**JDSS** Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

**RESEARCH PAPER**

# Indo-Pak Rivalry in the Age of Globalization: Regional Tensions in a Globalized Order

**[1]Khizar Jawad, [2]Ghulam Shabbir and [3]Madiha Abbas**

1. Assistant Professor, Department of History/Pakistan Studies, FC College University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan
3. PhD. Scholar/Visiting Lecturer, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan

| **\*Corresponding Author:** | ghulam. shabbir@uog.edu.pk |

**ABSTRACT**

This paper investigates the tenacity of the Indo-Pak conflict in an ever-growing globalized environment wherein economic globalization and transnational connectivity continue to exist alongside traditional political and territorial struggles. Although the globalization paradigm of a pacifying role, by offering trade, diplomatic interactions, and propagating normative values, implies a facilitative relationship between interstate tensions, the India-Pakistan conflict is still determined by post-colonial fissures, nationalist causes, and strategic anxieties. In that regard, the question that is asked is as follows: *How has globalization transformed the dynamics of the Indo-Pak tensions in the twenty-first century?* The analysis, based on a qualitative approach based on the foundations of scholarly literature, policy discourse, and recent case studies of the terrorist attacks in India, and the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor, shows that globalization has both created new venues of dialogue and brought new issues, including the emergence of digital propaganda, increased securitization processes, and an increase in the competition of power between countries. The empirical evidence therefore suggests that sustainable peace is a possibility that is conditional upon a shift in the direction of inclusive regionalism and demilitarized discourses, as well as economic cooperation based on mutual development rather than on hostile nationalism.

| **KEYWORDS** | Indo-Pak rivalry, South Asia, Hybrid Warfare, Trak-II Diplomacy, SAARC |

**Introduction**

The India-Pakistan conflict has remained one of the longest and most unstable conflicts in the post-colonial environment. Beginning with the traumatic Partition of British India in 1947, the conflict, which today is basically institutionalized, has been largely based on the Kashmir issue and since then has seen numerous wars, repeated border skirmishes, cross-border militancy, and competing nationalist narratives (Jalal, 1995; Pandey, 2002; Yaseen, Jathol & Muzaffar, 2016). Although the processes of globalization nominally transform international relations by interdependence, economic integration, and multilateralism, the Indo-Pak dynamics have mostly opposed this homogenizing move. Instead of diluting tensions between the two countries, globalization has intensified the conflict between the two countries, making the existing tensions in the region a part of larger power politics globally (Bajpai, 2013).

Theoretically, globalization is supposed to act as a catalyst of change to soften bilateral conflicts by increasing trade, cultural, and collaborative institutions. This potential is evident through the East Asian experience, where the economic interdependence between China, South Korea, and Japan has alleviated the historic hostilities (Bhasin, 2012). However, in South Asia, India and Pakistan have been unable to utilize global integration to refreeze friction. In as much as Paul (2010) asserts, the strategic logic of zero-sum

nationalism still prevails over the cooperative forces of regionalism, particularly with regard to the South Asian security architecture. Such a relation is reflected in the stagnation of SAARC, the cautious approach of India to Pakistan through the back channels and bilateral forums, and the increasing dependence of Pakistan on the extra-regionals like China (Biberman, 2019).

The Indo-Pak war has not simply survived the globalized age; in a series of aspects, it has become more complex. Extremist propaganda has been enhanced, cyber war has been launched, and disinformation campaigns have increased, leading to tension escalation due to technological globalization (Ollapally, 2008). Although economic globalization has increased the international relations of India, it has also increased the feeling of strategic isolation by Pakistan, especially due to the fact that India has been developing more relations with the United States and taking a strong stand in the Indo-Pacific system (Palit, 2011). In the meantime, the Belt and Road Initiative, being a particular case of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), has reformed the strategic calculus of South Asia. India views the transit of CPEC via Gilgit-Baltistan, the region it claims, as a sovereign violation and expands the fault lines in the region (Mann, 2014; The Diplomat, 2023). The revival of militant violence also depicts how globalization has not succeeded in alleviating this competition. These events indicate the interplay of globalized communication networks, transnational ideology, and securitized borders to respond to conflicts instead of solving them.

In addition, the regional institutions in South Asia have been underdeveloped and have not played the role of stabilizing forces in the new global order. The flagship organization in the region, SAARC, has remained mostly paralyzed by the Indo-Pak hostilities and has very little functional possibility in crisis resolution (Jalal, 1995; Chhetri, 2023). Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC), despite its more active work, does not include Pakistan in the field of its agenda and is very narrow. Such a vacuum in the institutions permits bilateral tensions to seep into the multilateral arenas and further alienate regional dialogue from the normative frameworks of international diplomacy (Tellis, 2018).

Globalization has brought in its turn potential opportunities of transformation, despite these challenges. Track-II diplomacy, transnational cultural interactions, online education services, and civil society interactions generate low-risk zones of interaction, particularly among the youth (Butt, 2017). Emerging spheres where collaboration can be conducted are academic exchanges and regional climate initiatives, although limited (UNESCO, 2023; Krepon, 2004). The spread of sub-regional trading arrangements beyond SAARC (BBIN (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal) is an example of how sub-regionalism can also provide a way forward to integration when the Indo-Pak stalemate is bypassed (Bhattacharjee, 2017).

The research question that will guide this study is as follows: *How has globalization transformed Indo-Pakistani rivalry dynamics, and what does that mean for regional stability in South Asia?* The paper aims at critically evaluating the question of whether globalization is a mitigating or aggravating phenomenon in the dispute with an analysis of the enabling nature as well as the contradictions of the same. Using a qualitative discussion of academic literature, regional policy, and major case studies, the most remarkable being CPEC and the terrorists attack, this work explores how domestic actors in India and Pakistan absorb, redefine, or resist the forces of globalization.

The research places the Indo-Pak rivalry in the framework of the global political economy, and therefore, it has a role to play in the emerging discourse that transcends the military or nationalist discourse. It claims that a defense posture or economic leverage cannot solely bring peace to the South Asian region in a globalized South Asia. Instead, it has

to be undertaken as a multidimensional approach that puts emphasis on political de-escalation, institutional transformation, inclusive development, and civic diplomacy.

**Literature Review**

The India-Pakistan crisis is among the longest and most volatile post-colonial crises that began with the traumatic Partition of British India in 1947 (Shah, 2014). The outcome of a largely institutionalized rivalry today has been deeply rooted in Kashmir and over the decades has created many wars, frequent border disputes, militant actions across borders, and conflicting nationalistic histories (Jalal, 1995; Pandey, 2002). Although globalization processes are said to be transforming international relations in terms of interdependence, economic integration, and multilateralism, the Indo-Pak dynamics have generally been opposing this homogenizing urge; instead of defusing the tensions, the globalization process would seem to be heightening the conflict, carving regional animosities in a wider struggle of global power politics (Fair, 2014).

Theoretically, globalization is projected as a catalytic process that has the potential to adjust bilateral conflicts through increased trade, cultural exchange, and spread of institutions of collaboration. Such a pacifying effect can be observed in East Asia, where economic interdependence between China, South Korea, and Japan has helped to cool down old enmities (Bajpai, 2013). In comparison, India and Pakistan in South Asia have not been able to use global integration to stabilize the friction. According to Paul (2010), the logic of zero-sum nationalism prevails over the cooperation motives of regionalism, a fact that is manifested in the lack of progress of SAARC, India being cautious when engaging with Pakistan through back channels and bilateral forums, and Pakistan being more dependent on external actors like China (Ahmed, 2013).

The Indo-Pak war has not only survived through the globalization era; it has only become more complex. Through technological globalization, extremist propaganda has gained greater strength, cyber warfare has escalated, and disinformation campaigns have increased, increasing tension (Ollapally, 2008). The globalization of the economy has increased international relations of India, but it has also created a feeling of strategic isolation in Pakistan, especially with the increasing relationship with the United States and the assertion of a strong position in the Indo-Pacific system (Palit, 2011). However, at the same time, the Belt and Road Initiative, as in the case of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), has changed the strategic calculus of South Asia. India views the passage of CPEC through Gilgit-Baltistan, which it considers a part of its sovereignty, as a breach of its sovereignty, thus deepening the rift divisions in the region (Mann, 2014; The Diplomat, 2023).

The rise of militant violence is yet another indication of failed globalization to reduce intra-regional rivalry (Bhasin, 2012). Terrorism in the year 2024 caused civilian deaths in a religiously based attack by militants that once again created tension among the people of the region. India reacted to them by launching strikes against supposed terror camps on Pakistani soil, which Pakistan denied; and they were civilian areas like mosques (Kweera, 2023). These instances highlight the interaction of globalized communication systems, transnational ideologies, and securitized borders, which are reactions to disputes and not solutions to them (Patel, 2023).

Further, South Asian regional organizations are still inadequately developed and working poorly as stabilization agencies in the new global order. The flagship organization is largely paralyzed because of the Indo-Pak hostilities and has a low functional ability in crisis resolution (Jalal, 1995; Chhetri, 2023). Although it is more active, BIMSTEC has Pakistan out of its agenda and is given a limited mandate to work with. Bilateral tensions will find their way into multilateral arenas through the institutional vacuum available and

push regional dialogue even farther peripheral to the normative frameworks of international diplomacy (Lieven, 2011).

In spite of these, globalization is offering possibilities of change. The low-risk areas of interaction are created through Track-II diplomacy, transnational cultural interactions, online education platforms, and interactions with civil societies, particularly among the younger generations (Konwer, 2023; Sabharwal, 2022). The new areas of cooperation are academic exchange and regional climate programs; however, they are not very numerous (UNESCO, 2023; Krepon, 2004). The expansion of sub-regional trade arrangements outside SAARC, like BBIN (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal), provides an example of how sub-regionalism can provide a way to integration when the Indo-Pak standoff is avoided (Javaid Chaudhry, 2023).

This study was therefore guided by the following research question: How has globalization changed the dynamics of Indo-Pakistani rivalry, and what does this entail in respect of the stability of the region in South Asia? This paper critically evaluates whether globalization is a restraining or causative factor in the dispute and evaluates its facilitation feature, coupled with its contradictions. This study provides insights into how domestic actors in India and Pakistan assimilate, rebrand, or oppose the impact of globalization through the use of a qualitative review of scholarly literature, regional policy, and major case studies, such as CPEC and the terrorist attacks in India.

The paper places the Indo-Pak rivalry in the context of the entire international political economy on the idea that defense stances or economic strength cannot guarantee peace in South Asia. Rather, it needs a multidimensional approach with a focus on political de-escalation, institutional change, inclusive development, and civic diplomacy.

## Material and Methods

This study uses a qualitative research approach, which is interpretivist in nature, to understand how the Indo-Pak rivalry is taking a different shape in the overall context of globalization. The intricate nature of the historical grievances, national identities, strategic issues, and economic interdependence makes qualitative research the best approach to understanding the intricacies and contradictions that quantitative research might fail to address. The paper aims at finding out the way globalization has rearranged, strengthened, or undermined traditional forms of hostility between India and Pakistan. This methodology is anchored in an interpretivist school of thought, as it gives the researcher the opportunity to explore the meanings and contextual basis of state behavior, elite discourses, and institutional practices.

The study is founded on the thematic analysis and a document-based design. It does not focus on statistical generalization; instead, it tries to find conceptual understanding and explanatory richness. The research question, which is how globalization has predisposed the nature and course of the Indo-Pak tensions, requires an exploratory, interpretive, and multi-layered approach. The study explores the multidimensional nature of South Asian security and diplomacy through the lens of political narratives, media representation, policy patterns, and institutional reaction to the same. The constructivist and interpretivist character of this study would equally explain the socially constructed character of geopolitical competition, in which globalization is not perceived as a pure economic or technological phenomenon but rather as a socially contested area.

The data is inferred based on four major categories. To start with, it has an academic background and literature wherein works by Jalal (1995), Paul (2010), Ollapally (2008), and others provide useful background and history of the Indo-Pak rivalry and its metamorphosis. Second, the evidence on the functioning of the system is in the form of official reports by multilateral bodies, including the United Nations Development

Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, and the World Bank. Third, policy-related information and regional views can be found in the policy papers and analysis provided by think tanks like the Observer Research Foundation and the Institute of South Asian Studies. Finally, possible news reports from reputable news sources such as The Hindu, Reuters, BBC News, and The Diplomat provide the most recent coverage and case-specific news, including the terrorist incidents and CPEC as a strategy. Such a multi-source approach guarantees analytical triangulation and a balanced and deep dataset.

Thematic content analysis is the major analytical instrument. Data analysis was done in three phases. The initial familiarity with texts and initial impressions were done on the first reading. Second, a grounded approach was used to manually code the content and identify themes like recurring themes, including, but not limited to, religious nationalism, economic asymmetry, digital conflict, external power dynamics, and institutional breakdown. Third, the themes were put together under broader categories and discussed in the context of the research question. This method enabled mapping the way traditional rivalries are being redefined by technological, economical, and institutional flows related to globalization.

To further base the analysis, the paper has used case studies to illustrate how globalization has affected the tensions between Indo-Pak. As the case that reflects the importance of digitally networked extremism and the force of politically exploiting religious identity, the terrorist attacks are discussed. On the same note, the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) is discussed as a geopolitical-economic initiative that has reorganized regional balances and feigned the sovereignty issue in India. Case studies used within the institution, like the fall of SAARC summits and the lack of enthusiasm of BIMSTEC, are examined to evaluate the constraints and prospects of regional multilateralism. These chosen cases are not comprehensive but are reflective of bigger trends and are used to relate abstract themes to developments in the world.

Because it was a desk-based study where the only data utilized was that which is publicly available and no primary fieldwork or human involvement was needed, no ethical approval and informed consent were needed. However, the study complies with the standards of responsible scholarship because of the transparency in the use of data, completeness in the citation, and impartiality in interpretation. The use of inflammatory language has been avoided, and politically sensitive information has been brought into perspective, especially with regard to religious identity, sovereignty demands, and narratives of conflict. The methodology of the study relies on academic honesty and respectful interactions with all opinions, including those of the state, the civil society, and the multilateral.

Although the research looks at India and Pakistan mainly, it does not ignore the impact of the overall regional and global processes, such as the role of China, the United States, and multilateral organizations. The study has its drawback in that it lacks data in the field, like interviews with policymakers, diplomats, or citizens who may have provided more depth in the study. Also, the dynamic aspect of global and regional politics may change too quickly such that certain developments may go outside the study. Nevertheless, these weaknesses are offset by the richness and range of secondary sources of data and the theoretical coherence of the study. After all, the methodology offers a dynamic and wide-ranging structure for investigating the stratified and changing nature of Indo-Pak relations in the globalized world.

**Results and Discussion**

Findings of the research suggest that the rivalry between India and Pakistan, as opposed to being neutralized by globalization, has been at the same time transformed. Territorial issues, military maneuvering, and religious nationalism remain the customary

sources of conflict that prevail on the bilateral agenda but are today being supplemented by the novel tensions of digital warfare, lopsided alliances, and uneven economies of scale in the global economy. It is in this section the main findings of the research are discussed in terms of five themes.

Globalization has strengthened the Indian economic and strategic position in the global arena, as it is now a preferred partner to the West in the Indo-Pacific region. At the same time, Pakistan has been facing economic turbulence, governance, and dependency on geopolitical rent. According to Palit (2011), the presence of India in the global economy has enabled it to grow in its strategic alliances as Pakistan has been more dependent on China to balance the hand of New Delhi.

The increasing asymmetry has been enhanced by such significant infrastructure projects as the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), which India has also objected to on the basis that it traverses territories governed by Pakistan in Kashmir. In this regard, Mann (2014) notes that such projects represent the shift of the traditional territorial disputes into economic and diplomatic struggles that occur at the global level. Globalization in this regard has, instead of integrating people, continued to widen the pre-existing divides by transforming infrastructures and trade routes into places of conflict.

Among the most notable in the Indo-Pak tensions in the globalized age is the emergence of hybrid warfare, especially along the digital platform. New instruments of both state and non-state actors have become disinformation campaigns, internet espionage, and the spread of extremist propaganda. Ollapally (2008) points to the growing process of mediating religious identity and nationalism online, strengthening polarized discourses and returning cycles of provocation and retaliation. Incidents like the terrorist attacks, where the militants that are members of The Resistance Front are suspected of targeting civilians due to their religious affiliations, are an indication of how the issue of extremist violence is not an isolated problem and is instead enhanced by regional and global radicalization and misinformation networks. This is a new type of war based on the global connectivity, and this has introduced a volatile aspect to an already unstable relationship.

Although the globalization process has the potential to promote peace by developing countries via integration of their economies, the relationship between India and Pakistan is still stuck in a web of securitized nationalism. The economic opportunities, including those in SAFTA, have constantly been sabotaged by strategic suspicion and the lack of dialogue breakdowns encouraged by common failures (Paul 2010).

Suspension of normal trade after large-scale crises like the Pulwama-Balakot exchange of 2019, shows how weak economic relationships can be to political surprise. According to Webb and Wijeveera (2015), regional organizations such as SAARC have been made irrelevant majorly by the Indo-Pak animosity, and this has curtailed the capacity of the South Asian region to devise joint economic plans. BIMSTEC, which is a relatively more active forum, does not have the institutional resources, as well as inclusiveness, to solve such deep-seated disputes.

The research concludes that the external forces have largely contributed to the dynamics of the Indo-Pak disputes in a globalized world. Great power rivalry has been increasingly influencing the strategic alignments, as the involvement of China in the development of infrastructure and military in Pakistan seems to provide one of the balances to the increasing proximity of India to the United States. As described by Palit (2011), India and China have pursued their own soft balancing strategies by economic outreach and alliances in the region, but their ever-growing hostility, particularly in the Himalayas and Indian Ocean, involves Pakistan even further in the fray.

Recent books and articles published by Routledge and Palgrave have observed that the dynamic of three actors between India, China, and Pakistan makes it hard to build trust between those countries, not to mention the takeaway of the world that regards South Asia as the region of instability and danger (Webb and Wijeweera, 2015; Vemsani, 2015). With this kind of environment, Pakistan can use the support of China in forums like the UN Security Council, and India uses its diplomatic capital to thwart any attempts by Pakistan in multilateral trade and security blocs.

Another key finding is the continuing inability of South Asian regional institutions to facilitate conflict or more effectively collaborate. The lack of normativity in regional diplomacy is embodied in the failure of SAARC to operate, as the lack of a norm is the lack of a date on when summits will take place. According to Palit (2011), although SAARC was meant to promote economic and social cooperation, it has not been able to solve bilateral problems, a factor that has seen it sidelined.

Other frameworks like BIMSTEC have some potential but leave out Pakistan and thus do not take into account the very fact of Indo-Pak conflict. The recommendation of trilateralism between India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh as suggested in the writings of Palit is just a dream, due to the political inertia and mistrust. Meanwhile, informal and Track II diplomacy are still under exploitation. The interactions of the civil society, culture, and academic collaboration have been inconsistent and prone to political retaliation. This undermines the social base on which to achieve peace outside the governmental system.

To conclude, the results indicate that globalization has changed but not ended the Indo-Pak conflict. It has created new sources of antagonism in cybersecurity, economic paths, and ideological stories and has strengthened previous sources of antagonistic contacts like territorial claims and strategic alliances. Instead of coming together to cooperate, both states have been selectively applying globalization, India to strengthen its international position, and Pakistan to ensure its strategic relevance with Chinese and Islamic alignments of the world.

There is no doubt that in the absence of sustained political conversation, institutional change, and involvement by the grassroots, the possibilities offered by the globalization process will remain wasted, as affirmed in the literature. The regional peace, however, cannot be left to the global mechanisms as such but has to be rooted in the primary reconceptualization of regionalism as more inclusive, resilient, and development-focused.

Considering the results of the above analysis, I would recommend a current of policy suggestions that would target governments of countries, regional organizations, and international actors. These actions aim at softening the Indo-Pakistani conflict and recalibrating the regional path of South Asia in the wider spectrum of globalization.

Despite the increase in the number of institutional structures, economic relations between India and Pakistan are rather unsatisfying. In line with this, the two states should focus on the reemergence of the South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA) in the SAARC system or, alternatively, make the bilateral trade track immune to political storms. According to Paul (2010) and Webb and Wijeweera (2015), economic interdependence may also foster long-term trust and cultivate peace constituencies. However, confidence-building measures (CBMs) in trade, including the reinstatement of the Most Favored Nation (MFN) status and the authorization of cross-border banking, ought to be done gradually.

Hybrid dangers, especially false information and cyber propaganda, have become one of the effective tools of provocation in the Indo-Pak relations. The diffusion of inflammatory content can be reduced by the formulation of a bilateral digital confidence mechanism that can be located within a SAARC cybersecurity forum. Based on the

experience of such players as the EU Cyber Diplomacy Toolbox, the two states should agree on the non-interference standards in the digital space.

Pragmatic engagement forums are offered in the face of the gridlock that has been experienced in SAARC through functional sub-regional forums like BBIN (Bangladesh-Bhutan-India-Nepal) and cross-border energy projects. India and Pakistan can also seek indirect cooperation by joining in multilateral infrastructure or environmental ventures under BIMSTEC or the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). Palit (2011) confirms the effectiveness of these indirect routes in dissipating tensions in the world regions that are different.

Track-II forums, that is, those consisting of scholars, retired officials, journalists, and peace activists, play a central role in defusing crises and suggesting alternative policy discourses. However, such forums are often viewed with cynicism or are made into political issues within the country. Governments have the responsibility of providing soft diplomatic acknowledgement and logistic support to such platforms, hence cushioning against their survival even in the face of official diplomatic breakdowns (Krepon, 2004). Universities like the South Asia University may be established to facilitate forums of dialogue on education, the environment, and regional history.

South Asia is still at very high risk of climate change, water shortage, and refugee migration. Therefore, the two countries ought to work together in transboundary river management, early warning mechanisms, and disaster preparedness (Khan, , Muzaffar & Mustafa, 2022. Effective Indo-Bangladesh river cooperation can be used as a prototype of the Indus Basin, given neutral international facilitation is obtained. UNDP (2023) and UNESCO (2023) argue that combined environmental and humanitarian efforts would be less politically charged and thus generate the diplomatic momentum even in the hostile environment.

Populist, state-sponsored representations of historical demonization of the enemy through the prism of religious or nationalistic interpretations must be actively replaced by pluralistic and shared historiographies. Peace education and cultural diplomacy need to be threaded into school textbooks, national media, and the commemorations of the people. It is necessary to shift national identity towards non-enemy-based foundations, as Ollapally (2008) and Ahmed (2011) argue that this is the only way to achieve long-term peace.

International actors must take up the position of having regional rivalry and not increasing it. The United States, China, and the Gulf countries should assume a strategic restraint position in South Asia. The partners in development, such as the World Bank, UN agencies, and the European Union, should promote joint development agendas (e.g., health, infrastructure, and resilience in climate) that involve India and Pakistan as stakeholders even though the implementation of such actions occurs via multilateral networks.

**Conclusion**

The India-Pakistan rivalry is a rivalry that has not been solved since the post-colonial period. Although the impact of globalization is often attributed to the integration of the economies, weakening the motivation towards conflict and promoting the use of diplomacy, this question proves that its effects on South Asia are twofold. Instead of a homogenous tempering of conflicts, globalization has transformed the theater of competition, creating new arenas of opposition alongside offering untapped opportunities of collaboration.

Using the resources of scholarly literature, policy reports, and current events like the terrorist attacks in India and geopolitical implications of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), agency theory, and this research, it concludes that globalization in South

Asia has intensified structural asymmetries. India, an up-and-coming global power, has gained more economic and strategic advantages from globalization, but Pakistan has remained the kind of country that relies on foreign balances, especially with China, to balance out its diminishing regional influence. This imbalance has spawned strategic anxiety and made nationalist discourses on each side more difficult.

Besides, technological aspects of globalization, particularly the spread of social media and online spaces, have also added to a new kind of hybrid warfare. The spread of disinformation, cyberattacks, or an ideologically based mobilization of the internet has not merely increased the level of diplomatic tension but also led to the further polarization of the country. These tools, which are especially becoming popular among state and non-state actors, have undermined the dialogue space, demonized dissent, and militarized the idea of nationalism.

At an institutional level, the inability of SAARC to transform itself into an effective regional organization highlights how Indo-Pak hostility has prevented multilateralism in South Asia. Regional peace mechanisms have been marginalized, and Pakistan has been excluded by BIMSTEC due to a wider unwillingness to share governance. Thereupon, regionalism has disintegrated into smaller sub-regional platforms like the BBIN and bilateral alignment with the external powers, which often mirror around the Indo-Pak divide or get worse.

However, the analysis also finds significant solutions to change. Track II diplomacy, education and cultural exchange, collective climate and disaster projects, and confidence building via trade and communication are also still possible and needed. Though these are marginal to the current policy debate, these channels have the prospect of creating social trust and minimizing political unpredictability. The rising power of youth-based civil society movements, interfaith activism, and online educational partnerships in South Asia indicates that the bottom-up strategies can humanize the enemy and can be used to reconcile the parties in the long run.

## Recommendations

Theoretically, the study would contribute to the body of literature as it fills the gap between globalization research and conflict analysis. It disputes the linear liberal hope that globalization inevitably brings peace in that it has shown itself to be a rival space whereby strategic ambitions, historical grievances, and ideological projects clash. The Indo-Pak case highlights the reality that globalization is not necessarily pacifying or destabilizing the world in one go; it is a process that is being constructed due to national interests, identity politics, and asymmetrical abilities.

In practice, the results warrant a reconceptualization of regional diplomacy in South Asia. Peace will not necessarily be a by-product of the Kashmir issue resolved in isolation, and neither will peace be the result of top-down political meetings. It should be constructed by building trust gradually, establishing a collective authority for cross-border issues like climate change, and fostering a regional identity that goes beyond ethno-religious nationalism.

Further research must include the limitations in this study, like the lack of fieldwork, elite interviews, or survey data. Specifically, the empirical research on the influence of social media discourse, diaspora politics, and new feelings about the relations between Indo-Pak generations would be valuable.

But, in the end, globalization provides weapons of war and war lotion. The India-Pakistan rivalry will either escalate or morph depending on the decision the region makes on the way forward in the globalized order: to perpetuate nationalist hostilities or to invest

in exclusionary, people-focused regionalism. It is time to not only cope with this competition but also re-examine it in the interest of the future of South Asia and its future in an increasingly globalized world.

**References**

Ahmed, I. (2011). *The Politics of Religion in South and Southeast Asia.* London: Routledge.

Ahmed, I. (2013). *The Pakistan Garrison State: Origins, Evolution, Consequences (1947–2011).* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Bajpai, K. (2013). *India's National Security: A Reader.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bhasin, A. S. (2012). *India–Pakistan Relations 1947–2007: A Documentary Study, Vol. 3.* New Delhi: Geetika Publishers.

Bhattacharjee, K. (2017). *The Great Game in Afghanistan.* Noida: HarperCollins.

Biberman, Y. (2019). *Gambling with Violence: State Outsourcing of War in Pakistan and India.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butt, A. (2017). *Secession and Security: Explaining State Strategy Against Separatists.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Chapman, G. P. (2009). *The Geopolitics of South Asia: From Early Empires to the Nuclear Age* (3rd ed.). London: Ashgate Publishing.

Chhetri, P. (2023). *Reviving BIMSTEC: Opportunities and Obstacles for South Asian Cooperation.* Observer Research Foundation. https://www.orfonline.org

Fair, C. (2014). *Fighting to the End: The Pakistan Army's Way of War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grare, F. (2013). *India Turns East: International Engagement and U.S.–China Rivalry.* London: Brookings Institution Press.

Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Javaid Chaudhry, F. (2023). India's Curious Strategic Obsession with China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). *Global Change, Peace & Security, 35*(3), 323–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2024.2405143

Khan, R., Muzaffar, M., & Mustafa, M. (2022). Pakistan-India Water Conflict: A Causal Analysis, *Annals of Social Sciences and Perspective*, 3(1),43-51

Konwer, S. (2023). Russia-Pakistan Relations and the 'China Factor' – Implications for India. *Strategic Analysis, 47*(4), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/09700161.2023.2288980

Krepon, M. (2004). *Nuclear Risk Reduction in South Asia.* New York: Henry L. Stimson Center.

Kweera, R. (2023). Drones in Modern Warfare: Utilization in India-Pakistan Cross-Border Terrorism and Security Implications. *Strategic Analysis, 47*(4), 376–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/09700161.2023.2288989

Lieven, A. (2011). *Pakistan: A Hard Country.* London: Allen Lane.

Mann, M. (2014). *South Asia's Modern History: Thematic Perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Murayama, M. (2008). Migration and Well-being at the Lower Echelons of the Economy: A Study of Delhi Slums. In H. Sato & M. Murayama (Eds.), *Globalisation, Employment and Mobility: The South Asian Experience* (pp. 263–284). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ollapally, D. M. (2008). *The Politics of Extremism in South Asia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palit, A. (2011). *South Asia: Beyond the Global Financial Crisis.* New York: World Scientific Publishing Company.

Pandey, G. (2002). *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patel, T. A. (2023). Bordering and Othering: Encounters at Shrine of Chamliyal at the India-Pakistan Border. *Journal of Borderlands Studies, 38*(3), 507–526. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2021.1948901

Paul, T. V. (2010). The Major Powers and the South Asian Conflicts. In A. Palit (Ed.), *South Asia: Beyond the Global Financial Crisis* (pp. 101–116). World Scientific Publishing.

Rajagopalan, R., & Mishra, A. (2014). *Nuclear South Asia: Keywords and Concepts.* New Delhi: Routledge.

Sabharwal, S. (2022). *India's Pakistan Conundrum: Managing a Complex Relationship.* London: Routledge.

Shah, A. (2014). *The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

South Asia Terrorism Portal. (2024). *Yearly Assessment of Terrorism Trends in South Asia.* https://www.satp.org

Tellis, A. J. (2018). South Asia's Nuclear Security Paradox. *The Washington Quarterly, 41*(4), 7–27.

The Diplomat. (2023, March 22). *Sri Lanka's Debt Diplomacy Dilemma.* https://thediplomat.com

The Diplomat. (2023, October 17). *South Asia's Strategic Entanglements in a Multipolar World.* https://thediplomat.com

The Guardian. (2023, June 10). *Deadly Heatwaves Intensify in India and Pakistan as Climate Crisis Deepens.* https://www.theguardian.com

The Hindu. (2016, September 28). *SAARC Summit in Pakistan Called Off as India, Other Countries Pull Out.* https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/SAARC-Summit-in-Pakistan-called-off-as-India-others-pull-out/article14584167.ece

The Hindu. (2023, November 5). *Crisis in Cox's Bazar: Rohingya Refugee Strain Grows Amid Aid Cuts.* https://www.thehindu.com

The Hindu. (2024, March 22). *Cross-border Militancy Resurges in Kashmir Valley.* https://www.thehindu.com

UNDP. (2023). *Human Development Report: South Asia 2023 – Inequality and Resilience.* United Nations Development Programme. https://hdr.undp.org/en/2023-report

UNDP. (2023). *South Asia Climate Risk Outlook.* United Nations Development Programme. https://www.undp.org

UNESCO. (2023). *Promoting Regional Cooperation through Education and Culture in South Asia.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://www.unesco.org

UNHCR. (2024). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in South Asia 2023.* United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. https://www.unhcr.org

U.S. Department of State. (2022, April 11). *U.S.–India 2+2 Ministerial Dialogue Joint Statement.* https://www.state.gov

Webb, M. J., & Wijeweera, A. (2015). *The Political Economy of Conflict in South Asia.* Palgrave Macmillan.

World Bank. (2023). *Groundswell Part II: Acting on Internal Climate Migration in South Asia.* https://www.worldbank.org

Yaseen, Z., Jathol, I., & Muzaffar, M. (2016). Pakistan and India Relations: A Political Analysis of Conflicts and Regional Security in South Asia, *Global Political Review*, 1 (I), 1-09