

## TRANSFORMATION OF WORLD ORDER: CHALLENGES AND OPTIONS FOR PAKISTAN

*Dr. Moonis Ahmar\**

### **Abstract**

*The transformation of world order from bipolar to unipolar following the collapse of the Soviet bloc reflected paradigm shift in global power politics. It was in the wake of the end of the cold war in 1991 that the then American President George H.W. Bush came up with the concept of 'New World Order.' Twenty eight years after the end of cold war the world is transforming from unipolar to multipolar. The decline of American power and the rise of a new power bloc composed of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa known as BRICS, will in coming decades reshape world order. Pakistan as the world's six populous country and the only nuclear state in the Islamic world will face enormous challenges in the transformational phase of world order. How Pakistan will deal with global issues fraught with tests and trials is a major question. This paper will analyze issues which tend to deepen the level of insecurity in global power structure and to what extent there is a possibility of averting global disorder in the wake of environmental, economic and security threats.*

**Keywords:** World War-II, Cold War, World Order, Unipolar World, New World Order, BRICS, Preventive Diplomacy, United Nations, Peace Keeping, Peace Making.

### **Introduction**

**T**he phenomenon of world order is as old as the modern history of this world. For centuries, the world had several centers of power and that order remained in practice till the end of the Second World War. The defeat of Axis powers and the decline of European empires in the post-1945 era led to the emergence of a bipolar system dominated by the then Soviet Union and the United States. The ideological division of the world with two poles of power shaped the dynamics of world politics. The Soviet led communist bloc and the US dominated democratic and capitalist world was the essence of bipolar order.

---

\*Dr Moonis Ahmar is Meritorious Professor in the Department of International Relations & Former Dean Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Karachi, Karachi. The authors' email address is amoonis@hotmail.com.

The transformation of world order from bipolar to unipolar following the collapse of the Soviet bloc reflected paradigm shift in global power politics. It was in the wake of the end of the cold war in 1991 that the then American President George H.W. Bush came up with the concept of 'New World Order.' In an article on "Bush's talk of a New World Order Foreign Policy Tool or Mere Slogan?" Don Oberdorfer argued that "President Bush actually had spoken of a "new world order" at least once before, in February 1990 political speech hailing the crumbling of the Iron Curtain. By August 30, the phrase became a central feature of Bush's public oratory, including an address to the UN General Assembly and three speeches to joint sessions of Congress. According to a presidential documents published by the White House, President Bush mentioned publicly to a "New World Order" at least 42 times from last summer to the end of March 1991".<sup>1</sup> According to Joseph Nye in his article; "What New World Order?" "the 1991 Persian Gulf War was, according to President Bush, about "more than one small country; it is a big idea; a new world order," with "new ways of working with various nations . . . peaceful settlement of disputes, solidarity against aggression, reduced and controlled arsenals and just treatment of all peoples."<sup>2</sup> He asked a question that, "Why not simply leave the task of world order to the UN? Because the United Nations is the sum of its member nations and the US is by far the largest power."<sup>3</sup> Robert T. Grey a former Political Counselor at the United States Mission stated that:

*The new threats to the international order now and in the future, are not likely to be armies crossing international frontiers. They will most often be ethnic and tribal conflicts within nation states, violation of human rights, humanitarian disaster resulting from massive refugee flows across national borders.*<sup>4</sup>

For critics, President George H.W. Bush's idea of a New World Order was a non-starter because neither peaceful settlement of disputes nor measures against aggression or reduction of weapons, became the basis of that order. Contrary to the assertion of President Bush that the New World Order will be based on shared principles and responsibilities of major powers through a responsible role of the UN, the world plunged into the vicious cycle of intra-state conflicts, violence and terrorism. The New World Order emerging from the ashes of the Old World Order faced numerous difficulties, crises and challenges. Therefore, it is rightly argued by Carl Gershman that, "the essence of the political crisis facing the world today is that no new international order has yet emerged to replace the old one that has disappeared. It may be emerging, but it is far from securely established, and its weaknesses and vulnerabilities are dangerous. The old state system succeeded, however crudely, when it was able to establish an equilibrium – between states

during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and between divergent political systems during the Cold War. All that is now history and the new challenge is to construct an international order that can contain disorder and gradually bring the forces of violence and disruption to submit to a framework of law.”<sup>5</sup>

Almost three decades following the end of the cold war, the world is transforming from unipolar to multipolar. The decline of American power and the rise of a new power bloc composed of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa known as BRICS will in coming decades reshape world order. Pakistan as the world's six populous country and the only nuclear state in the Islamic world will face enormous challenges in the transformational phase of world order. It is rightly argued by the analysts of international affairs that 19<sup>th</sup> century was Pax Britannica; 20<sup>th</sup> century Pax Americana and 21<sup>st</sup> century will be Pax Asiana. How Pakistan will deal with global issues fraught with tests and trials is a major question.

This paper will examine transformation in world order by raising the following questions:

- What is world order and how it has *transformed* in the last 74 years?
- Will American/Western hold over world order *diminish* resulting into the emergence of multipolar world with several centers of power?
- How *vacuum* in the prevailing world order is a threat to global and regional peace and security?
- What are Pakistan's options and challenges to deal with the transformation of world order?

Furthermore, the paper will analyze issues which tend to deepen the level of insecurity in global power structure and to what extent there is a possibility of averting global disorder in the wake of environmental, economic and security threats.

## **Dynamics of World Order**

Words like World, International or Global are synonymous with one another. International order is defined as,

*Sometimes used as a synonym for international system. It usually refers to a pattern of activities or the set of arrangements that characterizes the mutual conduct of states. In this sense, it has a number of formal*

*attributes – political, diplomatic, legal, economic, military – which ensures method and regularity to international relations<sup>6</sup>.*

Therefore, one can argue that the ‘contemporary international order is based on European state system established at the peace of Westphalia in 1648; multiplicity of sovereign states coexisting in a condition of anarchy which nevertheless, recognize common standards of behavior and interaction. There have been other international orders, such as empires, suzerainties and tribute systems with different mechanisms, but the contemporary order, which is now global, is based on a dismissal of world government and a presumption in favor of state sovereignty. It is said to display order in the sense that it recognizes regulating elements (e.g. balance of power, diplomacy, law) which provide a framework within which interaction takes place.<sup>7</sup>’ Three conclusions could be drawn from the definition of International order. First, states form the core of international order as their regulation and interaction can result into cooperation or conflict. Second, the contemporary international order has its roots in the treaty of Westphalia of 1648, which became the basis of nation state system. Third, International order would remain incomplete unless balance of power, diplomacy and law are included. The International order which emerged from the ashes of the Second World War replaced centuries of order which was imperial and colonial dominated by the European powers.

Peter Calvocoressi, a noted writer on World politics explains world order as: “World order is commonly measured by the sum of international and civil wars but financial instability, if seemingly less destructive, may destabilize world order no less than armed conflict. And just as the international political system was proving too weak to cope with the swelling range of armed conflict, the international economic order – both as provider and as regulator – was showing signs of lagging behind the process of change.<sup>8</sup>” Calvocoressi’s contention of world order makes sense because unless conflicts are peacefully resolved, there is little possibility of stability in international economic order. Since politics and economic are interlinked, any effort to stabilize world order cannot materialize unless issues which trigger anger, antagonism, violence, radicalization, militancy, wars and terrorism are adequately dealt with. Since 1945, the world has not experienced Third World War but the credit should not go to United Nations of averting another global war but to nuclear deterrence. Any global war or war between the two nuclear states will result into massive destruction.

After the end of cold war, the then Secretary General of UN Boutros Boutros-Ghali unveiled UN’s ‘agenda for peace’. Earlier, the then American

President George H. W. Bush had talked about his vision of 'New World Order.' In his 'agenda for peace' concept, Ghali argued that, "the passing of an old order does not of itself create a new order. Peace requires a comprehensive effort, across the spectrum of action and time. Preventive diplomacy seeks to resolve conflicts before violence breaks out. Peacemaking and peace-keeping are required to halt conflict and preserve peace once it is achieved. If successful, they strengthen the chances for post-conflict peace building. Preventive diplomacy is to avoid a crisis and peace-building is to prevent a recurrence. Each step reinforces the others. All are essential for the maintenance of international peace and security."<sup>9</sup>

Does it mean that nuclear weapons despite their destructive capability, are responsible for maintaining superficial peace in the world? The phenomenon of 'zero sum game' in case of a nuclear war, is enough to prevent such a thing to happen. Therefore, one cannot deny the relevance of nuclear deterrence in the post-Second World War era. Dynamics of world order cannot be analyzed unless the work of Joshua S. Goldstein is cited. Examining the evolution of International Order, the author holds that,

*Over the centuries, international institutions and rules have grown stronger, more complicated and important. International order started out based largely on raw power but it has evolved to be more on legitimacy and habit than on power. Domestic law, too, was once enforced only by the most powerful for the most powerful. The first states and civilizations were largely military regimes. Law was what the top ruler decreed. International law and organization likewise began as terms imposed by powerful winners or losers after wars<sup>10</sup>.*

For Goldstein, "twentieth-century world order depended heavily on the America power and for a few decades, on the division of power between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States at times, came close to following the explicit role of "world police force." But in truth, the world is too large for any single state - even a hegemon - to guard effectively. Rather, the world's states usually go along with the rules established by the many powerful state within constant policing."<sup>11</sup> The notion of single power dominating the International order is the bottom line. Goldstein further elaborated his perspective of world order by arguing that, "World orders encompass not only power relationships, but the rules and norms that transform behavior and patterns on international stage. International Law provides an important and detailed guide to such behavior, which states generally - though not follow the laws of war. One feature of world order during the decade preceding 2001, was the increasing role of international law."<sup>12</sup> But, the erosion of international morality along with international

institutions like the UN, International Court of Justice (ICJ) and International Criminal Court (ICC) to prevent aggression, occupation and violation of human rights by state security forces tends to augment the fragility of world order. Whether it is the use of force without seeking mandate from the UN Security Council in Syria, Yemen, Somalia<sup>13</sup> and Afghanistan or the policy of ethnic cleansing unleashed by the Indian security forces in occupied Kashmir, Israel in occupied West Bank and Myanmar against the Rohingya Muslims, there is no order to check blatant violation of UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed on December 10, 1948. Critics of world order argue that the erosion and fragile nature of international system is the result of the collapse of bi-polar world and the emergence of a unipolar world order. When states and not international institutions responsible for maintaining world order get an upper hand and when the UN is bypassed while using force, it means the degeneration and fragility of world order.

The dynamics of world order can be further analyzed by outlining eight major realities. First, Euro-Atlantic dominated world order is still in existence since the end of the cold war. While Europe is a junior partner of the U.S led world order, it largely shares cultural, religious, economic and political values with North America. Countries representing Group of Seven, called as G-7<sup>14</sup> is the most powerful economic, political and security framework which came into existence in the aftermath of oil crisis of 1973-74. Briefly, it was transformed as G-8 when the Russian federation was co-opted after the collapse of the USSR but was barred when Moscow occupied Crimea in 2014. G-7 members meet every year and discuss global financial and security order and threats to their interests. Contradictions within the Euro-Atlantic alliance on issues ranging from terrorism, extremism and NATO exist, but the alliance is still intact. Second, the reality that there exists great leadership vacuum in world order in the event of a crisis cannot be denied. Those who wield power are unable to stop violence and bloodshed in Libya, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Palestine, Afghanistan and Kashmir. They were also unable to prevent the genocide of Rohingya Muslims at the hands of fanatic Buddhist groups and the military. As a result, one can observe surge of violence, terrorism and inadvertent use of force in different parts of the world. The United Nations, which is supposed to play a leadership role in enforcing peace and security, is in the background and powerful states like America, Russia, Israel and India get a free hand in dealing with issues which require consensus and multilateral diplomacy. When recently American President Donald Trump signs an order which recognizes Golan heights (part of Syria but occupied by Israel in June 1967 Arab-Israeli war) it means violation of UN Security Council Resolution 242 which called upon Israel to

withdraw from Arab occupied areas of Gaza, Sinai, West Bank and Golan heights. Unilateralism has permeated in the existing world order with serious implications.

Third, the reality of BRICS as an alternate to the U.S led world order will go a long way in transforming not only international system but also regional orders. Formed in 2009, BRICS favors transforming the world order by inducting multipolarity and giving space to those countries which are not in consonance with post-cold war realities. Will BRICS be able to provide an alternate leadership to the world? It all depends on the unity of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance and the G-7 members to sustain their edge as far as world order is concerned. But it seems, BRICS representing the non-Western world has the capability and resources to cause a shift from unipolar to multipolar world. Fourth, the rise of China as the world's second largest economy with its political, economic and security clout in parts of Asia and Africa through its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is perceived as a major change in global order. It is estimated that in coming 10 years' time, China will supersede the United States as the world's number one economic power. And it is not the economic might of China which will transform the world order but it is also world's second largest military spender. Fifth, the role of non-state actors particularly multinational corporations, corporate sector and violent/ terrorist groups also shape and influence the world order. When erosion of state actors creates a vacuum non-state actors take advantage of the space which they get. The surge of income disparity as a result of corporate culture tends to augment extremism and radicalization of youth. The absence of a mechanism to deal with multiple threats of violence and terrorism in the aftermath of Christ Church terrorist attack on two mosques on March 15, 2019, cannot be taken lightly. In that case, more threats from state actors, is the one from the network of violent and terrorist groups.

Sixth, the fragility of global order cannot be analyzed unless the threat of global warming and climate change is also taken into account. Environmental pollution is the single man made threat which cannot be dealt by erecting a wall. Unfortunately, the U.S President Donald Trump announced America's withdrawal from 2015 Paris agreement on Climate change mitigation. Erosion of glaciers, rise in sea levels, melting of Arctic and Antarctic cannot be termed as mere superficial threats but are real. The absence of wise, prudent, visionary and bold leadership at the international level is responsible for the mushrooming of environmental threats in different parts of the world. If the United States, which still claims to be the world's only superpower, doesn't feel responsible to be part of Paris agreement in that case, it will have to face consequences of global warming and climate change.

Seventh, global order will also be at stake if the gap in resources particularly water and energy widens. Already, world's population has reached around 8 billion people. It is feared that if there is no control over the surge in population, the world will experience serious food crisis and famine. Same is true as far as shortage of water and energy is concerned. Already, water crisis particularly in water deficient countries will augment inter and intra-water conflicts. Over population and unplanned urbanization will deepen human security issues. The marginalization of international institutions dealing with energy, food and water crisis is because of irresponsible attitude and behavior of states with surplus resources.

Finally, the role of technology in generating crisis and conflict is a major reality in contemporary global order. Certainly, technology is a double edged sword because it can be used for human development and destruction. Presently, the world spends 1.6 trillion dollars on military expenditures out of which the US share is almost 50% i.e. 700 billion dollars. China is second and spends 175 billion dollars. Top arms exporting countries are primarily from the West and major arms importing countries are from the Middle East and South Asia. Reversal of nuclear arms control talks between the US and Russian federation and America's withdrawal from Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty of 1987, tends to augment the threat of nuclear proliferation. When there is no leadership at the global level which can take initiative for nuclear and conventional arms control, if not disarmament, one can expect more fragility of world order in the years to come.

## **The Process of Transformation**

World order can never be static or to the advantage of dominating power(s) forever. Never in world history, there is any precedent that only one power or two and three were able to maintain their influence. During the medieval era, Umayyad, Ottoman and Mughal empires had reached their zenith defeating Christian rulers of Spain, Constantinople and Balkans. The Mongol empire also emerged as a force during medieval era and established its influence from China to Central Asia, Iran, Iraq and Russia. Multipolar world existed even after the medieval era and the rise of European imperial powers till the end of the Second World War, when the United States and the Soviet Union transformed the world from multipolar to bipolar. It was for the first time in medieval and post medieval history that the world became unipolar which is still the case to a large extent.

The emergence of America as a regional power when it defeated Spain in the American-Spanish war in 1898, reflected a transformational change in the world



which was still imperial. Amazingly, America was able to emerge as a regional power in a span of only couple of decades. During the inter-war period, 1919-1939, the world was dominated by the European powers because of their imperial and colonial tutelage. But, the defeat of Axis powers and the process of decolonization led to a paradigm shift and the United States took the responsibility as the guardian of western interests.

Samuel P. Huntington, an American Professor of Political Science at Harvard University wrote an article “Clash of Civilizations” in which he discussed the challenges emanating after the end of the Cold War with reference to Western, Islamic and Confucian cultures. Linking civilization and order, Huntington argues that, “during the Cold War, what order there was the product of superpower dominance of their two blocs and superpower influence in the Third World. In the emerging world, global power is outdated, global community a distant dream. No country including America, has significant global security interests. The components of order in today’s more complex and diverse world are found within and between civilizations. The world will be ordered on the basis of civilizations or not at all. In this world, the core states of civilizations are sources of order within civilizations and through negotiations with other core states, between civilizations<sup>15</sup>.”

Huntington in his research, pertaining to ‘Clash of Civilizations’ mentions far reaching changes which took place in an era of modernization, industrialization and technological advancement. While civilizations played a leading role of shaping one’s cultural and religious identities, connectivity also made it easier for knowing each other. He argues that, “in today’s world, improvements in transportation and means of communication have produced more frequent, more intense, more symmetrical, and more inclusive interaction among people of different civilizations. As a result, their civilizational identities become increasingly relevant. The French, Germans, Belgians and Dutch increasingly think of themselves as Europeans. Middle East Muslims identify with and rally to the support of Bosnians and Chechens. Chinese throughout East Asia relate their interests with those of the mainland. Russians provide support to Serbs and other Orthodox peoples. These broader levels of civilizational identity means deeper consciousness of civilizational differences and of the need to protect what distinguishes “us” from “them.”<sup>16</sup>” When cultures and religions, instead of ideologies like communism, capitalism and democracy determine and shape perceptions and policies of state actors, it means the deepening of polarization in world order emerging after the end of the cold war.

Transformation of world order in the post-9/11 era led following dominant patterns:

- Islamophobia
- Terrorism
- Religious Extremism
- Radicalization of Youth
- Regime Change
- Collateral Damage
- Preventive Strike

As mentioned earlier, the marginalization of United Nations and other international institutions to ensure order, rule of law and justice system provided space to powerful global actors to impose their will on weak and small states. Four major requirements of transformation of world order which since the emergence of international system till today are:

- State Transformation
- Actor Transformation
- Role Transformation
- Cultural Transformation

State transformation impacting on world order means when the nature of state changes in case of the United States, Peoples Republic of China and Russian federation. If a state pursues an aggressive or conciliatory role in world affairs, it has an impact on world order. It also depends on the nature of state: whether it is democratic, authoritarian or a welfare state. Actor transformation means a situation in which an actor's influence on international system ceases to exist as was the case with the Soviet Union. Its disintegration ended the cold war and replaced bipolar system with unipolar. Role transformation means a situation in which the role of a particular power changes from ideological to non-intervention. For instance, Peoples Republic of China for decades played the role of assisting, supporting and sponsoring socialist and communist parties in different parts of the world. That role ended in 1979 when under the 'open door policy' China decided to focus on economic progress and development instead of intervening in different countries.

Cultural transformation means when soft power becomes a part of state policy to influence the world by spreading its culture through diplomacy, aid, trade, technology, music, songs and cuisine. The use of culture to deepen its influence is a pillar of soft power as is done by China and some western powers including the United States. Unfortunately, unlike soft power which is a prudent way to influence the world order, the use of hard power is common particularly exercised by the United States, Russian federation, Israel and India. Coercion, the use of force, sanctions, threats and brinkmanship are the tactics which are used by such power to maximize their influence particularly on the weak states and groups.

## **Challenges and Options for Pakistan**

In view of its geo-strategic location, world's fifth largest populous state; sixth largest military and the only nuclear state in the Muslim world, Pakistan is termed as a pivotal state<sup>17</sup>. Pakistan's role in the bi-polar and unipolar world order was based on two different policies. First, during the Cold War days, Pakistan became a part of western alliance system in 1950s which proved to be counterproductive because of the backlash from the Soviet Union and India. By identifying itself from one pole of power, Pakistan minimized its options in bipolar world. Second, in the post-cold war era, despite the fact that Pakistan acted as a 'frontline' state benefiting the US/Western interests, it was India which despite its anti-American stance was able to reap the benefit of a unipolar world. The growing Indo-U.S nexus, particularly the nuclear deal deepened Pakistan's strategic and security equation with China. In a nutshell, if Pakistan was an ally of the United States during cold war years and India was non-aligned but close to Moscow and rather hostile to Washington, the beneficiary was India and the loser was Pakistan. During 1990s, Pakistan was the most sanctioned ally of the United States till the time after 9/11 when it joined the U.S led war on terror, it again assumed the role of a front line state for America in the region.

Like many Third World countries, Pakistan also faced a difficult situation in the post-cold war era and the emergence of unipolar world. Therefore, "with the end of the Cold War the constraints have increased. The threat from Pakistan's regional environment lives on in the form of a perceived Indian dominance, only this tie the global environment that is not able to compensate for its regional weaknesses. Pakistan's objectives have not changed with the transformation of the international system from bipolarity to uni-polarity; in fact, it is Pakistan's very inability to adjust to the post-Cold War order, with its new mechanisms that have restrained Pakistan's foreign policy.<sup>18</sup>" Therefore, "Pakistan's security concerns imposed certain limitations on its foreign policy which led it to depend on extra-

regional interference in its affairs; as a result, it became involved in Cold War politics. Any change at the global level had a direct impact on Pakistan's foreign policy options"<sup>19</sup>. How Pakistan needs to adjust in changing world? That would require Pakistan to "adapt to the changing world order. Pakistan needs to stabilize itself internally and consequently become a model for the region. The perception of security in its broad sense is mainly dependent on a stable domestic environment, which can be achieved through democracy. The development of a democratic society ought to be supported by economic development and an element of continuity in the domestic setting rather than through a reliance on superpower politics"<sup>20</sup>." Pakistan faced several challenges as a result of transformation of world order from bipolar to unipolar as it was India which benefited from the collapse of the Soviet Union and not Pakistan. Civil war in Afghanistan which erupted after the Soviet military withdrawal had serious negative implications on Pakistan. The euphoria which existed as a result of the emergence of Central Asian independent states disappeared because of instability and violence in Afghanistan.

Some of the challenges which Pakistan faced after the transformation of world order were:

- War and civil war in Afghanistan.
- Shifting of alliances and interests with India getting closer to the United States.
- Imposition of nuclear and democracy related sanctions against Pakistan in 1990, 1998 and 1999 by the United States which were only lifted after 9/11.
- Surge of extremism, intolerance, militancy, radicalization of youth, violence and terrorism.
- India's policy to isolate Pakistan.
- Cutoff of American economic and military aid during Trump administration.

No country can deal with external challenges unless it is able to put its own house in order. Same is true of Pakistan because unless the country is able to strengthen its economy and ensure political stability, its internal fault lines will continue to augment its vulnerability in dealing with external challenges. A secure Pakistan in the domestic front will not give any opportunity to a hostile neighbor or a big power to meddle in its affairs.

What are the options for Pakistan to deal with the challenges when the world order is passing through a transitory phase and its transformation from unipolar to multipolar is in the offing? One can figure out four options for Pakistan in the prevailing world order and once it is transformed. First, a confident, secure, progressive, enlightened and developed Pakistan requires a leadership whose level of maturity, prudence, intelligence, integrity and courage is beyond any shadow of doubt. World history is replete with examples to prove that states faced enormous challenges and threats were able to confront difficult situation because of their leadership. Second, the focus of state should be on human and social development so that people feel secure and can deal with any external and internal challenges. Countries like China, Malaysia, South Korea and Singapore gave priority to provide access to the basic necessities of life like clean and safe drinking water, providing better health and quality education, affordable housing and public transport. As a result, the standard of living of people of such countries improved substantially and along with that their economic conditions also improved. Pakistan can also follow such models of development so that its per capita income, Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Gross National Product (GNP), foreign exchange reserves and Human Development Index (HDI) can improve. Only with a sound economic and technological base can Pakistan have its mark as far as world order is concerned.

Third, in the arena of foreign policy, qualitative change should take place. Instead of reactive, Pakistan's foreign policy should be proactive in nature so that countries in the region and outside should think twice before exerting pressure on Pakistan. And foreign policy of a country is a reflection of its domestic politics. If Pakistan is domestically peaceful, secure and prosperous, certainly such pluses will have their impact on the country's foreign policy. It may be difficult for Pakistan to undo with the baggage of cold war days when it joined the Western alliance system Baghdad Pact in 1955 renamed as Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in 1958 and South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1955. Pakistan paid a heavy price of joining CENTO and SEATO in the form of hostility of Soviet bloc. Every time Pakistan agreed to be a frontline state all the way since 1950s till 9/11 it complained of letting down by the United States in the form of suspending its military and economic aid and imposing sanctions. The policy of 'not putting all eggs in one basket' should have been pursued by Pakistan but it was because of nexus between the pro-Western elites of Pakistan and the United States which lured Pakistan of siding with America. Finally, a policy of self-reliance and not depending on foreign aid/loans will go a long way in strengthening Pakistan and not coming under external pressure or coercion. The more Pakistan is dependent on external assistance and loans, the more it will lose its sovereignty resulting into

its diminishing status in global affairs. No nation can get self-respect unless it is economically strong, politically stable and technologically advanced. Pakistan, like many post-colonial states has a long way to go in order to have its noticeable influence in the world and that it is only possible when the country comes under top fifteen economies of the World. If poverty, under-development, social backwardness, illiteracy, extremism, militancy, intolerance, violence and terrorism are eradicated from Pakistan, one can expect the country to seek recognition and respect in the comity of nations.

When the per capita income, exports, foreign exchange reserves, GDP, GNP, remittances and foreign investments will substantially augment, in that case Pakistan can expect to have its prominent place in world economy. Additionally, advancement in science and technology, research and development and sports will also go a long way in enabling Pakistan to have its mark in world affairs.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Don Oberdorfer, "Bush's talk of a New World Order Foreign Policy Tool or Mere Slogan?" in *The Washington Post*, May 26, 1991.
- <sup>2</sup> Joseph Nye, "What New World Order?" *Foreign Affairs* (New York) Vol. 71, No. 2 Spring 1992, p.83.
- <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.
- <sup>4</sup> Robert T. Grey, "Strengthening The United Nations To Implement The Agenda For Peace," *Strategic Review*, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (Summer 1993), p. 20.
- <sup>5</sup> Carl Gershman, "The United Nations And The New World Order," *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 4, No. 3, July 1993, p.14.
- <sup>6</sup> Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations* (London: Penguin Books, 1998), p. 269.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, The authors further argue that, "order cannot properly exist between states until central authoritative institutions commanding the loyalty of all have been created.
- <sup>8</sup> Peter Calvocoressi in his book *World Politics Since 1945* (New York: Longman, 1996), p. 168.
- <sup>9</sup> Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "An Agenda for Peace: One Year Later," *Orbis*, Summer, 1993, pp. 324-24.
- <sup>10</sup> Joshua S. Goldstein, *International Relations* (New York: Pearson, 2005), pp. 255-56.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 278.
- <sup>13</sup> See news item, "Amnesty says US strikes in Somalia kill large numbers of civilians," *Daily Dawn* (Karachi), March 21, 2019.
- <sup>14</sup> G-7 is composed of Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States.
- <sup>15</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash Of Civilizations And The Remaking Of World Order*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 156.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.129
- <sup>17</sup> Hasan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan" in Robert Chase, Emily Hill, Paul Kennedy (eds.), *The Pivotal States A New Framework For U.S. Policy In the Developing World* (New York: W.W Norton & Company, 1998), p. 64.
- <sup>18</sup> Marvi Memon, "Reorientation of Pakistan's Foreign Policy After the Cold War," *Pakistan Horizon* (Karachi) Vol. 47, No 2 (April 1994), p.46.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.