Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

South Asia and the Challenges of Regional Stability: Geopolitical, Security, and Developmental Perspectives

[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

A review of the situation in South Asia as far as regional stability is concerned makes it evident that it is on a knife edge, most predominantly due to the combinations of geopolitical rivalries, domestic security issues, and long-term developmental imbalances. This paper questions the creation of these overlapping variables that come together to disarm peace and frustrate the working together of people, with a specific emphasis on how these interactions occur between India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh. Using a qualitative and thematic approach to the analysis of the available academic literature, policy briefs, and region-specific case studies, the study explores unresolved territorial disputes, religious extremism, the weakness of regional organizations, and uneven economic growth, all of which have been found to determine the core determinants of instability. Through our findings, we have found that despite these incremental changes made through regional forums and diplomatic efforts, deep-rooted mistrust and lack of state institution integration remain major challenges to sustainable peace. This paper finds that the establishment of coordinated conflict-resolution measures, strengthening of multilateral institutions, and formulation of development policies that emphasize human security and inclusive development are the key elements of ensuring the establishment of long-term stability in South Asia.

| **KEYWORDS** | South Asia, Geopolitical Rivalries, Terrorism, Extremism, Regional Stability |

Introduction

The strategic salience of the region, the demographic size, and historical commonalities are not able to overcome regional instability in South Asia. The South Asian region, which comprises Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, has approximately a quarter of the world population, and it is a geopolitically vulnerable nexus of Central Asia, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia (Mann, 2014; Chapman, 2009; Yaseen, Jathol& Muzaffar, 2016). Nevertheless, the region is still characterized by long-standing interstate tensions, civil strife, weak local governments, and extreme inequality in terms of development, among which chances of peaceful coexistence and cooperation are hampered.

The genesis of South Asian instability is the colonial partitioning and the formation of the state that follows. The partitioning of British India in 1947 caused enduring territorial unrest, population displacement, and nationalism of identity, particularly between India

and Pakistan (Jalal, 1995; Talbot, 2000). The unresolved Kashmir issue has been the focal point, and it has been used to influence the military ideologies, local politics, and foreign policies (Ganguly, 2001; Rajagopalan and Mishra, 2014). The frequent crises and wars have established a general level of distrust towards each other; militarization and institutionalized nuclear deterrence became the staple of the regional security (Krepon, 2004; Paul, 2010; Hanif& Muzaffar, 2024).

South Asia faces a growing number of non-traditional security issues in addition to the traditional interstate conflict, which further complicates the stability in the region. Religious extremism and terrorism have been escalated in the region, which in most cases is driven by internal political dissatisfaction, socio-economic marginalization, and transnational competition as opposed to ideology in isolation (Ollapally, 2008; Ahmed, 2011; Yaseen & Muzaffar, 2018). The insurgencies in Afghanistan and in some areas of Pakistan, militant groups in Kashmir, and the cases of radicalization in Bangladesh and Sri Lanka demonstrate how the issues of internal and transnational threats undermine the authority of states and destroy the trust between them (Fair, 2014; Tellis, 2008).

The drivers of insecurity have turned out to be climate change and environmental stress that have not been sufficiently considered. South Asia is extremely susceptible to the increased temperatures, melting glaciers, unpredictable monsoons, floods, droughts, and sea-level rise, which threaten the food security, water supply, and livelihoods (IPCC, 2014; UNDP, 2023). Transboundary river systems like the Indus and the Ganges have been turning out to be the place of political conflict, with environmental issues turning into strategic issues (Swain, 2004; Krepon, 2004; Karamat, Muzaffar & Shah, 2019). The displacement caused by climate and humanitarian crises also puts a burden on the weak governance systems and impedes the collaboration on the regional level (World Bank, 2023).

The other inherent challenge to stability in the region is economic and developmental differences. South Asia is also one of the least economically integrated regions in the world, and a country with little intra-regional trade and endemic poverty for hundreds of millions (World Bank, 2020; Webb and Wijeweera, 2015). Although the economic growth in some countries is significant, the majority of countries rely on foreign trade and suffer from poverty. The lack of governance, corruption, and economic nationalism remain as blockage factors to collective development efforts and social inequality (Jalal, 1995; Murayama, 2008). This group of structural injustices, researchers claim, contributes to political instability, migration pressures, and vulnerability to radicalism, which further contributes to insecurity (Sen, 1999; UNDP, 2023).

Other regional organizations like the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) were formed to encourage collaboration and peace, but this has been grossly limited by political animosity, especially the Indo-Pakistan hostility (Paul, 2010; Chapman, 2009; Muzaffar, Jathol, & Yaseen, 2017). Other and minor regional or sub-regional organizations such as BIMSTEC have also been seen to play a bigger role, but with similar issues concerning institutional capacity and political will (Mann, 2014). Therefore, South Asia is still deprived of strong conflict resolution, disaster management, and coordinated development mechanisms.

This paper attempts to analyze the interactions between geopolitical tensions, security issues, and developmental disequilibrium to destabilize the region in South Asia. The integrated analytical framework adopted in the study is one step further than state-centered and military explanations to indicate the interrelatedness of political, social, economic, and environmental factors that determine the security situation in the region.

These dynamics would be critical in finding its ways of achieving sustainable peace, inclusive development, and resilient regional cooperation.

Literature Review

The academic literature on regional stability in South Asia in general seems to be unanimous on three dimensions, which are connected with each other: geopolitical rivalry and strategic rivalry, non-traditional security threats, and structural developmental and institutional vulnerabilities. The available literature highlights that no single factor alone can create instability within the region, but it is the combination of historical legacies, political decision-making, and socio-economic inequalities that may lead to instability (Chapman, 2009; Mann, 2014).

Strategic Unpredictability and Geopolitical Competitions

Much literature outlines the Indo-Pakistani rivalry as the pivotal point of South Asia's security dilemma. Historians believe that the segregation of British India in 1947 institutionalized hostile national identities, thus giving rise to unresolved territorial claims; Kashmir is among the most notable that has dominated the politics of the region (Jalal, 1995; Talbot, 2000). Ganguly (2001) argues that the recurrence of wars and crises between India and Pakistan has exercised normalization of militarization, which has also limited the freedom of diplomacy.

This rivalry has changed but not ended with the introduction of nuclear weapons. Although nuclear deterrence possibly averted all-out war, low-intensity conflict and proxy warfare have become possible because of the stability-instability paradox (Krepon, 2004; Rajagopalan and Mishra, 2014). Paul (2010) also points out how the interests of the big powers in South Asia make the region lack stability since they strengthen alliance politics and strategic competitions rather than organize and establish cooperative mechanisms of security.

In addition to the Indo-Pakistani tensions, the Indian strategic interests are also spread to its northern borders, especially in reference to China. Mann (2014) notes that unraveled boundary issues and mounting strategic rivalry are some of the factors that breed the security concerns in India and thus influence the behavior of India in the region. These conflicting interests form a complicated geopolitical situation where there is a lack of trust and the possibility of the crisis escalating is always a threat.

Non-Traditional Security Threats

In addition to the traditional issues of military interests, the scholars are emphasizing more the non-traditional issues of security as leading keys to the instability in South Asia. Terrorism and religious extremists have always been researched as the results of domestic political failure and regional power politics (Ollapally, 2008; Ahmed, 2011). Instead of looking just at the concept of extremism as an ideology, scholars believe that militant activities are frequently perpetuated by socio-economic marginalization, poor governance, and cross-border processes (Fair, 2014).

The protracted war in Afghanistan has also been cited as a major destabilizing factor to the region in general. Tellis (2008) goes further to assert that the spillover effects of insurgency, narcotics trade, and refugee flows undermine security in the neighboring states, more so Pakistan. These issues of transnationalism prove that state-centric ways of securing people are limited and that regional collaboration is required.

Another important field of scholarly interest has been environmental security. The effects of climate change are severe on the food security, water supply, and human livelihoods in South Asia, thus increasing the current social and political tensions (IPCC, 2014; Swain, 2004). Krepon (2004) and Swain (2004) argue that transboundary water conflicts, especially around the river systems of Indus and Ganges, are becoming more and more securitized, which is to turn the environmental stress into a strategic challenge.

Lack of Development and Economic Disintegration

Constant developmental inequalities are also highlighted in the literature as an underlying cause of instability in South Asia. Though economic growth has been experienced, poverty remains prevalent, and most people lack access to education, healthcare, and governance gaps are significant in the region (Sen, 1999; UNDP, 2023). Murayama (2008) highlights that economic vulnerability and labor precarity are the sources of social unrest and labor migration pressure, especially in the urban and border regions.

The integration of the region has been perceived to be a lost chance of stability. Researchers observe that among the countries, intra-regional trade in South Asia is the lowest globally, which is in part caused by protectionism, political distrust, and poor infrastructure (Webb and Wijeweera, 2015; World Bank, 2020). Paul (2010) asserts that economic nationalism often dominates over collective economic reasoning, which makes the regional institutions ineffective.

Institutions and Governance of the Region

South Asian studies have paid much attention to the institutional drawbacks of the regional cooperation frameworks and especially the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Even though the idea behind SAARC was to enhance economic and political cooperation, bilateral conflicts and reaching decisions by consensus have ruined the effectiveness of this group (Chapman, 2009; Jalal, 1995). Individually, scholars are largely in agreement that SAARC has neither transformed into a serious conflict-resolution nor an economic integration vehicle. This has been countered by sub-regional projects, including the BIMSTEC, which have gotten increasing scholarly interest. Mann (2014) implies that an alternative approach that is more pragmatic is the BIMSTEC option because it does not have to overcome deep-rooted rivalries, but its effectiveness is restricted by poor institutionalization and insufficient political commitment. All in all, according to the literature, institutional fragility is one of the most significant barriers to stability in a region.

The analyzed literature shows that the instability of South Asia is a multidimensional phenomenon, which is based on the interplay of geopolitical rivalries, non-traditional security threats, developmental inequalities, and weak institutions. However, very little of the available literature analyzes these factors separately and tends to favor either a state-centric or a military viewpoint. In this paper, this gap has been tackled by adopting an integrated approach whereby the security and development are interconnected, thus leading to the need to adopt collaborative, people-oriented, and institution-based strategies for regional stability.

Material and Methods

The current study applies a qualitative research paradigm to examine the complex and intertwined factors that define the stability of the region in South Asia. Due to the multidimensional character of the topic, including geopolitical conflicts, security issues,

and developmental inequalities, in order to understand the history, the context, and the interpretational depth, a qualitative approach specifically suits the topic in question. The approach allows considering regional dynamics holistically, which cannot be sufficiently described by quantitative measures, particularly in those regions where the political relations are developing and structural limitations are embedded (Creswell, 2013; Denzin and Lincoln, 2018).

The study is situated on an exploratory and explanatory research design that aims at uncovering trends and correlations and not testing set hypotheses. South Asia is analyzed as a region, and special concern is given to India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh because they are the main actors in determining the outcome of the regional security and development. Such cases are discussed in comparison and context to bring out the interaction between domestic and transnational variables to produce instability in the region (George and Bennett, 2005). The research is based solely on secondary sources, which are peer-reviewed scholarly articles and policy papers and analytical reports published by international organizations and reputable research institutions. The selection of the sources was based on the scholarly credibility, relevance to the research question, and consistency in time, as all the materials were published not later than 2025. The use of a varied base of sources enables the process of triangulation and eliminates the possibility of institutional or ideological bias, which contributes to the strength of the analysis (Yin, 2018).

Thematic and interpretive content analysis were used to propose data analysis. Conceptually related, relevant texts were systematically reviewed to find repeated ideas that concerned geopolitical conflict, non-traditional security threats, institutional performance, and developmental inequality. These ideas were then compiled into larger themes of analysis, which were in line with the research questions of the study. Themes were then discussed in case studies to identify convergent tendencies and divergent trends in regional politics and make a comprehensive evaluation of contested issues of security and development (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

The analytical framework incorporates the understanding of the regional security complex theory and view of human security. Regional security complex theory focuses on the dependence between security interactions among the states that are geographically close to each other, but the theory of human security stretches the concept of stability to include economic well-being, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion (Buzan and Waever, 2003; UNDP, 1994). This synthesis can enable the paper to go beyond state-centric and militarized thinking that previews how the quality of governance and human development are likely to maintain peace in the region.

In order to guarantee methodological rigor, validity is enhanced with source triangulation and systematic thematic coding, whereas reliability is supported with clear documentation regarding data selection and the analysis process. The ethical aspects are considered by the utilization of the publicly available data only and strict practices of academic citation. Even though the lack of primary fieldwork restricts the direct interaction with the local views, the given shortcoming is compensated by the use of a large variety of authoritative and locally based sources, thus providing an opportunity to conduct analytical generalization instead of statistical inference (Yin, 2018).

Results and Discussion

The thematic analysis identifies four intertwined themes explaining the continued instability in the region in South Asia: deep-rooted geopolitical rivalry, emergence of non-

traditional security challenges, institutional fragility and governance gaps, and endemic developmental and economic disparities. The themes are repeated throughout the academic literature, and they demonstrate how the lack of security and development issues strengthen each other instead of being independent of each other.

Deep Rooted Geopolitical Competitions and Strategic Mistrust

The discussion confirms that the most pertinent and disruptive element of the regional structure of South Asia is the enduring geopolitical rivalries, especially between India and Pakistan. There is always a claim by authors that unresolved territorial conflicts, particularly over Kashmir, have solidified hostile security ideologies and inculcated national identities (Ganguly, 2001; Jalal, 1995). Although nuclearization has changed the kind of conflict, it has not weakened hostility; rather, it has enabled some low-intensity conflicts or proxy wars in the stability-instability paradox (Krepon, 2004; Narang, 2014).

In addition, the strategic mistrust is not limited to the Indo-Pakistani dyad. The concerns of India with the growing regional presence of China and the lack of a clear demarcation of the two countries on the border are another source of South Asian strategic insecurity (Mohan, 2012; Mann, 2014; Muzaffar& Khan, 2021). This system web of mutual rivalry negatively affects the work of multilateral cooperation because states are more concerned with relative gains and mutual hedging rather than collective security. According to Acharya (2014), it is in areas characterized by conflicting security orientations that one finds it difficult to institutionalize a form of cooperation grounded on the principle of trust, and this is quite evident in South Asia.

Growth of Non-Traditional Security Threats

The second primary topic of the analysis, which can be noticed, is the growing significance of non-traditional security threats, in particular, terrorism, extremism, climate change, and forced migration. The literature also proves that terrorism in South Asia is strongly combined with domestic governance failures, social marginalization, and regional power politics, and not the ideology of the religions only (Ollapally, 2008; Fair, 2014). As seen in Afghanistan and Pakistan during the period of militancy, in Kashmir during insurgency, and in Bangladesh by case studies of incidences of radicalization, internal conflicts have created their regional spillover effects (Tellis, 2008; Bose, 2018).

Another, not less militarized, source of instability is climate and environmental stressors. The thematic analysis highlights that climate change exacerbates socioeconomic vulnerabilities that exist, which increases competition for water, land, and resources (IPCC, 2014; Swain and Ojendal, 2018). The population growth and climate changes exert more pressure on water-sharing agreements like the Indus Waters Treaty and are converting environmental problems to strategic ones (Zeitoun, Mirumachi, and Warner, 2011). These results suggest that environmental insecurity can be defined as a threat multiplier in delicate political environments (Barnett and Adger, 2007).

Weaknesses in Institutional Fragility and Governance

A third theme revolves around poor regional institutions and lack of governance. The discussion supports a wider academic belief that regional organizations, especially SAARC, are yet to become efficient conflict-resolving or economic integration zones because of the political stalemate and need to arrive at a consensus before making choices (Chapman, 2009; Paul, 2010). Instead of easing the situation, bilateral tensions are periodically crippling institutional processes, hindering group reaction to crises.

BIMSTEC and BBIN are often mentioned as viable substitutes due to their sub-regional character, but the literature demonstrates that these organizations are also characterized by a lack of institutional capacity, insufficient finances, and a lack of political will (Dash, 2016; Haokip, 2020). The lack of governance at the domestic level in the form of corruption, bureaucratic inefficiency, and uneven capacity of the state undermines the cooperation between regions by undermining the policy coordination and trust (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012; Rotberg, 2014). The results are that an institutional weakness is a symptom of the instability, not alone but a strengthening mechanism that supports the instability.

Inequality in Development and Economic Disparity

The last theme emphasizes long-standing developmental inequalities and economic disintegration as organizational sources of instability. Although certain areas of the region have witnessed significant economic development, South Asia remains highly poverty-stricken, unequal, and lacking in human security (UNDP, 2023; Sen, 1999). Analysis indicates that there is a great deal of scholarly consensus in that economic exclusion and absence of opportunity are causes of political instability, migration stress, and vulnerability to extremist mobilization (Stewart, 2008; Murayama, 2008).

The level of intra-regional economic integration is still impressively low, as trade barriers, low connectivity, and political mistrust hamper the achievement of regional economic complementarities (Kathuria, Kedia, Varma, & Bagai, 2018; World Bank, 2020). Economic nationalism usually eclipses the pursuits of collective development, furthering ties with extra-regional players and diminishing regional collaboration motivation (Webb & Wijeweera, 2015). The results highlight the fact that the problems of underdevelopment and insecurity are constitutive in relation to each other: the low level of economic integration increases political tension, and the insecurity level, in its turn, discourages investment and collaboration.

Combined, the thematic results reinforce the view that regional instability in South Asia can best be seen as the result of intersecting security, institutional, and developmental failures. Non-traditional threats are further aggravated by geopolitical controversies; the failure of institutions to respond collectively and the presence of the inequalities in developmental matters ensure the continuance of the fragility of the social and political systems. This model of interaction will enable the literature to call for a move from the tight, militarized paradigms of security to integrated strategies that incorporate conflict management, human development, and institutional reforms (Acharya, 2014; UNDP, 1994).

Another significant gap identified in the results is the critical difference between identifying common problems and the political leadership that is needed to ensure that such problems are dealt with collectively. Unless there is continuous investment in the relationship to build trust, reinforce institutions, and focus on the inclusive development of South Asia, it will continue to be caught in the loop of firefighting approaches instead of moving towards the sustainable development of the region.

Conclusion

This paper provides an in-depth academic analysis of the continued predicaments facing and affecting regional stability in South Asia in terms of geopolitical, security, institutional, and developmental perspectives. The discussion has shown that the causes of instability in the region have long historical roots, including the unresolved issue of the

territorial claims, historical strategic rivalries that persist to this day to influence the state actions, and priorities of security concerns. These historical insecurity problems are further compounded by the emergence of non-traditional insecurities like terrorism, religious extremism, climate change, mass displacement, etc., that do not respect the borders of countries and make the unilateral and militarized policy imperfect.

The results underscore the fact that the regional instability in South Asia is perpetuated by a vicious cycle wherein a lack of good governance and institutional weakness are the factors that weaken cooperation in politics, and insecurity is further fueled by economic and social inequalities. Even with their potential, regional and sub-regional institutions have failed to deliver on their mandate because of political distrust, lack of autonomy, and inconsistent adherence by member states. This means that the collective action opportunities in disaster recovery, conflict prevention, environmental protection, and economic integration are largely under-explored.

In addition, the paper highlights that there can be no development or security in South Asia without each other. Continued poverty, unemployment, and lack of access to basic services do not only restrict human well-being, but they also provide grounds on which social disquiet, radicalization, and transnational instability flourish. Lack of inclusive growth policies and regional coordinated development further cements intra- and interstate divisions. Based on this, security-focused strategies are not sufficient to establish regional stability, and a holistic system is necessary where human security, institutional reformation, and sustainable development are the central pillars of the regional policy.

Overall, the paper holds that South Asia is at a very crucial crossroad. Although the region still experiences major structural and political limitations, it also has a lot of potential based on its demographic dynamism and economic complementarities, as well as its similarity in culture. To exploit this potential requires a paradigm change from reactivity and fragmented response to proactivity, collaboration, and people strategies of regional stability.

Recommendations

To promote sustainable regional stability, the states in South Asia need to adopt an overall long-term approach that would address both the causal factors and the correlative conditions of insecurity. One of the first steps is the institutionalization of the long-term political dialogue and confidence measures as a way of reducing mistrust and as a way of dispute management. Diplomatic activity on a regular basis, formal crisis-communication measures, and military-to-military contacts will help to reduce miscalculations and create the space where the transformation of a conflict will be gradual. The informal and Track-II conversations are supposed to supplement the official ones by keeping the lines of communication open in times of further political tension.

The second pillar, which cannot be ignored, is the significant reform of regional and sub-regional institutions. These organizations should be empowered with better mandates, enhanced funding, and more independence to undertake regional initiatives to an effective extent. The decision-making processes should be flexible enough to exclude the occurrence of political stalemates, and the various mechanisms of accountability should be strengthened to ensure accountability and performance, which can be measured. Institutional fragmentation can be reduced and policy coherence can be increased through improved coordination at the regional and sub-regional levels.

The third priority is related to the mitigation of non-traditional security threats by means of collective preventive measures. The regional collaboration in climate adaptation, water governance, disaster-risk reduction, and public health, as well as counter-extremism, should be prioritized as core security objectives. The collective efforts in joint research, strong early-warning systems, and information-sharing platforms will have a strong effect in enhancing the resilience of regions and counteracting the spillover effects of environmental and humanitarian crises.

Fourthly, inclusive economic growth should be accepted as a pillar of long-term stability. The states of South Asia must strive to reduce trade barriers, improve connectivity in the region, and develop cross-border investment and supply chains. Special attention should be paid to the reduction of poverty, the creation of new jobs, education, and health care as the tools to overcome structural inequalities and promote social integration. Regional economic cooperation must not be viewed as just a strategy to grow but as some form of confidence mechanism that breeds mutual dependence and benefit.

Lastly, there is a need to have more focus on people-to-people engagement as a bridge for gaining trust and establishing a common regional identity. Academic exchange, cultural, media, and youth-oriented programs can be used to overpower the hostile discourses and encourage mutual understanding among societies. The presence of civil-society organizations, learning institutions, and the private sector should not be left behind in the regional cooperation initiative so as to make stability initiatives socially based as well as socially sustainable.

All these intersect on the conclusion that regional stability in South Asia requires the rethink of state-focused paradigms of security to an inclusive human-centered approach. With the willingness to change the situation by the political will, institutional capacity, and inclusive development, the region will be able to slowly turn the challenges that face it into an opportunity of cooperation, resilience, and shared prosperity.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

Acharya, A. (2009). *Whose Ideas Matter? Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Acharya, A. (2014). *The End of American World Order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

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

Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2007). Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict. *Political Geography, 26*(6), 639–655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2007.03.003

Bose, S. (2018). *Kashmir at the Crossroads: Inside a Twenty-First-Century Conflict*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Buzan, B., & Wæver, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dash, K. C. (2016). Regionalism in South Asia: Negotiating Cooperation, Institutional Structures, and Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly, 60*(3), 574–585. https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqw017

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Ganguly, S. (2001). *Conflict Unending: India–Pakistan Tensions Since 1947*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Ganguly, S., & Kapur, S. P. (2010). *India, Pakistan, and the Bomb: Debating Nuclear Stability in South Asia*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haass, R. N. (2017). *A World in Disarray: American Foreign Policy and the Crisis of the Old Order*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Hanif, E. & Muzaffar, M. (2024). The U.S.-India Nuclear Deal: Strategic Shifts and Security Implications in South Asia, *Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 9* (2), 471-489

Haokip, T. (2020). India's BIMSTEC Policy and Regional Cooperation in the Bay of Bengal. *India Review, 19*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2020.1695334

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Karamat, S., Muzaffar, M., & Shah, A. S. (2019). Politics of Religious Extremism in Pakistan: An Analysis, *Review of Economics and Development Studies, 5* (2), 315-322

Kathuria, S., Kedia, S., Varma, S., & Bagai, S. (2018). *A Glass Half Full: The Promise of Regional Trade in South Asia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Khan, R. (2017). *Pakistan's Nuclear Policy: A Minimum Credible Deterrence*. London, UK: Routledge.

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

Malik, V. P. (2019). *India's Military Conflicts and Diplomacy*. New Delhi, India: HarperCollins India.

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

Mohan, C. R. (2012). *Samudra Manthan: Sino-Indian Rivalry in the Indo-Pacific*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Murayama, M. (2008). Migration and Well-Being at the Lower Echelons of the Economy. In H. Sato & M. Murayama (Eds.), *Globalization, Employment and Mobility: The South Asian Experience* (pp. 263–284). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Muzaffar, M. & Khan, I. (2021). China's Foreign Policy and Strategic Stability towards South Asia: An Analysis, *South Asian Studies, 36* (2), 339-350

Muzaffar, M., Jathol, I., & Yaseen, Z. (2017). SAARC: An Evaluation of its Achievements, Failures and Compulsion to Cooperate, *Global Political Review, II* (I), 36-45

Narang, V. (2014). *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

Pant, H. V. (2016). *Indian Foreign Policy: An Overview*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

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). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.

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

Rotberg, R. I. (2014). Good Governance Means Performance and Results. *Governance, 27*(3), 511–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12084

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, F. (2008). *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Swain, A. (2004). *Managing Water Conflict: Asia, Africa, and the Middle East*. London, UK: Routledge.

Swain, A., & Öjendal, J. (2018). Water Security and Regional Stability in South Asia. *Journal of South Asian Studies, 41*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2018.1419792

Talbot, I. (2000). *Pakistan: A Modern History*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Tellis, A. J. (2008). *Pakistan and the War on Terror: Conflicted Goals, Compromised Performance*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Tellis, A. J., Fair, C. C., & Medby, J. J. (2017). *Limited Conflicts Under the Nuclear Umbrella*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York, NY: UNDP.

United Nations Development Programme. (2023). *Human Development Report 2023: Inequality and Resilience*. New York, NY: UNDP.

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

World Bank. (2020). *South Asia Economic Focus: The Cursed Blessing of Public Banks*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank. (2023). *Groundswell Part II: Acting on Internal Climate Migration*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yaseen, Z., & Muzaffar, M. (2018). Extremism in Pakistan: Issues and Challenges, *Journal of Politics and International Studies, 4* (I), 31-42

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

Zeitoun, M., Mirumachi, N., & Warner, J. (2011). Transboundary Water Interaction and the Climate Change Debate. *Global Environmental Change, 21*(3), 716–727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.02.006