

**State Sovereignty under Strain: Pakistan's Experience in Contemporary Public International Law****Muhammad Afzal¹, Dr. Rehman Akhtar*²**¹ Ph.D. Law Scholar, Times University Multan. Email: ayyanameen@hotmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7538-0835

² Assistant Professor Law, Hajveri Law College, Department of Law, Times University Multan.*Corresponding Author Email: drrehman@t.edu.pkDOI: <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v4i1.1897>**Abstract**

The concept of state sovereignty is considered to be one of the pillars of public international law. Yet, it has been drained over the years by globalization, the formation of international legal regimes, and the emergence of new geopolitical realities. The international commitments, regional security, and national constitutional framework constitute a dynamic and complex environment in which Pakistan's sovereignty is at play in the present case of developing countries. This paper is a critical examination of the situation of state sovereignty in Pakistan, regarding the present-day concept of modern international law, international treaties, and international organizations in governance of the world, the extent of the impacts of the regional conflicts in terms of international law, and the local legal systems of Pakistan regarding its sovereign power. The paper takes a doctrinal and analytical position and applies the instruments of international law, constitutional law, judicial law, and the history of geopolitics. It writes that the sovereignty of Pakistan did not expire; rather, it has been re-functionalized into a qualified and relational structure by consent-based commitments and external pressures. The article can be applied to the scholarship on the Global South because it uses Pakistan as an example of a strategically critical yet economically constrained state that balances legal freedom and dependence on the universal common good.

Keywords: State Sovereignty, Pakistan, Public International Law, Geopolitics, International Treaties, Global Governance**Introduction**

Sovereignty of states has always been assumed to be a principle of public international law, the supreme authority of a state over its territories, its nationals, and its internal affairs, without interference from others (Núñez, 2024). The legal and political system that underpinned the international system of today was based on the doctrine of sovereignty, which originated with the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 (Jürgens, 2024). It accepted the autonomy and equality of states and denied legitimacy with respect to the integrity of territory, while providing a normative basis for non-intervention in domestic matters. For centuries, the classical concept of sovereignty affected relations between states and served as the primary principle for the segregation of international law (Schmidt, 2025).

The shift in the conventional concept of sovereignty, however, has been substantive due to changes in the realities of the international system. The extension of international law norms, the proliferation of multilateral conventions, and the emergence of international and regional institutions have all subjected state power to the legal jurisdiction across borders (Bashir & Bashir, 2025). The only unilateralism means that the recent issues

of international terrorism, global warming, cyber threats, international financial disasters, and humanitarian interventions cut across boundaries and require a communal response; a country's response is limited. As a result, sovereignty, as experienced today, is no longer absolute or impenetrable; rather, its exercise occurs within an elastic framework of international legal obligations and a common system of administration (Shahid et al., 2026).

In the modern order of international law, sovereignty is a relational and consensual concept, rather than a claim to absolute power. States make commitments willingly through treaties, by membership in international institutions, by acquiescence in customary international law, and by submitting themselves to certain affirmations of restraint in their freedom. Even though these types of legal commitments enhance cooperation and stability in international relations, fundamental questions arise about how many states; particularly developing and postcolonial states can enjoy real autonomy in their decisions. The presence of structural inequalities in the global system is more likely to give rise to situations of imbalanced application of international law, being more restrictive of weaker states while allowing stronger ones to exercise greater latitude (Quince, 2026a).

The sovereignty to explore, particularly in such a situation, is especially very interesting in the case of Pakistan. With the strategic geopolitical advantage and the possession of nuclear weapons, the public international law officially grants the sovereign equality of states to Pakistan (Nasir, 2025). It is a key player in security, trade, and diplomacy, and this is due to its location at the crossroads of South Asia, Central Asia, and the Middle East, making it an important regional player. At the same time, the domestic conflicts between the nations and security, anti-terror measures, financial vulnerability, and extensive participation of international legal and financial institutions are the constant threats to the sovereignty of Pakistan. These are all that affect how Pakistan exercises sovereign authority at both the local and international levels (Bukhari & Gaho, 2025).

This research paper explains that Pakistan's sovereignty has been compromised within the scope of contemporary international law governing the people. It examines the relationship between legal compulsion and mutual geopolitical and domestic governance structures in shaping Pakistan's sovereign space. The paper demonstrates that sovereignty is not destroyed; it has been redefined by placing the experience of Pakistanis within broader discussions of how sovereignty has changed, since it is a negotiated, movable concept, not a legal right.

Research Problem

The paper is a discourse on the effects on Pakistan's state sovereignty, in light of existing public international law, international legal commitments, geopolitical forces, and the domestic constitutional framework. Even though sovereignty and equality were officially acknowledged, external legal frameworks and institutions often constrain Pakistan's policy independence. The research addresses a knowledge gap in the literature by examining the role of a combination of these factors in altering the sovereignty of developing states, using Pakistan as an example.

Research Methodology

The qualitative methodological approach adopted in this research is doctrinal analytical research. It is based on the analysis of international treaties, customary international law, constitutional law, statutory law, and judicial decisions. Theoretical and contextualized knowledge is also achieved through the aid of analysis of scholarly literature, reports of international organizations, and policy documents. It examines Pakistan's experience with the contemporary legal structure of public international law in the form of a case study. It assesses the correlation between the existence of legal norms, the presence of geopolitical forces, and the domestic regimes that shape state sovereignty within the critical analytical approach spectrum.

The notion of Sovereignty as presented by the Contemporary Public International Law

The perceptions of sovereignty in international law are both legal status quo and status functional, which govern the recognition of states' rights and obligations within the international system(Quince, 2026b). The legal meaning of sovereignty is to grant a state legal personality, with legal self-determination and territorial integrity, and to secure its recognition as a state. It is a functional concept that regulates how state power is used in interactions with other actors, both within states and globally. This Janus-faceted quality is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. In this Article, 2(1), in the first place, this principle entrenches the virtue of the sovereign equality of member states; under Article 2(7), the principle of non-intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction is strengthened. All of these provisions integrate to make up sovereignty as part of the international legal order(Cameron, 2025).

In the meantime, the sovereignty under the category of public international laws has never enshrined the constancy of legal restraining. Since its founding, international law has made numerous attempts on the part of states in the form of treaties, customary international law, and general principles, through the perception of civilized nations. This normative framework has become very wide in contemporary times, where binding commitments have been introduced in order to address human rights, international humanitarian law, environmental protection, trade regulation, and global security(Hassanien Aliaa Riad, 2026). Scholarly opinion that the sovereignty operates on a stratum of legal values, which restricts the discretion of the state in certain spheres of expertise of ultimate importance, is also reinforced by peremptory norms of international law (*jus cogens*), over which no derogation is permitted(Handayani, 2025).

This law-making is reflective of a broader transformation of the classical concept of absolute sovereignty to the paradigm of conditional or qualified sovereignty. In this type of state, the actions of the state are practiced within accepted bounds of law because of a free consent to participate in international legal obligations(Sharma, n.d.). Sovereignty is no longer determined by the non-intervention by others of the states, but rather by the capability of the states to participate in the obligation of acting reasonably and actively in the international law system. These human rights protection principles that control the use of force, international economic control, and the duty to defend are rather a reflection of the way of sovereignty in the framework of international interests of the collective interest. The operations redefine sovereignty rather than exclude it, developing accountability-based and relational models, rather than power. The concept of sovereignty, as it is applied to international law, is thus believed to be dynamic and situational. The states are technically equal in the law, but the functioning of sovereignty is rather dissimilar in terms of political strength, economic capability, and strategic relevance. The point of difference has some particularity when dealing with developing and postcolonial states, which are mostly sovereign, basically, in the sense of being oppressed by underlying structural inequalities of the international law and economic system. The formally agreed international law duties may be an imbalance in the real world that brings about an imbalance in the provision of freedom of choice of policies and the actions of the government(Kamal, 2025).

The conceptual transformation of sovereignty is no longer linked to the complex reality in the geopolitics of the case of Pakistan. The official stand of Pakistan as a sovereign and an equal role model to the international system is in parallel with the systematic external forces of the security system in the region, counter-terrorism systems, and the economic dependence on the country, and the alliances. All these geopolitical factors are in conflict with international legal obligations, which render the notion of sovereignty negotiable and relative rather than absolute and legal. The Pakistan case provides evidence of how sovereignty in the context of the modern ultimate international law is obtained by the laws changing and making a balance rather than isolating or staying independent(Asghar, 2025).

In this regard, it is in this conceptual point of view that sovereignty is seen not to be an exhausted principle but rather an emerging shape of the law that is predetermined by the international norms, the power relations, and national capacity to govern. It is such a conception of sovereignty that can provide an analytic base upon which to examine the experience of Pakistan in the setting of the modern public international law and assess

the ways in which all degrees of legal and geopolitical power influence the scope and formulation of the state power(Alaka, 2025).

3. The Sovereignty of Pakistan and the International Laws.

One of the key factors of the contemporary sovereign existence of this country is the international treaties and the participation of Pakistan in the multilateral organizations. As Pakistan is a member state of the United Nations, which joined the United Nations in 1947, it has the obligations of the United Nations, which take place under the United Nations Charter, involving the provisions of peaceful resolution of disagreements, respecting international peace as well as international organizations, and adhering to the decisions made by the competent international organizations(Iqbal, 2024). The same assurances place the country of Pakistan in the spirit of collective security of international law; however, at the same time, outline the extent of its autonomous action in foreign policy and national security.

Besides the UN system, Pakistan is a signatory to a very large number of multilateral treaties that govern different areas of governance. It is necessary to note that the fact that it acknowledged major international instruments of human rights like the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant of Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights suggests the acknowledgment of international guidelines of behaviours on the part of a state towards an individual. These treaties spill over into domestic law and administration as the state is obligated through these treaties by the creation of law, change of institution, and judicial interpretation. This, in turn, results in the adoption of the international human rights law in the domestic law of Pakistan, which serves as an informer in the formulation of policies and application of the law(Imran et al., 2023).

In as much as such international guarantees can assist in creating legitimacy and recognition of Pakistan in the international climate, there are also legal and institutional constraints on the societies in Pakistan(Mushtaq et al., n.d.). The two sources of normative pressure on legislative and executive power are the establishment of reporting pressure by means of a treaty, periodic assessments by international monitoring bodies, as well as interpretive recommendations by treaty committees. In certain aspects, such as counter-terrorism, criminal justice reform, minority rights, and freedom of expression, Pakistan has made certain legal reforms in order to harmonize domestic laws with international standards. There are some tensions in these processes, however, particularly the one facing the international norms against constitutions or security issues or socio-political facts(Afzal & Mushtaq, 2024).

The interference with the international economic and financial regimes has also significantly controlled the sovereignty of Pakistan. Joining international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, has exposed Pakistan to external control and conditionality over the economic governance of Pakistan. The financial assistance programs typically assume that the structural change in the sphere of fiscal policy, tax, state expenditures, and the regulatory framework has been introduced. Although the organization of such is grounded on a formal agreement, it is restricted in reality to policy choice during the economic crisis and fiscal dependency. Subsequently, economic sovereignty has become a byword to comply with foreign suggestions of management.

This contradiction between international law and the needs of the economy leads to a greater inconsistency in contemporary international law. The sovereignty may be formally preserved, but, due to the structural features of the globalizing financial system, states, such as Pakistan, are not able to make independent decisions in their economy. International legal norms, thus, are not merely instruments of neutral regulation, but, rather, are the instruments that affect the domestic policy interests and governmental favor(Kranke, 2024).

Pakistan's experience demonstrates that sovereignty is simultaneously both enabled and constrained by international legal undertakings. By adhering to the international system of law, the state receives provisions of diplomatic legitimacy, economic support, and normative protection, but it is also vulnerable to systems of regulation influencing internal governance. In this respect, sovereignty is exercised in a sense of being in a

state of strategic engagement and legal modification rather than being in absolute autonomy, which constitutes a reminder of the perplexing realities of the developing states against the modern public international law(Afzal & Mushtaq, n.d.).

4. Stereotyping. Geopolitics, Regional Security Dynamics

It is impossible to discuss the sovereignty of Pakistan, excluding the context of geopolitics in general and the environment of security in the region in particular. Ever since its formation, Pakistan has been operating in a complicated security environment that is marked by unresolved territorial disputes, an uncertain coalition in the area, and the national interests of the major powers. The unrelenting enmity with India, particularly the Jammu and Kashmir issue, continued instability in the western border with Afghanistan, and the participation of Pakistan in the global counter-terrorism structures have subjected the state to direct foreign criticism at some point(Lepskiy & Lepska, 2025). These dynamics have played a significant role in the manner in which the sovereign power of Pakistan is carried out and attributed in the international system. The Kashmir problem is among the fundamental issues threatening Pakistan with respect to its territorial stability and political autonomy(Hussain & Hussain, 2024). Though an internationally accepted dispute falling under the United Nations Security Council's resolutions, it was on the ground that the developments have been overwhelmingly against international legal proceedings(Kuszevska, 2022). The scenario presented of the cross-border military activities, violation of the ceasefires, and increase in the diplomatic tension in the scale of legal norms in the application of force and peaceful settlement of the dispute, illustrates the insignificance of the legal norms in the use of force and amicable settlement of the dispute. The emergence of a geopolitical consideration limits Pakistan in applying international law in enforcing international law, asserting its position in international relations(Khan & Usman, 2023).

The problem of sovereignty on the western side of Pakistan has brought complicated issues to the country because of the long history of poor governance in Afghanistan. Cross-border militancy, the flow of refugees, one of them being unilateral on matters of security, has disturbed the boundary demarcation lines on the territory's jurisdiction(Zubair et al., 2025). To be more precise, the legality of the drone operations and the application of the intelligence-based interventions on the basis of counter-terrorism have brought forth the crucial legal issues concerning the violation of territorial integrity and the prohibition of the use of force. It is true that international law has certain exceptions, such as self-defense in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter, but the rise in the number of such declarations in the real picture is rather a measure of power imbalance as opposed to observing equality in the application of law(Kaleem, 2025).

Pakistan took part in global counter-terrorism efforts, and this aspect has contributed to making this nation tougher to detect. Far-reaching legal and institutional restructuring has resulted because of the global pressure to reconcile domestic laws together with practices of enforcement of security laws and institutions with the international counter-terrorist norms and standards. As much as these measures have enhanced compliance of Pakistan with the international requirements, they have also limited policy discretion in some sensitive areas of internal security and criminal justice. Such selective application of international law principles to counter-terrorism cases characterizes the formal sovereignty versus functional constraint(Haidari, 2024).

In the meantime, Pakistan has been attempting to offer itself a way out of geopolitics through strategic alliances and regional alignments. Most importantly, it has greatly received economic, diplomatic, and security helps via its strategic friendship with China. The bargaining power of Pakistan in the international system has been boosted by the intensive infrastructure development and investment projects, particularly the regional connectivity and economic development ones. However, such partnerships are associated with long-term agreements, which subsequently affect the national policy decision-making and regulations. It is an example of sovereignty being exercised through tactful accommodation and negotiated co-operation instead of isolation or unilateralism(Mansoor, 2025).

The case of Pakistan, in general, helps us to learn that the geopolitical pressures and regional security relations

are intertwined with the international legal norms to find out how the practical exercise of sovereignty is possible. Though there exist formal provisions on international law on the protection of territorial integrity and political integrity, they are usually subject to usefulness based on the overall consideration of strategies. The sovereignty of Pakistan is thus being exercised in a very dynamic and contradictory space within which the ideals of law exist and within which geopolitical reality restricts and postulates the degree of state powers(Ali, 2022).

5. The internal and constitutional Sovereignty.

Sovereignty is not faced as a description of external relations of a state; it is socially embedded within its own constitutions and systems of governance. In Pakistan, the constitutional framework is that of internal sovereignty, which defines the persons who exercise authority, legitimacy, and state power and do so on a legal basis. It is reiterated in the constitutional document of Pakistan that faith in Allah Almighty vests the sovereignty in the people by the representatives elected by the people, hence creating a special synergy between the principles of democracy and ideology. This is a constitutional identity that outlines the constitution, and the process of power legitimisation and utilisation is improved in Pakistan(Khan et al., 2025). This idea of sovereignty in the constitution is highly relevant in providing the answer to the status of international law, as much as the domestic concerns are involved. Pakistan conforms to the dualist perception, according to which international conventions do not always directly impact domestic jurisdiction until they are incorporated with it through the assistance of legislation. This, therefore, means that it is upon the congruence of the international legal specifications with the international statutes and the constitution that the international legal obligations should be instituted. Such a system ensures constitutional superiority but allows a selective assimilation of the international standards, hence preserving internal sovereignty of the local law order(Khan, 2024).

The 18 th Constitutional Amendment is a gigantic restoration of domestic sovereignty in Pakistan. The amendment gave federalism and strengthened the participation of the democracy at the sub-national level through devolving the legislative and administrative powers to the provincial government. The impact of this decentralization was the redistribution of sovereign powers between the national and provincial levels since it restored the relationship between the federation and the provinces. Even though the amendment saw greater political autonomy and accountability, the attainment of national coherence in policy creation and execution was an issue(Akram & Alvi, 2022).

The challenges are witnessed mostly in the sectors that are directly linked to the international mandate of Pakistan, such as education, people's health, and environmental and social welfare. The divide in competencies as experienced by the federal government and provincial government has, in certain cases, rendered it challenging to fulfil the international treaties in a way in which the three levels of government can draw strings together, so as to make sure that the treaty is eventually realized in every aspect. The internal sovereignty in Pakistan thus operates under a complex federal government, which has to strike a balance between the aspect of decentralization and the necessity to ensure uniformity of the country in practicing international commitments(Nazir et al., 2024).

International law method has been dominated by the application of judicial interpretation, which has been critical in the interpretation of the connection between international law and the sovereignty of the constitution. The Pakistani courts have been stable in putting the Constitution first, and the appeal of the international legal principles more so in the issues relating to the fundamental rights and humanitarian principles. The judiciary has not been much interested in coming up with laws that would tie the International law through accorded precedence to international norms, implying a cautious and objective attitude. This has been a jurisdictional custom, which allows constitutional sovereignty and authorizes the international law to educate domestic jurisprudence where it is appropriate to do so.

The internal sovereignty of Pakistan is controlled by the concerns of constitutional identity, federal structure,

and the judiciary. These are all the important aspects that the international legal binding makes its reception and operationalization in the domestic law system. The constitutional primacy and the foreign relations lead to the situation that the sovereignty is challenged in Pakistan, not only because of the rigidity and exclusiveness, but it is a subject of continuous negotiation based on the standards of constitutional government(Nashit, 2024).

6. A Critical Analysis

The example of Pakistan has shown that the principle of sovereignty is not absolute in the classical meaning of the term in the modern-day law and order of the contemporary public international lexicon, and at the same time, it is not obsolete. Sovereignty is a dynamic and negotiating position instead of being a geopolitical force, and this is jointly decided by the presence of legal consent, geopolitical force, and inner governmental capability. Despite the fact that the principle of sovereignty and equality of all countries is formally accepted in international law, the expediency of the sovereign power is increasingly dampened with the assistance of external systems of law and structural restraint of the global system.

What the international law turns out to be, per se, is not necessarily blight to sovereignty. The commitments that result in legal obligations and are created through the treaties, customs, and multilateral systems are founded on the state consent and are supposed to introduce cooperation and stability. Nevertheless, these are very strong burdens to every state, which can be considerably varied depending on the political power, financial stability, and online status. This has been undergone with regard to the situation in Pakistan, where restraining forces of international commitment in economic feebleness, necessity of security, and the instability of the region have often pooled together to transform formal agreement into forced compliance. This distinction shows that law as a normative system has less determinant effect on sovereignty and going over, and is the system of unequal power relations in the processes of its implementation and execution(Volk, 2022).

The indicators of sovereignty under stress in Pakistan are patterns of strategic adaptation and selective compliance. The state must frequently fulfil the demands of the international community with the reality on the ground in politics, and also constitutional restrictions and the security demands. In some instances, Pakistan has aligned its domestic laws and rules with international ones so that it may be legitimate and be able to receive economic or diplomatic support. It has been holding back or procrastinating on other occasions when the international standards seem to run counter to constitutional guidelines, federal schemes, or even to socio-political realities. This discriminatory relation is an effort at functional sovereignty within a limiting geopolitical and legal structure.

The sovereign practice is also centred on legal balancing in Pakistan. The activity of the state is held within the dense system of international commitments comprising security, human rights, economic government, and environmental regulation. The solution to working through these overlapping regimes is to continue negotiating between the outside commitments and the inside governing ability. Isolation or refusal of international law will therefore not express sovereignty, but a measured engagement that tries to strike a balance between national interests by minimizing external constraints as much as possible. Markedly, the case of Pakistan is not an isolated representation but that of the tendencies of functioning within the states of the Global South. The same can be said about most of the developing and postcolonial states that are encumbered by the issues of the formal sovereign equality prevailing with material inequality and misbalanced influence in the international decision-making process. The example of Pakistan thus demonstrates structural incompatibility between the legal character of the sovereign equality on the one hand, and the character of the realities of an unequal international system on the other.

In this regard, we at least must begin to consider sovereignty under pressure as a condition of limited agency in contrast to legal atrophy. The sovereign facility of Pakistan is not lost; it has the constitutional facilities or overseas character, and all these are exercised within the context in which they are always required to

compromise and to negotiate. In this critical commentary, the point explains the importance of reinventing sovereignty as an adaptive jurisprudential and political practice as a creation of power, assent, and institutional capacity, and not as a stable or disgraceful concept.

7. Conclusion

State sovereignty has proven to be a dynamic and relative construct, as the contemporary public international law has suffered in Pakistan. The powers of Pakistan, despite it being an independent state according to the provisions of international law, are shaped by both international law obligations, geopolitical considerations, and the home constitutional provisions. Mutualism and engage in negotiating and aligning strategically, but not isolated, which is exercised today by sovereignty. The article emphasizes the need to view sovereignty as a diminishing principle or concept and to view it as a modulating legal concept, which is responsive to global interdependence. The situation with Pakistan places significant stress on the necessity to enhance the domestic legal institutions, enhance the policies with respect to coherence, and the ability to embrace international law from the vantage point expressed by informed consent. In such a way, the sovereignty may be preserved without being absolute independence, but being an effective and legitimate state in the existing mode of international law.

References

- Afzal, M., & Mushtaq, S. A. (n.d.). Pakistan's Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty: An Analysis of International Law and Implications. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 6(3), 320–337.
- Afzal, M., & Mushtaq, S. A. (2024). The Concept of Ratification of Treaties and Protocols in Public International Law and Their Non-Binding Effects on Developing Countries' Sovereignty: A Case Study of Pakistan. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 546–559.
- Akram, M., & Alvi, A. S. (2022). Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan: With Respect to 18th Constitutional Amendment. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 10(4), 137–147.
- Alaka, O. O. (2025). Post-Sovereignty vs Postcolonialism: A Business Philosopher's Perspective on African Political and Economic Autonomy. Available at SSRN 5374125. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5374125
- Ali, G. (2022). China–Pakistan cooperation on Afghanistan: Assessing key interests and implementing strategies. *The Pacific Review*, 35(3), 506–528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2020.1845228>
- Asghar, T. (2025). The Role of Regional Geopolitics in Shaping Pakistan-Bangladesh Relations in The 21st Century. *Social Science Review Archives*, 3(1), 1332–1341.
- Bashir, M. A., & Bashir, M. A. (2025). *The Influence of International Organizations on National Sovereignty*. <https://hrjha.lexarcheus.com/storage/app/public/pdf/1745145182.pdf>
- Bukhari, A. H. S., & Gaho, G. M. (2025). Regional Politics And Its Impact On National Stability: A Case Study Of Pakistan's Strategic Challenges. *Assaj*, 3(01), 1674–1686.
- Cameron, J. (2025). *Her Fundamentals: Justice Abella and Section 2 (b) of the Charter*. https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/scholarly_works/3188/
- Haidari, M. (2024). Analyzing Analyzing the Role of Cross Border Trade Policies in Facilitating Pak-Afghan Trade Post–Taliban. *International Journal of Management and Business Applied*, 3(1), 21–30.
- Handayani, I. (2025). Concept and Position of Peremptory Norms (Jus Cogens) in International Law: A Preliminary Study. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 5(2), 235–252.
- Hassanien Aliaa Riad, A. R. (2026). *Between Borders and Bodies: Sovereignty, Universality, And The Crisis of Enforcement in International Law*. <https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/2638/>
- Hussain, N., & Hussain, M. (2024). A Journey of the Political History of Jammu and Kashmir: Autonomy and Conflict. *International Journal of Political Science and Public Administration*, 4(1), 10–51483.

- Imran, M., Murtiza, G., & Akbar, M. S. (2023). Pakistan's Role in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: An Analysis. *J. Pol. Stud.*, 30, 1.
- Iqbal, R. (2024). Pakistan on the World Stage: A Comprehensive Appraisal of its Engagement in the United Nations (2014-2023). *Journal of Emerging Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(4), 52–62.
- Jürgens, H. P. (2024). Peace of Westphalia 1648. In K. Van Nieuwenhuyse, J. Maiden, & S. Sinclair (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning About Religious Diversity in the Past and Present* (pp. 81–92). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75868-3_5
- Kaleem, R. (2025). PAKISTAN AFGHANISTAN RELATIONS: CASE STUDY OF LAND BORDER MANAGEMENT IN RELATION TO NATIONAL SECURITY OF PAKISTAN. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, 3(1), 62–79.
- Kamal, S. M. F. (2025). *A Theory of Religious Sovereignty Private Law Disputes and State-Religion Relations in Bangladesh and Pakistan* [PhD Thesis, University of Toronto (Canada)]. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/1416f5656d58dd76e03e37c0616e9675/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Khan, A., Naseem, I., & Inamullah, M. (2025). Constitutional Dynamics and Judicial Autonomy in South Asia: A Comparative Study of Pakistan and its Neighbors. *Al Manhal Research Journal*, 5(1). <http://almanhal.org.pk/ojs3303/index.php/journal/article/view/246>
- Khan, A., & Usman, M. (2023). The effectiveness of international law: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences*, 2(3), 780–786.
- Khan, H. (2024). The Impacts of Judicial Review over the Sovereignty of the Parliament in Pakistan. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 3, 126.
- Kranke, M. (2024). Intricate interactions: The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In *The Elgar Companion to the World Bank* (pp. 178–189). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781802204780/book-part-9781802204780-27.xml>
- Kuszevska, A. (2022). The India-Pakistan Conflict in Kashmir and Human Rights in the Context of Post-2019 Political Dynamics. *Asian Affairs*, 53(1), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2022.2041288>
- Lepskiy, M., & Lepska, N. (2025). The Phenomenon of the Terrorist State in Contemporary Geopolitics: Attributive, Static, and Dynamic Characteristics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 69(11), 1353–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642231214080>
- Mushtaq, S. A., Akhtar, R., & Shahab, S. (n.d.). Private International Law and Environmental Challenges in Pakistan: Assessing Legislative Measures, Promoting Sustainable Development Goals, and Ensuring Social Rehabilitation. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 5(3), 409–431.
- Nashit, M. (2024). Parliamentary Sovereignty: An Evolving Misnomer in Pakistan's Constitutional Framework. *Journal of Law, Society and Policy Review*, 1(02), 61–77.
- Nasir, M. (2025). Sovereignty and Survival: The Pakistani Context. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 337–345.
- Nazir, J., Jabeen, Z., & Khan, S. U. (2024). THE FUTURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE IN PAKISTAN: PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES. *Journal of Religion and Society*, 2(4), 126–141.
- Núñez, J. E. (2024). State Sovereignty: Concept and Conceptions. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 37(7), 2131–2150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-024-10170-y>
- Quince, C. (2026a). *Customary International Law: A Comprehensive Study of State Practice, Opinio Juris, and the Legitimacy of Norm Formation*. Vernon Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=hQqYEQAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP9&dq=In+the+modern+order+of+international+law,+sovereignty+is+a+relational+and+consensual+concept,+&ots=TQkcMIYGJ5&sig=MgBHo5KczkVJTEKVVn_9cEYNcbE

- Quince, C. (2026b). *Customary International Law: A Comprehensive Study of State Practice, Opinio Juris, and the Legitimacy of Norm Formation*. Vernon Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=hQqYEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP9&dq=The+perception+s+of+sovereignty+in+international+law+are+both+legal+status+quo+and+status+functional&ots=TQkcMIYIJ2&sig=BZaAD588B24W_3J-rwDVCnNVj6o
- Schmidt, G. (2025). The Peace of Westphalia Revisited: The Peace as the Constitution of the German Nation, Known as the Reich. *German History*, 43(3), 341–354.
- Shahid, A., Ihsan, E., & Shahid, Q. (2026). Changing Security Threats and Global Realities: An Analysis of US Presidential Doctrines from Bush to Biden. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 10(1), 56–66.
- Sharma, C. (n.d.). *Reimagining State Sovereignty in International Aviation Law: Towards a Functionalist Epistemology for the Global Airspace*. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from <https://isil-aca.org/download/papers/ISIL-Occasional-Paper-9-2025.pdf>
- Volk, C. (2022). The Problem of Sovereignty in Globalized Times. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 18(3), 716–738. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1743872119828010>
- Zubair, M., Khan, D., & Salim, A. (2025). India-Pakistan Cross-Border Tensions Post-2019: Strategic Stability, Diplomatic Stalemate, and Prospects for Conflict Resolution. *Journal of Social Sciences Research & Policy*, 3(2), 39–47.