



RESEARCH PAPER

The Post World Wars Realities and Pakistan Security Dilemma: an Analysis

Muhammad Tariq Javed*

PhD Scholar, IR Department, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan

PAPER INFO

ABSTRACT

Received:
December 07, 2020
Accepted:
March 01, 2021
Online:
March 15, 2021

Keywords:
Pakistan,
Post World War,
Security
Dilemma.
Wars Realities

***Corresponding
Author**

tariqjavedup@g
mail.com

The paper examines post-world wars' developments; ushered with the making of Nation States. Pakistan was one such creation of the changing international order. Pakistan is situated on a strategic locus that is concern of International and Regional powers. The legacy of historical invasions, the Great Game, and the end of the British Empire impacted the National Security of the newly founded nation of Pakistan all along. The comparatively short history of Pakistan is replete with National security turmoil and dilemma. The paper digs out the major factor of International politics that leads to Pakistan's security dilemma. A mixed research method has been used. Metadata and historical facts have been correlated and conflated, which finds incoherent foreign policy and unstable political order in Pakistan that invited foreign influence on her affairs, consequential to her security dilemma. The paper gives recommendations for coherent and National interest-based foreign policy in the realm of International Relations has a better National Security strategy.

Introduction

The post-First World War Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination ushered a new era of nation-states after detriments of this doctrine established its theoretical credentials at the end of the Second World War. How former US President echoes even today is reflected in the speeches of contemporary US presidents who referred to his doctrinal ideas most important in prescribing the present time world order.

"President Obama spoke at West Point, where he defined America's place in the world much as Wilson might have – propping up the international order, defending human rights, and walking eternally down the path of virtue. George W. Bush, so different in so many ways, also radiated Wilsonian idealism, even as he claimed to be an un-Wilsonian realist. His second Inaugural Address, drawn straight from the Wilson playbook, declared "the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world." (Widmer, 2014).

The later modern political developments, model; events to suit the emerging nation-state order. The emergence of nation-states provoked a consciousness of identities variants that divided nations on ethnic, geographical, ethnic, linguistic, ideological religion, and faith distinctions. With new political realities and a Westernized society that experienced a cultural, educational, and modern transition from their normative cult made the faith bonded ideology fractured into secular, nationalist, sectarian, inter-faiths, and religions factionalism, resulting in sub conflicts at the regional level. With these fault lines internally and at the regional level, Pakistan became an easy prey in the hands of international power politics players to serve their purpose for peanuts of foreign aid surrendering its sovereignty at times. Departure from the old ethos and adjusting to new world realities created disagreements, conflicts, and confrontations which also impacted Pakistan as an important entity on the world map with Muslim identity and a cause of Pakistan's Security Dilemma.

On the international scene, world war was an afresh event with its post-war international relations adjustments. A weaker Europe, assertive America, post-empire, Russia transformed with three-decades-old Bolshevik revolution which started in 1917, flexing with its communist ideology. These events were making the next phase of world power politics. The rest of the world was going through the process of emancipation and nation-states. The newly emerging nation-states were sandwiched between two political and economic systems each bidding higher to lure them in their ideological fold. This lead to alliances and pacts pitched against two major political economies the capitalist West and the communist Soviet Union. From North Africa to India however, the nationalist zeal was predominant on the political scene except for two world states Israel and Pakistan that were basing their identity on faith but a secular functioning Pakistan leaned mostly on Western nations where India chose to join the non-alignment movement and avoided joining any anti-communist pact but harboured a communist leaning. This divided both the sub-continental rivals into two Capitalist and Communists camps, adding to their security complexities as both got arms from the states of respective alliances. India had a double advantage as it was getting from both. In the case of Pakistan, the arms provided were meant against communist advances but it was well understood that Pakistan is strengthening this way to ward off any aggression from India.

The Changed Structure of Nations

The political development in India was parallel to the Westphalia paradigm shift of 1648 in international relations and new democratic doctrines of the West in the late 20th century. The post-World War international regimes and organizations provided a more integrated international political system that led to the formulation of fundamentals of self-determination and democracy. The phased-out systems of classic empires came to a grinding halt and nation-states mushroomed through passive political movements replacing aggressive military conquests and expansionism. However, this shift did not rid the world of the imperialistic notions of powerful states under the newly emerging political theory of realism. "Formation

of imperial world order in the second half of the 19th century produced and faced the challenge of racial and geopolitical perception of global humanity" (Aladag, 2016).

US became the major proponent of realism, a countervailing superpower against the former USSR. The new international political strategy did not entail only the physical occupation of other nations but through cultural and ideological engineering and political influence. The basic character of the dominance of powerful nations thus remained unchanged and ostensibly became more aggressive by other means with power still the major driving force. This can be identified as the birth of 'Realism', as a potent political tool that threatened the world peace as "...of all the countries in the world landlocked Afghanistan was perhaps the most 'secure' from US attack, yet as we have seen, in the autumn of 2001 Washington was able to bomb it and encourage an uprising which, within a few weeks, overthrew the government." (Jackson & Towle, 2006, p. 53).

There emerged so many weaker nations without a central power base like military and well-engrossed leadership cadre to sustain it. Numerous weaker states created on the democratic principle of self-determination lacked the natural process of establishing itself with power and complete dominance thus remained dependent on powerful and abler international forces for its security. Pakistan came through a political struggle and was part of this new international relations paradigm. Analysing these deficiencies establishes that the momentary cadre of leaders that led the Pakistan movement proved a passing phase and their removal from the scene as soon as Pakistan came into being made a factor of its Security Dilemma as it left it without political direction in formulating well-deliberated security policy.

Pakistan's weak military and state structure could not cope with security threats right at the onset of its creation. Pakistan inherited a dispute with India on the annexation of Jammu and Kashmir through plebiscite which Indian initially acceded to and later changed its stance. This proved to be a persistent predicament for the economy and the security of Pakistan as all the rivers originate from the state of Kashmir held by India. The issue of Kashmir became the mother of all the issues Pakistan faces and it can be rightly said that this is the major cause of Pakistan's Security Dilemma. If this issue is resolved it would impact positively on the overall regional strength and the powers that be would be discouraged to manipulate either India or Pakistan.

Crafting of Interventionist Provisions and Pakistan's Security Dilemma

The emerging extended security concepts haunt Pakistan of a Security Dilemma in making as following narratives and conceptual interpretations of interventionist reasoning. The new concepts of R2P, sovereignty, national interest, and others fall in the postmodernist category to view the world in its objectivity; framed with other modernist theories. It would, therefore, be pertinent to discuss the new emerging concept and postmodernist explanations of Responsibility to Protect (R2P), Sovereignty, and National Interest.

The concept of protecting the civilians from their governments' 'atrocities' or where the governments fail to protect them, is projected by Western nations part of international consent to allow military intervention. These are presented as a set of principles or international norms that define sovereignty, not as a right but a responsibility. When sovereignty is divorced from responsibility, it becomes a collective responsibility shifted from a government to the international community to protect the people anywhere on the globe. This disregards the generally perceived right of sovereignty to protect people from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing. In the world summit in 2005 R2P provision was included in para 138 and 139 reaffirmed by the UN in April 2006 through resolution (S/RES/1674) formalizing UN support for the R2P. These provisions prescribe:

"138. Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning capability."

139. The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We stress the need for the General Assembly to continue consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and its implications, bearing in mind the principles of the Charter and international law. We also intend to commit ourselves, as necessary and appropriate, to helping States build capacity to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and to assisting those which are under stress before crises and conflicts break out(United Nations, 2005)

The concept of collective security is a corollary for regional alliances. At the regional level countries integrate into a group or alliance on common grounds of culture, religion, political, economic interest, and shared values peculiar to a region. All these factors become divergent in a global scenario. In some global conflicts, different perceptions make it ambiguous and ill-defined, as to what makes an ideal case for military intervention. The regional collective model like EU has successfully ensured security in Europe to a greater extent, but the disintegration of the USSR, the emergence of non-state actors, interfaith issues, and transnational threats in the post-

cold war era mushroomed, making it an additional burden on national and international security due to its extended and radically divergent character.

Concepts of Security from alliances to the most intrusive articles of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has created the most critical element of Security Dilemma for states that lack in the field of real politick and has caused an ever-increasing threat within the paradigm of nation-states that have resulted at the end of big Empires and emergence of two big powers now reduced to one only. In contemporary power politics, it has sceptically created a fear in weaker states those defy powerful states' political order. Engineered chaos in politically discriminated states; can be construed by the powers that matter, to justify military intervention in energy, resource, and market lucrative zones to exact regime change. Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya have become fresh models in this regard notwithstanding the justification of the use of force, but its impact on the security and application of the latest doctrine of military intervention. Pakistan falls in a strategic zone having the potential to become a prey of critical Security Dilemma owing to strategic abrasiveness and a declined trust factor and rapport with the international community. Pakistan is seen playing the double game as an ally in the war on terrorism by NATO nations and others. CIA discarded any sharing with its ally in the War on Terrorism in the killing mission of Osama Bin Laden in the Pakistani city of Abbottabad on 2nd May 2011. The US while planning the raid excluded Pakistan as confidante doubting, it might not tip if it harboured, Osama Bin Laden. The CIA Director Leon Panetta said, "It was decided that any effort to work with Pakistanis could jeopardize the mission. They might alert the targets"(Frizell, 2015). This scepticism is a loud indicator of any future Security Dilemma in the wake of Pakistan's assertiveness in perusing its perceived interest in the region and international pledges as an ally in the War on terrorism at the same time. This creates another question, can a nation have full liberty to choose between tactical and strategic options to achieve its foreign policy objectives that imply like harbouring people as a tactical tool of influence and at the same time act as a strategic partner in collective international security. Nations do need a strategic space to keep intact their interest in finding a way out in its collective international obligation. It is fair to have this right disrespecting big or small size of nations. Lack of national power keeps this option out seemingly in loud and clear terms which is reflected the way ex-US President George. W. Bush declared in his speech on 20th September 2011 to a joint session of Congress addressing the world "*Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.*" The implicit consequence of not joining the team effort is to be deemed an enemy and is therefore a harbinger of a Security Dilemma in making. The May US raid in Abbottabad was based on notions of big power pre-emption and intervention the political thinking which undermines the classic concept of sovereignty.

Failure of Collective International Peace Forums

UN's role in settling the issues between nations is not seen as assertive as it is towards the issues involving powerful nations. In the case of Pakistan Kashmir issue

is one of such unresolved conflicts that has created Pakistan's Security Dilemma. "The UN had many successes, but it met the needs of another era—the post-World War II period." (Amin, 2006, p. 342). UN's role in politically less influential regions has resulted in a bloody resistance in the Middle East, Caspian, and Africa regions. The Palestine issue is a chronic cause of deterring peace in the Middle East. In Caucasia; Dagestan and Chechnya are still fighting for their independence and other Muslim Central Asian States still live under the iron hands of Russian Federation backed and installed rulers who are also partly backed with half-opened eyes by the West and US i.e. Russian indiscriminate bombing of civilians and siding with Syrian minority sect leader Bashar al Assad regime, as it expediently considered. The US is coordinating battlefield procedures with Russia in Syrian regions that aims at blocking anti-US elements who are an immediate threat to her interest. (Quinn & Matthews, 2017). The US perceived common threats of so-called 'Muslim Fundamentalism' with the Russian Federation. "It increases the chances of greater US-Russian cooperation" (Gusovsky, 2015). This also serves their economic, resource, and market interest in the region. In the same region, Georgia got focused political support of Western nations to be free of Russian Federation control as it aligned itself with the USA and Western powers that have increased influence on international regimes with the erosion of the Soviet Union.

This seeming dichotomy weighs on the side of the powerful states and undermines the common interest of the nations as equal members of a pluralistic international regime. This has resulted in resistance movements in Kashmir, Palestine, Chechnya, and elsewhere linked directly or indirectly to pan Islamic world movements like Al-Qaeda and various other resistance groups. Western perspective about such movements is understandable 'terrorism' related which, however, has an equal opposite connotation as of oppressed and subject of injustice. These movements are deemed to enjoy wider sympathy in the Muslim world and most of Africa and else of the like who grudge benefits of pluralistic international regimes. The leadership that has emerged with an Islamic composure in Egypt, Tunis, and Turkey is a strong indicator of this trend to find an alternative. Afghanistan and Pakistan's North-Western Pashtun belt show the effects of this inequality when their normative, tribal, and traditional values are not taken into consideration resulting in the ongoing decade-plus old resistance. Pakistan is directly affected by this international political discontent as it hosts a major portion of the people, groups, and movements involved in the international ideological and political conflicts. The rest of Pakistan's social fabric in general is permeated with the undercurrents of political perceptions that have become synonymous with resisting the USA's influence. It will be hard to overcome the state of chaos and violence in less privileged regions of the world, in particular, and the world as a whole. Without a universal pluralist approach aiming at common and granting a particular interest of normative and customary individuality.

With India prominent in the NAM pushed Pakistan to opt for joining Western alliance's as it needed immediate aid and political support under the feelings of international isolation where it could not muster enough support after

India joining and leading NAM. Pakistan had more strategic importance for the USA due to its proximity to its major ideological rival USSR around which it decided to make a ring of its international political affiliates bordering or in the proximity to the former USSR as a part of the West's containment policy. Pakistan's alignment with the West against the communist USSR was a naïveté diplomatic act as it did not bargain any diplomatic or military favour on the issue of Kashmir and rather pledged its support voluntarily at the cost of its future political and security miseries and dilemma.

The Character of Western Political and policy Approach

To understand Pakistan's Security Dilemma it is necessary to know the Western strategic culture that affects it. The USA is a major factor in this regard. With more than a thousand military bases matter in global security. Pakistan is an icon of Islamic revivalism as its national ideology is faith-based and thus represents, if not in character, in theory, the urge to resist Western secular, philosophical, political, and religious influences that can undermine the fundamentals of Islamic faith thus becomes the prime focus of the powers that seek reasons to project their power. A natural making of insecurity is a conflict that needs settlement. As natural as its creation, it should logically end with the resolution of the conflict itself. Presumably, Pakistan's single dispute with India on the issue of Kashmir, if resolved should end the dispute between them. But for the US it would need more reasons to keep intact its power projection, which makes it androgenic. This is what adds to the security liability beyond conventional threats. Barry Buzan has elaborately explained the new realm of security theory practiced by the US and the West; basing not only conventional threat but if that might be in form of human rights, environment, nuclear proliferation, democracy, etc. The new concept of R2P (Right to protect) is one of the lethal tool in hands of powerful nations especially the USA, to intervene in other nations threatening their security like we saw it practiced in Libya, bringing democracy was made a theme in the case of Iraq, terrorism became keyword to occupy Afghanistan. Pakistan and Iran are also in the same line due to international concern for nuclear proliferation and terrorism which can be instrumental in its Security Dilemma.

NATO: A New Formation with Old Legacies?

The US power projection is shared indirectly by all the NATO members. This power projection depends on a reason to justify it. US strategic culture has been the formation of the enemy and to weave around it its security policy. America is historically relevant to Muslim resistance thus security as the fall of Muslim rule in Granada and the start of the Voyage of Columbus to find new lands happened at the same time. One of the aims of Columbus voyage was, 'Whereas, Most Christian, High, Excellent, and Powerful Princes, King and Queen of Spain and the Islands of the Sea, our Sovereigns, this present year 1492, after your Highnesses had terminated the war with the Moors reigning in Europe...I saw the royal banners of your Highnesses planted by force of arms upon the towers of the Alhambra'

(Columbus, 1492). After greeting the queen, clearly showing his religious inclinations, Columbus goes on to describe his passion for the voyage in these words, 'Your Highnesses, as Catholic Christians, and princes who love and promote the holy Christian faith, and are enemies of the doctrine of **Mahomet**, and all idolatry and heresy, determined to send me, Christopher Columbus, to the above-mentioned countries of India, to see the said princes, people, and territories, and to learn their disposition and the proper method of converting them to our holy faith'(Columbus,1492).This journal is widely known and contested due to saving respect to Columbus as he has become an American national symbol but the very presence of this kind of literature that date back to the start of Columbus voyage explicitly reveals the political roots of the present American character and that of European in general. What has mostly been contested about this document are the details of atrocities by the Columbus contingent that went with the voyage, and recorded in the journal. His intentions about the followers of 'Mahomet' as he mentions Muhammad, peace be upon him are not seen contested, however.

The prevailing studies and political theories explain European and US strategic culture that has the impact of its historical roots. A recent study edited by (Smith, 2010, p. 85), elucidates it like, '...Security cultures predict and determine the importance countries place on certain policy domains (e.g. the military rather than the civilians). The security strategies base varying emphasis on the major security domains that include prevention, assurance, protection, and competence or a combination of all these. British have visualized itself, ... 'a leading member of world most successful alliance- NATO, the European Union' in the word of British Chief of Defence Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Jock, who suggested in defines Committee proceeding that, '... the UK is going to play a substantial role in delivering the right degree of global stability in that extremely challenging environment' (Smith,2010). In a recent keynote speech at Bloomberg, the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair said, 'The important point for western opinion is that this is a struggle with two sides... It is a struggle in which our strategic interests are intimately involved...Underneath the turmoil and revolution of the past years is one very clear and unambiguous struggle: between those with a modern view of the Middle East, one of the pluralistic societies and open economies, where the attitudes and patterns of globalization are embraced; and, on the other side, those who want to impose an ideology born out of a belief that there are one proper religion and one proper view of it, and that this view should, exclusively, determine the nature of society and the political economy. We might call this latter perspective an 'Islamist' view'' This mind-set indicates clear security lines drawn. Pakistan has not been mentioned by name as a major concern. The British involvement in Afghanistan and supporting US initiatives is part of Pakistani security liabilities. With this strategic assessment, Tony Blair pinpointed the threatening region that clearly shows the increased worries for Pakistan's Security Dilemma while indicating our region and Pakistan, in particular, he says, 'What is presently happening there, still represents the biggest threat to global security of the early 21st Century. The region, including the wider area outside its conventional boundary - Pakistan, Afghanistan to the east and North Africa to the west - is in turmoil with no end in sight to the upheavals and any

number of potential outcomes from the mildly optimistic to catastrophe.’ The speech closes on to the specific element of strategic threat that haunts the Christian West making a case for the religious bias in their security strategies that is alarming, ‘from Iraq to Libya to Egypt to Yemen to Lebanon to Syria and then further afield to Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan – this is the essential battle... there is something frankly odd about the reluctance to accept what is so utterly plain: that they have in common a struggle around the issue of the rightful place of religion, and in particular Islam, in politics.’ This makes a paradigm shift from containment of communism to a confrontation with Islam in modern political parlance. He, however, identifies the internal complexities derived from tribes, traditions, and territory of regions including among top Pakistan, (Avenger, 2014). This makes it a protracted and persistent scenario prone to a conflict that would add to Pakistan’s Security Dilemma.

The West’s Strategy of Securitizing Elements of National Power of Rival Nations

The Westphalia political experience established an order aimed at the balance of power. Balance of power restrained the power level of all regional nations not to exceed a certain threshold where it threatened the other nation. In modern times after the making and extension of NATO and with keeping in view the prevailing global implications, power has been monopolized by the few. Europe has a collective military and defines system in the form of NATO with the US in lead. Civilization and a major clash between the religious orders and the modern political ideologies that in present time prominently interprets into the West, Islam and other major international actors like China and Russia have been spiralled from regional to a global level where not the balance of power but the curtailment of power destruction of societies of rivals has become a new Western strategy.

Pakistan being a leading Muslim country with other Muslim nations confront this new rivalry on front lines. For example, the US keeps a strict vigil on Pakistan’s nuclear program and other aspects of social trending like extremism, the development of economic, science, and technology, and means of power projection of any regional power or single smaller state to cross a certain threshold. USA expresses its reservations and scepticism about Pakistan’s mega-project CPEC as it can extend China’s economic and military reach through the Indian Ocean. The USA is also wary of China’s extension in South China. The USA has diplomatically put a restraint on Iran to stop its nuclear program. According to Whitehouse on 16th January 2016 the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) confirmed that Iran has completed necessary steps under the Iran deal that will ensure Iran nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful. (Whitehouse, n.d.)

The denial of science and technology is part of the Western Strategies to keep the weaker nations dependent on them or to control arms proliferation. According to Amitav Malik of Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

“The relevance of technology to security is manifold and the role of ‘technology control’ as an important tool for national security strategies is significant... During cold war years, the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls (COCOM) was a technological embargo regime to prevent the transfer of dual-use technology and equipment to communist bloc states.” (Malik, 2004) & (Muzaffar & Khan, 2016)



Figure: The Technological Block, Iranian Nuclear Deal 2016

Source: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal>

Salient points of Iranian accomplishment according to the deal:

- Shipped 25,000 pounds of enriched uranium out of the country
- Dismantled and removed two-thirds of its centrifuges
- Removed the calandria from its heavy water reactor and filled it with concrete
- Provided unprecedented access to its nuclear facilities and supply chain

It has put a caution on Pakistan’s nuclear program and now is wary of its CPEC mega project of Gwadar to block Chinese influence and Pakistan’s economic development that would imply in terms of eroding US influence at its cost. The CPEC project might lessen Pakistan’s dependence on the USA as it would open so many new avenues for the self- sufficiency and future economic development of Pakistan and will result in furthering China’s influence. The USA has been observed annoyed and helpless in checking North Korea’s nuclear and missile program development. The North Korean nuclear and missile development would affect the US influence in the region as it directly threatens its ally, South Korean, and Japan

and might compromise its security. Israel under the economic and military influence of the United States allow cement and basic construction material in the Gaza strip as Palestinians might use to smuggle weapons and logistics that might impact negatively the defines of Israel. All the measures of blocking Iran and any other do not affect the case of Israel if the criteria are to block a state's military and economic development for world peace. Israel is an undeclared nuclear power the biggest recipient of military aid instead. Pakistan is exposed to all such strategic trending and threats that have put it in Security Dilemma.

Pakistan has been evading this level of confrontation and blocking measures to its nuclear and missile programs due to certain concessions and owing to its inevitable strategic importance for the USA. Pakistan has even approved certain unpopular acts for the USA which in normal circumstances would be deemed a denial of its sovereignty. Pakistan's present political elite have a quite willing composure to assuage American concerns for their survival in competition with internal soaring civil-military relations. This kind of shady practice is also causing a national security hazard and the Western powers are apt in exploiting such an opportunity as part of their strategic cultures.

Strategic Reality and Political Crafting

US support to military or democracy depends on its strategic designs. Its support for either of these two instructions depends on the level of affinity with international order and US foreign policy. In the case of Pakistan and in other parts of the world US has focused on individuals as installed leaders with pro-US approaches or the one aligned with the U. S's fundamental strategic interests. US has a history of covert regime changes (Bonicelli, 2015), where a national leader acted against the US's national interest. The US shifted its stance from supporting military governments to democracy or civilians' rules to take all on-board. The US had their interest not to rely on the military only this time, as they wanted to accomplish it with a new strategy of courting civilians' governments for realizing their foreign policy objectives, maintaining parallel relationships with military governments in Pakistan. The US did so keeping in view the popular view about dictatorship and democracy. US support for military government only would have created an impression as if the war on terrorism does not enjoy people's support. Elaborating on US policy in this regard, Henry Kissinger writes in his article, "US policy has been to urge President Pervez Musharraf into forming a coalition government with one or more civilians' parties, which would pursue the anti-fundamentalist war (or the war on terrorism) in a more coherent and determined manner." The purpose of such a combination in a country where most the military had been involved in security policies is to balance it with civilian's control over it.

This enemy crafting is processed through media projection and for demonizing the target entity to legitimize counter actions under coercive strategies. Stephen Kinzer's view is very important to substantiate this fact owing to his vast experience. In an interview, he explains this formation crafting as the US as a

strategy, "The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was not an isolated episode. It was the culmination of a 110-year period during which Americans overthrew fourteen governments that displeased them for various ideological, political, and economic reasons." (Whitney, 2012). The US doesn't lay down regime change as an element of foreign policy but as a strategy of international relations. This strategy haunts Pakistan's stability and adds to its Security Dilemma.

Kinzer answers in the interview (Whitney, 2012), as to how a regime change is conceived and executed, "The first thing that happens is a foreign government ... try to control their natural resources, ... The directors of these companies [usually US citizens), outraged at attempts of some foreign government to regulate them, come to the White House and complain. That's the first phase... The second phase ... They transform the motivation from an economic one to one that they call 'political' or 'geo-strategic'. They allow themselves to become convinced that any government that would be bothering, harassing, restricting, or taxing an American company must be anti-American, anti-capitalist, evil, repressive... that's trying to subvert American power in the world. That's the way the motivation morphs in the political process... It then morphs one more time when American leaders have to explain to American citizens and others around the world why we carried out a particular intervention [legitimacy]. At that point, we usually do not use the economic, or even the political, motivations to explain our actions. Instead, we say that we are intervening out of charity – that we are doing it to help an oppressed people who are being brutalized by an evil regime" [or as part of 'Responsibility to Protect' or delivering democracy]. The example of the Musadiq government in Iran, the occupation of Iraq, and regime change in Libya under the 'Responsibility to Protect' propositions substantiates this view. In the case of Afghanistan and Pakistan, they apply a no different strategy. Afghan *Jihad* was an official version when waged against the former USSR and has become terrorism when the same lot started resisting the US itself as an occupier. US kills the same lot in Afghanistan and forces Pakistan to kill them in the war on terrorism and aid and help them fight in Syria where the same so-called terrorists are dubbed as moderates because they serve the US interest there fighting as proxies. Chris Floyd notes, "All these ideological and religious labels don't matter at all to the leaders of the Terror War; the only thing that matters are the temporary expedients of power... Fight al Qaeda in Iraq; fund al Qaeda in Lebanon; arm and train Shiite militias and death squads in Iraq, then fight Shiite militias and death squads in Iraq" (Floyd, 2007).

Conclusion

The impact of World Wars on the International Relations was catalyst. It resulted in new Intentional developments that impacted the newly emerged National States and their sovereign rights that had now a new defining dimensions. Pakistan was affected due to the new international political developments in post-world war environments that lead to her creation and issue that followed. Pakistan rivalry with India pushed it to international alliances. These alliances made it dependent in so many regards. All this lead to weave Pakistan into International political crafting. It could not afford to be neutral as it confronted comparatively

militarily more powerful enemy, India. This all leads to Pakistan's Security Dilemma; confronting terrorism, International power politics effects compounded with the threat from India on the issue of accession of Jammu and Kashmir. The study concludes that the resolution of Jammu and Kashmir can assure both Pakistan and India mutual security, less dependence on International regimes and powerful Nations. Lesser dependence can lead it to determine National Interest based policies. Pakistan and India need a Regional strategy to evolve, that can lessen their military expenditure which can be diverted to its people's prosperity and development and enduring peace.

References

- Aladağ, F. (2016, October 12). *Anti-Westernism in Question: An Interview with Cemil Aydin on Pan-Asianism, Pan-Islamism, and the Idea of the "Muslim World" in History*. <https://toynbeeprize.org/posts/cemil-aydin/>
- Amin, S. (2006). *Empire's Law: The American Imperial Project and the "War to Remake the World."* In A. Bartholomew (Ed.), *Whither the United Nations?* (pp. 340-366). London, UK: Pluto Press (UK).
- Avenger, M. (2014, April 27). *Tony Blair's speech on the war against Islam(ism)*. <https://maskedavenger1.wordpress.com/2014/04/27/tony-blairs-speech-on-the-war-against-islamism/>
- Bonicelli, P. (2015, May 26). *A Brief History of the 'Democracy through Regime Change' Policy That Never Was (Part 1)*. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/26/a-brief-history-of-the-democracy-through-regime-change-policy-that-never-was-part-1/>
- Columbus, C. (1492). *The Journal of Christopher Columbus (1492)*. <http://www.historyguide.org/earlymod/columbus.html>
- Floyd, C. (2007, May 28). *The Left Coaster: War is our Destiny and Our History*. <http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/010398.php>
- Frizell, S. (2015, May 11). *White House Stands by Original Story of bin Laden Killing*. <https://time.com/3854546/white-house-seymour-hersh-bin-laden/>
- Gusovsky, D. (2015, November 16). *Russia, US may find common ground in fight against ISIS*. <https://www.cnbc.com/2015/11/16/russia-us-may-find-common-ground-in-fight-against-isis.html>
- Jackson, R., & Towle, P. (2006). *Temptations of Power the United States in Global Politics after 9/11*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mallik, A. (2004). *Technology and Security In The 21st Century: A demand-Side Perspective*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Muzaffar M. & Khan, I. (2016). *China-Russia Relations after the Cold War*, *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 1 Issue II, 151-169
- Paul, B. (2012, March 28). *America's Century of Regime Change*. https://www.guernicamag.com/americas_century_of_regime_cha/
- Quinn, L., & Matthews, A. (2017, January 24). *Russian warplanes fly combat mission in Syria with US*. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4148880/Russian-warplanes-fly-combat-mission-Syria.html>

- Smith, M. (2010). United Kingdom: How much continuity? How much change? In J. Sperling & E. J. Kirchner (Eds.), *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance* (1st ed., p. 85). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- United Nations. (2005). *Draft resolution referred to the High level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly by the General Assembly at its fifty ninth session (59)*. Author. Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/556532?ln=en>
- Whitehouse. (n.d.). *The historical deal that would prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon*. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal>
- Whitney, J. (2012, March 28). *America's Century of Regime Change*. https://www.guernicamag.com/americas_century_of_regime_cha/
- Widmer, T. (2014, August 13). *Long Echoes of War and Speech*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/14/opinion/woodrow-wilson-world-war-1-and-american-idealism.html>