

BOOK REVIEWS

DR AYESHA SIDDIQA, *MILITARY INC. INSIDE PAKISTAN'S MILITARY ECONOMY*

(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2007), pages 282.

Dr Ayesha Siddiqa is a military analyst with a Ph.D. degree in War Studies to her credit. She obtained this degree from King's College, London. Her recently published book: *Military Inc: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*, is an extremely controversial book and as such, it has created plenty of ripples. She has mercilessly lashed at the economic "empire" that the armed forces have built up in Pakistan.

Keeping in view her sound scholarly accomplishments, especially in the field of research and reference, it was expected that she would be fair and candid in her judgment and would carry out her analysis without any malice or prejudice, but, regrettably, her narrative falls far short of our expectations. The general reaction of the discerning reader is that the author has pre-conceived notions and her prime object is to malign the armed forces out of all proportions. Attributing motives to an Organisation that has made tremendous sacrifices for safeguarding the geographical and ideological frontiers of Pakistan, is extremely regrettable. However, of late, she appears to have softened her stance towards the armed force. Assuming a defensive position, she regrets that the people have not properly understood her viewpoint. At the recent launching of her book in London, she assured her audience that the book was not about Pakistan and, in fact, Pakistan was only used as a "case" study.

There is a general consensus among the academia that the book suffers from many factual mistakes as well. To quote only one example out of many: she levelled a few charges of financial scam against General Hameed Gul and his daughter Uzma Gul. The General summarily dismissed all these charges and in turn, served a legal notice of 1.4 billion for writing something in the book that is totally "false and unauthentic".

Ayesha's book, primarily revolves around "Milbus" (i.e., military business), which, to her, is meant for the gratification of senior officers by transferring huge funds from public account to individuals, without transparency. Elaborating her point, she says that while Western initiatives, operate from outside, making money and doing business from other countries, here in Pakistan, the military perpetrates inside to get embedded in the socio-economic and political area. She contemptuously remarks that for sixty years, the military classes have cohabitated with ruling elites, such as the politicians, bureaucracy, civil society and businessmen, thus wresting an "empire" for

themselves, especially, for the senior army officers. Democracy in any case, is their anti-thesis.

Continuing her diatribe against the defence forces, she discloses that it took her two years to research to find an answer to the issue as to why everybody in the military was “biting into the pie” and the corporate and the political elites were letting them do that? And then, she felt relieved to find an “explanation” at last. She learnt that in Pakistan, *Predation is the norm and the predators are the ruling elites*: Explaining her point, she cynically remarks that the defence forces, along with others, have preyed on and plundered the resources of the State. She makes us believe that this conclusion she has drawn after having interviewed around “100 odd johnnies”.

Dr Ayesha reiterates that profits of “*milbus*” accrue without any accountability to some individuals in the top echelons of the army, navy and air force and as such, the need to protect this capital serves as a factor in the military’s compulsion to stay in politics. It thus exercises its hold on political power that allows it to make rules to protect the privileges of the officers cadre and their counterparts.

Thus, she frankly suggests that the chances of the revival of democracy in Pakistan are bleak. On the same analogy, she asserts that *Milbus* also determines the foreign policy of the country.

Further, she asserts that financial autonomy to the military creates other groups in the society, who ask the military to attain political autonomy. This trend forces the military to get power in various controls. She maintains that under such circumstances, democracy cannot prosper. In countries like Turkey, Indonesia and Pakistan, the armies exploit their economic strength to capture political power and then close doors on the democratic forces at the cost of losses to their own professionalism. In the process, ruling elite, big businessmen, and top civil bureaucracy join the military establishment and get benefits.

We do concede that, Ayesha has every right to enunciate her viewpoint. However, those who closely know the working of the defence forces, are shocked at the deep rooted prejudice that she displays against the defence forces. Things do not happen the way she has painted them to be.

Commenting on the contents of the book, Defence Minister, of Pakistan, Rao Sikander Iqbal, has categorically refuted her observations. To him, contents of the book are highly misleading and the entire account is based on distortion of facts, conjectures and personal bias. Further, he asserts that the Armed Forces have a very robust and strong welfare system. It not only looks after welfare of its personnel, but also contributes greatly to national development. Organisations like: *The Fauji Foundation, Army Welfare Trust; Shabeen Foundation and Babria Foundation*, are all success stories.

Propaganda launched by Dr. Ayesha and other detractors of the Armed Forces is certainly damaging to the officers and men who are serving the country under extremely trying circumstances, viz., facing vagaries of wind and weather. Those who are tarnishing the image of the Defence Forces, will do well to see its working from closer quarters. Hopefully, they will change their jaundiced views.

Post Script

Cary Schofield, a well-known British authoress and intellectual, has criticised Dr Ayesha for use of “emotional” language in the book. Quoting one example, she says that Ayesha had written on pages 65 of the book that military “mocks” at civilians for lack of good performance. Cary suggests that this is not the way, military expresses itself. She suggests that instead, Ayesha might have used the word “exasperated”. One wonders, if Dr Sahiba would find time to heed to this suggestion!■

Ghulam Sarwar, Consulting Editor, *IPRI Journal*.

SAMIR AMIN, *BEYOND US HEGEMONY? ASSESSING THE PROSPECTS FOR A MULTIPOLAR WORLD*

(London: Zed Book, 2006), pages 191.

Samir Amin is considered as one of the world’s foremost radical thinkers. He was the Director of the UN International Institute for Planning from 1970 to 1980; Director for World Forum at Dakar, Senegal, and the Co-Founder of the World Forum for Alternatives. He has a number of books to his credit. As a world class economist he is considered by some readers as a prospective Nobel Prize contender.

In this book, Samir Amin, deeply reflects on the present times. He argues that US hegemony under President George Bush Junior has reached a dangerously new level. In his view, Bush’s hubristic militarism will reach a never-ending cycle of wars and block all hopes of social and democratic progress not only in the developing world but also in the developed North.

Amin rejects the highly ideological notion that current form of neo-liberal capitalism, the “really existing capitalism”, in which imperialism is an integral and permanent part, would be an inevitable future for humanity. Yet, he is not averse to globalisation, in which the whole world is irrevocably connected and feels that solidarity in diversity is the key to struggle for a better world.

Amin makes a convincing case for building a multipolar world, but thinks that this is a challenging task, entailing a gradual process that would evolve over a period of time. The “triad of imperialism”, comprising North America, Europe and Japan, is not easy to disentangle. But the three strategic

opponents of the US., viz., China, India and Russia, are not only retreating but also maneuvering for advantages and trying to avoid a clash with the sole superpower, the US. In some areas, they act in unison with the US, especially against all forms of Islamic radicalism. Also, in the Marxist term, “compradorisation” of the ruling classes in the developing world has taken place. It makes both the elite and their economies vulnerable. In fact, the “emergent countries”, such as Korea, India, Brazil, China and Japan, unlike the Bandung spirit of the 1950s and 1960s, are oriented towards “growth maximisation within the system of globalization” (p.150).

The “logic of capitalism,” he opines, has brought only waste, inequality and misery. The “law of immiseration,” formulated by Marx, has worsened the plight of the underprivileged over centuries. However, Amin remains rather sceptical about the European project to counter American hegemonism. He recalls that this is reminiscent of the former alliances that led to world wars and colossal destruction. He envisages a “new axis” of Paris, Berlin, Moscow and subsequently of India and China, together with the global South. But in his view, there are some problems with Europe, as the latter has been equally exploitative and culpable of “capital accumulation” by hewing a neo-liberal agenda. Hence, Africa, Asia and Latin America, need to forge a common front in facing this challenge.

However, he feels that the “logic of capitalistic expansion” will soon falter after resistance mounted by multifarious social forces, which he terms as “anti-systemic forces” (p.152). He recommends a global alliance to defeat the “Americanisation of the world”. This includes neutralising and subduing other partners of the Triad (Europe, USA, Japan) and minimising their capacity to act outside American control. Secondly, to establish military control through NATO and “Latin Americanise” former parts of the Soviet world. Thirdly, to exercise undivided control over the Middle East and Central Asia’s petroleum resources. Fourthly, to dismantle China and ensure subordinating large states such as India and Brazil to US hegemony. This would prevent formation of regional blocs that are able to negotiate terms of globalisation. Fifthly, to marginalise regions of the South that are of no major strategic interest for the US.

He thinks that the real movement of societies, following internal reforms and global level developments, would prove instrumental than mere woolly concepts of “democratic movements” and “civic societies”. He envisages that developments such as new social Europe that “exits Atlanticism and neo-liberalism”, the prevalence of market socialism over “national capitalism,” building of peoples and states in the South with “common front” against pro-Western blocs, and nationalist impulses that advance level of national sovereignty, are some of the hopeful trends (p. 157).

Notwithstanding the lackluster performance of social movements, the author avers that there are seemingly some positive developments across-the-

board that could act as harbingers of change. The agents of change could be multifarious forces: the rise in environmental consciousness, widening economic disparities, national and global militarisation and reaction in form of disarmament, ill-effects of foreign military aggrandisements, unfair terms of trade, “increasing immiseration”, issues of governance, human rights, etc. Yet, he acknowledges that most of these movements have been either hijacked by parochial, ethnic and religious forces or become victims of despondency.

Therefore, he advocates a “broad open alliance” of progressive movements that would marginalise narrow reactionary movements. However, it would set a brake to accentuating “center-periphery” relationship as formulated by Raul Prebisch, the noted political economist. The Triad, in his formulation, tends to obfuscate progressive agendas and is an attempt by “globalisationists” to weaken the movement (p.164).

Finally, according to him, “another world is possible” but if this were to happen, diverse groups need to “bite the political bullet” and recognise that for transformation of the world system, it is essential to seek political power. ■

Dr Maqsudul Hasan Nuri, Senior Research Fellow, IPRI.

JIMMY CARTER, *PALESTINE: PEACE NOT APARTHEID*

(New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), pages 265.

The work of Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States, gives a brief and fine historical account of Arab-Israel conflict and peace efforts in which he himself had remained involved. The reader is facilitated with historical chronology of important events from Prophet Abraham’s journey to Canaan (1900 BC) till Israel-Lebanon War (2006) and nine informatory maps beginning with the UN Partition Plan of Palestine (1947) to the present-day Middle East. He discusses causes of the conflict, and various peace efforts, and then apports blame and offers solutions.

Among the causes of the conflict, the author includes the occupation of Arab land by Israel, mistreatment of the Palestinians, and non-acceptance of Israel, within its legal borders (p.202). He rightly blames Ariel Sharon for provoking the second *intifada*, which enabled the Israel government to declare failure of the peace negotiations due to the Palestinian terrorism (p.154). He feels that another potential cause of violence, since 1967, is the holding of 630,000 Palestinians (about 20 percent of the total population), in the occupied territory (pp.196-7).

Without mincing words, he criticises Israeli governments of Ariel Sharon and Ehud Olmert for building the fence and wall, entirely within Palestinian territory, intruding deeply into the West Bank to encompass Israeli settlement blocks and large areas of Palestinian land (p. 190). Whatever territory Israel decides to confiscate will be on its side of the wall, and at the

same time, Israelis will retain control of the Palestinians who will be on the other side (p.192). In July 2004, the International Court of Justice has determined that the segregation wall in the occupied Palestinian West Bank is illegal (p.193). The wall is not separating Palestinians from Jews but the Palestinians from the Palestinians (p.194). The Palestinians are surrounded by walls, fences and Israeli checkpoints and are living almost as prisoners within the small portion of land left to them (p. 215).

Carter is forthright in saying that another cause is the condonation of illegal Israeli actions by a “submissive White House and U.S. Congress” during recent years (p. 209). “Israeli government decisions are rarely questioned or condemned, voices from Jerusalem dominate in our [US] media, and most American citizens are unaware of circumstances in the occupied territories” (p. 209).

Unanimously adopted U.N. Resolution 242 (1967) mandates Israel’s withdrawal from occupied territories and is reconfirmed by Israel’s leaders in agreements at Camp David (1978) and Oslo (1993). He thinks that Israel’s continued control and colonisation of Palestinian land, have been the primary obstacles to a comprehensive peace agreement in the Holy Land. He also casts aspersions on the policy of his own country, when he writes, “The United States is squandering international prestige and goodwill and intensifying global anti-American terrorism by unofficially condoning or abetting the Israeli confiscation and colonisation of Palestinian territories” (p. 216). He is right when he says that lack of efforts to resolve the Palestinian issue is a “major source of anti-American sentiment and terrorist activity throughout the Middle East and the Islamic world.” He has also referred to *International Herald Tribune’s* October 2003 survey of 7500 citizens of 15 European nations, who consider Israel to be the top threat to world peace, ahead of North Korea, Iran, or Afghanistan (p.209).

Carter rightly takes credit of the Camp David Accords concluded during his presidency (1977-81). He appreciates President George W. Bush’s positive response to the plan of Saudi Crown Prince (now King) Abdullah, on 27 March 2001, who has offered Israel normal relations with all Arab states if the former complied with U.N. Resolutions 194 and 242 (p. 156). In June 2002, President Bush, for the first time, announced a two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thereafter, in April 2003, U.N. Secretary General, Kofi Annan announced a “Roadmap” for resolving the conflict on behalf of the U.N., the U.S., Russia, and the European Union (known as the Quartet). It also called for the emergence of an independent, democratic Palestinian state, living side by side in peace and security with Israel and its other neighbours. The Palestinians accepted the roadmap in its entirety, but the Israeli government announced fourteen caveats and prerequisites, some of which preclude peace talks (p.159).

According to the author, there are three basic requirements: Israel's right to exist in peace within recognised borders; the killing of noncombatants not to be condoned; and living of Palestinians in peace and dignity in their own land. The security of Israel must be guaranteed, the internal debate within Israel must be resolved in order to find Israel's permanent legal boundary, and the sovereignty of all Middle East nations and sanctity of international borders must be honoured. It appears that his thinking is in line with International Law and as such, should be acceptable to all, unless one has contrary designs.

The positive factors, according to Carter, are that the majority of people in both Israel and Arab world desire peace. The hope for resolution of the dispute is contained in the proposal supported by majority of Israelis who favour "swapping land for peace", the proposal made by Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah (p. 211), U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338, Camp David Accords, the Roadmap for Peace, and the two-state proposal (p. 213). He is of the view that exchanging Arab territories for peace has been acceptable since several decades by a majority of Israelis but their minority rejects it being strengthened by the "vocal American Jewish community".

Although he gives a balanced version of facts, yet, his work is subjected to severe criticism by pro-Israel critics. Perhaps, any objective account will be criticized by extremists. He is, therefore, charged that he is sympathetic to the Palestinian cause. In fact, Jimmy Carter should be praised for telling the truth to the Americans, so that they may not follow biased policies towards Palestinians. Carter deserves the credit to highlight the true facts in an atmosphere where anything considered against Israel's policy is condemned and is branded anti-Semitism. It is an act of courage to present a balanced account of overall picture of the Middle East. Undeterred by opposition of Zionist Jews, Carter, a man of peace and a winner of Nobel Peace Prize, is bold enough to stand up to them and tell the truth. Israelis and pro-Israeli lobbies in the US do not support his analysis of events. In fact, it appears that the author's aim is not to criticise Israel but to tell them and their supporters as to how Israel's sovereignty and security could co-exist permanently and peacefully along side Palestine. He wants an end to "this continuing tragedy".

It is in the interest of peace in the Middle East that sane voices are heard in the US. This is not the first time that it has been brought out that the powerful Jewish lobby has been influencing US foreign policy. Earlier, Paul Findlay, a US Congressman for 22 years from Illinois, had authoritatively explained that the pro-Israel forces were wielding remarkable power in the White House, the Pentagon and Universities, to suppress free debates, compromise national secrets, and shape American foreign policy that was lopsided vis-à-vis the Middle East. (Paul Findley, *They Dare to Speak*, Connecticut: Lawrence Hill & Company, 1983). Carter has contributed a work which sheds light on the working of US foreign policy. Whereas there is no

dearth of works on the Middle East, Carter's book provides correct first hand information, based on historical facts and data, which is essential for anyone interested in understanding the Middle East conflict in its true perspective. ■

Dr. Noor ul Haq, Research Fellow, IPRI.

SUDHIR DEVARE, *INDIA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA: TOWARDS SECURITY CONVERGENCE*

(Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2006), pages 252.

In spite of rich cultural interactions, civilisational linkages, historical affiliations, and close geographical proximities, Cold War drove both India and South East Asia into two extremely opposing camps. This created an unnatural distance between them. India's decline of interests in South East Asia was marked by its overall objection to US policy and even Sino-Indian rivalry. The end of the Cold War, however, along with the increasing globalisation and post 9/11, introduced a new dimension in India's foreign and economic framework towards South East Asia and the country came up with Look East policy by the early 1990s. The closer India-South East Asia relationship has rather just begun. Interestingly, unlike the Cold War era, India is not trying to counter-balance or even accommodate with the United States' hegemony at present in the region by becoming a strategic partner.

In the 21st Century, South East Asia has been rapidly emerging as an economic hub and a political powerhouse in the Asia-Pacific region. South East Asia can play the role of a catalyst for the fulfilment of the long-cherished goal of Pan-Asianism. Sudhir Devare in *India and Southeast Asia: Towards Security Convergence* brilliantly sheds light on broad and crosscutting themes of India's ties with South East Asia with a particular emphasis on political and strategic landscape, maritime cooperation, economic integration, democratic and cultural interactions. He discusses, in detail, India-ASEAN relations in the light of Look East policy and brings to life the current policy choices available to India to foster its ever-expanding ties with the economically dynamic ASEAN region. The study, however, does not focus on India's bilateral relations with South East Asian countries as such. Rather, a broad frame portrays India-South East Asian links and relations in the context of general themes. During the Cold War, the author confessed that "India remained isolated and marginalized" in its neighbourhood (page 1). Under the changing circumstances, the author is of view that "closer India-South East Asia relations have just begun" and both "are on a learning curve" (pages xi & xii).

As far geo-strategic architecture and interplay of major powers in South East Asia are concerned, United States' unilateralism, China's economic rise, and Japan's economic might influence the region in one or the other way. These situations have also impacted upon India's role in the region. Devare

offers a succinct account about the Japan and China factor in South East Asia. The author, while debating the case of India-South East Asia relations, does not ignore the rise of China as an important security and economic factor in the region. He argues that the economic growth of both India and China will continue to engage the attention of the whole of Asia-Pacific. He suggests that “India should continue to leverage its fast developing relationship with ASEAN to expand interaction with the countries of Northeast Asia, including China” (page xii). Indo-US strategic partnership would go a long way to develop a common stance with other South East Asian countries namely Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam (p. 35). While debating Japan’s position in this whole scenario, Devare downplayed Japanese standpoint with regard to Indo-US nuclear deal. He even tried to portray Japan’s appreciation of Indo-US nuclear deal. The case is definitely not as delicate as portrayed by the author (p.36). Moreover, as far India-China factor in South East Asia is concerned, he has also skillfully skipped from making an in depth and serious analysis, as he simply went through shallow remarks.

Devare broadens the scope of his work by encompassing terrorism and focussing on challenges being faced by Myanmar. The author provides a refreshing insight into the changed complexion of relations between India and South East Asia in recent decade as a result of “Shining India” and people’s general consciousness that tended to rediscover their historical past. Indian Ocean has been the main but inexpensive conduit for communities’ interaction across the Indian Sub-continent and South East Asia for centuries with unconsciously transferring cultural and ideological influences. This seems to be the primary reason for a smooth relationship between the peoples of India and several of South East Asian countries. Fast emerging economic relations and security convergence are likely to convert India and South East Asia much integrated in the coming years. Both peoples’ “relentless attachment will tie them in an inseparable manner and motivate them to strive for a better tomorrow”, in the future, as maintained by Ong Keng Yong, Secretary-General of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in his Foreword written in the book. The author comes up with a suggestion that Myanmar’s challenges should jointly be tackled by developing a dialogue with that country comprising ASEAN, India, China, and Japan, with a focus on ensuring political stability and economic development (p. 204).

Certain drawbacks in the book cannot be ignored. Central theme or argument has not been well knitted throughout in Devare’s work. Arguments and certain points have been repeated at several places and on occasions, there is a lack of coherence. Jargon is noticeable at several places. The work appears to be somewhat more journalistic than a serious research study. Devare’s diplomatic rhetoric also prevails, which prevents him from bringing up highly controversial points in the light. In spite of these weaknesses, the book is a useful study for readers interested in India-South East Asian relations in the

broader Asia-Pacific context. Devare's diplomatic experiences in Myanmar, Indonesia, and Singapore, where he served in diplomatic positions, have also helped him to build his analysis. In this way, it is a bountiful diplomatic-led scholarly effort by Devare to promote India-South East Asia relations. Moreover, the book contains useful documents for researchers with regard to India-ASEAN relations. In a nutshell, Devare has made an insightful inquiry into the fast changing ties between India and South East Asia. ■

Dr. Ahmad Rashid Malik, Research Fellow, IPRI.

**ABDUL SATTAR, *PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY, 1947-2005*
*A CONCISE HISTORY***

(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2007), pages 329.

Those seriously interested in Pakistan's foreign policy, would have keenly awaited Abdul Sattar's book for a couple of reasons. First, there is a serious dearth of literature on Pakistan's foreign policy. All of us who have studied the subject academically are familiar with S. M. Burke's *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An historical Analysis*. Burke's superiority lies in his great ability to record history of Pakistan's foreign policy, by presenting documents, which could only be obtained not only through sheer hard work but dedication to a higher cause. His effort to compile Pakistan's foreign policy is comparable to Hector and Achilles' joint effort in the War of Troy. Some of us are also aware of Shahid M Amin's *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, which is based more on analysis than on documentation of a gigantic nature. Sajjad Haider's *Reflections of An Ambassador* deals brilliantly and critically with the years of Soviet intervention of Afghanistan, bringing in experiences of personal nature which indeed make the book a very interesting reading. Agha Shahi's *Pakistan's Foreign and Security Policy* is once again a critical and analytical account of Pakistan's foreign policy. It sets a precedent that even if one had been involved in framing or implementing of Pakistan's foreign policy, one still had the insight to view it from a reasonable distance and reasonably apply one's critical faculties, which would enable higher echelons of Foreign Office to make and implement a more effective foreign policy. Largely, this was the context, in which Sattar's book was keenly awaited. Second, academicians and researchers alike awaited the book expecting that it would either be like *Burke's* or *Amin's*, more like Burke's because of the recent de-classification of historical documents on US-Pakistan relations. Whatever anyone has to comment on Sattar's book, must be viewed within this light.

Regardless of whether the book met the general expectations of the academicians and serious researchers or not, Sattar must be complimented for undertaking such an ambitious project. Recording 58 years of Pakistan's foreign policy, is by no means, an easy task. His distinguished career in

Pakistan's foreign office for over three decades, placed him in a unique position to write this book. The book scans Pakistan's foreign policy from the emergence of Pakistan (pp. 1-7) to policy ups and downs during 1965-71 (pp.105-111), increasing isolation during 1990-2000 (pp. 225-240), down to post 9/11 developments. Once again, people expected Sattar to bring more of his personal insight into foreign policy making, implementation and its consequences. Those who complain of a lack of personal touch must read and cherish the chapter titled "Simla Agreement: Negotiating under Duress" (pp. 124-143), which gives a deeper insight into how personalities impact upon foreign policy decisions. Due to his broad coverage of foreign policy, the book is indeed a distinguished work that can be safely recommended at the postgraduate level.

Both the specialists and the generalists have much to gain from reading this book. The specialists could enjoy the text, thinking that it has given them access to available documents. Moreover, specialists believe that being an insider, Sattar could have had much better access to foreign policy documents than the budding novices. The generalist could enjoy the entire text due to the clarity of language, ideas, as well as the chronological setting of the book. Within this backdrop, this book can safely be recommended for those interested in Pakistan's foreign policy. ■

Dr Mavara Inayat, Research Fellow, Institute of Regional Studies (IRS), Islamabad.

**ABDUL SATTAR, *PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY (1947-2005)*
*A CONCISE HISTORY***

(Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2007), pages 329.

Following his predecessor, late Ambassador, S.M Burke, who wrote the first authoritative book on Pakistan's foreign policy, veteran diplomat, Abdul Sattar has tried to narrate, what he calls "plain history" of foreign policy of Pakistan since independence in his well-researched book. Sattar has had an illustrious career of thirty nine years in Foreign Service. His job assignments included important postings as ambassador to India, as well as representative to the IAEA in Vienna. Besides being a successful diplomat, he has emerged as a lucid analyst on foreign and domestic political issues.

The purpose of this book is two-fold. Firstly, to provide objective, factual and detailed account of history of Pakistan's foreign policy, over the last fifty eight years, Secondly, while providing a historical framework, to inspire policy makers to develop deeper and richer understanding of the political and strategic milieu in the making of Pakistan's security and foreign policy. As Isaac Asimov once said, "It is the writer who might catch the imagination of young people and plant seed that will flower and come to fruition".

This book is neither a memoir nor a critique but a survey of foreign policy of Pakistan since independence till to date, covering all significant milestone events. The author explained the genesis of Pakistan's foreign policy, which, according to the founding father Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, was based on the principles of friendliness and goodwill towards all nations of the world. This idealist approach suffered disillusionment, when hard realities of international politics stressed hard at the young nation. However, history of its foreign policy reflects that it has adjusted well to immense challenges.

The foreign policy of a state, according to the author, is a means to an end and it must adapt itself to safeguard its independence, sovereignty, security and integrity. Moreover, it should promote the legitimate aspirations of its people towards economic and social progress and attain dignity and honour in the comity of nations. In the opinion of the author, since the beginning of its foreign affairs, Pakistan had to face two major dilemmas. One, there was the search for remedy against wide disparity in power in the region, and second, to explore new resources for development. There was realisation to have a "mast" to sail smoothly in foreign affairs. Thus, the contours of foreign policy of Pakistan, were shaped by quest for security and economic development.

The author has written a much-needed book by providing basic understanding to a layman while to a student of foreign policy, it brings out the dynamics at play in foreign relations. In this well documented book, out of twenty three chapters almost nine are devoted to Indo-Pakistan relations. The references number around 500, thereby providing its objectivity through hard factual data. The style of writer is clear and covers all events comprehensively.

Yet, when viewed with any other good book, providing an in-depth insight into the foreign policy of Pakistan, it suffers from several limitations. The author has contextualized the events and leaders decisions, as legitimate. However, some aspects of Pakistan policy, especially on Afghanistan, have not been given due coverage. Also, Pakistan's role in raising, supporting and training of Taliban in the 1990s, is only explained and not critically evaluated.

The chapter on Simla Agreement and its implications are written in a very coherent manner, yet it carries certain technical flaws. For instance, basic thrust of the chapter on Simla Agreement was that it was an "imposed" treaty. While the experts on International law and treaties, give different view points and say that according to article 52 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, "a treaty is void if its conclusion has been procured by the threat or use of force". This means that treaty is binding on the states even if it is concluded under "duress". And, Pakistan has never challenged the validity of the treaty. Instead, it has always owned it, which can be judged from the prevailing fact that it wants solution of the Kashmir conflict under the Simla Agreement and UN resolutions.

In the chapter on historical events after 9/11, the author contends that the decision to join the US war against global terrorism was taken before the US had asked, or, in the words of writer, before a “request” was made. This is, however, not supported by facts that appeared in later accounts and writings. It can be judged from this that Pakistan had decided to take a “U-turn” in foreign policy by abandoning the Taliban regime in Afghanistan under US pressure. In Musharraf’s autobiography, *“In the Line of Fire”*, it is mentioned that former Secretary of State, Colin Powell’s telephonic call “ordered” Pakistan to join the US led coalition forces in war against Afghanistan. Also, Richard Armitage threatened to “bomb Pakistan back to the stone age”, which does not support author’s argument. In fact, Bob Woodward in his book *“Bush at War”*, also described the fact of US diplomatic pressure on Pakistan for making a turn around in its policy. The author has also been unable to explain the resurgence of Taliban in Afghanistan and Pakistan’s efforts to curb its subsequent spillover.

More significantly, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs seems to have been somewhat ignored in this book, as one cannot overlook its significant role in formulating and implementation of foreign policy. It is ironical that the author, as a member of Ministry of Foreign Affairs for almost four decades, should not accord due significance to the role of foreign office.

Overall, the book, its shortcomings notwithstanding, is very informative and provides enough food for thought for policy makers, researchers and general readers. Moreover, it is a valuable addition to the existing literature on foreign policy of Pakistan by an experienced diplomat, who has been an eyewitness to significant developments over the years. ■

Farhat Akram, Assistant Research Officer, IPRI.

D. SUBA CHANDRAN, ED., *ARMED CONFLICTS AND PEACE PROCESSES IN SOUTH ASIA*

(New Delhi: Samskriti, 2006), pages 333.

It is a matter of common knowledge that sixteen percent of the world population lives in South Asia - a region beset with numerous conflicts. While the armed conflicts have become bloodier in recent years, the Peace Process could not be sustained for different reasons. Initiating a peace process is easier than sustaining it. The last few years have witnessed various initiatives taken by Pakistan, Kashmiri leadership, Nepal, India, and Sri Lanka. The presence of numerous actors, role of civil society, space and rules of bargaining, lack of tools, independent inputs or lack of inputs, external support, all these factors play an important role in sustaining the peace process. Peace and conflicts are intertwined with each other. Where there are longer years of peace, there are latent stirrings of conflict as well. The intellectual different ideas trying to take

precedence over others, aspirations of people in terms of words or actions, over a period of time, turn into conflicts.

Nine essays contributed by various writers published in D. Suba Chandran's edited work under review critically look at conflicts and the peace processes in the South Asian region. He lays out two factors for which it is important to conduct a study on the topic of armed conflicts and peace processes. Firstly, armed conflicts have been continuing in South Asia since 1940's, and in fact, have increased in recent years. Secondly, peace processes, though have been initiated at various levels and various periods, could not be sustained. Chandaran has given all the essays a common format i.e., short history, principal actors, and conflict in the previous years, peace process, and a conclusion. The section on principal actors in the conflict focus on the major actors, their perceptions, policies and strategies, state and non-state actors. Conflict in the previous year is the main focus of the study, covering extensively all that happened during the previous year. The last section deals with major impediments in the peace process.

Professor P.R.Chari's chapter on "Armed Conflict in South Asia: An Overview" and General Dipankar Banerjee's chapter on "Promoting Peace in South Asia", are interconnected as former's chapter is more of an overview and analytical while the latter's is more prescriptive. The distinction between the internal armed conflict and civil war, on one hand, and a criminal war, terrorism, and insurgency on the other, have been brought out. The transformation of various conflicts into civil wars has been analysed. More importantly, this chapter discusses the paradoxes, roots, and characteristics of South Asian conflicts in an analytical fashion.

An interesting paradox that has been pointed out is related to factors, such as commonality of language, shared history and religion, civilizational bonds among people and states, and spelling out reasons for incompatibility. The submission that the absence of interstate conflict does not mean that states can live in peace and harmony because of the propensity of the states to use subterranean forms of interstate violence such as subversion, promotion of terrorism, and proxy wars in the neighboring countries, is important. This makes South Asian conflicts distinct from others and thus these deserve a special treatment.

An equally convincing proposition is that regional countries intervene in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries to externalise internal problems to gain political leverage. From the point of view of the people in decision-making, research, and academics, it would have been better if the root causes of conflict, as identified, have been exemplified in order to complete the linkages and understanding of the issue. As far Left extremism or Naxalite type of extremism, it is important to hit at the root cause because failure to do so would generate more conflicts. The cross-border movement, ethno-

political, socio-economic, communal, religious, politics and terrorism, are the areas where the breeding ground of present and future conflicts lies.

Intervention in neighbouring countries through subterranean forms of violence needs to be watched carefully. It has been suggested that mutually beneficial trade could ease tension and conflict. Banerjee has characterised conflicts as interstate/intrastate, independence/autonomy, ethnic/tribal, socio-economic movements, insurgency and terrorism. Banerjee's chapter has a lot of relevance to the current situation. This provides an understanding of the present and also helps in moving into the future. The point that, apart from the political causes, all other causes are intra-state is well taken. It has been pointed out that the highest percentage of conflicts in future would be interstate. The two chapters are interlinked, yet they focus on different aspects. They arrive at similar conclusions in spite of different interpretations. This is the central theme of the book.

Malika Joseph's chapter on "Left Extremism in India: From Red Corridor to Red Line" suggests that the Left wing problem should not be seen in terms of statistics alone. It is a serious problem because it tends to spread today. The important aspect is the number of people involved in the attacks or incidents of violence. In such cases, response option becomes difficult and is limited, because helplessness of response brings violent changes. In future, this is likely to increase as more and more people are being mobilized, so would the author argue.

The chapter on Nepal provides an illuminating background to show as to how the conflict developed from the beginning till the last decade. Factors that influenced the conflict have been covered. Last one year had been eventful. Recent visit and remarks by Prachanda that Indian Maoists are ideologically misled, is significant.

In his chapter, entitled "Sri Lanka: Negative Peace, Positive Violence", N. Manoharan says that the problem is three-dimensional. First is the Sri Lankan Government-LTTE angle. The situation is messy. "Peace of the graveyard" prevails as Manoharan puts it. Along with two thousand casualties this year, on the one hand, Sri Lankan government is convinced and determined to have a military solution, while the LTTE is fixed on its demand, on the other hand. The second dimension is that the international community's negotiations are at a dead end. They have no solutions, as both LTTE and Sri Lankan Government, are indifferent to each other. The international community is not in a position to impose any solution. The third dimension is that there is a feeling in the international community that India is not involving itself in a way that it should, while others are convinced that India has certain influence over LTTE, but is not exercising it.

BP Rhoutray gives a detailed account of the "North-East: Failure of Peace Process". She talks how governments create counter insurgent groups, as well as how this approach has failed. Only the government should possess

arms and that any group, which is created, would ultimately turn against the state. The government has not learnt any lesson from the past. It does not solve the problem.

B. Rajeshwari talks about the story of Bangladesh and her problems. She stresses on the point that development should reach the lowest strata in the society. The ongoing economic exploitation must be put to an end.

In his first essay on “Jammu Kashmir: Infiltration Declines, Violence Persists”, Chandran opines that since 1989, conflict of Kashmir has merged into conflict in Kashmir. Pakistan, India and the State of Jammu & Kashmir are the main state actors while non-state actors include militants, jihadi’s and surrendering militants. Of late, the armed conflict in Kashmir is attaining a religious dimension, he argues.

In his other contribution, Chandran talks about “Pakistan: Tribal troubles in Balochistan and Waziristan”. He is of the view that political initiatives were planned but never sustained and the Government of Pakistan has been pursuing a military approach towards the resolution of political problems. There is an immediate need to undertake reforms in FATA, which have been neglected and Pakistan needs better border management with Afghanistan, especially in FATA region, he suggests.

In short, the book gives an excellent insight, with regard to armed conflict and peace processes in South Asia during 2006. The book provides some help to practitioners in dealing with these problems. ■

Rafeh A. Malik, Assistant Research Officer, IPRI.

BHAGABAN BEHRA, *CENTRAL ASIA-CHINA RELATIONS SINCE 1991*

(Delhi: Vista International Publishing House, 2006), pages 210.

Bhagaban Behra’s book carries out an in-depth study of two important regions – Central Asia and China. In this context, it is obvious that the Central Asian states had got independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991. The disintegration of the Soviet Union, attracted all the big powers and neighbouring Muslim countries to the region. China’s contiguity with these countries, as well as its significant size, burgeoning economy, and powerful military, also made it a potential major player in Central Asia. As deposits of oil, gas, minerals and metals in Central Asian States are vital for China’s rapid industrial development, it started evincing keen interest in Central Asia.

As will be seen, the present Chinese policy in Central Asia is governed by strategic and economic considerations, which have a strong linkage with the geo-politics of Xinjiang. The rising threat of ethno-nationalism in the neighbouring Central Asian republics is a matter of grave concern for China in various ways. Thus, it wants the present status quo to continue in Central Asia. The existing status-quo can ensure tranquility on its borders and good

relations with its neighbours. In this context, it has sought for a cooperative security framework with Russia for maintaining peace and stability in Central Asia. However, the situation in Afghanistan and Tajikistan, where Islamic forces are on the rise, is a source of constant worry for China. Despite all these difficulties, China is keen to play a constructive role in Central Asia, with emphasis on mutual cooperation and peace with neighbours.

China's strategic concern primarily lies in the stabilisation of the North-Western frontiers and in the creation of a favourable external environment. China has 3,500 km joint border with Central Asian countries and as such, it is China's strategic interest to maintain security and stability in its North-Western part. Security and stability in this part of China is an essential link for the whole external environments.

The second strategic consideration is that China should try to tackle the separatist tendencies and the extremist infiltration in the country. It becomes imperative for China to ensure that any engineered social interest is not allowed to affect its security and stability. China must intelligently handle ethnic and religious problems. If not handled properly, these can easily lead to social turmoil and affect security and stability in this region.

Talking about that role of ethnic factors in Central Asia-China relationship, the author reveals that the process of ethnic revivalism and integrating people on ethnic lines has serious impact on China's Xinjiang Uighur population. The freedom movement of Uighur's in the region is very important for China's national security and also for economic reasons. China's development work in the region is a step to protect the interest of the region.

As both Central Asian States and China are facing the same sort of problem, they have agreed to solve the issue jointly. This is evident from the various agreements signed between them, both bilaterally and multilaterally. Both are working jointly to curb ethnic conflicts.

Realistically speaking, both Central Asian states and China, cannot ignore the long lasting influence of Russia in the region. Rather, it will be difficult for the Central Asian states to make alliances with other states against Russia. While building close relationship, China must make sure not to replace the Russian influence in the region. China's influence in the region is also checked with the presence of the USA in the region and Russia's looking back approach towards the region.

It will be seen that cooperation between China and Russia has facilitated the development of Central Asia-China relations to a greater degree than is commonly appreciated. Any deviation on the part of China from the present trend, can complicate its relations with the region's government and any fissure would impact most acutely on China's Xinjiang region. For the Central Asia countries, China has emerged as a natural partner for market economy and growth of democracy. Both are transforming their centralised

state-owned economy to market economy and can help each other in this endeavour.

The author also draws our attention to the presence of US troops in the Central Asia region, close to the Chinese territory. Obviously, this poses a threat to the defence system of China. China's nuclear testing sites and the defence activities could be easily monitored by the American forces. To counter these threats, China actively participates in the SCO, in order to keep the Central Asian states engaged with China in a friendly and cooperative framework.

The author concludes with the remarks that like China, Russia is also concerned about its security and that of the Central Asian States. Russia has taken many steps to keep that security structure of the region within its control. The complexity of the security structure of the region keeps both Russia and China concerned. The need of the Central Asian states, however, is to establish friendly relations with Russia, Europe, China the US, and other powers in order to preserve their independence. ■

Ghulam Sarwar, Consulting Editor, *IPRI Journal*.

MICHAEL E.O'HANLON, *DEFENCE STRATEGY (FOR THE POST SADDAM ERA)*

(New Delhi: Manas Publications, 2006), pages 148.

The book is an effort by the writer to prove that war could not only be won by bullet but also by pen. The work primarily discusses US military strategy and the defence budget. The author looks into questions of America's "two war-planning" framework and implications of Bush Administration's "Preemption Doctrine" for the US and its armed forces. Further, he focuses on the lessons of the Iraq and the Afghanistan campaigns.

According to the author, the Iraq operation is putting extra burden on the active and reserve US forces. He recommends sending of additional 40,000 ground troops in the near future. He focuses on the Iraq operation, but before discussing long-term policies and capabilities, he also deals with naval conflict in the Taiwan Straits, the Persian Gulf, the Korean Peninsula, and the large-scale multilateral stabilisation missions in South and South East Asia. He also discusses the Pentagon plans to revamp its overseas bases and the possibility of US allies, requiring enhanced military budget in the coming years.

In addition, the author dilates on the theme that these wars should be well reviewed before formulating any recommendations. He questions whether "Operation Enduring Freedom" validates the theory that traditional warfare should be replaced by high technology, special forces and creative war plans? According to him, in the Afghanistan War, the local allies were critical about winning the war against Taliban and al Qaeda. In Iraq, besides the post-

Saddam stabilization mission, traditional combat capabilities mattered a lot in the second phase of the war. He thinks that such a proposition is ambiguous. Donald Rumsfeld, the former US Defence Secretary's thinking to use precision and speed to win a war in a battlefield might be useful. According to the author, the US should retain a broad range of capabilities to face new challenges, even when the Iraq and the Afghanistan missions are completed.

In the opinion of the author, the current 1-4-2-1 framework for force planning is a better modification than the previous two-war framework. In the former approach, the US is prepared to defend its homeland, maintain strong forward deployments in four theatres that is (Europe, the Persian Gulf, North East Asia and other parts of the Pacific Rim), defeating two regional "aggressors" and overthrowing one of them. But it basically refers when war against Iraq and Korea was dominating the US defence policies. As the author speculates, there could be different scenarios that might emerge to attract attention of the strategy makers by the end of this decade. Though Pentagon has shifted from threat-based analysis to capabilities-based analysis, yet the latter approach needs deeper analysis on the nature and size of threats. He has tried to present various scenarios to determine the quantum of the US force requirements. The author is putting forward another framework: 1-4-1-1-1. According to the writer, the "4" would be interpreted rather differently, that is, to have overseas deployments to counter limited scale terrorist attacks. Others may be large-scale stabilization missions in Iraq, or perhaps in South and South East Asia etc. A high intensity war with Korea and one naval air engagements in the Taiwan Straits or the Persian Gulf, might be plausible scenarios in future.

Just as the Afghanistan War took many defence analysts by surprise, so could other military scenarios. At least, war against Iran would have some similarity to a conflict in the Taiwan Straits. The author says that these scenarios are only for analysis and further reflection on stabilisation and reforming a Palestine State, preventing nuclear catastrophe in South Asia; stabilizing a large country such as Indonesia or Congo, and protecting Persian Gulf shipping against threats from Iran.

The author is of the view that the US does not know how to predict its enemy well enough. This is not to advocate pure capabilities-based planning. However, scenario-based planning is still needed. According to the author, there is a need to plan for the future with foresight and imagination, trying to envision possible military scenarios. He is of the view that the US should develop a firm idea whom to fight against and at what cost. There is a feeling that war against Iran would affect the pro-Western reformists in that country, but a dramatic shift could occur if Iran develops nuclear weapons and encourages Hezbollah to escalate attacks against Israel and some Western countries. Spread of weapons of mass destruction and threat of global terror confront the US and the humanity.

This work advocates expansion of current capabilities of the US Army and Marine Corps to deal with ongoing demands in Iraq and Afghanistan. Though the strategists always think of long-term possibilities, yet today the armed forces of the US face a near-term challenge to stabilize Iraq without wearing out. Thus, it is a major challenge posed to the US armed forces.

Though one may tend to agree with the analysis of the author, the US needs to be more sensitive to the rising anti-American sentiments. The fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan is only the starting point/beginning for a long battle against global terrorism. And, as a superpower, the US has a responsible role to play in world affairs. In short, the book is an effort to look at the US long-term policies and capabilities.■

Nuzhat Khanum, former Assistant Research Officer, IPRI.