

# The Age of Strategic Uncertainty: Great-Power Rivalry and the Fragmentation of Global Politics

*Dr. Shivani Rai<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Rohit Kumar<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1 & 2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & IR, Gautam Buddha University, Greater Noida.

**Abstract:** The contemporary international system is undergoing a profound transformation characterised by intensifying great-power rivalry, growing geopolitical uncertainty, and the fragmentation of global politics. The post-Cold War expectation of a relatively stable, rules-based international order has increasingly been challenged by strategic competition among major powers, particularly the United States and China, renewed tensions between Russia and Western countries, and persistent conflicts in the Middle East. These developments have exposed the limitations of existing multilateral institutions in addressing complex security challenges and reconciling competing national interests. This article examines the relationship between great-power competition, strategic uncertainty, and the declining effectiveness of international cooperation. Drawing on realist and liberal institutionalist perspectives, it analyses how shifting power configurations, security dilemmas, economic nationalism, technological competition, and the politicisation of global interdependence contribute to the fragmentation of the international order. It further explores the challenges faced by international institutions, the strategic autonomy pursued by regional powers such as India, and the evolving role of the Global South in an increasingly contested geopolitical environment. The article argues that contemporary global politics is not necessarily moving towards the complete collapse of international cooperation; rather, cooperation is becoming increasingly selective, conditional, and shaped by strategic interests. It concludes that managing strategic uncertainty requires strengthened multilateral institutions, credible diplomatic engagement, crisis-management mechanisms, and renewed commitment to cooperation on shared global challenges. Ultimately, the future stability of the international system will depend not on the elimination of great-power competition, but on the ability of states to manage rivalry without undermining the foundations of international order.

**Keywords:** Strategic Uncertainty, Great-Power Rivalry, Geopolitical Fragmentation, International Cooperation, Multipolarity, Strategic Autonomy,

## Introduction: The Age of Strategic Uncertainty

In the contemporary international arena, characterised by ideological diversity and competing national interests, it is essential to understand why political actors and decision-makers at the highest levels of power

continuously struggle to expand their influence over other states. Such competition often arises from the pursuit of strategic interests, political dominance and the desire to shape the international order according to national priorities. However, this raises a fundamental question: if democratic governance is rooted in the will of the people, why do states that identify themselves as democratic continue to engage in strategic rivalry and geopolitical competition? Democracy, while emphasising popular sovereignty and political participation, does not necessarily eliminate conflicts of interest between nations. Rather, the pursuit of national security, economic advantage and international influence often transcends ideological commitments, creating contradictions between democratic principles and the realities of global power politics.

The historical rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War provides an important illustration of this contradiction. The ideological confrontation between capitalism and socialism was not merely a disagreement over economic systems; it also represented a struggle for political legitimacy, strategic influence and competing visions of international order. The United States promoted a liberal capitalist framework, while the Soviet Union advanced a socialist alternative. Both powers sought to extend their influence across different regions, transforming ideological differences into a broader contest for global supremacy. Although the Cold War eventually ended with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the underlying dynamics of strategic competition did not disappear. Instead, they evolved alongside changes in the global distribution of power and the emergence of new geopolitical challenges.

In this context, the *age of strategic uncertainty* reflects a world in which states increasingly struggle to predict one another's intentions, reconcile competing interests and maintain a stable international environment. When powerful nations pursue dominance through coercion, military confrontation or economic pressure, they risk undermining the principles of sovereignty, peaceful coexistence and international cooperation. Such behaviour can intensify insecurity and contribute to a fragmented global order in which opportunities for collective progress are constrained by geopolitical rivalry. Therefore, understanding contemporary international politics requires examining not only the ideological differences between states but also the strategic calculations that shape their behaviour. This article explores how great-power rivalry generates geopolitical uncertainty, challenges the effectiveness of international cooperation and raises fundamental questions about the possibility of maintaining a stable and inclusive international order.

### **Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

Understanding strategic uncertainty in contemporary international politics requires an examination of realism, liberalism, ideological polarisation, and the security dilemma. These concepts help explain why powerful states continue to compete for influence even when they publicly support peace, international cooperation, and the stability of the global order. The central argument of this article is that strategic uncertainty emerges

not only from the distribution of power among states, but also from the difference between their declared principles and their actual political decisions.

The realist approach provides an important foundation for understanding this contradiction. Hans J. Morgenthau argued that international politics is fundamentally connected with the pursuit of power, while Kenneth Waltz explained how the structure of the international system encourages states to prioritise their survival and security (Morgenthau, 1948; Waltz, 1979). From this perspective, even states that advocate liberal values may pursue strategic advantages when their national interests appear to be threatened. This raises a significant question: to what extent can powerful countries maintain an international order based on peace and cooperation when their own pursuit of influence contributes to competition and insecurity? States possessing exceptional international authority, including permanent membership and veto power in the United Nations Security Council, have a particularly important responsibility to consider how their decisions affect international peace. Their influence should be measured not only by their capacity to exercise power, but also by their willingness to use it responsibly.

Liberalism offers another important dimension to this discussion. Michael Doyle's examination of liberalism and international relations highlights the relationship between liberal political principles and the possibilities and limitations of international peace (Doyle, 1983a, 1983b). However, the presence of democratic institutions or the public commitment to liberal values does not automatically eliminate strategic rivalry. When political leaders place geopolitical advantage above consistent principles, the gap between the language of peace and the practice of international politics becomes increasingly visible. The resulting contradiction can weaken public trust and make the intentions of powerful states more difficult to interpret.

Strategic uncertainty is closely connected to the security dilemma, through which one state's efforts to protect itself may generate insecurity in another. John Herz (1950) introduced the concept into modern international relations scholarship, while Robert Jervis (1978) examined the conditions under which the security dilemma can intensify competition or permit cooperation. This framework suggests that security cannot be understood exclusively through military strength. It must also include the protection of ordinary people, their right to live with dignity, and their freedom from the devastating consequences of armed conflict.

The experience of Gaza and the wider Israeli–Palestinian conflict demonstrates the human consequences of prolonged insecurity, where civilians bear an enormous burden of violence and displacement. Such realities challenge the assumption that strategic policies necessarily produce security for everyone. Leaders may present their actions as essential for national protection, yet the consequences of conflict can undermine the security of neighbouring societies and ordinary citizens alike.

Therefore, this article conceptualises strategic uncertainty as a condition in which competition for power, ideological polarisation, and the inconsistent application of political principles weaken trust between states and expose populations to insecurity. Sustainable international peace requires more than declarations of cooperation: it requires credible diplomacy, restraint in the exercise of power, and a commitment to human security alongside national interests.

### **3. The Return of Great-Power Rivalry: The Emergence of Great Economic Powers**

The return of great-power rivalry has become one of the most significant developments in contemporary international politics. However, rivalry should not automatically be considered a natural or unavoidable condition of international relations. Countries may have different political systems, ideological beliefs, economic priorities, and strategic interests, but these differences do not necessarily require them to engage in continuous confrontation. The more important question is why political leaders sometimes transform differences into conflicts and why the pursuit of influence becomes more important than the shared interests of humanity. Understanding the behaviour of states and their political leadership is therefore essential to understanding the contemporary international order.

The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union provides an important historical example. Following the Second World War, the two superpowers represented competing ideological and economic systems. The United States became the principal leader of the Western bloc, while the Soviet Union led the socialist bloc. Their competition extended beyond military strength to economic development, technological progress, political influence, and the ability to shape the international system. Although the two powers avoided a direct, full-scale war against each other, their rivalry contributed to regional conflicts, arms competition, and prolonged international insecurity. The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 appeared to create opportunities for a less divided world. Nevertheless, the subsequent emergence of new economic powers and renewed strategic competition demonstrates that the end of one historical rivalry did not necessarily end the politics of power.

The contemporary international system is increasingly characterised by the redistribution of economic and political influence. The United States remains a major global power, while China has emerged as a leading economic and technological competitor. Russia continues to exercise significant military, diplomatic, and energy-related influence, although its economic position differs considerably from that of the United States and China. Other countries and regional groupings are also seeking greater influence in global institutions, trade, technology, and development. Consequently, the present international order cannot be adequately understood as a simple division between a Western bloc and an Eastern bloc. These categories may describe certain historical and strategic alignments, but the interests of individual countries frequently cross such divisions.

The economic rise of Asia has further complicated this picture. Western European countries acquired considerable economic power through industrialisation, maritime commerce, technological development, and the expansion of international trade. However, European economic growth was also historically connected with colonial expansion, slavery, and the extraction of resources and wealth from colonised societies. Research by Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2005) examines the relationship between Atlantic trade, colonialism, institutional change, and the rise of Western Europe. This history is important because contemporary economic inequalities cannot be understood solely through the present performance of individual countries; they must also be examined in the context of the historical structures that shaped global production, trade, and wealth. The growing economic significance of Asian countries therefore represents not simply a shift in markets, but a wider transformation in the distribution of international influence.

Nevertheless, the emergence of new economic powers should not be interpreted as a reason to establish another rigid division of the world. If the rise of one group of countries is understood primarily as a threat by another, economic development may become entangled with strategic suspicion. Trade, investment, technological cooperation, and international institutions can then be treated as instruments of competition rather than opportunities for shared progress. The objective should not be to replace Western dominance with Eastern dominance, but to develop an international system in which countries can pursue prosperity without being compelled to participate in permanent geopolitical confrontation.

India provides a particularly important example of this challenge. Its foreign policy is shaped by the pursuit of strategic autonomy: the capacity to make independent decisions according to national interests while maintaining relationships with different international partners. India's engagement with Russia, cooperation with the United States, participation in BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, and involvement in other international partnerships demonstrate that its foreign policy cannot be reduced to a simple choice between East and West. As Rajeev (2025) explains, India's approach to strategic autonomy has evolved in response to changing geopolitical circumstances rather than remaining a fixed or unchanging doctrine.

Strategic autonomy, therefore, should not be confused with political indecision or an attempt to maintain equal distance from every major power. It concerns the ability to evaluate each relationship according to India's security, economic development, energy requirements, technological capabilities, and wider national interests. For India, the central issue is not whether cooperation with a particular country is inherently right or wrong, but whether that cooperation advances its legitimate national priorities without unnecessarily restricting its freedom of decision-making.

This question becomes especially significant when external powers attempt to influence how regional conflicts should be resolved. The terrorist attack at Pahalgam on 22 April 2025 and India's subsequent Operation Sindoor brought renewed attention to the relationship between counterterrorism, sovereignty, and international

diplomacy. The episode also generated debate about the role claimed by the United States in facilitating the subsequent cessation of military hostilities. Such claims and their interpretation should be examined through official statements and independently verified evidence rather than treated as proof of a country's intentions. The broader concern, however, remains important: international mediation may contribute to de-escalation, but it should not be assumed that every external diplomatic initiative necessarily overrides a state's sovereignty or that every disagreement with a major power indicates submission to it.

Ultimately, the return of great-power rivalry raises a fundamental question about the purpose of economic and political power. If the growth of powerful states produces greater insecurity, intensifies ideological divisions, and reduces the freedom of other countries to pursue their development, then the meaning of progress itself requires reconsideration. The emergence of new economic powers should create opportunities for a more representative and balanced international order, not merely a new competition for dominance. For India and other countries seeking independent development, the challenge is to engage with competing powers without surrendering the ability to determine their own priorities. A stable international future will depend not only on which countries become more powerful, but also on whether that power is exercised in ways that support cooperation, sovereign equality, and shared prosperity.

### **Geopolitical Uncertainty and the New Security Dilemma**

Geopolitical uncertainty has become a defining feature of contemporary international relations, as states increasingly struggle to predict the strategic intentions and future actions of other countries. The changing distribution of global power, intensifying military competition and declining trust between major powers have created an international environment in which decisions taken to strengthen national security can unintentionally increase insecurity elsewhere. This situation can be understood through the concept of the *security dilemma*, which explains how one state's efforts to protect itself may be perceived as a potential threat by another, generating a cycle of suspicion, military preparedness and strategic competition.

The security dilemma is particularly evident in relations between major powers. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union developed extensive military capabilities to deter one another, resulting in an arms race that increased the risks of confrontation despite the existence of nuclear deterrence. Although the Cold War ended in 1991, the underlying dynamics of mutual suspicion have continued in different forms. Contemporary tensions between the United States and China, particularly concerning Taiwan and security in the Indo-Pacific, illustrate how military modernisation, strategic partnerships and regional deployments can be interpreted differently by competing states. Actions presented as defensive by one government may be perceived as attempts to expand strategic dominance by another.

Another important source of geopolitical uncertainty is the changing character of military competition. Advances in cyber capabilities, artificial intelligence, missile technology and space-based systems have complicated traditional understandings of national security. States must now consider threats that may emerge without conventional military confrontation, while uncertainty surrounding the origin and intentions of certain activities can make an effective response more difficult. Furthermore, the growing importance of economic security has blurred the distinction between military preparedness and economic policy, as governments increasingly treat technological dependence, critical infrastructure and supply chains as strategic concerns.

The Russia-Ukraine war provides another illustration of how geopolitical uncertainty can extend beyond a regional conflict. It has intensified tensions between Russia and Western countries, strengthened the importance of military alliances and raised concerns regarding European security, energy supplies and nuclear deterrence. The conflict demonstrates how regional confrontations can influence international alignments and create wider uncertainty about the stability of the international order.

However, strategic competition does not inevitably result in war. Diplomatic engagement, credible communication, arms-control arrangements and confidence-building measures can reduce the risks of miscalculation. The central challenge is to prevent defensive measures from generating an escalating cycle of insecurity. Ultimately, the new security dilemma reflects a fundamental contradiction in international politics: while states seek security through the accumulation of power, their actions can undermine the security of others. Managing this contradiction is essential to reducing geopolitical uncertainty and preserving opportunities for international cooperation.

### **Fragmentation of Global Politics**

The contemporary international system is experiencing a process of fragmentation in which political, economic and strategic relationships are increasingly shaped by competing interests rather than a universally accepted set of international priorities. Although globalisation has connected states through trade, investment, technology and institutions, these interdependencies have not eliminated geopolitical rivalries. Instead, growing strategic mistrust has encouraged governments to reconsider the costs of dependence on other countries. Consequently, the international order is becoming more complex, as cooperation in certain areas increasingly coexists with competition and confrontation in others.

One of the most significant manifestations of fragmentation is the transformation of the global economic system. The expansion of international trade following the Cold War created extensive supply chains connecting economies across continents. However, the growing rivalry between the United States and China has demonstrated that economic interdependence can also become a source of strategic vulnerability. Restrictions on advanced technologies, trade disputes, sanctions and efforts to diversify supply chains reflect

the increasing importance of economic security in foreign policy. Governments are increasingly concerned not only with economic efficiency but also with maintaining control over critical technologies, industrial capabilities and essential resources. Nevertheless, this development should not be interpreted as the complete disappearance of globalisation. Rather, economic relationships are being <sup>ii</sup>reorganised according to considerations of security, political alignment and strategic reliability.

Fragmentation is equally visible in the functioning of international institutions. The United Nations, established in 1945 to promote international peace and security, remains a central institution of global governance. However, disagreements among permanent members of the Security Council can obstruct collective responses to major international crises. The use of veto power illustrates the tension between the principle of collective security and the national interests of powerful states. Similar difficulties emerge in international economic governance, where disagreements over trade rules, development priorities and the distribution of economic responsibilities complicate the achievement of common objectives. These challenges raise questions about whether institutions created under an earlier distribution of power can adequately respond to the demands of a changing international system.

Another dimension of fragmentation concerns competing interpretations of sovereignty, democracy, human rights and international order. States differ in their understanding of political legitimacy, intervention and the appropriate balance between national autonomy and international responsibility. These disagreements frequently influence diplomatic alignments and reduce the possibility of establishing a universally accepted approach to international problems. Furthermore, information competition and the circulation of conflicting geopolitical narratives can deepen mistrust between governments and societies.

Nevertheless, fragmentation does not necessarily mean that the international system is collapsing into completely isolated geopolitical blocs. States continue to participate in international trade, diplomatic negotiations and multilateral forums, even when their strategic interests' conflict. The same country may cooperate with one power on economic development while maintaining security partnerships with another. This overlapping pattern of relationships demonstrates that contemporary fragmentation is selective rather than absolute.

Therefore, the fragmentation of global politics should be understood as a weakening of shared strategic understandings rather than the complete breakdown of international interdependence. The central challenge is to preserve mechanisms of cooperation while accommodating a more diverse distribution of power. Without credible institutions and sustained diplomatic engagement, however, the increasing politicisation of global relationships may make collective responses to shared challenges considerably more difficult.

## The Limits of International Cooperation

International cooperation remains one of the most important foundations of contemporary international relations, yet its possibilities are restricted by the political realities of the international system. Unlike a country, where a government exercises authority over its territory and population, the international system has no single world government capable of enforcing every decision upon sovereign states. This condition, commonly described as international anarchy, does not mean that the world is necessarily in a state of disorder. Rather, it means that states operate without a supreme political authority above them. Each country remains responsible for protecting its sovereignty, security, economic interests, and political independence. The difficulty begins when the pursuit of these interests becomes a competition to exercise greater influence over others.

Historically, the desire to expand authority beyond one's own territory has been visible in the behaviour of monarchs, empires, and competing kingdoms. Rulers frequently sought to increase their influence through territorial expansion, military strength, and control over resources. Although the contemporary international system differs significantly from the political world of monarchies, the underlying question of power has not disappeared. Modern states may express their ambitions through diplomacy, economic agreements, military alliances, or international institutions rather than territorial conquest alone. Nevertheless, the tendency to protect national interests, gain strategic advantages, and influence the decisions of other countries continues to place limits on international cooperation.

The central contradiction is that countries require cooperation to achieve many of their objectives, yet they remain reluctant to depend entirely upon the decisions of others. Trade agreements, investment, energy supplies, technological exchange, and international business connect countries in ways that make complete isolation difficult. Cooperation also creates opportunities for people to migrate in search of education, employment, safety, and a better quality of life. International agreements can help establish rules for these exchanges, protect certain rights, and reduce the possibility of misunderstandings between governments. In this sense, cooperation is not merely an economic arrangement; it is also a means of improving human welfare and managing the consequences of an increasingly interconnected world.

However, economic interdependence does not automatically produce political trust. A country may depend upon another for energy, technology, investment, or essential goods while simultaneously considering that country a strategic competitor. Governments may also use economic restrictions, trade barriers, or access to important resources to influence the decisions of others. Consequently, the same relationships that encourage cooperation can become instruments of pressure. When political rivalry begins to dominate economic relationships, the costs are not necessarily confined to governments. Businesses may face uncertainty, workers

may lose opportunities, and ordinary citizens may experience the consequences of decisions over which they have little control.

Another limitation arises from the tension between national sovereignty and collective responsibility. Every country has the right to determine its own political and economic priorities, but the actions of one state can affect the security and well-being of its neighbours. Terrorism, armed conflict, environmental degradation, public health emergencies, and forced displacement cannot always be addressed effectively by individual countries acting alone. Political leaders must therefore recognise that protecting national interests does not require disregarding the legitimate interests of neighbouring states. A country's long-term development is more difficult to sustain when its surrounding region remains unstable.

For this reason, international cooperation requires more than occasional meetings or declarations of friendship. Countries need credible agreements that establish clear expectations regarding trade, peaceful dispute settlement, non-interference, respect for sovereignty, and the prevention of unnecessary escalation. Such agreements must also be supported by practical mechanisms for consultation, verification, and accountability. Without these arrangements, cooperation risks becoming a temporary understanding that survives only while it serves the immediate interests of powerful participants. Nevertheless, it would be unrealistic to assume that an agreement can eliminate every disagreement between states. Differences in political systems, historical experiences, economic capabilities, and strategic priorities will continue to exist. The purpose of international cooperation should therefore not be to remove every difference, but to ensure that differences do not automatically develop into confrontation. Stronger countries have a particular responsibility to recognise that their decisions can have consequences far beyond their own borders, while smaller countries should have meaningful opportunities to express their concerns within international institutions.

Ultimately, the limits of international cooperation reveal a fundamental challenge in world politics: countries seek the benefits of living in an interconnected world while attempting to preserve complete freedom in the pursuit of their national interests. Yet sovereignty and cooperation do not have to be opposing principles. Properly designed agreements can protect the independence of states while establishing common rules for managing shared problems. International cooperation becomes meaningful when it goes beyond the interests of political leaders and economic powers to protect the dignity, security, and opportunities of ordinary people. The objective should not be to establish the dominance of one nation over another, but to create an international environment in which countries can pursue their development without making the insecurity of others a condition of their own success.

### **Regional Powers and the Global South**

The changing distribution of global power has increased the significance of regional powers and countries of the Global South in contemporary international relations. Traditionally, major international decisions were strongly influenced by the strategic priorities of established powers, particularly the United States and its Western allies. However, the economic expansion of countries such as India, Brazil and Indonesia, alongside the growing diplomatic influence of several African and Asian states, has complicated this arrangement. These developments have created opportunities for a broader range of countries to influence international debates, while also exposing them to the pressures generated by great-power rivalry.

India provides an important example of how regional powers navigate an uncertain international environment. As its economic capabilities and international partnerships expand, India seeks to strengthen its position while preserving strategic autonomy. It maintains a significant relationship with the United States, particularly in areas such as Indo-Pacific security, technology and defence cooperation, while also retaining longstanding defence and diplomatic ties with Russia. India's participation in forums including BRICS, the G20 and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation reflects its willingness to engage with different international groupings rather than rely exclusively on a single strategic partnership. This approach demonstrates that states may pursue overlapping relationships to protect their interests and maintain diplomatic flexibility.

However, strategic autonomy does not eliminate the challenges associated with great-power competition. Regional powers must balance security requirements, economic dependencies and domestic development priorities. Tensions between major powers can affect their access to markets, advanced technologies, energy supplies and investment. Smaller states may face even greater difficulties when their security or economic survival depends heavily on relationships with competing external actors. Their foreign-policy choices can therefore become increasingly complicated when major powers demand political alignment or interpret neutral positions as strategically significant.

The Global South also occupies an important position in debates concerning the legitimacy of international institutions. Many developing countries seek reforms that provide greater representation in global decision-making, alongside improved access to development finance, technology and international markets. Climate change is particularly significant because developing countries frequently face substantial environmental and developmental challenges despite differences in their historical contributions to global emissions and their capacities to finance adaptation. These concerns have strengthened calls for more equitable burden-sharing and a greater role for developing economies in shaping international priorities.

Nevertheless, the Global South should not be treated as a unified geopolitical bloc. Its members differ considerably in economic structure, political systems, security concerns and relationships with major powers. Some countries prioritise close security partnerships, while others emphasise non-alignment, regional integration or economic diversification. Their interests may converge on particular issues without producing

agreement across the entire international agenda. The growing importance of regional powers therefore presents both opportunities and challenges. Their diplomatic influence can contribute to mediation, regional cooperation and institutional reform. At the same time, competing priorities may reproduce existing divisions or complicate collective action. Ultimately, the role of the Global South in an uncertain international order will depend on its ability to transform economic growth and diplomatic influence into meaningful participation in global governance while preserving the flexibility necessary to pursue diverse national interests.

### **Emerging Domains of Strategic Competition**

Great-power rivalry is no longer confined to conventional military capabilities or territorial disputes. It increasingly extends into technological innovation, cyberspace, energy systems and critical infrastructure. These emerging domains have expanded the meaning of national security and complicated the relationship between domestic economic policy and international strategic competition.

Artificial intelligence and semiconductor technology have become particularly important because they influence economic productivity, military capabilities and technological independence. Governments increasingly seek to protect sensitive technologies, secure access to advanced manufacturing and reduce dependence on potential strategic competitors. Although these measures may strengthen national resilience, they can also restrict technological exchange, increase economic costs and deepen divisions between competing technological ecosystems.

Cybersecurity represents another major challenge. Digital infrastructure supports financial systems, public services, communications and essential industries, making it a potential target during periods of geopolitical tension. The difficulty of attributing cyber operations to particular actors, combined with uncertainty about their intentions, complicates deterrence and diplomatic responses. The absence of universally accepted and consistently enforced rules further increases the difficulty of managing these risks. Energy security and climate change also connect economic development with strategic competition. Dependence on external energy supplies can influence foreign-policy decisions, while competition over critical minerals and clean-energy technologies is reshaping international economic relationships. At the same time, climate change creates a shared incentive for cooperation, demonstrating that strategic rivalry and collective responsibility can operate simultaneously.

These developments indicate that future geopolitical competition will increasingly involve the control of technological capabilities, information, resources and economic networks. Effective international cooperation will therefore require not only traditional diplomacy and arms control but also practical agreements on cybersecurity, emerging technologies and energy security. The challenge is to protect legitimate national interests without allowing competition in these domains to undermine global stability and shared progress.

## **Future Scenarios and Policy Recommendations**

The future of the international system will depend on how established and emerging powers respond to strategic uncertainty. Three broad scenarios illustrate the possible direction of global politics.

The first is managed multipolarity, in which states continue to compete but preserve diplomatic channels, respect agreed rules and cooperate on shared challenges. The second is intensified fragmentation, characterised by increasingly restrictive economic relationships, rival strategic groupings and reduced confidence in multilateral institutions. The third is selective cooperation, in which major powers remain strategic competitors while collaborating on specific issues such as climate change, public health, nuclear risk reduction and international economic stability. These scenarios are not mutually exclusive, and elements of each may emerge simultaneously across different regions and policy areas.

Reducing the risks associated with strategic uncertainty requires practical policy measures. First, states should strengthen crisis-communication mechanisms, military deconfliction arrangements and diplomatic dialogue to reduce the possibility of miscalculation. Second, international institutions should pursue reforms that improve representation, legitimacy and their capacity to respond to contemporary challenges. Third, governments should preserve cooperation in areas where collective action is indispensable, particularly climate change, nuclear risk reduction and public health. Fourth, international dialogue should support workable norms for artificial intelligence, cybersecurity and emerging technologies. Finally, countries should diversify vulnerable economic relationships without unnecessarily dismantling beneficial trade and investment networks.

The objective should not be to eliminate great-power competition, which is unlikely to disappear, but to prevent it from becoming an obstacle to every form of international cooperation. A more stable international order will require states to recognise that long-term security depends not only on national capabilities but also on credible rules, responsible diplomacy and the management of shared risks.

## **Conclusion: Managing Uncertainty in a Fragmented World**

The age of strategic uncertainty reflects a fundamental tension in contemporary international politics: states seek greater security and influence, yet their pursuit of power can intensify the insecurity of others. The emergence of new economic powers, the return of great-power rivalry and the fragmentation of international institutions demonstrate that the global order is undergoing significant transformation. These developments have complicated cooperation without necessarily making its continuation impossible.

The central argument of this article is that geopolitical fragmentation results not simply from ideological differences, but from the interaction of competing national interests, shifting power relations, strategic mistrust

and institutional limitations. Democracy, economic interdependence and multilateral institutions can contribute to cooperation, but none automatically eliminates geopolitical competition.

Managing uncertainty therefore requires a realistic understanding of international politics combined with a renewed commitment to diplomacy, inclusive global governance and practical cooperation. The objective should not be a world without rivalry, but an international system in which rivalry does not prevent peaceful coexistence. Ultimately, global stability will depend on whether states can reconcile their pursuit of national interests with their shared responsibility for maintaining international peace, security and collective progress.

## References

- Doyle, M. W. (1983a). Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs, Part 1. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 12(3), 205–235.
- Doyle, M. W. (1983b). Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs, Part 2. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 12(4), 323–353.
- Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79. [https://doi.org/10.1162/isec\\_a\\_00351](https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00351)
- Herz, J. H. (1950). Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma. *World Politics*, 2(2), 157–180. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009187>
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). *Liberal Leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. *World Politics*, 30(2), 167–214. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958>
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (2006). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (7th ed., K. W. Thompson & W. D. Clinton, Rev.). McGraw-Hill Education. (Original work published 1948)
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- World Bank. (n.d.). *GDP (current US\$)* [Data set]. World Development Indicators. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>

United Nations. (n.d.). *Charter of the United Nations*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

## Bibliography

Acharya, A. (2018). *The end of American world order* (2nd ed.). Polity.

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states, and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era* (2nd ed.). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Krasner, S. D. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press.

Nye, J. S., Jr. (2011). *The future of power*. PublicAffairs.

Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2025). *SIPRI yearbook 2025: Armaments, disarmament and international security*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2025>

Allison, G. T. (2017). *Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's trap?* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Beckley, M. (2018). *Unrivaled: Why America will remain the world's sole superpower*. Cornell University Press.

Blackwill, R. D., & Harris, J. M. (2016). *War by other means: Geoeconomics and statecraft*. Harvard University Press.

Brands, H. (2022). *The twilight struggle: What the Cold War teaches us about great-power rivalry today*. Yale University Press.

Buzan, B., & Lawson, G. (2015). *The global transformation: History, modernity and the making of international relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Colby, E. A. (2021). *The strategy of denial: American defense in an age of great power conflict*. Yale University Press.

Cox, M. (2018). *The post-Cold War world: Turbulence and change in world politics since the fall*. Routledge.

Doshi, R. (2021). *The long game: China's grand strategy to displace American order*. Oxford University Press.

- Friedberg, A. L. (2011). *A contest for supremacy: China, America, and the struggle for mastery in Asia*. W. Norton & Company.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A new history*. Penguin Press.
- Haass, R. (2017). *A world in disarray: American foreign policy and the crisis of the old order*. Penguin Press.
- Hurrell, A. (2007). *On global order: Power, values, and the constitution of international society*. Oxford University Press.
- Kagan, R. (2018). *The jungle grows back: America and our imperilled world*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Kaplan, R. D. (2012). *The revenge of geography: What the map tells us about coming conflicts and the battle against fate*. Random House.
- Kissinger, H. (2014). *World order*. Penguin Press.
- Krastev, I., & Holmes, S. (2019). *The light that failed: Why the West is losing the fight for democracy*. Pegasus Books.
- Kupchan, C. A. (2012). *No one's world: The West, the rising rest, and the coming global turn*. Oxford University Press.

## Endnotes

<sup>i</sup>Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2005). The rise of Europe: Atlantic trade, institutional change, and economic growth. *American Economic Review*, 95(3), 546–579. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828054201305>

Rajeev, N. (2025, February 21). *Understanding India's evolving policy of strategic autonomy*. S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. <https://rsis.edu.sg/rsis-publication/idss/ip25015-understanding-indias-evolving-policy-of-strategic-autonomy/>

<sup>ii</sup>Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7sq9s>

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VI: Pacific settlement of disputes (Articles 33–38)*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-6>

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations, Chapter IX: International economic and social cooperation (Articles 55–60)*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

**Publisher's Note:** The views and opinions expressed in this article are solely those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher, editors, or the editorial board.