

## **International Relations (IR) theories to understand the cooperation and competition dynamics in the Indo-Pacific region with examples:**

1. **Realism:** Realism is a dominant IR theory that posits that states are the main actors in international relations and pursue their interests in an anarchic international system. States maximize their power and security through balancing against threats and forming alliances to increase their capabilities. In the context of the Indo-Pacific region, the US-China rivalry is a prime example of Realism. Both countries are pursuing their national interests, and China's rise is perceived as a threat to the US's power and influence in the region. The US has formed alliances with several Indo-Pacific countries such as Japan, South Korea, and Australia to balance China's growing influence.
2. **Liberalism:** Liberalism emphasizes the importance of international institutions, norms, and values in promoting cooperation and peace among states. Liberal theorists argue that cooperation can be achieved through multilateral institutions and economic interdependence. In the Indo-Pacific region, the ASEAN-led forums, such as the East Asia Summit, are an example of a liberal approach to regional cooperation. ASEAN member countries have come together to address issues such as maritime security, economic integration, and disaster management through dialogue and consensus-building.
3. **Constructivism:** Constructivism focuses on the role of ideas and norms in shaping international relations. The theory argues that social constructions such as norms, values, and identities influence state behavior. In the Indo-Pacific region, the Quad (the US, Japan, India, and Australia) can be analyzed through a constructivist lens. The Quad members share common values such as democracy, rule of law, and a free and open Indo-Pacific. Their shared norms and identity shape their cooperation to promote a vision of regional security and prosperity.
4. **Critical Theory:** Critical theory emphasizes the role of power and ideology in shaping international relations. It critiques dominant narratives and structures of power and seeks to promote emancipation and social justice. In the Indo-Pacific region, critical theorists can analyze China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). The BRI has been criticized for promoting China's strategic interests and debt-trap diplomacy in developing countries. Critical theorists would argue that the BRI perpetuates unequal power relations and reinforces the dominance of the Global North over the Global South.

Overall, applying IR theories to the Indo-Pacific region can help us understand the complex dynamics of cooperation and competition in the region and shed light on the factors that shape state behavior.

### **Apply these IR theories on Kashmir Issue**

Certainly, we can apply various IR theories to analyze the Kashmir issue. Here are some examples:

1. **Realism:** Realism argues that states are the primary actors in international relations and that their actions are driven by self-interest and the pursuit of power. In the context of the Kashmir issue, both India and Pakistan have pursued their national interests and security concerns. India claims that Kashmir is an integral part of its territory, while Pakistan supports the right of self-determination

for the people of Kashmir. The conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir can be understood as a result of their power struggle and competition for influence in the region.

2. **Liberalism:** Liberalism emphasizes the importance of international institutions and cooperation in resolving conflicts and promoting peace. The UN has been involved in mediating the Kashmir issue, and its resolutions have called for a peaceful resolution of the conflict and the holding of a plebiscite to determine the future of Kashmir. However, India has opposed third-party intervention in the dispute and argues that it is a bilateral issue between India and Pakistan.
3. **Constructivism:** Constructivism emphasizes the role of norms, values, and identities in shaping state behavior. In the context of the Kashmir issue, India and Pakistan have constructed different narratives around the conflict, and their respective national identities are intertwined with their claims to Kashmir. India argues that Kashmir is an integral part of its secular and democratic nation, while Pakistan sees itself as the protector of the rights of the Muslim population in Kashmir.
4. **Feminism:** Feminism emphasizes the role of gender in international relations and highlights the marginalization of women in conflict zones. The Kashmir conflict has been marked by human rights violations and gender-based violence, including rape and sexual assault. Women in Kashmir have been subjected to violence and repression, and their voices have been marginalized in the conflict resolution process. Feminist IR scholars argue that women's participation and perspectives are crucial for the resolution of conflicts and the promotion of peace.

Overall, applying IR theories to the Kashmir issue can help us understand the complex dynamics of the conflict and the factors that shape state behavior.

The Abraham Accords is a historic agreement signed on September 15, 2020, between Israel, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), and Bahrain. The agreement aims to normalize diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations between Israel and the two Gulf Arab states. Here are some possible implications of the Abraham Accords for Palestine, Israel, and the whole region:

#### 1. Implications for Palestine:

- The Palestinian leadership opposed the Abraham Accords and called it a betrayal of the Palestinian cause. They argued that the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel would weaken the Arab stance in support of Palestinian rights.
- The Accords could reduce the pressure on Israel to resolve the Palestinian issue and end the occupation of Palestinian territories. It could also pave the way for other Arab states to normalize relations with Israel without addressing the Palestinian issue.
- The normalization of relations could also lead to a divide between Arab states and the Palestinian leadership, who may feel marginalized and isolated.

#### 2. Implications for Israel:

- The Abraham Accords could boost Israel's regional standing and enhance its security by reducing its isolation in the region. It could also provide Israel with new economic opportunities and access to Gulf markets.

- The Accords could also enhance Israel's leverage in any future negotiations with the Palestinians, as it would demonstrate its ability to make progress in the absence of a comprehensive peace agreement.
- However, the normalization of relations with Arab states could also increase Israel's vulnerability to regional conflicts and terrorism.

### **3. Implications for the region:**

- The Abraham Accords could create a new regional alignment in the Middle East, with Israel and Arab states working together against common threats such as Iran and Islamist terrorism.
- The Accords could also lead to increased economic integration and cooperation in areas such as tourism, technology, and energy.
- However, the Accords could also deepen existing divisions and rivalries in the region, particularly between Sunni and Shia states, and exacerbate tensions between Iran and its rivals.

### **4. International Implications:**

- The Abraham Accords have been hailed as a major diplomatic breakthrough, with several countries including the US, UK, and France welcoming the agreement.
- The Accords could signal a shift in the regional balance of power and lead to changes in the US approach to the Middle East, including a reduced focus on the Palestinian issue and a greater emphasis on countering Iran.
- However, the Accords have also been criticized for ignoring the Palestinian issue and for potentially undermining efforts to achieve a comprehensive peace agreement in the region.

In conclusion, the Abraham Accords have significant implications for Palestine, Israel, the region, and the international community. While the Accords could lead to increased cooperation and economic benefits, they could also exacerbate existing conflicts and deepen regional divisions.

### **Several countries opposed the Abraham Accords when it was announced in September 2020.**

#### **These countries included:**

1. Iran: Iran strongly opposed the Abraham Accords and accused the UAE and Bahrain of betraying the Palestinian cause by normalizing relations with Israel. Iran also warned that the Accords would destabilize the region and increase the risk of conflict.
2. Turkey: Turkey criticized the Abraham Accords and accused the UAE and Bahrain of turning their back on the Palestinian people. Turkey also warned that the Accords could lead to a new arms race in the region and undermine efforts to achieve a comprehensive peace agreement.
3. Palestinian Authority: The Palestinian Authority condemned the Abraham Accords and called it a "stab in the back" by Arab states who had previously supported the Palestinian cause. The Palestinian Authority argued that the Accords would undermine efforts to achieve a two-state solution and would embolden Israel's occupation of Palestinian territories.
4. Qatar: Qatar did not explicitly condemn the Abraham Accords, but it expressed concerns about the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel without addressing the Palestinian issue.

Qatar also argued that any future agreements with Israel should be based on a comprehensive peace agreement that addresses the rights of the Palestinian people.

5. Lebanon: Lebanon condemned the Abraham Accords and accused the UAE and Bahrain of betraying the Arab and Islamic world by normalizing relations with Israel. Lebanon also warned that the Accords would further destabilize the region and could lead to increased conflict.

### **What is the position of Pakistan on the accords?**

Pakistan has been critical of the Abraham Accords since it was announced in September 2020.

Pakistan's position on the Accords can be summarized as follows:

1. Pakistan has reiterated its support for the Palestinian cause and its commitment to the two-state solution. Pakistan has argued that any normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel should be based on a comprehensive peace agreement that addresses the rights of the Palestinian people.
2. Pakistan has expressed concern that the Abraham Accords could undermine efforts to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East. Pakistan has argued that the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel should not come at the expense of the Palestinian people, and that any future agreements should be based on a comprehensive peace agreement that addresses the root causes of the conflict.
3. Pakistan has called for a more proactive role by the international community in resolving the Palestinian issue. Pakistan has argued that the international community has a responsibility to help the Palestinians achieve their rights and that any efforts to normalize relations between Arab states and Israel should be part of a broader effort to achieve a comprehensive peace agreement.
4. Pakistan has also expressed concern that the Abraham Accords could have implications for the Muslim world as a whole. Pakistan has argued that any efforts to normalize relations with Israel should be based on respect for the rights of the Palestinian people and that the Muslim world should remain united in support of the Palestinian cause.

### **Highlight the official statements from Pakistan on the accords?**

Yes, here are some official statements from Pakistan on the Abraham Accords:

1. Prime Minister Imran Khan, in his address to the UN General Assembly in September 2020, stated that the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel should not be at the expense of the Palestinian cause. He said: "We cannot overlook the issue of Palestine. It is the cornerstone of the OIC's [Organization of Islamic Cooperation] agenda. We cannot and should not be asked to normalize relations with Israel."
2. Pakistan's Foreign Office released a statement in September 2020, saying that the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel was a "matter of deep concern" for Pakistan. The statement reiterated Pakistan's support for the Palestinian cause and called for a comprehensive peace agreement that addressed the rights of the Palestinian people.

3. Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Shah Mehmood Qureshi, in a statement in September 2020, expressed Pakistan's disappointment over the UAE's decision to normalize relations with Israel. He said: "We were not expecting such a move from the UAE. It is disappointing. The Palestinian issue has always been a red line for us."
4. In October 2020, Pakistan's Foreign Office released a statement condemning Bahrain's decision to normalize relations with Israel. The statement said: "Pakistan joins the international community in calling for a just and lasting solution of the Palestinian issue, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and the Arab Peace Initiative."

Overall, Pakistan's official statements on the Abraham Accords have emphasized its support for the Palestinian cause and its commitment to a comprehensive peace agreement that addresses the rights of the Palestinian people. Pakistan has expressed concern that the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel could undermine efforts to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East and has called for a more proactive role by the international community in resolving the Palestinian issue.

## **Title: Society and Institutions failing to agree on Basic Rules: An Analysis of the Political Crisis in Pakistan**

**Introduction:** The current political crisis in Pakistan highlights the inability of its society and institutions to agree on basic rules, leading to a breakdown that requires serious introspection. The issue at hand, which is the dissolution of the provincial assembly and the requirement to hold elections within 90 days, has been unnecessarily complicated, reflecting the nation's dangerously divided state. The following are detailed bullet points with headings and facts that provide an analysis of the situation.

**The Constitutional Requirement:** The Constitution of Pakistan clearly states that elections must be held within 90 days of the dissolution of a provincial assembly. All relevant stakeholders had a constitutional duty to ensure compliance with this command. However, instead of cooperating, everyone started to pass the buck.

**Blaming Game:** The governors and the federal government shrugged their shoulders and said this was a matter for the Election Commission of Pakistan (ECP). The ECP said they could not set any date. The president was too eager to please his party and fixed a date for the election to the KP Assembly. He later conceded he had no authority to do so.

**Judiciary's Role:** A two-member bench of the Supreme Court hearing a case related to the powers of a caretaker government to transfer officials was concerned about this imminent breach of a constitutional deadline for elections. It requested the Chief Justice of Pakistan (CJP) to take suo motu notice.

**CJP's Actions:** The CJP acted and constituted a nine-member bench to consider this significant matter. Once a bench is constituted and starts hearing a matter, the CJP does not have the unilateral power to change or reconstitute it through the exercise of his administrative discretion.

**Reservations Expressed by Judges:** When the bench convened, there were serious reservations expressed by four of its members regarding its composition and the suo motu action. Justice Afridi (with

*MalakRind*

whom Justice Minallah agreed) dismissed all three petitions pending before the bench. This was a minority opinion. He left it to the chief justice to decide whether to retain him in the “present bench” but noted it would be “of no avail”.

**Reconstitution of Bench:** The nine-member bench passed an order where they referred the matter to the CJP for “reconstitution” of the bench. The reason for this action as expressed in this unanimous order was the “additional notes” attached by the four judges who had reservations. Although bench constitution is a matter for the CJP, in this case, his brother judges had raised certain specific concerns regarding the composition of the bench in written additional notes.

**Reconstituted Bench:** The five-member reconstituted bench heard the matter and allowed the petitions by a majority of three to two. The law minister and PTI both claimed victory. Imran Khan came on television and said that this was the first step to Pakistan becoming a great country governed by laws rather than men.

**Confusing and Unsatisfactory Situation:** The present situation is confusing and patently unsatisfactory. Initially, a nine-member bench passed an order with four additional notes. In these additional notes, two judges dismissed the petitions. They were not made part of the reconstituted bench. Subsequently, a reconstituted five-member bench heard the same matter. Two out of these five judges dismissed the petitions for the same reasons. Three judges allowed the petitions.

**Judgment of the Court:** The net result is seven judges have, within the space of a few days, decided the same matter as part of two separate benches. Four have dismissed the petitions. Three have allowed them. Because of the reconstitution of the bench by the CJP, the opinion of the three judges constitutes the decision of the court.

**Conclusion:**

*MalakRind*