

FROM DE-HYPHENATION TO REBALANCE: PARADIGMATIC SHIFT IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA PACIFIC

Sajid Masood Sadiq*

Abstract

American's policy of 'De-Hyphenation in South Asia' was replaced by 'Rebalance Asia Pacific' in 2012. America's heavy diplomatic, economic and military engagements in Asia Pacific, as dictated by the latter, led to an impression that it was aimed at countering China in Asia Pacific as a likely challenger, revisionist, and a Peer Competitor in particular and all over the world in general. A critical analysis of the real nature of Chinese rise and American decline and its impacts on the existing world order; the differences between Westphalian and Sino-Sphere visions and their conflicting dynamics with regard to 'Rebalance'; the real motives behind the shift in America's Foreign Policy in Asia Pacific are major concerns of this research paper.

Keywords: Balance of Power, Hegemony, Strategy, Peer Competitor, Revisionist and Transition of Power

Introduction

At the end of 20th century, under the policy of De-Hyphenation, Indo-US relations improved and resulted in the form of agreements like Civil Nuclear Deal and Strategic partnership, which relegated Pakistan's privileged status of Non-NATO Ally to the background. This policy got bipartisan approval of US Senate. Later, mixture of policies dubbed as De-hyphenation,¹ Defensive Insulation² and Cooperation and Prevention,³ influenced by Bruce Riddle, appeared with no specific names. These policies were aimed at capping and controlling of Pakistan's Nuclear Programme (PNP) through the use of hard and soft power.

Sino-US shared strategic history is tapestry of cooperation and differences as reflected by rift over Taiwan, direct clash in Korea, cooperation against USSR during Cold War despite their ideological differences, deeply intertwined economies, and the recent tension in their relations. In October 2011, Secretary Hillary outlined three aims, with six key lines of actions, of American Foreign Policy in Asia Pacific (AP).⁴

* Sajid Masood Sadiq is researcher and has area of interest of Foreign Policy of big powers.

President Barack Obama signed this strategic guidance in January 2012. This strategy known as 'Rebalance' called for three-dimensional engagement in the areas of economy, diplomacy and security with all the countries of AP at bilateral as well as at multilateral level.⁵

This research paper, divided into five sections, is an effort to gauge the necessity of measures taken by US in correspondence with this strategy to counter real or imaginary threats in military, economic and political areas posed by China and consequent change in the existing American Led Western World Order (ALWWO). Section one explains De-Hyphenation in South Asia, section two focuses on 'Rebalance to Asia Pacific' from various angles; section three addresses the question of Chinese rise and American decline; section four describes the differences between ALWWO and the Sino-sphere vision and the fifth section identifies the reality of the Chinese rise and American decline and their likely impacts on Pakistan.

IR Literature and Theoretical Framework

Current IR literature revolves around a number of issues, which can be grouped into three main categories: multi-perceptiveness and scholarly disagreements; a plethora of writings available on every subject, mushrooming with every passing minute especially the subjects like 'Rebalance to Asia Pacific' and the conflicting and contrasting conclusions by the writers. Going through the whole literature along with drawing objective conclusions is very difficult task. In this research Realist perspective will be employed for the analysis of the current situation which involves conflicting perspectives. Employing Realist perspective to the current situation would suggest that America is likely to go to considerable length to check the Chinese rise. American policies of De-Hyphenation, Rebalance, Cooperation and Prevention are in line with the realist perspective hence this framework provides the suitable lens for understanding their real motives.

De-Hyphenation and Indo-US Closeness What is De-Hyphenation?

Karen A. Feste states that US Foreign Policy (USFP) modes under Clinton, Bush and Obama were conflict avoidance, fight to win, and problem solving through a combination of covert and diplomatic tools respectively.⁶ Cohen views 'De-hyphenation' in South Asia as a calibrated policy, with its roots in Regan administration which was adjusted by Clinton on nuclearization of

South Asia, given name by Bush, implemented by Obama in his first term and modified by him in middle of 2012 by signing a 'classified national directive' during his second term. India accepted De- Hyphenation with pleasure whereas Pakistan had to tolerate it. As a result by mid-2012, Pak-US relations got strained and Indo-US relations started flourishing at a rapid pace.⁷

Why Adjustment in De-Hyphenation?

Bruce Riddle, Obama's advisor is of the view that for Indo-US closeness the foundation was laid by President Clinton and advanced by presidents Bush and Obama which has gained now the bipartisan consent of US Congress.⁸ Mary Buckley and Robert Singh claim that Bush's policy had Pakistan as 'natural target' of WOT.⁹ Markey states that if today America ignores Pakistan as 'a rusty old Volvo'¹⁰ like Eisenhower¹¹ or as Rice and Ashley preferred India over Pakistan in 2000¹² under policy of 'De-Hyphenation', it will be a catastrophic approach. He further claims that strategic compulsions of the US need both India and Pakistan¹³ as ignoring Pakistan will force it to act as 'spoiler'.¹⁴ He notes that Bush's policy, designed by Powell and Armitage, has failed and that Pakistani Government, seventy percent people¹⁵ and military are unhappy with USA.¹⁶

Assessment of Bruce Riddle about Pakistan indicates that Pakistan can be converted into a nuclear jihadist state, which, by supporting Hamas and other terrorist groups can also jeopardize Israel's peace and security. Therefore with respect to that America needs revisiting its South Asian Policy.¹⁷ Daniel S. Markey views utility of ISI and Pak-Army for China to seek intelligence in Afghanistan, get access to a land route to the Arabian Sea which connects Iran and Central Asia and about Indian western flank'.¹⁸ Cohen suggested to America to build the biggest block of democratic countries, linked with Indian economy with Pakistan as being a part of it.¹⁹

It clearly indicates that America is preparing for containing China's rise and Pakistan can be another target, being an old comrade of China. Therefore, De-hyphenation was replaced with more coercive strategies and policies to transform Pakistan's stature so that it would not become problematic while dealing with China. All actions suggested by the policies of Defensive Insulation and Cooperation and Prevention indicated that Pakistan was treated less like a friend and more like an enemy. This treatment continued till American shift of action towards Asia Pacific. Containment of China was also visible from the worries of American think tanks and policy planners.

Understanding Rebalance to Asia Pacific

At the end of the Cold War, Russia disappeared from the scene and the American engagement in AP was also reduced. In the last decade of 20th century, America started completing the left over task of Westphalian Vision (WV) in the form of Arab-Spring, aimed at transforming the Arab World, as envisioned by American Foreign Secretary Madeleine Albright. Nuclearization of South Asia and War on Terror (WOT) kept USA busy till 2010. In twenty-five years' time after the end of the Cold war, Chinese economy progressed with a very fast pace. Chinese initiated a military modernization plan and started exerting their influence in AP. Chinese economic success and other initiatives indicate that at the start of 20th century China was in a position to face the world with confidence and in the words of Nye 'started scaring USA'.²⁰ America's reappearance in AP and Chinese initiatives in the same timeframe suggest the likelihood of the cause and effect relationship between the two powers.

What is Rebalance in Actual Sense?

'Rebalance to Asia' was under discussion in American politburo at the start of 21st century for quite a while. However, it appeared for the first time in a Foreign Policy article titled 'America's Asia Pacific' written by Foreign Secretary Hillary Clinton. She stressed the need for maintaining US global leadership, securing interests, and advancing US values and gave six key lines of actions to achieve these goals.²¹ These actions included economic, diplomatic and security oriented engagement with all the countries of AP. The primary focus of all types of engagement was to broaden areas of cooperation, beneficial to the US, regional states and institutions; strengthen relations with American allies and partners to develop regional norms and rules compatible with the international security, economic, and political order already supported by the United States. President Barack Obama signed this guideline (grand strategy) in January 2012. This grand strategy got unopposed 'bipartisan' approval from US Senate.²²

US Explanations about Rebalance

This strategy was initially named as 'Asia's Pivot' but renamed later due to possible doubts surfacing because of its stress on military component. Hillary was very categorical in explaining the maintenance of US global leadership, protection of interests and spread of US liberal values as the objective of this grand strategy. Some other Americans like U.S. Secretary of Defence, Leon Panetta, claimed that it had nothing to do with Chinese rise and China should

not take it as counter measures against it; rather it was aimed at promoting regional stability and deepening Sino-US ties.²³

Three-Pronged Engagements and Actions

On the Diplomatic front, in the form of 'Forward Deployed Diplomacy', as expressed by Hillary, a surge in top-level visits of officials including president was apparent in 1st four years tenure of President Obama. The President, other top executives and officials from related fields were seen shuttling to and fro AP. Despite the snags of economic laws, Obama Administration succeeded in getting approval from the senate for Korea-United States Free Trade Agreement (KORUS), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), and enhancement of economic trade with the countries of ASEAN. In the field of security, some of the measures taken were repositioning and enhancement of US forces, including increase in naval and air force strength, placement of intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets, conducting of 18 major and 150 service exercises with the forces of 30 countries costing about \$ 100 million, getting integration of south East Asian countries in securitization of the South East Asia (SEA) and achieving an upsurge in the number of students attending the AP Centre for Security Studies in Hawaii.²⁴

Challenges in Implementation of Rebalance

A group of five experts on 'Asian Studies' cited three challenges in the way of implementing 'Rebalance': possible backlash from China, economic unaffordability of 'Rebalance' and commitment of US high officials including President for the execution of the grand strategy.²⁵ Phillip C. Saunders also notes six challenges apart from these three issues. These are managing of the domestic politics, obstructing regional free-trade agreements, issues in fulfilling U.S. military and diplomatic commitments, and cooling down Sino-US competition rhetoric at global and regional levels.²⁶

Chinese Perception about Rebalance

Chinese perception can be divided into two groups; one group views USA at a decline in relative terms and unaffordability of 'Rebalance' and prescribes China not to overreact while the other takes 'Rebalance' as alarming and aimed at targeting China. All the cadres of Chinese officials- academics, military officers and nationalists- share the view of the first group and are unanimous in advocating staunch position on the disputes of sovereignty. There

is yet another view which maintains that since USA itself has been an expansionist, it fears that China will follow the same path.²⁷

Chinese consensus reflects that US policy is aimed at isolating, containing, diminishing Chinese status and encouraging internal divisions and sabotaging China's leadership.²⁸ Yang Yi, director of strategic studies at the National Defence University, also claims similar objectives of US policy and states that Western theories are aimed at putting China at 'defendant position'.²⁹ A document 'number 9' was circulated as warning for elite politburo of China which notes that China is the main enemy of USA and threat to its hegemony.³⁰

Question of Chinese Rise and American decline Realist's Philosophy of Rise and Decline of States' Power

Realists like Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, Mearsheimer and Farid Zakaria have found four objectives of great powers: to have power and regional hegemony, maximization of wealth, to seek pre-eminence and nuclear superiority. The factors affecting the attainment and the loss of power include internal conditions of states, structure of the international system, historic conditions of the country and its ability to possess and project soft power. Strategies to shift the balance of power are War, Blackmail, bait and bleed with balancing and buck-passing being the principal strategies employed for Balance of Power (BOP).³¹ Hegemony is exercised in three forms: influence, coercion and force. Stagnation at national level, over engagement without adequate latent power, Inadequate BOP, and rise of other great power(s) may result in loss of hegemony, initially at regional and then at global level.

Views of IR Scholars on Current Situation

The question of Chinese Rise and American Decline divides scholars into two main groups. One group, which includes scholars like Doug Guthrie and YU Xintian, adopts a modest approach and takes Chinese rise and American decline as reality but avoids deducing radical deductions and zero-sum inferences and advocates cooperation between the two great powers. Second group, which includes scholars like Mearsheimer, Ashley, Barry Buzan and Farid Zakaria, the band of realists, takes the Chinese success in economy and other initiatives as a direct threat to the American hegemony, paints very gloomy and scary picture, offers web of alliances as a line of action to contain and control China and predicts cold war at minimum and hot war at maximum. Mearsheimer

states:

In particular, the power gap between China and the United States is shrinking and in all likelihood 'US strategic primacy' in this region will be no more...To put it bluntly: China cannot rise peacefully...Washington is likely to go to considerable length to prevent China from becoming too powerful...And there is little doubt that there is one (hegemon) on the horizon.³²

Sino-US Economic Asymmetry

Historically, China has been a great economic power that, about two centuries back, after industrial revolutions in Europe, was surpassed by many other nations including America. The situation after the reforms of President Deng Xiaoping in 1980s³³ started a reversal of this situation at the end of 20th and at the start of 21st century. These reforms had two features: state-controlled market and state-owned Industry. While USA was, in the words of Guthrie, showing 'fiscal irresponsibility',³⁴ Chinese were busy raising the mountains of wealth. When USA was buried under trade deficit (\$ 700 billion in 2008 and \$ 1.4 trillion in 2009),³⁵ China was busy in buying USA treasury bonds. In 1997 Chinese foreign reserves reached up to \$ 2.3 trillion which included US treasury bonds in billions as compared with \$ 83 billion US holdings.³⁶

The purchase of US treasury bonds by China is taken as Chinese 'trump card',³⁷ Sino-US economic stability card,³⁸ US inability to dictate its terms to China³⁹ and as China's softening up of American decline.⁴⁰ Today, China undoubtedly is 'economic super power'⁴¹ and Sino-US war over economy has begun. In 2009 an American TV host declared Obama's visit to China as a 'visit to US money'.⁴² Some of the American hawks were also found asking, 'Can China be fixed'?⁴³ Handle Jones sketches Sino-US economic standing in following words

Essentially, the United States is in the same position that Europe was in after World War II, watching another car, roar past it, on the economic highway.⁴⁴

Might of the Chinese hybrid state-owned companies can be seen by Lenovo's purchase of US IBM's laptop division; by Haier's spending \$ 40 million on building of a science park in North Carolina, and purchase of US Maytag; China National Offshore Oil Corporation's (CNOOC) purchase of US Union Oil Company of California (Unocal) and by the assets of Petro China alone which are valued today over \$ 1 trillion.⁴⁵ China's investments in billions in China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) in Pakistan and \$ 60 billion aid and loan to African

nations speak of its economic muscles. These figures are without any military expenditure which are required by the US to maintain its forces.

Military

Before drawing the comparison between the ‘Tangled Titans’ on the military basis it is important to know that both countries have different approaches, concepts and strategies towards the application and projection of power. As compared to America, Chinese believe more in application of soft power instead of hard power;⁴⁶ therefore comparison on the basis of military oriented statistics may be misleading. There is no comparison between the two in military terms at global level; however the comparison in AP presents altogether a different picture. As far as the war machines are concerned, USA possesses 10:1 overall superiority ratio, which is without its allies’ strength in comparison with China.⁴⁷

Technological Front

In the wake of latest and sophisticated technology transferred or sold to China in Bush and Clinton eras⁴⁸ and proven theft of US secrets regarding nuclear and most sophisticated American military technology,⁴⁹ Chinese technology also appears to be not less than that of USA in any case. Today China’s Missile inventory has long Range China Surface-to-Surface (CSS-4), Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) capable of hitting New York and Washington and medium-range solid-fuelled road-mobile nuclear-armed DF-21, capable of carrying one million tons of Trinitrotoluene (TNT) which can target US bases in South Korea, Japan, and Okinawa and US Pacific fleet in the South China Sea. In 1998 an estimated sixty of these missiles on land were available.⁵⁰

Military Budgets

China’s official military budget has been increasing by double digits every year since 1989 to 2014, which, now, is 11 percent of global military expenditure whereas America’s was 39 percent. It is estimated that at current growth rates Chinese military budget may reach half of USA by 2020.⁵¹ US forces are committed around the globe and China has no such commitments.

Soft Power

President Hu Jintao diverted his attention towards the development of Chinese soft power in 2007. Organization Olympic Games in Beijing, developing

hundreds of Confucius Institutes, teaching Chinese language and very rich cultural history⁵² duly supported by strong Chinese economy and adopting soft approach towards the other nations are some of the steps taken by Chinese Government to project and enhance its soft power as a policy. This approach, as compared with that of US which is coercive and interventionist one towards the weaker countries, coupled with America's economic difficulties, may topple the US military and political superiority.

Military Situation at AP Front

Constantine C. Menges, an American scholar, author, professor, and Latin American specialist for White House, US National Security Council and a former CIA officer, has revealed shocking Chinese capability at AP level. While quoting a Chinese strategy and military plan by President Jiang Zemin to handle USA and Taiwan, which was to be handed over to President Clinton in a face to face meeting at the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in New Zealand in September 1999, he reveals shocking Chinese strength, confidence and strategic thinking. The Salient features of the plan include the Chinese readiness to fight all types of war with Americans and Taiwanese simultaneously, capability to defeat USA, capability to sustain major losses and to destroy completely the US air/naval forces and the bases in Japan, Okinawa, South Korea, and elsewhere in the region, capability for second and third nuclear strikes, ability to kill twenty million or more Americans, and finally, forcing USA to completely withdraw from East Asia region as was done in the case of Southern Vietnam.⁵³

There are a number of incidents which conform to the facts given in the above plan, for example, Chinese stubbornness in the incident of 'USS Kitty Hawk' in 2010, Chinese position told to US high-ranking American policymakers regarding Chinese core interest in South China Sea, Taiwan and Tibet, in July 2010 obstructing and forcing USA to shift US and South Korean naval exercise adjacent to the Chinese coastline to Japanese Sea, Lieutenant General Xiong Guangkai's ridiculing Americans by asking Americans if they would prefer Los Angeles over Taipei,⁵⁴ and in April 2000 placement of 2000 troops, more than one thousand jetfighters and three regiments of missile forces having more than eighty ballistic missiles.⁵⁵

Assessment about Chinese Rise and American Decline

Handle Jones views China as a pack of bamboo sticks, difficult to bend and impossible to break.⁵⁶ Barry Buzan admits that today no Asian power wants to serve as American outpost in front of China.⁵⁷ Michael D. Swaine along with others observes that US capabilities and influence in AP are diminishing.⁵⁸ Fareed Zakaria has written a book and titled it as 'Post American World'. Joseph Nye Jr. drawing a comparison of Sino-US indicators of rise and decline concludes that the American Century began in 1914 and has ended in 2014 because its foreign policy has failed, economy doesn't work well and democracy is broken. He narrates the story of a child-cry of wolf, wolf and ultimately wolf comes and no one believes him the wolf (China) has come.⁵⁹ Christopher Coker while quoting Murray and Morris states US situation as:

Social contract is crumbling; the dream is over...the United States has grown increasingly weary of foreign...entanglements... It would decline, if at all, because of 'the mediocrity of its desires', and its power would gradually ebb away only for 'want of ambition'...The world's first globocopy in 1815 Britain eventually cracked under the weight of its global responsibilities; the next, the US, may do the same.⁶⁰

Westphalian Order versus Sino-Sphere Vision Westphalian Vision

Development of Current ALWWO can be divided into three phases. Pre-Westphalian order was based on Latin Christendom, Augustinian political theology and rule-ordered Westphalia system. Initially the chain of Christian Churches⁵⁸, then Augustinian political theology and in fifteenth-century, after the religious reformation, Westphalian representative type government was established which was secular in nature and left the religion to the conscience.⁶¹ At the dawn of 19th century UK was super power, however, it was replaced by USA after the World War I & II. The thumb rule during 19th century was if any state would violate the will of a super power that would be punished.

Sino-Sphere Vision

Sino-Sphere vision was based on kowtowing (bowing) principle in which children kotow to parents, parents to grandparents (and the ancestors), ministers to the emperor, and the emperor to heaven itself.⁶² Logic behind this principle was self-rectification; putting the own house in order and organization of kingdom on the same principle will bring peace under all the heavens. This

system was agent centred and king was the agent, who would ask for the tributes and in return he would give silk which would be superior to what he got. This system had the capability for self-correction, strong centre will control the periphery and if the centre is weak, periphery would correct it.⁶³ The rules had secondary significance and were not part of the system's basic structure. Moreover, the Sino-sphere relied far more on soft power than hard power. It lasted till 1871 when it was overtaken by the Westphalian order.

Inherent Tensions between the Two Visions

Christopher Coker while quoting Andrew Phillips states that all international orders are 'normative' and have spiritual and physical components and the tension between the two worlds is accepted by all.⁶⁴ There is a basic difference of structure in the two visions, one being socialist (Sino-Sphere) in nature keeps spiritual and temporal components together whereas Westphalian (ALWVO) draws clear difference between the two. Socialist's organization being conservative in nature keeps the control on the subordinate institutions of the state and the society, as Chinese have state controlled markets, state owned industries and many restrictions on its citizens. Western vision seeks democracy, market based economy with minimal governmental control and liberal values.

Current Situation

After the disintegration of USSR, US mode changed into 'Hyper Power'⁶⁵ and USA tried to force the whole world to work according to one system which reminds us of Fukuyama's thesis of 'End of History'. With their re-emergence as a great economic power, Chinese are dissatisfied with the ALWVO and believe that on the basis of actual situation and capability, China should provide more 'public goods'⁶⁶ and should play more active role in the changing international scenario⁶⁷ and redraw the relations with USA on the lines of 'Win-Win Cooperation' which would be a new model for Sino-US relations. Wealth is another competing arena, as Coker claims that the conflicting motivations between China and the United States are leading to a war over wealth.⁶⁸ Chinese view all US actions as prejudice attitude towards Chinese success. Kevin Rudd notes that

Uncomfortable truth is that our existing system of global governance, anchored in the United Nations (UN) and the Bretton Woods institutions is becoming increasingly dysfunctional.⁶⁹

Having antagonistic opinion about each other, America takes China as a

threat to its hegemony and China views USA as an obstruction to its rise as a great power and now both are locked in a titanic struggle over competing visions of a world order.⁷⁰

Although U.S. officials are bashful about describing China plainly as a geopolitical threat, there is little doubt that they recognize the possibility of a coming power transition.⁷¹

Conclusions and Impacts on Pakistan

The name of the strategy as 'Rebalance' itself raises questions like what is rebalance and to whom to rebalance? Three pronged engagements indicate the serious challenges faced by USA in AP. Shuttling of officials to and fro AP and involvement of top-level diplomats including president indicates the gravity of the situation. Creation of economic forums indicates an effort to raise the Chinese stakes by knitting the web of interdependence as a policy prescribed and advocated by liberals. Dominant military component of Rebalance indicates realist policy prescription to maintain BOP against the emerging power, endangering the hegemony. Three conclusions can be drawn from the objectives of 'Rebalance': both powers are certainly involved in competition over leadership and economic gains, Chinese rationale and complaints regarding encirclement and containment of Chinese rise appear to be relevant and finally China is posing multiple threats to USA and its hegemony in AP. This brings us closer to the idea of Mearsheimer that 'China cannot rise peacefully'.

On the basis of current Chinese military statistics China for sure is a peer competitor in military term at AP level and America has lost its hegemony in AP. Moreover, US security engagements in AP indicate that it is trying to balance Chinese Military dominance in AP through the web of alliances, creating security networks to check the Chinese rise and 'hedging' behind the other AP countries. On economic front, China has surpassed USA and is in a far better position than USA. With the economic might, Chinese soft power will further increase with the passage of time, Chinese altruism may appeal more to the weaker countries (client states) and in this case conflict between the two may prove true Huntington's thesis of 'Clash of Civilization'. With the increased economic and military strength and consequently increasing soft power coupled with the conclusions drawn from the discussions over 'Rebalance', it can be said that Chinese trajectory is towards the ascension and America is losing its pre-eminence day by day. The title of Fareed Zakria's book, '*The Post American World*' itself speaks of the current situation.

The world has never been governed by one single order. It will be a fallacy to imagine so and the thesis like Fukuyama's 'End of History' may be misleading and a sheer exaggeration of American power and only an exhibition of American supremacy over literature. Today, Chinese state-controlled capitalism and state-owned MNCs are giving far better results than the US unfettered MNCs and self-controlled capitalism. Even the Chinese socialist democracy is doing fine and American scholarly predictions regarding Chinese internal collapse are proving wrong and America is facing more domestic hardships than China. The Realist perspective states that this is the power which decides the top position, neither the form of government nor the norms and values.

In view of the US Rebalance, its objectives and US actions, current standing and trajectories and two different visions of the powers initiating and promoting these visions it can be concluded that since China is rising and wants to change the existing international system it will be able to do so and American efforts to check the Chinese rise will not succeed. The way Chinese rise is becoming a reality, American decline is also becoming a reality but only in relative terms not in absolute terms. USA is losing its 'Exceptionalism' and the myth of 'Manifest Destiny' is disappearing. It is also important to understand that USA will not disappear; rather rise of other nations will come to share the power with it. Thesis of power with others and power over others will be US future discourse.⁷²

It is difficult to predict whether China will use coercive measures to implement its vision over others or not and whether USA will go to maximum length to compete with China pushing this whole world once again into the trouble like cold war? If both choose to clash as per the realist's logic it may engulf the whole world. Future of the whole world today depends a great deal on the wisdom and ability of both the powers to cooperate. Whether they choose to cooperate or compete, the prosperity and destruction totally depends on the choice that both will make.

Kevin Rudd's comments on the current situation appear to be the most logical and in order in which he identifies that global balance of economy has already shifted towards Asia (China) which can be seen from the Chinese entry into Latin America, Europe and Africa in the form of billions of US dollars as aid and loan. Chinese economic strength once converted into political strength, will

ultimately reshape the international norms, rules and institutions but it will take a couple of decades or even more. Economic and military pivots will further deviate. As a matter of fact, all nations are not satisfied with the Bretton Woods institutions and the international system hinged on these. There is a need for USA to understand that the current order can be reshaped and modified. If USA and China choose to compete instead of cooperation, it will be a total catastrophe for the whole world.

Impacts on Pakistan

Increase in American attention in AP resulted into tangible decrease in America's engagement in the South Asian region. These changes appeared in Pakistan in the form of decrease in bomb blasts, drone attacks, space and territorial violation, and diplomatic coercions. General state of peace was improved by various operations of Pakistani Armed forces and timely advent of CPEC helped retrieval of broken economic back of Pakistan.

'Rebalance to Asia Pacific' and consequent shift in American attention to South Asia on one side has created opportunity and on the other side a concern also. Due to Indo-US strategic partnership and American efforts to strengthen India by providing military and economic incentives has widened the Indo-Pak gap on the basis of their capabilities. Pakistan may not be concerned about economic gap but difference in armed forces capability will surely create concerns. Even on this account, Pakistan need not bother much because in the presence of nuclear weapons, India is likely to think many a time before initiating any war like act. It may not be called band wagoning in the classical sense but capitalizing on the good old relations Pakistan can economically benefit from China and even from Russia by joining all the forums where China has influence.

Pakistan may not pray for America's decline but it must work to adjust itself and its policies as per the emerging realities due to Sino-US competition. By recalling its lessons, learnt from its past during cold war, in Sino-US asymmetry, Pakistan must not go for extremes in maintaining its relations with only one of the super powers at the cost of the other. Cold war or hot war whatever the case scenario may be, Pakistan should avoid extreme choices during conducting its relations with America, China, India, and even with Afghanistan. In a nutshell, Rebalance in Asia Pacific, CPEC in South Asia and the likely reshaping of World Order is likely to prove good for Pakistan.

Conclusion

China now has started to project its power at international level. America is surely on the decline and it is likely that its hegemony will be no more in Asia within a decade or so. Though America, being a realist power, is trying to create web of alliances around the globe but the other nations do recognize that American might is fading day by day. This realization also prevails among the leading scholars and analysts. China's rise may or may not help some nations but surely its will provide a moral support to the nations of the whole world to have another power in case of crisis situation. Muslim World as on the forefront of American war machines and coercive strategies and Pakistan would also be among the major beneficiaries.

NOTES

- ¹ De-hyphenation: It is a policy, which deals with America's relations with India and Pakistan and it decides which country is to be preferred over other as per the need of time. (Stephen P. Cohen's Book '*Shooting The India-Pakistan Conundrum For a Century*', page 177 and Bruce Riedel's book '*Avoiding Armageddon: America, India, and Pakistan to the brink and Back*', page x)
- ² Defensive Insulation: This policy is an advanced version of De-hyphenation offered by Daniel S. Markey (Member of US Council for Foreign Relations) with two components military cooperation and comprehensive cooperation. Daniel S. Markey's book '*No Exit from Pakistan America's Tortured Relationship with Islamabad*' page 276)
- ³ Cooperation and Prevention: This is also a foreign policy prescription suggested by Stephen P. Cohen (South Asian Expert), which by using hard and soft power change asks for to transform Pakistan's anti-US mindset, strengthening democratic government, cultivation of US-friendly leadership, targeting youth through education programmes and Internet, organizing US-hosted public events, paid media campaign to demonstrates long-term interests of America; and he also suggests creation of US Presence Posts in every province to gauge success of the targets set. (Stephen P. Cohen's book '*The idea of Pakistan*', page 308)
- ⁴ America's Pacific Century, The future of politics will be decided in Asia, not Afghanistan or Iraq, and the United States will be right at the center of the action, by Hillary Clinton, October 11, 2011. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/>
- ⁵ China's Power and Asian Security, edited by Mingjiang Li, Kalyan M. Kemburi, Routledge UK. pp-60-90, <https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=OVScBQAAQBAJ&pg=PA86&lpg=PA>
- ⁶ Karen A. Feste *America Responds to Terrorism Conflict Resolution Strategies of Clinton, Bush, and Obama*, (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011): 6-7
- ⁷ Stephen P. Cohen *Shooting The India-Pakistan Conundrum For a Century*, (Washington, Brookings Institution Press, 2013): 177
- ⁸ Bruce Riedel *Avoiding Armageddon: America, India, and Pakistan to the brink and back*, (R. R. Donnelley Harrisonburg: 2013): 199
- ⁹ Mary Buckley and Robert Singh *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism* (New York, Routledge Taylor and Francis, 2006): 98
- ¹⁰ Daniel S. Markey *No Exit from Pakistan America's Tortured Relationship with Islamabad*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013): 155
- ¹¹ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 105
- ¹² Daniel S. Markey, Page, 240
- ¹³ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 241-242
- ¹⁴ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 247-248
- ¹⁵ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 102
- ¹⁶ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 148
- ¹⁷ Bruce Riedel, Page, 112-113
- ¹⁸ Daniel S. Markey, Page, 249
- ¹⁹ Stephen P. Cohen, *Shooting The India-Pakistan Conundrum For a Century* (Washington, Brookings Institution Press: 2013): 194-195
- ²⁰ Joseph Nye Jr, *The Future of Power*, (New York, Public Affairs: 2011): 153
- ²¹ Hillary Clinton, 'America's Pacific Century' *Journal of Foreign Policy*, page 3-5, November 2011, <http://foreignpolicy.com>
- ²² Robert G. Sutter, et, al., 'Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability', *Sigur Center for Asian Studies, The George Washington University*, August, 2013, page, 15
- ²³ Robert G. Sutter, Page, 5
- ²⁴ Philip G. Saunders, 'The Rebalance to Asia: U.S.-China Relations and Regional Security' *Strategic Forum National Defense University USA*, 2013, SF No, 281, page, 5-9.
- ²⁵ Philip G. Saunders, page, 26-27
- ²⁶ Philip G. Saunders, page, 14
- ²⁷ Kevin Rudd, "The Future of U.S.-China Relations Under Xi Jinping" *Summary Report UC China 21*, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs Harvard Kennedy School 13-

- Email: belfer_center@harvard.edu Website: http://belfercenter.org
- ²⁸ Kevin Rudd, Page, 14
- ²⁹ Yong Deng, *China's Struggle for Status*, The Realignment of International Relations United States, Naval Academy, Maryland, (New York, Cambridge University Press: 2008): 126
- ³⁰ Christopher Coker, *The Improbable War China*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015): 77
- ³¹ J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Chicago USA: John University of, 2001): 97
- ³² John J. Mearsheimer, 'The Gathering Storm: China's Challenge to US Power in Asia, *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 3, (2010): 381-396
- ³³ Joseph S Nye Jr, Page, 53
- ³⁴ Dough Guthrie, *China and Globalization* (New York, Taylor & Francis: 2009): 315
- ³⁵ Handel Jones, Page, 34
- ³⁶ Handel Jones, Page, 7
- ³⁷ Dough Guthrie, Page, 28
- ³⁸ Dough Guthrie, Page, 315
- ³⁹ Dough Guthrie, Page, 316
- ⁴⁰ Ibid
- ⁴¹ Dough Guthrie, Page, 47
- ⁴² Dough Guthrie, Page, 316
- ⁴³ Dough Guthrie, Page, 307
- ⁴⁴ Handel Jones, Page, 25
- ⁴⁵ Dough Guthrie, Page, 307
- ⁴⁶ Christopher Coker, Page, 68
- ⁴⁷ Constantine C. Menges, "China The Gathering Threat" (USA: Nelson Communications, 2005): 53
- ⁴⁸ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 127-128
- ⁴⁹ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 158
- ⁵⁰ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 121-122
- ⁵¹ Joseph S Nye Jr, Page, 53
- ⁵² Joseph S Nye Jr, Page, 56
- ⁵³ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 141-144
- ⁵⁴ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 131-132
- ⁵⁵ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 147
- ⁵⁶ Handel Jones, *China America: The Uneasy Partnership That Will Change The World*, New York, McGraw-Hill eBooks, 2010, page xix
- ⁵⁷ Barry Buzan, "Security architecture in Asia: the interplay of regional and global levels" *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2 2003: 170
- ⁵⁸ Michael D. Swaine, et al, "A Strategic Net Assessment" *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. (2015): 3
- ⁵⁹ Joseph S Nye Jr, Page, 15
- ⁶⁰ Christopher Coker, Page, 52-79
- ⁶¹ Ibid
- ⁶² Ibid
- ⁶³ Constantine C. Menges, Page, 67-72
- ⁶⁴ Ibid
- ⁶⁵ Jhon Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, "Globalization and global Politics: An introduction to world Politics" ed 5. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 69
- ⁶⁶ YU Xintian, "Harmonious World and China's Path for Peaceful Development" *International Review*, Vol. 45 (Winter 2006): 19
- ⁶⁷ Christopher Coker, Page, 72
- ⁶⁸ Christopher Coker, Page, 31
- ⁶⁹ Kevin Rudd, Page, 2-3
- ⁷⁰ Robert G. Sutter, Page, 5
- ⁷¹ Ashley J. Tellis, 'Balancing without Containment' *The Washington Quarterly*, fall 2013, Page: 6
- ⁷² Joseph S Nye Jr, Page, 98