

## **US Role in Bending Democracy during Cold War: A Case Study of Pakistan**

**Khawaja Alqama**

*Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan*

**Rafida Nawaz**

*Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan*

### **ABSTRACT**

History does not come neatly packaged in distinct periods but in order to find clarity of facts, to identify a 'regime of truth', we mark such epochs. End of the Second World War was in fact the beginning of one such period, a new phase in world affairs, in which the European state system was extended to what had previously been colonies. The century was reckoned to be the century of freedom of nations. But while in letter, the system may have been based on the principle of the equality of nations in spirit, the system was a hierarchy in which "the United States was the hegemonic power" with a contender Soviet Union. Events of the second half of the twentieth century made it evident that actors on the international stage were judged, condemned, classified and determined in their undertakings, according to two dominant modes of living, i.e., Liberalism and Communism. The term 'Cold War', coined by George Orwell to name this particular era was heralded by President Truman in his address to Congress on March 12, 1947. During Cold War period, world was divided between those who hailed the U.S as a leader of the world forces of human freedom and those who saw it as an imperialist power. This article comprises of two sections.

**a.** In the first sections, following two prepositions will be tested.

- 1) US policy makers after the World War II were committed to promote values of freedom, democracy and individual Rights.
- 2) Liberal ideology and theory of individual rights were mere masks veiling the interests of a global capitalist class to acquire legitimacy of power by the U.S.

The first section will also trace, therefore, the genealogy of democratic principle after Second World War in third world countries while the struggle for democracy in Pakistan will be studied to test the above mentioned prepositions.

**b.** In the second section, third preposition will be examined by making Pakistan a case study. As during the Cold War period the US was responsible for bending democratic Principles in order to promote the interests of a propertied class. Within the American sphere of influence totalitarian, military and personal rule were promoted, patronized and protected by the US to promote its national interests/interests of global capitalism.

**KEY WORDS:** Democracy, Truman Doctrine, Capitalism, Cold War, US, Pakistan

## **Introduction**

History does not come neatly packaged in distinct periods, but such periods, epochs and episodes are the resulting effects of a dominant power. This paper studies one such epoch- named the “Cold War” by George Orwell- from a Post-modernist perspective, which states that knowledge and power are intimately related and therefore, there is no objective reality; everything involving human beings is subjective and hence knowledge is not immune from the workings of power (Smith, 2001: 240). A discourse takes place between principles and objects based on interests. At the end of this tug-of-war situation, principles in real spirit are excluded and the mere names of principles remain to give rhetoric cover of ideals to action. So the discourses of power promote the discourses of knowledge, with ideals like liberty, equality, fraternity, democracy, emancipation etc, attaining and sustaining hegemony.

US domestic as well as foreign policy is centered on three main pillars: Democracy (including human rights), Free Trade (including regional trade policies) and Open Market (Wiarda, 1997: ix). Democracy in our view represents the ideal, and the remaining two pillars - free trade and the open market represents - the ideology of liberalism as well as the interests of the global capitalist class.

## **A Genealogical<sup>1</sup> Reading of Democratic Principle after Second World War**

In the words of famous French thinker Michel Foucault, theory is not like pair of glasses; it is rather like pair of guns; it does not enable one to look better but to fight better (Merquior, 1985:85). Theory thus is in a struggle for undermining and capturing authority and there is no such thing as ‘truth’ existing outside of power. The effects of truth are produced and transmitted by power, which in turn reproduces this power (Foucault, 1980: 92-108). To paraphrase Foucault, “how can history have a truth, if truth has a history”? Truth is not something external to social settings but is instead a part of them (Smith, op cit).

## **Beginning of Democratic ‘Regime of Truth’**

End of the Second World War was in fact the beginning of one such ‘regime of truth’, a new phase in world affairs in which the European state system was extended to previous colonies. The century was reckoned to be the century of the ‘Freedom of Nations’, a modernizing transition from the “rule of force” to the “rule of law”. A promise of change rather than a ‘break’ with the past was made by liberal nationalist reformists. New possibilities were constructed and old ones destroyed. These changes do not reflect a simple expansion of individual choice, but the creation of conditions in which only new (i.e. modern) choices would be

made. The reason for this is that the changes involved the reformulation of subjectivities and the reorganization of social spaces in which subjects act and are acted upon (Asad, 1992: 337).

“Truman Doctrine” referred to these choices in the following way:

“At the present moment in world history, nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one. One way of life is based upon the will of the majority and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections and guarantees of individual liberty freedom of speech and religion and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of the minority, imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections and suppression of individual freedom” (Truman, 1977: 60-61).

In letter, the system was based on the principle of equality of nations but in spirit, the system was a hierarchy in which the United States was a hegemonic power with a contender in the Soviet Union.

## **War of Words: Discourse on Freedom between Two Dominant ‘isms’ of the Period**

Events of the second half of the twentieth century made it evident that actors on international stage were judged, condemned, classified and determined in their undertakings, according to two dominant modes of living, i.e., Liberalism/capitalism and communism. Those nations and leaders who attempted to adopt a way, independent of these modes had to bear the brunt of consequences in terms of blood bath, large scale massacres and assassinations. Others followed the course with the help of collaborators of this “new Imperialism”, who were the beneficiaries of the system at the expense of the majority. Both views have their own perspectives on democracy. One view reflected on the incompatibility of democracy and capitalism, while the other considered democracy and capitalism to be a pre-requisite for each other.

One view was based on Marxist theology that ‘chosen people would escape the bondage of capitalism and bring the democratic promise of history to its fulfillment. Marxists identified the proletariat as the driving force of the revolution that would overthrow capitalism, making possible the realization of a socialist democracy. The upholders of this point of view believed that Marxism enabled people to understand the larger social structures in which their own lives were embedded, granted them a means of engaging in political transformation and facilitated the creation of a networks of activists, thereby, linking distinct regions and people.

## **South Asian Studies 25 (1)**

Liberals, on the other hand viewed, executed and confronted Marxism as a cold war terror that fortified illiberal forces, militarized societies and broke the links between freedom and equality. They promoted and enacted a neo-liberal model of the free market based on private enterprise and individual rights such as freedom of expression and a free media.

Viewed from a Liberal point of view, one pole of the ideological construct of Cold War was a “nightmare” and the other pole was the “Defender of Freedom”. The world community was divided between those who hailed the U.S as a leader of world forces, representing human freedom and ‘others’ who saw it as an imperialist power, an opponent of what it pretends to defend (i.e. the integrity and vitality of free society, founded upon the dignity and the worth of individual and to safeguard these values throughout the world) (Wallerstein, 2004).

Democratic ideals are as old as human beings. But democracy in the twentieth and twenty first century is in fact strategically married to free market capitalism. So democracy, according to the dominant discourse, meant a free market place of resources whose interaction is in effect self-regulating through citizen institutions and ultimately freely elected governments (Ibid).

### **Objectives Attained with Words**

American politics has over the centuries, tended towards a pronounced rhetoric of greater democracy, openness, pluralism and transparency. In the Monroe Doctrine, of the early nineteenth century, President James Monroe compared the Old World of European powers with the New World of Americas:

“They are mainly monarchies and practitioners of absolutism and autocracy, while we practice Republicanism<sup>2</sup>. They believe in domination and tyranny while we practice liberty. Moreover, they uphold the European practices of balance of power and empire while we believe in freedom. They utilize the old world techniques of diplomacy, secrecy, balance of power and Machiavellianism while we are apostles of openness, moral percepts and honor” (Wiarda, op cit: 1).

With the same language of moral superiority and purpose, President Truman over a hundred years later heralded the Cold War era, in his address to the Congress on March 12, 1947. While urging Congress to give assistance to Greece, President declared that “it must be the policy of United States to support free people who are resisting subjugation by the armed minorities or by the outside pressure” (Truman, op. cit.).

With its obvious overtones of the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine put the United States in a position of pursuing a policy that became known as containment of communism or building a global environment all over the world, fertile for capitalism.

In the very first years of Spanish empire, the imperial grammarian 'Antonio de Nabrija' had written that 'Language is Empire. Language has always been the consort of empire and forever shall remain its mate. Together they come into being, together they grow and flower and together they decline.' Since then up to our times, there has been a fight for the construction of meaning (Alvers, 1990:85-89). This need for a high moral purpose expressed by the language is manifested in the words of top decision makers who shed light on American beliefs and reinforced the sense of American distinctiveness from the powers who practice realpolitik. The following question thus arises here, "Does moral rhetoric expressed by Monroe via Wilson to Truman till today contains 'true' meaning or is it truth as an effect of power"? The answer lies in an NSC Memoranda, one of the highest level government planning documents. The author of NSC 68, Paul Nitze explains, "Our free society is marked by marvelous diversity, deep tolerance, lawfulness a commitment to create and maintain an environment in which every individual has an opportunity to realize his creative Powers. The assault on free institutions is worldwide and imposes upon us our responsibility of world leadership. Since a defeat of free institutions anywhere is a defeat everywhere. No corner of the world, however tiny and insignificant, can escape our ministrations". A memorandum calling for an increase in armament at the same time proposed a domestic program counter to ideals, it proposed.

"To achieve these essential goals, we must overcome weaknesses in our society, such as "the excess of preliminary open mind", "the excess of tolerance", and "dissent among us". We will have to distinguish between the "necessity of tolerance" and "just suppression", a crucial feature of the democratic way. It is particularly important to insulate our labor unions, civic enterprises, schools, churches and all media for influencing public opinion from the evil work of "Kremlin' which seek to subvert them and make them source of confusion in our economy, culture and body politic"<sup>3</sup>.

From the above mentioned memoranda, we can draw the conclusion that the US is a state with a split personality or a dichotomy exists between lofty democratic principles and crude interests lying behind. When the United States "stole" (Teddy Roosevelt's words) Panama from Colombia in 1902 in order to build Canal there, and subsequently sent military occupation forces to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua and Panama, did Americans genuinely believed that they were bringing the benefits of a superior civilization (democracy, elections, Protestantism, free enterprise) to "less fortunate" lands and peoples?

In most cases throughout history-especially First and Second World Wars, American statements of moral purpose and the pursuit of hard-headed national interests went hand-in-hand. That is, the United States which went to war against Germany and the Axis powers; both in order to defend threatened the US interests globally and in Europe, as well as to "make the world safe for democracy" or to

## South Asian Studies 25 (1)

defeat fascism. The Cold War for all those decades was both a strategy to contain the Soviet Union and to defeat "Godless communism". Internally, this led to repressions and communist hunt, known as 'McCarthyism', which curbed freedoms of expression and fiercely opposed anything that sounded remotely communistic or socialistic. Unions were purged of radical influences and communist and other leftist parties were effectively proscribed. FBI infiltration of anything considered oppositional began in earnest. All this was legitimized as vital to internal security of the US in the face of Soviet Union<sup>4</sup>.

To paraphrase Arendt, "Leviathan imposed order upon the potential chaos of individual interests. Labor was pushed and cajoled into a general compact with the capital, coupling wages with productivity gains. Working class support was procured for US politics abroad in the name of communism and economic self interest (Arendt, 1968: 23). In foreign affairs, US presented itself as the chief defender of freedom (understood in terms of free markets) and the rights of private property. The century was hailed as "American Century"<sup>5</sup>, suggesting an inevitable destiny beyond empire and beyond reproof (Smith, 2003).

Two main strategies were set for internal order and protection of the American empire.

1. To protect internal social order within the United States, with no radical distribution of wealth and power and no major challenge to elite and/or capitalist class.
2. To encourage continuous expansion of domestic capital accumulation and consumption to ensure domestic peace and tranquility (Williams, 1980).

Externally, US provided economic and military protection for propertied classes or political/ military elites, wherever they were located. In return, these propertied classes and elites typically were focused on pro-American policies in whatever country they happened to be (Harvey, 2003: 53).

Within the US sphere of influence, the so-called 'free world' it sought to construct an open international order for trade and economic development and rapid capital accumulation along capitalistic lines. In the newly liberated world, national liberation and sovereignty were not only powerless against global capitalist hierarchy but also contributed to its organization and functioning (Hardt & Negri, 2000:336).

US exercised its powers as a super-imperialist state based on leadership of propertied classes and dominant elites, wherever they existed through privileged trade relations, clientelism, patronage and covert coercion as chief weapons of control. Indeed, US after the Second World War, bended the very foundation of episteme<sup>6</sup> of the given era democracy, by supporting and patronizing friendly dictators and overthrowing popular democratic governments to safeguard the interest of the capitalist class, that was by the time dominant factor in the decision making of these countries. Following examples will serve to prove this proposition to be true.

Roosevelt, though sick, on his way back from Yalta conference, went out of his way to stop in order to talk with the non-representative House of Saud, about the importance of maintaining flow of oil, necessary for military and industrial activities that were boosted by Marshal Plan, after the onset of the Cold War. Overthrow of Prime Minister Mossadegh, who had nationalized the oil fields of Iran and his replacement by Shah in 1953 and subsequent support to guard US interests in the Gulf region was typical of this approach (Harvey, op cit: 54).

Ahmed Sukarno of Indonesia could be both, a democrat or demagogue. PKI that supported him during the 1950s and early 1960s, had won a widespread support not as a revolutionary party but as an organization defending the interests of poor within the existing system. He encouraged mass trade unions and peasants, women and cultural movements. It was this popularity, rather than the threat of armed insurgency that alarmed the Americans (Crouch, 1997: 155,351). A file in 1964 called for the 'defense' of western interests in South-East Asia, a major producer of essential commodities. The region produces nearly 85% of world's natural rubber, over 45% of tin, 65% of copra and 23% of the chromium ore' (Curtis, 1995: 57). In 1962, British Prime Minister Macmillan and President Kennedy agreed to remove Sukarno. In 1990, American journalist Kathy Kadane revealed the extent of secret American collaboration in the massacres of 1965-66 which allowed Suharto to rise to the presidency (Washington Post, 1990, May 21). Suharto was regarded in western media discourse, as a "Modernist" making Indonesia a model pupil of capitalism (Pilger, 2002).

## **Pakistan: A Case Study of Dichotomy Among Rhetoric and US Strategic Interests**

Pakistan is an interesting case because it has experienced a wide range of military democracies with of the United States. Pakistan's journey en route to democracy was guided by the US Military dictators who were in the driving seat. This road to democracy, however, took many turns. From the modernism of Ayub era, it was turned to the path of achieving Islamic democratic ideals by General Zia-ul-Haq and then under Musharraf, Pakistan took a 'U-turn' on the path of 'Enlightened Moderation'".

## **Match of Interests between Non-Representative Institutions of Pakistan and US Policy of Containment (1947-1969)**

During the period 1947-1969, the will to be modern and fear of India was the guiding principles of Pakistan's domestic as well as foreign policy. These policies heavily depended on aid. These interests match the US interests of containment in the region.

In case of Pakistan, the post-colonial state required state formation and nation building as well as the fulfillment of promises of economic prosperity for those Muslims of the sub-continent, who ended up living in Pakistan after 1947. The state of Pakistan, which was formed in 1947, inherited from the colonial era an extremely backward economic system and a range of acute socio-economic and political problems. The ruling set up of the country was weak and had no firm roots in the state and from the very beginning it depended upon various forms of support and assistance from outside in order to consolidate its position (Moskalenko, 1974). Pakistan's ruling circles also needed support in connection with tension that had arisen in relations with India, as well as Afghanistan. Indeed, very few countries were born in an atmosphere so surcharged with intense ill will and mutual hatred, as Pakistan did at independence due to the partition of the sub-continent. In early years, almost every action of Pakistan could be interpreted as being motivated by the fear of India (Sayeed: 1964).

Therefore, the main driving force behind Pakistani foreign policy for many years was an attempt by its ruling groups to have, in the words of Ayub Khan, "friends-powerful friends, who are interested in our security, who are interested in our freedom, and who are interested in our progress" (Khan, 1967: 116).

Cold War considerations were no doubt, primarily responsible for America's increased interest in a country which more than once proclaimed its agreement with the US ideological attitude towards world Communism. Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan's visit to the United States in early 1950, may well have been a turning point in American attitude towards Pakistan. While Nehru's India maintained a neutralist posture during the Korean War, it was the Pakistani condemnation of North Korean aggression and its extended support to the United Nations that tilted American sympathy towards accommodating Pakistan as an ally. Similarly, Pakistan's outspoken support of the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951 with Japan contrasted sharply with Nehru's adamant criticism of American policy in Asia. India's incessant sermonizing on the moral superiority of non-alignment, combined with criticisms of American concern with "Communist expansionism", gradually made certain circles of the Truman Administration wonder, how a containment policy could be applied to South Asia, if "that greatest Asian democracy" firmly refused to be a part of the so-called free world's defense system. The most logical alternative was to lay the ground work for a mutually beneficial working relationship with the other major state of the subcontinent, Pakistan (Lerski, 1968).

While on the external front, Pakistan was seeking powerful friends in free world, for having support to modernize its industrial structure and fulfill its security requirement. Internally civil and defence officials and their allies among important West Pakistani landed and business families were developing a political culture to marginalize the majority Bengalis in a parliamentary democracy based on the principle of majority rule. Fear of Bengali domination led politicians from the West Wing to become junior partners of non-elected institutions, who defined



state imperatives in terms of their own more narrowly focused institutional interests (Jalal, 1995:50-51). Pakistan's political culture was marred by three non-representative institutions, with a strong imprint of colonial heritage i.e. Bureaucracy, Army and Judiciary since 1953 with the dismissal of Nazimuddin Government.

The supremacy of the executive (bureaucrats turned politician with the army and still has a covert influence), not only over the legislative but also the judicial organ of the state was established with Maulvi Tamizuddin (case). By the time, Pakistan entered military treaties such as SEATO & CENTO with US Alliances of non-representative institutions suited the hegemonic interests of the US, a torch-bearer of John Locke republicanism and apostle of limited government, based on checks and balances among representative as well judicial organ of the state.

Governor General Ghulam Mohammed's tenure in office, the U.S. made the 'dramatic entry' into the political arena and went so far as to influence the appointment of Muhammad Ali Bogra (An ambassador to US) as Prime Minister of Pakistan (Alvi & Khusro, 1965:10-11). The bureaucratic, military and industrial elites, all had ties with the imperialist power but each for different reasons. The military elites wanted to increase their fighting machinery, industrial elites their economic power and the bureaucratic elite their industrial power.

## **Indirect Intervention in Pakistan via Expert Rule**

Pakistan was no exception from "the will to be Modern" which was strong in ex-colonial countries because of the nature and priorities of the elite groups that had emerged during the colonial period. Western industrial nations were projected as examples of such modernization, ignoring the fact that Europe had a unique experience of evolution of democracy as well as that of exercising imperial powers over the rest of world. Because such experience can not be replicated in third world so these countries turned towards "internal colonialism" on the basis of advice from foreign knowledge/power complexes or centers such as Harvard Advisory Group (HAG). The Harvard advisory group was installed in the Planning Board in 1954. It remained in Pakistan from 1954-70 and funded by Ford Foundation, World Bank and the United Nations, where its role was to supervise the economic development of Pakistan. But, implementing western doctrines of economic development, this group was not in tune with the problems of the majority of people in Pakistan and failed to recognize the realities on the ground that were faced by different regions of Pakistan, in part it over looked the ethnic impacts of its policies that were responsible for incremental and ever-mounting disparities between different regions. One study produced by this group stated that "underdeveloped countries do not really need 'people' to come and give them counsel on what to do. There are times when a particular piece of expert's

## **South Asian Studies 25 (1)**

guidance is needed in order to decide some technical detail, but in general it is all too obvious what needs to be done” (Hussain, 1979: 164-67).

Military took direct control of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1958. The period of Ayub Khan, then was regarded as a success story for the so-called ‘Development Paradigm’. During this period, the Planning Commission of Pakistan was dependent on HAG. HAG’s influence involved ‘the direct transfer of economic knowledge to the highest policy levels of government’ (Papanek, 1967: 85). This period ended with highly politicized impact of modernization policies in terms of the raised expectations, leading to a new wave of nationalism, ethnic competition, rivalry, tension and alienation between different regions of Pakistan. In 1971, the external powers intervened to dismember Pakistan. United States remained a silent spectator of Yahya regime (mass killings in East Pakistan), while India backed by the USSR, intervened in the region for the creation of Bangladesh.

### **Pakistan Crush with Democracy (1971-1977)**

After the dismemberment, of Pakistan Z.A.Bhutto, like Sukarno in Indonesia, tried to follow an independent course in foreign policy, named “bilateral trilateralism”, namely good relations with each of the superpowers and to cultivate friendly ties with three important Muslim countries, i.e. Saudi Arabia, Iran and Libya (Bhutto, 1977: 85-89). Bhutto expressed anti-American sentiments in his 1970s election campaign. He sought to link the military rulers and economic elites with US imperialistic interests and predicted that the fall of one inexorably, meant the fall of the other. He declared his moral aversion to Pakistani ties to SEATO and CENTO and its subservience to a great power on whose help it depended. Bhutto, a self-proclaimed socialist was one of the first leaders to speak about the third world, with its new found unity and he identified oil rich Muslim countries with the rest of third world and perceived new opportunities in terms of North South relations (ShIrin, 1982:53).

Bhutto’s clash with US was based, not on his socialist policies adopted to favor the leftist faction within his party (as he was regarded a socialist of convenience rather than conviction), rather it was a result of his nationalistic views which determined to pursue a nuclear option for Pakistan. Pakistan’s standing in the Islamic world and its role in the third world forums offered an opportunity to counter the US, and this route was exploited adroitly by Bhutto (ibid). During the popular movement of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) against Bhutto’s government that accused him of election rigging, his advisors felt that that the US was likely to stir up agitation. Bhutto and his inner circles of advisors often cited Kissinger’s remarks of August 1976, when he urged an end to the reprocessing plant agreement with the Ford Administration because “if Carter comes in, he will make a horrible example of you”. Anti-Bhutto movement of March-July 1977 was thus seen in the Bhutto camp, as reflecting deliberate US policy to “make a

horrible example' of an independent-minded and nationalistic Prime Minister (Ibid). Bhutto's Pakistan had run foul of Carter's nuclear non-proliferation policies. His replacement by the military, if not actually aided, was nonetheless, not actively discouraged (Ibid).

### **Zia's Model of Islamism-Promoted by US to Fight Communism**

Pakistan with Zia ul Haq in charge was a leading actor in the final episode of Cold War played out on the stage of Afghanistan's mountains. US entered this last front with Carter's doctrine pledging that "any attack by an outside force to gain control of Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force" (Ibid). Gross human rights violation by Zia regime and delay in the process of democratization were all ignored by US and an anti-democratic militarily strong man became a 'frontline soldier' to protect democratic ideals of the free world.

This time a moral paradigm was created by Pakistan when it converted 'war-mongering tribal lords' into Mujahidin, fighting a jihad (just war) against a godless power, the Soviet Union. Thousands of militants were trained to fight a guerrilla war. Fighter recruits after receiving training in US-sponsored madrassahs of the North West Frontier Province fought 'the last crusade' against communism. The madrassah became a place for injecting ideology of violence and superiority of purpose in raw minds in 1981.

As the Soviet forces withdrew, the process of the disintegration of Soviet Union gained momentum. In 1992, world became unipolar with the fall of the only contender to the dominant capitalist designs.

### **Conclusion**

In the words of Plato, truth for the chained men caught in chains and captive in a dark cave is nothing but shadows. Most of the people of third world though free, remain captive of either one group or the others. With a bitter undertone, one could say that only the malignant shadows change from time to time their form. Therefore, the dreams for a better future and fruits of independence were never realized.

As a historical matter, it was the US determination after Second World War to promote capitalism and contain communism that was the driving force behind the creation of the World Bank, IMF, GATT and most recently WTO as well as a host of other free market oriented international institutions. In the words of Friedman, "Even within the Cold War system, America was hard at work building up a global economy for its own economic and strategic reasons" (Kaplan, 2000: 63-

## South Asian Studies 25 (1)

78). The historical facts stated above shed light on the reason of growing Anti-Americanism all over the third world, especially Muslim world.

Thus, it will be proposed here that only by in sharing its material and spiritual wealth with the world at large, America is able to advance its own interests. Mere rhetoric will not serve the purpose any more. US has to create under her own leadership an empire of collaboration for the advancement of democratic and scientific knowledge. In the end, this will best serve their national interests.

Today's universal prescription for the multiple ills of underdevelopment, given by the dominant discourse, is that of democracy and capitalism. Market capitalism is said to be the most efficient economic system and democracy is also reputedly the fairest political system, the world has ever known. It is seen as the most respectful of individual liberties. Working hand in hand, markets and democracy, it is hoped that it will gradually transform the world into a community of prosperous, war-shunning nations and individuals into liberals, civic-minded citizens and consumers. In the process, ethnic hatred, religious zealotry and other backward aspects of underdevelopment will be swept away (Chua, 2004:89).

This dream is so vividly and ardently expressed by the new US "Empire" in the twenty first century that the subsequent events of this century will shed light on the realization of this dream. May be this new "imperial dream" is only a figment of the (American?) imagination ... or it could turn out be an historical epoch of truth, lived in peace and prosperity by nearly all of mankind.

## Notes

1. A genealogical reading involves a radical shift in one's analytical focus. It involves a shift, away from an interest in uncovering the structures of history and towards an interest in understanding the movement and clashes of historical practices that would impose or resist a structure. ...With this shift, social inquiry is increasingly disposed to find its focus in the posing of 'how' question, not 'what' questions. How are structures of history produced, differentiated, reified and transformed? How are fields of practice pried open, bounded and secured? How are regions of silence established?
2. Locke's society is fairly slanted in favor of the individual: preservation of the person, privacy of property. At the same time, the pressures towards conformity and the force of majority opinion are also strong. The structure of his civil society, with its checks and balances, its separation of powers, its groundin on law of nature is designed to achieve a balance between the rights and needs of individual and the need for security and order.
3. *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)*, 1950, Vol. I, 234-92, made public in 1975. National Security Council (NSC) memoranda are the highest level government planning documents.
4. See Macarthyism in Encyclopedia of American History, also in Encyclopedia Britannica, Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.
5. 1941 cover editorial of Life magazine was entitled "American Century" by Henry Luce an isolationist who considered that history has conferred global leadership on America.
6. Episteme according to Foucault, represents a particular epoch of history differentiated from other periods, on the bases of Principles that become the bases of everything else

in that period. If democracy and liberty was the guiding principle of episteme started after WWII, then US itself was making epistemic violence to the governing principle (Democracy) of this particular episteme, heralded as “New American Century”.

## References

- Alvi, Hamza & Khuro, Amir. (1965). *Pakistan and U.S Aid*. Syed and Syed, Karachi.
- Arendt, H. (1968). *Imperialism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Janovich.
- Bhutto, Zulfikar. Ali. (1977). *The Third World: New Directions*. Quarter Books, London.
- Chua, Amy. (2004). *World on Fire*. Anchor Books A division of Random House, Inc. New York.
- Crouch, Harold. (1997). *The Army and Politics in Indonesia*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Curtis, Mark. (1995). *The ambiguities of Power: British Foreign Politics since 1945*. Zed Books, London.
- Endicott, E. John., & JR., Stafford Roy W. (ed.). *The Truman Doctrine in American Defense Policy*. Truman, H. S. (1977). The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.
- Gailey, Christine. (ed.). *Civilization in Crisis*. Asad, Talal., *Conscripts of Western Civilization in Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*. Vol. 1, 1992, University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Gordon, Colin. (ed.). *Power, Right Truth in Power/Knowledge*. Foucault, Michel. *Power, Right Truth in Power/Knowledge*. (1980). Harvester, New York.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Harvey, David. (2003). *New Imperialism*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Hussain, Asif. (1979). *Elite Politics in an Ideological State: The Case of Pakistan*. DAWSON, London.
- Jalal, Ayesha. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Kaplan, Robert D. (2000). *The Coming Anarchy*. Andom House, New York.
- Khan, M.Ayub. (1967). *Friends not Masters A Political Autobiography*. Feroz sons Publishers, Lahore, Karachi, Dacca.
- Merquior, J.G. (1985). *Foucault*. Fonana Press, Collins.
- Moskalenko, Vladimir. (1974). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*. *Asian Survey*, Vol. 14, No. 3, Soviet Scholars View South Asia. (March, 1974).
- Nandy, Ashis. (ed.). *Science, Colonialism and Violence: A Luddite View in Science, Violence and Hegemony*. Alvers, Clause, Oxford India paperbacks, 1990.
- Papanek, G.F. (1967). *Pakistan's Development: Social goal and Private Incentives*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Pilger, John. (2002). *The New Rulers of the World*. Verso, London, New York.
- Sayeed, Khalid Bin. (1964). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Pakistani Fears and Interests*. *Asian Survey*, Vol. 4, No. 3. (March, 1964).
- Smith, Neil. (2003). *American Empire: Roosevelt Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. University of California Press, Berkley.
- Smith, Smith. (2001). *New Approaches to International Theory in the Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Tahir-Kheli, Shirin. (1982). *The United States and Pakistan: The evolution of an Influence Relationship*. Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2004). *Quo Vadis America?* Yale Global.
- Washington Post*, May 21, 1990.
- Wiarda, Howard J. (1997). *Cracks in the Consensus, Debating the Democracy Agenda in U.S. Foreign Policy*. The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Connecticut London.

## South Asian Studies 25 (1)

Williams, W.A. (1980). *Empire as a Way of Life*. Oxford University Press, New York.

### Biographical Notes

**Prof. Dr. Syed Khwaja Alqama** is Professor of Political Science & International Relations in the Department of Political Science & International Relations, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan and currently serving as Pakistani Ambassador to Yemen.

**Rafida Nawaz** is Lecturer in the Department of Political Science & International Relations at Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan.

---