Policy Research Journal
ISSN (E): 3006-7030 ISSN (P) : 3006-7022 Volume 4, Issue 2, 2026

FRAGILE DETERRENCE UNDER SYSTEMIC COMPRESSION: ESCALATION DYNAMICS AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF WARFARE IN SOUTH ASIA

Atif Anwer Dar

M.Phil. (International Relations), School of Politics and International Relations (SPIR), Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad and Masters in International Relations, University of Karachi

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18832452

Keywords
Deterrence Theory, Systemic Compression, Strategic Signalling, Fragile Deterrence, South Asia, India–Pakistan, Escalation Dynamics, Multi-Domain Warfare

Article History
Received: 29 December 2025
Accepted: 13 February 2026
Published: 28 February 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Atif Anwer Dar

Abstract
This article examines the transformation of deterrence and escalation dynamics in South Asia through the concept of systemic compression, with primary empirical focus on the 2025 Indo–Pakistan crisis. It argues that contemporary instability does not originate in the failure of nuclear deterrence, ideological hostility, or leadership pathology, but in the erosion of conventional deterrence under conditions of accelerated technological change and slow institutional adaptation. Drawing on structural realism and an expanded formulation of deterrence theory, the study shows how compressed decision-making timelines, multi-domain operations, and early strategic signalling have inverted traditional escalation sequencing. Methodologically, the article adopts an interpretive and case-informed qualitative approach, centring the 2025 crisis as a consolidated expression of structural change while using earlier crises within the past decade only as contextual reference points. The article contributes to international relations scholarship by refining the stability–instability debate and advancing systemic compression as a regional explanatory framework for understanding fragile deterrence in the nuclear age.

Introduction

The contemporary international security environment is increasingly shaped by accelerated escalation, technological saturation, and the declining effectiveness of institutional restraint. South Asia exemplifies this transformation with particular clarity. Despite the persistence of nuclear deterrence, the region continues to experience recurrent crises characterized by compressed timelines, ambiguous signalling, and early international involvement. The 2025 Indo–Pakistan crisis represents a critical inflection point in this evolution, revealing how deterrence now operates under conditions fundamentally different from those assumed by classical strategic theory.

This study is necessary because dominant analytical frameworks, particularly the stability–instability paradox, no longer adequately explain the form, tempo, and sequencing of contemporary South Asian crises. While nuclear weapons continue to prevent large-scale war, they have not produced sustained strategic stability. Instead, crises have become faster, more technologically mediated, and increasingly embedded in broader geopolitical structures. The objective of this article is to explain why instability persists under nuclear

deterrence and to identify the structural forces that generate escalation risk even in the absence of deliberate war intent.

The article advances the argument that instability in South Asia is produced by systemic compression, a condition arising from the convergence of rapid technological militarization, real-time intelligence penetration, alliance involvement, and the slow maturation of institutional checks and escalation management mechanisms. Under systemic compression, conventional deterrence erodes, escalation ladders collapse into compressed fields, and strategic signalling is pulled forward into the opening phase of crises. Methodologically, the study adopts an interpretive and qualitative approach, centring the 2025 crisis as the primary empirical anchor while referencing earlier episodes only to clarify what has structurally changed.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis is grounded in structural realism and an expanded understanding of deterrence theory. Structural realism conceptualizes the international system as anarchic, compelling states to prioritize survival, relative power, and strategic autonomy. In South Asia, these pressures are intensified by geographic proximity, enduring rivalry, conventional asymmetry, and the involvement of external powers.

Deterrence theory is employed beyond its classical nuclear formulation. Nuclear weapons continue to function as existential backstops, but their stabilizing effect is conditional rather than absolute. Nuclear deterrence rests atop a layered structure in which credible conventional deterrence and escalation control mechanisms play a decisive role. When conventional deterrence erodes, nuclear deterrence does not collapse automatically, but it becomes operationally brittle.

This article refines the stability–instability debate by arguing that nuclear stability is dependent on the health of conventional deterrence. Stability and instability are not paradoxically linked but structurally nested. Systemic compression weakens the conventional layer, thereby transferring stress upward toward the strategic level and increasing reliance on early signalling.

Systemic compression is analytically distinct from related concepts such as entanglement, inadvertent escalation, or risk manipulation. While those frameworks emphasize interaction effects or decision-making errors, systemic compression explains how structural acceleration itself reshapes escalation behaviour by collapsing time, multiplying domains, and overwhelming institutional restraint.

Systemic Compression in the South Asian Strategic Environment

Systemic compression in South Asia is driven by the interaction of three structural forces. First, rapid advancements in precision strike systems, drones, electronic warfare, cyber operations, and ISR architectures have drastically reduced decision-making time. Second, institutional mechanisms for crisis communication and escalation management have not evolved at a comparable pace. Third, alliance dynamics, particularly Pakistan–China strategic cooperation and US–India convergence, have internationalized regional crises from their earliest stages.

Under these conditions, operational, tactical, and strategic warfare can no longer be distinguished primarily by spatial depth or force mass. Instead, they are defined by timing, informational dominance, and resource integration. Escalation unfolds through simultaneity rather than sequence, producing a compressed battlespace in which multiple thresholds are approached almost concurrently.

Compressed Escalation and the 2025 Crisis

The 2025 crisis represents the most consolidated manifestation of systemic compression in South Asia. Strategic capabilities were employed at the outset of the confrontation rather than reserved as deterrent backstops. Ballistic missile signalling, precision strikes on strategically significant targets, deep-penetration drone operations, and real-time ISR support were integrated into the opening phase of escalation. Conventional ground manoeuvre remained largely absent, while

airpower, electronic warfare, and non-contact operations dominated the conflict space.

The use of drones deep inside Pakistani territory marked a qualitative expansion of the battlespace and introduced escalation dynamics characterized by deniability, persistence, and ambiguity. Pakistan's response relied heavily on airpower, electronic warfare, and Chinese-origin ISR and combat systems, reflecting a strategy of constrained balancing under conventional asymmetry. The crisis also witnessed early diplomatic and strategic intervention by external powers, underscoring the extent to which regional escalation is now embedded within broader geopolitical structures.

What distinguishes this episode is the inversion of escalation sequencing. Strategic signalling preceded conventional containment rather than emerging as a final deterrent measure. This reversal reflects the structural effects of systemic compression rather than deliberate escalation intent by either side.

Pakistan as a Constrained Balancer under Asymmetry

Pakistan's strategic behaviour under systemic compression illustrates the logic of constrained balancing. Facing persistent conventional pressure and technological asymmetry, Pakistan sought to stabilize deterrence through selective capability integration, airpower dominance, and alliance-enabled ISR support. Nuclear deterrence remained intact but functioned primarily as an existential ceiling rather than an active instrument of escalation management.

This posture does not imply inherent stability. Instead, it reveals how deterrence increasingly depends on fragile technological systems and external partnerships. The erosion of conventional deterrence does not compel nuclear use, but it increases reliance on early strategic signalling, thereby compressing escalation timelines and elevating miscalculation risks.

Implications for Deterrence and Escalation Control

The central implication of this analysis is that future instability in South Asia is more likely to arise from systemic failure than deliberate aggression. Crisis frequency may increase even as war duration decreases. Deterrence will depend less on declaratory doctrine and more on the resilience of socio-technical systems, alliance management, and institutional adaptation.

Effective escalation control under systemic compression requires renewed emphasis on conventional deterrence credibility, crisis communication mechanisms, and restraint in multi-domain operations. Without such adaptation, deterrence will remain formally intact yet operationally fragile.

Conclusion

This article has argued that contemporary instability in South Asia is best explained by systemic compression rather than nuclear deterrence failure or ideological conflict. The compression of escalation dynamics, driven by technological acceleration and institutional lag, has transformed how deterrence functions in practice. Nuclear weapons continue to prevent total war, but they rest on increasingly brittle conventional foundations.

By advancing systemic compression as a regional analytical framework, this study contributes to broader debates on deterrence, escalation, and the transformation of warfare. Unless institutions evolve to match the speed and complexity of modern conflict, deterrence will persist as a formal structure while becoming progressively more fragile in operation.

REFERENCES

Biddle, S. (2023). Military power and international order after Ukraine. *International Security, 48*(1), 7–45.

Buzan, B., & Wæver, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: The structure of international security*. Cambridge University Press.

Dar, A. A., & Mehrukh, N. (2025). Systemic compression, fragile deterrence, and the transformation of warfare in the twenty-first century. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies, 3*(4), 2997–3001. https://doi.org/10.59075/d4vv6x17

Freedman, L. (2003). *The evolution of nuclear strategy* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Freedman, L. (2024). Strategy in an age of acceleration. *Survival, 66*(2), 7–28.

Ganguly, Š., & Kapur, S. P. (2010). *India, Pakistan, and the bomb*. Columbia University Press.

Horowitz, M. C. (2018). Artificial intelligence, international competition, and the balance of power. *Texas National Security Review, 1*(3), 36–57.

International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2025). *The Military Balance 2025*. Routledge.

Jaspal, Z. N. (2015). *Nuclear deterrence and crisis stability in South Asia*. Routledge.

Lieber, K. A., & Press, D. G. (2023). The new era of counterforce. *International Security, 47*(4), 9–49.

Morgan, P. M., et al. (2023). *Deterrence now* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

SIPRI. (2024). *SIPRI Yearbook 2024*. Oxford University Press.

UNIDIR. (2024). *Artificial intelligence, deterrence, and strategic stability*. United Nations.

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

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research