

Iqra national university

Name rafiullah

Id 15440

Assignment of pak study

Student of 3rd semester BBA

Submitted to miss bennish

Two questions assignment which

I have done below.

PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

Since its inception in 1947, Pakistan has been facing numerous tumultuous challenges both internally and externally encompassing the issues of democracy, social equality, political stability and economic development [1].

The very idea of the creation of Pakistan came under questions from different quarters within and outside. The creation of Pakistan was criticized by many from litterateurs [2] religious ideologues and political analysts [3] who

declared it a creation as a result of pathological politics which is empowered by basic elements such as exclusion, subjugation, threats and use of force etc. Oldenburg quotes critically renowned Salman Rushdie's argument regarding Pakistan's creation and declare it a place which was just insufficiently imagined [4]. Within the very first years of its independence Pakistan had to go through sour relations with two of its immediate neighbors India and Afghanistan. It was just few months after the partition of subcontinent that Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan emerged in October 1947, which resulted in first proper war between India and Pakistan in the spring of 1948 [5]. Again within the very first year of independence Pakistan on its North West frontier encountered with another neighboring country Afghanistan being the only country which voted against Pakistan's admission to the United Nations for its claims on Durand Line [6]. Pakistan, geographically located thousands of miles away in two different parts which were known as East Pakistan and West Pakistan before celebrating its first silver jubilee, tragically disintegrated in the wake of 1971

third Indo-Pak war [7]. Oldenburg goes to an instinct and declares this division of East and West Pakistan as inevitable. India played its role during 1971 that resulted in Pakistan's disintegration apparently on humanitarian grounds to stop the genocide in East Pakistan which was rightly challenged by Cordera who claims that India waged a full-fledged war on the basis of realpolitik calculations [8].

THE 9/11 AND PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY:

In the wake of 9/11 attacks almost three years after 1998 nuclear tests, Pakistan once again had to play an active role as front line state in the US led war against terrorism [21].

Pakistan, compelled by the United States to once again play its role as frontline state in another US led war on terrorism (WOT) chose to be the part of WOT because of its regional and international situation [22]. Pakistan in order to counter Indian efforts to make international community recognize Indian crisis as terrorism not the fight for liberation joined American led war on terrorism. Pakistan has always declared to have strategic depth in Afghanistan, joined the war against its own homegrown Taliban regime which was yet another

major shift in Pakistan's foreign policy because of international power's pressure towards both India and Afghanistan (Pattanaik, 2008). Change of regime in Afghanistan as a result of WOT has once again put Pakistan in an awkward situation where successor government was in opposition to the Pakistan's homegrown Taliban government. Nonetheless, Pakistan played as an active frontline state of the US during WOT. As in past, the strains of deficit of trust existed between the triangular relations as Pakistan being the most critical player in these relations. Pakistan was continuously asked for doing more in order to fight against terrorism and on the other hand the new regime did not trust Pakistan for its favorable role towards Taliban in the past.

FOREIGN POLICY; AN ANALYSIS:

An inquiry into the problems, their causes and outcomes that Pakistan is facing can help understand the dilemmas of its foreign policy. Stephen P. Cohen has very rightly pointed out different dimensions of failure in Pakistan including the failure to live up with past expectations, failure of vision, failure of leadership, failure of vision and economic failure.

The study is based on empirical evidences as well as perceptive in nature. However, after extensive research on Pakistan professor Stephen P. Cohen has not painted a total gloomy picture, rather has left some advices for Pakistan and appreciated the resilience of Pakistani society [23]. As a matter of fact, since its inception Pakistan remained in trouble internally and externally both. What caused this, wrong choice and wrong decision making in different situations where Pakistan's leadership whether political or military, was put to test, most of the time it failed [24]. On the other hand, during first two decades, Pakistan did pursue a proactive foreign policy, particularly vis-à-vis India and Kashmir dispute (Cohen, 2004). However the Pakistan was unable to pursue proactive policy making approach in the coming decades. The major reason responsible for Pakistan's failure to deliver minimum expectation of the social contract was intermittent military coups or the legacy of military dominance over civil leadership [25]. A commentary on foreign policy of Pakistan aimed at educating Pakistan's parliamentarians by Professor Hasan-Askari Rizvi has very

briefly and precisely discussed various phases of Pakistan foreign policy from 1947 till the 9/11 [26]. However, it lacked addressing the dilemmas of Pakistan's foreign policy which need to be understood to reconsider the orientation of Pakistan's foreign policy making, its process and mindset. Shankar's Indian perspective on Pakistan's foreign policy seems interesting where he points out the internal division within Pakistan over the issues of strategic and policy level significance which has roots in the history, and primarily Indian foreign policy making mindset has made Pakistan keep „deficit of trust“ as basic and fundamental principle in its foreign policy vis-à-vis India.

RESEARCH METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS: The quantitative approach used in this paper reflects the perception of the people of Pakistan towards its foreign policy. The data are analyzed using SPSS based statistical tools followed by a brief discussion on the response of people. The research tool used is primarily a questionnaire and the data was collected from three strata namely the working professionals, students and government employees. The

instrument used was derived from two similar researches in few other countries and the data collected and analyzed below suggests that this research paper enriches the existing body of knowledge [31,32].

Summary of Data:

Table No. 1 shows a brief summary of the collected data including sample design, mode of data collection, language, sample size, margin of error, language and representation. As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire was driven from few previous studies therefore in order to establish a connection with such researches, the language used in the questionnaire was English and respondents were those who had good understanding of English Language. It was a long questionnaire with 26 questions, but because of the limitation of research paper, only the most relevant questions and their tabular description and brief analysis will be given in this part of the paper. Table No. 2 reflects that as many as 65 percent of the respondents expressed either extreme or partial interest in the politics.

In Table No. 3 more than 55 percent of respondents claimed

to have better understanding of Pakistan's foreign relations. Table No. 4 & 5 suggest that people's perception regarding Indo-Pak relation with reference to 9/11 remains almost same with 70 percent of them declaring hostile relations with India. What is note-able here is decline in the percentage of those who considered friendly relations with from around 7 percent before 9/11 to 3 percent after 9/11.

Table No. 6 & 7 and reflect that perception regarding nature of Pakistan's relations with US, whether hostile or friendly was greatly changed. Around 40 to 45 percent of the people perceived that Pakistan enjoys friendly relations with the US both before and after 9/11. However, there was great difference in the perception of those who considered Pakistan's relations with the US as hostile from 20 percent before 9/11 to 40 percent after 9/11.

Table No. 8 & 9 show that respondents' perception about Pak-Afghan relations had a major shift. Those who perceived to have friendly relations with Afghanistan before 9/11 were 50 percent which decreased to just 16 percent after 9/11. Likewise, those who perceived that Pakistan enjoyed hostile

relations with Afghanistan increased from 19 percent before 9/11 to around 55 percent after 9/11.

Table No. 10&11 show that peoples“ percentage of the people who perceived to have hostile relations with Israel remained almost the same in pre and post 9/11 scenario with more than 60 percent.

AN ANALYSIS OF PAKISTANI FEARS AND INTEREST

Every country pursues her foreign policy in accordance with her national interests. These interests depend upon a number of factors like cultural and historical traditions, geography, economic and political objectives. But in this medley of interests there often is an overriding objective which is not based purely on rational considerations. Every country has a ruling passion in her foreign policy. When one calls it a passion, one is not suggesting that this is something entirely emotional or irrational. It may be based on genuine fears and hatreds which have accumulated over the years and which may be intertwined with material and religious considerations. Pakistan is no exception to this. Indeed very few countries were born in an atmosphere so surcharged with intense ill-will and mutual hatred as Pakistan was in 1947 as a result of the partition of the sub-continent. Almost every action of Pakistan can be interpreted as being motivated by fear of India. She complains

that India opposed her very formation and that her policy of intense hostility continues unabated. India, both in manpower and material and military strength, is vastly superior to Pakistan. Before India's border clash with China, even with the aid Pakistan was receiving from the United States, her armed forces never exceeded more than one-third of India's strength. After sixteen years of Pakistan's independent existence, and even after India's humiliating defeat in the border clash with China, Mr. Nehru in an inter. view declared that Indo-Pakistani "confederation remains our ultimate end." Similarly, Pakistan alleges that India has been promoting subversive activity in East Pakistan and that in the event of a military conflict her first and relatively easy target would be East Pakistan. American aid to India has only accentuated Pakistan's fear in the sense that a well. equipped Indian army meant for China in the North-East Frontier Agency would be "so positioned as to be able to wheel round swiftly to attack East Pakistan."² Thus, Dawn in an editorial observed: "If the main concern of the Christian West is the containment of Chinese Communism, the main concern of Muslim Pakistan is the containment of militarist and militant Hinduism."³ One may find all this a bit exaggerated, but the fact remains that Pakistan joined the various defense pacts with the United States largely to protect her interests against the future aggression of India. According to Pakistanis, Communism poses a threat to all and is not likely to make Pakistan its exclusive target whereas Indians themselves have made it clear more than once that Pakistan is their number one enemy. In

1954, when the United States extended military aid to Pakistan, the Indian Government was assured by the United States that if Pakistan were to misuse this aid in an aggressive fashion against another country, the United States would immediately take appropriate action both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression. In November 1962 there took place a full turning of the circle when the United States extended military aid to India to help her against the Chinese attack and assured the Government of Pakistan that if India misused this aid against a country like Pakistan, the United States would resort to appropriate action in support of Pakistan both within and without the United Nations. But Pakistan's complaint was that the attitude of the United States had undergone a radical change under the Kennedy administration and above all that it was grossly unfair to treat an allied country and a non-aligned country on a footing of equality. The United States as an ally of Pakistan should have made it clear to India that military assistance would be given to her only when and if she settled her outstanding problems like Kashmir with Pakistan. As long as a major source of tension like the Kashmir problem remained unresolved between India and Pakistan, massive military aid to India, particularly when all signs of a full-scale invasion of India by the Chinese had disappeared, was fraught with serious dangers to Pakistan's security. One can understand such complaints from Pakistan. But the American position was by no means an enviable one. At a time when India was suffering reverses in her border clash with the

Chinese, the United States would have added insult to injury by pressuring India to settle her dispute with Pakistan. However, another series of talks on Kashmir between India and Pakistan, largely as the result of the persuasive efforts of Mr. Duncan Sandys, the British commonwealth Secretary, were held during the first half of 1963, but again no settlement was reached.

Q2: cpec : prospect and challenges?

China-Pakistan Economic Corridor – Challenges And Prospects

China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) has the potential to bring regional economic integration and cooperation. It is a win-win situation for both China and Pakistan as they are the primary beneficiaries of the project. It has a capacity to cater to the needs of the landlocked Central Asian states. Moreover, it will provide a safe and the shortest route to the fastest growing Chinese economy. It will also stimulate the economy of our country. However, the new emerging power dynamics pose serious challenges to the CPEC. If these challenges can be effectively tackled then it may result in economic interdependence which could be a milestone for peace and economic development in the region.

Pakistan has a strategic importance in the region. On the eastern side, the arch-rival India is situated. India is the largest democracy and the biggest emerging market in the world. On the western side of the border is Afghanistan, which is one of the most troubled zones in the world, with an ongoing war since 9/11. China, the second largest economy and the most dominant over all the global markets, is on the northern side. Iran is also in the global spotlight due to its nuclear program and its bitter rivalry with the US, Israel and the Gulf Arab states. Moreover, the 21st

century is being referred to as the Asian century. This continent has become pivotal to global politics. Besides that, the Strait of Hormuz from where one-third of the world's oil passes, lies near the Gwadar port. Therefore, Pakistan is situated at the crossroads of oil and gas-rich countries and the largest economies.

Chinese president Xi Jinping announced the "One Belt, One Road" policy in 2013. It is a long term transnational strategy to connect Asia, Africa and Europe through a network of highways, railways and ports. China, being the second largest economy and an emerging superpower, took this initiative to access markets. The "One Belt, One Road" policy mainly consists of two parts. One is the "New Silk Road" and the other is the "Maritime Silk Road". This strategy is inspired from the ancient "Silk Route". In the past, Chinese silk was transported to European markets from one country to another. So the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor is part of the "One Belt, One Road" policy.

Due to Gwadar's strategic importance, the CPEC was under consideration for a long time. Ex-president Pervez Musharraf proposed this project during his tenure, though it could not be materialized owing to the deteriorating law and order situation in the country. During Pakistan Peoples Party's government, Singapore was handling the Gwadar port. The then President Asif Zardari took the initiative and cancelled the contract with Singapore that was dealing with the development of the port.

After this cancellation, the contract was signed with China. In 2013 the Chinese premier Li Keqiang visited Pakistan. Both countries signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and Gwadar port's development and operations were handed over to China.

2015 was a landmark year for the history of the two countries. Chinese President Xi Jinping made a historic visit to Pakistan in April of the same year. During his visit, Pakistan and China signed 51 Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) worth 46 billion dollars.

It has been the largest foreign direct investment (FDI) in the country. It encompasses huge infrastructure development, roads, restructuring of railways and energy projects, etc. CPEC will begin from Gwadar's deep sea port to Kashgar, the Chinese Xinjiang province.

Since the very beginning, the idea of CPEC has faced multiple challenges. Domestically, the poor security situation is one of the biggest challenges of the country. Terrorism engulfed the region after 9/11. Suicide bombings and targeted killings were a routine. The situation went from bad to worse. Fear gripped the entire country. Hardly any city was immune from this menace. Sensitive installations like the Karachi Airport, Mehran Base, Army Headquarters (GHQ), etc. were attacked. Attack on the Army Public School (APS) Peshawar was the extreme of brutality where 146 innocent school children were martyred. Moreover, many notable personalities like Benazir Bhutto, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa's senior Minister Bashir Bilour and Interior Minister of Punjab Shuja Khanzada became victims of this scourge. Security is much better now than in the past, though managing it remains a challenge. Mainstream media has reported that there has been a *"70% decrease in terrorism related incidents as compared to pre-2014 situation"*. Unfortunately, on October 24, 2016, terrorists carried out an attack on the Police Training School in Quetta in which more than 60 people were killed. This indicates that despite military operations and relative peace, security challenges persist.

Political instability is another important challenge which our country is facing. Since its inception, Pakistan faced instability due to the absence of a Constitution. The first **Constitution** was promulgated 9 years after independence.

The **Constitutions** of **1956** and **1962** were abrogated by military dictators soon after their promulgation. After the death of Liaquat Ali Khan, six Prime Ministers were dismissed in a short span of time between 1951 and 1958. Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif's first and second tenures met the same fate. Thus, the frequent

changes of government without completing the tenure of five years have weakened the country politically. But, the last PPP government did complete its tenure and paved way for successful democratic transition.

Frequent martial laws have weakened the political setup of Pakistan. Martial laws started soon after independence. Iskander Mirza imposed the first martial law on October 7, 1958 and Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan, Zia-ul-Haq and Musharraf followed suit. Pakistan has been ruled for almost half of its 69 years by these military dictators who ruled the country according to their own whims.

Civil-military relations heavily influence domestic politics. Because of the repeated martial laws, there exists a civil-military imbalance, unlike in other popular democracies. The government enjoys nominal power in the domains of foreign and defence policies with reference to India, Afghanistan and the United States. Former Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar admitted in *Al-Jazeera's* program *Head to Head* that, "*the military has a larger role in the country.*" The military occupied that space partly due to the inability of the politicians to manage political affairs effectively. Ayub Khan was appointed as the Defence Minister of the country while he was the Army Chief. It is a rare possibility in successful democracies. Moreover, in the 1950s and 1980s, the ruling party and the opposition indulged in the politics of leg pulling. It weakened the institutions and paved way for military interference. Imbalanced civil-military relations created mistrust between the two important pillars of the state. In spite of that gulf, the situation is better today than it has been in the past.

Inter-provincial grievances are also serious challenges which the CPEC is facing. It is alleged that the ruling party in the centre is trying to maximize benefits for the Punjab province at the cost of other provinces. This has created rifts between the federal government and the provinces. The major bone of contention has

been “the route change”. The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa government protested that the federal government wanted “to work on the eastern route” which passes through central Punjab and was longer than “the western route”. However, the proposed route was “the western route” which passes through Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. This has further added to the inter-provincial mistrust. According to *Dawn* newspaper, “*The Chinese government urged Pakistani leaders to sort out the differences.*” The Chinese Ambassador to Pakistan, Sun Weidong met the leaders of the mainstream parties in this regard. Thus, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif convened an all parties conference (APC) where inter-provincial grievances were addressed. Provinces were assured that there was no change in the proposed routes. Moreover, provinces would enjoy equal fruits of CPEC. However, skepticism has not been eliminated entirely.

Apart from domestic issues, international challenges are also hindering the progress of CPEC. Since partition, India has left no stone unturned to hurt Pakistan. Both countries fought wars in 1965, 1971 and 1999. In 1971, India supported *Mukhti Bahini* and fought alongside the rebels. Resultantly, Pakistan was dismembered. It was a confession on part of India recently when the Indian Prime Minister Modi, during his visit to Bangladesh said, “*It was Indian support which helped the creation of Bangladesh.*” In the same fashion, India is trying to subvert CPEC. The then Army Chief, General Raheel Sharif during his visit to the victims of Quetta Civil Hospital blast said that, “*Attacks in Balochistan are the activities to undermine CPEC.*” The illegitimate stance of India is that Gilgit-Baltistan is a disputed territory, therefore CPEC’s route passing through it is illegal. Prime Minister Modi authenticated the doubts in his address at Lal Qila, Delhi by saying that Baloch leaders “thanked him for his support”. It was in reference to the rebel leaders who were in self-exile. Moreover, print media reported that, “*Modi expressed his concerns about CPEC with China that were disregarded by Chinese leadership.*” India is apparently not happy with this

development. Arrest of the Indian agent Kulbushan Jhadev attested to India's involvement in Balochistan in particular and Pakistan in general.

Afghanistan, our western neighbor, remains problematic due to its internal instability. Moreover, Afghanistan claims sovereignty over the region of the Durand line. However, that claim has no credence. That is an integral part of Pakistan. Even though the people of that region are happy as ever with Pakistan, Afghanistan always tacitly supports anti-Pakistan activities there. The roots of almost all terrorism related activities can be traced back to Afghanistan.

For CPEC, the Indo-Afghan nexus remains an arduous challenge. India, in collusion with Afghanistan, is creating security problems for Pakistan. India has made a base in Afghanistan from where it carries out terrorist activities. Former American Defence Secretary Chuck Hegel admitted in a leaked video that, "*India has financed to create problems for Pakistan.*" Furthermore, the then Commander of the ISAF forces in Afghanistan, General Stanley McCrystal also advised his government to stop India from interfering in Pakistan that afflicted American interests in Afghanistan resultantly. This Indo-Afghanistan nexus is particularly troublesome because of the porous border. Infiltration becomes easier since Pakistan shares the longest border with Afghanistan.

In addition to that, Gulf states are also creating problems for CPEC. Oman and Arab Emirates are particularly anxious about it, because once the Gwadar port starts operations, it will minimize the importance of their ports. UAE's port is the busiest port and it is mostly used for transit trade. Due to the strategic significance of Gwadar port in the region, the ports of the Gulf states will be affected. The development of friendly ties between India and Gulf states is also due to these converging interests. Prime Minister Modi recently visited these states in this regard. It was a rare

occurrence. It was after many decades that an Indian Prime Minister visited the Gulf monarchies.

Iran is also a challenging factor. Iran, in cooperation with India, is developing Chabhar port. India is investing around 20 billion dollars for its development. It is in Seestan province of Iran, at a distance of 72 kilometers from Gwadar. India is investing in this port so as to neutralize the potential of Gwadar port. In fact, it is in competition with Gwadar. The Indian objective is to connect Chabhar with the landlocked Afghanistan and Central Asia. Furthermore, Indian agent Kulbhushan admitted to having entered in Pakistan from Iran. Pakistan requested the Iranian President Hassan Ruhani to keep a check on Indian conspiracies hatched in Iran against Pakistan. India is investing in Chabhar to rival it to Gwadar. But, President Ruhani disregarded that Indian perception and said that, *“Chabhar is not in competition with Gwadar, rather both will complement each other.”*

In addition to that, the US is aggressively pursuing the policy of “containment” against China. China has become the second largest economy and an emerging superpower. US considers a rising China as a threat to its global dominance. Gwadar port is part of the “new Silk Route”. US is also creating hurdles for the Gwadar port as it perceives that this port could be used for military purposes in future. As part of its containment policy, the US signed “strategic and economic partnership” with India and has also established “India Rapid Response Cell” (IRRC) in the Pentagon. That is a rare status enjoyed by any country. American support to India for the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is also a part of that partnership. Their cooperation poses a serious challenge to not only China but also to Pakistan.

If CPEC is properly managed, it will be a game changer for Pakistan. It has brought the largest ever foreign direct investment in the country. During President Xi’s visit to Pakistan, both countries signed agreements of 46 billion dollars. This would

provide a boost to Pakistan's ailing economy as Pakistan is under heavy debt. According to Finance Minister Ishaq Dar, the current debt is 73 billion dollars. Each year, a huge chunk of the budget goes to debt servicing. In the fiscal year 2016-17, debt servicing was around 25% of the budget. Therefore, CPEC would help Pakistan in becoming economically self-sufficient. According to rough estimates, CPEC will create 700,000 jobs. Besides that, millions of people will benefit from it.

CPEC includes a range of development projects. Out of 46 billion dollars, around 35 billion dollars are for energy projects. The government is hopeful that through this investment they will be able to add the required electricity to the national grid which will end the shortfall of electricity in Pakistan. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in a public address assured that by the end of 2018, not only would load shedding be ended but surplus would also be available. Furthermore, CPEC includes restructuring of the decades old railways network keeping in view modern standards. It also includes motorways, highways, industrial zones, economic zones and airports, etc. throughout the country.