

EMERGENCE OF NEW WORLD ORDER

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem*

Abstract

The United States has taken over its global ambitions from Britain, its socio-political precursor mentor. Woodrow Wilson, it may be recalled, championed the same cause while he was vehemently pleading for the establishment of League of Nations. But as he was partly incapacitated by a heart-stroke, he couldn't carry his nation or the Congress along with these ambitions. The U.S has to wait for another World War-II- to turn to these global objectives. In the early 1990s, Bush Senior in particular, took these ambitions more seriously than his predecessors. The stage was further set mainly because the Soviets lost their global hegemony in its Afghan invasion. Since the removal of the Soviets, Muslims with their passionate involvement in their Islamic ideology, are deemed to be the sole obstacle in their way to global imperialism camouflaged under a diplomatic expression – the New World Order. In order to push the Muslims out of their way, the U.S and its allies are engaged in two types of battles that is, the battle of arms and the battle of Ideas. Overriding objective of both these battles is to dominate and control the Muslim world and exploit their natural /mineral resources. This brief article is meant to analyse this new adventure of the U.S and assess its implications for the Muslim World.

History testifies that every new-born imperialism comes to the centre-stage with an ambition to reshape the world to its hearty desires by introducing a New World Order.¹ Modern-day imperialists are no exception. It may be underscored that in 1990s Bush Senior was largely responsible for propagating the U.S. dreams for a New World Order². Some observers at the time expressed their skepticism saying it was the old world order dressed up in new clothes, an imperialism in the guise of globalization to extend American hegemony. and whatever was left undone by his father, has been picked up by George W. Bush, the son, and taken to completion. Bush ringed the world with U.S. military bases

* Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem is the Dean of Social Sciences in Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar Campus.

and carrier battle groups, making US 'military juggernaut intent.'³ Driven by an exaggerated sense of threats, and a self-serving military-industrial complex, this juggernaut is tightening its noose on much of the world. The State Department has been replaced by Pentagon as the primary architect of foreign policy making. In this scenario, the American military empire is a novel form of dominion, an "international protection racket: mutual defense treaties, military advisory groups, and military forces stationed in foreign countries to 'defend' against often poorly defined, overblown, or nonexistent threats."⁴ Great Roman Empire and the Han Dynasty of China ruled their domains with permanent military encampments that garrisoned conquered territory, whereas, the American empire is not based on the acquisition of territory, it is an empire of bases, hell-bent for economic exploitation and political domination. Johnson fears that this military empire will corrode democracy, bankrupt the nation, spark opposition, and ultimately end in a Soviet-style collapse.⁵

The Bush administration's war on terrorism, invasions of Afghanistan and preemptive occupation of Iraq and its subsequent destruction, expanded military budget, and controversial 2002 and 2006 National Security Strategies defining Bush fire type of New World Order, have thrust American Imperialism into the light of the day and has deeply unsettled much of the world. Muslims in particular and the world at large in general, are paying a heavy price for American ambitions of global imperialism and a debate is going round the globe that the empire⁶ is back, as the United States run a global order driven by military action and the fear of terrorism. In confronting terrorism by invoking a right to unilateral action, preventive war, and regime change, the Washington has undermined the very framework of international cooperation and law that

is necessary to fight terrorist anarchy.⁷ The vision of this new form of world order is founded on illusions of U.S. power which failed to appreciate the role of cooperation and rules in the exercise and preservation of international order. The concept of New World Order or New Military World Order is ever-evolving and did not learn from the fate of old world orders of similar types. Its goals and objectives keep on changing according to the changed geo-political scenarios. Since September 2001, the main victim of this New World Order is the Muslim World and the main casualty is the intra civilization relationship and trust. American policies and power have left the legacy of resentment, fear and anxiety especially in the Muslims World. Muslims and their religion are under attack everywhere. Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq, Israeli aggression in Lebanon, siege of Palestine, threatening posture for Iran and Syria, demand for secularization are few dots amongst many in hidden agenda of Bush world Order. The 2003 Iraq war was undertaken on the basis of assumptions of the worst that would happen if it was not fought and the best that would happen if it was. The New World Order has damaged every individual and institution it has touched, including the USA occupying forces that soon came to be seen as a menace to the local people rather than their liberators and set the scene for growing chaos. Nobody wants to hate America because it produces porn, or because it does not cover its women. Rather it is emerging American Empire and imperialism which has earned it a title of Rogue State from its own citizens like William Blum, Noam Chomsky etc.⁸ Of late, New World Order (Muslim World Disorder) seems to involve the following strategic steps: -

1. Secularism:

Main thrust of American Imperialism is to push the Muslim world towards secularism. Richard Clarke, in his book: *Against All Enemies*, contends that the Arab mujahideen brought three things in Afghanistan, that is, money, manpower, & the holy Quran. Money, they used for the purchase of portable weapons, manpower was turned into trained guerrilla fighters or mujahideen & the Quran was used to revitalize the spirit of jihad. And with this combination, these Arab mujahideen, in conjunction with their Afghan co-religionists & their hosts, were able to bury the Communist Empire in the dust of history.⁹ Richard Clarke apprehends that if these mujahideen were left alone, they might do the same to the sole super power left in the field (i.e. the U.S.).¹⁰ The U.S. strategists are fighting against this fear, the fear of the Muslims— Islamophobia. Subsequently, in his Task Force Report,¹¹ he recommends that the U.S. will be well-advised to focus itself against all these vital elements of Muslim strength. Money, especially circulating thro' charity organizations, should be frozen. Manpower involved in jihad, should be dubbed as fundamentalists, terrorists and extremists. Further, he recommends that the exiting lot of jihadis should be killed by joint efforts of our U.S. agencies empowered with lethal actions (under the U.S. Patriot Act) on the one hand, and the armed forces of the enlightened moderate rulers of the Muslim world on the other. And in order to freeze and eliminate the further possibilities of the growth of jihadis, we should secularize the system of education in the entire Muslim world and sweep aside all references to such Quranic Suras and verses which advocate jihad against the oppressive, suppressive and exploitive rulers.

The west is also determined to keep the Islamists away from the corridors of power regardless of whether they wish to come to power through ballot (political process) or through bullets (i.e., thro' jihad against their own corrupt rulers working as stooges for their Western masters). For instance, *Time Magazine* in an article titled: "Struggle for the soul of Islam" reports: the prospects of Islamic radicals' seizing power in Pakistan is frightening to U.S. officials who say such a shift could bolster the Taliban's revival in Afghanistan, scuttle the hunt for bin Laden and give terrorists free access to nuclear materials.¹² In its final report the independent U.S. Commission investigating the Sept. 11, attacks recommended that Washington pony up more aid to defend Musharraf against the extremist.¹³ It is also reported that the U.S. and the West are spending 70 to 80 million dollars per month on the security of Gen. Pervez Musharraf.¹⁴ The West holds the same attitude towards the Islamists through-out the Muslim world. For instance, Hamas who won the majority in the Parliament and have been successful in electing their own Prime Minister and his Cabinet are denied their democratic right to govern Palestine, a mutilated and truncated state. Let us see what former President Jimmy Carter has to say on this issue. Carter laments in his recent book titled: *Palestine Peace not Apartheid*: "A new factor in the region is that the Palestinian election of Jan. 2006 gave Hamas members control of the Parliament & a Cabinet headed by the Prime Minister. Israel & the United States reacted by announcing a policy of isolating & destabilizing the new government, elected officials are denied travel permits to participate in parliamentary affairs, Gaza is effectively isolated & every effort is made to block humanitarian funds to Palestinians, to prevent their right to employment or commercial trade, and deny them access to Israel & the outside world".¹⁵

This is by no means a new phenomenon. James Baker, Secretary for foreign affairs during Bush Senior's term in office, has expressed the same contention about Algeria:

*“When I was at the Department of state we pursued a policy of excluding the radical fundamentalists in Algeria, even as we recognized that this was somewhat at odds with our support of democracy. Generally speaking when you support democracy, you take what democracy gives you. If it gives you radical Islamic fundamentalists, you are supposed to live with it. We don't live with it in Algeria because we felt the radical fundamentalists views were so adverse to what we believe in.... & to the national interests of the United States”.*¹⁶

One may add that the fundamentalists' rule of Taliban or the fundamentalists' rule of Mehmoud Ahmedinejad, or the fundamentalists' rule of MMA would likewise be considered “adverse to what we believe in and to the national interests of the United States.” So what is really required in international politics is not “regime change” according to the hearty desires of the U.S. On the contrary, we should strive for a “change in the U.S. attitude” especially its foreign policy in order to safeguard the rule of law as opposed to the rule of War and Violence perpetrated by Bush & Blair & their respective hawks.

2. Sectarianism:

Bush was able to exploit 9/11, a human tragedy, to further his own political ends. He immediately blamed al-Qaeda for this terrorist attack whose culprits are, of course, still shrouded in mystery. He was riding on a high tide of global sympathy. He asked the poor Taliban regime to

surrender Osama bin Laden to the U.S. or be ready for the U.S. invasion. Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and other neo-cons were anxious to exploit this opportunity to go after Iraq as well because in their opinion al-Qaeda alone might not have been able to manage terrorist attacks of this magnitude. Moreover, Saddam Hussain who was presumably sitting on huge piles of WMD might pass on these WMD to al-Qaeda who, in turn, would kill our children in our own cities and streets. Bush, however, brushed aside two frontal wars at this stage but promised to come back to Iraq sometimes in the near future. Afghanistan was attacked and reduced to ruins and rubble. US Army Major General, while speaking of attack on Shahikot Valley in Afghanistan, remarked: "We leveled it. There was nobody left, just dirt and dust."¹⁷ But when the war was half completed and terrorism was not even bruised, he rushed to Iraq. Democrats contend that here he was guilty of alienating the U.S. from the rest of the world, as he was not backed by the international community. He however, consoled himself by asserting: sometimes, we (the U.S.) may be left alone. It is OK with me. We are America.¹⁸

Immediate objective of Iraq invasion was to occupy the oil fields and the energy resources of the Muslim world. For this purpose occupation of Afghanistan on the one side and Iraq on the other, was deemed essential. Afghanistan could help control the oil fields of Central Asian Muslim states while Iraq could be the key to the Middle East including the Iranian oil fields. The purpose was to acquire super-economy in order to support super war-technology. And then go after the rest of the world including China. Of course, a side interest was also to help Israel to materialize its goals of regional hegemony by demolishing Iraq and its armed forces. Probably they also wanted to divide Iraq on ethnic and sectarian lines and damage its prospects as hostile Islamic state. Bush,

Rumsfeld, Cheney, and others were expecting this war to be just a cakewalk.¹⁹ In fact, they were intoxicated by an extremely cheap victory in Afghanistan. They invaded and occupied Iraq without incurring much of human or material loss. Initially Bush was able to declare that “mission” has been “accomplished”. Their problem, however, started when they began to govern this multi-ethnic and multi-sectarian state. To begin with, they dismantled the Iraqi army and the police force and the Sunnis received the shock. Kurds had already acquired autonomy and were patronized by the U.S. during the prolonged period of sanctions. Shiites took control of the state because of their numerical strength in elections. Moreover, both these groups, that is the Shiites and the Kurds are also having independent access to Iraq’s oil fields. Sunnis are deprived of oil resources and equitable accommodation in the constitution and the governance of the country.

Contrary to the expectations of Bush-Blair administrations, the invading armies were not treated as liberators or the saviors of the Iraqis. Instead they were taken as unwanted occupants. Initially both Sunnis and Shiites offered a stiff resistance. In order to weaken their strength, the U.S. started playing one community against the other (i.e. resorted to old policy of divide & rule). There might have been some element of resentment & revenge in some quarters of the Shiites against Saddam and his Sunni co-religionists as well. In any case, now there is a growing civil strife. On the average, there are ten instances of sectarian strife and more than 150 persons are killed daily because of Shia-Sunni civil war. Some of the western sources have reported that more than 650,000 Iraqis are killed so far.²⁰ More than one million have become refugees within their own homeland. And around two million of them have moved to Jordan, Syria, and other neighboring states.

Madeline Albright has criticized Bush and has termed his Iraq invasion as the “greatest disaster in the U.S. foreign policy”. In some of her TV interviews concerning the promotion of her recent book, *The Mighty and the Almighty*, she said that one might agree with Bush that as super power we have a right to access to the world energy resources. But to pay the price of oil in blood is just not bearable or acceptable. It reflects the failure of our diplomacy. The fact of the matter is that we could have pushed the entire Middle East to a sectarian war and violence—similar to Iran-Iraq war, and ensured our access to the oil resources.

One may see that the same agonizing situation is emerging in Iraq. Still there are hopes that Sunnis could be accommodated both in equitable share in Iraq’s oil revenue as well as an equitable participation in the governance of the state. If these hopes are shattered there are grave dangers of turning the entire Middle East into a sectarian war. Condoleezza Rice has made similar observations. “With lid lifted there is struggle between Shiites and Sunnis to redefine their relationship. There is struggle inside Islam to re-define the roles of politics and religion. Above all, Rice contends, there is struggle between extremism and moderation” Vali Nasr the author of an excellent book *The Shiites Revival: How the conflict within Islam will shape the future* holds that by toppling Saddam Hussein, the Bush administration has liberated and empowered Iraq’s Shiite majority and has helped launch a broad Shiite revival that will upset the sectarian balance in Iraq and the Middle East for years to come.²¹ This development is rattling some Sunni Arab governments, but for Washington, it could be a chance to build bridges with the regions Shiites, especially with Iran.²² Vali Nasr, it may be underlined is a Shiite by persuasion and an Iranian by origin. He

contends that “the Sunni backlash has begun to spread far beyond Iraq’s borders, from Syria to Pakistan, raising specter of a broader struggle for power between the two groups that could threaten the stability in the region.”²³ King Abdullah of Jordan has warned that a new “Shiite Crescent” stretching from Beirut to Tehran might cut thro’ the Sunni dominated Middle East”. Vali Nasr concludes:

*“But if Washington and Tehran are unable to find common ground -- and the constitutional negotiations fail -- the consequences would be dire. At best, Iraq would go into convulsions; at worst, it would descend into full-fledged civil war. And if Iraq were to collapse, its fate would most likely be decided by a regional war. Iran, Turkey, and Iraq's Arab neighbors would likely enter the fray to protect their interests and scramble for the scraps of Iraq. The major front would be essentially the same as that during the Iran-Iraq War, only two hundred miles further to the west: it would follow the line, running through Baghdad, that separates the predominantly Shiite regions of Iraq from the predominantly Sunni ones. Iran and the countries that supported it in the 1980s would likely back the Shiites; the countries that supported Iraq would likely back the Sunnis”.*²⁴

According to *New York Times* Saudi Arabia has told Bush administration that it might provide financial backing to Iraqi Sunnis in a war against Iraq’s Shiite if the United States pulls its troops out of Iraq.²⁵ It is further reported that during Dick Cheney’s recent visit to Riyadh, King Abdullah also expressed strong opposition to diplomatic talks between the US and Iran, and pushed for Washington to encourage the resumption

of peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians. Saudis are also opposed to American pull out from Iraq, citing fears that Iraq's minority Sunni Arab population would be massacred.

The Bush administration is also working on a way to form a coalition of Sunni Arab nations and a moderate Shiite government in Iraq along with United States and Europe, to stand against "Iran, Syria and the terrorist". The US has been prodding Saudi Arabia to take a more active role in Iraq and with Iran. It is also reported that a group of prominent Saudi clerics called on Sunni Muslims around the world to mobilize against Shiites in Iraq. The statement called the "Murder, torture, and displacement of Sunnis" as "outrage".

If all these elements/statements are pieced together, one can't resist the conclusion that the stage is nearly set for sectarian war in the Middle East that may have its spill over effects for the entire Muslim world. One can only hope and pray that both these communities learn to accommodate each other and their equitable constitutional and financial rights. If sectarian emotions are allowed to run wild the whole Muslim Ummah may run into a serious catastrophe.

3. Religious And Cultural Invasion:

Bush and Blair are engaged in a religious and cultural invasion/crusade against Islam and the Muslims. They have also inducted Pope Benedict XVI to promote their cause just as they recruited late Pope John Paul II in their fight against communism during the cold war era.²⁶ It is interesting to note that Pope Benedict quotes a Byzantine emperor of 14th century rather than any Christian saint or a scholar to score a point against Islam. Pope Benedict attacks the concept of Jihad (which he translates as Holy War) and then goes on to attack the prophecy and

Prophethood of Muhammad (Peace and blessings of God be upon him). Emperor is reported to have said: “show me just what Muhammad brought that was new and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached” Pope Benedict goes on to quote how emperor advocated: “Why spreading faith through violence is something unreasonable ...faith is born of the soul, not of the body. Whoever would lead someone to faith needs the ability to speak well and to reason properly, without violence and threats...”²⁷

“There is no compulsion in religion”: Q: 2:256 is dismissed by the Pope as irrelevant because, the Pope contends that this is a verse pertaining to Meccan life where the Prophet was still powerless and helpless²⁸. It may be observed that there are quite a few other issues raised by our learned Pope Benedict in his lecture. But I will prefer to skip over them for the time being and focus my attention on the points underlined above.

In my opinion, the Pope is guilty of doing violence to the teachings of the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet (Peace Be Upon Him). Let me point out that Islam attaches the highest value to human life so much so that if you take away one life unjustifiably it is as if you have killed the whole humanity. Further, Islam contends that God has infused his own spirit in man. So to do any violence against any human being amounts to doing violence against the Godly element in him. In fact, Islam insists that God Almighty has endowed man with two attributes: He blessed him, with intellect and liberty/ freedom; intellect so that he could see the difference between the devil and the divine; and liberty to choose either of the two and transform his life accordingly. So Islam unlike Christianity---which is committed to “original Sin” and stands on the

redemption of the Christ (Peace be upon him)—holds that man is His vicegerent. His job is the eradication of evil and establishment of a just moral order in this world. Jihad, it may be observed, has never ever been recommended as an instrument of religious conversion. In fact one of the great blessings of the Quran is that it has transformed war (or Jihad) to a moral virtue and a moral obligation and has dismissed war as an instrument of violence, repression and oppression against the helpless and the destitute. The Quran calls upon the Muslims to stand up against the oppressive rulers and wants us to stop them from spreading corruption and exploitation in this world. Islam identifies that the single most duty of the Muslim Ummah is the establishment of justice—socio-political and moral justice. And for the realization of this goal, Muslims are required to go for persuasion and education as the first requirement. If that dose not operate and the mischief mongers don't mend their ways, then Islam calls upon its followers to sacrifice their life and property for the realization of this goal. And if they turn their back on this obligation, then God will turn His back upon them.²⁹

The Prophet (Peace Be Upon Him) further qualifies that mujahideen are not allowed to harm innocent children, women, sick and old, wayfarers monks or religious devotees; nor or they allowed to destroy the crops, fruit trees, water resources, buildings, cities, animals or the live-stocks of the innocent people. They are required to fight only those who have come to fight against them.

It may also be observed that the holy prophet (SAW) didn't march against his Meccan opponents, instead he was attacked by them, and was left with no option but to defend his new born state and society. There is not a single instance where jihad (or sword) was used for religious

conversion. Islam recommends instead to invite people to the right path with wisdom and Hikamat. Islam indeed springs from the depths of human heart and transforms his being instantaneously. It has nothing to do with war and violence. But if war is thrust upon the Muslims, they are supposed to fight back with all the courage and conviction and not to turn their back to the enemy. I hope this little note will clarify the misgivings about Islam and its philosophy of jihad. Madam Albright has underlined one point in her recent book that there is a common element between religion and democracy and, that is that both stand on the dignity and liberty of man and demand that they should not be compromised. Religions, she insists, should be used to unify mankind rather than divide them. I do hope and pray that Pope Benedict listens to her wise counseling. Religion, she holds, is an integral part of political life and can't be dismissed as irrelevant. One may feel inclined to subscribe to her contentions.³⁰

4. Military Occupation & Economic Exploitation:

The United States is gradually unfolding its charter for global imperialism. It has a bloody beginning and is still staying on the same course. To begin with, it killed over 20 million Red Indians to establish its own state. Soon after it moved to Latin America to control and exploit its financial and natural resources. After World War II, it spread itself to Europe and Japan under the garb of Marshall Plan. Also, it moved towards Middle East and planted Israel in the heart of the Muslim world. To protect the Jews from genocide in Europe, the U.S. and its European allies, shifted them to the Middle East with the open mandate to indulge in genocide of the Palestinians to consolidate their Zionist state. This process is still going on. Israel in turn, urged Bush to invade and occupy Iraq. They were at the front-line to paint the horrors of Saddam Hussein;

his WMD; & his active contacts with al-Qaeda. Israel has also been urging the U.S. to go after Iran & reduce it to ashes so that Israel could be left unhindered to establish itself as regional hegemony. Besides these geo-political considerations, the U.S. was also prompted to occupy the Iraqi oil fields & financial resources as well. Purpose was to frighten the rest of the oil rich Arab countries & exploit their resources as well. To justify these adventures the U.S. agencies provided her the much needed “political context”. In order to move further, the Pentagon circulated its thesis of “Blood Borders” whereby the entire Muslim world was to be mutilated & restructured. Almost all major Muslim countries, such as, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan were its target.³¹ By way of initial steps, the U.S. urged Israel to go after Lebanon. Purpose was to clear its way for Iran invasion. Hezbollah’s heroic resistance, however, shattered the myth of Israel’s invincibility. The U.S. frustration in Iraq, coupled with the defeat of Israel in Lebanon, apparently forced the U.S. public to pressurize the Bush administration to change its course in Iraq & the Middle East. In November, 2006 elections Republicans have lost their majority both in Congress and the Senate.

Baker-Hamilton study group report states that the situation in Iraq is quite grave & deteriorating. America is losing war in Iraq. It will, therefore, be advisable to talk to Iran and Syria and work-out a plan for territorial integrity of Iraq and withdraw its own forces by the beginning of 2008. America has suffered quite a loss to its international standing and credibility. We have received body-bags of more than 3,000 soldiers while more than 21,000 are seriously wounded. Financially we have spent around \$500 billion & the ultimate cost of this war might be around 2 trillion dollars.³²

Bush, however, is reluctant to accept the recommendations of the Baker-Hamilton Study Group. He is likely to announce his own strategy by Jan. 2007. He is earnestly soliciting the advice and in-put of his newly appointed defense secretary, Robert Gates, former Director of C.I.A. This is only one side of the story. On the other side, America has inadvertently served as a mid-wife to some of Iran's geo-political ambitions. America toppled Taliban Govt. in Afghanistan and Saddam Govt. in Iraq. Both of these were presumed to be Sunni states. Shiism is on the rise and has its own plans for the Middle East. Iraq, as of now, is passing thro' Shia-Sunni sectarian violence and its likely to spill-over to the entire Middle East. If Iraq is up for chaotic disintegration and all three groups, that is, Kurds, Shias, and the Sunnis are running for autonomous zones, it may gravitate its neighbours to this war. Turkey may jump in to nip the Kurds in the bud; Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt and other Sunni states may rush in to protect the Iraqi Sunnis from an outright genocide at the hands of Shia militants operating under Iranian guidance. This calamity may have disastrous consequences for the entire Muslim world. It is all too obvious that we are driven to this tragic situation by the U.S. and its global imperialist designs. Communism is dead and gone. Muslims are in deep crisis. We are indeed passing thro' very critical period of our history. Our leadership must realize its responsibility, unify itself & help our Shiites and Sunni brethren in the Middle East to avoid this collective suicide. Through unity alone we can frustrate the enemy designs.

PAKISTAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAMME

Bob Woodward reports in his book: '*Bush at War*' that Musharraf said [to Bush] "his deep fear was that the United States would in the end abandon Pakistan and that other interests would crowd out the war on

terrorism”. Bush fixed his gaze: “Tell the Pakistan people that the president of the United States looked you in the eye and told you, we would not do that.”³³

Musharraf draws the attention of the U.S President Bush to an article in *The New Yorker* by investigative reporter Seymour Hersh, alleging that the Pentagon, with the help of an Israeli special operations Unit, had contingency plans to seize Pakistan’s nuclear weapons should the country become unstable. “Seymour Hersh is a liar”, Bush replied.³⁴

George Friedman, the author of *America’s Secret War*, tells us with hypnotic clarity the story of how Pakistan’s President Gen. Musharraf was forced to relinquish control of Pakistan’s nuclear facilities to the United States.³⁵ It may be re-called that India played a well-rehearsed drama wherein some so-called trouble-shooters were shown to have attacked the Indian Parliament House. The so-called terrorists were killed but the incident was attributed to Pakistan’s ISI. By using this as a pretext (& following the new found preemptive doctrine of the United States) India decided to advance its forces towards Pakistan-border. By exercising blatant coercive measures, India asked Pakistan to hand-over certain other terrorists and control the cross-border terrorism otherwise India would feel free to attack Pakistan even with nuclear weapons. President Musharraf who was already brought to his knees by Colin Powell and directed to fight against Taliban regime & al-Qaeda in Afghanistan felt that he was really squeezed from all directions. He felt constrained to approach the U.S. authorities for intervention with a view to persuading India to back off so that Pakistan could continue to render its services to the U.S. in Afghanistan. The U.S. found this as a golden opportunity to realize its own objectives. The US authorities told

Pakistan that India may or may not be in a position to go for a nuclear war, while the United States do intend to do so if Pakistan fails to hand-over the control of its nuclear facilities to the U.S. Here is a verbatim reproduction of some of the relevant passages from this book that tells us the full story:

“The critical issue was that the U.S. was telling Pakistan & other countries as early as December 2001, that it would not tolerate the existence of any facility that was not under clear control. In late December, when it appeared that India might launch a nuclear strike at Pakistan, Pakistan was facing a nuclear threat from two direction” [that is, both from India & from the United States].³⁶

“When U.S. officials went to mediate the crisis, it was also to deliver this message to Musharraf: Unless U.S. observers, to put it politely, were given access to Pakistani [Nuclear] facilities in order to guarantee that nuclear materials were not taken out by nuclear scientists and technicians close to ISI, the U.S. would have to take steps to destroy those facilities, steps that would, if no other way was available, include nuclear strikes. But the U.S. did not want to deal with Pakistani issue in isolation. It had much more ambitious plans.”³⁷

“In the midst of the nuclear crisis with India, the United States created another nuclear crisis for Pakistan. Unless they were able to place observers on Pakistani nuclear sites, which meant taking over those sites, the United States would not only remove any restraints that India felt but would also feel free to strike if necessary. Pakistan faced a nuclear nightmare from a completely unexpected source (i.e. Musharraf’s

friendly U.S.). The United States wanted control of Pakistan's nuclear capability, and it wasn't bluffing. It wanted that control quickly."³⁸

"The United States was prepared to do this secretly. It did not want to take down President Musharraf, but it was looking for more than a symbolic gesture. The U.S. wanted sufficient force on the ground to control access to Pakistan's nuclear facilities and explicitly wanted the ISI & their pet-scientists kept out. Musharraf assured the U.S. that ISI's control would be limited and the key scientists would be removed. He swore that [Gen. Hameed] Gul & his allies would be frozen out. The U.S. had no trust in Musharraf's promises & wouldn't bend. Musharraf was facing catastrophe."³⁹

"It has never been clear if Musharraf buckled, if the U.S. simply presented him with a fait accompli, or if Musharraf secretly agreed but wanted it to appear that he had been forced. However, at a point in March 2002, U.S. forces (not in uniform and drawn primarily from former SOCOM troops transferred to CIA and units from SAD), along with scientists from NEST [Nuclear Emergency Search Team] deployed simultaneously to all of Pakistan's nuclear reactors. They rushed to take inventory of what was there and examine records of what ought to be there. The records were scarce. No conclusion could be drawn, but the technology found indicated that Pakistan was certainly in no condition to deliver a small nuclear device to al-Qaeda, given U.S. monitoring of their facilities. Also found were advanced Chinese plans for other devices that had not yet been built but which would have made Pakistan much more dangerous by increasing the reliability & sophistication of its weapons."⁴⁰

“The United States had secured Pakistan’s nuclear facilities, although it was only nominally observing them. Musharraf worked with the U.S. to keep this secret. The ISI, of course, knew what had happened, but this was not the time or place to challenge the Americans. Musharraf was conducting careful purges in the ISI – nothing definitive but the handwriting was on the wall. The ISI contented itself with playing a waiting game. It was all very quite among the main players.”⁴¹

“Taking out the nukes was important. Taking out al-Qaeda was more important in the long run. While al-Qaeda was running loose, anything was possible. *The Pakistani nukes were safe for the moment*, but no one knew what al-Qaeda already had in its hands.”⁴²

“After the capture of Saddam, the United States began to think about a campaign in Pakistan to destroy the remnants of al-Qaeda. Indeed, the United States moved Special Forces across the border from Afghanistan regularly, hunting for bin Laden and al-Qaeda.... [But] the U.S forces are in Iraq and scattered across other theaters of operation. The lack of U.S. reserves means that the Pakistan campaign must be postponed.”⁴³

In a special interview conducted for the projection of *America’s Secret War*, George Friedman, the author of the Book, further underscored the objectives of the United States:

During the Confirmation Hearing of Condoleezza Rice, John Kerry, former contestant for the Presidential race against G.W. Bush, expressed his concern about Pakistan’s nuclear assets. He said, we all know that the terrorists have attacked the President of Pakistan twice in quick succession & he has narrowly escaped with his life. But if because of some tragedy the President is gone off the scene & the nuclear assets

pass on to the fundamentalists, what would be your plans? Initially Condoleezza Rice tried to avoid the question. But when John Kerry kept coming to the same point she said: well! Mr. Senator, *I can't tell you the details! But that matter has already been taken care of.*

In the light of these observations one feels driven to the conclusion that in all probability, Pakistan has lost control over its nuclear facilities. Besides, if we notice extremely submissive & docile attitude of our Government towards all sorts of demands of the India Govt. it lends further substance & credibility to our apprehensions. If you add up to it the derogatory comments of our President concerning Dr. A. Q. Khan (in his book: *In the Line of Fire*) one feels convinced that our general has surrendered not only the nuclear scientist but also the nuclear programme as well.⁴⁴

While Pakistanis stand totally confused as to whether or not they are still holding on to the nuclear deterrence, India has marched ahead and has nearly elevated herself to the membership of nuclear club thro' its Indo-U.S. 10 years nuclear deal. Bush has categorically denied the same facilities to Pakistan. Indian democracy, he stressed, is of paramount importance. She is our strategic partner & we are anxious to accommodate her needs & help her in her development as a world-power. This deal, amongst other things, would help her meet her energy needs & save her from costly Middle-Eastern oil. Pakistan on other hand, is our non-Nato ally & a front-line state in our war against terrorism. And we appreciate her contributions. This nuclear deal, though apparently directed against China, is more likely to squeeze Pakistan instead.

U-TURN ON KASHMIR

As a frontline state in the American war on terrorism, Pakistan has exposed itself to American pressures viz a viz India. She was asked to help India in Kashmir against the pressure of freedom fighters. Pakistan was obliged to make commitment in this regard and withdraw support from the freedom fighters in Kashmir. Though the freedom fighters in Kashmir cannot be called terrorists by any definition of that term, but since they happened to be Muslims and the war on terrorism in the new world order is basically unleashed against Islam and Muslims, the Kashmir freedom fighters were dubbed as terrorists.

To cover up this abject surrender to the Indo-U.S. strategy, Pakistan has tried to evolve novel ideas for the resolution of Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. In presenting these proposals, Pakistan has grossly deviated from the legal & moral stance that successive governments in Pakistan have upheld at the international forums as well as bilateral negotiations with India. There is complete consensus in Pakistan on this principled stand, which derives its legal and moral strengths from the U.N. resolutions of 1948 and 1949. According to these U.N. resolutions the dispute of Jammu & Kashmir is to be resolved according to the wishes of the people of Jammu & Kashmir as ascertained through an impartial plebiscite under international aegis.

By offering novel and strange proposals, with no moral & legal standing, for the resolution of the most difficult and long standing dispute between the two countries, Pakistan had weakened its negotiating position beyond repair. By the same token, Pakistan has strengthened India to hold onto its obduracy, and continue harping on its claim that Kashmir is an integral part of India. This is a clear example of how dictatorial

dispensation can damage national interests by presiding over the destinies of nations without legitimacy.

CONCLUSION:

Pakistan's present regime is enjoying a singular reputation for taking frequent U-Turns on our well established national concerns/policies. Pakistan has not only taken a U-turn on Afghanistan, U-turn on Kashmir, U-turn on nuclear deterrence; she is also guilty of taking a U-turn on our religio-moral fundamentals as well. Apart from her interest to secularize the system of education, the regime is also busy in eroding our religio-moral fabric. For instance, of late he has pushed the Parliament to pass a so-called Women Rights Protection Bill. I don't want to go into the details of this bill here. Instead, I would like to draw your attention to the plight of women in the United States where they are supposed to be enjoying "Ideal" rights. Probably our rulers want us to catch-up with them.

Father Falwell in his White House address concerning the 9/11 human tragedy lamented that we, the Americans, ourselves have invited the wrath of God. We have lost sex-morality & have also lost respect for our traditional family life. The result is that we witness mushroom growth of dens of homo-sexuals & Lesbians & staggering figures of Uni-sex marriages around the country. Not only that our mothers are also guilty of killing 40 million children through abortion. In my opinion, we ourselves have invited the wrath of God by our own immoral & indecent conduct.⁴⁵

Michael Moore, a popular critic of Bush Administration, further elaborates this point in his book: *Dude where's My Country*. He observes:

“And when it comes to holy matrimony, the number of people who live together and don't get married is up 72 percent in the past decade, and 43 percent of them have children.”⁴⁶ He goes further:” Majority of Americans is baby killers. Since abortion became legal in 1973, there have been 40 million abortions in the country. One in three women will have an abortion by the time she is 45, & of those who do, almost half will have more than one”.⁴⁷

*(One can see that from 1973-2001, i.e. (during 28 years)
Americans have killed 40 million children & have produced a
staggering figure of un-wed mothers and illegitimate children)*

Now if I were to address our revered Pope Benedict, I would very humbly suggest that, among other things, he should pay attention to this moral chaos of the Western society. He should tell them:

Save your Women!

Save your Children!

Show Christian love & compassion to your own women and children.

This is your moral & religious obligation.

He should also tell them to avoid imposition of democracy thro' bombs & bullets. If religion—which relates to eternal life not just the life on this side of the grave – can't be spread thro' sword, war and violence, I am sure, democracy cannot be spread in this way either. Bush in one of his speeches said that liberty/freedom is not his invention. In fact it is God's gift to mankind. Madam Albright has beautifully added that we should remind ourselves that God has not chosen America (or Bush for that

matter) to distribute this gift to mankind.⁴⁸ Meaning thereby that we will be well-advised to allow this democratic right to every state & society to develop itself according to its own ethico-religious & political ideals.

End Notes

- 1 . In 1988, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the United Nations of a need to search for "universal human consensus" as humanity moves toward a "new world order." In 1990, United States President George Bush seized on the term to describe the new level of post-cold war cooperation among nations--and especially to the United Nations action against aggression in the Persian Gulf.
- 2 . George Bush, *Heartbeat*, New York, Scribner, 2001, p.150
- 3 . Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic*, New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004
- 4 . *ibid*
- 5 . *ibid*
- 6 . The term "empire" refers to the political control by a dominant country of the domestic and foreign policies of weaker countries. If empire is defined loosely, as a hierarchical system of political relationships in which the most powerful state exercises decisive influence, then the United States today indeed qualifies.
- 7 . Benjamin R. Barber, *Fear's Empire: War, Terrorism, and Democracy*. New York: Norton, 2003
- 8 . William Blum, *Rogue State*, London, Zed Books, 2002,. And, Noam Chomsky, *Rogue State*, 2003.
- 9 . Richard A. Clarke, *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror*, Free Press, London, 2004, p.
- 10 . *ibid*
- 11 . Richard Clarke et al, .e. "Defeating the Jihadists: A Blur Print for Action"
- 12 . "Struggle for the soul of Islam" , *Time Magazine*, September 13, 2004
- 13 . *The 9/11 Commission Report*, London, W.W. Norton, pp.367-369

-
- 14 . Leaked think-tank paper Ministry of Defense, UK
 - 15 . Jimmy Carter , *Palestine Peace not Apartheid*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2006, p.210
 - 16 . Madeline Albright , *The Mighty & the Almighty*, New York, Miramax Books,2006, P. 226
 - 17 . William Blum, *Killing Hope: US Military & CIA Interventions since World War II*, London, Zed Books, 2003, p.391.
 - 18 . Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2004
 - 19 . ibid
 - 20 . John Hopkins, Al Mustansiriya, “The Study of Iraq Mortality”, *The Lancet*, London, October, 2006. Also see *The News*, Islamabad, “Grim Report on Iraq”, October 14th, 2006.
 - 21 . Vali Nasr, *The Shiites Revival: How the conflict within Islam will shape the future*
 - 22 . Vali Nasr, “When the Shiite Rise”, *Foreign Affairs Journal*, July-August 2006
 - 23 . ibid
 - 24 . ibid
 - 25 . *New York Times* ,Dec. 13, 2006
 - 26 . Uneri Avenry, , “Islamic Sword, Pope in the Service of George W. Bush, *Advance Contemporary Affairs*- Book 47, Lahore, Advance Publishers, 2006, pp.62-65
 - 27 . Lecture of the Holy Father: “Faith, Reason and the University Memories & Reflections”. Sept. 12, 2006
 - 28 . ibid
 - 29 . Quraan, “Sura Tauba”
 - 30 . Madeline Albright , *The Mighty & the Almighty*, New York, Miramax Books,2006
 - 31 . Ralph Peters, *Blood borders: How a better Middle East would look*, *Armed Forces Journal (AFJ)*. Available at: <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2006/06/1833899>
 - 32 . Baker-Hamilton study group, *The Iraq Study Group Report*. Available at: http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/international/20061206_btext.pdf

-
- ³³ . Bob Woodward, *Bush at War*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2002, p.303.
- ³⁴ . ibid
- ³⁵ . George Friedman, *America's Secret War*, London,. Little, Brown, 2004
- ³⁶ . George Friedman, *America's Secret War*, London,. Little, Brown, 2004,
p.226
- ³⁷ . ibid. p.227
- ³⁸ . ibid
- ³⁹ . ibid
- ⁴⁰ . ibid.pp.227-228
- ⁴¹ . ibid.228
- ⁴² . ibid
- ⁴³ . ibid. pp.336-337
- ⁴⁴ . Pervez Musharaf, *In the Line of Fire: A Memoir*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2006, pp.283-294
- ⁴⁵ . Thierry Meyssan, *9/11 The Big Lie*, London, Carnot Publishing, 2002, p.74
- ⁴⁶ . Michael Moore, *Dude where's My Country*, New York, p. p 206
- ⁴⁷ . ibid. p 209
- ⁴⁸ . Madeline Albright , *The Mighty & the Almighty*, New York, Miramax Books,2006