

**ISSUE VIII
WINTER 2005**

Al-Siyasa

**A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture
Special Conference Issues**

Department of Political Science
Program in Diplomacy & Strategic Studies
Program in International Relations

University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Special Conference Issue

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

APRIL 18, 2005

***Pakistan's Foreign Policy:
Challenges and Options***

**CONVENER
DR. UMBREEN JAVAID
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR & INCHARGE**

EDITOR

Dr. Umbreen Javaid

Advisory Board

Hassan Askari Rizvi

Dr. Askari is former Chairman,
Department of Political Science,
University of the Punjab

Syed Riffat Hussain

Dr. Riffat Hussain is Visiting
Professor, National Defence
College, Islamabad.

Ahmad Faruqi

Dr. Faruqi is a fellow of the
American Institute of International
Studies, based in the San Francisco
Bay Area, USA.

Imtiaz H. Bokhari

Dr. Bokhari is former Vice President,
Islamabad Policy Research Institute
(IPRI), Islamabad.

Mughees ud Din Sheikh

Dr. Mughees is Professor &
Chairman, Department of Mass
Communication, University of the
Punjab

Muhammad Anwar

Dr. Anwar is Dean, Centre for
Health and Population Studies;
He is former Chairman,
Department of Sociology,
University of the Punjab

Adnan Sarwar Khan

Dr. Adnan Sarwar is Chairman,
Department of International
Relations, Peshawar University

Moonis Ahmar

Dr. Ahmar is Professor and
Project Director, Program on
Peace Studies and Conflict
Resolution; Department of
International Relations,
University of Karachi.

Habib Khan

Dr. Habib Khan is Director
General, Academy of
Educational Planning and
Management; Ministry of
Education, Islamabad

Established in 1933, the Department of Political Science is one of the oldest teaching faculties of the University of the Punjab, Lahore. It offers Master; M.Phil and Ph.D. degrees in Political Science as well as M.A. and Ph.D. in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies Programs. The Department has a well-established evening Diploma Programs – Diplomacy in International Affairs (DIA) and Diploma in Local Self Government (DLSG). The Department has also launched M.A. in International Relations.

**Department of Political Science
Program in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies &
Program in International Relations
University of the Punjab
Lahore – Pakistan
Phone: 92-42-9231229 Fax: 92-42-5838263
Email: pspunj@yahoo.com**

AL-SIYASA – A JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY & CULTURE

Department of Political Science;
Program in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies and
Program in International Relations
University of the Punjab, Lahore – Pakistan

ISSUE VIII (Special Conference Issue)

WINTER – 2005

C O N T E N T S

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE i

Presentations

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|
| Pakistan's Post 9/11 Foreign Policy: Challenges and Responses | Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi | 1 |
| An Overview of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003) | Ms. Mubeen Irshad | 17 |
| China's Regional Approach – New Dimensions | Dr. Muhammad Ijaz Butt | 25 |
| Pakistan's Foreign Policy in the post 9/11 Security Environment: Challenges and Options | Dr. Nazir Hussain | 37 |
| Strategic Partners or Tactical Allies: Pak-US relations in the post-9/11 era | Dr. Rashid Ahmad Khan | 47 |
| Post 9/11 Challenges for Pakistan: Trends in Foreign Policy, Regional and Global Perspective | Dr. Razia Musarrat | 53 |
| Nuclear Weapons Proliferation: Role of Pakistan | Zafar Nawaz Jaspal | 67 |
| Pakistan-India relations: Challenges & Adjustments | Ms. Iram Khalid | 85 |
| Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing geo-strategic environment | Rehana Saeed Hashmi | 101 |

C O N T R I B U T O R S

Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi is Dean of State Sciences at Balochistan University, Quetta.

Ms. Mubeen Irshad is Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Dr. Muhammad Ijaz Butt is Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Dr. Nazir Hussain is Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad.

Dr. Rashid Ahmad Khan is Senior Research Fellow, Islamabad Policy Research Institute (IPRI), Islamabad.

Dr. Razia Musarrat is Chairperson, Department of Political Science, Islamia University, Bahawalpur.

Zafar Nawaz Jaspal is Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad.

Ms. Iram Khalid is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Ms. Rehana Saeed Hashmi is Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Information for the Contributors

Articles, Book Reviews, Review Articles and Policy Papers on themes of contemporary domestic, regional and international issues with particular reference to Pakistan's Politics, Society and culture are invited for Al-Siyasa.

The Contributors are advised to submit two hard copies of the manuscript along with a soft copy on floppy diskette or CD, or sent via email as an attachment. It is desirable that referencing be as endnotes in APA or Cambridge style at the end of the documents.

Bibliography can also be included at the end of the document, Endnotes should be numbered consecutively and bibliography be organized alphabetically.

The documents should be typed in double space with wide margins. All tables and statistical data should be organized with consistent style so that it may easily be composed for the Journal.

Note: The advisory Board reserves the right to make necessary editorial revisions.

Abstracts

Authors should submit abstracts of their articles 100-300 word. The first page should include the title, authors' full name, designation, institutional affiliation, address and email address if possible.

Subscription

Pakistan:

| | |
|--------------|--------|
| Single Issue | Rs.100 |
| Annual | Rs.200 |

Foreign Countries:

| | |
|--------------|---------|
| Single Issue | US\$ 10 |
| Annual | US\$ 20 |

ISSUE VIII

W I N T E R 2 0 0 5

Al-Siyasa

A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture

Special Conference Issue

**Department of Political Science
Program in International Relations**

University of the Punjab, Lahore

Pakistan's Post 9/11 Foreign Policy: Challenges and Responses

*Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi
Ms. Faiqa*

Introduction

Foreign policy of a country is the pattern of relationship it establishes with the outside world for the promotion of its national interests, the eternal phenomenon in international politics. The outside world includes state and non-state actors including Non Government Organizations (NGOs) and International Governmental Organizations (IGOs). In a political scientist's analysis, a foreign policy is "the actions of a state toward the external environment and conditions under which (foreign) actions are formulated. Foreign Policy is also a synthesis of the ends (national interests) and means (power and capabilities) of nation states. The interaction between national goals and the resources for attaining them is the perennial subject of statecraft.¹

Pakistan is an independent and sovereign nation-state by occupying an independent position in the South Asia. It emerged on the world scene on August 14, 1947 as a strong Muslim state to promote the aspirations of Indian Muslims, independent of Hindu clutches.

Pakistan's foreign policy has always been in consonance to western interests. In both ways some times the west supported Pakistan, but most of the time Pakistan's foreign policy stood by the foreign interests. So the hypothesis for this paper is, "If there is a change in international political system, then a change in Pakistan's foreign policy is likely."

The significance of this study stems from corroborated features of Pakistan's foreign policy and its symbiotic relationship to international realism of political system. The study period [9/11] chosen for this study identifies the international political system quite detrimental to foreign policies of few countries and Pakistan is one of them because of its geopolitical location.

The paper is an attempt to analyze the major challenges and problems of Pakistan's Foreign Policy in the post 9/11 period. The paper will analyze the theoretical framework of foreign policy, Long Cycle theory and the historical and present history of Pakistan's foreign policy.

Nation State Division

Challenges and responses foreign policy of a country faces can better be defined under the structural division of the nation-states in international system with its internal and external factors influencing its foreign policy.

The world is divided into three categories of developed (First), developing (Second) and underdeveloped (Third) World. The division is largely based on the division of their capabilities based on the economic and political developmental indicators, social conditions and external transaction such as foreign debt and representation in international agencies. The First World as A.F.K. Organski describes in his masterpiece, originally published in 1958: World Politics in support of his power transition theory for the depiction of international political system, states can be a dominant state, the one with the largest proportion of power resources (population, productivity, and political capacity meaning coherence and stability).² In case of America it is, as Noam Chomsky states a preeminent superpower of the world which having chosen to leverage that position to pursue an "imperial grand strategy", for ensuring itself "unilateral world domination through absolute military superiority".³

Foreign policy behaviour of developed countries is stable and supportive of core values with little change under a control factor than developing and underdeveloped world. Pakistan is either a developing country or underdeveloped with a fact that it has a lack of representative government as well as huge foreign debt. Under the framework of latest books on foreign policy analysis the countries without a representative government and huge foreign debt are less independent, particularly in case of Less developed countries. According to long cycle theory the change can affect it rather easily. Such a foreign policy can easily be controlled from a super or regional power. The same is the case in Pakistan where a regime is trying to win pseudo legitimacy of a representative system without economic stability and foreign debt.

Challenges and Responses

War against Terrorism

Robert Gilpin, a realist due to his focus on power politics says that a dominant power defines the rules of the international system and makes its repercussions for small powers in redefining its foreign policy.⁴

The major challenge for Pakistan after September 11 was the predicament of war against terrorism. In the medium term after the military operation --- the US agenda became more complicated bringing new challenges. Pakistan should spin on its head, discard the Taliban, discard Islamic Jihad, discard Islamic fundamentalists, and become an accomplice in American military intervention in Afghanistan or else face the consequences. President Bush had made it clear that those who failed to join hands with them against terrorism were then against them.⁵ As Dr. Subhash Kapila describes in his article *Pakistan's Foreign Policy Predicament Post 9/11: An Analysis*, Pakistan faced grave foreign policy predicaments in the aftermath of the Islamic Jehadi bombings of the citadels of United States power in New York and Washington on the morning of September 11, 2001. Within hours of these despicable acts, Pakistan's strategic delinquencies brought it face to face with a most traumatic imposition by the United States ultimatum, namely: Pakistan should spin on its head, discard the Taliban, discard Islamic Jihad, discard Islamic fundamentalists and become an accomplice in the American military intervention in Afghanistan or else face the consequences.

Pakistan's military ruler, General Pervez Musharraf, buckled under the United States ultimatum and agreed unconditionally to all American demands. He addressed the Pakistani nation on television and sought to make a virtue out of his necessity for a sell-out of Pakistan's long held foreign policy and strategic objectives. The General even went to the extent of invoking Islamic scriptures (an eye opener) as to how even "no war" pacts with an enemy could be entered into as a temporizing measure by an Islamic State for the sake of political or strategic expediency and could then be reneged later on to defeat the enemy. The reference logically seems to have been implied against the United States, in that Pakistan could back out of its commitments to USA, post-9/11. The Taliban were discarded overnight and the United States was provided bases in Pakistan for launching military operations against Pakistan's erstwhile ally in Afghanistan. To save his own skin, General Pervez Musharraf provided the scalps of his fellow Islamic fundamentalist Generals by sacking his trusted colleagues and those who brought him into power "in absentia".⁶ As Samina Ahmed describes, "The September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade

Center and the Pentagon transformed U.S. policy in Southwest Asia. As the United States embarked on a long-term, comprehensive campaign to counter global terrorism, Pakistan once again assumed the position of a frontline state, just as neighboring Afghanistan became the target of a new U.S. hot war in Asia. U.S. indifference to the turmoil within Afghanistan evolved into a policy of active intervention, and past differences with Pakistan were overlooked in the effort to develop a military partnership in the war on terrorism. These changes in U.S. policy in Southwest Asia could bear long-term implications for American security." Pakistan had no choice but to join America's war. Otherwise it would have been indicted along with the Taliban. But it was absolutely unnecessary for India to have offered unconditional support to the Bush administration's war in Afghanistan. In keeping with its tradition and on the basis of a careful assessment of the situation, it had a responsibility to give leadership to nations and peoples who wanted to avert this catastrophic war. It had a chance to stand up for peace and it blew it.⁷

Organski and Gilpin assume a predominant hegemonic state able to impose rules on other states in the system. For these authors, these rules are not part of "international structure," even though they have a similar impact on the behavior of weaker states and operate through the same mechanism of expectations. Without a hegemonic, these theories produce indeterminate predictions. How rules are defined in non-hegemonic systems is addressed later in the paper.⁸ America defined the rules. In the vaguely defined international coalition in the "war against terrorism" India and Pakistan occupy perhaps the most uncomfortable positions. Pakistan was an ally of the United States during the cold war, and India, a significant leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, was seen as an obstacle to U.S. goals and objectives. Throughout the 1990s U.S. relations with India warmed, while they cooled with Pakistan. Prior to September 11, Pakistan, an authoritarian regime, was one of three countries to recognize the Taliban, and its intelligence services had close ties to the Taliban. India, on the other hand, was a democracy, and had ties to the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance. By warming up to Pakistan in the aftermath of the attacks, the U.S. has reversed the tilt toward India for which it had assiduously worked for some three years, favoring its "tactical ally" (Pakistan) over its "natural ally" (India). The Indian government appears, however, to be sacrificing its traditions of non-alignment and support for international law in order to rebuild an alliance with the U.S. After 9-11: U.S. Foreign Policy and the legacy of the Twin Towers Washington's priorities changed. Self-defence and anti-terrorism had taken hold as the new pillars of U.S. foreign policy. This supplanted

anti-communism of the Cold War and George W Bush Senior's New World Order and lain to rest global intervention in the guise of multilateralism at the core of Clinton foreign policy. President George W Bush was reported to believe that his Presidency would be judged according to the effectiveness with which he wages this war.⁹ President Bush acknowledged in his State of the Union address that America was no longer protected by vast oceans (its founding myth) and only vigorous action abroad would protect the USA in the future. President George W. Bush told US citizens that the country faced the "First war of the 21st century". President Bush was set to become the "War President". The Presidency of the second Bush administration had shifted from Warren Harding to Woodrow Wilson in character, referring to Woodrow Wilson's break with US isolation with the advent of World War Two. Concerns abounded about President Bush's proudly proclaimed ignorance of foreign affairs and foreign policy and its high profile withdrawal from international engagement. Despite these concerns Richard Haass, key policymaker in the Bush Administration, has proclaimed that "In the 21st century (post-9/11 period) the principal aim of American foreign policy is to integrate other countries and organizations into arrangements that will sustain a world consistent with U.S. interests and values and thereby promoting peace, prosperity and justice. President Bush framed "the non-negotiable demands of human dignity, rule of law, limits on the power of the state, equal justice, religious tolerance as well as respect for women. The rocking of twin towers had done what foreign policy reformers had long been sought-injected global affairs into America's mainstream consciousness. The following strengths have emerged from U.S. And then as Noam Chomsky states the aggressive behaviour of the US in international relations for the last thirty years showed an unflinching sense of outrage."¹⁰

Pakistan was praised for its Afghan policy. "Pakistan has come a long way; it is not the Pakistan of September 11, 2001 and not the Pakistan of September 11, 2002" These observations were made by the visiting US Secretary of State Condoleza Rice along with her Pakistan counterpart at the joint press conference in Islamabad on March 17, 2005. She was appreciative of Pakistan counteractive role in cultivating good neighbourly relation will suit Afghanistan. Something which was, to "unthinkable a few years ago".¹¹ The obvious reference is to Islamabad collaboration with the occupying US forces and Afghan troops in thwarting the attempts of the militants to sabotage the Afghan Presidential elections in October 2004.

It may be recalled that Pakistan deployed 70,000 troops along the Durand Line to prevent the cross-border incursions into Afghanistan from Pakistani side. Furthermore, Pakistan official provided fool-proof escort to the Afghan refugees in Pakistan to participate in the country's first ever held election under US occupation. It is true that the elections in Afghanistan could not have been held without Pakistan's active role. This has given the to baseless allegations often made the Bush Administration special envoy Zalmay Khalilzad, an Afghan immigrant to US that Islamabad was not doing enough to prevent its ambitions from carrying on terrorist attacks inside Afghanistan from bases in Pakistani tribal areas. But he was not alone in his vilification of Pakistan, certain US generals of the occupation army and Afghan military commandos went to the extent of blaming Pakistan's armed forces for sheltering the militants even Osama bin Laden and his followers. The American and Afghan forces often crossed Pakistan territory and shot and captured the militants in what they called hot pursuit. Such violations of Pakistan's sovereignty apart from affecting the morale of Pakistan army provoked strident indignation from the public opinion in the country. This hampered the counter-insurgency operations launched by Pakistan to destroy the alleged sanctuaries launched by Pakistan carry North.

The US central commands starting revelations that Islamabad had suffered a loss of \$ 10 billion during the Afghan war was due to the proclamation of war zone in the region that had suspended land and overseas trade and flights schedule. However, Pakistan's then Finance Minister, Shaukat Aziz, refuted the statement, arguing that such a loss would have caused a national loss.

Either with us or Against us (Foreign Policy)

President George W. Bush in his forceful address to Congress stated that "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists".¹² Such rhetoric were meant to prove to be threatening and uncompromising. President Bush's war declaration on October 7th with the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom stated that "as we strike military targets, we will drop food for the Afghan people". This led to the killing of thousands of innocent Afghans who fell victim to the air strikes. This served to boost the United States of America's magnanimity. Yet it was doubtful if the US would have followed through on true nation building and reconstruction of a country it help to deconstruct further and that only became a priority, due to the presence of terrorists, that directly

threatened US interests on that fateful day of September 11, 2001. President Bush's statement was the reflection of US inching toward imperialism and militarism for many years. The statement emphasized that their foreign policy was designed for the US being "lone superpower," "indispensable nation," "reluctant sheriff," "humanitarian intervention," and "globalization." by giving way to assertions of the Second Coming of the Roman Empire.¹³ "American imperialism used to be a fiction of the far-left imagination," writes the English journalist Madeleine Bunting, "now it is an uncomfortable fact of life."¹⁴

Indian Factor in the Post 9/11 for Pakistan

The Indian government appeared to have been quite pleased when a senior U.S. official called India the U.S.' "natural ally" on the eve of Indian Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee's visit to the U.S., echoing the sentimental phrase first coined by India itself. However it was disappointed that there was no specific reference to cross-border terrorism in Kashmir (read from Pakistan) in the joint statement issued on November 10th following the first ever summit between President George W. Bush and the Prime Minister, Vajpayee. The Indian Prime Minister offered unsolicited and unlimited cooperation with U.S. military operations in the war against terrorism even though large numbers of Indians opposed such cooperation.

Indirectly endorsing Samuel P. Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations" thesis Prime Minister Vajpayee told the United Nations General Assembly on 10 November, "We in India know from our own bitter experience that terrorists develop global networks driven by religious extremism." Vajpayee was essentially repeating what he had told the U.S. Congress last year about religious wars: "In our neighborhood in this twenty-first century, religious war has not been fashioned into, it has been pushed to be an instrument of state policy." India seems to claim the copyright for the mission statement on terrorism. For Pakistan the only practical and wise way was to accept the American demand for providing them all possible in their war against terrorism. If Pakistan had not supported the war in Afghanistan, India would have benefited from the situation.

US support for Pakistan

On Oct. 16, 2001, Congress passed legislation that waives restrictions on U.S. arms exports and military assistance to Pakistan and India. Most U.S. economic sanctions were lifted or eased within a few months of their imposition, however, and Congress gave the President the authority to remove all remaining restrictions in 1999. The two countries were sanctioned following nuclear tests in 1998, and additional sanctions were levied against Pakistan when its head of Government was deposed by a military coup in October 1999. Pakistan was suffering more due to sanctions.

Both India and Pakistan had conducted tests of nuclear explosive devices, drawing world condemnation. The United States and a number of India's and Pakistan's major trading partners imposed economic sanctions in response. Pakistan was under severe crunch of foreign exchange shortage after donors stopped its aid. In the wake of triggering U.S. economic sanctions as required by the Arms Export Control Act and the Export-Import Bank Act.² Prior to the tests, for international treaty purposes, the two countries were classified as non-nuclear-weapon states; the tests put each country in jeopardy of world condemnation and sanctions. In the United States, the law required the President to impose the following restrictions or prohibitions on U.S. relations with both India and Pakistan: termination of U.S. foreign assistance other than humanitarian or food assistance; termination of U.S. government sales of defense articles and services, design and construction services, licenses for exporting U.S. Munitions List (USML) items; termination of foreign military financing; denial of most U.S. government-backed credit or financial assistance; U.S. opposition to loans or assistance from any international financial institution; prohibition of most U.S. bank-backed loans or credits; prohibition on licensing exports of "specific goods and technology;" and denial of credit or other Export-Import Bank support for exports to either country. Since 1990, Pakistan had been under a sanctions regime that was mandated by another provision of U.S. law pertaining to U.S. foreign assistance. The Pressler amendment, added in 1985 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, requires the President to determine that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device and that any proposed U.S. assistance would reduce the risk of obtaining such a device. President Reagan and President Bush issued determinations each year until 1990, when then President Bush did not make the finding required to make assistance available. In 1995, this requirement was changed to apply only to military assistance to Pakistan, making the country eligible for other foreign assistance.

President Bush in his speech “I hereby determine and certify to the Congress that the application to India and Pakistan of the sanctions and prohibitions contained in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (G) of section 102(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act would not be in the national security interests of the United States. Furthermore, pursuant to section 9001(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79), I hereby waive, with respect to India and Pakistan, to the extent not already waived, the application of any sanction contained in section 101 or 102 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 2(b)(4) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945, and section 620E(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.”¹⁵ The Senate passed S. 1465 on October 4, 2001, which would remove the impediments on foreign assistance for Pakistan for the next two fiscal years, if that aid is granted as part of the war against international terrorism. On September 23, 2001, the President issued Executive Order 13224 to block property and transactions with 27 organizations or individuals who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism. The Secretary of the Treasury added another 39 entities and individuals to the list on October 12, 2001, in part to include the 22 persons listed among the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Most Wanted. Some of the organizations listed are based in Pakistan and others may have ties to that country. Few weeks after Pakistan and the US have signed an agreement to reschedule the \$ 379 million government-to-government debt of Pakistan. This seems to indicate that President Bush exercised authority under USC 2364 to lift all restrictions under Section 508. For all practical purposes, we can assume Section 508 has ceased to exist.

Kashmir Situation and US-India Post 9/11 Collaboration

A major change witnessed in the post September 11 period was the restructuring of Pakistan’s foreign policy on Kashmir in view of emerging US-India relationship. The US-India collaboration was also a matter of big concern for Pakistan. The Indian foreign policy which is run on professional and representative bases has always been to “seek chance and occupy.” Since India condemned the September 11 attack and responded prompt support for the US anti-terrorism stunt, India wanted to avail the opportunity by entangling Pakistan. It offered its bases to the US forces in case Pakistan had denied. India wanted to prevent Pakistan from becoming the driver of US regional policy. It continued propagating Pakistan as terrorist state. The key Indian officials have

stressed that like the United States, India had been a victim of terror and hence also has the right to use military force to protect itself. "Our fight against terrorism did not start on September 11," Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh stated that they had been fighting the battle of terrorism. To him, Pakistan "has spawned, encouraged and sustained terrorist activities in Kashmir."¹⁶ Similarly to condemn Kashmiri militancy, the Bush administration soon after September 11 placed a Pakistan-backed Kashmiri organization, Jaish-e-Muhammed, on the U.S. terrorist watch-list to attack on Kashmir's legislature.

For Pakistan Kashmir is an integral part of Pakistan whose fate is still to be divided or should be divided under the UN plebiscite promised in 1948. The war against terrorist meant that Pakistan had to turn its back to insurgents it actually supported the leading of them was the Harakat-ul-Mujahideen. The Bush administration had branded it as a terrorist organization.¹⁷

The restructuring of relationship between India and Pakistan was the cornerstone of Bush Administration in pursuit of anti-terrorism stunt. India was uneasy and even reacted to the statement by the Secretary of State Collin Powell that the Kashmir dispute is "central" to the India-Pakistan relationship. It was the ultimate US support for a settlement between the two for goodwill policy that India despite constant Pakistani provocation, decided to contain use of military violence across the LOC. Pakistan recognized the threat of "state terrorism . . . especially in Indian-occupied Kashmir." Pakistan's support for the US stunt against terrorism now encourages the regime to increase its support of Kashmiri insurgents in the belief that U.S withdrew its support from Kashmiri fighters.

President Musharraf in his statement said that "striking things in stark contrast to the conventional policies of Pakistan." His statement was a "drift from the traditional positions on Kashmir. He called for a mutually flexible solution for Kashmir and urged for a relaxed Pakistani insistence on holding a plebiscite, and pledged directly to PM Vajpayee that he would not permit any territory under Pakistan's control to be used to support terrorism. Musharraf's repositioning on Kashmir fits within his larger vision of transforming Pakistan into a 'moderate, developed, enlightened and welfare Islamic state.'¹⁸

On 14th August Independence Day his statement vocally urged that there was a need to project a "soft image" of Pakistan through culture, sports

and tourism. Musharaf represents a larger civil military oligarchy, 'The Establishment' of Pakistan. Pakistan's foreign policy, domestic and economic dimensions are drafted by International Student/Young Pugwash "Towards a new paradigm of international governance".¹⁹ On Nov. 26, 2003 Indian and Pakistani armed forces ended 14 years of virtually daily artillery exchanges, when they began a "general" cease-fire that covers the international border between India and Pakistan and the Line of Control (LOC) and Siachen Glacier in the disputed Kashmir region.

Discussion have been under way to revive the old train link between India and Pakistan known as Monabao-Khokharapar. The distance between Mirpur Khas to Monabao on this route is 128 km out of which a patch of up to 10 kilometers has no track whereas remaining part of the track was in dilapidated condition based on the old narrow gauge system. The bus service between Lahore and Delhi was the immediate result of the normalization of relationship between the two countries. The bus service between Muzaffarabad and Srinagar is soon to begin.

Support for internal US Anti-Terrorism Drive

A consequence of a shift in Pakistan's foreign policy was to face another form of terrorism with in the country. It appeared in shape of suicide bombings and its indiscriminate targeting of the foreigners. Pakistan could never be so openly forced by foreign pressure to limit the activities of Jihadi/fundamentalist groups.

Pakistan's first military ruler Gen. Muhammad Ayub Khan soon after taking power in 1958 brought the dispute between the modernists and Islamic radicals into the open. In his autobiography "Friends not Masters" he complained about the "osburantists who frustrate all progress under the cover of religion".²⁰ He recognized that Pakistan had witnessed a conflict that Zia made Islam a centerpiece of his administration. Soviet invasion appeared a good opportunity for Gen. Zia to make himself as a key cold war ally of the US. Washington turned a blind eye to Zia's process of Islamization. The campaigns for women to cover their heads, for shutting down restaurants during Ramadan and for enforcing the Hudood and Zina Ordinances can all be ascribed to the fact that, after Zia, Islamic radicals held positions of authority.

Gen. Zia's impact on Pakistan was so enduring in part because his civilian successors in the 1980s, Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sahrif did little to dismantle his legacy. Sharif's successor, Gen. Musharraf himself gave an early indication of his thinking when he described the Turkish secularist Mustafa Kamal Attaturk as hero. In his first major policy speech Musharraf included a passage on Islam: "And now far a few words on exploitation of religion. Islam teaches tolerance not hatred; universal brotherhood and not enmity; peace and not violence; progress and not bigotry. I have great respect for the Ulema and expect them to curb elements which are exploiting religion for vested interest and bring bad name to our faith"

President Musharraf also expressed determination to control the Madrassas which had played an important role in fostering Islamic literacy. At the time of Pakistan's independence there were an estimated 250 Madrasas in Pakistan. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan transformed the situation. The Madrassas were a well deserved reputation for producing highly motivated anti-Soviet fighters. As a result, foreign funds from US and Saudi Arabia flowed into Madrasa system. By 1987 there were 2862 Madrasas producing around 30,000 graduates each year. A survey carried out in Punjab in 1995 revealed that there were 2,512 Madrassas in Punjab alone. In 2001 General Mascara said that there were 7,000 or 8,000 Madrassas in Pakistan and between 600,000 and 700,000 students attending them. After 9/11 Musharraf announced measures to control Madrassas. Clerics running the schools were told they had to turn away any foreign students who did not have a letter of approval from their own governments and to start teaching science, English and Pakistan Studies alongside religious subjects. Musharraf also ordered the creation of a registration system for all those attending the Madrassas.

Dan McNeill, the American General heading the US led campaign in Afghanistan, said in August 2002 that "hundreds, may be even a thousand" Al Qaeda operative were in Pakistan. Taliban and Al Qaeda fugitives have assiduously taken advantage of the porous Pak-Afghan border in their quest for a sanctuary in Pakistan. 443 of the Al Qaeda suspects were arrested by Pakistan authorities till December 2002, 380 were detained in the Northwest border region, while the rest were apprehended from various parts of the country. American commandos operating out the Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan were quoted as saying in July 2002 that 400 to 1,000 Al Qaeda operatives may be on the loose in the tribal areas in Western Pakistan Uzbek and Chechens operatives

have taken shelter in the NWFP and FATA. Many Islamic parties like Lashkar-e-Jhangvi, Harkat ul Mujahideen, Jaish-e-Mohamad, the Harkat-ul-Jehadi-e-Islamand, Lashkar-e-Taiba have shelter in Karachi, Kashmir and NWFP.

President Musharraf during a televised address to the nation on January 12, 2002 announced the proscription of five terrorist groups, taking the number of banned groups to seven. He banned two groups active in the "Jaish-e-Mohammad" and "Lashkar-e-Taiba. Sectarian terrorist groups, "Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan", Tehreek-e-Jaferia" Pak and Tehreek-e-Nafaaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammadi were also proscribed. He announced that the Sunni Tehrik has been placed under observation. Lashkar-e-Jhangvi and Sipah-e-Mohammed Pakistan had earlier been banned in August 2001, security agencies detained over 1,975 persons linked to such groups. Similarly a large number of Lashkar-e-Jhangvi activists were targeted and killed.

Conclusion

The foreign policy of Pakistan since 9/11 has undergone a U turn on a number of its principles having been in practice for the last many decades. A major shift was the change in its Afghan policy from friends to foe. The Talibanization of Afghanistan actually began with the active support of Pakistan was soon to be discarded under the core-periphery relationship after the attack on twin towers. Pakistan supported the active military presence of the US against Afghanistan. A major shift in Pakistan's foreign policy towards India owed to the post-9/11 scenario. The two countries have buried hatchets over a number of issues which in past had been a bone of contention between the two countries. The reactivation of abandoned roads, normalization of cross-border transaction, lessening of visa restrictions, and signing of a large number of protocols are the indicators of the restructuring of Pakistan foreign policy.

Selective Bibliography

Aron, Raymond, **Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations**, Richard Howard and Annette Baker Fox, New York: Paeger, 1966.

Bardal, J. K., **International Politics: Dynamics and Dimensions**, New Delhi: South Asian Publishers, 1987

Bhutto, Zulfikar A., **The Third World: New Directions**, Lahore: Classic, 1994.

Brown, Chris., **Understanding International Relations**, 2nd edition. New York: Palgrave, 2001

Coleman, James and Carl Rosberg., **World Order and New States**, New York: 1962.

Cox, W. Robert, ed., **The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism**, London, 1997.

Falk, Richard A. & Saul H. Mendlovitz., **Regional Politics and World Order**, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1973.

Field House, D.H., **The West and the Third World**, Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Klaus, Knorr., **The Power of Nations: The Political Economy of International Relations**, New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1975.

Krugman, Paul R. & Maurice Obstfeld., **International Economics: Theory & Practice**, 3rd Edition, Harpr Collins College Publishers, 1994.

Gilpin, Robert. **War & Change in World Politics**, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Khan, Ayub. **Friends not Masters: A Political Autobiography**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Lake, David A. and Robert Powell, eds., **Strategic Choice and International Relations**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Levy , Jack S, "Long Cycles, Hegemonic Transitions, and the Long Peace." In Charles W. Kegley, Jr. ed., **The Long Postwar Peace**. New York: HarperCollins, 1991. pp. 147-176.

Modelski, George. "The Long Cycles of Global Politics and The Nation-States" **Comparative Studies in Society and History**, 20th April 1978, 4-35.

Morgenthau, Hans J., Hans Morgenthau, **Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power & Peace**, New York: Knopf, 1978

Noam Chomsky., **Hegemony or Survival**, New York: Metropolitan Books 2003

----- **World Orders: Old and New**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Organski, A.F.K. **World Politics**, 2nd ed., New York: Knopf, 1968.

Rosecrance, Richard "Long Cycle Theory and International Relations"
International Organization, Vol.41, No.2, (Spring 1987), pp.283-301

Wall, David., **The Charity of Nations: The Political Economy of Foreign Aid**, New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Waltz, Kenneth N., **Theory of International Politics**, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1979.

End Notes:

¹ Theodore A. Coulombis. James H. Wolf, **Introduction to International Relations: Power and Justice**, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1994, p 115.

² A.F.K. Organski **World Politics**, New York: Alfred 1958, and Noam Chomsky **Hegemony or Survival**, New York: Metropolitan Books 2003, p. 13

³ Noam Chomsky----- **World Orders: Old and New**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, 41.

⁴ . See Robert Gilpin, **War and Change in World Politics**, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 22.

⁵ Hasan Askari-Rizvi, "Pakistan in 1998: The Policy under Pressure," **Asian Survey**, Vol. 39, No. 1 January/February 1999, p. 184.

⁶ <http://www.saag.org/papers4/paper324.html>" _Pakistan's President Musharraf Unmasked" _ SAAG Paper No.324 dated 21-09-01

⁷ See Donald H. Rumsfeld, "A New Kind of War," **New York Times**, September 27, 2001, <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/27/opinion/27RUM.html>.

⁸ A.F.K Organski, **World Politics**, 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968 and Robert Gilpin, **War and Change in World Politics** New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

⁹ S.E Miller, 2002. The end of unilateralism or unilateralism redux? **The Washington Quarterly**. Vol.25, No.1. Winter 2002

¹⁰ . Noam Chomsky----- **World Orders: Old and New**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

¹¹ . **Dawn**, daily, Karachi, Pakistan March 18, 2004

¹² "War on Terror: Perspectives." **Newsweek**. 1 Oct. 2001: 17.

¹³ . Madeleine Bunting, "Beginning of the End: The U.S. Is Ignoring an Important Lesson from History--that an Empire Cannot Survive on Brute Force Alone," **The Guardian**, February 3, 2003a

¹⁴ . Madeleine Bunting, "Beginning of the End: The U.S. Is Ignoring an Important Lesson from History--that an Empire Cannot Survive on Brute Force Alone," **The Guardian**, February 3, 2003

¹⁵ September 22, 2001 - Presidential Determination - No. 2001-28 Pursuant to section 9001(b) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79) published in daily **Dawn**, November 12, 2001

¹⁶ **Hindustan Times**, October 2, 2001, <http://www.hindustantimes.com/nonfram/021001/dlnat>

¹⁷ Rama Lakshmi, "Pakistan's New Role Riles Indian Leaders: Actions in Kashmir Called 'Terrorist,'" **Washington Post**, September 27, 2001, p. A15.

¹⁸ **www.student-pugwash.org/seoul2004 Seoul**, South Korea, October 3-4 2004

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Khan, Ayub. **Friends not Masters: A Political Autobiography**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

An Overview Of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003)

Ms. Mubeen Irshad

There exists a relationship between the foreign policy of every country and between two specific factors; the geo-strategic context (regional and global), within which a country is located and the domestic compulsions of a country including governance issues, economic constraints, actors role and some other inputs that exist.

One of the most significant relationships within the environment is the interaction between domestic and foreign affairs. Differentiation of nations according to level of economic development has been cited as having a bearing on the relationship between domestic and foreign conflict. Foreign policies are shaped by the internal needs of a state or are the projection of internal policies.

Foreign policy depends on the economic strength, the military power and the leadership of a country, and vice versa the foreign policy is influenced by these elements. A dynamic connectivity is in fact constantly at work between foreign policy, governance and the geo-strategic environment. Autonomy, admittedly of varying degrees, is therefore available to all states to make their choices on the foreign policy. Their choices therefore define regional and global geo-strategic environments.¹

James N. Rosenau in his book, "World Politics" writes that,

Foreign policy subsumes a number of distinct dimensions, that the actions of nation states are undertaken by concrete and identifiable officials, that these actions are responses to a host of internal and external stimuli and are addressed to many diverse objectives that the actions can take many forms and can result in many out comes. Analysis of foreign policy has become increasingly sophisticated, giving rise to the development of more elaborate and more precise conceptual equipment with which to sort out and assess the complex phenomenon that link nations to the world beyond their borders.²

An Overview Of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003)

Given the moral claims that can be made on behalf of duties beyond borders, decision makers are thus faced with the potential problem of serving competing constituencies, while conversely having other states taking a more direct interest in their domestic environment.³

In recent years foreign policy analysis has often been seen as realist on the grounds that it is state centric. This is ironical given that foreign policy analysis grew up in reaction to the assumption of classical realism that the state was a single, coherent actor pursuing clear national interests in a rational manner, with varying degrees of success according to the talents of particular leaders and the constraints of circumstances.

The politics of foreign policy are perpetually changing, depending on the country or the region, and by no means always in the same directions. This is why case and country studies are so important. The study of foreign policy faces perpetual challenges of both an intellectual and practical kind, as with any branch of social science. Equally, the exponents of foreign policy have to cope with a confusing, multiple actor international environment where obstacles and opportunities are by no means clearly delineated.

In the seventies the reorientation of a divided Pakistan by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto towards the Muslim world yielded multiple advantages. The Middle East connection ensured flow of petrodollar, defense alliances and a special stature for a divided and defeated Pakistan. Bureaucracy was fragmented and demoralized. By the mid-eighties the flow of funds from around 3 million Pakistani workers amounted to around 6 billion dollars. This largely covered the trade imbalances caused by the increase in oil prices.

In the period of government of Prime Minister, Z. A. Bhutto the bureaucracy was fragmented and demoralized. He carved out from the bureaucracy a personalized chain of command through the appointment of politically loyal individuals in key positions.

The period of the eighties was an aberration in Pakistan's history. More of a nightmare. The military dictator General Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq and a domestically isolated man ended up ruling the country for eleven long years. On the foreign policy, he converted his foes into friends; he spent his eleven years befriending India, warring Iran, Iraq and the Arab states. The military was formulator of the policy and the bureaucracy was made responsible for implementing it.

Nasim Zehra explains:

“Whatever Zia's successes on the foreign policy, otherwise his Afghan policy that yielded the Washington-Rawalpindi nexus helped Pakistan to earn a 3.2 billion dollar aid and loan package. Together the CIA and Pakistan's ISI co-authored and engineered the Afghan jihad. Zia opted for Machiavellian embrace with the Americans prompting his Foreign Minister Aga Shahi to resign. Differences emerged between the foreign office and the Generals' military team. Having promised to his Foreign Minister Aga Shahi that Pakistan a NAM member will not offer basis to the Americans, he broke his promise.”⁴

Equally Zia's state apparatus too busy with the Afghan jihad allowed Pakistan to get deeply involved with the proxy wars being played in the Middle East. Pakistan fully bore the brunt of the Afghan jihad, the radicalization of the Middle East politics and the American anti-Iran and anti-Soviet agenda. Zia took Pakistan deep into the sectarianism, klashnikov, drugs, and the ethnic problems despite warnings from various domestic quarters. Zia's politics wrought havoc on Pakistan's civil society. It mutilated the evolution of the domestic political forces, artificially strengthening some while forcibly undermining others.⁵ Until the eighties Pakistan's foreign policy continued to provide easy cash injections and military windfall to Pakistani state.

In the nineties while policy in the period of Prime Minister, Benazir and Nawaz Sharif on the security front remained on track, the inept state and inept leadership steered the country from crisis to crisis. Against the backdrop of sectarian and ethnic violence problems of corruption, nepotism and inefficiency the country got deeply mired in the debt trap.

The Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif expended much energy on foreign visits; his government's foreign policy was in no better shape for this. With key foreign policy areas such as relations with the U.S, India and even Iran, virtually frozen, the Prime Minister's overseas trips do not seem part of any coherent foreign policy design aimed at securing clearly defined objectives.⁶ He has seen the external relations more in its public relating dimensions than in terms of policy. With the notion of foreign policy as principally a photo- opportunity, a visit oriented rather than an issue-oriented approach has developed.

An Overview Of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003)

With a government that had de-emphasized the role of the Foreign Ministry, professionals in the organization have found that there was no one to listen to them. A different kind of coordination problem had arisen from too many members of the cabinet trying to play at being foreign ministers. Conflicting statements on a range of foreign policy issues made it difficult to determine the exact position of government. The inability to control this free for all expression of views has led many observers to conclude that the government lacked a serious and sober approach to foreign policy.⁷

It is a matter of great concern that Nawaz and Benazir administration had opened a third-front against Pakistan. By putting all its eggs in one basket in Afghanistan, Pakistan has annoyed brotherly neighbor Iran and the Central Asian republics. The threat to national security has increased three-fold: One, from India on Kashmir; two, from US-led G-8 on non-proliferation and terrorism; and three, from Russia, Iran and Central Asia which were concerned about Pakistan's backing for Taliban. Pakistan had lost all friends from Iran to Central Asia.

Since the early nineties Pakistan has demonstrably played an important role in trying to bring peace to Afghanistan. Significantly the only negotiated instrument that ensured peaceful transfer of power was the 1993 Islamabad Accord.

Musharraf took the charge of government in 1999, faced the crisis of 9/11 along with the attack of U.S on Afghanistan and Iraq. He joined hands with U.S against war of terrorism. He took many difficult decisions after 9/11. Today, Pakistan is under immense internal and external pressure to formulate its policies, both foreign and domestic, in accordance with a global dispensation that is over whelming under the influence of US.⁸

Expectations were great and hopes were high when President Musharraf announced elections in 2002 to restore democracy in the country and transfer power to an elected government, to run the country with an independent and sovereign parliament taking decisions on all national as well as foreign issues. Though a façade of democracy has been put up, parliament has not been empowered to rubber- stamp the policies of the Musharraf- Jamali government. The opposition parties were expecting the government to initiate a debate on Pakistan foreign policy vis-à-vis India and take the Senate into confidence over the recent developments in

relations between two countries and formulate a national consensus for the forth-coming talks between Islamabad and New Delhi.⁹

Pakistan has attached its foreign policy with U.S and working as a buffer for U.S interests. To support the super power is good but there should be a cut-off level in supporting it because Pakistan has its own domestic compulsions. Afghanistan, Iran and Central Asia are getting away from Pakistan through its wrong policies and India through its successful foreign policies has underlined Pakistan's friends.

The history of the changing balance of power between the army and the bureaucracy shows a rapid increase in the weightage of the military relative to the bureaucracy in determining national policy in the major spheres of foreign policy, the economy and internal security. Pakistan's foreign policy is reactive not pro- active. The policies after 9/11 compromised the political sovereignty and damaged the economic sovereignty, isolated in Islamic Republics by negating Arab cause by accepting Israel.

Pakistani decision-making process has been highly centralized and personalized in the Chief Executive through out the history. The ruling elite enunciated and implemented a conservative domestic policy and an expedient foreign policy.¹⁰ Therefore the elite in Pakistan tended to favor a controlled democracy with severe limitations on popular participation.

On the military security front Pakistan has done well. A nuclear deterrence, a professional army and a national will to defend the country inspire confidence. However, on a broader, crucial level what is happening in the hearts and minds of our people? What is the economic situation in the country? What is the true role of legislature in foreign policy? Does Pakistan require military rule? The answers are as:

Organized and armed hate and anger exists within our own ranks; economic crisis needs no elaboration as we are confronted by a \$40 billion worth of external debt and finally according to Washington and some Arab countries those committing and planning acts of sabotage in the United States are being tracked back to training camps functioning in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Economic crisis is the cumulative outcome of flawed policies and a failure to make tough choices opt for documentation of the economy for instance, because the Middle East remittances, the Afghan jihad money,

An Overview Of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003)

petro-dollars and the aid money came easy. It has been a ruling class that has been on a perpetual picnic. On the internal security front too the situation has continuously deteriorated. Pakistani commentators endlessly cautioned against the fall-out of the klashnikov culture, the drug culture, the sectarian curse etc. Until recently all this has continued to flourish because of the failure of successive governments because of their own weaknesses and the lack of consensus among different state institutions on a strategy to deal with the problem.¹¹

Pakistan's legislature has witnessed many stormy scenes in its long history under various regimes. The denials of legislative requests to discuss foreign policy and the reluctance to bring foreign policy matters to the legislature have greatly reduced legislative participation. However, successive legislative assemblies have attempted to establish their position in foreign affairs by various methods, such as requesting the executive to take the people into confidence, protesting that the Assembly has not been informed, criticizing the foreign minister as an imperialist agent and moving cut motions on embassy expenditures. There are many incidents in which the government has closed discussion or ruled it out of order against the wishes of the members of the Assembly.

As far as military rule is concerned, no time is good for military rule, especially now when the world seems to be changing fast, we as a nation cannot afford military at the helm of affairs, making decisions on important national and international issues. It is difficult to tolerate military rule and still claim to be a part of the democratic world. Policies should be made and discussed in parliament before their implementation.

On issues like the Pak-India relations, the nuclear issue and Kashmir where Pakistan has adopted a wisely thought thorough policy, the Kargil episode being the exception. Pakistan's foreign policy has helped Pakistan to effectively deal with the security threats it has confronted. The tragic breakup of 1971 however was caused by the failure of the Pakistani state, weak governance and Indian aggression. Pakistan has never reconciled with the illegal occupation of Jammu and Kashmir by India. As a UN-acknowledged party to the Kashmir dispute Pakistan will continue to support the Kashmiri struggle for self-determination. But there is mismanagement and opportunity lost in relations with Afghanistan and Middle East. One-dimensional relations have led to developing tenuous and fragile relations with even our close friends. For

example, problems with Iran over Afghanistan has led to a crisis in our relations.

The state has consistently been able to take autonomous decisions in the foreign policy arena on key security issues. Minimal benefits that translate into peoples' prosperity and a nation's progress have been harvested from Pakistan's foreign policy. There has been a complete failure to capitalize on the economic front. Living off cash windfalls over the years the Pakistani state acquired a predatory non-productive character.

A proactive foreign policy conducted only on the security front. On the economic front the focus has been on acquiring aid and loans. Minimal effort was made to develop economic relations with our regional and distant friends. The economic benefits from successive foreign policy have fed the non-productive predatory state. Because of a weak state and a weak commercial activity operationally Pakistan has pursued a one-dimensional relationship in which economic relations have not been cultivated.

The country seems to have become diplomatically pressurized in this changing world; relations with traditional friends like Iran, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and the Gulf countries are either frozen or afflicted by irritants. The country's foreign policy establishment has lacked the political leadership and strategic direction or thought to exploit these.

The in-charge of foreign affairs knew very little about the art of diplomacy and the absence of a perceptive and well articulated public opinion on their own resources to fashion the country's international linkage. Pakistani leaders should adopt realist, practical and pragmatic foreign policies.

Conclusion

The conclusion from the above discussion has to be very clear that Pakistan's foreign policy having direct effect of domestic actors like military and bureaucracy and a very less effect or one must say no effect of Parliament. No impressive performance of Parliament is seen in the history of Pakistan's foreign policy and most crucial turning points in the foreign policy of Pakistan have taken place under pressure from military leadership.

An Overview Of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (1971 to 2003)

There is also a strong relationship between Pakistan's foreign policy and different inputs like, geo-politics, economic issues, historical legacies and leadership. The history of Pakistan's foreign policy shows that foreign policy making has been undertaken autonomously by the state and has not been responsive to populist pressures.

REFERENCES

¹ Nasim Zehra, Foreign Policy and Crises of Governance, Defense Journal, March, 2000,p.45.

² James N. Rosenau, "Fixed Determinants", in Amanullah Memon, (ed.) Reader: Foreign Policy of Pakistan. Islamabad, Allama Iqbal Open University, 1988, p.13.

³ Christopher Hill, The changing Politics of Foreign Policy. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 21.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Maleeha Lodhi, Pakistan's Encounter With Democracy. Lahore, Vanguard Books, 1994, pp.271-274.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Farooq Hasnat & Tahmina Rashid, "Implications of the 9/11: A Pakistani Perspectiveop" IPRI Journal,.Vol.iv,No.1,Winter 2004,p.93.

⁹ Daily Times, Lahore, February 26, 2004.

¹⁰ Robert Laporte, Jr., Power and Privilege: Influence and Decision Making in Pakistan. California, University of California Press, 1975, pp.11-13.

¹¹ Nasim Zehra, op.cit.

China's Regional Approach – New Dimensions

Dr. Muhammad Ijaz Butt

China shares a long border in its south with Pakistan, India, Nepal and Bhutan. It is a close neighbor of South Asia and significantly concerned with South Asian developments. During the cold war, China's policies towards South Asia were shaped firstly, by opposing Soviet social imperialism and hegemony and secondly thwarting Indian expansionism by supporting smaller South Asian states.¹

With the end of cold war and dissolution of the Soviet Union, a qualitative change has occurred in China's foreign policy. Firstly post Mao-China found the prudent leadership of Deng Xiaoping who introduced many reforms in the Communist system and under his guiding principles China has been pursuing earnestly the four modernization programs with emphasis on economic development. Secondly it considers itself as part of the developing world with flourishing GDP growth rate in the last decade. Thirdly it has been able to survive the economic crisis that hit other East Asian countries in 1997-98.²

Since 1991, China's foreign policy about South Asia has undergone with some noticeable changes. Now China does not want to impose itself in South Asia but desires South Asia to be a conflict free region that should be on the road to high development like itself. That is why it has urged strengthening of SAARC Forum and economic collaboration. It has also welcomed the January 2004 peace process in South Asia when former Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee visited Pakistan on occasion of 12th SAARC Summit. During the summit, the agreement for creation of SAARC Free Trade Area by 2006 was termed by China as a 'realistic approach of the member countries.'³

Fourthly, it desires South Asia to remain free from big powers rivalry. China has dispelled the impression of pursuing the goal for becoming a Super Power.⁴ It does not think it has the leverage to act as a mediator and therefore has stressed upon both India and Pakistan to resolve the Kashmir dispute through "mutual dialogue" and "bilateral means". It does not favour formation of blocks, pacts, or alliances but only in military and technical cooperation.⁵

In the Kargil crisis and during the 2001-2002 Indo-Pakistan military standoff, it urged upon the two countries to exercise maximum restraint and pleaded resolution of their problems through peaceful means.⁶

Fifthly, China is sensitive to nuclear proliferation in South Asia. On 12 May 1998 following the Indian nuclear tests, the Chinese Foreign Ministry stated “The Chinese government is seriously concerned about the nuclear tests conducted by India and the test ‘run counter to the current International trend and are not conducive to peace and stability in South Asia.’⁷ China also rejected as ‘totally unreasonable’ India’s stated rationale that it needs nuclear capabilities to counter a Chinese threat.”⁸

When Pakistan conducted nuclear tests in response to India, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said, “China has always advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and is opposed to any form of nuclear weapon proliferation. The Chinese government is deeply worried about this and feels uneasy about the present nuclear race in South Asia. We hereby call on countries concerned in South Asia to exercise the utmost restraint and to immediately abandon all nuclear weapons development programs to avoid a further worsening of the situation and for the sake of peace and stability in the South Asian region”.⁹

Sixthly, China is greatly concerned about the threats emanating from international terrorism. It has special concerns about the rise of radical Islamic Movement in Xinjiang and the activities of some separatist elements. That is why it tacitly accepted, if not openly welcomed the US military strikes to oust the Taliban regime in Afghanistan in October 2001.¹⁰

In the recent past, China had forwarded a list to Pakistan of what it claims are Xinjiang Islamic insurgents or Al-Qaeda members operating on Pakistani territory that it wants to be extradited. In this connection Pakistan’s interior Minister had visited Beijing. On his return he acknowledged “The Chinese government has provided us a list of wanted criminals and terrorists who have sought refuge in Pakistan. We would shortly take action against them”.¹¹

During the last four years, there has been a growing perception that the nature of Chinese relationship is undergoing a change. Change of leadership in China from old to new has been responsible for making its policies more pragmatic, largely subservient to the needs of changing

times, in keeping with the dynamics of its fast growing economy and of Beijing's geo-strategic role as a much bigger player in global politics.¹² Under this perception, China is building fruitful economic relations with India.

China does not want to intrude into South Asian affairs and tacitly discourages India's central thought of "non-hegemonistic" role. It does not want any outside powers to interfere in South Asian affairs to complicate the situation.

China no longer supports any Communist party or movement in India, Sri-Lanka, Nepal or Bangladesh as it did in the past. Its present motto is state to state rather than Comrade to Comrade relations.¹³ Earlier in the 1960s, to 1980s, smaller countries of South Asia were apprehensive of Pak-India and Sino-Indian rivalries and wanted to redress the balance by using the Chinese or Pakistani cards. But after 9/11, Russia and China have improved their relations and from 2004 the same trend has caught on between India and Pakistan. This has considerably eased the anxieties of small countries to take sides. Pak-China relations are historic and time-tested that has developed a momentum of their own – turning it into a model of friendship. Both countries have a strategic need for each other. China is one of the countries that are extending significant military and economic assistance to Pakistan and there are almost 148 Chinese aided development projects in Pakistan. On the other hand China is always grateful for Pakistan's past role in opening with the US and bringing it into the United Nations.¹⁴

Yet it would not help to remain smugly complacent about these relations. Inter-state relations like human relations need to be constantly nurtured and can turn sour if mutual interests and sensitivities are neglected or abused. Instead of being taken for granted, relationship should be assiduously cultivated and kept in good shape. Since 9/11 Pakistan has taken a U turn in its foreign policy and assumed the role of a frontline state against International Terrorism. The influence of United States has increased manifold and the government is providing intelligence, logistic and surveillance facilities to US officials in this strategically important region. China considers that fighting terrorism, is not the only objective of United States. As a matter of fact America wants to encircle China and to deny its access to the Central Asian huge oil reserves.¹⁵ The recent kidnapping of the Chinese engineers in the tribal areas that led to the death of one of them along with the killing of three others earlier in Gwadar were obviously designed to mar Sino-Pakistan relations.

Keeping in view the growing American influence in Pakistan, Sino-Pakistan experts are of the view that the two countries, while maintaining proximity in public, are actually drifting away from each other – a development that needs to be nipped now. Since in the long run, Pakistan would be the loser.¹⁶ Its friendship with China has withstood severe tests and stresses, while Washington has always betrayed it in its hour of distress.

A Futuristic Strategy: In view of the regional situation and the impact of developments at the global level, a proper strategy for security in the region should focus on the following facts:

1. There should be no doubt that the region has been in the throes of instability because of mutual conflicts between the states of the region as well as because of the proxy wars of global powers. This region is one of the the most backward areas in the world, in terms of development of human resources. It is, therefore, necessary to give attention to economic and social development.
2. In the present day world, which has shrunk to a global village, stability is impossible to achieve without preventing and eliminating the danger of aggression from any country. Adoption of a common strategy for meeting the challenge of hegemonic designs, whether at regional or global level, is becoming inevitable. China and Pakistan have exhibited exemplary cooperation in this regard. Maintaining these good relations and keeping the level of cooperation high, efforts should be made to include other countries of the region in any such scheme of mutual cooperation and working together. It is pertinent to note here that relations between Pakistan and Russia have improved during the last few years, while the relationship between China and Russia has become stronger. The need is to come up with a common vision and a scheme for joint actions, taking along the Central Asian states.
3. Instability in Afghanistan gives rise to instability in the whole region, besides being an obstacle in the way of full use of resources in the region for economic development. No doubt, this is a formidable challenge and interest of different countries even conflict with each other, at time, the common destiny requires that Afghanistan's neighbors should

increase mutual consultations and contacts and find out some common strategy. It should not be forgotten that instability in Afghanistan is exploited by the outsiders for their own intervention and presence in the region.

4. A review of the defense capabilities and technological development of the countries in the region establishes that India's efforts about acquiring latest, sophisticated military equipment along with developing its own nuclear and missile programs have Pakistan as their first target, and China as the second. However, defense strategies of both the countries and their close relations have prevented it from committing any aggression. It is necessary to keep a check on India's growing war capabilities.
5. Besides the hegemonic designs of India, the prolonged Kashmir issue between India and Pakistan poses a grave threat to regional security. Because of deep public emotions on both sides, the two countries cannot resolve the issue by themselves. All bilateral efforts have invariably failed to produce any tangible results, let alone a lasting solution of the contentious issue. It is, therefore, inevitable for the international community and the neighbors to play their role and try to enforce a judicious solution to it for the sake of peace in the region. Being a major country in the region as well as being a neighbor of both Pakistan and India, China can play a role in diffusing tension between Pakistan and India. It can play a better role than any 'outside' power. Obviously, no outside country can be as sincere in, or in as much need of, peace in the region as those situated here.
6. Along with the Kashmir issue, the question of Palestine and other problems are symbols of injustices committed in the past, yet they are victims of indifference of the international community and institutions. Continued insensitivity of the international community has turned political movements in these areas into armed struggles, which, in return, has led to an unending chain of violence and counter violence. Doubts and suspicions over the US-led war against terrorism carry weight: that is more about serving self-interests rather than elimination of terrorism, that this war has in fact increased the dangers to world peace. Before these suspicions come true and the situation get further aggravated, the need is to make international institutions stronger and more effective. Along with recognizing movements for right of self-

determination and distinguish between freedom struggle and terrorism, these institutions should be able to resist the US unilateralism and the US approach of bypassing international law and norms. Otherwise, wide-spread anger and frustration would feed those who can go to any extent of use of force for achieving ends.

7. While terrorism is being condemned everywhere, proper attention has not been paid to its causes. Terrorist activities in which human beings sacrifice their lives indicate to the height of frustration. This frustration is there among the Muslim masses because their genuine freedom struggles are being suppressed by repressive regime, on the one hand, while, on the other, their leadership do not represent their sentiments, nor do international institutions and powers exhibit any judicious approach or inclination in solving their problems.

Pak-China Institutional Collaboration: Continued strategic dialogue between China and Pakistan on security and defense issues at both governmental and institutional levels would greatly contribute to maintaining peace in the region. For this purpose, panel of experts should be formed. An enhanced level of interaction between the two countries, which have historically enjoyed exemplary relations, would also promote the idea of joint strategy for regional peace. Similarly, joint military exercise on regular basis and collaboration in R&D along with the continued sharing military know-how and technology would enable the two to face emerging challenges and war off threats and thus ensure peace in the region.

Economic and Trade Cooperation: The trend of closer regional ties, particularly closer cooperation in economic and trade fields, is fast emerging in the changing international situation. The nations living in different parts of the world are enhancing their relations with their neighbors in a way in which they not only learn from one another's experiences but where benefits of economic development can also be transferred and result in overall regional development. European Union is a significant example in this regard. Similarly, the increasing cooperation between South East Asian countries from the forum of (ASEAN) is brining stability and prosperity in that region.

Recommendations: The following suggestions are made in this regard:

1. In recent years, China has made enviable progress in economic and financial areas and, therefore, enjoys great importance in world economy. While the Chinese products and technology have flooded the world markets, other countries of the region are still dependent on Western countries in the fields of technology. By transferring technology to these countries, China can not only earn foreign exchange but can give a boost to economic development in these countries, which in turn goes to benefit the entire region.
2. Many Chinese companies are investing through-out the world. Chinese investors should invest in their neighboring countries where low level of economic development also owes to very small foreign direct investment (FDI). These countries, too, should try to make their laws more attractive for Chinese investment.
3. It is necessary for the promotion of regional cooperation in trade that all the countries give importance to marketing each other's products, so as to introduce them. Exhibitions and fairs should be organized at regional level for this purpose, and participation of traders and industrialists should be ensured.
4. There is a need to improve the existing land and air travel facilities between China, Pakistan, Central Asia and other countries of the region. The need is to fully use the historical Silk Route (Karakorum Highway), which remains closed for almost half of the year. All available means and resources should be exploited to devise a plan to keep this route open for the maximum period of the year.
5. Without the provision of banking facilities, it is impossible to think about expansion in economic and trade cooperation in today's world. But, banking links are very few between the countries of the region. In addition to opening the branches of national banks, China, Pakistan and other countries should also study the establishment of a common bank or financial institution.
6. The implementation from October 2003 of an agreement on transit traffic between Pakistan, China, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan is a good omen. It is, however, pertinent to note that this agreement had been signed in 1995, but could not

be implemented for eight years for petty matter like route permit and transit fees, etc. Such slow pace impedes regional cooperation and must be curbed in future. Now, the need is to make this agreement really effective, besides considering its expansion for the benefit of other landlocked countries like Afghanistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

7. To exploit the energy resources in the Central Asia, particularly in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, developed countries are not only strengthening the network of their multination companies for exploration of these resources, they are also trying to make such routes for easy access to these resources which could serve their long term goals as well. China's stewardship in this regard is the need of the hour. Chinese investors have an opportunity here to flow their money in this direction. Though Western countries have an edge in the oil exploration technology, yet joint ventures and investment with Western countries can be entered in to share in the benefits and use of these resources for the betterment of the people of the region. Afterwards, fast developing Gawadar Port (which provides nearest port to these countries) can be utilized. The need is to coordinate all efforts in this regard.
8. The construction of gas line from Turkmenistan to Pakistan through Afghanistan is in limbo because of the instability in Afghanistan. This gas line can also go further into India. This underscores the need of peace and stability in Afghanistan for better use of vast energy reserves of Central Asia, besides the development of Afghanistan itself.
9. China's northern province of Xingjian has common borders with eight countries, providing vast opportunities to China for extensive trade with these countries. Since 1967, there existed a trade agreement between China and Pakistan, but it ended in 2000. It aimed at enabling the people of Xingjian and Pakistan's Northern Areas to meet their needs from areas across the borders without being dependent on the far-off economic hubs of their respective countries. The need is to not only revive this agreement but also expand the area of its jurisdiction and inclusion of more trade items in it. Other countries, too, should move in this direction through either bilateral agreements or regional arrangements.
10. Afghanistan is in the throes of anarchy and destruction for the last about 30 years. An amount of \$15 billion has been

announced for its reconstruction and development. This process is slow as well as dominated by Western companies. There is an opportunity there to promote regional cooperation, for which China, Pakistan, and Iran should especially come forward to devise a common strategy.

11. The decisions of international financial institutions and World Trade Organization (WTO) do not much keep in view the interest of the developing countries. Countries in the region should evolve common strategies at these forums to protect their own interests.
12. Pakistan provides nearest approach to the Arabian Sea to the states of Central Asia, while Afghanistan is already benefiting from Pakistani harbor. Pakistan, along with Iran, provides way to Central Asian countries for their world trade.

References:

1. Francis A. Lees, 'China Super Power' St. Martin's Press, New York, 1997, p.12
2. Ibid
3. Daily Times, October 26, 2004.
4. Daily 'The Nation'
5. Khalid Rehman, 'Pakistan-China Relations in the 21st Century, Institute of Policy Study, Islamabad, p.70
6. Ibid, p.72
7. New York Time, May 13, 1998.
8. 'India's Nuclear Test Show fear of China' Wall Street Journal" New York, May 15, 1998.
9. 'China and the Nuclear Tests in South Asia' Centre for Non-Proliferation Studies' Monetary Institute of International Studies, USA, p.06.

China's Regional Approach – New Dimensions

10. The Nation, November 1, 2004.
11. 'Independent' Weekly Vol. 4, No.19, October 28-November 03, 2004, p.08
12. Ibid.
13. Fazal-ur-Rehman, 'Pakistan-China Relations in a Changing Geo-Strategic Environment' Strategic Studies'.
14. Dr. Muhammad Ijaz Butt, 'China Aided Development Projects in Pakistan' – Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan vol. XXXVII, No.3, July 2000
15. Benjamin Self, 'Asian Security Environment After 9/11' RIETI Policy Symposium 2003.
16. Independent, Op.cit.

Pakistan's Foreign Policy in the post 9/11 Security Environment: Challenges and Options

Dr. Nazir Hussain

The US led international coalition's war on terror has not only altered the strategic dynamics of Afghanistan and then Iraq, it has also affected Pakistan immensely. Responding to the US call for help, Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf considering Pakistan's strategic interests to the economic recovery, to ensure the security of its nuclear installations and to keep the Kashmir issue alive, agreed to extend full cooperation to the US. Therefore the post 9/11 international environment changed strategic dynamics of Pakistan's security policy. Pakistan, once again, became a frontline state for the ongoing war against terror. By abandoning its Afghan policy, Pakistan managed to avoid being labeled as a country sponsoring terrorism but at the same time it created enormous internal and external challenges for Pakistan.

This paper is an attempt to highlight some of the security challenges faced by Pakistan in the post 9/11 period. The paper is divided into three parts; the first part shall provide a comparative analysis of international and regional security environment in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks and in the present scenario; the second part would deal with the challenges faced by Pakistan in the changing security environment at internal, regional and international levels; and the third part shall suggest some options available to Pakistan for safeguarding its strategic assets and national interests.

Security Environment

Attacks on World Trade Center and the Pentagon were a direct threat to American homeland and this single incident changed the security environment of the whole world. US president's clear message that "either you are with us or with the terrorists" left no choice for Pakistan except to join the international coalition against terrorism.¹

9/11 multiplied Pakistan's security problems. Traditional hostility with India saw a new dimension. Indian propaganda put Pakistan at the defensive. There was a military stand off between the two states for a year. Increased Indian hostility coupled with hostile Afghan leadership posed a two front war scenario first time since the creation of Pakistan.²

Other countries like China did not want to be engaged in Indo-Pakistan dispute. Iran's improved relations with India worsened the situation for Pakistan. Thus Pakistan was facing a gloomy situation at the regional level.

At international level Pakistan's pro-US policy isolated it with other powers of the world. Pakistan was forced to make compromises on its Kashmir policy. Apparently relations were friendly but US continued to follow policy of coercion against Pakistan to achieve its own objectives. US was also critical about Pakistan's nuclear program. India became a priority partner for US, thus it did not support Pakistan during crisis with India. US treatment to Pakistan had always been according to its own needs.³

In the post 9/11 scenario Pakistan was faced with many challenges. It managed to tackle some of these problems by providing its unprecedented support to the USA, which made Pakistan a major non-NATO ally, but still this policy shift has continued to result in many problems at internal level, as outlined by President Pervaiz Musharraf. While addressing the joint session of parliament on January 17, 2003, the president said, "Pakistan is today facing four dangerous allegations, spreading terrorism from tribal areas to Afghanistan, cross border terrorism in Kashmir, proliferation of nuclear weapons and an impression of our society as being intolerant. Besides these negative impressions, the Muslim Ummah, of which Pakistan is an important member, is faced with difficulties and confusion and Islam is being projected as a religion of extremism."⁴

Terrorism/Extremism

Since years Pakistani society is being influenced by the nature of Taliban ideology, because a large number of Taliban have obtained their religious education from Pakistan and have developed strong ties especially with the people of NWFP and Balochistan provinces. Post 9/11 US military operations in Afghanistan forced the remnants of Al-Qaeda and Taliban to flee the country and to seek refuge with the sympathizers and hideouts in inaccessible areas bordering Pakistan.⁵ Numerous operations were conducted without the consent of provincial government and local tribal elders, annoyed them and consequently developed hostile feelings towards Pakistan army and central government.⁶ In spite of the fact that Pakistani authorities apprehended and subsequently handed over 500 suspected Al-Qaeda terrorists to the

US authorities,⁷ the world still believes that Pakistan is not sincere enough in nabbing these elements. Afghan government started blaming Pakistan for harboring and organizing Taliban. Afghanistan president Hamid Karzai, while giving an interview to a western journalist claimed the he had received credible information that Mullah Umer was seen offering Friday prayers at a mosque in Quetta city.⁸ This was strongly denied by the Pakistani authorities. These exchanges of blames led to the development of mistrust between the two states.

Hence, Pakistan is facing the serious allegations of spreading terrorism from tribal areas to Afghanistan. Al-Qaeda remnants are thought to be present in the tribal belt of Pakistan. After the military operation in Waziristan agency and the support of local population to the Al-Qaeda remnants situation has become even worst. Western world considers Pakistan a partner in the coalition against terror thus expects that it can track down on terrorist elements, whether local or foreign, operating from its territory. Pakistan has been, and is, extending all-out support to combat Al-Qaeda and Taliban remnants with the army going into the tribal areas for the first time since Independence.⁹ The massive military operation against Al-Qaeda elements in Wana, South Waziristan Agency, was clear proof of Pakistan's commitment to the war on terror. However, Pakistan also chose to use non-violent means to detach its tribal population from the foreign elements sheltered by them.¹⁰ Because it would have otherwise worsened the situation for Pakistan internally. After Pakistani authorities' negotiations and granting of amnesty to five tribal elders in South Waziristan Agency, US and Afghan troops intruded into the Lowara region, North Waziristan Agency. This was followed by the US commander in Afghanistan, General David Barno's statement expressing concerns over the granting of amnesty and urging Pakistan to kill or capture foreign militants in the region as they were still allegedly using that area for attacks inside Afghanistan.¹¹ The intrusion incident has since been repeated a number of times, and General Barno's statement led to a serious reaction from Pakistan. The Foreign Office Spokesman said that Pakistan made its own decisions and Pakistan considered that political track to resolve the issue was as important as the military track.¹²

The government has very small room to contrive between the alienation of the local people and satisfying the international community. So far the government has hardly satisfied the demands of the outside world but earned the displeasure of its own people. The authorities have lost the trust of the tribals and the outside world is equally dissatisfied unless all

the militants are eliminated, which seems unlikely in the short term. So this pose a grave challenge to Pakistan that at one side it is fighting a war against its own people and on the other hand it had been unable to satisfy the west.

There are many misperceptions about the nature of Pakistani society, the remarkable success of its religious parties in the 2002 elections. Pakistani society is seen as Talibanised; its army under the fundamentalist hold and its polity led by Jihadi and fundamentalist forces. In Pakistan, there has been the problem of sectarian terrorism and the state had begun outlawing many groups linked to this, much before September 11, 2001.¹³ However, with a focus on trans-national extremist groups, the sectarian problem has tended to take second place with the result that it has become exacerbated once again.

Although the extremist elements in Pakistan are in a minority but they have robust network and have the power to wreak havoc in the peaceful lives. One fails to understand as to which brand of Islam they are propagating which has not only tarnished Pakistan's image abroad but has also brought an otherwise peaceful religion, to be viewed in negative terms. This very fact is enough to prove that such elements are being used by some foreign hands to ruin Pakistan's image as a peaceful country.

Today, however, despite the fact that all the extremist organizations are banned, sectarianism continues to exact its toll. The government is ultimately detested in this regard on having failed to prevent the rise of sectarianism, to root out the cause behind these shameful acts. The government has taken important steps in this direction but how far they have been effective is still questionable.

Kashmir

At the regional level, Pakistan is under increasing pressure to withdraw all manners of support for the Kashmir struggle for self-determination and accept the LOC as international border to resolve the Kashmir issue. After 9/11 India launched propaganda against Pakistan maligning it as a state sponsoring terrorism. India managed to link legitimate freedom struggle with terrorism, thus pressurizing Pakistan to abandon its Kashmir policy. Pakistan is being asked to restrain freedom fighters that are actually fighting against the Indian army in occupied Kashmir. India repeatedly accused that Pakistan is involved in cross border terrorism in

Kashmir. Sensing the international mood and lack of support to Pakistan's stand, government has drifted from its decade old position on Kashmir and is showing signs of compromise so that the dispute could be settled and with hopes of gaining something. Today it remains the fact that despite a big change in Pakistan stand on Kashmir issue, international environment is still not conducive to resolve Kashmir dispute in Pakistan's favor.

Nuclear Proliferation

Pakistan's nuclear capability is perceived as posing a global threat in view of unrelenting Indian and western propaganda of this capability passing into the hands of extremist and terrorists. Proliferation issue has generated a heated debate in the country especially after the scandal over illicit nuclear deals by Pakistani scientist Dr. A. Q. Khan with North Korea, Iran and Libya. The Pakistani connection was first revealed during September 2003 Iran-IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) standoff. Iran claimed that the traces of highly enriched uranium found at one of its nuclear facility were contaminated by the previous owner, which was Pakistan. Then, the American disclosure that the warhead design flown from Libya starkly resembles the Pakistani warheads, confirmed these allegations. Lastly, it was Dr. Khan who accepted in a personal apology to the country on this issue and revealed that North Korea was also a part of this link.¹⁴ Though Pakistani establishment claimed that it was Dr. A. Q. Khan alone, who for his personal benefits sold the Pakistan's know-how of nuclear weapons technology to these countries, it brought Pakistan's claim of nuclear safety under question.

This scandal posed a direct threat to the Pakistan's nuclear program and it requires serious consideration. The US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's April 2005 visit to Pakistan and her statement during the visit that the US still has to ensure that all the tentacles of A. Q. Khan's network have been cut implies that this issue is not over yet.¹⁵ Though surprisingly the US has not pressurized Pakistan regarding its nuclear program mainly due to Pakistan's role in war on terror but still there are fears that Pakistan would be pressurized on this issue in the future. However, Pakistan's said that it would not rollback its nuclear program claiming that the country's nuclear assets were fully protected under a perfect and multi-layered control system.¹⁶

Options

The post 9\11 security environment has further dissipated the regional divide, especially from Pakistan's security perspective. With new external powers now directly interacting in the region and with the US pushing for an aggressive global policy premised on military force, Pakistan would have to make itself strong internally, to focus on regional allies and a more aggressive diplomatic pro-activism.

War on terrorism is losing direction and Pakistan must reevaluate its course on this front. It must reevaluate its foreign and domestic policy. There is need to focus on the domestic compulsions of extremism and terrorism to reassess a consensual and vibrant domestic policy. The Balochistan situation, with special reference to Bugti tribe, needs to be contained in order to prevent any such development to move further. Here one should also guard against US adventurism. External strength and out-reach are directly proportional to a country's internal strength and that is where real odds are against Pakistan and the country face the actual danger. It is in and through these weaknesses that India is likely to work despite the ongoing peace process. Pakistani decision-makers need to develop policies to counter internal weaknesses because that is where our external strength lies.

Some of the policy options open to Pakistan for addressing domestic as well as international security predicaments have been highlighted:

Internal level

Wipe out the menace of internal terrorism, not merely to please the western audience but primarily for Pakistan to be more progressive and balanced state in the world. Internal disharmony and fanaticism can only be defeated through economic and social measures like elimination of social injustices, economic deprivation, and persecution of the apprehended terrorists according to the law of the state. It must be dealt through political and psychological approach. Strict check must be enforced in regulating the use of mosques and Madrassahs. Make concerted efforts to eliminate infiltration in the occupied Kashmir and let diplomacy be given a chance to prevail at the moment, for the good of future generations of both the countries. Steps should be taken so that current peace process is not derailed. Intelligence and security agencies must be made more effective in dealing with terrorists organizations like

Al-Qaeda and prevent their regrouping and using Pakistani soil for any such activities.

Regional Level

Relationship with Afghanistan must be developed on stronger basis. State level interaction need to be enhanced to remove the anomalies and misunderstandings. Any Taliban retreating to Pakistan must be deported in full view of the media and not allowed to make new bases or sanctuaries in Pakistan. Exploit Afghanistan's dependence on Pakistan for land routes. Economic compulsions in due course would force Afghanistan to take and maintain a friendlier view of Pakistan and would lead to a lasting solution to the Durand line.

Strategic cooperation with China has to be enhanced for military gains; parity with India can only be achieved with China's active assistance. China's grievances regarding Pakistan's close relations with US should be addressed.

Relations with India should be based on equal footings. Ongoing peace process should be consolidated with concrete steps. But Pakistan, at the same time must be wary of the US intention to make India a great power as the various statements from the American official, show and also the Indo-US defense agreement, cooperation in space and civilian nuclear technology. The reversal in Afghanistan and its tricking similarity to the armed freedom struggle in Kashmir suggests change in the instrument of policy to political means coupled with diplomatic overtures at all available forums. Indian propaganda of Pakistan's involvement in 'cross border terrorism' should be countered at all possible levels, because, slowly but steadily it is undermining Pakistan's position on "war on terror". Sharing on terrorism to curb terrorist acts against each other. This should include mutual exchange of information on terrorist camps in each other's country and its subsequent verification by the UN military observers. International fact-finding mission may be asked by Pakistan to assess Indian projected cross border terrorism and state terrorism unleashed by Indian defense forces to counter the Indian allegation. Initiate military to military discussion on the reduction of each other's apprehensions. And steps should be taken so that a new arms race is not commenced between the two.

International Level

Pakistan should convince the US and rest of the western world that it is a responsible nuclear state. For that matter Pakistan should reiterate its unstinted commitment to the global/regional non-proliferation efforts.

Pakistan must closely monitor the new changing security environment at global level and increase its cooperation with Russia and European countries. Russia being an important actor in the region, having strong linkages with Iran and India, needs to accord its due status, which is long overdue. Pakistan should maintain cordial relations with United States as long as its national interests remain in alignment. Pakistan must make an effort to draw more benefit from the US in terms of political, diplomatic and economic fields. Pakistan should convince the US that it is politically stable and least likely to fall into the hands of radicals, and that its nuclear cores have safe mechanism against the threat of terrorists.

Pakistan should move in the direction of developing good relations with Israel which subsequently would lead to the recognition of Israel, thereby eliminating or at least neutralizing a major threat to its nuclear program.

Conclusion

In the post 9/11 period the world has become more unstable and anarchic. The concept of threat has assumed new dimensions. Threat is no longer restricted to a defined state and its capabilities. Threat perceiver has to work on different dimensions of a threat including economic and non-state actors. In addition to the conventional threat of state actors, undeclared and covert capabilities of non-state actors may also lower the nuclear threshold of threatened nuclear capable countries. Such a dynamic and volatile situation poses many challenges to countries like Pakistan. Though situation on the frontiers is satisfactory since Pakistan is enjoying relatively much better situation with India and Afghanistan but still it has to preserve its security at internal level. Economic interests and economic stability in the country should also be preserved. There is fear that as soon as the war on terror in Afghanistan ends Pakistan may face further international pressure in the form of sanctions and direct threat because of its internal instability and nuclear proliferation issue.

References

- ¹ Dr. Shireen M. Mazari, 'Pakistan in the Post-9/11 Milieu', *Strategic Studies*, vol. XXII, no. 3, Autumn 2002.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ See Najam Rafique, '9/11, A Year After: Apprising US Regional Strategies', *Strategic Studies*, vol. XXII, no. 3, Autumn 2002 and Rizwan Zeb, 'US Interests in South Asia: Effects on Pakistan', *Margalla Papers2004*, Islamabad, National Defence College.
- ⁴ Address to the Joint Session of the Parliament January 17, 2003, published by Directorate of Films and Publications, Ministry of Information and Media, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad.
- ⁵ See for details, Nazir Hussain, 'War on Terrorism: Implications for Pakistan', *Al-Siyasa* (department of Political Science Programme in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore) Special Conference Issue, Summer 2003.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Rizwan Zeb, 'War Against Terrorism: Lessons for Pakistan', *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. XXV, no. 3, Spring 2002.
- ⁸ Scott Baldauf and Owais Tohid, 'Pakistan region remains haven for Taliban in war on US', *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 11, 2003.
- ⁹ See Nazir Hussain, 'War on Terrorism: Implications for Pakistan', *Al-Siyasa* (department of Political Science Programme in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore) Special Conference Issue, Summer 2003 and Rizwan Zeb, 'War Against Terrorism: Lessons for Pakistan', *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. XXV, no. 3, Spring 2002.
- ¹⁰ Nazir Hussain, 'War on Terrorism: Implications for Pakistan', *Al-Siyasa* (department of Political Science Programme in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore) Special Conference Issue, Summer 2003.

¹¹ Pamela Constable, 'New Strategy Calls for Wooing Some in Taliban: US Forces in Afghanistan To Vary Tactics by Region', *Washington Post*, December 21, 2003.

¹² Foreign Office Spokesman, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Islamabad, Government of Pakistan, December 22, 2003.

¹³ Nazir Hussain, 'War on Terrorism: Implications for Pakistan', *Al-Siyasa* (department of Political Science Programme in Diplomacy and Strategic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore) Special Conference Issue, Summer 2003.

¹⁴ David Albright and Corey Hinderstein, 'Unraveling the A. Q. Khan and Future Proliferation Networks', *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 28, no.2, Spring 2005.

¹⁵ K. Ratnayake, 'US Secretary of State presses India and Pakistan to abandon Iranian gas pipeline', March 31, 2005, at www.wsws.org

¹⁶ 'Strategic assets in safe hands: Foreign Office' *Dawn* (Daily Islamabad) July 22, 2005.

Strategic Partners or Tactical Allies: Pak-US relations in the post-9/11 era

Rashid Ahmad Khan

This paper is based on the hypothesis that despite the assertions made by Islamabad and Washington that Pakistan and the United States have entered into a “long term strategic relationship” after 9/11, the latter still considers the former a tactical ally rather than a strategic partner.

To prove this hypothesis reference is made to:

- (1) the earlier phases of Pak-US relations during Cold War era and anti-Soviet struggle in Afghanistan:
- (2) the nature and level of US assistance to Pakistan since the latter joined the anti-terror global coalition led by the United States.
- (3) American policy objectives in the region, especially South Asia and Pakistan's perspectives:
- (4) U S perspectives on terrorism, nuclear non-proliferation, Indo-US relations and the rise of China.
- (5) US policy towards West Asia, particularly Iraq, Palestine, Iran and Afghanistan:
- (6) American insistence on Pakistan to do more in putting an end to what the US calls “cross-border infiltration” across LoC in Kashmir and pressure for Pak-Afghan joint operations against the remnants of Taliban in the Tribal Areas of Pakistan.

This is a well known fact that before the terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001, relations between Pakistan and the United States were at the lowest level. This was evident from a number of sanctions imposed by the United States on the country. In addition to the sanctions that were already in force, the United States imposed new sanctions when Pakistan in response to Indian nuclear explosions carried out its atomic tests in May 1998. Pakistan was subjected to new sanctions known as democracy sanctions, when the military led by COAS General Pevaz Musharraf deposed the former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif on 12 October 1999. These sanctions put heavy strain on the economy of Pakistan. Its Foreign Exchange reserves depreciated considerably and the country suffered from worsening balance of payments problem. Pakistan during those days was called the most sanctioned country in the world.

In contrast, relations between the United States and India, particularly under Clinton Administration were expanding in all fields, including military. The United States and India were focusing on the expansion of their relations in the economic and trade areas. The US investment in India was also on the rise.

However, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 brought about fundamental transformation in Pak-US relations. The change took place as a result of Pakistan's decision to provide logistical assistance to the United States for carrying out air attacks on Afghanistan, which led to the ouster of Taliban regime and installation of Northern Alliance-led government in Kabul in December 2001. Pakistan's assistance to the United States in military operation against the Taliban was of crucial importance to the United States for two reasons: geographical proximity and previously close relations with the regime of Taliban. Pakistan also joined the global coalition against terrorism and handed over to the United States more than 500 former members of Taliban and al-Qaeda suspected of masterminding the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Pakistan's role and cooperation in war against terrorism was openly acknowledged and appreciated by the United States. In appreciation of Pakistan's role and help in war against terrorism, the Administration of President George W. Bush has not only relaxed some of the sanctions against Pakistan, it has also signed with Pakistan a multi-billion dollar aid package that includes economic as well military components. The recent decision by the Bush Administration to sell nuclear capable F-16 planes to Pakistan represents further enhancement in the level of American commitment to strengthen Pakistan's security as a reward for the latter's contributions in war against terrorism.

But do these measures constitute a basis for a long-term strategic relationship between Pakistan and the United States? The question is pertinent in view of the past experience of Pakistan as America's Cold War ally and partner in Afghan resistance against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan from 1980 to 1989.

Pak-US relations during the Cold War and War in Afghanistan

During the Cold War period, Pak-US relations were marked by bilateral security ties and alliance relationship under regional defence pacts like Baghdad Pact (later CENTO) and SEATO. Under these security arrangements, Pakistan received substantial economic and military assistance, which, no doubt, went a long way in strengthening Pakistan's

economy and defence, but was never a basis for a long term strategic relationship between the two countries. The reason was that there was a divergence of perceptions between Pakistan and the United States on the objectives of the defence pacts. Similar was the case with regard to Afghanistan. The goal of America's involvement in war in Afghanistan was only the expulsion of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan. Once that goal was achieved, Pak-US relations reverted back to a low level.

Pak-US relations after 9/11

Although American officials, including President Bush and Secretary Condoleezza Rice describe the current relations between Pakistan and the United States as based on long term strategic relationship, a close analysis of American assistance to Pakistan would reveal that it is geared only to improve Pakistan's role in, both internally and externally, in war against terrorism as perceived by the United States. Even the sale of F-16 planes is not going to alter conventional military balance in South Asia in Pakistan's favour, and as a statement by an official of the US State Department implied it is linked with Pakistan's persecution of war on terror.

America's Policy Objectives in the region.

Terrorism, non-proliferation and democracy are among the top priorities of President Bush during his second term. Since Pakistan has its own perspectives on these issues, Pak-US relations may experience some strains in future.

American policy in the Middle East and the attitude towards Iran

These policies may widen the divergence between Pakistan and the United States as historically the problem of Palestine and friendship with Iran have been very sensitive issue in Pakistan

American policy on Kashmir and Afghanistan

Although United States has played the role of a successful and effective facilitator in reducing the tension between Pakistan and India and bringing the two countries to negotiating table under the on-going composite dialogue process, there is still pressure on Pakistan to do more in completely preventing the infiltration across the LOC. The United States is also engaged in the behind the scene efforts to move Pakistan

and India closer to the resolution of Kashmir dispute but is reluctant to put sufficient pressure on India to show flexibility on the Kashmir issue.

Similarly, the United States is asking for Pakistan's logistic support to ISAF in Afghanistan in fight against Taliban elements suspected of mounting attacks from the Pakistani side of Afghan border. Recently there has been increase in the Taliban attacks inside Afghanistan in which a number of American soldiers have also died. In the coming months when the snow on the hills melts, these attacks may pick up. This will generate American demands from Pakistan to take further actions against suspected Taliban elements believed to be based in Pakistan's Tribal Areas.

Indo-US relations and American perception of rise of China as a major economic Power

Despite progress in the movement towards Indo-Pak reconciliation under the on-going peace process and new Chinese outlook on its relations with the countries of South Asia, China and India will continue to remain two important factors in Pakistan's foreign policy, of course for different reasons.

After the recently concluded visit of Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Pakistan and China have laid down a new and stable foundation for a secure relationship in strategic as well as in the economic and commercial fields. The new relationship is symbolized by the signing of about two dozen agreements for cooperation in a number of fields and a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Good neighbourly relations between the two countries. Whatever changes may take place in the geo-strategic environment at the regional or global levels, close cooperation with China will remain the corner stone of Pakistan's foreign policy. However, divergent US perception about the rising China is likely to have implications for Pak-US relations.

Similarly, growing Indo-Soviet relations, particularly in the military fields will also remain a matter of concern for Pakistan. The Statement by Secretary Condoleezza Rice on American help to India to make it a major power should be carefully studied by Pakistan.

Conclusion

The developments following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have impelled Pakistan and the United States to forge a new relationship based on close cooperation in war against terrorism and enhanced level of US economic and military assistance to Pakistan. Under the new relationship, Pakistan has increased its role and cooperation at international levels through bilateral agreements with a number of countries. In this way the role of Pakistan has become more crucial in fight against terrorism. This will reinforce America's commitment to a stronger and prosperous Pakistan to serve as a bulwark against the forces of extremism and terrorism. But this commitment falls short of a long term strategic relationship as American assistance to Pakistan is linked with Pakistan's ability and willingness to cooperate in war against terrorism.

The future of Pak-US relations also depends upon what happens in Afghanistan, Iran, Central Asia and also in relations between China and the United States. Pakistan, therefore, should adopt a realistic approach to its relations with the United States of America. The current level of Pak-US relations does not suggest that United States has accepted Pakistan as a strategic ally. There are still serious U.S reservations about Pakistan, especially the control and protection of nuclear weapons. The United States is also not ready to support Pakistan's membership as a nuclear weapon state. On the contrary, in recent statement, the US official had called upon Pakistan, India and Israel to give up nuclear weapons and join NPT as non-nuclear weapon states.

Post 9/11 Challenges for Pakistan: Trends in Foreign Policy, Regional and Global Perspective

Dr. Razia Musarrat

The relations of the Muslim World with Christian countries wavered between harmony and hostility over the fourteen centuries. The pathways of the Muslim world and the west have crisscrossed on many occasions. After World War II, the emergence of Israel created the Palestinian problem. Consequently clear American support for Israel has also generally antagonized Muslims. While the governments of Muslim countries could be brought under many kinds of pressures including sanctions, non-state actors could not be easily controlled. Like resistance against Israelis, the Russian attack on Afghanistan was met with a violent reaction, which was finally exploited by the United States. During this period Muslims from many countries joined in this struggle against the Russians. These "Mujahids" were gradually armed by the US with highly sophisticated weapons, which led to the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan. This was followed by mutually destructive warfare between various factions of Afghan resistance. During this period, seasoned Muslim fighters returned to their state of origin and organized militant outfits to pursue their ideals based on their worldview. This led to many stresses and strains in their politically fragile societies. During the period, after the demise of the Soviet Union, the United State was generally blamed for most of the Muslim miseries. A similar disappointment process also happened in the Soviet Union. While Tataristan and Bashkiristan followed policies that were politically acceptable to the Kremlin, Chechnya was radicalized and became a nightmare for Russia.

Finally, Afghanistan emerged as the alma mater for Islamic revolutionaries. Lacking political synergy of the European Union and the military strength of NATO, some Muslim idealists began to organize secret, transitional networks, which were opposed to the interests of the West. As a reaction, several frustrating operations were under-taken to punish Osama Bin Ladin until September 11, 2001 when the twin towers and Pentagon were struck by high jacked aircrafts. This incident exposed the weak security measures of the West to a new kind of threat. In retaliation, many malcrimes against Muslims were committed in the United State. Consequent to these incidents, Al-Qaeda and Taliban were blamed and Afghanistan was subjected to a new kind of warfare. This "war on terror" was expanded. While Pakistan sided with the anti-terrorist

Post 9/11 Challenges for Pakistan

coalition, Iraq could not satisfy the US. With available evidence, the British-American nexus hardcore decided to invade Iraq. In this period, policy change, regime change and doctrine of preemption (unilateralism) became buzzwords. However, after occupation, Iraq witnessed the emergence of armed resistance, and the “War on terror” acquired an even more frustrating dimension. Malaysian Prime Minister, Mahathir Mohammad, charged at the 116nations Nonaligned Movement’s (NAM) summit meeting at Kuala Lumpur that the war against Iraq was no longer just against terrorism. It was in fact, war to dominate the world. Post war period witnesses the inability of the US to produce sufficient evidence of weapons of mass destruction. This also led to widespread disillusionment with the US policies, which initially sidelined the United Nations. Meanwhile, anger continued to grow in the Middle East due to the oppressive policies of Israel, which in the eyes of Arabs, enjoyed US support.

During this highly fluid environment, Muslims in general are questioning if Iran and Syria would be attacked next? Indeed more serious issues of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction have emerged. Iran was blamed for developing nuclear weapons while Syria was supposed of attempting to acquire biological weapons. This war is constantly being fought on the media. This is being done despite public threats from Al-Qaeda, which have purportedly been directed against US as a consequence of maltreatment of Guantanamo Bay Prisoners. From this vague notion of War against terror, a decree against WMD has also been directed against North Korea to denuclearize it. This becomes even more alarming when viewed in the context of US backed denuclearization scenarios visualized for Pakistan as outlined their war games.

Post 9/11 Challenges for Pakistan:

The historic transformation experience between 1989 brought changes all over the world. The bipolar system based upon two opposing geopolitical blocks, and two competing powers was shattered. Communist regimes in Eastern Europe collapsed – the Berlin Wall fell. After the Soviet defeat in Afghanistan and the “velvet revolution”, in Eastern Europe, it became fashionable on America’s part to “beat its swords not into plowshares, but into micro ships”¹

Owing to his implusion of the Soviet Union, the power structure had adopted a more complex shape. In the wake of Gulf War 1991, United States’ then president presented his vision of a New World Order.² The

most striking characteristic of New World Order is the hegemony of one super power, USA. The Western block became its 'coalition partner' to strengthen its new role. The United States re-assessed its foreign policy priorities and reshaped them on the basis of free trade, democracy, human rights, world peace and universal government. The Security Council of United Nations and the whole structure of the international relations appear to have come under the direct hegemony of USA. This situation brought a system change in economic, political, social and military environment, which has effected the whole environment, also affecting Pakistan. Pakistan possesses a unique geo-political and geo-strategic position in the world. It is comprised of an area of 310,402 square miles. Its population is over 33.8 million. It was divided into two parts separated by a 1000-mile long stretch of the Indian Territory. It has a southern coastline fronting on to the all-important Arabian Sea. To its west lies Iran, providing Pakistan its links with West Asia. To the northwest Afghanistan and Kashmir are situated. To its northeast lies People's Republic of China. Its eastern border shares with India, its major rival in the region. Geographical location is the most important factor in determining the nation's foreign policy commitments and to shape its interests. It determines state's position in the world. Pakistan's unique geographical status of proximity with the Soviet Central Asian republics, access to the strategic Gulf region and to West Asia make it strategically important but weak in terms of security.

At domestic level, Pakistan can be classified as a new state with an old society. Pakistan has been pervaded by chronic political instability, lack of clear sense of national identity, sub-per economic performance, and deteriorating institutions. Despite its attempts for democracy, it has experienced for most of the time a centrally controlled administration of feudal lords, bureaucrats and military men. It is safe to say that at domestic level, fragile democracy, economic, constitutional and governance problems and relationships with foreign countries have been the inevitable factors for Pakistan policy makers to think over while determining its foreign policy, Because "a foreign policy pursued by a nation in its dealing with other nations designed to achieve national objectives"³ Thus the primary task of policy makers in Pakistan is to articulate the country's external interests, fix the priorities and order them in some scheme of relative importance.

The government designed various policies but the external pressures generated by the new global environment posed challenges in the form

of globalization, regionalism, terrorism, non-proliferation and Islamic fundamentalism.

The Challenge of Globalization:

As America emerged victorious in the Cold War, it started materializing its dream of world governance through the tools of globalization.

It is imperative to note that the super power imposed new conditions that international aid was to be provided to those nations that shall proved themselves capable of sustained economic growth by encouraging both international and domestic foreign investment and showed an improved record of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom of their people and the rest of the world.

In this situation Pakistan felt betrayed. Despite being ruled by elected democratic government Pakistan could not obtain much benefits from the given world scenario. Such a situation came to the surface when economic sanctions were imposed by America in the backdrop of Pakistan's nuclear program as well as its alleged military assistance to the Kashmir in freedom struggle against India or the charge of terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism to aid the Afghan guerrilla groups which were once the blue eyed boys of the United State during Soviet Afghan war.

After 09/11, in the era of globalization, the internal economy of Pakistan reveals its inability to defend its economic stratum from outside actors. After the establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO), Pakistan as one of its 117 signatories has been forced to act upon the conditions of these institutions for receiving aid and loans. Pakistan is taking economic assistance form IMF and World Bank under the hard conditionality. In such conditions, the natural trade and industry cannot grow to make any considerable economic headway. At present Pakistan is under a debt burden of about 35 billion. It needs more loans for alleviating poverty and upgrading the banking system etc.

In order to meet the demands of IMF, Pakistan has to confront price hike. This increases strains on transportation and industry. The purchasing capacity of the consumer declines and the pace of production low down. It is safe to say that theoretically IMF assists democratic countries but in actual practice, it imposes unilateral policies upon the poor countries in a dictatorial fashion.⁴ The same dictatorship can be seen in Pakistan's

economy. Due to the policies of the IMF the future of the local industry in Pakistan is hanging in darkness.

This free trade is dangerous for Pakistan. Our country should have such sovereign power that could deter the capitalism and privatizing consequences. The current economic condition in Pakistan reflects many negative trends, which have emerged out of the influence of international donors and transnational corporations. The influential role of IFI, in Pakistan is apparent. They are promoting income inequalities among the people. The capital flight by multinational corporations has also disturbed Pakistan's economy.⁵

The contemporary global order has made Pakistan dependent on the IFI, and other consortium countries in the West. Pakistan's sustainability is conditioned by its viable and stable political system. Pakistan has to boost up its economy in the presence of global multinational companies. A way to counter the forces of globalization is to develop financial and institutional development. We should make it clear to him World Bank that Pakistan is not in a position of debt servicing at the moment.

Different international banks in Pakistan are giving loans to public employees to purchase computer and other luxuries. It may be noted, "Pakistan is a land of Asian Sub Continent where theory and practice live apart."⁶ Pakistan is an Islamic country. It has Islamic ideology yet black market could be found everywhere. People are living in posh areas but unable to get drinking water.

Globalization has affected deeply Pakistan's social, political and economic system. Western liberal market has captured the local market in Pakistan. Pakistan is a polarized society. It has many linguistic, ethnic, parochial and religious divisions. Thus Pakistan with heterogeneous culture and ethnic conflict has not been able to develop a sense of nationhood among the people. Increased participation of the people in national and international affairs is required. It needs devolution of powers to the grassroots level. Feudalism should be eliminated through literacy and enlightenment. Specialization of functions is a requirement in tacking the current rush of globalization. Every one should perform his functions according to his capability. Economic nationalism should be encouraged to increase love for local goods and services.

The Challenge of Nuclear Non-Proliferation:

Nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament have become challenges for Pakistan. Pakistan's worldview is characterized by a deep sense of insecurity. This condition is because of a hostile regional environment. Pakistan has traditionally perceived serious threats to its independence and territorial integrity from India.⁷ The issue of Kashmir, still unresolved, is at the heart of rivalry between India and Pakistan. Pakistan continues to regard India as the major and active threat to its national security.

Given the fact that Pakistan and India are now nuclear potential armed, the possibility of a conflict involving the first use of nuclear weapons since 1945 remains all too real. Today, neither of the governments appears to have made the political decision that its national interest would be served by movement toward genuine détente and a Kashmir settlement - except on its own terms.⁸ During the Cold War period Pakistan was serving the US interests in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union. Therefore, the US turned a blind eye to Pakistan's nuclear project. After the disintegration of Soviet Union, US adopted a tough policy towards Pakistan. After the Gulf War in 1991, President Bush declared its full support to the efforts aiming at arms control and nuclear non-proliferation. But it is important to note that only some countries like Pakistan, Iran, are not allowed to have Atomic weapons but other countries like Israel and India may continue to have these weapons. It created a difficult situation for Pakistan. There is a serious realization that there should be a constructive debate for avoiding nuclear risks. In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, questions about the security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons received importance. It is now hypothesized by the foreign media that "the main nuclear security problem posed by Al Qaeda today is access to radioactive materials in Pakistan."⁹ Paul Richter said that, "While the Nuclear Program was conceived to protect Pakistan from the perceived nuclear threat from India, some groups in the region view it's nuclear assets as the ISLAMIC bomb that could be used to defend the broader interests of the Muslim World."¹⁰ In the past, the US especially remained concerned that Pakistan could transfer nuclear technology to other Islamic countries particularly to Iran. The French President Jacques Chirac stated that if sanctions were imposed against Pakistan and millions of people were made to suffer, Pakistan might export its nuclear technology to other Islamic countries.¹¹ In fact, France was against the policy of sanctions against Pakistan because in its view, the sanctions were not the right way to resolve the problem of non-proliferation in the region. Pakistan was facing economic problems and

sanctions would further create hardships which could force it to take the decision of transferring technology to other countries. This concern was also shared by the US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright who said that sanctions would backfire. It was said by Western think-tanks that if these sanctions led to a collapse of Pakistan's economy, Islamabad would look for money from rich Islamic countries in return of its nuclear know-how.¹²

Pakistan, however, rejected these fears. Pakistan's government declared, her nuclear program was for peaceful interests of the region and also in secure hands. Pakistan was exploited against alleged involvement by the Western media. The New York Times published a report in February 2004 that Pakistan had conducted joint nuclear tests with North Korea. Whereas, this media did not expose the European institutions, scientists and personalities, who had been involved and pointed out by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The whole unpleasant episode had done enormous harm not only to the government's credibility but also to the very image of Pakistan.

Given the nature of Indo-Pakistan relations and the history of three wars, the US and western governments should understand the reason why Pakistan had to seek nuclear deterrence. Pakistan is once again down played by the US. Pakistan should make political and diplomatic efforts against the US involvements of its scientists in the nuclear technology. It would be advantageous for both Russia and Pakistan if both as a first step restore trust and confidence, enhance economic and trade ties and improve the public opinion about each other. The US after utilizing the Pakistan card is going to discard the same on the issue of nuclear conspiracy. The recent allegations on Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan for his transferring nuclear installations and information were critically pointed out by the west and also by Pakistani government. The government of Pakistan asked Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan for accepting such allegations before the nation, which was amazing and quit disgusting of the nation. Although, the nuclear installations and weapons in Pakistan are greatly exposed to terrorists at any time, but government also assures its security at any cost. Now the Bush administration decided to reverse its decision not to sell F-16s to Pakistan. US decision to sell F-16s to Pakistan is a reversal of US dating back to 1990 when Washington blocked the sale of F-16 Jets as a sanction against Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. An important element of US new strategy is to build relations with Pakistan and India at the same time.

According to Stephen Cohen in addition to rewarding Musharraf's steps against nuclear proliferation and terrorism, the sale may bolster Pakistan's military to help it reach an agreement with India over the disputed territory of Kashmir.¹³ The debate on this issue has centered on point scoring, whether or not it would upset the military balance between the two countries and who needs what to maintain a credible defense. Pakistan has a strong case in that India is already far ahead in terms of military capability. But in the debate few have bothered to look at the broader question of the level of militarization in the subcontinent and the huge amounts of money that it sucks away from development needs.

An arms race has always existed in the region, and it can only grow worse and become more expensive as India and Pakistan seek to acquire even more sophisticated weapons in addition to the nuclear arms that both already possess. Even if the later aspect is left aside for the moment – particularly since it is linked to the wider and more crucial issue of international nuclear disarmament. We have seen how both Pakistan and India have been engaged in test firing missiles. The question of rationalizing the arms race should, therefore, form an essential part of the peace agenda. Improved Indo-Pakistan relations should in time lessen the threat perception on each side, but there would be no guarantee that fresh justifications will not be conjured up (China, in the case of India) by military lobbyists and arms suppliers to keep stocking up arsenals on both sides.

What could perhaps focus attention on the issue is by stimulating greater realization of its political implications. Besides its economic cost, state militarization has shown a disturbing proclivity to strengthen militant trends in society. A culture of violence and aggression is inherent in militarized politics, with repercussions on everyday life. The rises of extremist groups in the region bear testimony to this. These groups have thrived in the climate of hatred and distrust that has been the lot of the region for the past five decades. When states bolster and glorify their military capabilities, they indirectly foster belligerence among ultra-nationalist and religious parties, with domestic consequences that are often understood only when great damage has been done to the political process. The mad arms race during the Cold War should have taught the world a lesson in this context, but we have seen how America, bloated with arms, has twice since 2001 thrown up an administration representing the military-industrial complex, an administration that in Iraq has exhibited its readiness to use arms to establish its hegemony. But that is no reason why we should ignore the lesson. The India-Pakistan

peace process must concern itself with the question of how the two countries can cooperate in lowering the level of militarization and nuclearization in the area.

The Challenge of Terrorism:

The resurgence of Islam as a global political force alarmed many in the west. They began to focus Islam as a new competing ideology replacing communism. As Huntington said in his book "The clash of Civilizations" that war in the 21st century will be not between nations but between civilizations and main contest being between (Christian) west and Islam.¹⁴

The Muslim community is becoming a political force in the world. Pakistan is a Muslim state. Therefore, Pakistan felt the pressure of this new ideology. After the terrorist attacks of 09/11 on America, Pakistan has been exposed to a new challenge, the challenge of global terrorism.

When the linkage between the highjackers, Al-Qaeda, and Afghanistan became clear, the United States moved immediately to root out the Taliban regime and track down Al-Qaeda. Recognizing that Pakistan's co-operation would be important to any operation in Afghanistan, the Bush administration turned to Pakistan, wielding sticks but also offering carrots. Had Pakistan not assisted in this effort, Washington would have turned to India. President Bush was able to reverse Pakistan's entire foreign Policy. President General Pervez Musharraf shifted from ally and sustainer of the Taliban to American ally and decelerated on September 13, Pakistan's "unstinted co-operation against war on terrorism." He turned over many Al-Qaeda leaders including Khalid Sheik Mohammad. Not since 1939 had world politics seen a reversal of alliances so sudden. Given Pakistan's weak economic position, America's fury; and India's strategic availability, General Musharraf did what any other Pakistani leader would have done.¹⁵ Because the newly expanded Indian US relationship had little direct impact on American operations in Afghanistan. It provided US with political leverage, as it made credible the implied threat that, if Pakistan did not cooperate with the United States, the latter might side with India on Kashmir and other issues. Pakistan policy makers have good reasons to be satisfied with their foreign policy in the year following the complete transformation of the global scenario in the aftermath of the 09/11 attacks on America. President Musharraf converted Pakistan to a major partner in the war against terrorism.¹⁶ But it must be remembered that the decision by

President General Pervez Musharraf to provide support to the US on terrorism in Pakistan was not appreciated by the religious parties and the common man. The mainstream political parties, the Islamic groups, the liberal sections of society, elements within the army and the ISI angled the situation according to their stands. Some reports suggest that the sympathies of hard line members of the military lie with the conservative Islamic elements that are challenging the present require. This kind of uncertain political atmosphere appears conducive to the rise of extremist and conservative Islamic elements.¹⁷

The state's policy change was a real setback for the right wing religious political parties. Pakistani government decision to join in the coalition against terrorism has brought serious consequences to the country internal and external politics. Its internal stability is at stake in face of the increasing anti American sentiments in the country. American concern has also shifted from democracy to the religious bigotry and various jihadi groups in the country. As a consequence of this development, the capacity of the Pakistani nuclear program as a safeguard against western meddling has been called into question.

It is a great challenge for Pakistan to tell the world that people of Pakistan have different views on how to fight international terrorism. There is a need to convince them that great cause of the so-called international terrorism is to resolve the conflicts like Palestine, Kashmir and Chechnya.¹⁸ Victory over international terrorism can be achieved by resolving these conflicts. Pakistan today is clearly both part of the problem and the solution to the threat of terrorism facing the United States.

Pakistan is today reluctant deliberately to pursue the Taliban along its western frontiers. Many of the observers welcome the changes in Pakistan's strategic direction under President General Pervez Musharraf since 09/11.¹⁹ The Military Operations against terrorists in WANA showed the government's stated reaction against terrorists. As a result, due to these efforts at the intentional scenario, Pakistan is not only able to build her image well but has also been declared by the USA as major. Non-NATO ally. So with the status of Non- NATO ALLY and global companion against war on terror, Pakistan has got fame and improved her image in future world politics. Although the task to counter terrorists is not a simple one as they have deep roots in the society, which might affect the government's status itself, yet the efforts related to counter such terrorists within and at the borders of the country show

government's interests in terms of tackling terrorists for reputing country at international fronts.

Islamic Fundamentalism and Jihadi Culture:

Before 09/11, the attention of the international community was turning increasingly to the phenomenon of terrorism. The USA in particular saw itself as a target of terrorism as evident from the terrorist attacks on its embassies and citizens especially in most of the Islamic countries.

After 09/11 the threat of Islamic fundamentalism" and "Jihadi culture" was greatly criticized by the west and they asked the Muslim nations to counter and act against such culprits. As a result, in Pakistan, the government has banned all such parties and is also taking close look at the (Madrassas), the religious institutions in the country. Moderation and toleration has directed the country's direction towards moderate Islamic country.²⁰

Conclusion

Post 09/11 events have been characterized by ups and downs reflecting changing priorities at the external and internal fronts of Pakistan. So far, Pakistani president General Pervez Musharraf appears firmly committed to the US led coalition. Most of the causes of Pakistan's decline over the last few decades, however, remain in place and have not been changed by the war against terrorism. If these serious flaws in Pakistan's governance remain undressed, the country will sooner or late slip into a continued state of crisis. Pakistan, a regional power with regional interest, has tried to use the United States as a source of economic, military and diplomatic support to balance India. The United States, a global power with global interests values Pakistan geo-strategic location and the importance of its access to both west and central Asia.

Especially after the event of 09/11, the importance of Pakistan became a reality. Keeping in view her geographical importance, Pakistan should get her interests and play a vital role in the global context.

In the contemporary environment any rash move can greatly damage Pakistan's national interests. In this period of immense political complexity, wisdom and pragmatism must be the hallmarks of the Pakistani game plan for retrieval from the current situation. Attempts by scholars and academia have to exceed theoretical bounds of paradigms,

which will ensure rearrangement of the geo- strategic land scope in a practical manner. It offers maximum security against foreign threats and promotes internal stability. Under the obtaining environment, absence of credible alternative, lack of government will, absence of strong Muslim transnational organizations, technological differential and economic weakness leave few workable options with the Muslim world. The working space for Pakistan in response to these challenges is constricted by various constraints and hemmed in by shrinking liberty of action in face of growing globalization. Pakistan's post 09/11 policy options must be based on consensus to prevent internal political backlash by disagreeing elements, which could lead to societal fragmentation. Besides immediate measures, long-term policies must seek institutional answers to the multidimensional multidirectional threats confronting the Muslim World.

References

1. Nixan, Richared. *Seize the Movement*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1992, P. 23
2. For detail see Marvi Memon, *Reorientation of Pakistan's Foreign Policy After the Cold war*, *Pakistan Foreign policy, Quarterly survey*, The Pakistan Institute of Intemational Affairs, Karachi, No. 2, Vol. 47 April 1994, pp. 45-61.
3. *Webster's College Dictionary* US Random House, 1993, p. 528
4. Joseph E. Stighiz, *Globalization and its discontents*, (England: penguin Books, 2002), P. 205
5. For detail see the *Frontier Post*, April 19, 2003
6. Robert D. Kaplan, *The end of the earth*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1996) pp. 312-337
7. Dr. Hasan Askari Rizvi, *Pakistan's Threat Perception and Weapons procurement*, *The Friday Times*, Lahore, July 6, 1994
8. Denis Kux and Mahnaz Isapahni (Project Director) *New priorities in south Asia; US Policy Towards India, Pakistan and Afghanistan*, P. 06.

Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Challenges and Options

9. Manzoor Ahmad, James Wames Woolsey, How Secure is Pakistan's Plutonium, in the New York Time, November 28, 2001.
10. Paul Richter, Pakistan Nuclear Wild card, in Los Angeles Times, September 18, 2001
11. Dawn, 10 June, 1998.
12. Ibid, 16 June 1998
13. Ibid, March 31, 2005
14. Samuel P. Huntington, The clash of Civilizations, New York, Simon & Schuster 1997, P. 209
15. Hasan, M. Syed, Pakistan Foreign Policy: Rethinking the Changing World. National Development, (Summer, 2003), P. 50.
16. Ibid.
17. "Foreign Office denies secret Test with North Korea" Dawn, March 28, 2004
18. Hassabm N. Syed, Pakistan Foreign Policy: Rethinking in the Changing World, National Development and Security Vol. XI, (Summer, 2003) P. 50.
19. Ibid.
20. Dr. Maqbool Bhatti, Terrorism and Religious Extremism in south Asia, in Regional Studies, Islamabad, Institute of Regional Studies, Spring 2002, P. 72-74.

Nuclear Weapons Proliferation: Role of Pakistan

Zafar Nawaz Jaspal

The most disturbing aspect of nuclear non-proliferation regime is how poorly it accomplishes its arms control and disarmament objectives. The recorded incidents of illicit nuclear trafficking marked the weaknesses of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system and nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT). The clandestine nuclear weapons related activities of Iran, Libya and North Korea also prove their lack of commitment with their obligations to NPT. The sixth review conference of the NPT was held on May 2-27, 2005 in New York. Yet, the nuclear-weapon states haven't taken any step to carry out their own commitments under the Article VI of NPT to make good faith efforts toward nuclear disarmament. On April 14, 2005, positively, the United Nations General Assembly passed by consensus an accord—the Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. It would oblige member states to prosecute those who illegally possess atomic devices or radioactive materials.¹

Pakistan a non-signatory member of the NPT is at the center of one of the world's worst nuclear proliferation scandals. The involvement of the Pakistani nuclear scientists, particularly Dr. Adul Qadeer Khan, has brought Pakistan's nuclear program under close international media scrutiny. The United States and Western countries are overly concerned about this aspect. The entire focus of accusation and nuclear related investigation is upon Pakistan. Whereas, the multinational nuclear Mafia includes both the citizens of developed and underdeveloped worlds.² Importantly, Islamabad has provided International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and foreign governments with information about Dr. Khan's activities. Ironically, they view this information with skepticism and demand direct access to question Dr. Khan and his arrested associates. The government of Pakistan has declined this request. At the same time, it permitted IAEA to submit written questions that Dr. Khan would answer.³ Despite the sincere cooperation of Pakistan, the Western electronic and print media have been maligning it. Contrary to U.S. official's claim, that there is no evidence of official Pakistani government involvement, anti-Pakistan lobby incognizance with international media has been doing its best to establish that President Pervaiz Musharraf and other senior civil-military leaders approved the deals.⁴

Before judging Pakistan's role in the nuclear proliferation, it seems appropriate to briefly identify systemic problem, which entails nuclear weapons proliferation. An analysis of Libya, Iran and North Korea's acquisition of nuclear weapons potential and Dr. Khan network is important to solve the puzzle. The study is divided into different parts. The first section deals with the Nuclear weapons proliferation. The second part contains Pakistan's nuclear non-proliferation efforts and stance. The final part examines the controversial debate.

Nuclear Weapons Proliferation: A systemic problem

Since the end of First World War, arms control and disarmament have become permanent themes in the foreign policies of nation states. The advent of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons has made arms control and disarmament more desirable goal than ever before in history. Even proponents of a nuclear deterrence policy often say that there is a policy of temporary insurance until disarmament can be negotiated.⁵ Yet the same advanced military technology which makes disarmament imperative also makes it the more difficult to achieve in a world of profound cultural differences, ideological divisions, and fundamental political disagreements over the way in which the international system is to be organized. Realistically, anarchic structure of the international system makes war a permanent feature of inter-state relationship. The participants in international system, therefore, are obliged to look after their own interests and pursue them employing their own resources. What are the means available to achieve this? Kenneth Waltz identifies two means—internal efforts and external efforts—to ensure the security of the states. The internal efforts are to increase economic capability, to increase military strength, and to develop clever strategies. And external efforts are to strengthen and enlarge one's own alliance or weaken and shrink an opposing one.⁶

The absence of international executing authority strengthens realist argument that the sovereign states have to rely on self-help to protect their sovereignty and national integration. Therefore, each state tries to acquire the maximum amount of power feasible under the circumstances. This struggle for power may at times subside for practical reasons, but it never ends. It is because the first goal of every state is to survive, and the more power a nation-state has, the greater its chances of survival in this anarchic world. The practitioners of *raison d'état* like Machiavelli concluded that the first responsibility of leadership is to organize power—the capacity to make someone do something he would

not otherwise do. This means having strong defenses and the capacity to punish others that threaten or use force against your people. In its modern guise, the doctrine places primacy on the state as the protector of the community, the condition for the preservation of its values, institutions and cultures.⁷

The Sovereign States, therefore, compelled to allocate a reasonable portion of their budgets for the development or purchase of armaments for the sake of power. The international politics manifest that there is no comparison between a state, which is armed and one, which is not. It is unreasonable to expect that a militarily strong state would obey one, which is not or that militarily weak state would remain safe and secure when its hostile neighbors possess sophisticated arms.⁸ More precisely, this systemic problem undermines the efforts for arms control and disarmament in the global politics. The strong states try to sustain the status quo, whereas underdogs always struggle to change that status quo. Thus, the primacy of security, survival and self-help concepts in chalking out nation states national policies forced them to develop or acquire the sophisticated weapons.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime (NNPR)⁹ is under serious stress in the present international strategic environment. The NPT has established the norm against nuclear weapons acquisition, disarmament, trade, modernization, and use.¹⁰ It has been unsuccessful in achieving its desired objectives. In fact, the nuclear-weapon states have failed to carry out their disarmament commitments made in article VI¹¹, and reiterated again at the 1995 and 2000 NPT Review Conferences. At the 1995 Review Conference, for example, the decision to extend the NPT indefinitely was taken in conjunction with two other decisions, one of which contained a set of agreed Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament. The objectives included: completion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which bans nuclear tests, by 1996; commencement and early conclusion of negotiations on a nondiscriminatory and universally applicable convention banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and determined pursuit by the nuclear weapon states of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons, and of all states of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.¹²

The non-compliance of Nuclear Weapon States led number of states to believe that the nuclear haves do not intend to fulfill their end of the NPT bargain -- their pledge to eliminate nuclear weapons. In addition, the sole super power—the U.S— is less willing to agree to further measures that would bolster the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Ashton B. Carter argued, “The NPT has been disparaged in the United States in recent years because, it is said, the ‘bad guys’ can ignore it with impunity (since it has inadequate verification and enforcement provisions) and the ‘good guys’ would be good even without the agreement.”¹³ In October 1999, the U.S. Senate rejected CTBT ratification and obstructed its entry into force. In February 2005, it decided to renew its funding request for research on new, earth penetrating nuclear weapons, which Congress denied last year.¹⁴ The Bush administration also deviated from the consensus document of Conference on Disarmament on fissile material cutoff treaty (FMCT).¹⁵ Thus, the current US policies run directly counter to the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps it and other nuclear states agreed to during the NPT Review Conference held in 2000, as well as to its obligations under Article VI of the NPT to work for the elimination of nuclear weapons.¹⁶ These developments undermine efforts to strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. More precisely, there is no progress in nuclear disarmament leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons. In the words of CIA Director George Tenet, “The desire for nuclear weapons is on the upsurge.... The domino theory of the 21st century may well be nuclear”.¹⁷

Khan Network: Government of Pakistan

Dr. A Q. Khan established gas-centrifuge program, which has been used to produce weapons-grade uranium for Pakistan’s nuclear weapons program. It was reported that that he also set up an international underworld illicit nuclear trafficking network, which operated successfully during 1980s and 1990s. It sold the equipment and expertise needed to produce nuclear weapons to Iran, Libya and North Korea.¹⁸ Daryl G. Kimball claimed, “For more than a decade, the Khan network secretly transferred some of the most sensitive technology, including uranium-enrichment devices and, in the case of Libya, even design and engineering plans for nuclear bombs.”¹⁹

Islamabad came under intense pressure to deal with A.Q. Khan and his associates. The government of Pakistan without hiding the secrets acted responsibly. Knowing the probability of political backlash, President

Pervaiz Mushaaraf not only initiated investigation against the scientists, but also took the nation into confidence. Pakistani government arrested Khan, whom most Pakistanis considered a national hero. After his arrest in February 2004, Khan confessed to selling sensitive technology and equipment to Libya, Iran and North Korea. He categorically stated that he alone was responsible and had acted independently of current and previous Pakistani governments. He received a conditional pardon and today remains under house arrest.

Through his press conference, he shared the real information with the people of Pakistan and international community. According to the Pakistani Official announcement the country's chief weapons scientist, Abdul Qadeer Khan, and his associates conducted the traffic without the approval and knowledge of the Government of Pakistan. President of Pakistan claimed in his news conference on February 7, 2004 that the civil and military bureaucracy was not a part of this illicit nuclear trafficking. Importantly, the international community seems unconvincing that the all-powerful Inter-Services Intelligence agency of Pakistan wasn't aware of Dr. A. Q Khan's foreign trips. To be precise, the involvement of Dr Khan in the nuclear smuggling has caused enormous damage to Pakistan's repute as a responsible nuclear weapon state and led to international embarrassment.

Nuclear Proliferation: Iran, Libya and North Korea

The detection of the international underworld nuclear network and subsequent developments disclosed that Iran, Libya and North Korea have been engaged in developing their clandestine nuclear weapons programs. Their clandestine nuclear weapons related activities prove their lack of commitment with their obligations to NPT. In their pursuit of nuclear weapons know how, they were benefited from the NPT membership and underworld nuclear mafia. These states, for example, took advantage of Article IV of NPT, which made a just-under-the-threshold nuclear weapons program feasible and legal for an NPT signatory; facilitated a demand for nuclear-related components and equipment for such a program; and made it worthwhile for many high-tech companies, factories, and shippers to meet the demand.²⁰ Under Article IV, all states-parties to the NPT have the inalienable right to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II. Also, under Article IV, all states have the right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and

technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.²¹ It allows a party of the NPT to develop the means to produce highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium—key nuclear weapons materials that also have civilian uses—and stockpile them without limit as long as they are placed under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

The purpose of Article IV is to permit the trade of nuclear technology for its non-military exploitation, i.e. in the field of medicines, agriculture and power generation. However, the negative aspect of this Article is that it develops the nuclear infrastructure of a non-nuclear weapon state, which it could use for military purposes. The member states develop a facility capable of manufacturing HEU and escape from the NPT obligations by invoking Article X. That article allows a party's withdrawal without penalty by giving three months' notice and declaring, with an explanation, "extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of the treaty, have jeopardized [its] supreme interests." North Korea, for example, had announced its withdrawal from the NPT—the first state ever to do so. It had also released itself from the 1992 agreement with South Korea to keep the Korean peninsula nuclear free. It sets a precedent for countries to walk away from NPT.

North Korea

North Korea sees its nuclear weapons program as "critical" to its survival. North Korean leader Kim Jong Il believes the rapid U.S. military success against Iraq demonstrated the weaknesses of North Korea's conventional military forces had heightened the value of nuclear weapons. On October 16, 2002, the US State Department announced that North Korea had acknowledged her continued covert nuclear development program.²² "We need nuclear weapons," Kang Sok Joo, the North Korean senior foreign-policy official, said, arguing that the program was the result of the Bush administration's hostility.²³ The clandestine development of nuclear weapon programme is a direct violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the 1994 Agreed Framework with the United States and the 1991 North-South Korean Denuclearization Agreement by North Korea. In order to justify her act, North Korea accused the US of taking steps that forced Pyongyang to nullify the 1994 Agreed Framework, which had provided Western energy aid in return for the North's promise to freeze the development of nuclear weapons. The breach of prior undertakings could enable North Korea to use nuclear material now stored under international supervision at

Yongbyon, the reactor site that was the centerpiece of a nuclear standoff between International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and North Korea in the early 1990's.

Where did North Korea acquire this advanced uranium enrichment technology? Jon Wolfsthal argued that:

Given its capabilities and its history of dealings with North Korea, Pakistan is the most likely source for the centrifuges and the know how to operate them.... Later, it purchased scud and no-dong missiles from North Korea. Analysts have wondered for years what North Korea got in exchange for the missiles, and one explanation is that the centrifuge technology was part of the larger transaction.²⁴

The Government of Pakistan denied helping North Korea and reiterated its commitment to non-proliferation.²⁵ President of Pakistan Gen. Pervez Musharraf, stated in November 2002, "There is no such thing as collaboration with North Korea in the nuclear arena". This announcement failed to generate an impressive impression. The issue didn't boil down. Secretary of State Colin Powell and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice said they believed him, although they refused to say in absolute terms that there had never been Pakistan-North Korean cooperation.

Libya

Libya acknowledged possessing a nuclear weapons program and nuclear weapon designs. In November 2003, however, Moammar Gadhafi renounced Libya's weapons of mass destruction program and opened his country's weapons laboratories to international inspection. The Libyan government gave a package of documents to the U.S. officials. Experts from the United States, Britain and the International Atomic Energy Agency analyzed the documents. These experts concluded that bomb designs and other papers turned over by Libya had yielded evidence of Pakistani-led trading network in transferring nuclear know-how to Libya. Moreover, on February 20, 2004, Malaysian Police reported that the former head of Pakistan's nuclear programme, Dr Abdul Qadeer Khan, sent enriched uranium to Libya in 2001 and sold nuclear centrifuge parts to Iran in the mid-1990s.²⁶

Iran

In January 2004, Iranian officials told U.N. experts for the first time that Tehran in 1994 obtained foreign designs for P-2 uranium enrichment centrifuges and subsequently tested some components based on the designs.²⁷ Buhary Syed Abu Tahir, named by the US as a middleman in an international nuclear trafficking ring, claimed Dr Khan asked him to send centrifuges to Iran in 1994 or 1995. He also added that two containers of used centrifuge units were shipped from Pakistan to Iran via Dubai and were paid for with about three million dollars in cash.²⁸ Contrary to it, the Iranian government denied any contact with the underworld nuclear network. Tehran reiterated its earlier stance that it is honoring its NPT obligation. Therefore, it is neither transferring nuclear weapon technology from Pakistan nor purchasing it from the underworld nuclear network.

The Iranians nonproliferation stance became questionable with the IAEA report given to diplomats on February 24, 2004, which concluded that Iran failed to declare sophisticated designs and components that could be used to enrich uranium quickly, a process that can be used to build a nuclear bomb.²⁹ In addition, the agency disputed Iran's estimates of how much plutonium it has produced in reprocessing experiments. The IAEA's concern was based on environmental sampling in and around Iranian nuclear facilities. To be precise the IAEA reports finding runs counter to Tehran's declaration.

Controversial debate

The government of Pakistan has adopted a nuclear transparent approach to end erroneous speculation about its alleged involvement in the nuclear weapons proliferation. It's responsible behavior and efforts to end the international underworld illicit nuclear trafficking network have failed to satisfy the International media. Many foreign media analysts have been twisting the actual facts and doing their best to prove that Pakistan is an irresponsible Nuclear Weapon State. They have been recommending impractical solutions to the nuclear proliferation problem, which undermines Pakistan's nuclear deterrence. Instead of appreciating the responsible behavior of the government of Pakistan and recommending it to the other nuclear weapon states, they are trying to establish that Pakistan is a rogue nuclear weapon state.

Though Pakistan is an ally of the U.S in its war on terrorism, but it is also victim of US non-proliferation agenda. The ongoing international nuclear debate manifests that the US led Western states' earnest desire is to eliminate or eradicate Pakistan's nuclear weapons potential. Therefore, they have adopted discriminatory anti nuclear policies against Pakistan. These states intellectuals, officials, electronic and print media have been always maligning Pakistan's nuclear program. They present hypothetical baseless worst scenarios, such as disintegration of Pakistan and falling of nuclear weapons in the hands of extremists or the change of President Pervaiz Musharraf government and access of Al Qaeda's sympathizers to the nuclear weapons and finally transferring them to the terrorists, which they would use against the US and its allies.

Jonathan Medalia, for example, chalked out hypothetical scenarios about the nuclear crisis in Pakistan. He argued that Pakistan might be the source of nuclear weapons or materials for terrorists under several scenarios: (1) Islamists in the armed services might provide such assistance covertly under the current government; (2) if the present government was overthrown by fundamentalists, the new government might make weapons available to terrorists; or (3) such weapons might become available if chaos, rather than a government, followed the overthrow.³⁰ Are these assertions based on the empirical research? What is reality in these arguments? The answer is simple that their findings lack reality. These fictions are biased and baseless. For instance, since the invention of nuclear weapons the nuclear Mafia has been operating, and one cannot find a serious action against the nuclear traffickers and their states of residence. Importantly, since they learnt about the involvement of Pakistani scientists in the nuclear black market, they have unleashed hostile propaganda against Pakistan. They deliberately ignore the Western members of the nuclear underworld network. The Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security concluded in its finding that there was a familial aspect to the underworld nuclear network. "Europeans who were involved in the 1970s or 1980s had sons that became involved with them in the 1990s," the report said.³¹ It seems that if they investigate the Europeans, the secrets regarding the clandestine development of Israeli nuclear weapons program become public, which is not in the interest of the US.

According to Americans' writings, for years, North Korea had been selling missiles to Pakistan. Pakistan had been paying cash for the missiles but ran into a foreign currency reserves crunch around 1996.³² At that point, it is believed, the North Koreans agreed to a barter

transaction involving the provision of centrifuges in exchange for missiles. But they themselves revealed that North Koreans had nuclear weapons capability in prior to 1996. The US CIA has long stated that it believed North Korea prior to 1994 had diverted enough plutonium to develop one or two nuclear weapons. Under the Agreed Framework North Korea placed its remaining 8000 spent fuel rods from its 5MW reactor into sealed, verified storage. By December 2002, however, North Korea had expelled IAEA inspectors, removed IAEA seals and surveillance equipment at its Yongbyon nuclear complex, and had begun preparing to reprocess the stored spent fuel.³³ Wade L. Huntley argued, "Successful reprocessing would provide North Korea with enough plutonium for a half dozen nuclear weapons, beyond the one or two weapons-worth of fissile material the regime is believed to possess already."³⁴

The most accessible nuclear device for any terrorist would be a radiological dispersion bomb (RDDs) also called Dirty Bomb. Its manufacture and use is simple and would be an effective weapon of terror because severe disruption would result from the widespread fear of radioactive contamination and long-term health affects. A dirty bomb consists of waste by-product from nuclear reactors wrapped in conventional explosives, which upon detonation would spew deadly radioactive particles into the environment, thereby augmenting the injury and property damage caused by the explosion. The capability of an RDD to cause significant harm is largely dependent on the type of radioactive material used and the means used to disperse it. Other important variables include location of the device and prevailing weather conditions.³⁵

A dirty bomb is an expedient weapon, in that radioactive waste material is relatively easy to obtain. Radioactive materials that could be employed in RDDs range from radiation sources used in medicine or industry to spent nuclear fuel from nuclear power plants. Hence radioactive waste is widely found throughout the world and in general is not as well guarded as actual nuclear weapons. For instance, in the U.S, radioactive waste is located at more than 70 commercial nuclear power sites.³⁶ It is an open secret that in the Russian Federation security for nuclear waste is especially poor. There have been incidents of theft regarding nuclear radioactive material missing from the Russian nuclear facilities.³⁷ Moreover, in January 2003, Japanese officials admitted that their pilot plutonium reprocessing plant at Tokai-mura "lost" 206 kilograms of weapons-usable plutonium (roughly 40 crude bombs worth) over the

previous 15 years.³⁸ Where this material might have gone? The British, meanwhile, have experienced similar losses at their plutonium reprocessing plant at Sellafield. There, 19 kilograms of separated plutonium went missing in 2003, and another 30 kilograms of separated plutonium were unaccounted for in 2004.³⁹ Importantly, these issues haven't been addressed in the international media as a serious problem. If similar incident unfortunately occurred in Pakistan, the Western media present it as leading news. They immediately conclude that Pakistan is irresponsible state.

The Western World has been pressurizing Pakistan to join the NPT as a non nuclear weapon state, and also sign CTBT. Contrary to it, the leading powers failed to fulfill their commitments to NNPR. The US and Russian Federation claimed that their May 2002 Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty (Moscow) was important contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament and a demonstration of their commitment to Article VI. Whereas, the Non-Aligned Movement stated that the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty reductions do not meet the "unequivocal undertaking under Article VI of the NPT to accomplish the total elimination of...nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament." In addition, it does not require the destruction of these weapons, does not include tactical nuclear weapons and does not have any verification provisions.⁴⁰

Conclusion

The illicit nuclear weapon trafficking undermines the spirit and objectives of the NNPR. It exposed weaknesses in global non-proliferation's enforcement efforts and alarmed that in future horizontal proliferation is a reality. The NPT has failed in curbing horizontal proliferation because of the policies of the de-jure members of the nuclear club. The NPT, for example, commits the nuclear five to gradually dismantle their nuclear arsenals (Article VI of the treaty). The United States is moving mini-nukes into its first-strike arsenal for the first time and its missile defense plans have derailed arms-reduction treaties with Russian Federation. These contradictions — and the West's silence over Israel's undeclared nuclear capability — endanger the good will needed to enforce the treaty elsewhere and curb the horizontal proliferation.

The international nuclear smuggling networks have been operating since the very beginning of nuclear weapons era. The underworld nuclear mafia managed to buy and sell key nuclear weapons components

eluding the world's best intelligence agencies and nonproliferation institutions and organizations. Despite a wide range of hints and leads, the U.S and its allies failed to thwart this network as it sold the equipment and expertise needed to produce nuclear weapons. It's because, nuclear weapons will bring security and international prestige. The U.S led Western world is pursuing black-market operatives who sell equipment and expertise related to chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. But they seem selective in this regard till the writing of these lines. The focus of the investigation is partial and only the selective nationals have been targeted. According to reports appearing in the western press, there is a thriving underworld in nuclear material, and those offering their services to the highest bidder come from America and a number of countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. The chief of International Atomic Energy Agency, Muhammad El Baradei stated, Dr. Khan was merely the "tip of the iceberg". His reference to the tip was meant to remind the international community that there exists a large underworld nuclear market, which is profitably cashing on the nations' desire to remove their sense of insecurity. Are the Western members of the Nuclear Mafia innocent? It's an open secret that the European citizens broke the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty and Nuclear Supplier Group commitments. Therefore, without prosecuting and punishing them, the illicit nuclear trafficking would not end. But they have been deliberately ignoring the other culprits of nuclear Mafia. It's imperative, therefore, that all members of nuclear Mafia would be prosecuted irrespective of their nationalities.

The basic, and even actual, point must be recognized that Pakistan (and India and Israel for that matter) has not been under any international regime, treaty or legal obligation not to transfer nuclear technology beyond its frontiers. The only restraint that could operate grows from its own sense of responsibility. Admittedly, Pakistan was a recipient of foreign assistance in the initial stages of its nuclear program and the nuclear facilities, which were developed with foreign assistance, have been under the IAEA safeguards. There is no evidence about the breach of Pakistan's commitments, which it negotiated before the development of these facilities with the supplier nations and IAEA. At the same time, its pertinent to understand that Pakistan's nuclear weapons program has not received any foreign state assistance. The history of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program reveals that Pakistan developed its nuclear weapons without violating any of its prior international commitments.

Islamabad has not entirely opposed the NNPR. It supports all equitable and multilateral measures to control the spread of nuclear weapons. It had proposed specific measures for nuclear disarmament, including a Convention to commit all States to the elimination of nuclear weapons. For instance, under the UN Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) Pakistan had submitted its National Report, which comprehensively explains measures the Government of Pakistan has taken for safety and security of material and technology meant for WMD and their means of delivery. However, the prevailing strategic environment of Pakistan manifest that the nuclear weapons disarmament would not be in its national security interest and therefore, it has not a good reason to join the NPT as a non nuclear weapon states. At the same time, the involvement of Pakistani scientists in the underworld nuclear activities also endangers its National Interest. It necessitate that it would cooperate with the international community for controlling illicit nuclear trade without compromising on its own security arrangements.

End Notes

¹ The pact will be open for signature on Sept 14, 2005 in New York, during a high-level summit and needs ratification from 22 nations to become international law. Addressing the UN General Assembly Pakistan's Ambassador Munir Akram emphasized the need for interpreting and applying the "Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism" in a manner fully compatible with the requirements of international law applicable in armed conflict, particularly the principles and rules of international humanitarian law. Masood Haider, "Suppression of N-terror treaty approved by UN", *Dawn*, April 15, 2005.

² The members of Khan network were arrested in other countries. For example, Gerhard Wisser of Germany, in South Africa. He was set to go on trial, on March 15, 2005. Another German, Gotthard Lerch, was involved in the ring as a dealmaker. He is currently in detention in Switzerland awaiting extradition to Germany at the request of the German Federal Public Prosecutor's Office. Buhary Seyed Abu Tahir, a Sri Lankan businessman is now under house arrest in Malaysia. Swiss citizen Urs Tinner detained in Germany since October 2004.

³ David Albright and Corey Hinderstein, pp. 116-117.

⁴ Daryl G. Kimball, "Arming Dictators, Rewarding Proliferators", *Arms Control Today*, April 2005.

⁵ James E. Dougherty, *How to Think about Arms Control and Disarmament* (New York: Crane, Russak & Company Inc, 1973), pp.6-7.

⁶ Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), p 118.

⁷ Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, "Worlds in Collision", in Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, ed. *Worlds in Collision Terror and the Future of Global Order* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 15.

⁸ The United States is militarily strong state, therefore, it did not refrained from attacking Iraq in 2003, despite the opposition of international community. Similarly, In August Iraq attacked its militarily weak neighbor Kuwait in August 1990. The sovereignty of states is very much depended on their military muscles.

⁹ The nuclear non-proliferation regime is an integrated network of treaties and other standard-setting arrangements, which provide a comprehensive framework for the behavior of states, and international organizations and other actors, in the nuclear area. See John Simpson and Darryl Howlett, 'The NPT Renewal Conference Stumbling toward 1995', *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1(Summer 1994) pp. 43-44.

¹⁰ The NPT permits all signatories to enrich uranium (in order to make fuel for power reactors) and reprocess plutonium (an inevitable byproduct in spent fuel removed from the reactor after it is used up), provided they declare what they are doing and submit to periodic inspections.

¹¹ Article VI of NPT calls on parties to the treaty to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race...and to nuclear disarmament." However, The NPT did not set out a timetable for achieving the goals of Article VI.

¹² Lawrence Scheinman, "Disarmament: Have the Five Nuclear Powers Done Enough", *Arms Control Today*, January/February 2005.

¹³ Ashton B. Carter, "How to Counter WMD", *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2004, p. 79.

¹⁴ The Department of Energy's fiscal year 2006 budget request includes \$4 million for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. It also envisions spending \$14 million on the project in fiscal year 2007. The Department of Defense's fiscal year 2006 budget request also includes \$4.5 million for work on the project, and it foresees spending \$3.5 million in fiscal year 2007. Whereas, the US, as a nuclear-weapon state, is obligated under Article VI of the treaty to end the nuclear arms buildup and pursue nuclear disarmament.

¹⁵ The Bush administration's policies have been viewed by many in Moscow and Beijing as arrogant and unilateralist.

¹⁶ "Statement of the Pugwash Council", *Pugwash Newsletter*, Vol. 40, No. 2, December 2003, p. 5.

¹⁷ Statement by CIA Director George Tenet, (February 2003). Quoted in Paolo Cotta-Ramusino, "Report of the Secretary General", *Pugwash Newsletter*, Vol. 40, No. 2, December 2003, p. 53.

¹⁸ David Albright and Corey Hinderstein, "Unraveling the A. Q. Khan and Future Proliferation Networks", *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2005, pp. 111-112.

¹⁹ Daryl G. Kimball, Op. cit.

²⁰ Leonard Weiss, "Turning a Blind Eye Again? The Khan Network's History and Lessons for U.S. Policy", *Arms control Today*, March 2005.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² On October 3-5, 2002, an eight-member American delegation led by Assistant Secretary of State James Kelly confronted its counterparts in Pyongyang with intelligence reports that North Korea was gathering high-strength aluminum for gas centrifuges used to enrich uranium. The North Korean officials admitted that the allegations were correct. Noriyuki Katagiri, "North Korea's Nuclear Program: analyzing 'confessional diplomacy'," *Center for Defense Information* (October 28, 2002).

²³ David E. Sanger, "Pakistan, North Korea set up nuclear swap", *The New York Times* (November 24, 2002).

<http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/134582675_pakkorea24.html>

²⁴ Jon Wolfsthal, "North Korea's Nuclear Breach" *Carnegie Analysis* (October 17, 2002).

<<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/article.asp?NewsID=3832>>

²⁵ "There is no truth in these reports whatsoever," said presidential spokesman Major-General Rashid Qureshi. "I do not know where the New York Times gets its information from. I am convinced that they need to update their intelligence gathering system". See "Pakistan dismisses DPRK arms deal report", *The News*, November 25, 2002.

²⁶ "Malaysian police report implicates Dr A.Q. Khan", *Dawn*, February 21, 2004.

²⁷ Joe Fiorill, "IAEA Blasts Iran on Centrifuge Designs, Uranium Traces, Polonium", *Global Security Newswire*, February 24, 2004. http://www.nti.org/d_newswire/issues/2004_2_24.html accessed on February 27, 2004.

²⁸ "Malaysian police report implicates Dr A.Q. Khan", *Dawn*, February 21, 2004.

²⁹ Melanie Sully, "Iran Failed to Declare Sensitive Nuclear Technology, says IAEA", February, 24, 2004. <<http://quickstart.clari.net/voa/art/bp/4F5FFD97-109F-4BE0-9507E3A33DC3DAFB.html>> accessed on February 27, 2004.

³⁰ Jonathan Medalia, "Nuclear Terrorism: A Brief Review of Threats and Responses", *CRS Report for Congress RL 32595*, 22 September 2004.

³¹ Anwar Iqbal, "Govt not involved with Khan network: report", *Dawn*, Islamabad, 13 October 2004.

³² Leonard Weiss, "Turning a Blind Eye Again? The Khan Network's History and Lessons for U.S. Policy", *Arms control Today*, March 2005.

³³ Wade L. Huntley, "Losing North Korea: How the Bush Administration Botched the Nuclear Crisis", *Asia Pacific Papers*, No. 6, December 2004, p. 4.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, "Operation Iraqi Freedom and WMD: Implications for World Politics", *IPRI Journal*, Vol. V, No.1, Winter 2005.

³⁶ Bruce G. Blair, "What if the terrorists go nuclear?", *Terrorism Project*, Washington. D.C., Center For Defense Information, 1 October 2001. <<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/nuclear.cfm>>, Accessed on 13 October 2004.

³⁷ K. Bhushan and G. Katyal, *Nuclear Biological and Chemical Warfare* (New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, 2002), p. 137.

³⁸ These reported losses were in addition to the 70 kilograms of plutonium Japan previously conceded remained unaccounted for at a plutonium-based fuel fabrication plant it was operating. Henry Sokolski, "After Iran: Back to the Basics on "Peaceful" Nuclear Energy", *Arms Control Today*, April 2005.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Lawrence Scheinman, "Disarmament: Have the Five Nuclear Powers Done Enough", *Arms Control Today*, January/February 2005.

Pakistan– India Relations: Challenges & Adjustments

Ms. Iram Khalid

In the arena of new challenges and pressures there is a great need to make mature but flexible decisions. But these decisions should not be at the price of national interest and pride. Pakistan and India are trying to have purposeful cooperation to defuse the traditional tension. What are the challenges in the way of cooperation? And where we have to stop to make certain adjustments. These questions will be the theme of this presentation. One can highlight the issues by raising some questions.

1. Is this platonic friendship only a matter of world pressure or it is originated from mutual concerns?
2. Can Pakistan afford to leave its traditional stand on Kashmir?
3. How the water issue will affect Pakistan's economy?
4. Can this visionary leadership also play the role of decisive leadership?
5. How much track III diplomacy will be effective?
6. Can the perceptions change so easily?

These are some of the areas of concern, everyone has in mind .Now an effort will be made to make the certain confusions clear. Since time immemorial to the present age South Asia has been the one region of the world, which has emerged as a focus of tremendous international concerns and related activities at the turn of new millennium. Although the region is historically well known for its great strategic salience and enormous market potential, its real significance in the contemporary scenario has magnified following the collapse of the Soviet Union and subsequent regional development following the nuclearization of South Asia in May 1998 which led to restructuring of great powers priorities.(1) The cold war saw an allied US and Pakistan rival the close relations between the Soviet Union and India in the subcontinent. The post – cold war era with comparing to East Asia and Middle East witnessed the low priority given to South Asia by the US. But the nuclear explosions, Kargil conflict and then President Clinton's visit to the region again topped off a changing US strategy towards South Asia with warm Washington – New Dehli rapprochement. The 9/11 incident saw bringing Pakistan once again at the central stage while U.S., India rapprochement continued. (2)

South Asian conflict and regional security dynamics revolve basically around the conflict and rivalry between India and Pakistan. They both are known to the world as the archrivals. Their style and attitude towards each other had remained aversive and mutually exclusive ever since they got independence from the British colonial rule.

The end of British rule and the emergence of two independent dominions in 1947 did not usher in an era of peace. The tragic events immediately before and after independence made good relations between the two countries almost impossible. The communal murder, mass immigration and division of assets gave them the worst possible start (3). The most alarming development was India's resort to arms to settle the dispute over accession of three princely states. Junagardh, Hyderabad, and Kashmir ' Pakistan India wars in 1965 and 1971 and the crisis during 80s added much to their unending hostility. The core issue of Kashmir has been a sore point between India and Pakistan constantly bedeviling the already adversarial relationship of the two countries since 1947. The restoration of mutual trust is interdependent. It is impossible to restore trust unless India is committed to resolve the Kashmir dispute (4).

Security perception of almost all nations are directly linked with the real and perceived threats confronting them from time to time. During the early phase, the India threat generated the acute sense of insecurity and Pakistan was compelled to align itself with the west. The desire to enhance Pakistan's security was one of the major reasons to join the west sponsored security arrangements in the early years. Pakistan joined South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in September 1954 and Baghdad pact later named as CENTO (Central Treat Organization) in July 1955 (5).

India's continuing quest for international recognition as more than "Pawn on a global Chessboard", to use Prime Minister Gandhi's phrase, is likely to constitute a growing pressure for a full-blown nuclear weapon program. Experience shows that India's foreign policy options in South Asia are based on the pillars of double speak and chauvinism (6). Soon after its independence in 1947 India developed its nuclear capability as a matter of choice, consistent with the policy enunciated by its concluding fathers, before and after independence (7). In May 1974, it carried out its first under ground nuclear explosions at Pokhran posing a direct security threat to other states in the region. Pakistan also showed its grave concern towards the explosion and its purposes

raised the issue at the international level and urged the United Nations and other major world powers to help establish a nuclear weapons free zone in South Asia. Pakistan, since then, proposed several points that include:(8)

- 1978 – India and Pakistan should make joint declaration renouncing the acquisition of manufacturing of nuclear weapons.
- 1978 – Mutual inspection of each other's nuclear facilities.
- 1979 – Simultaneous adherence to NPT by India & Pakistan.
- 1979 – Simultaneous acceptance of IAEA on all nuclear facilities.
- 1985 – Pakistan envisaged a declaration to be made by the states of South Asia i.e. to banish the specter of nuclear weapons from our region.
- 1987 – Bilateral / regional nuclear test ban agreement.
- 1991 – Pakistan proposed a Five Nation Conference of the United States, the Soviet Union, China, India and Pakistan to resolve the problem of nuclear proliferation in South Asia. (The 3 countries accepted and India rejected).
- 1992 – Pakistan proposed Indo – Pak agreement to ban all weapons of mass destruction i.e., Atomic, Biological, Chemical weapons and Missiles – ABCM. (India responded only to discuss chemical weapons and the two countries agreed on a Pak – India bilateral agreement in August 1992 not to manufacture or possess chemical weapons. Later India joined the CWC.
- 1993 – Zero Missile Regime in South Asia.
- 1997 – No War Pact between India and Pakistan.

But no effort was successful. This continuous effort of both the countries to develop their nuclear program resulted into a serious cause for world community. When India carried out further nuclear tests in May 1998, followed by provocative statements and threats against Pakistan by its leaders, Pakistan also demonstrated its nuclear capability to correct the nuclear imbalance in the region.

After the explosions by both India and Pakistan the threat has increased. To make nuclear diplomacy successful it must be conducted in private and without publicity. Neither India nor Pakistan should engage in the traditional practice of trying to score public relation points or of playing to political galleries back home. The dangerous game of

nuclear chicken underlines the critical need for serious India – Pakistan dialogues on the nuclear basics. The nuclear capacity of the two states underlines the even greater need of the confidence building measures between the two countries to avoid a future war.

One lesson that history teaches us is that any efforts at conflict resolution and prevention either international or within the states, must involve both government officials and non government participants, because it is only through a collaborative effort among societal sectors and power structures that real change is possible. But when governments cannot and will not talk, people should talk to promote peace in the region as troublesome as South Asia. Since 1994 when the official track-one dialogue between the two countries stumbled, the U.S. sponsored a Track-2 dialogue between India and Pakistan. It is called the Neemrana dialogue and meets alternatively in India and Pakistan. It is founded by Ford Foundation and consists of equal representatives from Pakistan and India.

Track-II diplomacy is often defined as a process of unofficial dialogues among non-official representatives of the parties involved in the dispute. Generally these non-official groups consist of influential persons who have either remained government officials in varied capacities and continue to enjoy the necessary access to the government or have the desired ability to influence public opinion in one way or other. When these officials have political influence their ideas can be included in track-1 conflict resolution process. In other words track-II endeavors to help clear the ground for Track-1 leaders to get to the negotiating table for meaningful dialogue contributing towards lasting peace.

Road to Lahore:

The second round of Pak-India dialogue since the nuclear tests of May 1998 was to be held in New Delhi from 18-20 Feb, 1999, when the foreign secretaries were to resume discussion on the main political issues, namely peace and security and the Jammu and Kashmir. But the next round of foreign secretaries talks was rescheduled when Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee planned to travel to Lahore by newly launched bus service to meet Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif (9).

A silver lining appeared on the dark horizon of Pak-India relations when the two governments took steps to improve the atmosphere of relations

through Track-2 diplomacy before the Lahore Summit. Sports exchanges became a major means of fostering detente and goodwill. Resumption of hockey matches and bilateral Cricket tests on Indian soil after twelve years was a significant development (10).

It was not an easy matter for Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif to send Pakistan's cricket team to India to play tests there after twelve long years and that too in the face of Bal Thackrey's threats. It was a success because the matches were played in a good and cordial atmosphere, free of untoward or ugly incidents. The tourists were given fool proof security, the grounds resembled armed fortress and hotels where they stayed were sealed and the gun loting commandos, on the ready, were present every where. The tour generated a goodwill of fragile kind. It showed Pakistan in a good light, willing to go an extra mile to bring about sanity in the political neighborhood. Given the threat to security of its players, Pakistan could have refused to tour, had laid stringent conditions but it accepted Indian government's assurance in good faith.

Under Track-2 diplomatic efforts another initiative to promote détente and reconciliation resulted from the organization of a Pak-India parliamentary moot at Islamabad by Pakistani newspaper The Daily News, on 12-13 February that enabled a discussion on the theme "Towards detente in South Asia". About thirty members of Indian parliament representing major parties in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha participated together with a representative group of Parliamentarians from the main political parties in Pakistan. Though dubbed "The private initiative", the conference had an official support from the governments of the two countries.

The parliamentary conference was in line with all efforts on Track-2 in the past to achieve more than an agreement in principle on ways and means to bring about the turn from hostility to peace. It was the first such meeting of the parliamentarians of both sides, and it was being conducted in a subcontinent over which shadows of nuclear weapons had become a tangible reality. After two days of deliberations in Islamabad and a seminar in Lahore, three areas of concern were dealt with in the form of proposals for further movement in improving relations. These three areas comprised the nuclear issue and arms race, political issues, and trade and economic relations (11).

Lahore Summit:

Pak – India relations were going through a curious phase of contradictory undercurrents when Vajpayee paid a visit to Lahore for a summit level meeting of February 20-21, 1999 held in Lahore. The summit was termed 'Historic' by official circles in both countries as well as many South Asian observers. This was the first ever visit by an Indian Prime Minister to Pakistan in a decade and was seen a potent gesture of hope and reconciliation. An Indian official advance party arrived at Lahore on 12 February to formulate the schedule and discuss duration of the visit and other related matters, besides drawing up a 'loose agenda' for the two Prime Minister's meeting. Indian Prime Minister arrived at Lahore aboard a Delhi Transport Corporation bus in February 1999. He was received with warmth by Nawaz Sharif. In a brief written arrival statement, the Indian Prime Minister said,

"I bring the good will and hopes of my fellow Indians, who seek abiding peace and harmony with Pakistan I am conscious this is the abiding moment in South Asian history and I hope we will be able to rise to the challenges" (12). Addressing a banquet hoisted by Nawaz Sharif in the honour of Indian premier at Lahore Fort, Vajpayee said: "As we seek to resolve issues, we have to be conscious that there is nothing which cannot be solved through good will and dialogue. The solution of complex, outstanding issues can only be sought in an atmosphere free from prejudice and by adopting the path of balance, moderation and realism". Speaking at the banquet Nawaz Sharif said that Jammu and Kashmir was the root cause of tension between the two countries. For the purpose of normalizing the relation with India, he suggested that "India and Pakistan should go beyond stated positions". Before the Summit, Indian premier categorically stated that Kashmir issue will be discussed at the summit. This was a major departure from the initial stance that India had adopted so far on this dispute. This was for the first time since the Simla agreement was signed in 1972 that the Indian side had so categorically stated that Kashmir will be put as a central agenda on the items of talks.

Another important positive step towards normalization of relations and confidence building was Vajpayee's offer to sign a no war pact and a no first use of nuclear weapons accord with Pakistan. After the two sides detonated their nuclear devices in May 1998 and are known to possess the capability of using nuclear weapons, the compulsion to prevent a nuclear conflict has increased manifold.

During his visit, Prime Minister Vajpayee visited Minar-e-Pakistan, Mausoleum of Allama Iqbal, Guradawara Dera Sahib and Smadhi of Maharaja Ranjeet Sing. Prime Minister Vajpayee's visit to Minar-e-Pakistan, a symbol of separate nationhood of Pakistan, was considered a highly symbolic gesture on the part of Vajpayee as it sought to remove any doubt about India's acceptance of Pakistan as a sovereign country. The message was strong and clear, poetic in expression and lofty in thought he said;

"I have said it earlier and I say it again that I and the Indian people have a deep desire of peace and friendship for the Pakistani people. India and its people want to see prosperous and strong Pakistan and no one should have any doubt about this, because only a strong Pakistan is in the interest of India – The good beginning has been made and better results are forthcoming – we have to work together to usher in a new era".

The two prime ministers signed the Lahore Declaration embodying their shared vision of peace and stability between their countries and of progress and prosperity for their people. Declaration said that the two prime ministers have agreed that their respective governments (13):

- Shall intensify their efforts to resolve all issues including the issue of Jammu and Kashmir.
- Shall refrain from intervention and interference in each other's internal affairs.
- Shall intensify their composite and integrated dialogue process for an early and positive outcome of the agreed bilateral agenda.
- Shall take steps for reducing the risk of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons and discuss concepts and doctrines with a view to elaborating measures for confidence building in the nuclear and conventional fields, aimed at prevention of conflict.
- Reaffirm their commitment to the goals and objective of SAARC and to concert their efforts towards the realization of SAARC vision for the year 2000 and beyond with a view to promoting the welfare of the people of South Asia and to improve their quality of life through accelerated economic growth, social progress and cultural development.
- Reaffirm their condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.
- Shall promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Pakistan– India Relations: Challenges & Adjustments

Pursuant to the directive given by their respective Prime Ministers in Lahore, to adopt measures for promoting a stable environment of peace and security between the two countries, the foreign secretaries of India and Pakistan on 21 February 1999 in a memorandum of understanding agreed to the following (14):

1. To provide each other with advance notification of ballistic missile tests.
2. To undertake national measures to reduce the risk of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons under their respective control.
3. To notify each other immediately in the event of any accidental unauthorized or unexplained incident that could create the risk of a fall out with adverse consequences for both sides, or an outbreak of nuclear war between the two countries, as well as to adopt measures aimed at diminishing the possibility of such action, of such incidents as being misinterpreted by the other. The two sides agreed to establish the appropriate communication mechanism for this purpose.
4. To abide by their respective moratorium on conducting further nuclear tests explosions unless either side in exercise of its national sovereignty decides that extra ordinary events have jeopardized its supreme interests.
5. The two sides shall conclude an agreement on prevention of incidents at sea in order to ensure safety of navigation by naval vessels, and aircrafts belonging to the two sides.
6. The two sides shall periodically review the implementation of existing CBMs and where necessary, set up appropriate consultative mechanism to monitor and ensure effective implementation of these CBMs.
7. The two sides shall undertake a review of existing communication links (e.g. between the respective DGMOS) with a view to upgrading and improving these links, and to provide for fair-safe and secure communications.
8. The two sides shall engage in bilateral consultations on security, disarmament and non-proliferation issues within the context of negotiations on these issues in multilateral form.

A joint statement issued at the conclusion of Vajpayee's visit to Pakistan, 21 February, 1999, where the two leaders held discussions on the entire range of bilateral relations, regional cooperation within SAARC, and issue of international concern. They decided that:

1. The two Foreign Ministers will meet periodically to discuss all issues of mutual concern, including nuclear related issues.
2. The two sides shall undertake consultations on WTO related issues with a view to coordinating their respective positions.
3. The two sides shall determine areas of cooperation in information technology, in particular for tackling the problems of Y2K.
4. The two sides will hold consultations with a view to further liberalizing the visa and travel regime.
5. The two sides shall appoint a two-member committee at ministerial level to examine humanitarian issues relating to civilian detainees and missing POWs. (15)

Journey to Agra:

Both countries again experienced the tense and hostile relations in the mid 1999. After the Kargil incident a new military ruler of Pakistan visited India to ease the tension, but the new efforts could not be productive, productive in a sense that no mutual or joint statement was delivered at the end of the summit.

Post 9/11 Pak – India Relations:

The 9/11 incident increased the tension between the two countries. Pakistan support to US policy against terrorism and India strongly to build its image not as the power of South Asia but rather a major Asian Power bound the two to start dialogue between the two.

In this phase, other new factors besides the emergence of India and Pakistan as nuclear weapons state, that might shape American engagement in South Asia, either for crisis intervention, or in terms of a changed relationship with India or Pakistan include the expected growth of the Indian economy which will engage American cooperation and investors and the movement of “ethnic” lobbies of Indian American and Pakistani Americans into positions of political, administrative, and financial influence (16). US prefer to be active in crisis management because the goal is to avoid a negative outcome. But in dispute or conflict resolution when the goal is to achieve a positive outcome and parties are unwilling to concede ground, the US traditions in South Asia are not sound (17). US will support till the methodology or strategy of

Pakistan and India be according to its basic policies. To achieve the goals Pakistan has to make its own planning because a large group of Americans believe that “the logic behind the US, Pakistani partnership died with the Soviet Union”. Now it is US concerns about “Islamic terrorism” and they need Pakistan’s help to control these elements (18).

The prospects of peace are more difficult because of past baggage of mistrust and suspicion. This is still carried while making efforts to resolve the issues because “It is an accident prone relationship that any incident could derail the whole process” (19).

“India’s capacity to affect others and to resist undesired influence results from the country’s various forms of hard and soft power. These forms of power include military strength, social cohesion and mobilization, economic resources, technological capacity, quality of governance, and diplomatic and intelligence acumen. A careful analysis of India in each of these realms confirms that the country has just enough power to resist the influence of others but must still make great strides before it can attain significant power over other states and thus in the international system at large” (20).

With borrowed economic structure and narrow political system Pakistan is facing many challenges in the new era. One has to look into the new realities and try to find out options because international community will help us but will not provide solutions to the problems. Realities have changed now at the theoretical, practical and diplomatic level. So now if Pakistan wants to stick to the stand, then the focus on to wait and not to pursue the things in old style. Traditional confrontation will prove high cost so the diplomatic efforts can prove some results but not according to our traditional choices. But we have to control these adjustments by mobilizing international support on Indian strategy in Kashmir and their planning regarding water issue.

India’s Kashmir policy is actually their weak point. What is the justification of the presence of six lac army? The violation of human rights, the death toll and the other incidents are the weak points and Pakistan can mobilize international support on such violations. Narrow minded and irresponsible Indian attitude towards Kashmir issue can cause problems at any stage again.

Indian inflexibility to resolve the Baglihar Dam dispute through bilateral talks is the other area of concern. "In contrast to Islamabad's flip-flop, a determined and focused New Delhi continued construction of the disputed dam, ignoring ineffective protests from Pakistan" (21). The Pakistani government is totally relying on CBMs, India is likely to finish work by the end of the month. "Reliance on India's good will has led to a situation where the country may face shortage of 7000-8000 cusecs of water daily in the Rabi season having a devastating impact on the Punjab's wheat crop (22).

They have already made a tunnel almost 22 kilometers from river Neelum (Ganga Krishan) till the Wuller Lake. Almost the half of the part is completed with concrete. This is just to control the river Jehlum. So after Ravi and Satluj, now they are in the effort to barren river Jhelum. River Kabul is the main counterpart of river Sindh. Indian engineers and finances are also involved in the project of 'Kama', which will affect the water resources in river Sindh and Pakistan's hydal projects. So these all intentional projects are the reflection of India's Long term planning to barren the lands of Punjab (Pakistani Punjab).

With all these facts Pakistan is relying on visionary leaders and track-III diplomacy. These visionary leaders can only talk about the platonic friendship. They don't have decisive role, so the confusion is still there. Showing friendly gestures, frequent visits will not decrease the importance and relevance of the intensity of the issues between the two countries. Track III Dialogues, principally people to people initiatives focus on contemporary policy issues but these explicitly function apart from, or beyond the government. Track-III only can be a tactic until it may influence the decision makers. If it may continue in such speed then expectations may rise and the absence of any serious moves, many questions will arise.

Suggestions:

- The most relevant point is the inward looking: the economic advantages to all; to provide the basic facilities; trust in the system; increasing growth rate; and social justice, can strengthen the system to bargain. Political consolidation and domestic support for the diplomatic efforts are also needed.
- Let's give the chance to institutions rather than the dependence on personalities.

Pakistan– India Relations: Challenges & Adjustments

- The ‘high speed’ can cause set backs, and the immature decisions only can increase the pressures. The patience & tolerance is much more needed now than ever before. Because fast speed can be seen in two ways. 1: It will create doubts among people and in serious elements of society. 2: It will involve such elements those do not have the political weight or strategic thinking national objectives and interest. Communication measures, notification measures, transparency measures, consultative measures and military good will measures are in practice from 1980’s. The CBMs need to be tread with caution and deliberation. It is incremental process which entails imagination and cautious optimism.
- ‘Down to earth’ policy is suitable. The understanding of the situation; review of policies, to asses the abilities and capabilities will make the leaders to articulate their point of view regarding new challenges and to decide where they must stop while accepting new realities.
- A future area of concern is discussed by Major General Vinod Siaghal in his “Restructuring South Asian Security” 2004. “This country continues to believe that, regardless the emotiveness of the Kashmir issue, the silent majority in Pakistan, and especially its non-Punjab provinces would be ready to explore many alternatives for a harmonized subcontinent; at peace with its neighbors and at peace with itself. To these elements, desiring peaceful co-existence, proposals should be offered for economic betterment of both countries. In the first instance, it is proposed to construct an oil and gas pipeline running from: Central Asian Republics – Iran – Baluchistan – Sind – to Rajasthan. A task force to prepare the blueprint should be set up for the purpose. Generous partnership incentives should be offered to the leaders of Baluchistan and Sind at a special conference in Tehran, New Delhi or London. The consortium and its lead bankers should be identified. The Government of Pakistan can consider coming abroad in due course, failing which conditions should be created for the said provinces in Pakistan to break away, retain their autonomy in a sub-continental confederation and join the consortium as independent entities. Since it will take a few years to finalize the blueprint, the other stakeholders

should proceed on the basis that in due course saner counsels "will" prevail in Pakistan.

References:

- 1) Zaglul Haider, "US Policy Towards Nuclear South Asia at the Dawn of 21st Century;" Regional Studies Vol XX, No. 2, Spring 2002, pp. 83-85.
- 2) Amera Saed, "Indian Foreign Policy Under the BJP", Regional Studies, Vol. XXII, No. 2, Spring 2004. pp. 30-31.
- 3) S. M. Burke, "Pakistan's Foreign Policy – An Historical Analysis (Karachi: Oxford University Press), 1973, pp. 30-50.
- 4) Ibid.
- 5) G. W. Chaudhary, 'Pakistan's Relations with India.' (London: Pall Mall Press, 1968), pp. 40-44.
- 6) Hasan Askari Rizvi, Pakistan's Nuclear Programme, (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1991), p. 6.
- 7) Nazir Kamal, "Nuclear Free Zone in South Asia: Pakistan's Proposals and Problems" Strategic Studies, Vol. X, No: 2, Spring 1987, p. 51.
- 8) Ibid.
- 9) Archara Gupta, India and Pakistan: The Conflict Peace Syndrome, (New Delhi: Kalinga Publications, 2005), p. 93.
- 10) Ibid.
- 11) Vandana A. Ashok C. Shukla, "Security in South Asia" Trends & Directions (New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation, 2004) pp. 100-116.
- 12) Surendra Nath Kaushik, "The Sharif Regime and the Military Take Over" in Contemporary Pakistan Trends and Issues ed. Ramakant S. N. Kaushik, (New Delhi: Kalinga Publications, 2001) p. 289.
- 13) Prakash Chander, "India and Pakistan Unending Conflict III", (New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Cooperation, 2003), pp. 70-71.
- 14) Ibid.

- 15) Sumit Ganguly, "Conflict Unending India – Pakistan Tension since 1947" (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 136-137.
- 16) Robert M. Hathaway 'Confrontation and Retreat: The U.S. Congress and the South Asian Nuclear Tests" Arms Control today: Vol. 30. No. 1, Jan-Feb. 2000 pp. 8-11.
- 17) Denis Kux, "U.S. Foreign Policy in South Asia: Some Lessons from History",
- 18) Joel F. Starr "Can the U.S. and India Be" Stead Fast Friends"? Orbis Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2001. P. 117.
- 19) Zahid Husain, The Lon Road to Peace Quoting Maleeha Lodhi" News Line, June 2003, p. 24.
- 20) Geore Perkovich, Is India a Major Power? Washington Quarterly. 2003-04/pp. 124-130.
- 21) Indian Inflexibility, The Nation, April 1, 2005.
- 22) Ibid.

Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment

Rehana Saeed Hashmi

Since the inception of this world, feelings of hostility and friendship have existed among the human groups and societies. In the primitive period, either the people living in an organized group or as individual, had the feelings to minimize the threats and maximize the benefits of peace and cooperation. In other words, from old days to modern world, individuals and their organized groups have made their utmost efforts to minimize the threats, while using different means like interaction among the societies and enhancing mutual concerns with regard to Peace and Security. It means the need to Peace and Security remained an important aspect of Government's Policies.

In today's modern Societies, which have stable and developed Governments and where states have become institutions, Security or defence is an important segment of their domestic and foreign Policies. The concept of Security is not only important for a state but it has serious implications regionally as well as globally.

Keeping in view, the significance of Security, states and their Governments use different tactics, and plan numerous strategies to secure their interests. Sometimes small states try to acquire the Security umbrella from big powers in the shape of military and economic assistance, and they usually prefer to get military assistance rather economic. The big powers using their influence affect the policies of these dependent states.

The recent global changes have completely restructured the existing power equation in the world, particularly the region where Pakistan is situated, giving new shape and dimension to our national Security environment. These dimensions have both external and internal Security parameters, producing a spectrum of multi directional threat to our National Security. Such threats are identifiable not only in the form of armed aggression, but also in other forms threatening many elements of our national power.

This paper will examine the Security concerns of Pakistan in the wake of September 11, 2001 event. The paper will also deal with the Geo-Strategic location and importance of South Asian region, where Pakistan is situated. Theme of the paper is to discuss the security concerns of Pakistan with its potential neighbours like India, Afghanistan, and Iran and their impact on the domestic Policies of Pakistan. It is also viewed that what type of foreign policy Pakistan has to adopt to strengthen its Security.

Before discussing the Geo-Strategic location and security concerns of Pakistan, it is imperative to discuss Security and National Security.

What is Security?

In the words of Charles W. Kegley, "Security means freedom from fear, risk and danger"¹. But Moonis Ahmar has introduced it as the most "misunderstood" and "confused"² term in the literature of international relations because it differs from people to people and society to society. Security is a rational phenomenon. It involves the capabilities, desires and fears of individual as well as the other states with which they interact³.

What is National Security?

National Security is the condition of freedom from external physical threat. It has wide meanings and multi-dimensional aspect. It is not only concerned with defending the territorial integrity of a nation but is also concerned with political and economic stability, and ethno-centric harmony and social integration⁴. It can be said that National Security means to secure threat internally as well as externally, maintain internal cohesion, economic security, economic self reliance, and attaining a stage of self-sustaining growth where economic and industrial growth is possible without the support of others.

Security Concerns of Nations:

Basic desire of the origin of society and state has been security. They accepted authority in order to better cope with an hostile environment⁵. It indicates that concerns for the security of the nations are as old as nation-state itself. However, a serious awareness of the security problems of nations and academic interest in national security studies began only in the aftermath of world war-II. (WWII). After decolonization

(that was a major outcome of WW-II) a lot of new nations emerged in Asia, Africa and Latin American. They had the need for an awareness of the security problems of modern nation-state⁶.

Security is the utmost need of every nation. Their primary goal is to protect and secure adequate defence for its homeland. One state's security concerns vary from other state due to their geo-graphic placement in different regions. But all the states require to have territorial integrity, protection and preservation of security and prosperity, having friendly relations with other states, freedom for commerce and Trade and opposition and condemnation of hostilities.

Geo-Strategic Placement of Pakistan in South Asian Region and its Security Concerns

It is said that geography controls the political environment of a country and there is no escape from one's geography and its impact on the policies. Geographically, South Asia can be defined as a sub region of the Indian Ocean. The base of the mountain wall that extend from Kirthar range of Baluchistan, North to the Khyber Pass. The East along the foothills of Himalayas until it runs sharply South at the Arakana Yama, defines the North West, Northern and Eastern boundaries of South Asia. Where as the bay of Bengal in the East, the main body Indian Ocean in the South, the Arabian Sea in the West, complete the demarcation of South Asia cultural zone⁷. In this cultural zone of South Asia Pakistan occupies a very important position. It is situated in a region described as the "Fulcrum of Asia"⁸ because states from three important regions i.e. South Asia, Central Asia and South East Asia meet. From the East, Pakistan is bounded by the Indian states of Punjab and Rajasthan and the Arabian Sea lies to the South of the Country⁹. It has mountainous terrain, which runs from the Sarikol range of the Pamirs in the North to the Iranian border at the Kho-I-Malik Siah. Pakistan has about 590 miles of common frontier with Iran, which is spread from Kho-I-Malik Siah to Gawadar. The 450 miles long coast line of the Arabian Sea Stretches from the Run of Kutch / Indian border to Iran in the west¹⁰.

Pakistan also has its border ties with Afghanistan, Pak-Afghan border that is called the Durand Line has mountainous terrain and is about 1200 miles long. It runs from the Sharikal range of the Pamirs in the North to the Iranian border to Kho-I-Malik Siah. A number of passes in the mountain ranges are dividing the two countries¹¹.

Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment

Since independence in 1947, Foreign Policy of Pakistan has reflected permanent feelings of insecurity. These feelings of insecurity are due to the Geo-Strategic position of Pakistan.

Pakistan's feelings of insecurity heightened by experience. Because of these feelings during cold war Pakistan joined US military umbrella and in the decade of 80's Pakistan fought a proxy war in Afghanistan against the Russian invasion but in favour of USA. After cold war, when the concept of security was totally changed and was reorganized in the form of collective and comprehensive security, Pakistan's position remained insecure due to the presence of hostile element on its eastern and western borders.

More serious questions about the security situation of Pakistan came in sight in the wake of 9/11/2001 event. When the responsibility of these attacks was posed to Osama Bin Ladin and his terrorist organization Al-Qaida.¹² Since the event of 9/11 to date, Pakistan got the status of a frontline state in the global efforts against terrorism.¹³ In this new phase of security and threat perception, Pakistan's foreign policy about its immediate neighbours like, India, Afghanistan and Iran made some serious impacts on its domestic politics. Here the study is made to examine the security concerns of Pakistan and its foreign policy with India, Iran and Afghanistan and its impact on domestic politics as well.

Security Concerns of Pakistan with India:

The deep-rooted historical and cultural conflicts between India and Pakistan clearly indicate that why India Pakistan relations have been marred by armed conflicts and tensions. There is a long list of events that created animosity and security problems for Pakistan. But the core issue is the Kashmir dispute. The problematic Kashmir issue is the root cause of all confrontations, which also caused the wars of 1948, 1965 and the Kargil Crisis 1999.

In the present Geo-Political environment where Pakistan have acquired a major status of US ally in the war against terrorism,¹⁴ efforts are being made to normalize the situation and to minimize the confrontations with India.

According to these efforts, both the Governments have increased their communication at Governmental level and are trying to improve at cultural and social level. Different confidence building measures (CBMs)

have also been introduced to normalize the situation. Pakistan has introduced a very flexible foreign policy towards India that is based on the principle of cooperation and adjustment. But the concerned circles have still some doubts about Indian intentions and policies because of its attitude about Kashmir, Buglehar and Kishan Ganga Dams.

Indian attitude about these issues have strengthened the opinion of those who believe that India is an aggressor neighbour and it has hegemonistic ambitions¹⁵ in South Asia. They also have the view that internal disorder in Pakistan is due to the Indian intervention. It is argued that during the process of normalization both the states have to use certain parameters which strengthen the efforts of peace keeping.¹

But it seems that India regularly is not only increasing its defence budget but it has started an arms race in the region and Pakistan is compelled to pursue it because of the feelings of insecurity. One of the major reasons of this escalation of tension is the element of mistrust from both the sides, the extremists from India and Pakistan are not in favour of normalizing the Indo-Pakistan relations. So they design the strategies to fail the Peace Process between them.

In present days, Pakistan's foreign policy towards India is also criticized. People are of the view that Pakistan have introduced very flexible foreign policy towards India and is trying to adjust all the mentioned challenges including the challenge of Kashmir, but this is not reciprocal. India is getting advantages and serving its own interests while Pakistan has opted a policy "wait and see". At this stage flexibility and adjustments are required from both the sides in equal proportion, otherwise serious consequences can be visualized in the domestic scene of Pakistan.

Security Concerns of Pakistan vis-à-vis Afghanistan:

Despite shared geography, ethnicity and faith, relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan have never been smooth except the Taliban Government, in Kabul from 1995 to 2000; Islamabad's relations with the Kabul remained far from cordial.¹⁵ Due to geographical proximity, Afghanistan is not only important for Pakistan for its relations with other states but it has serious repercussions on its own security and even integrity.

Since the creation of Pakistan, its foreign policy about Afghanistan is based on the principle of Muslim brethren. But Afghan Governments

Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment

remained pro Indian and Pakistan felt its eastern and western borders insecure. In 1997, first time Afghan's Taliban government, shook hand with Pakistan and in response, Pakistan extended its full support to Taliban government, by recognizing them on May 25, 1997. Pakistan's Pro-Taliban policy was criticized by the world due to the opinion that Talibans are extremists and they made Afghanistan a terrorist's supportive land. Pakistan's Pro-Taliban policy was due to its security perception. Pakistan's Security strategy with Afghanistan was, to support Taliban, because a supportive and friendly government in Afghanistan could lessen the defence burden.

After the incident of 9-11-2001, it was claimed that Afghanistan has become a base camp of terrorist activities against the US. When Taliban Government refused to handover alleged "Osama" to the US, it had to face a coalition-led attack on October 7, 2001.¹⁷ Due to the border proximity with Afghanistan, Pakistan was compelled to change its policy in favour of US. The News, a widely circulated paper commented that,

"That terrorists and their Taliban bakers who infact wanted Pakistan to share their suicidal mission, had left no option for Pakistan except to form the largest ever world coalition of the mightiest force against terrorism".¹⁸

President of Pakistan General Pervaiz Musharraf in his television address to the nation on September 19, clarified that they had no option except to change their pro-Taliban policy. Apart from the stress that Pakistan government faced to change its Afghan policy, there are certain other factors, which compelled Pakistan to change its policy strategies. First, Pakistan wanted to save itself from being declared a "terrorist state", because in 1990's Bush administration activity considered declaring Pakistan a "terrorists" state for its support to terrorist activities in Kashmir.¹⁹

At present Pakistan's Afghan policy is to support the Karzai Government to overcome its internal difficulties, because a peaceful, friendly, and cooperative Government in Afghanistan assuring Pakistan's interest both in Afghanistan and Central Asia. Another important factor of Pakistan's pro-Afghan policy is that the shape of Pakistan is like a strip of land, and its all major cities are located close to its border, it means that Pakistan lacks strategic depth. This would be available only if a friendly Government ruled over Afghanistan.

Pakistan's pro-Afghan policy is not being criticized in the domestic political circles because if Afghan government is successful to create and maintain stability inside, many of our internal problems would be solved.

Pakistan – Iran Strategic and Security Ties:

Apart from the common borders, there are two more factors, which enable to facilitate ties between Iran and Pakistan. These factors are common faith and common culture.²⁰ Some permanent and nonpermanent things become a base in the relationship of states in the relationship of Pakistan and Iran. Permanent things are their geographical proximity and common culture and faith while, the nonpermanent factors are the changing security environment, economic or ideological policies. Due to these factors Pakistan and Iran have some common interest.

For Pakistan, Iran is another source, provides natural depth to Pakistan and support in the eventuality of an outbreak of hostilities on the eastern borders. China, Iran and Afghanistan are the key strategic partners of Pakistan and have the ability to cover Pakistan.

The Iranian also have the approach that a weak Pakistan would seriously threaten Iran's South Western frontier region.²¹ For Iran, Pakistan also serves as a vital link to West Asia, and a trade route to South and Southeast Asia.

In spite of these factors Pakistan have some security problems with Iran, in which, Iran's growing relationship with India remained a threat to Pakistan's security. Iran also criticized Pakistan's Afghan Policy. During Taliban government in Afghanistan, Pak Iran relationship touched their lowest ebb. Sectarian conflict in Pakistan is another main issue that could cloud their relations.

Security concerns of Pakistan and Iran are mutually interlinked and invisible. At present, under the new Geo-Strategic realities both the nations and the Governments are under US Pressure regarding the issue of nuclear proliferation. At this stage, Pakistan's position has become more vulnerable, if the conflict turns in the shape of aggressive and hostile action Pakistan's position would become more critical. It has to face domestic as well as global pressures.

Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment

In this situation once again Pakistan could be in a situation of “either with us or not”. If Pakistan pursues the pro-US Policy, domestic pressure would damage the Government’s interests. Anti-Government lobbies would be activated and a civil disorder would be observed in the state while considering the other options Pakistan has to absorb the global pressure. Probably Pakistan has to face certain economic sanctions. Although the Pakistani authorities have repeatedly announced, that Pakistan will maintain its neutral status²² in US Iran confrontation, but the situation would become difficult to handle.

Conclusion:

In this type of Geo-political and Geo-strategic environment the policy makers of Pakistan have to judge the circumstances (the global and domestic environment) and to make such policies, which could remove the irritants. Following considerations should be kept in mind.

- (1) They should constitute a policy, which provides safeguard to its national interest.
- (2) For the promotion of peace and co-operation in the region, must address the core issue. Until the core issue is resolved, peace in the region is impossible.
- (3) Foreign Policy makers must keep in mind the proportion of flexibility and the level of adjustment to maintain in their policies.
- (4) Foreign Policy must show the strength of the Government that the people and the Government have the some wavelength to deal the issues related to internal and external security.
- (5) To establish a pattern of stable and friendly working relationship with neighbouring states.
- (6) Matters of priority should be to de-escalate the tension.

References:

1. Charles W. Kegley, Jr, Eugene, R. Wittkopf, World Politics, Trends and Transformation, Sixth Edition. (New York: Macmillan Press Ltd. 1997) P-316.
2. Moonis Ahmar, "South Asia Security in the New Millennium", (in) Rajesh M, Basrur (eds) "Security in the News Millennium: views from South Asia". (New Delhi: India Research Press, 2001) P-201.
3. Kanti P. Baj Pai, "Regions, Regional Politics and Security of South Asia", (in) Marvin G. Weing baun and Chetan Kumar, (eds) South Asia approaches the millennium. (Lahore: Vanguard Books Ltd, 1996), PP-205-206.
4. B. M. Jain, "South Asia Security Problems and Prospects". (New Delhi: India, 1985) P-5.
5. Marvin G. weing baun, "Security regimes in South Asia: Definitions and Priorities, in Marvin G. weing baun op. cit, P-4.
6. P.S. Jayaramu, "India's National Security and Foreign Policy". (New Delhi: 1987) P-3.
7. Encyclopedia Intentional, Vol, No.-II, US American Book (Stafford Press, Inc, 1970) P-11.
8. Sen-Gupta Bhabani, "The Fulcrum of Asia". (New York: Pegasus, 1970).
9. Ikram Azam, "Pakistan's Geo-Political and Strategic Compulsions". (Lahore: Progressive Publishers, 1980) PP-241, 242.
10. Mujtaba Rizvi, "Pakistan's Geo-Political Environment and Security, (in) Mehrun-nisa Ali, (ed) "Reading in Pakistan Foreign Policy 1971-1998" (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2001). PP-183-197.

Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment

11. Hassan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan's Defence Policy" (in) Syed Farooq Hasnat and Anton Pelinka (eds) "Security for the weak Nations" (Lahore: Izhar Sons, 1987) P-104.
12. Dr. Maqbool Ahmad Bhatti, "Terrorism and religious extremism in South Asia", Regional Studies, Vol-XX, No. 2 Spring 2002. PP-66-81.
13. Hassan Askari Rizvi, "The State of Pakistan India Relations", Dawn, 23 March, 2002.
14. Dawn, Sep14 2001, See also The News and Nation Sep 14 2001.
15. J.N. Dixit, "Future of Security in South Asia-Trends and Directions, (in) vandana, A. Ashok C. Shukla, (eds) Security in South Asia: Trends and Directions, (New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation, 2004) P-12.
16. Riffat Hassain, "Pakistan's Relations with Afghanistan continuity and change", Strategic Studies, Vol, XXII, Winter 2002, No. 4, P-43.
17. Daily Dawn, October 8, 2001.
18. The News, September 16, 2001.
19. Dr, Maqbool Ahmad Bhatti, "International Terrorism: Global and South Asian Perspectives, Regional Studies Vol-XV, No. 2 Spring, 1998, PP-138-150.
20. Nasim Zahra, "Pakistan Iran Relations: Compulsions and conditions for a Strategic Relationship", Strategic Studies Vol-XXIII, No. 1 Spring, 2003 PP-76-89.
21. Sohail Mahmood, "China and South Asia: current Foreign policy Dynamics," National Development Security, Islamabad, Vol, VII. No. 9-10, May – June, 1998, P-28.
22. Daily Dawn, April 10, 2005.

THEME AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

The foreign policy of a state refers to its aspired as well as actual patterns of relations with the other states. It is the key process in which a state translates its broadly conceived goals into concrete courses of action for securing its defined national interests. The foreign policy determines the broad outlines which a state is supposed to follow in its interaction with other states in order to maximize the well being of its people and empowerment as a nation. Foreign policy is the sum total of the principles, interests and objectives which the state formulates in conducting its relations with other states. These activities are evolved by the nations for influencing and changing the behavior of other states and adjusting their own activities to international environment. Multiple determinants play a significant role in the conduct and formulation of foreign policy. It can be safely stated that process of formulation of foreign policy is complex and dynamic which is all the time influenced by the change in domestic as well as regional and international environment. Pakistan's foreign policy has historically revolved around its key concerns of safeguarding its sovereignty, preserving its territorial integrity, promoting the well being of its people through economic development, advancing the collective interest of the Muslim Ummah, and securing an honorable position in the comity of nations. In the pursuit of these goals, Pakistan developed its relations with the countries all over the world. It also joined a number of multilateral institutions with a view to advance its economic and security interests. Over the course of nearly six decades of its independent existence, the foreign policy of Pakistan marched through a variety of challenges and opportunities with mixed outcomes.

Today, at the dawn of 21st century and the post 9/11 strategic environment, new challenges and opportunities await Pakistan. At present Pakistan needs a pragmatic and rational approach in the formulation of its foreign policy priorities. This requires an understanding of forces of the highly competitive world of today. While keeping in front the internal, regional and global challenges, there is need for Pakistan to restructure its foreign policy as to face the challenges ahead. There is a growing realization in Pakistan to bring about changes in the internal dynamics and external orientation that adjusts with the rapidly changing economic, social and political world politics. This conference not only represents such realization in the academia of Pakistan but also provide an opportunity to contribute to and influence the shaping of the future dimensions of the foreign policy of Pakistan.

The department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, organized a one day national Seminar on **“PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY”: CHALLENGES AND OPTIONS**” on April 18, 2005. The faculty members and renowned scholars from different universities of Pakistan participated and presented their papers with thought provoking ideas.

The seminar had three main working sessions. The inaugural session starting at 9:30 was honored by Mr. Makhdoom Khusro Bakhtiar (Minister of State for Foreign Affairs). He presented a key note address about Pakistan's Foreign Policy. The presidential address was delivered by the Vice Chancellor, University of the Punjab, Lt. Gen. ® Arshad Mahmood, and Dr. Umbreen Javaid, Incharge of the Department presented an introductory note about the seminar and the department.

The first working session was about domestic factors of Pakistan's Foreign Policy. The session was presided by Dr. Qalb-i-Abid. In this session Dr. Nazir Hussin from Quaid-e-Azam University, had discussed the situation after 9/11 event and the challenges for Pakistan's Foreign Policy, while Mr. Zafar Nawaz Jaspal who belongs to Quaid-e-Azam University discussed the issue of nuclear proliferation and the role of Pakistan. He argued on certain western perceptions regarding Pakistan and also dealt with those allegations and explained Pakistan's stance.

Ms. Mubeen Irshad from Punjab University gave an overview about different domestic factors like parliament, bureaucracy, and military role and how these institutions are affecting the Pakistan's foreign policy since 1971.

Last speaker of this session was also from Punjab University, Ms. Rehana Saeed Hashmi, discussed the security concerns of Pakistan in the changing geo-strategic environment. Second session's central theme was 'Regional factors of Pakistan's foreign policy". The session was presided by Dr. M. Sarwar. In this session Dr. Rasool Buksh Rais from Lahore University of Management Sciences presented his paper regarding Pakistan's geo-political vision of Afghanistan: Some old and new perspectives. Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi from Quetta University, discussed post 9/11 Pakistan's foreign policy regional perspective and Dr. Adnan Sarwar from Peshawar University submitted his views about Pakistan's foreign policy on Kashmir in the era of challenges and opportunities. Ms. Iram Khalid from Punjab University discussed Pak-India relations and the new challenges, which the both states are facing and also the adjustments, which India and Pakistan

have designed to normalize the situation. Dr. Ijaz Butt, from Punjab University highlighted the importance of China, a very important actor in regional politics, its role in South Asian politics.

Third working session had the central theme about global perspective of Pakistan's foreign policy. In this session Mr. Shabbir Ahmad Khan from Punjab University discussed Pak-US relations in historical perspective. Dr. Razia Musarrat from Islamia University, Bahawalpur presented her paper about post 9/11 challenges for Pakistan: New Trends in foreign policy, regional and global perspective.

Dr. Rashid Ahmad Khan from the Islamabad Policy Research Institute, Islamabad discussed Pak-US relations as strategic partners or tactical ally and Pak-US relations after 9/11.

The Seminar ended with the thanks and concluding remarks of Incharge of the Department of Political Science, Dr. Umbreen Javaid.

**DR. UMBREEN JAVAID
CONVENER**