism.