

US Policy Paradigms at the Turn of the 20th Century: Pakistani Perceptions

M. Nasrullah Mirza*

The end of the Cold War with the demise of Soviet empire has generated security problems independent of the past US-Soviet rivalry. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile technology in the developing countries, the emergence of regional hegemony, threatening the US regional and global interests, and pressures of American public to reduce the costs of global leadership and divert national resources for revival of their own domestic economy have created new imperatives and opportunities for redefining of the US foreign policy, both in theory and practice.

These changes have brought important implications for the US policy and practice. It has affected US priorities in different regions. The nature and types of political, economic, scientific, technical and military developments need constant monitoring. During the Cold War the US policy of containment was essentially a single-minded approach, perceiving the predominant source of threat and seeking to meet it, wherever it jeopardized vital US and

* Muhammad Nasrullah Mirza, teaches Defence and Strategic Studies at Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. The paper was prepared for an international conference on "US Foreign Policy at the turn of the Century: New Grounds for Dialogue between United States and South Asia," organized by American Studies and Research Centre, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India, November 9-12, 1998. The author could not manage to present the paper at the conference because of post-nuclearization security scenario in the region. Later, the paper was presented in a conference, organized by the Program on Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States of America, May 2003, during his affiliation with Program on Arms Control, Disarmament and International Security (ACDIS), at the University of Illinois as a Fulbright Fellow. This paper is a revised version.

its allies' interests. However, the post Cold War political scenario has produced three paradigms of the US global policy imperatives, which played significant role in devising the policy of 'engagement and enlargement.'

The aim of the paper is to critically evaluate the Post-Cold War paradigms of the US policy and the Pakistani perception at the turn of the 20th century. The three paradigms — unipolarism, non-interventionism, and multilateralism — of the US policy are discussed below following the Pakistani perceptions.

Unipolarism

The proponents of *Unipolarism* define interests broadly and recommend that United States, as the sole remaining superpower, should exercise leadership in all aspects of world affairs. Under this paradigm, the US is given preponderance in the world affairs with a half dozen other states having special strength that makes them salient in certain areas (e.g., Japan is a global economic giant but weak in military and political prestige, Russia is militarily predominant in Eurasia but is crippled by political instability and economic weakness; unified Germany is pre-eminent in Europe but lacks the military capabilities as a global power, Britain and France wield certain diplomatic clout but rank below Germany in economic might and are also well behind the United States in military strength, China enjoys rapid economic growth but has to deal with uncertain political future and its armed forces are in dire need of modernization). The United States possesses a unique amalgam of political, economic, cultural, and military clout that enables it to exercise unparalleled and multi-dimensional influence throughout the world.¹

The international system, with the passage of time, may become multipolar as the present great powers [China, Japan, Russia, united Germany] are closing the gap with the United States. But for at least a generation, the US will continue to hold sway and will have to shoulder the burdens of a 'unipolar moment'.² The

1 Samuel P. Huntington, "America's Changing Strategic Interests," *Survival* (January/February 1991), p.6.

2 The term 'unipolarism' is derived from Charles Krauthammer's concept of 'unipolarity'. See "The Unipolar Moment," *Foreign Affairs* 70 (1990-91), pp.23-33.

interaction between and among the great powers will be characterized by ‘cooperation and competition’ and will therefore be more ambivalent. The world would remain hazardous place to live. Multiple dangers persist in the shape of regional conflicts, arms proliferation, militant nationalism, ethnic and religious hostilities, political instability, terrorist movements, drug trafficking, and mass starvation.³ These problems have been exacerbated or made more salient by the end of the US-Soviet competition and could disrupt international order and threaten the security interests of the United States as well as those of its allies. Viewed in this context, military strength still remains an important element of national power.

Unipolarists also argue that civilizational differences (e.g., Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Slavic-Orthodox) constitute the key cleavages in global politics. The ‘central axis’ of this ‘clash of civilizations’ is the division between ‘the West and the rest’. In near future, the challenge to the US and its Western allies is said to be emanating from cooperation between Confucian states (China and North Korea) and Islamic states (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Algeria and Pakistan) in efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems.⁴ After the May 1998 nuclear tests in South Asia Pakistan is increasingly viewed as a ‘target’ state in this category.

Noninterventionism

The concept of *noninterventionism* has replaced the old paradigm of ‘isolationism’. Isolationism, in a strict sense, includes political, economic and military withdrawal from international affairs, but the concept of non-interventionism demands military disengagement only not complete political detachment or economic autarky.⁵

3 Samuel P. Huntington, *op.cit.*, p.6.

4 Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72 (Summer 1993). See also Responses to Samuel P. Huntington’s “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72 (September / October 1993), pp.1-26 and Samuel P. Huntington, “If Not Civilizations, What? Paradigms of the Post-Cold War World,” *Foreign Affairs* 72 (November/December 1993), pp.186-94.

5 Ted Galen Carpenter, *A Search for Enemies: America’s Alliances after the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1992), p.189. See also Doug Bandow, “Keeping the Troops and the Money Home,” *Current History* (Jan. 1994), p.13.

Noninterventionists believe that the contemporary world suffers from a multitude of disorders, but with the disintegration of Soviet Union, the US faces no major security threat. Therefore, the US military strength can be reduced significantly to cater to the needs of direct defence of American territory. Moreover, use of the US armed forces for other purposes (countering regional aggression, supporting peacekeeping and humanitarian missions) is almost always unwarranted, dangerous, costly and futile, rather, they contend that 'market forces' can only provide economic security and protect the US position.⁶

Non-interventionists further believe that 'hidden-hand' forces will tend to maintain a rough equilibrium in the distribution of power. In self-preservation, the states in proximity to the emerging hegemon will go for massive arms build-up and form military alliances with local states to counter aggression (China and Pakistan will constrain India; India with Russia and Japan, in turn, would contain expansionist China; Germany and Japan will be counterbalanced by Ukraine, Russia, China and South Korea). Had the US failed to oppose Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, Iran, Syria, Turkey and Egypt eventually would have to be united to keep Saddam Hussain in check. These 'regional anti-bodies' will serve the required purpose and the US has consequently no need to intervene in various regional conflicts. The US intervention might be required in rare cases to tip the balance of power in favour of anti-hegemonic forces.⁷

Multilaterism

The *multilateralists* envisage courses of action predominantly based on the concerted behaviour of several states or the actual ceding of national authority to an international organization. They believe that the US can neither retire from the world entirely nor defend its interests successfully on its own. The animating vision is one of an increasingly interdependent world in which the US no longer should pursue autarchic policies. They argue that the

6 John J. Kohout III, *et al.*, "Alternative Grand Strategy: Options for the United States," *Comparative Strategy*, Vol. 14. No. 4 (October/December 1994), pp.384-85.

7 Christopher Layne and Benjamin Schwarz, "American Hegemony-without an Enemy," *Foreign Policy*, No. 92 (Fall 1993), pp.22-23.

financial burden of military preponderance puts the US at a considerable disadvantage with respect to its main economic competitors (Japan, Western Europe) which it continues to protect.⁸

Multilateralist solutions to global problems is not unique in the post-Cold War international political system. Rather, this type of solution was sought through formation of League of Nations and United Nations following the World War I and II, respectively. The two major differences, however, are: First, the end of the military confrontation between the East and West, long-standing problems that shaped national policy, such as the US-Soviet struggle for geo-strategic advantage, the fear of large-scale conflict in Europe, and the threat of general nuclear war, practically have disappeared. Second, the end of the Cold War has enhanced the need for economic cooperation. The topography of 'strategic landscape' has changed from geo-political advantages to economic benefits through free-market forces, promotion of democracy, human rights and protection of environment from rapid degradation.⁹

Policy of Engagement and Enlargement

The post-Cold War world requires a different and more nuanced worldview, reflecting the intricacies and complexities of power and its uses, which makes obligatory the determining role of the US as a sole superpower. The US policy of 'containment' of communist ideology which shaped the world political system as tight bipolar has transformed into policy of 'engagement and enlargement' with the end of the Cold War.

According to the White House the meaning and objectives of the US policy of 'engagement and enlargement' are:

Our national security strategy is based on enlarging the community of market democracies while deterring and containing a range of threats to our nation, our allies and our interests. There are three central components to our strategy of engagement and enlargement: our efforts to enhance our security by maintaining a strong defence capability and promoting

8 Ashton B. Carter, William J. Perry, and John D. Steinbrenner, *A New Concept of Cooperative Security* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1992), p.4.

9 John J. Kohout III, *et al.*, *op.cit.*, pp.402-06.

cooperative security measures; our work to open foreign markets and spur global economic growth; and our promotion of democracy abroad.¹⁰

The post-Cold War policy reflects focus on functional issues compared to erstwhile geopolitical imperatives and is aimed at global integration in terms of economic and security networks through the promotion of democracy and free-market economy.

The policy of *enlargement* presupposes engagement with the world. The views expressed by the large community of analysts after the end of the Cold War were that the US will pursue a policy of isolationism in the wake of the 'eradication' of the opposing pole, but President Clinton made it clear that the "United States will continue to play an active role in international affairs,"¹¹ e.g., reaffirmation of American role as a world leader. This policy of 'engagement and enlargement' has four basic components: strengthening of the community of major market democracies; fostering and consolidation of new democracies and market economies; countering of states hostile to democracy and free markets; and pursuit of humanitarian agenda not only by providing aid, but also by working to help democracy and market economies in the regions of greatest humanitarian concern.¹²

The policy of enlargement is based on five courses of action in terms of regional priorities and five in terms of trans-national problems. First, economic policy placed at the heart of US foreign policy; Second, the US support for reforms in Russia and the newly independent states of Central Asia; Third, maintaining the NATO alliances; Fourth, expansion of strategic ties with East Asia and Fifth, to secure peace in Middle East.¹³ In terms of trans-national problems, the Clinton administration's security policy addressed nuclear non-proliferation, combating terrorism, controlling drug trafficking, protecting human rights and environmental degradation.

10 The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, July 1994), p.2.

11 President Clinton said in the *State of Union Address*, January 1994 (mimeo), p.10.

12 Anthony Lake, "From Containment to Enlargement," remarks at the John Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Sept. 21, 1993 (mimeo), p.5.

13 Lloyd Bentsen, then-Secretary of the Treasury, Statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee, April 27, 1993, p.1-15.

The other crucial aspect of the US foreign policy is the use of military force where diplomacy and other non-military alternatives fail. The National Security Adviser to the President, Anthony Lake, listed the following situations where the US could use military force:

To defend against direct attacks on the US, its citizens at home and abroad, and its allies; to counter aggression, which is central to preserving a peaceful world; To defend our most important economic interests, because it is here that Americans see their most immediate personal stake in our international engagement; to preserve, promote, and defend democracy, which in turn enhances our security and the spread of our values; to prevent the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, to prevent acts of terrorism and to combat the deadly flow of drugs; to maintain our reliability. When the US makes commitments to other nations, we must keep our promises; and for humanitarian purposes, such as combating famine and other natural disasters and in cases of overwhelming violations of human rights.¹⁴

In response to fears that the United States was pursuing a 'neo-isolationist' policy, the then US Ambassador to the UN, Madeleine Albright, categorically stated: "Our nation will not retreat into a post-cold war foxhole, ... not the strict reliance on unilateralism or multilateralism, instead the United States will decide how to achieve its goals on case-by-case basis."¹⁵ As Christopher noted "the question of unilateralism or multilateralism creates a false polarity.... It is not an either-or proposition."¹⁶

The policy of 'engagement and enlargement' is a rational mix of the above stated three paradigms — unipolarism, non-interventionism and multilateralism. These paradigms are basically the ideal types. In real terms, no US administration is likely to adhere scrupulously to a single ideal. The Clinton administration has borrowed guidelines from all the three ideals, although the multilateralists' prescriptions seem to dominate. The principal objective of the United States is to hold on what it has now and preserve it for as long as possible. The Clinton administration is trying to realize this principal national goal through strategic tools

14 Anthony Lake, "American Power and American Diplomacy," Warren and Anita Manshel Lecture at Harvard University, Oct. 21, 1994 (mimeo), p.4.

15 James M. McCormick, "Assessing Clinton's Foreign Policy at Midterm," *Current History*, Vol. 94, No. 595, (November 1995), p.371.

16 *Ibid.*

by supporting forces of democratization, free-market economy, stopping proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology, promotion of human rights, combating terrorism and controlling drug-trafficking. Here, it will be appropriate to discuss the Pakistani perceptions regarding the use of these strategic tools by the Clinton administration in order to achieve the US national goals.

Pakistani Perceptions

‘Incoherent’, ‘inconsistent’, ‘indecisive’, ‘unjustified’, ‘lopsided’, ‘dual in nature’, and ‘discriminatory’, have, too often, become the catchwords for describing American administration’s foreign policy towards Pakistan. This Pakistani perception is based on its experience in dealing with the Americans for the last five decades since independence. Before coming to the Pakistani perceptions regarding the US policies at the turn of this century let us first review Pakistan’s experiences and perceptions in the Cold War period, when Pakistan was termed as “most-allied ally” of the United States.

The US involvement in South Asia was no doubt in pursuit of its global policy of containment of communism but in its manifestations it moved from one end of the spectrum to another leaving different impressions on the two South Asian rivals — India and Pakistan.

The sense of insecurity and helplessness during the early years of independence pushed Pakistan into the lap of the US. Pakistani policy-makers threw their weight whole-heartedly with the Americans without giving much thought to its geo-political realities in face of the perceived Indian threat and hence to acquire the much needed economic and military assistance. The Americans accepted Pakistan’s participation in their collective security arrangement without realizing the nature and intensity of the deep-rooted Indo-Pakistan hostility. Both the countries went into alliances with an expectation that they will serve their own national interests without giving thought to the implications and consequences of such alliances between unequal partners.¹⁷ The

¹⁷ The involvement of a superpower in any part of the world is basically the product of two principal categories of interests; those related to its global position as a

Americans never contemplated the deployment of the US forces and the use of American-supplied equipment against India. The Pakistanis, on the other hand, expected that the Americans would not only extend full diplomatic support to Pakistan's case on Kashmir but would also actively back Pakistan in the event of war with India.

The Pakistani perceptions, though a little on the high side, were not unnatural as they thought that the Americans were not only fully conscious of the Indian threat to Pakistan's security but also realized that this was the main factor that induced Pakistan to ally itself with the US. Perhaps the view was naive on the part of Pakistan but this naiveté could have been the product of both ignorance of world politics and lack of experience in diplomacy. The Americans were also equally naive because of their limited experience as a world policeman. They could not properly judge the implications of an alliance between a superpower and a small state which was deeply locked in a local and fratricidal conflict. Therefore, it is not surprising to find the Americans, along with the USSR, building up India in the wake of the Sino-India border clash in total disregard of Pakistani susceptibilities.¹⁸

Pakistan felt betrayed in the aftermath of the Sino-Indian border clash when the Americans rushed for the shipment of substantial quantities of military equipment to India without consulting their 'most allied ally'. As compared to the defence support of around \$55 million to Pakistan, the US gave India military aid worth \$90 million up to 1965.¹⁹

superpower and those associated with the area in the context of regional and bilateral relations. For a small state, the major reason for forging closer relations with each or any of the superpowers often stem from a desire to correct the regional imbalances of power and to advance its economic development. However, close association between a big and small state may not prove to be lasting because of the relationship between the two is inherently unequal and because their interests do not usually compliment one another. Shifting perceptions of interests do not only vitally affect the durability of a given set of relationship but may also result in a new set of relationship.

18 Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, "Changing Patterns of American Policy in South Asia," *Asian Defence Journal* (November 84) p.55.

19 Stephen P. Cohen, "US Weapons and South Asia: A Policy Analysis," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Spring 1976), p.50.

The American policy during those years created impression among many Pakistanis that although the Indians suffered a defeat at the hands of the Chinese, it was the Americans who panicked. Pakistan again felt betrayed as President Kennedy's commitment given to President Ayub Khan was that Pakistan would be consulted before any decision to be taken on the question of arms supply to India.²⁰ Moreover, despite Pakistan's all out efforts to induce the Americans to use their influence in order to have the Kashmir dispute resolved, only a half-hearted effort was made by the Americans in this regard.²¹

Following the Sino-Indian border clash and the American military aid to India, Americans made frantic efforts to convince the Pakistanis about their good faith and gave repeated assurances to come to Pakistan's help even against Indian aggression.²² Despite these assurances, the Americans belied these expectations of their 'most-allied ally' when in September 1965 Indian forces crossed international borders and a full-fledged war took place between India and Pakistan. The Americans once again let down its 'most-allied ally' declaring that there was no clear aggression against Pakistan. Over and above, the Americans imposed an arms embargo against Pakistan which was totally dependent in terms of arms procurement on America as compared to India which had just 10 per cent of arms supply from the US. When in the 1971 Indo-Pak war the whole world community regarded India as an aggressor, the *US Enterprise* Mission was interpreted in Pakistan nothing more than a symbolic gesture as it could not prevent the dismemberment of the country.

Despite the Soviet Union's active involvement against Pakistan in the 1971 Indo-Pakistan war, the Americans decided to

20 Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters* (Lahore: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp.129-53.

21 Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, *op.cit.*, p.58.

22 G.W. Chaudhry, *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and the Major Powers* (New York: The Free Press, 1975), pp.112-13. G.W. Chaudhry has given a long list of important American officials who tried to mollify Pakistan's fears emanating from rash American reaction to Sino-Indian War. Among the officials who gave categorical assurances to come to Pakistan's help if aggression was committed against it were: Harriman, Rostow, Dean Rusk, George A. Bill, Philip Talbot, and General Maxwell Taylor.

pursue not only the policy of ‘inaction’ but also endorsed the State Department’s conclusions that “independence for East Pakistan was inevitable and desirable.”²³ This dispelled all doubts in the minds of Pakistanis that they were no more than a pawn in the US global chess game. Pakistan’s disenchantment with the US which started with Sino-Indian border clash of 1962 had thus reached its climax in 1971. This inconsistency in US policy towards Pakistan became evident when viewed within the context of Indo-Soviet friendship and the support that the Soviet Union had given to the Indians over the years during times of peace and war.

Pakistan has a pervading perception that it had paid a heavy price for aligning itself with the US. It not only antagonized the Soviets as well as many Arab states but it also provided India with an excuse to wriggle out of its commitments on Kashmir. The only benefits Pakistan achieved through this policy of alignment with America was economic and technical assistance, which to some extent, has contributed towards economic development but at the same time was seen as counter-productive as the American economic strategy resulted in an excessive concentration of wealth among a few families in Pakistan, thereby creating socio-economic distortions in the society.

The duality of the US policies towards Pakistan and India became also evident in the decade of 1970s. Despite Indian nuclear explosion in 1974, nothing was done against India to control nuclear proliferation. When Pakistan tried to acquire nuclear breeder plant from France both Pakistan and France came under strong pressure from the US to cancel the deal. Under the US non-proliferation law of 1978, India was ineligible to receive nuclear fuel from the US on two grounds: (i) it had not signed the NPT and (ii) it refused to allow full-scope safeguards on the operations of all its nuclear plants.²⁴ The American president not only overruled the Nuclear Regulatory Commission but also won the backing of the US Senate for shipment of nuclear fuel to India.²⁵

23 Richard M. Nixon, *Memoirs* (New York: Grosset and Dunlop, 1978), pp.521-31.

24 Fred Greene, “The United States and Asia in 1980,” *Asian Survey*, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (January 1961), pp.10-11.

25 *Ibid.*

On the other hand, Pakistan's efforts to acquire nuclear breeder for its modest nuclear programme was projected as an 'Islamic Bomb' and Pakistan-specific amendments were brought into the US non-proliferation laws. The Symington and Glenn Amendments paved the way for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions by the US on Pakistan. It was the height of duality that the US which persuaded France to supply nuclear fuel to India had pressured France not to supply reprocessing plant to Pakistan, even if we took the case in the context that both the states refused to sign NPT: India outrightly terming it discriminatory and Pakistan on the basis of its real perception of insecurity emanating from Indian nuclear explosion of 1974 and military build-up, linked the signing of the NPT to Indian compliance.

Pakistan, in principle, has always adhered to the nuclear non-proliferation but the discriminatory policies of the US about the implementation of non-proliferation regime shows an unprincipled deference to realpolitik. Following the Indian nuclear test in 1974 the then US president Carter rewarded India by shipping it another 38 tons of enriched uranium; South Africa conducted a nuclear test, in collaboration with Israel, off its eastern coast in 1979 and the US has been protecting it ever since against international censures and sanctions with generous use of its veto power; Israel has been confirmed by the UN inquiry (Israeli nuclear technician Venanu and the US investigative reporter Seymour Hersh) to have emerged as the world's sixth largest nuclear power, with the help of technology, men and material from the US itself, but far from attracting any Pressler Amendment; rather it was provided military and economic assistance about \$4000 million a year — more than the total amount Pakistan received spread over six years being the front-line state in pursuit of US agenda to counter the Soviet moves towards 'warm waters' through Afghanistan.²⁶

With the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, the Americans launched a massive effort to establish 'new relationship' with Pakistan regarding it a 'front-line state' but the Pakistanis preferred to exercise caution in their dealing with the Americans, even then Pakistan's caution did not pay expected

26 Ghani Eirabie, "Pakistan-US ties: at the crossroads," *The News*, November 17, 1991.

dividends. The US kept control over the in-flow of aid-cum-sale deal on year-to-year basis as they were anxious to strengthen Pakistan's defence capabilities with a view that the enhanced capability, in turn, would raise the cost for the Soviets if they decided to invade Pakistan otherwise Pakistan might use American equipment in some undesired direction.²⁷ Thus the American commitments with the Indians were kept intact in their Pakistan equation but it has never been honoured vice versa.

With the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan the US left Pakistan alone to deal with the legacy of the Afghan war in the shape of about 3 million refugees, proliferation of sophisticated weapons in the society creating law and order situation, and the profusion of narcotics which have been playing major role in vitiating the body politics of the country. After the signing of Geneva Accords for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, the US re-imposed economic and military sanctions in 1990, under the Pressler Amendment. This country-specific law was blatantly discriminatory, singling out only one nation — Pakistan.²⁸

The US double standards were implicit from the fact that it remained reluctant to include India in the list of countries supporting terrorism despite New Delhi's well-documented support to LTTE and other Tamil terrorist groups tearing Sri Lanka apart. At that time, even the Indian press reports of Indian intelligence agencies having trained the LTTE activist implicated in the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi, could not convince Americans that India's track record in fomenting terrorism is far worse than that of all the countries on the US list of supporters of 'terrorism'. On the other hand Pakistan's moral and diplomatic support to the Kashmiri Mujahideen's uprising against the Indian rule, has been termed as terrorism. Thus the 1990-93 remained the crisis-ridden years confined to crisis-management in the shape of nuclear non-proliferation issues, terrorism, human rights and drug-trafficking.²⁹

27 P.I. Cheema, *op.cit.*, p.58.

28 Maleeha Lodhi, "Defining moment in Pak-US relations," *The News*, April 4, 1995.

29 *Ibid.*

After the realization that the Pressler amendment was a “blunt instrument” that had not achieved the policy goals but had proved counter-productive and besides being a symbol of discriminatory treatment, was also a structural impediment to non-proliferation in the region³⁰ — it acted as disincentive to respond to any of the half a dozen non-proliferation proposals that Pakistan had offered to India. The declaratory policy of the US ‘balance’ and ‘even-handedness’ since 1995 can only be termed as balanced if the US had removed all the discriminatory amendments against Pakistan. The Pressler sanctions have eroded Pakistan’s conventional capability and have aggravated the military imbalance in the region. The inherent asymmetry in the conventional balance between Pakistan and India has been accentuated by the cut-off of all American military sales to Pakistan whereas India has been extended economic assistance by the US and all types of military sales also resumed from Russia after a short break.

Post-Nuclear Tests Scenario

With the nuclearization of South Asia in May 1998, Pakistan has figured as an important state primarily for one negative reason: the fear in the minds of many Americans that Pakistan may transfer nuclear technology or expertise to other Muslim countries, and, also marginally, its proximity to and religious affinity with the newly-emergent Central Asian Muslim republics. But there are some other factors which also are important in bolstering Pakistan’s geo-strategic position. 1) Pakistan’s close links with the oil-rich Gulf region. 2) Pakistan offers the newly independent landlocked Muslim republics of Central Asia the shortest and quickest access to sea. The restoration of old religious, cultural and commercial ties could buttress Pakistan’s political position with the goodwill of an additional 50 million Muslims. 3) Pakistan (besides Iran and Turkey) is the only substantial military power in the Muslim world that possesses considerable professional, technical and entrepreneurial skills and has earned the Ummah’s goodwill for its ardent advocacy of the Islamic causes. Also Pakistan remains, notwithstanding some perceptions to the

30 William Perry, US Defence Secretary, acknowledged it in a speech to Foreign Policy Association, New York, January 1994.

contrary, a moderate, modern and democratic Islamic state. There is no doubt that the mullahs (religious leaders) wield considerable street-power but Pakistan's national leadership has not permitted it to sway state policies. 4) Pakistan's proven friendship with China, an emerging great power, cannot be underestimated in any strategic calculus.³¹

The above stated factors are major determinants in shaping the course of Pak-US relations. The ongoing trans-national issues in which Pakistan is being implicated require special attention to predict the future course of Pakistan-US relations. These are nuclear non-proliferation, globalization through free-market democratization, combating terrorism and protection of human rights.

Pakistani public believes that India's nuclear tests of May 11 and 13th, left Pakistan with no choice but to respond in kind or 'live in shame'.³² Pakistan has conducted nuclear tests to counter the threats posed by India, following nuclear tests, to its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Therefore, the US sanctions against Pakistan are outrightly unjustified.³³

Second, Pakistanis believe that nuclear weaponization will stabilize the deterrence between India and Pakistan.³⁴ The US contention that the "Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests have made South Asia and the world, a more dangerous place,"³⁵ seems unfounded. Nuclear deterrence contributed to stability between the US and the Soviet Union so, why it cannot do the same for India and Pakistan? Majority of the Pakistanis endorse Kenneth N. Waltz's views for promoting the notion that "with more nuclear states, the world will have a promising future."³⁶ If the US is really

31 Ghani Eirabie, *op.cit.*

32 Ishtiaq Ahmed, *New Nuclear Order: Call from Chaghi and Pokhran*, (Islamabad: Institute of Regional Studies, 1998), pp.101, 104.

33 *Ibid.*, pp.105-11.

34 *Ibid.*, p.115. See also K. Subrahmanyam, *The Economic Times* (19 May 1998).

35 Council on Foreign Relations, "After the Tests US Policy Toward India and Pakistan," <http://www.foreignrelations.org/studies/transcript/after.html>, p.4.

36 Ishtiaq Ahmed, "Nuclear Proliferation is not a Bad Thing," in *New Nuclear Order: Call from Chaghi and Pokhran*, *op.cit.*, p.89. For details on Kenneth N. Waltz's six convincing arguments see "Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May be better," *Adelphi Paper* No. 1717 (London: IISS, 1981). Kotera M. Bhimaya, "Nuclear in

serious in achieving the goals of non-proliferation then it should work to resolve the issues between India and Pakistan, especially the issue of Kashmir — the root-cause of Indo-Pak hostility, which has resulted into three full-fledged wars between them. The recommendations of the Council on Foreign Relations regarding Kashmir are a deliberate effort to favour India on this issue. There is indigenous militant movement against the Indian rule and the people of Kashmir are demanding their legitimate right to self-determination, promised under UN resolutions. There are gross violations of human rights, rather the Kashmiris are victim of the Indian state terrorism. Almost 50,000 Kashmiris have laid their lives for their just cause. Even then the Council says that “the dispute is not ripe for final resolution. It is even not ripe for mediation by the United States or anyone else. Consistent with these realities, diplomacy aimed at now resolving the permanent political status of Kashmir is bound to fail.”³⁷ The suggested measures for ‘calming Kashmir’ are wanton avoidance on the part of the US. The word ‘calming’ itself reflects the US intentions to endorse the Indian stand on Kashmir. India has been urged to “grant increased political and economic autonomy to the inhabitants of Kashmir.”³⁸ This prescription is not in line with the US advocacy of protecting human rights or combating terrorism.

Third, the popular perception is that the non-proliferation regime is discriminatory and Pakistan should not join this regime. Signing of CTBT may not be against Pakistan’s national interests but it will give the Americans a lever to further entangle Pakistan in the non-proliferation regime. The US has been devising Pakistan-specific laws in the past and it has proved itself as a non-dependable ‘strategic partner’. The US, no doubt, is the most powerful country in the world but how much we can depend on its ‘word,’ is indeed questionable. We live in a world which is devoid of higher human values, where principles have given way to realpolitik and there is no place for morality. Acceptance and

South Asia: Civil-Military Relations and Decision Making,” *Asian Survey*, Vol. XXXIV. No. 7 (July 1994), pp.647-59.

37 Council on Foreign Relations, “After the Tests US Policy Towards India and Pakistan,” <http://www.foreignrelations.org/studies/transcript/after.html>, p.10.

38 *Ibid.*, p.11.

practice of such degenerated values have been upheld and recognized as 'pragmatism, by the West. Practising of double standards is an accepted norm. Similarly selective implementation of policies is a matter of choice and convenience to suit one's own vested interests. The US has always supported India covertly as well as overtly at the cost of its most-allied ally, Pakistan. Despite being an ardent advocate of human rights, democracy and social justice, the US has deliberately ignored the avowed principles in the case of the oppressed people of Kashmir.³⁹

Fourth, any decision regarding the joining of non-proliferation regime should be determined by the considerations:⁴⁰ (a) Has the recent series of tests provided Pakistan with sufficient data to proceed with the further development of design and fabrication of nuclear warheads? (b) Is Pakistan confident that the existing nuclear capability based on relatively unsophisticated first generation weapons is adequate and reliable enough to provide a minimum deterrence capability? (c) Is Pakistan contemplating the development of thermonuclear weapons at any stage in the future? and (d) Is there still a need to maintain a linkage to the Indian policy in this regard?

The academics believe that if the answer to the first two questions is in the affirmative and the last two is in the negative, then Pakistan can safely sign the CTBT without compromising on its national interests. In case India decides to stay out of the treaty, which seems to be highly improbable at the moment, it will be politically suicidal for it to embark on a fresh series of tests. However, if the BJP continues on its reckless course of defying the world community, Pakistan can always invoke the escape clause in the treaty on the basis of putting into jeopardy of its supreme national interests by such a development. This, in any case, will not be easy. North Korea's abortive attempt is a case in point.⁴¹ We must also be mindful of the fact that if a perception is created that we have taken the decision to accede to the treaty as a result of the

39 Fasahat Hussain Syed, "Strategic Options for Pakistan: Post-Nuclear Scenario," *The Nation* (Lahore) August 18, 1998.

40 Naeem Ahmed Salik, "Advent of Nuclear Weapons and the Evolution of Nuclear Strategy" (unpublished paper).

41 *Ibid.*

arm twisting by the multilateral aid agencies, it might set a dangerous precedent for these institutions linking any future assistance to more and more concessions on proliferation front. But in any case “Pakistan, having severed the nexus with India’s behaviour, could make its own adherence to CTBT conditional on being accorded the same concessions that may come to be extended to India for the latter’s eventual accession to CTBT, if the P-5 and other signatories pledge their acceptance in advance. If not, they could choose to object, Pakistan would then not be in a position to challenge them.”⁴² The CTBT deprives qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons excluding P-5 who are capable of conducting sub-zero, low-yield tests etc. through computer simulation technology and do not need further traditional testing of nuclear devices. Therefore, the newly emergent nuclear powers — India and Pakistan — are the direct target of the CTBT. Moreover, some nuclear strategists believe that “first generation nuclear weapons do not create [credible] deterrence in the Indo-Pak and... Sino-India context.”⁴³

On the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament have yet to take off. Pakistan will, of course, be participating in them even though the “agreed mandate for these negotiations is seriously flawed.”⁴⁴ Hence it would be highly premature for Pakistan to commit itself before how the text of the Convention turns out to be, particularly its provisions for verification of fissile materials production. Also, “India may well become less enthusiastic about submitting its present inspection-free reactors producing plutonium, its reprocessing plants and other plutonium-related facilities to international inspection. FMCT, is likely to take several years from now to enter into force. De-linking from India at this stage is not called for.”⁴⁵

42 Agha Shahi, “Talbot Visit: NPT & CTBT,” *Dawn* (Karachi), July 21, 1998.

43 T.T. Poulouse, “India’s Nuclear Option and National Security,” in P.R. Chari, *et al.*, *Nuclear Non-Proliferation in India and Pakistan: South Asian Perspectives* (Colombo: Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, 1996), pp.13, 44-47.

44 *Ibid.*

45 *Ibid.*

The FMCT is basically designed to perpetuate the technological and quantitative superiority of the established nuclear powers since there is a large difference in the existing stockpiles of fissile materials of these countries vis-à-vis countries like India, Pakistan and Israel. China, which has the lowest holdings of fissile material amongst the recognised nuclear powers, is also an intended target. However, it is not only the cessation of fissile materials production but the 'intrusive inspection' and 'verification regime' which will be required to be put into place for its effective implementation which carries more serious consequences for countries like Pakistan. The international safeguards regime which Pakistan has painstakingly avoided by staying out of the NPT will thus be imposed on it through the FMCT.⁴⁶

Further, there is also a wide gap in the existing holdings of fissile materials between India and Pakistan which will be frozen by any fissile material cut-off convention. Therefore, Pakistan must persist in its demand to take into account the existing stockpiles as well so that a baseline is laid beyond which no one is allowed to retain any fissile material stocks. Meanwhile, India and Pakistan have the advantage of the hindsight and can learn from the experience of the two superpowers and avoid the pitfalls which they faced in the age of nuclear innocence. In this regard, it is in the interests of both the countries not to get involved in a nuclear race which would have catastrophic consequences for their economies. The trend after the stabilization of the nuclear deterrence should now be towards conventional forces reduction on the pattern of mutual and balanced force reduction (MBFR) in Europe and stabilize the conventional balance at a lower level.⁴⁷

The role of the US to stabilize South Asia is crucial and at the same time will also remain a hurdle until and unless India and Pakistan are treated as equally important strategic partners. The Council's report has just endorsed 'restoration' of US relations with Pakistan but strongly advocated closer 'strategic cooperation' with India. Reemphasizing the recommendations of the last similar

46 Naeem Ahmed Salik, *op.cit.*

47 *Ibid.*

report, the Task Force endorses: “The time is ripe, in particular, for the United States to propose a closer strategic relationship with India, which has the potential to emerge as a full-fledged major power.”⁴⁸ Many Pakistanis feel that the US is again deliberately ignoring the real problems vitiating the South Asian security environment. Treating India as a major power and ignoring Pakistan altogether is unjustified and discriminatory. “A stable Pakistan in possession of nuclear weapons is reason enough to worry,”⁴⁹ for the US but India being recognized as potential ‘great power’ in possession of nuclear weapons is in favour of the US for the realization of its grand designs in Asia. If that trend continues in the US policy toward South Asia the prospects of durable peace in the region would remain bleak.

The US growing emphasis on the ‘globalization’ through free-market economies is bringing with it some major problems specially for the developing states. globalization, largely an economic phenomenon, is failing to reach all the states alike. “Too many are excluded, unable to obtain access to the prosperity it offers. At the same time, the market economy that is the engine of this movement is, by its very logic, driving large numbers of people — in developing, developed and transitional alike — into deeper poverty and despair.”⁵⁰ Regional arrangements, non-governmental organizations, transnational business, academic and policy research institutions — all are taking on greater global roles. Their collective impact on world events now surpasses that of traditional national as well as international structures. As civil strife and social disarray undermine the authority of the state, these networks of new actors also erode it. The control of money, credit and fiscal policy was the most important pillars on which Jean Bodin, one of the exponents of nation-state based his concept during the late sixteenth century. These pillars are now on the verge of collapse which has, of course, come about over a period of time.

48 Council on Foreign Relations, “After the Tests US Policy Toward India and Pakistan,” <http://www.foreignrelations.org/studies/transcript/after.html>, p.5.

49 *Ibid.*, p.7.

50 Boutros Boutros-Ghali, “Global leadership After the Cold War,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (March/April 1996), p.88.

By the late nineteenth century, the dominant currency was no longer the state-minted coins or state-printed bank notes but the credit created by fast-growing privately controlled commercial banks. Every nation-state countered the trend with the establishment of central banks and their credits. Throughout the nineteenth century, one nation-state after another had performed under the control of non-national gold standard which imposed strict limit on a country's monetary and fiscal policy. Even the gold exchange standard agreed upon at Breton Woods after the World War II did not give individual state a full monetary and fiscal sovereignty. This 'extended' concept of globalization — shifting power from states to non-state authorities like multinationals or transnational firms, has allowed international bureaucracies to further undermine the nation-state fabrics.

The process of globalization has opened up tax-evading doors for the multinationals as well as many unscrupulous individuals. As more tax havens open up, greater use is made of them. States' revenues and welfare services have suffered badly and subsidies are cut back. In desperation, states are raising money by selling off state-owned enterprises under the pretext of privatization — a phenomenon that is also going on in Pakistan with attendant adverse effects.

Globalization is not a complete answer to the needs of developing countries. In the first place, the process is by no means complete. Despite increasing linkages it is premature to speak of an integrated global economy. There are still barriers to trade, to the flow of capital, more often due to the political reasons. It is liable to reversal, if economic circumstances in any developed country turn adverse. In such a situation, restrictive barriers could re-emerge that will reverse the trend of widening opportunities for the developing countries. Secondly, closer integration can result in greater instability and heightened fluctuations and increase still further the vulnerability of the developing countries. Third, the impact of the benefits of globalization on the developing countries has been highly uneven and the disparities and imbalances can well increase as the process advances. Fourth, it should not be forgotten that policies of free-market economy, liberalization and globalization were pursued for long period by many of the former

colonial territories. This resulted in a kind of integration into the world economy through participation in commodity trade, but it did not lead to industrialization or end the dualism in their economies. Nor did it lead to greater quality among trading partners.

Since the industrial revolution it was argued that economic interdependence would prove stronger than nationalist sentiments, but whenever in the last two centuries political passions and nation-state politics clashed with economic rationality the political passions and the nation-states have invariably won. Nevertheless, there will be multifarious changes in the nation-state, especially in domestic fiscal and monetary policies, control of international business, and in the conduct of war. The “battle lines of the future” (to use Huntington’s expression) will not be different from the past. “Countries have always competed for wealth and security, and the competition has often led to conflict. Why should the future be different from the past?”⁵¹ Territorial schisms of the earlier periods will be revived in the years ahead, with Germany, Japan and rising power of China building its military strength in order to contest America’s global dominance.⁵²

That is why in many cases the Clinton administration’s policy seems inconsistent, assuming ‘ad hocism’ of which Bush administration had also been accused. Dealing with China, the Clinton administration had been caught in a dilemma between promoting democracy and human rights and fostering economic security. The administration opted for economic benefits, despite President Clinton’s pledge to do otherwise. On the other hand, the developing states, which are facing problems because of the US policies of free-market democracies and globalization, are being targeted as ‘pariah’, ‘holdout’, ‘pivotal’, ‘rogue’, ‘outlaw’, ‘fundamentalists’, and ‘terrorist’ states. Interestingly, barring some states, all the states falling in above categories are Muslim states — Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Sudan, Afghanistan and, of course, Pakistan.

51 Kenneth Waltz, “Why should the future be different from the past,” *International Security* (Summer 1993).

52 Michael T. Klare, “Redefining Security: The New Global Schisms,” *Current History*, Vol. 95, No. 604 (November 1996), p.354.

Globalization also demands change of perceptions, beliefs, ideas and tastes. This is exactly where the process of globalization collides with cultural/civilizational differences that exist between and among the nations. No doubt, the sensitivities and susceptibilities of individuals and societies are being gradually modified by a process of global homogenization but at the same time it leaves pervasive complexities and contradictions which are widening the gap between national past and global future. The basic differences between Islamic and Western views about politics, economic and social values will ever remain the elements of perpetual problems-generating mechanism. Islam does not endorse the Western style of democracy. Islam bans interest-based economic system which acts as the lubricant in the engine of capitalist economy. In case of social and moral values Islam abhors free-sex society while in the West there is no restriction. Islamic philosophy considers the individual and the society equally significant while the West gives too much importance to glorification of individuals.

The Pakistanis believe that the US sees the growing Islamic resurgence in the world as threat to Western values and its global supremacy. Over the last two decades, Muslims all over the world have developed a strong desire to seek guidance and inspiration from their religion. The Iranian revolution marked the beginning of an era in which Islamic ideology gained much popularity in a number of Muslim countries. At present, Iran, Afghanistan and Sudan have Muslim extremists in power, whereas strong Islamic movements exist in Pakistan, Turkey, Egypt and Algeria. With the demise of the Soviet Union, Muslim Central Asia emerged on the world map. So, Islamic ideology is today's revolutionary philosophy. Its appeal may be confined to the Muslims only, but the Muslims are a quarter of the world's population.

Why the Muslim extremists are against the US? Actually, America's attitude and policies towards the Muslims of the world clearly manifest a strong bias against them. The most disturbing fact in this regard is its blind support for Israel since its creation, despite all the wrongdoing of the Jewish state and against the collective will of the whole world, the US is so kind to and overprotective of Israel. On the other hand, the US is so harsh

towards Islamic states i.e., Iraq, Iran, Libya, Sudan and Afghanistan, especially, its treatment of the Iraqis is unjustified.⁵³

A strong feeling exists among the Muslims that America does not care about them, although it claims to promote peace, justice and human rights in the world. The US did nothing to save the helpless Muslims in Bosnia, despite the fact that the Serbs had committed some of history's worst atrocities against the Bosnian Muslims. The same tragic story is being repeated in Kosovo these days. They believe that the treatment of Pakistan's nuclear programme, portraying it as an 'Islamic Bomb' is a clear proof of the US anti-Islamic policies. Similar callousness is evident in its policy towards the acknowledged right to the self-determination of the Kashmiri Muslims. They believe that the Americans are mistaken in thinking that they can cope with the threat of Islamic resurgence by the use of force. Capturing Muslim activists or going for indiscriminate use of military force like firing rockets on the other states just on the basis of presence of the alleged terrorists in their territories, in defiance of the international law, is going to be counter-productive. The Americans must realize that their own policies and actions over the decades are responsible for the Muslims' anger against them. This anger, in turn, inspires some individuals to carry out acts of violence against them, which is a natural reaction to their unjustified actions.⁵⁴

Conclusion

At the turn of the century the above stated three paradigms of the US foreign policy — unipolarism, non-interventionism and multilateralism — have culminated in the policy of 'engagement and enlargement,' which is a rational mix of all these paradigms. These paradigms are basically the

53 Nadeem Shahid, "America and the Islamic World," *The Nation* (Lahore), September 1, 1998.

54 Israrul Haque, "Terrorism, US and the Islamic world," *The Nation* (Lahore), September 9, 1998; Mohammad Qayum, "USA: the principal enemy of Islam," *The Muslim* (Islamabad), September 6, 1998; Akbar Hussain, "The Stands of Anti-Americanism," *The News* (Islamabad/Rawalpindi), March 11, 1991; Anisa Mustafa, "Nursing anti-Americanism," *Frontier Post* (Peshawar), March 1991; Syed Javed Hussain, "Untenable US plan for Muslim world," *The Muslim* (Islamabad), November 28, 1991; *The Muslim* (Islamabad), August 23, 1998.

ideal types. In real terms, no US administration is likely to adhere scrupulously to a single ideal. As the Clinton administration had borrowed guidelines from all the three ideals, although the multilateralists' prescriptions were dominating. The US administration seems to focus on functional and transnational issues aimed at global integration in terms of economic and security networks through the promotion of democracy and free-market economy. The principal objective of the United States is to hold on what it has now and preserve it for as long as possible. The Clinton administration tried to realize this principal national goal through strategic tools i.e., by supporting forces of free-market democracies, stopping proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology, combating terrorism and controlling of drug trafficking.

There is dominant perception in Pakistan that the American policies are anti-Islamic because the US perception of Islamic resurgence as a major threat to the promotion of its values is evident. The most disturbing fact in this regard is the blind support of the US for Israel since its creation, despite all wrongdoing of the Jewish state and against the collective will of the whole world.

Pakistan has regained strategic significance because of one negative reason: first Muslim state which possesses nuclear weapons' technology and there are apprehensions that 'Pakistan's nuclear technology is an exportable item.' This mistaken perception should be countered by all possible means. It will certainly strengthen Pakistan's credential as responsible nuclear state. Pakistan has realized that the road to salvation may not lie through Washington. To come out of the present economic crunch would require austerity measures at home and a mature relationship with growing economic powers.

The international community after decades of obliviousness has been forced to focus on the oldest unsettled

issue — of Kashmir — on the UN agenda leading to the global recognition that the issue of Kashmir cannot be ignored in the context of established peace and security in South Asia and without the willing consent of India and Pakistan there can be no resurrection of the non-proliferation agenda. Having gone through the ‘necessary evil’ Pakistan must now be pragmatic in charting out national priorities, especially concerning Kashmir. Pakistan should engage actively the Indian leadership in a diplomatic dialogue and also encourage all external mediation possibilities.