

**Q.1) a) The Non-Aligned Movement's relevance in a "neo-minilateral" world. Discuss****Answer:**

Born in 1961 to protect newly-decolonised states from bloc politics, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) still rallies 120 members around the *Bandung* principles of sovereignty, anti-colonialism and equitable development. Even after the Cold War, NAM caucuses at the UN have championed the right to development, nuclear-weapon-free zones and fair technology transfers—functions the base content rightly calls *soft-balancing mechanisms* that “delegitimise super-power excesses” and prevent the global order from sliding into war.

The pressure today comes from **neo-minilateralism**: small, issue-specific clubs such as the Quad, I2U2 or Digital Nations that promise speed and focus. Their appeal is captured in the maxim that **diplomacy should involve “the smallest possible number of countries needed to have the largest possible impact on solving a particular problem.”** Minilaterals offer agility, but they exclude many developing states and often echo great-power agendas.

Far from being redundant, NAM supplies the missing counterweight. It aggregates the numerical strength of the Global South, sets floor norms for minilateral deals and feeds collective positions into the G-77, WHO and climate talks. Uganda’s 19th Summit (2024) created task-forces on vaccine equity, climate finance and digital governance—precisely the granular mandates critics said the Movement lacked. As UN Secretary-General **Kofi Annan** observed, “*The collective mission of this movement is more relevant than ever.*” Nepal’s Prime Minister **Prachanda** also said after the Kampala summit: “*The importance of the non-aligned movement remains the same... to guarantee freedom, independence and geographical integrity to all countries.*”

Nonetheless, reform is imperative. NAM must (i) professionalise its coordination bureau, (ii) create rotating, expert-led “issue minilaterals” under its banner, and (iii) link its economic demands to concrete South-South financing instruments. By combining its moral legitimacy with modular formats, NAM can turn minilateral momentum to multilateral ends.

**b) Evaluate ASEAN's performance as a security community****Answer:**

ASEAN embraced the security-community idea in 2015, aiming for “a rules-based community with shared values and norms... a cohesive, peaceful, stable, and strong region with shared responsibility for comprehensive security.” One core objective is “regional peace and stability through consistent recognition of justice and the rule of law in regional interactions.”

**Practical gains**

- Norm-setting has deepened through the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, the *ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific* and its **3 Ms**—mutual trust, respect and benefit—giving ASEAN convening power across multiple forums.
- The ASEAN Regional Forum has evolved from confidence-building to a sharper focus on preventive diplomacy; members now press for an updated Plan of Action to meet complex threats such as maritime frictions, cyber risk and climate insecurity.
- Operational cooperation is widening: disaster-relief exercises and a 2024-27 ARF Work-Plan on disaster risk reduction, regional cyber norms and an ASEAN CERT framework, and an **APSC Strategic Plan** (2025-35) that links defence, law-enforcement and human-security agendas.

**Limitations**

Yet ASEAN's security community remains “early-stage” and fragile. Khoirunnisa lists a weak Secretariat, major-power pressures, unresolved territorial disputes and the gap between non-intervention and human-rights demands as structural handicaps; she warns these challenges “pose serious threats to the Community’s objectives of establishing a common norm for regional peace and stability.”

**Balance sheet**

ASEAN has delivered habits of dialogue, rising transparency and a web of regional norms. However, crisis management still relies on national restraint, not collective enforcement, and core disputes—from the South China Sea to democratic backsliding—remain unresolved. The record therefore points to qualified success: ASEAN has laid the foundation of a pluralistic security community, but its cohesion and deterrent capacity are not yet assured.

**c) Comment: The international rise of China is a hint that the so-called lost bipolarity is returning.**

**Answer:**

According to international theorists, “bipolarity” is the state of world affairs in which two superpowers control all others. These two countries are referred to as “poles” or superpowers. In the same way as the north and south poles are at opposite ends of the planet geographically, the two superpowers are considered to be at different ends of the world politically.

Many people believe that the emergence of China signifies the presence and significance of a bipolar world. Some predict—even advocate—a U.S.-Chinese relationship like that of the Cold War. Numerous academics contend that the evidence shows a bipolar geopolitical structure, albeit one that is markedly asymmetrical because of the superiority of the US military.

**Data sufficient to support the claim that the current global order illustrates a case of bipolarity:**

- 1) widely comparable competitors in terms of skill distribution
- 2) significantly isolated from the other major powers.
- 3) Bipolarity may continue even if there is a notable difference in the powers on an important criterion, such as military or economic might. For example, during the so-called bipolar era of 1970, the nominal GDP of the Soviet Union was around 40% of the US GDP.
- 4) The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) reports that China's nominal defense spending in 2020 was comparable to the US's in terms of proportion (32%), and it was the same as the year before.

Consequently, these elements suggest that the current global order might be an example of bipolarity between the US and China. Some academics, however, disagree. They contend that the existence of several powers, including the United States, the European Union, China, Russia, India, and Japan, characterizes the current international order, in contrast to the Cold War era, which was described as a “bipolar” one. As a result, the international order is substantially different from what it was during the Cold War.

Therefore, the current US-China conflict illustrates that a new type of competition is forming rather than a rerun of the “Cold War.” A famous instance of the “Thucydides trap” occurs when an established power (the USA) is challenged by a rising power (China).

Furthermore, the polarity of power thesis is moot because the current global order, which was brought about by the conclusion of the Cold War, **is sometimes referred to as the age of complex interdependence**. But in the current era of intricate interconnection, we are seeing **the emergence of the multipolar world represented by the BRICS countries, as well as the potential for a new kind of bipolarity between the US and Russia**.

**d) Comment: Mercantilist Approach to International Political Economy.**

**Answer:**

For Oatley, "mercantilism is a traditional school of political economy dating from (at least) the **seventeenth century**. It asserts that power and wealth are inextricably connected. Accordingly, it argues that governments structure their international economic transactions to enhance their power relative to other states and domestic society. **Mercantilism thus depicts the international political economy as inherently conflictual.**"

**Mercantilism envisions how the conflict between states plays out in the international economic arena by looking at the trade balance.** The ability of a state to win or if a state is winning the economic struggle with other states is determined by whether it exports more than it imports. As a result, it is a state that records trade surpluses rather than trade deficits. **A related issue is a state's ability to master today's modern technologies.**

Mercantilism came to presume that a state was powerful if it was at the technological frontier and had industries based on the most advanced technologies of the day because humankind's economic development was dependent on a continuous process of growing technological and technical capacities. **This is significant since early mercantilism in the 16th and 17th centuries was more concerned with dominating foreign markets by force and ensuring that the riches collected via that control primarily benefited the mother country.** It wasn't so much about mastering the technological development process.

**Recent mercantilist thinking has focused on East Asia's successful 'developmental' states: Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and China.** They underline that economic success has always been accompanied by the state playing a strong, commanding role in supporting economic development.

The economy, according to mercantilism, is subordinate to the polity and, in particular, the government. **Economic activity is viewed in the perspective of growing state authority.** The organisation in charge of defending and furthering the national interest, meaning the state, has precedence above private economic interests. Wealth and power are complementary rather than antagonistic aims. **Economic reliance on other countries should be avoided to the greatest extent practicable.**

**International political economy** investigates issues that arise or are influenced by the interaction of international politics, international economics, and various social systems (e.g., capitalism and socialism) and societal groups (e.g., farmers at the local level, different ethnic groups in a country, immigrants in a region such as the European Union, and the poor who exist transnationally in all countries).

**Mercantilists are like realists in that they focus on conflicting interests and capacities of nation-states in a competitive quest for dominance and security.** These perspectives are frequently applied to problems at several levels of study, pointing to complex fundamental causes of conflict that may be traced back to human nature (the personal level), national interests (the national level), and the structure of the international system (which lacks a single sovereign to prevent war).

**e) The European Union as a model of regional integration and its “ever-closer union” mandate**

**Answer:**

“Determined to establish the foundations of an ever-closer union among the European peoples”, the Treaties set a telos that still shapes global debates on regionalism. From the 1957 EEC onward the Union fused market-making with “a supranational legal, institutional and political layer capable of neutralising the once sovereign Nation-States”.

**Giuliano Vosa** traces this to the *Planungsverfassung* doctrine: the Treaties were read as “constitutions-to-be” that allowed any measure widening Union scope to claim fidelity to the founders’ will and thus gain primacy over national law.

In material terms the Union remains the world’s densest bloc—27 states, half-a-billion people and the largest trading area—which inspires later projects from Mercosur to AfCFTA. Its cohesion policy adds the social pillar: multi-level funds, place-based programmes and an “integrated approach” meant to balance competitiveness with solidarity, so that long-term dynamism is “unattainable without cohesion”.

Yet the mandate is contested. The Court of Justice’s set-effet utile, expansive competence, value conditionality—now advances what **Vosa** calls “the ever-closer union project ... to be pursued at any cost”. Crises have shifted the narrative toward “integration through fear”, while **Ulf Hedetoft** reads the EU as a “**civilian empire**” whose centre-periphery tensions question voluntary consent.

The balance sheet is mixture of effects. The Union still offers the most sophisticated template for pooling sovereignty, anchoring peace and reducing internal disparities. But the original consensus—that legal integration protects national constitutional legacies—has frayed. Without recalibrating primacy, voice and cohesion instruments, the model risks emulating the empires it once meant to transcend rather than the pluralist federation it promised.

**Q.2) a) “Current realignments in West Asia have left one regional actor with unmatched military capabilities.” Critically analyse the evolving security architecture and assess whether it points toward bipolar, multipolar or hybrid ordering.**

**Answer:**

Israel is the unmatched actor in West Asia today. Its precision-strike air force, multilayer missile defences and covert reach now dwarf every rival, while Iran leans on missiles and an ageing air arm. The recent war was an aerial war between the most advanced air force in the region and the most advanced ballistic missile capability in the Middle East. **Israel’s 2025–26 doctrine** therefore emphasises pre-emption, rapid manoeuvre and U.S. tie-ups.



## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

Through a bipolar lens the picture looks simple: Israel versus a weakened “axis of resistance”. The Gaza–Iran war slashed Hezbollah stocks, tied down Syria and exposed Iran’s limits. Yet Arab capitals resist hard alignment. Riyadh maintains that “the kingdom will not recognise Israel without a Palestinian state,” keeping normalisation on ice; Qatar mediates; Bahrain alone joined strikes on the Houthis; the UAE hedges between Washington and Beijing.

Beneath this, a multipolar current runs. Russia’s Gulf security blueprint, Iran’s *Hormuz Peace Endeavour* and China’s *Global Security Initiative* all champion non-bloc, UN-anchored collective security and digital-age cooperation—principles that Gulf states accept because they maximise diplomatic room for manoeuvre. Analysts observe that a new era of hybrid order is unfolding. States will increasingly tailor security and economic partnerships to their varied interests.

Hence, the hard-power balance is almost bipolar, but the diplomatic–economic web is multipolar. West Asia is crystallising a **hybrid order**—Israeli military primacy co-existing with overlapping, issue-specific coalitions that shift by sector and crisis.

**b) Analyse the factors that have contributed to the establishment of the nuclear taboo. How has this nuclear taboo influenced state policies and conduct?**

**Answer:**

The “nuclear taboo” embodies a widely accepted normative prohibition against the utilization of nuclear weapons in armed conflicts. This ethical restraint has exerted a profound impact on the landscape of international relations since the conclusion of World War II. The indelible memory of the catastrophic outcomes caused by nuclear bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 has spurred a collective consciousness regarding the ominous potential of these weapons.

The genesis of the nuclear taboo can be traced back to the harrowing events of 1945, when the unprecedented loss of life and the enduring aftermath of radiation underscored the cataclysmic implications of nuclear warfare. This realization prompted a global awakening to the cataclysmic capacity of nuclear weapons. **Scholars such as Scott Douglas Sagan and Kenneth N. Waltz expound** on the factors that have contributed to the establishment of this taboo. **Sagan, in his work “The Limits of Safety,” underscores the acute awareness that leaders possess concerning** the public’s staunch opposition to nuclear weaponry, rendering their deployment politically, ethically, and strategically unviable.

**Kenneth N. Waltz, a preeminent theorist in international relations, contributes to this discourse through his neorealism theory. In “Theory of International Politics,”** he contends that states are primarily driven by the pursuit of survival within an anarchic global system. In this context, the nuclear taboo can be perceived as a rational response to the inherent anarchical nature of international relations. States recognize that resorting to nuclear weapons could culminate in their own annihilation, thus instigating a form of voluntary constraint.

**Influenced state policies and conduct:**

The nuclear taboo has transformed into a norm that has influenced state policies and conduct. Nuclear-armed nations experience both internal and external pressures that dissuade them from employing such weapons. Public sentiment, international treaties, and diplomatic conventions collectively reinforce this

restraint. **The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of nuclear weapons (NPT), for instance, embodies the international commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, further bolstering the nuclear taboo.**

Scholars such as Nina Tannenwald, in her work "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," underscore how the normative framework surrounding nuclear weapons cultivates anticipations of responsible behaviour and deters any transgressions of this norm.

**The nuclear taboo is not immune to challenges:**

The ascent of non-state actors and the potential for accidental use in the era of cyber warfare introduce novel threats to the stability of the taboo. Additionally, shifting geopolitical dynamics and the emergence of revisionist powers prompt inquiries into the ongoing efficacy of the taboo in deterring nuclear weapon deployment.

**Waning nuclear taboo in south Asia:**

In a recent Stimson Centre paper, Nina Tannenwald explores the "nuclear taboo" in South Asia, focusing on its weakening dynamics. India, traditionally adherent to a "no first use" (NFU) policy, is experiencing a fading nuclear taboo due to factors like heightened anti-Pakistani rhetoric and unclear NFU commitments. **Pakistan's nuclear strategy, relying on responding to specific Indian conventional attacks, has always had a weaker taboo compared to India.**

Pakistan's nuclear capability has enabled it to sustain a low-level insurgent-terrorist campaign in Kashmir against India, deterring significant Indian retaliation. **This has led India to seek ways to deter further attacks, including the development of its "Cold Start" strategy.** Pakistan countered this with tactical nuclear weapons, sparking debates within India about the viability of its NFU doctrine and further eroding the nuclear taboo. This decline emphasizes the need for improved institutional relations between India and Pakistan to stabilize deterrence.

**Pulwama and the Changing Discourse of the Nuclear Taboo:**

**During the Pulwama Crisis in 2019, both India and Pakistan seemed willing to escalate, posing concerns about nuclear restraint.** The crisis revealed trends challenging deterrence and the nuclear taboo. India's response involved conventional strikes, while Pakistan returned an Indian pilot as a peace gesture under international pressure.

Notably, missile threats emerged on both sides. India's bold statements, such as claiming to expose Pakistan's nuclear bluff, received criticism for crossing boundaries. **Pakistani leaders interpreted India's actions as moves toward nuclear risk.** Meanwhile, Pakistan's stance shifted, emphasizing deterrence over use. Public opinion in Pakistan also showed an increasing awareness of nuclear war consequences. This crisis appeared to nudge India from the nuclear taboo and draw Pakistan closer to it.

**The nuclear taboo has played a pivotal role in shaping the landscape of international relations by establishing a normative foundation against the utilization of nuclear weapons.** Originating from historical trauma and fortified by moral considerations, public sentiment, and global accords, this taboo has significantly impacted state behaviour and contributed to the overall equilibrium of the global order. However, its resilience amid evolving challenges remains a subject of continuous scholarly discourse.

**c) Do you believe that liberal international politics have definitely won the Cold War? Provide your arguments.**

**Answer:**

**Bernard Baruch, an American statesman, coined the phrase "Cold War," although Prof. Lippmann is credited with popularizing it.** He used it to discuss the strained circumstances that had arisen between the U.S and the U.S.S.R. **K. P. S. Menon claims the Cold War,** as it was known throughout the world, was a conflict between two ideologies (**Capitalism and Communism**), two political systems (**Bourgeoisie Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship**), two political blocs (**NATO and the Warsaw Pact**), two states (**the United States and the Soviet Union**), and two individuals (**John Foster Dulles and Stalin**).

With the collapse of communist ideology, several nations began adopting the western model of politics and economy. **Francis Fukuyama claimed that this was the "end of history" because the USA was left as the only superpower, with no other nations or blocs to confront it.** With the exception of China, North Korea, Cuba, Iran, the monarchies of the Gulf, and a few isolated regions in Africa, most countries transitioned toward the model of liberal democracy during the 1990s (after the collapse of the USSR).

After the Cold War ended, the liberal world order reached its pinnacle. **LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, Globalization) reforms in almost every country were highly successful.** The formation of the WTO is considered the zenith of the liberal world order.

**In his paper "The Twilight of the Liberal World Order," Robert Kagan discusses how the current international order is deteriorating.** He argues that the liberal system established after World War II may be coming to an end, as it faces opposition from both internal and external forces. The desire of dissatisfied great and medium-sized states to overthrow the U.S.-dominated strategic system is a significant external challenge. They seek to establish hegemony over their respective regions. **Given their military, economic, and political strength and their willingness to use them, China and Russia pose the biggest threats to the international system.**

**Since the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, we have seen the decline of the liberal world order, with nations reverting to the previous paradigm.** Examples include state-centric geopolitics, the rise of protectionism, Russia's invasion of Crimea, BREXIT, regionalism, the America First policy, Atmanirbhar Bharat, and the impact of the pandemic, which highlighted flaws in the current world order. **C. Raja Mohan noted, "Covid has shown the fractures in current global international systems." – a sentiment echoed by PM Modi at the NAM summit.**

**However, Samuel P. Huntington, in his book "The Clash of Civilizations,"** argues that the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War period will be culture, and future wars will be fought not between countries but between cultures. **According to many scholars, the recent conflict between Ukraine and Russia, which NATO, the UN, and other international organizations were unable to control,** as well as the USA's failure to stop the conflict and the rising military spending of nations like China, mark significant challenges to the liberal international order.

The phrase “Cold War 2.0” became popular during the administration of Donald Trump in reference to the U.S.-China competition, which has been exacerbated by China’s economic growth. **China is contesting the U.S.-led economic system and is laying the groundwork to become a military superpower.**

**Q.3) a) Terrorism and nuclear proliferation continue to undermine the promise of a secure global order." Critically examine in the current context.**

**Answer:**

Specifically, the post-Cold War conditions suggested a safe and collaborative world environment where arms control as well as the shallow prevalence of collective security would dominate. But again, the continuous rise of terrorism, increase in nuclear proliferation has greatly challenged this vision. **Terrorism on the other hand, adapts through transnational networks and radical ideologies and technologies; nuclear proliferation on the other hand poses a threat to the global non proliferation regime, through escalating geopolitical tensions.** These problems because of increased geostrategic competition and the decline of the rules-based order put at risk global security in a more multipolar world.

**The Terrorism Challenge:**

Terrorism has evolved from local insurgencies to technological sophisticated global systems that incorporate the Internet and secure modes of communication. While unstable countries like the Middle East and Africa provided playgrounds for ISIS and Al-Qaeda, lone wolves working in Western countries represented the decentralized nature of terrorism. **"Inside Terrorism" by Bruce Hoffman argues that the degree of tolerance to international pressure that the groups can endure allows them to survive.**

Recent attacks in Afghanistan under the Taliban regime and the rise of ISIS-affiliated groups in Africa show that there is an inability to approach terrorism from a holistic global perspective. **The UN Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee** has often not acted in a decisive manner because the major powers were unable to agree on measures, such as designating groups based in Pakistan as terrorist organizations.

**Nuclear Proliferation:**

Nuclear proliferation is still one of the key dangers since North Korea, Iran, and Pakistan violate international standards. The continuous tests of North Korean missiles in 2023 and its claim of having miniaturized nuclear warheads reflect the failure of sanctions and diplomacy under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. **On the other hand, Iran's nuclear steps despite the JCPOA indicate that any agreement made by the US with another nation can be broken when policies shift.**

Increased risk proliferation is also associated with the rivalry between superpowers. The United States withdrawing from the arms control treaties, such as the INF Treaty, and the continuous build-up in China's arsenal complicate the disarmament agenda. **The existence of nuclear weapons promotes deterrence and stability according to Kenneth Waltz. In the world of multipolarity and multiple non-state actors, nuclear material proliferation becomes a catastrophic threat.**



**Interlinkages Between Terrorism and Nuclear Proliferation:**

The combination of terrorism and nuclear proliferation raises the security threats. Finally, dangers associated with nuclear proliferation by non-state actors or use of nuclear materials or technology – so-called nuclear terrorism – are still very real. **Graham Allison** in his book **Nuclear Terrorism: The interest of The Ultimate** Preventable Catastrophe is that nuclear stockpiles are at risk and the safeguards, or lack of them against theft or smuggling, are grossly insufficient. For instance the exposed syndicate smuggling uranium in Eastern Europe this year 2021 sheds light on the fact that nuclear security requires cooperation of countries.

**The Role of Multilateral Frameworks: Successes and Failures:**

**The UN, IAEA, and FATF, among others, are playing critical roles in fighting terrorism and nuclear proliferation.** The latter has further tightened anti-terror financing mechanisms, but its effect is normally diluted by the lack of cooperation from states harboring terrorist networks. In the case of the IAEA, it monitored compliance with nuclear agreements but could not enforce stringent measures against violators such as North Korea.

Nuclear Security Summits initiated by the Obama administration also promised possibilities of cooperation but failed to deliver the needed continuity, whereas geopolitical cracks in global architecture like US-China rivalry and nuclear aggression by Russia, inhibit the collective steps taken inside these structures.

**Case Studies:**

South Asia continues to be a hub for terrorism and nuclear risk. **Tactical nuclear weapons in Pakistan along with its support for proxy groups in Kashmir make the environment volatile.** Terror may lead to near-conflict among nuclear armed states, such as was seen in Pulwama attack in 2019 and the resultant Balakot airstrikes.

The Middle East: Iran's nuclear ambitions and its proxy networks in Yemen, Syria, and Lebanon destabilize the region and undermine efforts toward a secure global order. **The Abraham Accords face challenges from Iran's strategic calculus that is being advanced through regional cooperation.**

A huge threat arising from East Asia is North Korea's nuclear advances and the lack of any concrete US-China strategy to answer them. **Tests in 2023 that shot missiles into Japan and South Korea point to the potential for a miscalculation in the region.**

**Current Developments:**

Russia's veiled threats to use tactical nuclear weapons in Ukraine bring these into sharper focus and have set a dangerous precedent for nuclear-armed states in conflicts. **Likewise, the US-led coalition's response to terrorism in Afghanistan has faltered post-2021 with the Taliban resurgence emboldening extremist networks.**

Emerging technologies layer even more complexity onto this security matrix. Cyberterrorism and potential cyberattacks on nuclear facilities expand the scope for potentially cataclysmic results. **The UN Group of Governmental Experts on cyber norms is woefully underfunded and has no authority, which epitomizes global inaction.**

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

Multilateralism needs to be revitalized for the goals of counter-terrorism and nuclear proliferation. **Reforms in the composition of the UN Security Council to bring in emerging powers, tougher enforcement by the IAEA, and a global treaty on cyber-nuclear security are called for.** Regional organizations such as SCO and African Union need to be proactive against terrorism.

The global order would remain secure if and only if collective will is developed in the states so that interests in security at the global level would override narrow geopolitical interests. **Kofi Annan** said aptly, **"We will not enjoy development without security, we will not enjoy security without development, and we will not enjoy either without respect for human rights."** Balancing all these imperatives could pave the way for a stable and resilient international system.

**b) Evaluate the effectiveness of global governance in addressing the challenges posed by climate change and gender inequality.**

**Answer:**

Multilateral institutions and frameworks operate in the context of global governance on issues such as climate change and gender inequality. These are interrelated issues where the impacts of climate change are largely against vulnerable groups and, more specifically, women; once again, gender inequality bars equal participation in decisions regarding climate change policies. There are improvements through avenues such as UNFCCC and UN Women; **however, there is considerable heterogeneity in the effectiveness of global governance due to geopolitical competition, lack of resources, and systemic incompetence.**

**Global Governance and Climate Change:**

**Previous approaches, which include but are not limited to UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol and the Paris agreement established the sovereign power and was over the climate change process.** Structures have promoted shared action, and in the case of the Paris Agreement structures, highlighted the CBDR-RC as its preeminent feature. The need for multilateralism in tackling climate change is evident from institutions such as the ISA and the Global Methane Pledge.

**Robert Falkner of *The Handbook of Global Climate and Environment Policy* writes that the issue is with the piece-meal nature of climate regulation where national interests often supersede joint commitments. For example, major emitters such as China, the United States and India cannot balance economic growth and emission cuts. The inability to deliver financial commitments, including the annual \$100 billion climate finance pledge, fuels the exacerbation of inequality-whether in Africa or in the Pacific. The North-South divide, so visibly manifest in climate negotiations, stands as an example of the kind of structural inequities that can undermine the workability of global governance.**

**The GCF and COP28's focus on "loss and damage" funding are efforts to try to close these gaps. However, Thomas Hale of *Transnational Climate Governance* notes that voluntary commitments under the Paris Agreement have no enforcement mechanism to hold parties accountable. Geopolitical divisions between developed and developing countries add another layer of complexity to consensus-building, as witnessed in the recent tensions over emission reduction targets during COP27 and COP28.**

**Global Governance and Gender Inequality:**

International control of these issues has played the most important role in global management, especially **with the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, SDG 5, and establishing UN Women**. The general lines of these policies have reinforced female emancipation, gender mainstreaming, education, employment, and equality at various levels of healthcare. Introductions such as HeForShe have brought international focus towards males taking leading parts in attaining parity results.

Despite all this, structural barriers still linger. **Amartya Sen's** work in **Development as Freedom** underlines that the fact that gender inequality operates as a restraint on human development at large and limits political, economic, and social opportunities for women is the very reason for its survival. Women's underrepresentation in decision-making processes in climate governance is one stark example of the gap between policy frameworks and ground realities. **Actually, by COP27, less than 30% of delegates were women.**

**Naila Kabeer-Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought**-it has been inferred that there should be greater complexity in thinking. The displacement of women is at a greater extent than the men due to climate changes; besides, they face a disadvantageous position owing to lesser resource availability. With UNFCCC, the gender action plan formulated under UN Women shows promise; **however, there is significant inequity in the implementation procedure for resource and institutional reasons.**

**The Nexus of Climate Change and Gender Inequality:**

This intersection highlights important gaps in global governance; women, yet again, are disproportionately affected by climate impacts-in this case, food insecurity and water scarcity. **Vandana Shiva in Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development**, argues that the exploitation of women and nature are two sides of a similarly intricately intertwined under global capitalist framework.

The interlinkages identified here are addressed through various initiatives undertaken by global governance. **For example, Climate Resilience Fund for Women announced at COP26 and focal points in Gender and Climate Change in UNFCCC.** It is once more underfunded and undermined by patriarchal norms and institutional capacity which lacks necessary competence. Now while gender inequalities may not entirely be responsible for this state of affairs, COVID-19 did much to unravel gender empowerment.

**Current Context and Future Directions:**

Some of the current incentives include low rates of energy transition, and women's marginalization in climate decisions and policies. **On one hand, COP28 acknowledged the need to increase climate ambition in order to mitigate global warming to 1.5° C.** However, on this task there is a need for more effective compliance measures. The same thing can be applied to the G20 Empower Initiative which can provide a platform for women to work and spur development but doing so, the program must address marginalized groups to be effective.

**Joseph Stiglitz (Globalization and Its Discontents)** argues that serious changes must be made in the rules governing global governance institutions. Climate finance also remains a problem that requires strong influence to enhance the transparency of the funds and distribution of resources for developing countries in order to enable them to develop strong Climate change Adaptation. But as said by **Naila Kabeer, Gender**

**mainstreaming has to come out of an endeavor of ‘add woman and stir’ and wake up to incorporate intersectionality into the structures of global governance.**

Although global governance has major milestones in climate change and gender inequality, the latter continues to be systemic. **The way forward is evident, it is estimated into reshaping the institutional framework to make it more liberal, equal and responsive.** These intertwined issues can be addressed when global governance pays due attention to fiscal responsibilities, increases minorities’ participation, and accommodates intersectionality. **In contrast to the historical institutionalist conception of global governance,** there is empirical evidence which shows that the solution to collective action problems afflicting the **various dimensions of global governance are cooperation, participation, and context-specific institutional arrangements as Elinor Ostrom parted to us.** Only if these gaps are closed can global governance open the full possibility to build a just and sustainable world.

**c) The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) has significantly reshaped North America’s economic dynamics. Analyse the political and economic implications of this transformation.**

**Answer:**

USMCA came into force on 1 July 2020, replacing NAFTA but keeping the core achievement of zero-tariff trade for most goods while adding chapters on digital commerce, stronger labour and environmental rules, a six-year joint review and a 16-year sunset clause .

#### **Economic implications**

USMCA deepens regional value chains. Tighter automotive rules of origin (75 % regional content and a wage floor) are pushing parts production from Asia into North America . As a result, trilateral trade has already expanded from ≈ US \$1.2 trillion in 2019 to about US \$1.8 trillion in 2023 .

*The supply chains of the three members of the USMCA are heavily intertwined*”. New e-commerce and IP provisions integrate fast-growing digital sectors, while the Rapid Response Mechanism cuts factory-level violations swiftly, encouraging near-shoring of sensitive industries.

However, stricter content rules raise compliance costs; *The Economist* remarked that “*taken as a whole [USMCA] is a step backwards for free trade*”.

#### **Political implications**

USMCA has become the reference point for Washington’s “worker-centred” trade strategy. As USTR **Katherine Tai** told Congress, “*our home base... is to always come back to the renegotiation of NAFTA. The establishment of the USMCA... broad bipartisan support*”. Labour provisions now sit inside the agreement rather than a side letter; the U.S. Department of Labor notes they are “*the strongest... of any U.S. trade agreement*”. Mexico’s 2019 labour-justice reforms and Canada’s dairy-market opening flow directly from these clauses, showing that trade rules are steering domestic politics.

Yet the pact remains a shallow ‘market-only’ regime. It creates no supranational institutions, does not ease migration, and leaves regional development gaps to markets. The six-year review offers leverage to U.S. administrations and, coupled with tariff threats, injects periodic uncertainty into investor calculations. Rising U.S. protectionism could still weaponise the sunset clause, fraying the political trust that underpins the bloc.



USMCA keeps the idea of integrated trade in North America, but *shifts the focus or fine-tunes the rules* to give more importance to labour rights, digital economy, and secure supply chains. Economically it fortifies the region against external shocks but at a higher compliance cost; politically it amplifies U.S. influence and embeds social clauses, yet leaves integration vulnerable to leadership changes and uneven gains. Whether the 2026 review renews or unravels the pact will test how far this “updated NAFTA” can move from transactional bargain to stable community.

**Q.4) a) Has the age of American dominance ended? Discuss the current status of the US in the world hierarchy of power, examining the challenges it faces from rising powers, the implications of its declining relative economic and military power, and the prospects for its continued leadership in global governance.**

**Answer:**

In the transnational political landscape, new power centres are emerging. China, Russia, India, and Turkey are all over the place trying to carve out a place for themselves in the evolving international order. Most importantly, with China and Russia becoming increasingly close, the balance of power is shifting from west to east. **Former US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was among the first to notice "a shifting balance of power to a more multi-polar world as opposed to the Cold War model of a bipolar world."** This noticeable shift in multi-national political setup was also recognised by Ban Ki Moon, the then Secretary-General of the United Nations, who stated that we have begun to “move increasingly and irreversibly to a multi-polar world.”

**The Trump administration's vision to "make America great again" contains a much stronger resistance to abandoning unipolarity.** Political pundits such as Robert Kaplan continue to question whether there is an overlap of unipolar and multipolar world realities; where the US retains military supremacy and is expected to do so for the foreseeable future, while China leads in the economic realm. Additionally, nations from the former Third World are gaining status as rising powers, most notably India, which has acquired global reach through smart diplomacy over the years and is now shaping the international agenda.

**The revival of grand strategy:**

International politics had clearly entered a new era, one in which predatory state behaviour had returned, and the putative global hegemon proved unable to stop it. Russia's invasion of Ukraine, in February of this year, challenged American dominance. In the near future, the United States will face three adversaries: China, Iran, and Russia. Each is a revisionist power seeking to acquire new or recover old possessions in its immediate neighbourhood. To tackle today's challenges, the USA must focus on statecraft rather than grand strategy. Statecraft, which is about sensing, adjusting, exploiting, and doing rather than planning and theorising, is far more important. **As stated by philosopher Isaiah Berlin “understanding rather than knowledge,” an ability to “tell what fits with what: what can be done in given circumstances and what cannot, what means will work in what situations and how far.”**

**Death of the nation state: A Myth**

The death of the nation state was greatly exaggerated. The end of history has not arrived, nor is liberal democracy on the rise. **Glenny contends that “Fukuyama and others under-estimated Western hubris and the greed of financial capitalism which contributed in 2008 to one of the most serious political and economic crises since the Great Depression.** These shocks – alongside a vicious backlash against

globalization – enabled alternative models of governance to reassert themselves ... with China and Russia but also other states in Europe ... and the consolidation of illiberal nation states.”

**U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan:**

It led to humiliating images of ragtag Islamists defeating the world's sole superpower. And it dented the popularity of a president seeking to restore American prestige. The chaos on NATO's border, for example, could divert US resources away from Asia, and it has already shifted the US focus back to the old cockpit of Cold War struggles.

**Improving American statecraft:**

**For more than a decade, the United States has been unable to develop and deploy the military force required to deter Russian aggression.** Today, in a world crowded with aggressive autocracies, sliding democracies, and unpredictable global phenomena, the United States simply cannot devise schemes comparable to those of the immediate post-war period. Climate change, democratic decay, and Islamist terrorism will all create new opportunities for unforeseeable crises. **The goal of the United States should be to deal with this chaotic reality rather than to provide a framework for global politics.**

**Hard Power:**

**Still Dominance of Big Players** Parag Khanna explains, “large, continental-sized nation states will continue seeking to control supply chains in energy and technology while smaller states will need to band together or suffer the consequences of irrelevance”. Larger nation states are steadily bolstering their military capabilities, rather than experiencing a decline in hard power. In 2021, the top five spenders were the United States, China, India, Russia and the United Kingdom. Some of these countries, along with major purchasers like Israel and Saudi Arabia, appear to be gearing up for conflict in the coming decade. Since the late 1990s, global defence spending has steadily increased, reaching \$1.6 trillion last year. These trends are expected to continue in the coming decade.

**Sovereignty of Nation State:**

Nation states are not the only forms of political and economic organisation. They are already ceding sovereignty to alternative governance, power, and influence configurations. This transition is being accelerated by the fourth industrial revolution. **As Anne-Marie Slaughter explains, "nation states are the world of the chessboard, of traditional geopolitics ... web is the world of business, civic, and criminal networks that overlay and complicate the games statesmen play."** Stateswomen, she believes, must learn web craft to mobilise and deploy non-governmental power in the same way that statecraft does for government power. On the effects of America's domestic political situation on its overall status as global hegemon, international relations scholars such as **Francis Fukuyama believe that America's ability to assert global dominance, security, and influence is heavily dependent on a peaceful political situation at home.**

**The Black Lives Matter protests and the January 6th, 2021, attack on the Capital** demonstrate the instability of domestic politics in the United States, as well as extreme political polarisation. As these events unfolded over the last 18 months, the global public was left wondering how the US could prevent the threat of rising powers around the world if it couldn't prevent an attack on the Capitol by its own citizens. This question has significant implications for US global hegemony.

**Post COVID-19 Scenario:**

As new regional and global powers emerge, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to destabilise domestic and international politics, economies, and societies, and powerful new technologies are developed faster than governments can regulate them, a cauldron of tension is brewing in the realm of international geopolitics. Furthermore, casting doubt on the role of the United States raises concerns for middle powers and allies like Australia as they try to navigate regional tensions and develop security strategies.

To summarise, before we reach a multipolar world order, there will be a period of increasing uncertainty caused by the rise of revisionist powers, the paranoia of the United States, and the growing ambiguity of conflict and cooperation. Furthermore, political pundits are divided on whether multipolarity is more unstable than unipolarity or bipolarity. **Kenneth Waltz was a strong supporter of "bipolar order as stable." In their 1964 article, "Multipolar Systems and International Stability," Karl Deutsch and David Singer saw multipolarity as guaranteeing a higher level of stability. In "Goodbye Hegemony," Simon Reich and Richard Ned Lebow (2014) question whether a global system without a hegemon would be more unstable and prone to war.** However, whatever system the world is likely to witness in the coming days, let us hope that it is in the best interests of humanity and will make the lives of the people on this planet peaceful and prosperous.

**b) "The growth of multilateralism is being aided by the potential for greater regionalism on a worldwide scale". Comment.**

**Answer:**

The term "regionalization" refers to the growing political and economic interconnectedness between different countries and other entities within a certain geographic area. On a larger scale, regional cooperation can take many different forms, such as collaboration in foreign policy, political cooperation, economic cooperation, and security cooperation. These are typically modest agreements made between states to cooperate and accomplish certain objectives. The procedure is mostly run by the state.

One way to think of regional integration is as a step up from collaboration. In comparison, its nature is more permanent. It might also include connections between different communities. Furthermore, the state may or may not be in charge of it; in certain situations, it may only serve as a facilitator.

**In this case, economic integration is particularly different from methods such as monetary union, single market, and customs union.** Additionally, at least when it comes to tariff policy, the entire area may speak with one voice on a global scale. Nonetheless, regional integration and collaboration are not wholly antagonistic concepts. Instead, a combination of both is typically seen in all regional patterns.

**Why is there a rise in regionalism?**

It aids in the administration of national independence, since many recently independent states seek to redefine and resolve their relationships with colonial powers and neighbors. **Additionally, this seeks to guarantee security in the area under question. It aids in defining their social and economic relationships with other people.** In order to boost their home output, it also aids in market expansion. When an area acts collectively rather than independently on a shared issue, it also gives the region additional clout in many international forums. For instance, EU nations working together are better able to handle US unilateralism than those working alone. **Likewise, ASEAN functions more effectively when it acts as a unit.**

**In what ways does regionalism improve the chances for multilateralism?**

It aids in encouraging internal state conditions to shift in a direction that is more supportive of global multilateralism. It illustrates the demonstration effect, or the different players participating in the consequences of globalization. The margin of preference gets less with each new regional agreement. **Consequently, it progressively erodes the resistance to multilateralism. Regional agreements are thought to have less to do with economic liberalization and more to do with political and geopolitical alliances.** Additionally, regionalism has more beneficial than negative effects. For example, nations will be more hopeful about international cooperation when they see how expanding regionalization benefits them.

**How is multilateralism made more challenging by the regionalism process?**

**Preferential agreements may ultimately cause some trade to shift from global to regional markets.** Additionally, there may be cases of "attention diversion," where nations lose interest in multilateralism. Regional and international accords for nations may become incompatible due to competitive arrangements. The establishment of multiple legal frameworks and dispute resolution procedures could impair the organization's efficiency and discipline. Additionally, it may increase rivalry and hostility among various economic blocs.

**It is evident from the foregoing that both will behave in opposition to one another and in tandem with one another in the context of global economic governance.** Maintaining sound economic governance around the world depends on both of them. Regional blocs and multilateral organizations must change their regulations to support equality and inclusive values in order for this to be accomplished.

**c) Analyse the arguments for and against the abolition of permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council.**

**Answer:**

**The United Nations (UN) has undergone several reforms since its founding in 1945 to address the evolving demands and standards of the international community.** Notably, Former and Forthcoming US President Donald Trump spoke at the UN General Assembly (UNGA) and questioned the necessity of global governance, the significance of UN Security Council (UNSC) decisions, such as the Iran nuclear deal, and the effectiveness of the UN Human Rights Council, from which the US withdrew on June, 2018.

**According to Hannah Ryder and Anna Baisch, the typical response to the UN's failures has been to enlarge the Security Council's five permanent members (P5),** who represent the main World War II victors, by bringing in more global powers like Turkey or India, rearranging the representative seats, adding new classifications, increasing the number of seats for Africa, and reducing the P5's ability to veto actions. However, these actions are merely tweaks and insufficient. They argue that decolonization, the primary difference between 1945 and 2020, must be acknowledged, and that the permanent members of the Security Council should be completely abolished.

The United Nations has strong colonial roots. Four of the original five P5 members were colonial powers in 1945. **Over the 75-year history of the UN, 80 former colonies—from India to Kenya, Nigeria, and Kazakhstan—have gained independence.** In 1945, the P5 countries—China, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Russia—represented only 10% of member states but over 50% of the global population. Today, they represent merely 3% of UN member states and 26% of the world's population.



## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

The Security Council's composition remains heavily Eurocentric, even with the inclusion of 10 non-permanent members. **Despite representing only 17.1% of the world's population, the Western European and Others Group and the Eastern European Group hold 47% of the Security Council's seats.** Additionally, larger nations dominate these groups: Japan has served on the Security Council for 22 years, Brazil for 20 years, while Nigeria, with 10 years, is the closest among African nations.

This unequal distribution extends across the UN, particularly in the office of the Secretary-General. Four of the nine Secretaries-General since 1945 have been white European men. No Muslim has ever held the position. Consider the case of COVID-19. **The only resolution the P5-led Security Council unanimously adopted concerning COVID-19 was in support of the Secretary-General's March call for a global ceasefire to focus on combatting the pandemic.**

**Despite this, African nations have relied more on guidance from the African Union's Africa Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and financial support** from underrepresented but influential bodies like the G-20 and IMF, rather than the UN. One of the primary arguments for change is the UN's structural inability to compel the P5 countries to take decisive action for the common good.

**Another key issue is the P5's failure to equitably share economic benefits with the rest of the world despite the ongoing process of decolonization.** No country in the world inherently deserves a permanent seat on the Security Council. Decision-making with veto power should be earned, and standards for accountability and competence should be transparent and widely recognized.

**In a reformed Security Council structure, all 15 seats would be temporary, with five-year terms to encourage continuity.** There would be open global competition for each seat, strict monitoring of lobbying expenses, and two-term limits over a 30-year cycle to promote leadership while preventing hegemony.

Such a system would avoid becoming a toothless democratic body like the UNGA, where each nation has one vote regardless of its track record, income, population, or military strength, and where no nation wields veto power. **Similar to how non-permanent members have operated historically, these 15 nations would have to earn their positions by proving their capability and responsibility** through campaigns within the UN, building alliances, and demonstrating their commitment to addressing global challenges like poverty, climate change, pandemics, and financial crises.

## SECTION - B

**Q.5) a) Comment: Do you still think deterrence is an effective tool in international politics after the Ukraine crisis?**

**Answer:**

The goal of the deterrence strategy is to prevent an enemy from initiating an action. It is the capacity of a country to persuade a prospective aggressor that the costs of aggression will be greater than the gains. **"A credible nuclear deterrent must be always ready, yet never used," asserts Bernard Brodie. According to Thomas Schelling, the ability to cause harm to another state serves as a driving force for other states to steer clear of it or sway its actions.**

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

World leaders have been reminded that risk reduction must continue to be a top priority on the international agenda by the **resurgence of nuclear deterrent challenges brought about by Russia's situation in Ukraine.**

Nonetheless, a lot of people contend that because **the Biden administration has stated unequivocally that it will not interfere in Ukraine;** Specifically, failure was not deterred in the first place.

The Western message had no effect on Russia because he fully understood it, not because he misinterpreted it. **The "historic" goal of giving Ukraine back to Russia was deemed to be more significant than the expected costs of an invasion.**

Because it supported Putin's idea that Russia should be the main geopolitical enemy of the United States, **Biden's warning that Putin planned to destroy NATO and Western democracy also backfired.**

It should be mentioned that the deterrence theory is predicated on the idea that both parties or adversaries are logical enough to realize that the costs of aggression will be greater than the gains.

**However, the "rational actor" concept does not apply to all prospective aggressors, such as ISIS and other terror organizations.** Diplomatic Conflicting political beliefs or understandings may cause both parties to perceive threats more intensely, which could result in an "arms race" that raises the possibility of war.

Such a situation is also evident in Ukraine. Putin proceeded with the military operation in Ukraine even though he was aware of the financial implications to Russia because the ultimate objective was much greater than the sanctions. **As a result, it demonstrates the lack of meaningful deterrence rather than the failure of deterrence theory.**

**b) Comment: As fundamental ideas in international relations, emphasize the relationship between power and national interest.**

**Answer:**

The Study of International Politics is centered on the idea of "national interest." Classical realists contend that just as self-interest drives all human behavior, "National Interest" drives all state acts in the international sphere. Hans Morgenthau is a notable thinker of national interest. **In Morgenthau's view, national interest serves as the primary compass that guides political realism through the terrain of global politics (Politics among Nations).**

Morgenthau asserts that the National Interest is the unchanging criterion that must be used to assess and guide political actions. He contends that the idea of national interest serves as a guide for realism and that it ought to be applied as an analytical instrument in the creation and assessment of foreign policy.

**The ability of a nation to protect its national interests and aims in its interactions with other nations is known as its national power.** To achieve the goals of the national interest, it means possessing the power to use force, the threat of using force, or influence over others.

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

It is often known that power affects international relations. One unspoken norm of international politics is that states may use force to defend their national interests. **International law also recognizes that countries can use coercive tactics other than war to accomplish their desired goals and objectives.**

A nation can use popular coercive methods, such as intervention, embargoes, boycotts, non-intercourse, retaliation, retortion, severance of relations, and others, to make others accept a certain behavior or refrain from a behavior that the nation deems harmful.

However, it has recently been argued that the global world order has fundamentally changed how international politics is conducted **due to the emergence of global threats on the one side and global civil society on the other.**

It has been recognized that the concept of national interest needs to be expanded to encompass regional and international concerns. **To address issues like climate change, nations must cooperate and erode their sovereignty.**

**c) Comment: Emergence of the New Nuclear age.**

**Answer:**

The nuclear age began in mid-July 1945 when a nuclear bomb was detonated at the Trinity test site in New Mexico. It fundamentally changed the nature of world politics and military strategy. **It made total war obsolete & a shift to a policy of "massive retaliation" through the doctrine of 'Mutually assured Destruction [MAD].**

Up to the end of the cold war, the world order was bipolar - with the USA and Russia as the two poles. But post-cold war, world order has become multipolar - with many established nuclear powers, and few aspiring nuclear powers like Iran, Turkey, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, etc. **Recently, China has been investing heavily in nuclear weapons and ICBMs, which has left the scholars worried.**

**The Recent Trend especially after the COVID 19 pandemic has been an inflection point for three key features of a new nuclear age:** (a) renewed nuclear competition among several great powers; (b) the emergence of new nuclear powers, both adversaries and allies; and a greater tolerance for escalation among existing nuclear powers, with potentially catastrophic consequences.

**Why are States going for Nuclear weapons?**

- 1. Anxious Allies** - USA's America first policy and isolationism— has made the allies anxious.
- Many US allies like Saudi Arabia, South Korea etc want **to have nuclear deterrence of their own.**
- 3. Europe doesn't trust the US anymore** and wants a French nuclear umbrella.
- 4. Regional/great power ambitions-** Iran & Turkey wants to acquire its own arsenal.
- 5. Nuclear flash point: South Asia -**
  - Tensions between India and Pakistan, both nuclear weapons capable, often reach a nuclear edge.
  - China is making huge investments in stockpiling ICMS and nuclear warheads
- 6. Rapidly deteriorating U.S.-Russian relations**

7. **Russian invasion of Ukraine & USA's inability** to do anything against North Korea has made the smaller states believe that nuclear deterrence is the ultimate guarantee for security.

8. **Russian Wagner fighters came close to acquiring nuclear weapons that can cause strategic instability.**

**Conclusion:**

Thus, we can conclude that a new nuclear age has begun, where there are multiple nuclear actors, and where the nuclear taboo is weakening.

**d) Comment: Has the World Trade Organization (WTO) failed to deliver its key objectives?**

**Answer:**

Every State evaluates the successes & failures of WTO depending upon the national interest & foreign policy goals. While the developed economies evaluate WTO from the lens of trade liberalization and market access, **the developing world and LDCs view the WTO from the perspective of creation of a just & fair financial and trade system.**

**Achievements:**

1. **The WTO has not only enhanced the value and quantity of trade** but has also helped in eradicating trade and non - trade barriers.
2. **WTO has also broadened the trade governance scope** to trade in investment, services and intellectual property. It has contributed immensely to global economic growth over the last seven decades, by reducing average tariffs and steadily eliminating non-tariff barriers, improved living standards, and helped to underpin peace and security.
3. **The developing & least-developed countries receive** extra attention in the WTO
4. **Many countries like India, China, Brazil, Tiger economies, etc have benefited from WTO**

**Key challenges faced by WTO:**

1. **Decision Making-** There is a **general emphasis on consensus-based decision-making**, which tends to disadvantage developing countries which may have no permanent representation at the WTO's Geneva headquarters or have delegations much smaller than those of developed countries. Subtle biases and the general lack of transparency and accountability in its decision making processes have led to the WTO being described as a 'rich man's club'.
2. **The WTO Tramples Labour and Human Rights. Its rules put the "rights" of corporations to profit over human and labour rights.** WTO is seeking to privatize essential public services such as education, health care, energy and water-this inevitably puts poor people and poor countries at disadvantage.
3. **Destruction of Environment:** The organization is being used by corporations to dismantle national environmental protections, which are attacked as "barriers to trade". WTO has failed to conclude a single trade-negotiation round of global trade talks. The Doha Development Round, which was very important for developing countries, began in November 2001, but failed to reach a conclusion.
4. **During the current COVID-19 crisis**, for example, some countries have imposed questionable export controls on medical supplies and food products in order to mitigate shortages.
5. **WTO is highly biased towards the developed and rich nations-** they can maintain high import duties and quotas; impose non-tariff; subsidise & protect their while developing ones are pressed to open their markets;



**6. The TRIPs agreement is unjust towards the developing world as it limits them from utilizing advanced technology that originates from the West.** It jeopardizes health and human lives. Free trade is not working for the majority of the world. During the most recent period of rapid growth in global trade and investment (1960 to 1998) inequality worsened both internationally and within countries.

**Case Study of India:**

**WTO has been a mixed bag for India. The rule-based globalized trade system has boosted the growth rate of the economy, but at the same time,** the growth has been iniquitous and unjust. Indian farmers and small businesses have suffered. India's food security programme has come under scanner as it crossed de minimis under the Amber Box. Also, India's MSP system is seen as a trade distorting measure. Although India has been demanding to include its food security programme under Green Box or revise the base prices, there hasn't been any progress.

**The performance of the WTO has been mixed. Some countries have benefitted while others have lost. There have been intra-country variations too.** Mostly rich & developed regions have benefited more from the liberal trade regime of WTO, while poor & backward regions have suffered. A moribund WTO does not serve any country's interest & hence reforms are needed. **An effective, rules-based international trade system is a public good, and therefore all members should endeavour to maintain its credibility.** In a world economy already imperiled by COVID-19, members must show political will, determination, and flexibility so as to make it fair, just & equitable for everyone.

**e) Comment on the view that the spirit of the New Nonalignment is pragmatic and instrumental.**

**Answer:**

The Russia Ukraine war which pitted the West against Russia has brought back the relevance of non alignment as a foreign policy measure with various countries observing a studied neutrality between Russia and the West. **For instance, the vote to remove Russia from the Human Rights Council saw 58 abstentions including India, South Africa and other African nations.**

**Former Chilean diplomat Jorge Heine argues that** the inability of countries from the Global South to identify with the US's distinction of democracies vs autocracies has balanced their aversion to Russia's onslaught on the sanctity of state sovereignty and borders.

**The new non alignment is further instrumental in enabling the Global South to entertain Chinese funds** fueling infrastructure in their respective countries at a time when the US and the West have decreased economic support for the South while at the same time, seeking Western security guarantees against future Chinese geopolitical maneuvers.

The new non alignment is also necessitated as most nations don't share the same fears as the West of dangers to the existing World Order as they were victims of the same order which doesn't address their concerns like climate change, food and finances, **according to Shivshankar Menon.**

**Countries in the Middle East have also started "Qatarisation" or non aligning and balancing multiple powers, the way Qatar has.** For instance, it houses a US base and is a major non-NATO ally while also being

**Sectional Test #6 - Solutions**

on friendly terms with Iran and Hamas. It has helped Qatar navigate the unreliable US's Middle East policy while also safeguarding its economic self interests with China and Russia.

On the other hand, countries famed for their policy of non alignment like Finland and Sweden are looking to join NATO after the Russian invasion. **Even the Swiss broke their famed neutrality and joined the rest of the West in condemning the Russian invasion.**

New non alignment thus, is a sign of countries pursuing their own interests by leveraging great powers' conflict in what **Foreign Minister Jaishankar** calls a 'world of all against all'.

**Q.6) a) "Globalization has redefined the relationship between socialist economies and the international economic system." Evaluate with reference to China's economic trajectory.**

**Answer:**

Globalization has added significant changes in the interaction of socialist economies and the world economy, forcing a practical compromise between state control with certain market openness. **China's economic history is a premier example of how a socialist country exploits globalization to foster rapid growth while maintaining political control.** China shows a peculiar marriage of socialist tenets and global economic integration, yielding important lessons for other socialist economies.

**Reconciling Socialism with Globalization:**

Theoretical views on globalization regarding socialist economies diametrically opposed each other. **Immanuel Wallerstein's World-Systems Theory asserted that globalization propagates a scenario of dominance of the core economies over peripheries, and therefore both this scenario and the rule of the thumb for socialist states have not allowed for much room for maneuver.** However, adjustments in economy and other spheres of life generally inhibit peripheral socialist states like China from rising within the global hierarchy through an effective and strategic leverage of globalization. **China's other experiences provide other perspectives as Samir Amin condemned globalization as the neo-colonial rule;** yet it has used it to turn its disadvantage against itself and grow into a significant player in global trade and investment.

**China's Economic Trajectory:**

Probably the most relevant to the Chinese economic experience since 1978, when **Deng Xiaoping introduced his policy of Reform and Opening-Up is the redefinition of socialism within the globalization scenario.** Pragmatic reform lies in the **Deng quote : "It doesn't matter whether the cat is black or white, as long as it catches mice."** Building from Special Economic Zones like Shenzhen, China opened up itself to direct foreign investment and allowed imports into the country to tie into larger supply chains. The country has seen an increase in the percentage share of the world's manufacturing exports from 3% in 1990 to 18.8% in 2021; **it is the "factory of the world," says the World Bank.**

**Lessons from China's Evolution:**

**Giovanni Arrighi who claims in Adam Smith in Beijing that the rise of China is the reappearance of an economic hegemony that is non-Western and that it challenges Western neoliberalism but does not oppose state-led development strategies.** The Chinese model of development which is referred to as

Socialism with Chinese Characteristics is One Based on Marxism-Leninism but with market approaches permitting the state to direct the development of monopolizing sectors like banking, energy, and telecommunication, while other consumer areas are left to competition. **This, however, is different from the Washington Consensus model as the Chinese model is that which favors state sovereignty over stakeholders' conditionalities from global institutions like the IMF or World Bank.**

**Geo-Politically and economically in sectoral terms, effects of globalization on China are not limited to relations of trade.** First, China's entry into the WTO in the year 2001 is an event that needs highlighting. It made bypassing the level of the world market possible for Chinese goods and at the same time gave them favorable conditions that stimulated the growth of exports. At the same time, globalization worked to enhance the rate of foreign investments that contributed to technology learning, enabling China to shortcut a number of stages of industrial development. By the year 2022, R&D expenditures in China accounted for 2.55 percent of its GDP, surpassing the EU average of 2.18 percent, indicating that the country shifted from an industrial park to the center of innovations.

It entered the global economy selectively in finance with such strength of state involvement as part of its broad imperatives. Partial convertibility of the yuan and restrictions on foreign currency outflow also made the economy immune to external financial shocks. At the same time, through the Belt and Road Initiative which invests more than one trillion dollars in Asia, Africa, or Europe, etc, China is using globalization to enhance economic and geopolitical power. **Economist Dani Rodrik's "trilemma of globalization" which states it is impossible to achieve a high level of globalization, national sovereignty and democratic policy simultaneously.** China responds to this fundamental question in a direct manner: it will have to give precedence to state sovereignty at the expense of democratic governance in order to ensure stable control over the domestic impacts of globalization.

#### Challenges and Critiques:

Globalization is a very sensitive issue and a hard implementation for China; its practice is often questioned. **Minxin Pei says in his book, China's Trapped Transition, that it is due to this Authoritarianism of the state that stalled political reforms have kept the system structurally dysfunctional and given rise to an unjust society.** The factors have worsened due to globalization: the Gini coefficient in China increased from 0.3 in early 1980s up to 0.47 by 2021, which shows an increasing trend of inequality. Second, the over-reliance of China on export and investment-driven economic growth has further created weaknesses of the country's economy; the explosion of the worldwide economic crisis of 2008 and the ongoing trade wars with countries like the United States.

#### Temporal Shifts:

**Progress of globalization's impact on China was moving chronologically, from 1980s to the 1990s,** it only built itself in the world economies at low cost and laboring types of manufacturing, then in the 21st century it finds it building technologies, new renewable energies, and so many high-tech industries in the digital sector. **For example, in 2022, China was the world's largest producer of electric vehicles, where they make up more than 50% retail EV sales.** Huawei and Alibaba are some of the companies showing that China is positioning itself as a high technology power in its own right, similar to the Western innovation of ideas.

**Pandemic and Geopolitics:**

Meanwhile, the COVID-19 pandemic and changing geopolitics have further reshaped globalization in China's perspective. **The pandemic laid bare cracks in global supply chains, causing China to roll out a “dual circulation” plan that would prioritize consumption at home, yet remain connected to international trade.** At the same time, Western government efforts to decouple from China and impose sanctions on Chinese firms highlight the constraints of globalization, prompting a drive in China to develop greater self-sufficiency – particularly in sectors key to its national systems like semiconductors.

**In the future, China needs to resolve internal paradoxes and search for ways in an even more open environment.** At home this encompasses tackling inequality and transition to a green economy. The country has pledged to ensure carbon emissions reach their peak by 2030 and the country goes carbon neutral by 2060, the concern will be on how they will be able to respect the environment while at the same ensuring they have sustainable economic development.

Externally, China's engagement with globalization must change with shifting protectionism and geopolitical risks. **Initiatives such as the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and digital yuan can augment China's economic resilience and drive its leadership in global governance.** China's prowess to project its model as the alternative to Western neoliberalism, in turn, can revamp the global economic order, especially for developing countries seeking ways out of dependence.

**Conclusion:**

In conclusion, globalization has brought a new perspective into socialist economies' relationships with the international economic system. The Chinese experience presents an intriguing case here, **since the hybrid model that it espouses presents a good prospect of harmony between socialism and globalization;** however, at the same time, it indicates a conflict with inequality, environmental sustainability, and geopolitical frictions. **Managing these problems in a realistic manner may ensure the durability of China's growth, coupled with offering a new approach for socialist economies in the age of globalization.**

**b) "The United Nations has increasingly deviated from its envisioned role, necessitating urgent reforms." Critically analyze with examples.**

**Answer:**

**The United Nations formed in 1945 with the sole purpose of maintaining International peace and security, protecting human rights and promoting prosperity of all states.** However, it has deviated from trying to solve issues competing with speed, exclusion of people, and not solving modern challenges. Once, the UN was a forum for settling quarrels and assisting nations to recover from the wreckage during the Cold War era. Now, it's losing its grip. Why did we not consider the conflict in Syria, Russia-Ukraine war and how the COVID-19 vaccine was distributed. **David Kennedy in his book *The Dark Sides of Virtue* states that “When powerful states require an address to host their process the UN may present itself too.”**

**Institutional Challenges:**

Structural weaknesses of the UN, especially within the Security Council, have limited the effectiveness of the UN. P5 (United States, Russia, China, France, and the UK) have veto powers that are often used to create logjams as was experienced during the conflict in Ukraine, where Russia vetoed a decisive action. **Richard**



Falk in his works on *global governance* sharply criticized the domination of the Western liberal democracies within the UN framework, stating it for continuing the historic power imbalances. The developing countries, again represented by G77, frequently argue against the decision-making procedures that are unbalanced towards equilateral representation of people's voices.

**Peace and Security:**

The UN's prime mandate of international peace and security is heavily criticized since it cannot respond effectively to modern forms of conflict. The Syrian Civil War that has been going on for over a decade reflects the paralysis of the Security Council, as competing interests of the US and Russia blocked resolutions. Similarly, the Rohingya crisis of Myanmar proved that the UN fails miserably to prevent ethnic conflicts once the warning signs become blatant and apparent. **According to Michael Barnett, in *Empire of Humanity*, the UN has only operated on reactive approaches rather than developing preventive measures, prolonging human suffering.**

**Global Governance and Climate Action:**

Global challenges like climate change have threatened to denounce the UN's inability to coordinate effective international action. Though UNFCCC and conferences like COP28 have managed to gather all those nations under the same wing, results are not largely satisfactory. The majority of the commitments undertaken by such agreements as the Paris Agreements are still left partially unfulfilled because of major countries like China, US and EU refusing proportionate burden. **According to Jeffrey Sachs, reliance on voluntary pledges rather than binding commitments by the UN restricts its ability to handle existential crises such as global warming.** The marginalization of vulnerable nations, especially small island states, underscores the inequities in climate negotiations.

**Socio-Economic Development and Inequalities:**

The UNDP-type developmental initiatives by the institutions of the United Nations have only been partially successful. While the MDGs reduced extreme poverty, the SDGs are fighting a battle with low finances and global economic shocks, and the COVID-19 pandemic also exacerbated inequalities since the UN could not manage equitable vaccine distribution. **COVAX is a UN-backed initiative. Only a fraction of the promised doses reached low-income countries as wealthier nations secured extra supplies.** The capability approach of Amartya Sen illustrates institutional intent versus actual empowerment of vulnerable populations.

**Representation and Legitimacy:**

The UN's representational deficit is most glaring in the Security Council, where the composition of the P5 continues to reflect post-World War II geopolitics instead of realities today. Countries like India, Brazil, and South Africa, with their growing global influence, remain excluded from permanent membership. India's consistent contributions to UN peacekeeping missions and its leadership in climate diplomacy through initiatives like the International Solar Alliance position it as a deserving candidate. **Edward Luck (UN Security Council: Practice and Promise) argues that the Council's credibility depends on adapting its membership to reflect geopolitical shifts and demographic realities.**

**Current Reforms and Resistance:**

The UN reform efforts have so far been incremental and glacial. The 2005 World Summit Outcome Document calls for a more representative Security Council, but there never seems to be any unanimity

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

among the member states toward this end. The main deterrent is the P5s' unwillingness to concede their veto power. Beyond that, the UN has maintained its dependence on major contributors, such as the US contribution of 22% of the regular budget in 2022. **Thomas Weiss says Meaningful reform cannot occur in this situation of deep entrenched interests without changing the equation on equitable burden sharing between members.**

**Technological and Emerging Global Challenges:**

New challenges that the UN has to combat through new emerging technologies include cyber threats, artificial intelligence, and many other emerging technologies. Its current frameworks are not agile enough to regulate issues like cyber warfare or digital privacy. For example, there is a significant gap in international security by not having a comprehensive UN treaty on cyber governance. Similarly, the pandemics of COVID-19 exposed loopholes of the World Health Organization, as they could not immediately mobilize timely global responses. **Ian Goldin highlights that the UN should be proactive towards the challenges emerging and innovative, thus collaboration through multilateral cooperation.** The UN's growing deviation from its intended role calls for urgent reforms to adapt to the challenges of the 21st century. Institutional inefficiencies must be addressed, decision-making democratized, and equal representation ensured in organizations such as the Security Council. The UN must also improve its response to global dangers such as climate change, pandemics, and technological disruptions.

The UN has strayed from its original purpose, and it needs to change to keep up with today's world. This means fixing problems within the organization and making sure all countries have an equal say in groups like the Security Council. **The UN also has to be ready to tackle emerging issues like climate change, disease outbreaks, and the effects of new technology.** By making these changes and sticking to what it was created for, the UN can once again become a key player in how the world is run as power shifts between different countries.

**c) As the liberal international order has been in flux for quite some time, scholars have proposed multiple visions of the upcoming world order. Give an account of emerging world order as envisioned by various scholars.**

**Answer:**

The liberal international order, which has guided global relations since the end of World War II, is facing increasing scrutiny as the geopolitical landscape shifts. **Amitav Acharya, Antoni Estevadeordal, and Louis W. Goodman, in their book "Reshaping Global Order in the 21st Century: G Plus Leadership in a Multiplex World (2019),** call the evolving order "multiplex" because of the overlapping yet divergent interests of the actors involved and "G-Plus," signaling the importance of the increasing number and diversity of actors.

One of the most notable changes is the **transition toward a multipolar world**, where power is distributed among several influential nations instead of being centered on one dominant superpower, particularly the United States. Thinkers like **G. John Ikenberry argue that the emergence of countries such as China, India, and Russia indicates a need for a new framework of international cooperation.** This new order would **require a balance between the interests of rising powers and the fundamental principles of democracy and human rights** that have underpinned the liberal order.

In contrast, **John Meyer** presents a more cautionary perspective. He argues that a **multipolar world could lead to increased competition among great powers, potentially resulting in conflicts similar to those observed before World War I. Mearsheimer suggests that as nations pursue greater influence, tensions may escalate, posing a threat to global stability.** This tension between the need for cooperation and the reality of competition underscores the challenges of navigating international relations in an evolving global landscape.

Another critical element of the emerging order is the rise of authoritarianism. **Scholars like Fareed Zakaria and David Rothkopf highlight the deterioration of democratic institutions, not only in developing nations but also in established democracies.** Zakaria introduces the idea of “**illiberal democracy**,” where elections occur but essential democratic principles, such as the rule of law, are compromised. As established democracies struggle to tackle pressing issues like economic disparity and political divisiveness, authoritarian leaders often gain support by promising stability and national unity.

**Rothkopf** builds on this argument, pointing out that the **inability of Western democracies to effectively address global challenges - such as climate change and public health crises - has eroded their credibility.** In such a context, authoritarian regimes that offer order and decisive action may appear more appealing to citizens seeking solutions to complex problems. This trend poses a direct challenge to the ideals of the liberal order and raises important questions about the future of democracy worldwide.

In this evolving landscape, regionalism is also gaining prominence. Scholars like **Kirsten B. Westphal and Bobby Ghosh** argue that international relations may increasingly be organized around regional blocs rather than a cohesive global framework. Westphal contends that regional organizations, such as the European Union and the African Union, will be crucial in addressing issues like trade, migration, and climate change. This shift suggests that **while global cooperation is vital, local dynamics will play a larger role in shaping international relations.** However, **Ghosh warns that this emphasis on regionalism could lead to fragmentation, where different regions pursue their interests independently, potentially undermining global norms and standards.** As nations prioritize local solutions, there is a risk of losing the coordinated efforts needed to address shared global challenges effectively.

The environmental crisis, particularly climate change, has also become a central theme in discussions about the future world order. Scholars like **Naomi Klein and Elinor Ostrom** argue for a governance framework centered on sustainability. Klein asserts that **tackling climate change requires a fundamental rethinking of the global economic system**, emphasizing the importance of sustainable practices and social equity. Ostrom, known for her research on managing shared resources, **advocates for decentralized governance approaches that empower local communities to manage their resources sustainably.** She highlights the necessity of cooperation at various levels—local, national, and global—to effectively address climate change. This perspective underscores the inadequacy of traditional state-centric approaches and points to the need for innovative governance structures that can adapt to new realities.

Additionally, the impact of technology on the emerging world order is a crucial consideration. Scholars like **Joseph Nye and Shoshana Zuboff** explore how technological advancements are reshaping power dynamics and governance structures. Nye introduces the **concept of “soft power,”** emphasizing that nations must adapt to new opportunities and threats associated with information flow, cybersecurity, and digital

influence. He stresses the importance of establishing global norms and agreements to govern these technologies effectively. **Zuboff's analysis of "surveillance capitalism" raises concerns about the concentration of data and technological power among a few corporations.** She calls for new regulatory frameworks that protect privacy and promote social equity, arguing that technology should serve democratic values rather than undermine them. This technological dimension adds another layer of complexity to discussions about the future world order.

In this regard, the emerging world order is marked **by a complex interplay of geopolitical shifts, challenges to democracy, regional dynamics, environmental concerns, and technological transformations.** The future of international relations will likely be shaped by these intersecting forces, **requiring collaborative efforts among nations to create a more inclusive, equitable, and sustainable global framework.** As the liberal international order continues to evolve, the responses of governments and communities will play a pivotal role in determining the direction of our world in the years ahead. **While the challenges are considerable, they also present opportunities for innovation and cooperation in addressing the pressing issues that affect us all.**

**Q.7) a) "The unipolar world order post-Cold War has been increasingly challenged by the resurgence of regional powers." Critically examine this statement with reference to recent developments in global politics.**

**Answer:**

The post-Cold War period has assumed a unipolar structure dominated by America, now such a system witnessing hegemonic challengers are now rising from the regional level. **The US still holds an essential role in world politics, although the world is experiencing the turnover to multipolarity, as China, Russia, India, and other regional unions demand a larger role in it.** This demonstrates discontent with the US led liberal world order and the capacity of regional actors to counter it. The latest global politics developments such as the Ukraine war, the contestation in the Indo-Pacific and the proliferation of new types of economic relations focus on this.

**The Erosion of Unipolarity:**

It emerged through the institutions of NATO, the IMF, and the World Bank as tools in an assertion of U.S. dominance, as well as through military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan. **According to John Mearsheimer in *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, "unipolarity was always unsustainable because of systemic balancing tendencies."** All these-factors-the 2008 financial crisis, the US's withdrawal from Afghanistan, and domestic polarization have weakened its ability to project power globally.

Regional powers have exploited this relative decline further. **The Belt and Road Initiative and assertiveness in the South China Sea are a challenge to US maritime supremacy.** Russian intervention in Ukraine reflects a rebuff to the eastward expansion of NATO and an assertion of the sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. It marks the limit of the dominance of the United States and the increasing assertiveness of regional actors.



**The Rise of China:**

**One of the excellent examples of moving away from unipolarity is China becoming an economic and military superpower.** Under the Xi Jinping presidency, China went from a regional power to a world challenger. More than 140 countries have become signatories to the BRI, which influences almost the whole of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This way, it led to even greater networks of economic dependency. The militarization of the South China Sea and hegemony in geopolitical strategic partnerships through these SCO moves definitely confirm such hypothesis.

**Graham Allison (Destined for War) examines 'the Thucydides Trap' to see if there will be war between an ascending China and a standing US.** Beijing is prepared to challenge US hegemony in the Indo-Pacific, and the recent tensions over Taiwan, sparked by Nancy Pelosi's visit and China's associated military drills, reflect that point. Nevertheless, China's reliance on openness to the world, in both exports and labor imports, and its domestic economic problems constrain its ability fully to overturn the existing order.

**Russia's Revisionist Agenda and Eurasian Resurgence:**

Russia is yet another major challenge to the unipolar order. The annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 are demonstrations of how far Russia is willing to go with military force for the attainment of its regional interests. **These acts are, therefore, part of an even greater strategy to undermine NATO's expansion and revive Russia as a great power.**

Russia's energy diplomacy, primarily with Europe, and its policy of turning towards Asia through both China and India, clearly testify to its status as an important regional power. **Further, scholars like Stephen Cohen argue that the failure by the West to integrate Russia within the post-Cold War world has led to these revisionist tendencies.** The currently ongoing war in Ukraine has split the world further, giving countries like India and China a reason not to embrace the West completely, which manifests the breaking of unipolarity.

**India's Strategic Autonomy and Multipolar Aspirations:**

With India as a regional power with international ambitions, it further cements its influence on the post-unipolar order. The Indian state has always acted upon the principle of strategic autonomy, thus finding a subtle balance in its relations with the great powers and at the same time exerting regional influence. **Initiatives such as ISA and leadership in the Global South indicate a commitment to multilateralism.**

In the Indo-Pacific, active involvement by India in the Quad and other partnerships with ASEAN reiterates the balancing nature of India's relationship with China. **As C. Raja Mohan aptly points out in Crossing the Rubicon: the future of India also depends upon the ability to balance its foreign policy with internal economic progress.** The Russia-Ukraine conflict has also tried India's foreign policy muscles as New Delhi kept neutrality and successfully struck energy deals with Moscow by keeping channels open with the Western bloc.

**Regional Blocs and Alternative Frameworks:**

The rise of regional powers is matched by the emergence of regional blocs challenging US-led institutions. **The BRICS, which includes Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, which has lately accepted new members like Saudi Arabia and Iran, are in search of alternative economic and financial systems.** Moves

like the NDB and de-dollarization talks reflect dissatisfaction with structures dominated by the West like the IMF and the World Bank.

The European Union, for instance, appears to be more prone towards strategic autonomy, especially with the agenda of President Emmanuel Macron in reducing dependency on the US. **ASEAN-led Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, excepting the US, is a direction of regional economic integration within Asia minus the pressure from Western interests.**

#### Current Scenario:

Regional powers' resurgence is reframing global politics in several different ways. There is this multipolar divide created with the war between Ukraine because the West stands against Russia, but China, India, and Brazil seek independent policies. **The AUKUS alliance and Quad are parts of this containment of China in the US-China rivalry in the Indo-Pacific region.**

At the same time, Africa and Latin America are beginning to emerge as arenas for influence, as powers such as China, Russia, and India compete over economic and strategic partnerships. **According to Hedley Bull in *The Anarchical Society*, multipolarity opens up more balanced options for global governance** but can also lead to instability as regional agendas compete against each other.

#### Conclusion:

Resurgent regional powers challenge post-Cold War unipolarity to push into a multipolar world order, but the shift comes at an increased risk of fragmentation and potential for conflict. The emergent dynamics suggest that more is needed in terms of more inclusive multilateral frameworks for regional aspirations without exacerbating power rivalries. **As Fareed Zakaria writes in *The Post-American World*, "the rise of the rest should not mean the death of America but rather the reshuffling of global politics as it has evolved".** Navigating this shift in a more balanced and equal global order will demand pragmatic, cooperative leadership.

**b) 'States have always been the key organizations in the implementation of human rights; paradoxically, they are also the prime violators of human rights.' Examine the different issues faced by the regime of human rights in the context of the above statement.**

#### Answer:

The paradox of the state in human rights - that it is both the key defender and sometimes the greatest violator of rights - is a central issue in political theory. States are charged with the responsibility of upholding human rights, yet they often infringe upon them through surveillance, suppression, and even violence. **This duality raises critical questions about the nature of state authority and its limitations.**

**Social contract theory, championed by thinkers such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, explores the formation of the state as a means of protecting individuals. Hobbes argued that in the "state of nature," life would be chaotic and insecure, so individuals would willingly give up some of their freedom to form a government that could ensure stability.** Hobbes believed this required a strong, centralized authority, or "Leviathan," to maintain order. However, while this centralized power is intended to protect, it also opens the door to potential abuses, as the state may misuse its authority to control or oppress.

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

John Locke proposed a more limited government that exists primarily to protect “life, liberty, and property.” For Locke, a government that oversteps its role threatens the very rights it is meant to protect, and citizens have the right to resist it. While Locke’s version of the social contract emphasizes limits on state power, he acknowledges the potential for the state to overreach, infringing upon freedoms under the pretext of maintaining order. Thus, even though the state is formed to protect rights, the authority it holds to enforce laws can become a tool for restricting those rights.

Sociologist Max Weber described the state as the institution with a “monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory.” This means that only the state has the authority to use force to maintain social order. Weber’s concept highlights that this authority is essential for ensuring stability but can also enable the state to suppress its citizens. **The very tools that allow the state to protect—policing, imprisonment, surveillance—can easily turn into tools of oppression.** In democracies as well as authoritarian regimes, we see this tension. For example, cases of excessive police force, discriminatory practices, or invasive surveillance reveal how the state’s control over force can lead to rights violations. Weber’s insights underscore that the state’s power to maintain order can create the conditions for abuses, even if the original intent is protection.

Philosopher Michel Foucault introduced a unique perspective on how power operates in society, viewing it not only as coercive but also as shaping behavior and societal norms. **In Discipline and Punish, Foucault explains how institutions like schools, hospitals, and prisons create systems that monitor and control individuals, encouraging them to conform. This “disciplinary power” is used by states to regulate entire populations, often justifying these practices as necessary for public health, safety, or order. His ideas about “biopower” reveal how states manage society by promoting certain behaviors and discouraging others, which can lead to systematic rights infringements.** When states invoke security or morality to justify restrictive policies, such as those targeting specific social groups or personal freedoms, they often overstep. This view suggests that states, even in democratic societies, tend toward control and regulation in ways that can erode individual rights. For Foucault, modern states are predisposed to such control because they rely on disciplining populations to maintain stability.

Hannah Arendt, in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, examined the extreme end of state power in totalitarian regimes, where the state not only neglects but actively destroys human rights. Arendt argued that totalitarian states, like Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia, illustrate the state’s capacity to eliminate rights altogether by stripping individuals of their humanity and their protections. In such regimes, the state no longer exists to protect its citizens; instead, it uses its power to impose ideology and crush dissent. **Arendt’s insights are a cautionary tale about the risks of unchecked state power.** Totalitarianism shows what happens when the state becomes an end in itself, divorced from any ethical responsibility to protect its people. This extreme example reinforces the importance of accountability, suggesting that democratic checks and institutional constraints are crucial in preventing the state from becoming a violator rather than a protector of rights.

In international relations, liberal and realist theories provide different perspectives on state behavior concerning human rights. **Liberal thinkers argue that states have an obligation to protect human rights, influenced by international agreements and norms.** They suggest that democratic institutions and civil society organizations play essential roles in promoting and safeguarding human rights, making democratic states less likely to abuse them.

**Realists, however, are more skeptical, viewing states as primarily motivated by national interest, power, and security.** According to realists, states are inclined to prioritize their interests over human rights, particularly in times of crisis. From this perspective, even democratic governments may sacrifice human rights if it aligns with their strategic objectives. Realism thus accounts for why states might disregard human rights commitments in favor of stability or control, especially when they see rights as a threat to their authority or national security.

In this regard, political theories reveal that the state's role in human rights is fundamentally conflicted. On one hand, the state is essential for safeguarding order and protecting individual rights; on the other, the state's power to enforce laws and maintain stability can make it a potential threat to those same rights. **Social contract theories point to the need for balance between authority and individual freedom, while thinkers like Weber and Foucault show how the state's power, especially in its control over force and surveillance, can easily slide into repression. Arendt's analysis of totalitarianism and the realist view of state interests emphasize that,** in many cases, even states committed to rights can compromise them under certain conditions.

This paradox - where the state is both a defender and potential violator of rights - appears inherent in its very structure. However, checks and balances, strong legal protections, and active civil society engagement can help curb state overreach and protect rights. **In a world where states play a critical role in enforcing rights, people must remain vigilant and hold governments accountable, ensuring that states fulfill their mandate as protectors without compromising the very freedoms they are tasked with defending.**

**c) Bring out the key features and objectives of the New International Economic Order (NIEO). Why does the Third World demand a new International Economic Order? What are the characteristics of it? Do you think that global political order still shapes the global economic order or is it vice versa?**

**Answer:**

The New International Economic Order (NIEO) is a set of ideas proposed by developing nations to create a new interdependent economy and end economic colonialism and dependency. According to the main defense of NIEO, the current global economic order **"was founded when most developing countries did not even exist as separate states and perpetuates inequality."** In the spirit of "trade not aid," the NIEO called for **reforms in funding, technological transfer, industrialization, commerce, and agricultural output.**

In particular, they claimed that the preferential trade system, reciprocity, commodity agreements, raw materials, food, transportation, and insurance all needed to be redesigned through an NIEO. **In order to bring the international monetary system and other financial systems into line with development needs, they also demanded change.** NIEO demanded incentives for technology and financial transfer as well as support for industrialization initiatives in developing countries.

This sentiment among nation states was formalized in 1974 when **the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and its accompanying program of action.** Later, the UN General Assembly ratified the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.



**The fundamental features of NIEO are as follows:**

1. All states are equal in their sovereignty, free to design their own economic and social structures, and prohibited from interfering in their domestic affairs.
2. Every state has total sovereignty over its natural resources, other economic endeavors necessary for growth, and the control of multinational corporations.
3. A fair and equal relationship between the prices of raw materials and other commodities exported by developing countries and those of imported goods and raw materials from industrialized countries.
4. Increasing bilateral and multilateral international assistance to promote industrialization in developing nations, including sufficient funding and opportunities for the transfer of suitable methods and technologies.

Furthermore, it is accurate to say that the global political system influences the global economic order. as demonstrated by the rivalry between the US and China. **Despite their extreme economic interdependence, both nations engaged in a protracted trade war that harmed not just their own economies but also the global economy.**

**It is also evident in the case of the West's domination in the global political order, which in turn created the international economic order.** Because of their political clout, western nations control international organizations such as the World Bank, IMF, and WTO.

**The NIEO offered a novel concept for uniting third-world nations for joint action.** Regardless of its outcome, it offered a thorough analysis of the liberal international economic order and demonstrated how to move toward a more just future for it.

**Q.8) a) Assess the transformative potential of human rights in promoting social justice and dignity worldwide making it a better place. Under what conditions do human rights interventions lead to emancipatory outcomes?**

**Answer:**

**Introduction:**

**“To deny people their human rights is to challenge their very humanity.” – Nelson Mandela**

Human rights are rights that all people possess, regardless of race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, or other status. Human rights include, among other things, the right to life and liberty, the freedom from slavery and torture, the freedom of thought and speech, the right to labor and education, and many others. **Everyone, without exception, is entitled to these rights.**

**The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a watershed moment in human rights history.** The Declaration was drafted by representatives from all regions of the world with different legal and cultural backgrounds and was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on December 10, 1948, by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) as a common standard of achievements for all peoples and all nations.

## Sectional Test #6 - Solutions

For the first time, these rights were recognized as collective rights. **One can argue, in Kantian terms, that a priori rights apply not only to individuals but also to collectives, which include societies and nations.** However, the collective claims often turn out to be society's counterclaims to individual rights and may, therefore, have anti-individual rights consequences.

**The role of human rights in making the world a better place can be analyzed under the following headings:**

**1. Human Rights, Peacebuilding, and Sustaining Peace:**

The United Nations Human Rights system was established in the aftermath of World War II to assist the UN in establishing long-term peace and security and preventing future hostilities. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states **that "recognition of the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of world freedom, justice, and peace."** The United Nations has two complementary goals: human rights and peacebuilding. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has engaged with the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture.

**2. The UN's Work in Ukraine:**

The UN and humanitarian partners are stepping up to deliver lifesaving aid to those affected by the war in Ukraine. This illustrates how human rights interventions can be crucial during conflicts.

**3. Human Rights and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development:**

Both the sustainable development and sustaining peace agendas emphasize the importance of identifying and addressing the issues that put countries at risk of crisis or violence. The 2030 Agenda's logic is that achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will **"promote peaceful, just, and inclusive societies free of fear and conflict."** As the 2030 Agenda intends to **"achieve and preserve the human rights of all,"** it creates a direct link between peace and human rights.

**4. Effective and Independent Institutions to Guarantee Human Rights:**

The fundamental rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights must be respected, safeguarded, and upheld by states. As a result, they must ensure that people have access to efficient institutions and methods for resolving disputes and breaking the cycle of marginalization and prejudice. **The UN's Human Rights Up Front Initiative, which requires the entire "UN system to be alert to deteriorating human rights situations,"** is a step in the right direction and should be strengthened across all UN pillars.

**The universality of human rights implies that anyone (regardless of nationality) can reference and assert them at any moment.** The legitimacy of human rights lies in their universal applicability, making them a powerful foundation for creating and promoting lasting peace. This is further supported by the **Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP)**, which identified a high and favorable association between states' degrees of peaceability and their **"recognition of the rights of others."**

**5. Case Studies of Human Rights as a Tool for Peacebuilding:**

**The instances of Mauritius, Senegal, and Tunisia show that nations can maintain peace despite internal weaknesses and external pressures due in part to a steadfast commitment to preserving human rights.**

These countries are relatively peaceful due to their resistance to political, economic, and social upheavals. These positive examples demonstrate how human rights can be utilized as tools for prevention and can improve interactions and communication with wary regimes, as human rights sometimes inspire mistrust and skepticism. The idea of sustaining peace is based on emphasizing what works rather than what doesn't, and all three nations have something to teach the international community as it grapples with preserving peace.

#### 6. Human Dignity as the Essence of Human Rights Jurisprudence:

**The gist of human rights jurisprudence is human dignity. Only in times of peace can a person's human dignity be fully realized.** Peace is necessary for human development, survival, and happiness. It demands a proactive response from the standpoint of human rights. The right to peace is a vital human right; it is a solidarity right in the third generation of human rights. It is founded on the claims and expectations for the protection of human rights through all actions at the global, regional, and national levels. **All human rights are indivisible, interconnected, and interdependent, and the nature and scope of the right to peace as a third-generation human right cannot be overlooked.**

Human rights and peace are interconnected like an umbilical cord. Their relationship exemplifies a two-way street: there can be no peace if human rights are denied, and there can be no realization of human rights without peace. The absence of armed conflict alone does not constitute peace unless there is a healthy respect for human rights. The United Nations has consistently emphasized incorporating human rights concerns into its broader peace framework. The recent passage of the Right to Peace is regarded as a critical step forward. **Human rights are mentioned seven times in the UN Charter and are recognized as one of the three founding pillars of the UN's peace agenda.**

#### **b) Critically evaluate the challenges possessed by the terrorism on state sovereignty and the international community.**

##### **Answer:**

Terrorism is a plague from which no country and international community is immune. Terrorism does more than killing the innocent: it weakens democratic regimes, even in established democracies such as India, the United States, and Europe. **Terrorism's instilling fear may skew public debates, undermine moderates, elevate political extremists, and polarise nations.** A variety of players, including governments, international organisations, and civil society, can reduce the magnitude and breadth of terrorist violence, as well as its most catastrophic political consequences.

##### **Terrorism and soft power:**

**Joseph Nye, soft power theory, stated that soft power is the ability to attain goals by using attraction rather than coercion.** The power of terrorist organisations in the modern world can be explained by the theory of soft power. They propagate their beliefs and ideals throughout the world to influence, motivate, and ultimately win over people to terrorism. This kind of power is occasionally not possessed by states. States' lack of soft power can, at times, undermine their own legitimacy and cause them to lose control over their citizens.

**Globalization of insurgency:**

According to Vinci, the phenomenon of insurgency has become more widespread because of **globalisation**. It talks about armed organisations as insurgents who control global politics. They expand their operations on a global scale in a variety of spheres, including the military, the economy, and politics. **Jihad ideology is propagated throughout the world by terrorist organisations like Al-Qaeda, ISIS, and Abu Sayyaf to motivate their allies to commit acts of terrorism.**

**Democratizing technology:**

Things become democratic because of globalization, making them available to the public and free from restriction. **The challenge posted by the concept of “democratizing technology” is proposed by Joseph Nye.** He claimed that the democratisation of technology gives terrorist organisations free access to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and other cutting-edge technology that can counterbalance state power. **As non-state actors, this gives terrorist organisations the ability to influence the global order.**

**Terrorism challenges state sovereignty and international community:**

Terrorism challenges the sovereignty of a State because it questions the State's ability to protect its citizens against violence and therefore, the States needs to be perceived as acting against it. After the events of 9/11, it also constitutes a challenge to the nature of the State in international law and to the international community.

**GEORGE W. BUSH rightly quoted "Like slavery and piracy, terrorism has no place in the modern world."**

To mitigate the danger terrorism poses to states and the international community, the state should continue to emphasize intelligence-sharing and expand such efforts when possible. Improving social services to marginalised communities is vital, especially in new areas with many recent refugees. This involves governments, civil society organizations, and the international aid community.

**The “Tech Against Terrorism” initiative was launched in 2017 as a direct response to terrorist abuse of technology.** A joint private-public partnership that aims to help Member States and companies address these and related issues, it enjoys the support and active involvement of key industry leaders, including Facebook, Google, Microsoft, and Twitter.

**Terrorism is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon** that has become a global nightmare. It is a serious threat to international peace and security, **causing harm to innocent civilians, destabilizing governments, and undermining economic development.** To combat terrorism effectively, it is essential to understand its root causes, motivations, and consequences. In foreign policy, states and international organisations should try to decrease the intensity of wars in the Middle East by pressing states like Saudi Arabia and Iran to end their interventions, and in general, try to prevent and resolve wars in the region.

**c) Discuss the role of great power competition in promoting democracy and undermining authoritarianism.**

**Answer:**

**The Cold War has been replaced by the big power rivalry.** Great power competition is fundamentally a struggle for global dominance and strength between the United States, European Union, China, and Russia.



However, the great power competition is much more than a military or economic issue. **Russia and China, too, use the monolithic influence of their totalitarian governments to undermine freedom and democratic values.**

As a result, great power competition manifests itself in cyber espionage, defence planning, 5G tech, international aid, intellectual property theft, supply chains, coalition-building, election influence, military exercises, and other activities. Great

**Power Competition and the Path to Democracy:**

In the zone of great power struggle, minor states may emerge as democracies. Great power competition generates opposing political forces and numerous pressure organisations to limit governmental powers and place local actors in strategic competition within a democratic framework.

**Great power competition creates multiple centers of power:**

It makes actors interconnected and reduces their reluctance to democratise. Great power competition also improves the efficiency of local elite sanctioning procedures. Most crucially, democratic influence should be constant to halt unconstrained autocracy promotion efforts that present themselves in aggressive political and military activities aimed at undermining target countries' sovereignty.

**Great power competition is complicating global cooperation:**

As Robert Kagan wrote recently, the biggest question of the coming decades may be whether countries can “confine the global competition to the economic and political realms and thus spare themselves and the world from the horrors of the next great war or even the still frightening confrontations of another cold war.” Democratic countries, led primarily by the United States, have attempted to establish a united front in support of Ukraine's defence against Russia's invasion. whereas the Chinese government has so far refrained from condemning Russia's activities in Ukraine. Western countries have frequently cautioned Beijing not to provide military assistance to Moscow.

**China's challenge to the US-led order:**

**Even more than Russia, China is determined to shift the international system away from the USA and towards itself.** China is indicating that it no longer considers the US-led world system to be legitimate. China's rise and challenge to the United States as the world's most powerful nation resonates particularly among the global south. It is geared at developing countries with an emphasis on similar stages of development or historical experience with colonialism, as well as highlighting ideals of sovereignty and non-interference.

As professor John Lewis Gaddis once described “the calculated relationship of means to large ends” – **great-power competition is sorely lacking.** For starters, it's not clear whether competition is itself a means or an end. Despite the deepening schism between the two sides, Western democracies continue to hope for some sort of cooperation with Beijing on matters such as climate change. However, given the increasing competitiveness and growing mistrust, it has not been easy. **While governments understand the need to collaborate, more active cooperation may occur only on certain issues: mutual scepticism will prevail among the many capitals.**