



SEMINAR



**PAKISTAN AND FRANCE: GLOBAL SECURITY PERSPECTIVES AND  
WORLDVIEWS**

*November 7-8, 2006*

*Organised by*

***The Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad***  
*in collaboration with*  
***The Embassy of France, Islamabad***

## INAUGURAL SESSION

---

### OPENING REMARKS

*Mr. Inam-ul-Haque\**

---

Ambassador Regis de Belenet,  
Distinguished Scholars,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you all to the Seminar on “Pakistan and France: Global Security Perspectives and Worldviews”, jointly organized by the Institute of Strategic Studies and the Embassy of France in Islamabad. I would particularly like to welcome our distinguished guests from France. We look forward to our exchange of views with them during the course of the Seminar.

The participants will be discussing the following five themes:

- i. The Foreign policy makers: who are they?
- ii. Working with the United States
- iii. Dealing with the neighborhood
- iv. Pakistan-France Relations: The Bilateral Dimension
- v. Regaining the edge post-Cold War: The search for new ways and means of influence

I do not intend to preempt the discussions on these interesting and important themes and issues. In the next few minutes I will try to present to you a personal perspective on the issues confronting the international community. This perspective is not an enunciation of the official policies of the government. It is personal and subjective. It is also an effort to elicit responses from the distinguished participants to some of the questions that come to mind when we look at the world today and the policies being pursued by the powerful of the world.

Let me begin by stating that we live in an unjust and a dangerous world. Five years after 9/11 it is time to assess the impact of 9/11 on the world. Political and physical maps of countries and regions are in a state of

---

\* *Mr. Inam-ul-Haque is Chairman Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad.*

flux. The political, military, ideological, economic and cultural centres of the world are shifting. So, where are we headed?

We would do well to look at the major trends in the economics and politics of the world today, revisit the policies that have been adopted and the impact of the so-called war on terrorism pursued so murderously during these five years and assess whether these policies have been or can be successful in ridding the world of violence.

Since we live in unipolar world the starting point perforce has to be the United States. The so-called one-percent doctrine may or may not be a fundamental principle of US policy but the US has made no secret of the fact that it would not countenance the emergence of a challenger to its power. The US doctrine of full spectrum domination found fresh reflection in the new space policy announced by the United States recently, which is bound to raise concerns internationally.

Is the present configuration of a sole super power with a number of second tier powers - some friendly and some not so friendly to the United States with none of them individually or as a group having the strength or the gumption to take on the United States in a power contest - likely to continue for an indefinite period or are we likely to see the emergence of a multipolar world?

How will this multipolar world emerge? Will it emerge through the shifting of the financial power centre from the heavily indebted and militarily over stretched US to countries like China and Japan and others with large holdings of US treasury bonds? Would the use of this economic clout over the US be indeed possible? Are these economies not hostage to their huge trade surpluses with the US and would the collapse of the dollar based international trading system and economy not lead to a world wide economic recession with crippling results for all major economies? Would the Euro or a basket of currencies emerge as a replacement for the dollar to help the world economy absorb the impact of a weakened dollar?

Will the future configuration of power be democratic in outlook and policies or will the powerful of the world form an oligarchy to safeguard their interests at the expense of the weak and the vulnerable?

What are the major issues confronting the international community? Let me enumerate a few and raise a few questions:

- **Interstate Conflicts:** South Asia, the Middle East and Africa offer prime examples of interstate conflicts which have remained unresolved for decades and where the rights of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions of the UNSC remain unrealized. It is unlikely that many of these conflicts will be resolved any time soon.
  
- **Terrorism:** Is the war against terrorism turning into the promotion of a different agenda? Is it being converted into a civilizational conflict? If so, to what end? Is it the Muslim countries and peoples or is it the religion of Islam that is under siege? The treatment of Muslim communities and minorities in many parts of the world leaves much to be desired. The Muslims are being pilloried over the issue of Hijab and Jihad. New terms like “Islamic fascism” are being coined and bandied about. The lunatic fringe in Islam is being handed centre stage to the exclusion of the vast majority of peace loving Muslims. While there are examples of Muslim countries and territories being under foreign occupation there are no recent examples any Muslim country attacking and occupying Western countries. If there is a clash of civilizations, which civilization is the aggressive and violent civilization?

Why are some countries so opposed to including terrorism by states against occupied peoples or others within the ambit of a definition of terrorism? Surely states have a greater capacity for committing violence and acts of terrorism than non state actors, be they individuals or groups.

Why do the West and some others fight shy of even discussing, not to speak of eliminating, the causes of violence and individual acts of terror which lie in occupation, repression, denial of fundamental human rights, humiliation, economic deprivation etc. examples of Palestine, Kashmir, Chechnya spring easily to mind in this regard.

- **WMDs:** Is a coercive approach more likely to work as against accepting the Iranian declarations about the peaceful nature of its nuclear programme and the North Korean commitment to dismantle its nuclear weapons programmes through the Six-Party Talks mechanism? Would it not be preferable to bring these countries into a closer embrace with the IAEA and the international community instead of seeking to isolate them?
  
- **Nuclear Non-Proliferation or Regime Change:** Are the US and the West more interested in controlling nuclear proliferation or in regime

change? The lack of success, so far, in the case of Iran and North Korea, has resulted because of simultaneous efforts to achieve both objectives, which are completely incompatible. In exchange for their cooperation in the nuclear field both Iran and North Korea would require firm security assurances from the United States against any effort at regime change and the protection of their rights under the NPT. Is non-proliferation treaty being undermined by reinterpreting it to the disadvantage of the non-nuclear weapons signatory states and making exceptions in favour of non-signatories like India as provided in the Indo-US nuclear agreement?

- **Globalization and Free Markets:** While globalization is an inexorable process which has continued through out the history of human civilization, its ills are many and primarily impact the poor and the vulnerable among countries and within countries. Globalization has to be supportive of the poor and the disadvantaged.

Where does the World Trade Organization (WTO) stand after the failure of negotiations of the Doha development Round and particularly the on farm and export subsidies in the area of agriculture? Are the Western markets really free and accessible to the developing countries? Are the developing countries not being manipulated and at times being coerced to the advantage of the more powerful and industrially advanced countries? Are we returning to the colonial concept of the centre and the periphery with the periphery condemned to remain the suppliers of cheap raw materials?

- **Democracy:** Promotion of democracy is a very laudable ideal. But is it not being put into practice selectively and to exert pressure on specific countries? Is democracy to be introduced through selective regime change and through the use of force even if it destroys the fabric of a society, results in hundreds of thousands of deaths, civil conflicts and possible break-up of the country chosen for democracy, as in Iraq? And does the result of democratic exercises and elections have to bring into power regimes acceptable to the West or suffer the pain of economic, political and physical punishment, as in Palestine?
- What kind of dispensation is the Broader Middle East and North Africa initiative of the G-8 designed to usher in? The recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon was seen as a joint US-Israeli project. US Secretary of State declared in Israel that the death and destruction being rained on Lebanon by Israel with US weapons were “the birth pangs of a new Middle East.” Is that the way to a new and democratic

Middle East to be paved with cluster bombs and weapons using depleted or even enriched Uranium?

Could there be an effort afoot to redraw the boundaries of some Muslim countries to cut them down to size and convert them into docile client states either through overt aggression and occupation a la Iraq or covertly through subversion, terrorism, destabilization and regime change?

- **Human Rights:** Where do human rights figure in the beliefs and policies of the West? US and the Western countries never tire of accusing others of violations of human rights. Has any western country thought of arraigning the US in the Human Rights Council for violations of human rights, torture and custodial killings in Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, Bagram and secret prisons elsewhere? Does a different set of standards apply to the US?

The US policies having failed to achieve the results desired by the Bush Administration, are the US Congressional elections likely to bring about any major change in the direction of US policies or will there be the same brave talk about staying the course?

Global security will not be established through the use of indiscriminate force or the continuation of economic exploitation. The weaker nations and peoples cannot defend themselves if might is deemed to be right, the law of the jungle prevails in inter state relations and the UN is undermined if it refuses to act as a hand-maiden to one or a few of the major powers. Such policies can only breed deep resentments and give rise to random violence.

It is only through respect for international law and the United Nations Charter and a fair and equitable international economic order that we can hope to defeat violence and terrorist actions by individuals, groups and states.

The international community must change its priorities and devote its attention to the issues related to energy shortages, water scarcity, global warming, new diseases and natural disasters.

Our own region suffers from many shared problems. These include large populations, endemic poverty, lack of infrastructure, poor governance, unemployment, political instability, environmental degradation, water and energy shortages, and rapidly advancing deadly diseases like HIV/AIDS and others. There are also disagreements and

long standing disputes between the countries of the region. I trust that some of these issues will figure in our discussions during this seminar.

We look forward to a free, candid, intensive and instructive interaction.

I thank you.

## INAUGURAL SESSION

---

### REMARKS

*H.E. Mr. Régis de Belenet\**

---

Mr Chairman ISSI, Inam ul-Haque,  
Dr Shireen Mazari,  
Distinguished Panellists,  
Dear colleagues,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is the first ever Pakistan-French seminar on foreign policy issues held in this well-known think-tank.

I feel privileged to take part in this inaugural session.

I am impressed to recognize so many friends and experts in the audience. I thank them very much for their participation, and this demonstration of interest.

I'll limit myself to three very brief remarks:

1. First, I note this seminar follows recent meaningful developments :
  - The annual strategic dialogue between Pakistani, French and German research institutions.
  - The decision taken, last year, to have a French visiting scholar affiliated with the ISSI.
  - The start in November 2005, at the level of high representatives of our two countries, of a dialogue on security matters.

That means, it seems to me a conjunction of interests:

- A greater interest from Pakistan for the different players, within the European Union.

---

\* *H.E. Mr. Régis de Belenet is Ambassador of France in Pakistan.*



- A better consciousness from our part, the French side, of the importance of Pakistan.

2. I'd like to underline this last point, and that will be my second remark:

For France, Pakistan is a multi-faceted international player.

- Pakistan can not be ignored due to its geo-strategic location, at the crossroads of South Asia, Central Asia and West Asia, and as a country which borders the Arabian sea.
- We know also there are a lot of real or potential dangers in this part of the world, from unsolved disputes to weapons of mass destruction or all sorts of illegal trafficking activities.
- Pakistan is also a leading voice in the Muslim world.
- Pakistan has shown an impressive economic growth over the last few years.

3. Third remark :

Looking at the themes of the five sessions of this seminar, it seems to me there is some sort of red thread going through, all along, which is the following:

The world today is characterised by a paradox:

- On one side, we speak of unipolarity. I remember a French Minister of foreign affairs describing the United States not only as the superpower but as a hyper power.
- On the other side, international relations are becoming more and more complex with :
- New poles of influence coming up;
- Development of new risks, not of a military nature or not just of a military nature;
- Involvement also of a multiplicity of non state actors.

So, it's not so easy to qualify this international system we live in.

It's probably why we use so often the formula "the international community" without knowing really what does that mean? Do we intend to refer to multilateralism? To multipolarity? To a mixture of both, or to something else?

I am confident this seminar, due to the quality of the panellists and of the audience, not to speak of the chair, will bring to us, a real added value.

Thank you for your attention.

## **FIRST SESSION: THE FOREIGN POLICY MAKERS: WHO ARE THEY?**

---

### **THE FOREIGN POLICY MAKERS IN FRANCE: ELABORATION AND PUBLIC DEBATE**

*Prof. Serge Sur\**

---

Indeed France has a foreign policy - at least as far as it can be identified through specific actors and procedures. The question of its orientations, consistency and efficiency or influence is a different matter, and we have not to dwell on them now. But there are a lot of specificities in foreign policy elaboration and process, at constitutional and administrative levels, as well as the way this policy is a subject - or is not a subject - of public debates in France.

A preliminary observation to make is definitely that this policy is a State policy. It means that the ideas of the State, and of the interests of the State, are indeed predominant on private interests and lobbies: nobody, or very few people in France would argue that what is good for French firms is also good for the State. It doesn't mean that there are no economic preoccupations and objectives in this policy, but generally speaking they are always mediated by the State itself. This policy, by the same token, is also a public policy, mastered by public authorities.

The originality of the French foreign policy doesn't lie here, because it is also the case with domestic policies: the State and its institutions remains the recipe for public debates, and for the management of internal decisions. The stamp of the State is everywhere in France, which after all exists for a thousand years, and is the main component of the French identity, whether political or cultural. The separation between the State and civil society is certainly less apparent in France than in other Western democracies.

So, where can we find this specificity among other public policies? Basically, in the way the State apparatus is organized in this field. There are some specific provisions devoted to this subject in the Constitution of the Fifth Republic, and there are also well established practices for now quite fifty years, the Constitution itself having been adopted in 1958. In a

---

\* Prof. Serge Sur, University of Paris 2 & Director of Thucydide Centre (Analysis and Research in International Relations).

way it remains one of the main legacies of President de Gaulle, founder and first President of the Fifth Republic, and backed by all his successors, whatever their political origins and commitments.

In our analysis, given the time allowed, it will not be possible to make otherwise useful distinctions within the French foreign policies, for instance between the European policy, multilateral organizations - and in this context the permanent membership in the Security Council -, the transatlantic policy, economic policy, cultural policy, or to deal with some specific subjects like the African policy. There would be some nuances to make in this respect, but let's try to identify the main common characteristics. From this point of view, it seems necessary to consider at the same time the foreign policy and the defence policy. They are intertwined, despite the fact that they belong to different ministries, and they share the same characteristics, as they are the two main tools of the French external action.

To sum up these characteristics, I would like to emphasize five points : The central role of the presidency - The secondary role of the government - The specific influence of the foreign ministry and of the diplomatic apparatus, superseding the would-be influence of the Think Tanks and of the NGOs - The lesser role of the Parliament - and finally the contrasted role of the public opinion, which will lead to a conclusion, about the political consensus and dissension in France about the Foreign policy considered as a whole.

## **I. - The Central Role of the Presidency**

This central role derives from the Constitution itself, and is confirmed by its practice. As far as constitutional provisions are concerned, the President exerts both representative and substantial functions. He appoints the ambassadors, he negotiates and ratifies international treaties, with, in some cases only, the authorization of the Parliament. He is also responsible for their implementation at the international level. He is also the commander in chief of the armed forces, and legally in charge of the decisions concerning the nuclear deterrent. The consent of the Parliament is not necessary for the use of armed forces, apart a formal declaration of war which is not necessary nowadays : either the armed forces are used with an authorization of the Security Council (SC), or they are used in the context of a formal alliance, in both cases implementing international commitments of the State. And, for the Security Council for instance, in 2003, the decision to oppose any resolution from the SC backing a military intervention against Iraq was a presidential decision.

In practice, all the successive Presidents have been internationally very active. They participate regularly to international Summits, G 8 for instance, or to the UNGA regular annual sessions. They follow the negotiation and conclusion of the main political treaties, and sometimes directly, as in the European Summits. Indeed, the President is at the origin of the main orientations of the French foreign policy, and of their continuity. At the military level, he has also used intensively his powers, deciding for instance either to suspend (1992) or to resume (1995) the French nuclear tests, before deciding their definite cessation and the French participation to the CTBT (1996). The President has also decided, in 1995, to send a robust intervention force in Bosnia, and, for instance, to increase substantially the French participation to UNIFIL in 2006.

## **II. - The *Secondary* Role of the Prime Minister and of the Government**

Generally speaking, the duality between the Presidency and the Government in the Executive branch is a specificity of the Fifth Republic. In the international field, the Prime Minister and the Government are not deprived of powers and influence, even if they have fewer powers than in the domestic field. In European matters, nevertheless, it is difficult to distinguish between the domestic and the international field. At the international level, the Government has to approve the appointment of the ambassadors, and it may also negotiate and conclude international executive agreements. It is also in charge of the domestic implementation of international agreements. But, as far as the political majority in the Parliament is in accordance with the electoral majority of the President himself - who is elected by the vote of all citizens -, it means that the Presidency and the Government are in the same political line, and that the effective master of the public policy is the President, directly for the general directives, through his collaborators for the day by day policies.

We must nevertheless contemplate another possibility, which occurred three times in the course of the Fifth Republic - in 1986, 1993, 2002: the hypothesis of a contradiction between the political majority in the Parliament and the political orientations of the President. As the Fifth Republic remains basically a parliamentary regime, the Government is the expression of the majority of the National Assembly. The Prime Minister could thus be in opposition with the President, and there is a need of a minimal agreement between them in order to make their "cohabitation" possible. In the domestic field, the Government is rather free to implement its own policy, and it is the role of the President that becomes secondary. But in the international field, whether diplomatic or military, given the

presidential prerogatives, it is absolutely necessary that both authorities concur in the main orientations. Fortunately, it was the case during the three practical cohabitations, with some exceptions - for instance, an agreement in the economic multilateral field, the Blair House agreement, in the nineties, had to be renegotiated due to the change of parliamentary majority - which was accepted by the President. But, in the case of the treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, the main orientations were accepted by President Chirac and Prime Minister Jospin, in a context of cohabitation.

### **III. - The Specific Role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

Indeed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has an eminent and traditional role, not only in the implementation of foreign policy decisions, but also in their very definitions. It is due in part to its place in the political-administrative apparatus, which belongs to a more than secular tradition of the successive French Republics, and for another part to the professional quality and to the solidarity as a group of the diplomatic corps. And France keeps one of the main diplomatic networks all around the world. It is an elite, both by its recruitment, by a very selective process, and by its origin - diplomats are globally coming from the upper class, or from the upper middle class. Even in the French administration, whose high level is selected by the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, the Quai d'Orsay, "le Departement", or "la Carriere", remain very prestigious.

The Quai d'Orsay embodies a reservoir of knowledge, experience and wisdom of which French diplomats are both fully aware and proud. Besides, the diplomatic corps is able to manage the career of its members, the allocation of tenures and posts, and the political apparatus must take it into consideration. For sure, it is not in a position to define by itself the Foreign policy, especially when new decisions have to be taken. But it is able to put them in a larger perspective, in the perspective of the traditions and of the consistency of the traditional French foreign policies, and to smooth the moves which could be perceived as too far and too fast. The diplomats have the legitimate feeling of being the servants of the State, of its permanent interests and positions, and not the domestics of transitory governments. It could be a matter for further analysis and explanations, but let's stop at this for the time being. I would just like to highlight two consequences.

Firstly, by comparison with other Western democracies, the NGO's political role in France is rather limited. Indeed there are in France a lot of active NGO's, specifically in the field of human rights, humanitarian law,

and humanitarian assistance. Everybody knows Medecins sans frontiere, or Medecins du Monde, among others, and the name of Bernard Kouchner is a popular one. But in fact they do not really influence the foreign policy. From time to time, it is certainly possible to note that this policy is influenced by some coalitions of NGO's - for instance, with the Roma Convention of 1998 on the International Criminal Court, or with the Montreal Convention on anti personal mines. But it was more by international coalitions, in which the French NGO's were playing a limited role. On the contrary, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as the Ministry of Defence, are able to use the NGO's for their own purposes, and in a way to use them as tools. The relationship is more one of partnership than of lobbying from the NGO's, despite some appearances. It's another example of the central role of the State apparatus in the public life in France. It is for example symbolic that M. Bernard Kouchner, coming from the NGO's, was appointed minister in several governments.

Second, the role of the Think Tanks, still in comparison to other Western democracies, also remains a limited one. There are a lot of reasons to explain why the Think Tanks are globally underdeveloped in France, and for instance the lack of recognition of the study of international relations as an academic formation and topic. Another explanation is the central role of the State, which doesn't facilitate the private funding of independent research centres. But it is also a consequence of the traditions of the Quai d'Orsay, and of the idea that diplomats do not need academic expertise. They frequently dismiss it as theoretical, poorly informed or ideological. They sure pay a lip service to the importance of expertise and of external consultants, but they rarely take their advice into consideration. This situation is indeed evolving, and some Think Tanks are beginning to emerge, but the trend remains limited. And when some Think Tanks are mobilised, it is more as a tool for the French diplomacy than for an independent evaluation of the French foreign policies.

#### **IV. - The Intermittent Role of the Parliament**

In the global context of the Fifth Republic, and by comparison with the previous ones, the role of the Parliament has been dramatically reduced. It has been reduced in order to rationalize and stabilize the governmental life, which before that was very instable. Fifty years after, more and more voices are emerging from all the political parties, claiming a renewal and an extension of Parliament powers. But these claims do not seem to apply to the international powers of the Parliament, despite the fact that it is even more limited in this field than in the others. In fact, under

the previous Republics, the international powers of the Parliament were also strictly limited.

The Parliament has indeed to authorize the ratification or the approval of international agreements, but in some areas only - in particular, the treaties establishing military alliances are not concerned. And the rights of the Parliament in the discussion of the texts of the international agreements are very restricted: it can only adopt or reject the text, without any modification or interpretation. In fact, the parliamentary discussions about international agreements are frequently symbolic, and, under the Fifth Republic, no one was ever rejected by the Parliament. To the contrary, one was rejected by the National Assembly, under the Fourth Republic, in 1954, the treaty establishing a European Defence Community.

It could happen, and it happened several times, that the ratification of a given treaty should need a preliminary modification of the Constitution, because this treaty embodies provisions which are contrary to the Constitution. In this case, the Parliament is requested to adopt the requested modification, which it has regularly made, in the European building process notably, but also for the entry into force of the International Criminal Court. The general idea, traditional in some respect, is that the Parliament feels that it belongs to the Executive branch to play the leading role in international relations, and this idea is largely accepted in France.

As far as the use of force is concerned, we have already noted that, apart for a formal declaration of war, it has not to be authorized by the Parliament. It could happen nonetheless that, without any legal obligation, the government informs the Parliament, or that the President sends a message to the Parliament. In some cases, the government could request a vote of approval, in order to increase the legitimacy of the decisions, but it is not the regular practice. It is a political tool to obtain a manifestation of support, but it is not a legal obligation.

## **V. - Public Opinion and Popular Votes**

A particularity of the Fifth Republic is the possibility to ask the people to decide directly on important matters, through referendums. It has been used several times, and it is not a symbolic procedure, because two of these referendums got negative results - in 1969, provoking the departure of President de Gaulle, and in 2005, about the treaty establishing a European constitution. It was indeed a very important decision. Does it mean that international questions are a subject of serious dissension



among the citizens or between the leaders and the citizens? Certainly not, and this event, as spectacular as it is, remains an exception.

What is more striking in fact is the French consensus about international matters. Despite the vivid opposition between the political parties from the left and from the right, international subjects are rarely a subject of dissension among the political parties, and in the public opinion. For instance, the nuclear deterrent force, the presence of French soldiers in Afghanistan, the French position towards the Iraqi war, and more generally the idea that France is an ally but not a subordinate of the United States, the French position about the Israeli Palestinian conflict, or about the military operation of Israel against Lebanon, were not or are not really challenged. There is also a large support for the Kyoto agreement, the cessation of nuclear tests, the International Criminal Court, to take a few examples.

This consensus derives in part from bad reasons: among them a lack of interest; a lack of information - the French media seldom make a priority of international matters; the feeling that the events are not affecting the French people's daily life, or than in any case France has no grip on the situation, and should simply remain quiet about it. But, on the contrary, and this a more positive reason, numerous French people share the feeling that France has to play a role, and should express freely its own positions. In this respect, the French permanent membership of the Security Council is welcome, as well as its consequences, namely the maintenance of military armed forces able to intervene at the request or with the authorization of international bodies for the sake of international security. Also, there is the idea that the European building process is the new frontier for France. So, when we look at these various reasons, it is clear that there is some ambiguity in the consensus - as in every consensus, because in fact consensus is made for people who disagree.

Indeed the next presidential elections, in 2007, as the president is elected by a popular vote, will give an opportunity to evaluate this consensus, and to confirm it or to weaken it. Will the international subjects be a component of the presidential battle? It is too early to tell it. We have already seen some skirmishes about it, for instance about transatlantic relations. But the negative vote on the Treaty establishing a constitution of Europe has not created permanent political lines of divide between would-be candidates. And, for the time being, the opinion polls seem to indicate that the international positions taken by President Chirac during the eleven years of his tenure are largely approved, by contrast with his balance sheet on the domestic policies.



## **FIRST SESSION: THE FOREIGN POLICY MAKERS: WHO ARE THEY?**

---

### **THE FOREIGN POLICY DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN PAKISTAN\*\***

*Mr. Zamir Akram\**

---

First of all I would like to express my appreciation to the Institute of Strategic Studies for honouring me by inviting me to speak in this important seminar today. The topic assigned to me is the Foreign Policy Decision Making Process in Pakistan. He said that when he started trying to put together his thoughts he discovered that unfortunately there is not a lot of academic work on that subject in the country so the views that he will express here are based extensively on his personal experience and with the presence of so many of his senior colleagues here he will do that with a certain sense of trepidation and would be open to correction by them in terms of his analysis of the decision making process. It is important to distinguish between the formal decision making process and the informal decision making process.

The constitutional mechanism basically puts the authority in the hands of the executive branch of the government to make decisions about the foreign policy. However, there are other informal processes that work. Interesting thing to note is that both the formal and the informal processes do not necessarily work in tandem with each other and that is why conflict occurs between the policy makers, policy guidelines and its implementation. It is also recognized that there is a huge role played by important personalities no matter what the system may be. Personalities at the leadership level play very important role, sometimes, much beyond what is the accepted norm of the given policy. He said that in order to talk about formal process, he tried to use the traditional foreign policy model, the input output feedback model and using that as a frame work, the most important role for any institution in the country is that of the ministry of foreign affairs based upon the inputs that it receives from its mission abroad as well as from its own system within the headquarters and analysis of the situations, its formulation of options for policy and then its submission for a decision.

---

\*\* This is a transcribed version of Mr. Zamir Akram's presentation.

\* Mr. Zamir Akram is Additional Secretary (FA), Prime Minister's Secretariat, Islamabad.

Inputs from external sources are also very important and these include other ministries and departments of the government, media, academics, think tanks, civil society and of course pressure groups. Although we do not have an organized system of pressure groups in Pakistan, there is an emerging body of groups which reflect their own interests with the government and a clear example that I can give here is that trade with India is an issue which is opposed by Pakistani industrialists whereas supported by Pakistani traders. So these are two pressure groups that are effecting the Pakistani decision. The inputs from these sources of course lead us to make policy recommendations which is the output made to the chief executive. We have different power structures here at different times. Sometimes we have the chief executive as the prime minister and sometimes the president.

The output from the foreign office is based upon the inputs from different sources is the policy recommendations that are submitted to the chief executive. Then, from the chief executive we have a feedback. This feedback in some cases is based on involving the parliament depending upon the kind of the issue. Usually, there is a feedback made by the chief executive on the advise of the close members of his cabinet and sometimes made by himself. In certain cases of extreme importance to the country, such as, during the Afghan war, situation in Kashmir, tensions between India and Pakistan, we had situations where we had institutionalized forums such as Afghan Cell or the Kashmir Cell which had been created by the chief executive involving the ministry of foreign affairs, defence ministry, finance people, intelligence community to coordinate policy on these important issues.

In the informal process, there are several factors that need to be considered. The role of the foreign office depends on the kind of foreign office leadership. If we have a strong foreign minister, we have a very strong input in to the formulation of foreign policy. He said that he could recall the kind of inputs you would get under the times when Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was the foreign minister, who was actually formulating and implementing the policies by himself and considerable amount of leverage was given to him by the president at the time. So the personalities from the foreign office play an important role and the kind of effectiveness and input that foreign office can have in the implementation and formulation of foreign policies.

It is also important to note that the degree of willingness of the chief executive to enable the Foreign Office to play a role varies from time to time and individual to individual. The space the chief executive is willing to

give to ministry of the foreign affairs, plays a key role and this has in our history has varied from time to time. Sometimes we had situations where the foreign policy was almost the exclusive preserve of the chief executive and the foreign ministry was reduced to the role of just implementation. It is also possible that the chief executive can take decisions on all policies without actually involving the ministry of the foreign affairs. The decision can be made from other inputs, perhaps from the intelligence communities, defence and in some cases the finance and commerce ministries. So it varies from time to time by the level which the chief executive is involves the foreign office.

There are examples and instances where the chief executive has followed a dual track policy where there is an overt policy which is basically the policy recommendation of the ministry of the foreign affairs. Then, there is also a covert policy which is based upon the compulsions and the calculations of the information given by the intelligence community. So there can be a double policy in operation at the same time. At times, we have seen the effectiveness of the chief executive which impacts on the policy itself. A weak leadership creates or leads to a situation of conflicting policies. Policies that are advocated by the ministry of foreign affairs and the policy that is advocated by another branch of the government and we can have conflicting policies at the same time which can create difficulties for all of those involved in this process.

Perhaps the worst case scenario is competitive policies, policies that are advocated by the ministry of foreign affairs and a totally conflicting policy pursued by another agency of the government. For instance, before signing the Geneva Agreement, in 80's, when Zia ul Haq had a different point of view from that of Prime Minister Junejo and in that particular incidence the signing of the agreement was delayed for several weeks. Another example that he could give was when there was a difference of opinion between the president and the prime minister on one hand and the chief of the army staff on the other hand on the issue that of Pakistan should react to the first Gulf war.

He said that he would present as a kind of case study to illustrate the points by looking at one example. This is the decision on Pakistan's nuclear test in May 1998. The question was to test or not to test. There was tremendous pressure especially from United States at that time to not to follow the Indians and to test our own nuclear devices. There were also Indian threats speaking of strategic advantage they had attained as a result of their nuclear test and that issue like Kashmir had been "resolved forever". These were the major factors that became part of the decision

making mix. The immense economic implications, we knew at that time, that if we were to test we would come under sanctions, especially American sanctions which would have negative impact on our economy which at that time was rather in a delicate situation.

So there was a strong opinion from our economic ministries which were highlighting the threats and dangers if we were to decide to test. Then again there was also tremendous pressure on the government to test by people within and outside the government and the opposition. All these factors had played a role in making a decision. He said that at that time we did engage in a conscious effort at crisis management in order to make a correct decision about our nuclear program. It involved the prime minister, the president, the chief of the armed forces, the ministry of foreign affairs, ministries of finance and defence.

There are several other scenarios that one can build. For example, Pakistan's decision to join the international community in the war against terrorism after September 11, 2001. That can be another scenario for such analysis. We can talk about our decision to the response to the deployment of Indian troops on Pakistan's border in December 2001 and how we responded to them. These are all scenarios which can help us to evaluate the process through which we make decisions. He concluded by saying that as he had said in the beginning there was a formal and informal process. This is not specific to Pakistan. Every country has a formal and an informal process which is not really spoken about or written about. In some societies it is written about but mostly it is assumed that this is happening and we can get into that in the Question and Answer Session.

## **SECOND SESSION: WORKING WITH THE UNITED STATES**

---

### **PAKISTAN AND THE WAR ON TERROR**

*Dr. Shireen M Mazari\**

---

Ever since the War on Terror (WOT) began, in the wake of 9/11, Pakistan has been a focal point of this war in Afghanistan. Pakistan's decision to support this US-led and UN supported WOT has made it a frontline state – for the second time – in this war being fought in Islamabad. As the war has unfolded, some serious issues have been raised within Pakistan in terms of US and Western states' expectations and demands; and in the US and Europe regarding the extent to which Pakistan is living up to expectations. As the war has run into ever increasing problems, the blame game has become more intense – with Pakistan becoming a central target. This presentation is a Pakistani perspective on this increasingly contentious war – contentious not only in terms of the manner in which it has been and is being fought but also in the definitional parameters which are becoming problematic for Muslim states like Pakistan. Within this context it is essential to assess the WOT so far.

#### **Assessment of the post-9/11 War Against Terrorism**

From the start, there was a divergence between the US approach to this War and the perspective of states like Pakistan. While the US sought a purely military approach, Pakistan always sought to widen the context by seeking a more holistic approach, which would also take into account the root causes of terrorism. Unfortunately, a focus purely on the military has meant that the WOT has yet to be effective in containing terrorism. While it is still too early to give a definitive long term analysis on this count, one can state at least tentatively, based on the situation prevailing on the ground in terms of acts of terrorism and the fate of the terrorist networks, that at best, the war on terrorism has reached a stalemate.

While the massive military power of the US, aided by the international community's support for anti-terrorist conventions through the

---

\* *Dr. Shireen M Mazari is Director General, Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad.*

UN, has broken up and scattered the networks of the terrorist organisations; the manner in which the US has led and conducted the war against terror has not only failed in denying political space to the terrorists, it has in fact, created more space for them. In order to examine this assertion, there is a need to also look at, briefly, the conduct of the war against international terrorism by the US.

Having identified Osama bin Laden (OBL) and his Al-Qaeda as the central terrorist enemy, and the Taliban as cohorts in crime for providing sanctuary for Al-Qaeda, the US, supported by the international community, launched the war on terrorism in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001. Massive air power sent OBL and Al-Qaeda on the run and toppled the Taliban government in Kabul with the surviving Taliban leadership also going underground. A massive haul of prisoners resulted and many were taken to Guantanamo Bay to be incarcerated with no trial or POW protection – as required under the Geneva Conventions. As the war in Afghanistan unfolded in the full glare of the international media, the horror of the “Daisy Cutters” and “Bunker Buster” bombs against a hapless Afghan population first began to create space for the terrorists. The killing of POWs at a camp, Qila Jhangi in Afghanistan, and the death by suffocation and shooting of prisoners incarcerated in containers of trucks added to the tales of horror relating to the conduct of the US-led war in Afghanistan.

So very early on in the WOT, there was a growing human dignity deficit. The problem of the human dignity deficit is also exacerbated when whole groups are condemned for repression and persecution by the actions of a few. This trend of identifying groups for persecution on the basis of religion, has become more commonplace post-9/11 when anti-terrorist measures, both within states and in interstate relations, have selected to target Muslim populations. In fact, the war on terror has unleashed a complete destruction of the very notion of human dignity and human rights – in the face of the terrorist acts perpetrated against the US on 9/11. It was as if terrorism and suicide bombers were invented on that day – despite the horrors of Sabra and Shatilla and despite the daily suicide bombings undertaken by the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka prior to 9/11.

Gradually, in the face of these developments, the horror of 9/11 has diluted with a growing sense that the US was now actively targeting Muslims, both abroad and within the US. All these factors created space for the terrorists in terms of shelter and even future recruitments. The framing of the terrorist issue within a religious framework – the notion of “Islamic terrorism” – also allowed space to the terrorists on the run.



So, the war on terror failed to adopt a basic strategy – that of space denial to the terrorists. After all, the war was an unconventional war with an ill-defined and mobile enemy, so the first goal should have been of military and political space denial, but this was never part of the US strategy. Sheer military power was seen as the counter to the terrorist threat. To make matters worse, the US then dissipated the definitional focus of the war itself on the transnational network of terrorism, by moving into Iraq through an illegal invasion of a sovereign state which had no links to Al-Qaeda or OBL. Bush’s invasion of Iraq also added a new dimension to the terrorism parameters – that of WMD. The US began its new doctrine of the “axis of evil” and “rogue states” with WMD.

Iraq then also added to the problem of transnational terrorism because it allowed the terrorists to expand their operational milieu; and with the US occupation of Iraq, linkages between international terrorism and local groups resisting the invasion became intertwined, with the former feeding on the anger and frustration of the latter. Also, members of the US-led “coalition of the willing” found their nationals and territories being targeted by international terrorists – as in the case of the Madrid and London bombings. Ironically, post-Saddam Iraq is now seeing increasing space for Al-Qaeda acting together with disgruntled elements in Iraq as well as those opposed to the US occupation.<sup>1</sup>

So, clearly by all accounts, international terrorism has been on the increase in the aftermath of the internationally-declared war against terrorism led by the US – both in terms of intensity and operational milieu. This is despite that fact that at the politico-diplomatic level, there have been a plethora of global and regional conventions and agreements aimed at fighting terrorism, including focusing on the financing of terrorism, as well as a number of UN Security Council Resolutions.

On the other side, OBL and his deputy, Dr Ayman al-Zawahiri, as well as Taliban leader Mullah Omar, have neither been captured nor killed. Al-Qaeda seems to have “gone global” and Afghanistan has yet to become truly free. Presently not only are there foreign forces controlling security, but there is a resurgence of the Taliban. Additionally, in Afghanistan, linkages between drugs, organised crime and terrorism have increased. As for Iraq, it is seen as under military occupation by the US and its allies and

---

<sup>1</sup> The impact of the Iraq war on terrorist recruitment was admitted to by the CIA Director, Porter Goss before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, in February 2005, when he stated that, “Islamic extremists are exploiting the Iraqi conflict to recruit new anti-US jihadists ... These jihadists who survive will leave Iraq experienced and focused on acts of urban terrorism. ... They represent a potential pool of contacts to build transnational terrorist cells, groups and networks in Saudi Arabia, Jordan and other countries.”

there is an almost daily increase in the intensity of terrorist attacks. In addition, both Asia and Europe have become more vulnerable to acts of terror and the Arab world is highly destabilised.

As for Al-Qaeda, it has become what some have termed a “brand name”, having mutated into a “multi-headed hydra” comprising international leaders and local heads.<sup>2</sup> Worse still, with no central command or organisation, any group that wishes to come into the limelight selects the Al-Qaeda label or “brand”. This ensures publicity, which is part of the intent of such groups. New local obscurantist groups have surfaced that have no operational links to OBL and his leadership cadres, but they state an affiliation because this intensifies the context of a specific local act of terror. Using the brand name “Al-Qaeda” allows them space for recruitment and support. Equally interesting is the fact that many of the born-again obscurantists are not citizens of Muslim states but are part of first and second generation Muslims belonging to European states. As Pepe Escobar points out, members of Al-Qaeda’s new elite were “either born in Western Europe – many hold a legitimate European Union passport – or came to the West while still very young and then became radicalized.”<sup>3</sup>

So, it becomes clear that, at the very least, there is a stalemate in the war against terrorism and at worse, the terrorist threat seems to be on the increase both in terms of intensity and operational milieu. Worse still, with the very framework of the WOT becoming more and more fudged – with President Bush talking first of a war against “Islamic fascists” and then simply against “Islamic militants” – this continuous linkage of Islam itself to the war on terror has further aggravated the stalemate for which the causes are also clear.

It is in this stalemated situation, and a continuing destabilisation within Afghanistan, that one is seeing the resurgence of the Taliban. And in response to NATO and Afghan-US failures to deal with this resurgence, Pakistan is coming under increasing attack.

## **A Pakistani Perspective**

For Pakistan the global WOT began much after the Pakistani state had begun confronting the violent fallout of the first Afghan so-called “jihad” to send the Soviets out of Afghanistan. While for the US and the West, that all may be just so much history, for Pakistan the problems post-the Soviet

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

withdrawal are not merely historic but issues confronting the Pakistani state and civil society to date. 9/11 offered Pakistan an opportunity to delink from the Taliban – given that Pakistan’s Taliban policy had little domestic support.

Even more important, Pakistan had already begun outlawing some of the extremist groups within Pakistan, which had been responsible for sectarian terrorism in the country. President Musharraf had also, in principle, committed his government into reforming the whole madrassah system – much before 9/11. However, this particular policy was not showing much progress before 9/11. However, 9/11 brought with it funding resources for the implementation of Madrassah reform.

9/11 also ensured that Pakistan move continuously to fight the obscurantists within the country but for Pakistan this cannot mean fighting against the mainstream religio-political parties. A major point of divergence that continues to exist between the US-European approach to fighting terrorism and Pakistan is the latter’s efforts to focus on root causes even as it uses military force in this unconventional war. In this context, Pakistan has always maintained that there is a need to draw a distinction between the ordinary Taliban and Al-Qaeda – a point that still seems to be missed, especially by the US which fails to understand that an ordinary Taliban is very much rooted in the Pukhtun community and may well have no violent or any other commitment to the terrorist agenda of Al-Qaeda. A failure to comprehend this has led to disparate Afghan forces coming together to fight the US and its allies in Afghanistan.

Another major issue has been the role of the Western media, which continues to demand that Pakistan “do more” or that Pakistan is in fact becoming a haven for the Taliban. With a lack of local knowledge and relying on translators, stories are printed and aired in the Western media of Taliban roaming openly in Quetta or seeking medical assistance in the hospitals of Islamabad. Purported interviews on the ground with “Taliban” are cited as proof but the question is: How does a Western journalist distinguish between an ordinary Pukhtun and a Taliban except that he is told so by the translator or the interviewee for some financial remuneration! And the locals soon realize what will bring them cash benefits!

However, for Pakistan the issue is problematic because the WOT has got intertwined with its domestic terrorist problem – while at the same time, the US-NATO policies in Afghanistan have threaten to create a political backlash in Pakistan. As the Bajaur incident has shown, the US and NATO forces complete disregard for Pakistani sensitivities and, often,

Pakistani sovereignty, make the job of the Pakistan government that much more difficult in the WOT.

The Pakistan government's efforts to have a more holistic approach to the WOT has been hampered greatly by the disconnect between its policies and the militarist approach to fighting terrorism adopted by the US. For Pakistan, it was a priority to adopt a proactive approach to fighting terrorism in order to isolate the terrorists from their support base. It was this policy, which led the Pakistan army to enter the tribal belt of the country for the first time since Independence. However, after sending a strong military message to the tribals in the form of military action, with heavy losses for the army, the military realized the need to adopt a more fruitful policy of pacification through reward and punishment so that the locals hand over the foreigners in their midst. Efforts to sign peace treaties with the major tribal groups in the FATA have been one such effort – which puts responsibility for peace on the tribal leaders themselves. While the North Waziristan Peace Agreement signed with seven tribal representatives came under fire from Western Media and some official sources, eventually the British military in Afghanistan also opted for a similar agreement.<sup>4</sup>

The problem has, however, been aggravated on three counts: one, the local hospitality tradition of the tribes whereby they give sanctuary to any one seeking it; two, many of the foreigners have been in the area since the war against the Soviets in Afghanistan and have married into local families; and, three, the violations by US forces of Pakistan's sovereignty through military action on Pakistani territory. This creates a political issue domestically for the Pakistan government and undermines the credibility of the military in the operational area. While for the US and NATO collateral damage of civilians may not be a major issue, for Pakistan collateral damage in its tribal belt is unacceptable as it is seen as the killing of one's own citizens.

From a Pakistani perspective, one major shortcoming in the way the international community is looking at the issue of terrorism, which is also responsible for the continuing stalemate, is to focus on what is seen as "international terrorism". Yet, "international terrorism" is simply one form of the overall global trends in terrorism, and one can identify at least two other important trends. One of the problems confronting the war on terrorism is that none of the three trends function totally independently of the others.

---

<sup>4</sup> As a result of such an agreement, on October 17, 2006, about 120 British soldiers left Helmand's northeastern district of Musa Qala.

I – International terrorism can also be seen as transnational terrorism, with groups having linkages across national borders and subscribing to an international agenda. It is incorrect to brand this form as something new in the wake of 9/11. After all, the IRA had linkages to funding sources in the US and the PLO had tenuous links. Now, included in the transnational groups are members and sympathisers of Al-Qaeda and some of the Taliban leadership. Al-Qaeda remnants are thought to be present in the tribal belt of Pakistan, but a number of acts of terror in India also are now being linked to Al-Qaeda. Also, Muslim groups fighting in Chechnya and Uzbekistan are also being lumped with Al-Qaeda – at least those thought to be sheltering along the Pakistan-Afghan border. Since the US-sanctioned ‘jihad’ against the Soviets in Afghanistan, various Muslim groups seeking political change through violent means are thought to have created linkages with each other since the US recruited Muslim fighters from across the Muslim world to fight in Afghanistan.

Within this mode of terrorism, the US policies in Afghanistan and Iraq are creating breeding grounds for supporters and sympathisers of these groups who are increasingly seen to be challenging US oppression towards Muslims.

II – The second trend in terms of terrorism is the local, sub national extremist groups that are prevalent across many regions. In Pakistan, for example, there has been the problem of sectarian terrorism and the state had begun outlawing many groups linked to this, much before September 11, 2001. However, with a focus on transnational extremist groups, the sectarian problem has tended to take second place with the result that it has become exacerbated once again. Also, Al-Qaeda has fed into this problem directly by creating linkages between itself and some of the extremist Sunni groups. The same has happened in Southeast Asia in countries like Indonesia where local terrorist groups have gained a new revival with the Al-Qaeda label. In Iraq also one is seeing the linkages between local Iraqi resistance and Al-Qaeda.

One of the most violent subnational, separatist insurgencies was the LTTE movement of the Hindu Tamils in Sri Lanka. Over 64,000 civilians, security force personnel, and LTTE cadres have died so far in this conflict – which saw the emergence of suicide bombers as an integral part of the Tamil strategy.

III – The third terrorist trend is that of state terrorism. This has become more acute in the post-9/11 period with the US declaring its pre-

emptive doctrine, invading Iraq without a UN resolution and lending support to the Israeli policy of political assassinations. Strong regional powers like India have also claimed for themselves the right of pre-emption. Even before 9/11, the issue of state terrorism dominated the discourse on Palestine and Kashmir. The international community has shown no inclination to deal with this aspect of global terrorism.

Yet many states perpetrate violence against the people of other states to send a message to their governments to fall in line “or else”. When the state in question is a major or even a super power, then the issue will arise as to who will ensure that an act of terror by that state is punished?

These issues are one of the major factors aggravating the terrorist threat across the globe as is the linkage between the three broad trends identified above.

For Pakistan two issues now override all other issues linked to the WOT.

First, the constant targeting of Pakistan by the US and Europe – both officially and in the media – with the WOT being used as a pretext to target the country on a series of issues having little linkage to the WOT, like the issue of nuclear proliferation. In response to accusations of Taliban going from Pakistan into Afghanistan, it would serve the international community well to recall how the Taliban came to power in Afghanistan in the first place – because of the growing anarchy and complete breakdown of law and order. As for Pakistan, there is a growing sense that there is a need to seal the international border with Afghanistan, through fencing where possible.

But another view is also now emerging amongst some that the targeting of Pakistan may well be a more insidious design to use the WOT to send in US-NATO forces across the international Pakistan-Afghanistan border and eventually either aid and abet insurgency within the country or simply to target our nuclear assets. After all, there is growing talk in the US of redrawing the borders of the Muslim World – especially of large and militarily strong Muslim states.

Second, the damage being done to the WOT by the continuing targeting of Muslims and Islam – from the Pope to national governments to the media. If Islam continues to come under the sort of attack one is seeing in the Western media and amongst Western political circles, then

Muslims of all shades will feel under threat and react – thereby creating more space for the terrorists for the future. In fact, the debate on terrorism has to rid itself of the Islamic context, if it is to get anywhere substantive. The context of terrorism is political and that is the starting point in dealing with the issue. By removing terrorism from this false, religious context, dealing with the terrorists – including isolating them – will become much easier for states, especially Muslim states.

Also, there is a real need in Europe, especially, to be more inclusivist in terms of accepting cultural and religious diversity. “Secularism” or democratic ideals do not mean uniformity but a tolerance and acceptance of diversity – including religious diversity. For better or worse, a European identity today is not a Christian or “white” identity.

As for the Muslim World, it will have to realise that it cannot continue propagating a democracy deficit – although each state must have the right to evolve its own democratic model. In most Muslim states and societies, there has been a resurgence of religious identity and teachings at the popular, civil society level. Often this resurgence of populist Islam is reflected alongside a rising tide of nationalism and a rejection of old colonial legacies. Where non-representative governing systems exist, and rulers are closely linked to ties with Western states, the popular resentment targets these states as well as its own systems. The frustration of these civil societies against the inadequacies of their states to the needs of their people as well as unresponsive ruling elites is a major factor in the growing dialectic between Muslim societies and their states. Anger is further aggravated by a perceived inability or refusal of these states to protest the abuse of Islam in the West – especially Europe.

In this connection, two important steps need to be taken.

First: Muslim states must treat all citizens equally before the law and protect their minorities. At the very least the basic human rights that are prevalent in the Holy Quran must be respected. In addition there is the *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam* adopted by the 19<sup>th</sup> OIC Conference of Foreign Ministers on 5<sup>th</sup> August 1990. While the whole document reasserts the primacy of human dignity and human rights, Articles 1 and 6 are of special significance within these concepts.

Second: There is a need for the civil societies within Muslim states to reassert the inclusiveness of their religion – which spans many cultures – and to reject the extremists amongst them. Also, there is a need to be less

apologetic about being Muslim when confronting or interacting with the other.

There is also a need for dialogue both at the level of civil society and states between the mainstream Muslims and non-Muslims. But dialogue is not enough. At the level of civil society, there is a need to do joint research and have greater exchanges of scholars so that there is greater dissemination of information about “the other”. The media also needs to rid itself of negative stereotypes – especially of Muslims. But most important, it is the abuse of Muslims in the war on terror that needs to be rectified, including the abuse of Muslim POWs in Iraq, Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay and the abuse of Iraqi citizens.

Finally, in order to restore human dignity to the context of inter-state and intra-state interaction, we need to see a greater acceptance of one’s own shortcomings – both by the West and the Muslim World. This requires acceptance of truth and reconciliation to make dialogue meaningful. It also requires exposing long-established myths and hypocrisies. All these require an inclusivist rather than an exclusivist approach. It should be abundantly clear by now that unless human dignity is restored within international and domestic interactions, violence and terrorism will not be eliminated from within the international community.



## SECOND SESSION: *WORKING WITH THE UNITED STATES*

---

### THE FRENCH-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIP SINCE 9/11

*Dr. Guillaume Parmentier\**

---

For a long time specialist in transatlantic relations, it is healthy to visit other countries and regions. Many problems which can have a worldwide effect take their source outside the Atlantic region, and it is necessary, indeed salutary, to understand them. Different perspectives are enlightening. This is why I am particularly grateful to the Pakistan Institute for International Strategy for its invitation to talk to you today.

French-US relations have always been rather strange: the two countries are each other's oldest allies. France played a decisive role in helping the thirteen American colonies obtain independence. At the battle of Yorktown, which every American student knows was decisive in the emancipation of America, there were more French soldiers than American. France is also the only large country in Europe which has never waged war on the United States. And of course America contributed greatly to the eventual success of France in the First World War, and liberated France from German occupation in the Second. In spite of this history of alliance, however, the relationship has always been a difficult one. This is reflected in the study of these relations. The standard book in English on the history of the relationship is called: "Oldest Allies, Guarded Friends"<sup>1</sup> I have published a book on the recent relationship called: "Reconcilable Differences."<sup>2</sup> Always this mixed feeling: uncertainty, doubt, sympathy coupled with uneasiness.

Even their similarities often split the two nations. Both countries see their modern birth in the context of the Enlightenment. The United States, an idea made into a nation, is inseparable from the movement of ideas of the Eighteenth Century, with its emphasis on the individual, its freedom, its ability to choose for itself. France was obviously born long before the Enlightenment, but the French Revolution is seen by most Frenchmen as a

---

\* Dr. Guillaume Parmentier, University of Paris 2, & Director, The French Centre on the United States, French Institute of International Relations.

<sup>1</sup> Charles Cogan, "Oldest Allies, Guarded Friends", Harvard, Harvard University Press, 1993

<sup>2</sup> Michael Brenner and Guillaume Parmentier, "Reconcilable Differences, US-French Relations in the New Era", Washington DC, Brookings Institution Press, 2002

beacon of hope for other countries and other people. As a result, both France and the United States have the extraordinary audacity to believe that they have a global message. The Enlightenment, after all, was universal in its aims. But these two messages, though not completely incompatible, are nonetheless distinct. This is the case especially because the cultural references in both countries are so different.

Furthermore, the power relationship between the two countries has been reversed. France used to be a major world power, whereas the United States was a provincial country. Today, the United States dominates the world. As former French foreign minister Hubert Védrine likes to say, it is a “hyperpower”. France, on the other hand, while still a significant country, is much less powerful, and her ambitions are much more limited to Europe and its immediate vicinity: she has herself become a provincial power.

2002-2003 was a nadir in the recent relationship between France and the United States. From there on, the relationship could only go better. It would be wrong, however, to be complacent, because many of the root causes of the strong disagreements over the war on Iraq still remain unattended.

The reactions of France and the US to terrorism, with the Americans launching a war against terror which in the French view cannot be won, and France desirous to keep the target strictly limited to Al-Qaeda and its allies, for instance, make it difficult to reconcile positions, even if a sense of realism has led each partner to accept the need for the other's contribution.

## **Two Messages**

I will start with alluding to the underlying causes behind the tensions, such as the two different messages that the two nations have the pretension, indeed the audacity, to convey to the world. Both are based on the Enlightenment, and are therefore not exclusive, but they are sufficiently different to divide the leaderships of the two countries when problems arise on which the instinctive reactions of the two countries differ.

Furthermore, the vision that the French have of themselves, borne of their history, is that of a country resisting Empires, whereas many Americans believe that America can act for the common good. Clearly, in a situation where the United States enjoy an overwhelming predominance in raw power, these different visions easily lead to clashes.

As a result, both countries often see their foreign policy through the prism of opposition to the other's policies. On both sides, there is a tendency to be obsessed by the other, while dismissing it as less important than it actually is. *Le Monde Diplomatique* and other anti-Americans in France portray the US as being all-powerful while describing it as being on the verge of collapse (Olivier Todd, etc). In America, the neo-conservatives, and sometimes the State Department bureaucracy, see France as a spent force, while tracing every difficulty of American policy to its schemes, which is assuming that she has considerable political power....

### **After Iraq**

France's standing in America used to be good in the general public though poor among the policy-making elites. Since Iraq, French standing in US opinion polls has sharply deteriorated, but its image has somehow recovered in Washington circles now that its dire predictions over the Iraq operation have been proven abundantly true. The image of America in France has deteriorated regularly since President Bush denounced the Kyoto Protocol in March 2001. On the other hand, the need to cooperate has never felt stronger. It is too early to measure the consequences of the discovery of the CIA "black sites", and Vice-President Cheney's insistence that torture not be rejected officially as a means of counter terrorism. However, given the painful and shameful Algerian experience of France in the 50s, this will remain a problem in the bilateral relationship. And European integration will make it more difficult, since many European partners of France will take a moral view of this issue which will reverberate in the positions taken at European level.

In general terms, the impact of the Europeanization of French foreign policy on the bilateral relationship will be addressed, as well as the effect of French-US disagreements on France's hopes for a European foreign policy.

### **Redefining the Relationship**

After the Cold War, it is no longer possible to assume that whatever our differences, at the end of the day we'll have to agree on the fundamentals. In this sense, the controversy on Iraq could not have come as a complete surprise. Mutual dependency has enormously diminished. This begs the question of the adaptation of transatlantic institutions to the new situation, which the author considers overdue.

NATO's refusal to adapt to the realities of the post-Cold War situation means that it has been side-lined militarily in Kosovo, strategically after 9/11, and politically during the war on Iraq.

More importantly, the US-EU relationship needs to be addressed. This begs the question of the purpose of Europe: how far do the French want to go, geographically, but especially functionally; are French leaders federalists or not?

For the purposes of the transatlantic relationship, these questions are essential: the US cannot be expected to make Europe into a partner if the Europeans do not define the mechanisms which will allow the Americans to interact in a steady and efficient manner with their European partners. This begs the question of the form to be given to the Europeanization of foreign policy, which has been put in disarray by the French (and Dutch) rejection of the European constitutional treaty.

The transatlantic relationship, which was completely dominated by security during the Cold war is today a much broader one. Of course the security element is important, but it is not as overwhelming as it was during the Cold war. Therefore we need the transatlantic alliance to have a consultation process that goes further than is the case today. And this means that we need the EU to be represented as such, along with the main members state. The EU and the US have to have a permanent dialogue in order to work together. And people in Brussels love talking about the EU–NATO relationship, but that is not important politically. It is a technical relationship, which will easily be managed if we can manage the political relationship, the big political picture, this will come as a consequence. It is not worth spending too much time on the EU-NATO relationship.

The key is obviously the EU-US relationship. But the ball is clearly in the court of the Europeans on this matter. Because it is up to the Europeans to organise themselves, in ways that make it possible for them to be taken seriously in Washington. Clearly the six-monthly rotating presidency, the present arrangements at the level of the High Representative, all this does not make it possible for the Americans to take us seriously. I understand perfectly well why the Americans don't take us seriously when we come in such formations. It is of course a great pity from their point of view that we have failed to improve the decision-making process in this respect by rejecting the constitutional treaty and obviously from this perspective France is particularly to blame.

What we now need to do is to try and pick up the pieces. The political elements in the treaty are not in question, all the member countries of the union agree and trying to go and move forward with this in order to give us a functioning political system which has sufficiently clear rules for our partners, in particular the Americans, to understand them.

### **THIRD SESSION: DEALING WITH THE NEIGHBOURHOOD**

---

#### **MANAGING NATIONAL AND REGIONAL IDENTITIES: FRANCE AND EUROPE POST-MAASTRICHT TREATY**

*Prof. Robert Frank\**

---

The connection between national and European identities is a complex issue. Many opinion polls show that French see themselves French as well as Europeans, the same thing for the Italians, the Germans, the Dutch, the Danes, etc. For instance, sixty per cent of the French and Italians think they have a dual identity, national and European, whereas it is only and unsurprisingly a minority in Britain. This means that we have a diversity of identities within Europe and this is something new in the history of the continent. The problem now is how to manage double, if not triple identities since you may be, for instance, French and European but also coming from Normandy, Alsace or from whatever other provinces. For the same, you can also feel Bavarian, German and European. Then you have a mix of provincial, national and regional identities. How to manage these identities is a core issue in Europe.

Coming to the definition of a collective identity, there are many different meanings but we could still agree on one. A collective identity is the feeling of belonging to a collectivity. So, the national identity is the feeling of belonging to a nation-state. It is more difficult to define what is a European identity, since there is not a European nation as such and there is no feeling of belonging to a continent in geographical terms. There is certainly a cultural dimension, a feeling of belonging to a European culture, a European civilization. We know how these notions, culture and civilization, are difficult to comprehend. Inside one civilization, you have many civilizations and so on. Nonetheless, the elites of Europe feel since the end of Middle Ages that they belong to a common culture. But, for a long time, European identity is only a cultural identity and not a political one. Until the beginning of the 20th century, many European believed in European cultural identity but they do not ask for political unity. Cultural identity does not automatically lead to political identity; it is not because you feel yourself culturally as a European that you want the political unity of Europe. Of course, some Europeans wished this unity and the “idea of Europe”, i.e the idea of European political unity, existed for a long time : in

---

\* Prof. Robert Frank, University of Paris 1- Sorbonne, & Director Identities, International Relations & European Civilizations Centre(IRICE).

the fifteenth century, the King of Bohemia, George Podiebrad, wanted to set up a pan-European 'Christian League' against the Turks ; Sully, the French king Henry IV's minister, at the turn of the seventeenth century, thought of a Christian council of Europe disposing of a common army ; in the eighteenth century with philosophers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Emmanuel Kant, with the Romantics in the nineteenth century, like Victor Hugo and Giuseppe Mazzini, the notion of a European unity was advocated. Though it still remained the political project of a few: the "idea of Europe" was not yet a European identity, because it was not deeply rooted in European societies, not even in European elites. There lies the great difference between European identity and national identity: the first one is only cultural until the twentieth century, the latter is both cultural and political because it expresses the will to live together 'under the same roof'.

The change came with the twentieth century and the emergence of a "European consciousness", that means the feeling of absolute and vital necessity to build European unity. Ironically, the two world wars played a significant role in this new phenomenon. Lessons were drawn from these cataclysmic events. This time the notion of a 'United States of Europe' emerged not only from the minds of poets or philosophers but from the depth of European societies: it became indispensable to unite Europe if one does not want to live again the wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45. It was also a vital necessity to unite Europe for keeping a hold over the world's destiny. After the Second World War, Europe was losing his grip on world affairs to the two superpowers system. Fear of war and fear of decline were the two ingredients which mixed together hastened the rise of a European consciousness. Without this European consciousness, European integration would not have been possible in the fifties. And this integration had profound effects on the collective identities in Europe.

Yes, since the beginning of European integration, all identities are changing. National identities remain strong, but are not anymore a vehicle for acquisition of territories or more power, and have come to a stage of post nationalism. As a consequence, policies vis-à-vis the neighbourhood have quite changed since the rise of European consciousness. It was easy to manage national identities and European integration in the fifties and the sixties and this smooth dual management contributed to the success story that the first stages of European integration were.

In the seventies, it became more difficult to manage this dual identity. A man such as Denis de Rougemont, who brought some input in European unity at the congress of The Hague in May 1948, had a fairly good understanding of what was happening. He could notice that the

European integration might now become more arduous because Europe “was no more a question of life and death” as it was just after the Second World War. It was then relatively easy to arrange a European consciousness, but with the war becoming a distant memory, it was less easy to sustain vividly a European identity. Yet that does not mean there was no progress in the seventies and in the eighties. In 1973, at a conference in Copenhagen, a definition of European identity was formulated. It was based on the historical heritage of Europe and common values. It was supposed to give birth to a new political identity which had to take root over common foreign and security policies. It was at the time of the American defeat in the Vietnam War and the oil crisis, and it was about giving Europe a voice about all the forthcoming crises in the world. In February 1992, the Maastricht treaty was signed and gave birth to the European Union, with a future common foreign policy and a single currency. But by then a wave of Euro scepticism had started gaining strength and we have not come out of this phase. Since Maastricht, there have been some successful reforms but also many crises. The Bosnian War was certainly a momentous one, because war was again fought on European soil and the force of the event highlighted the necessity for a common foreign policy which had remained an empty shell after the Maastricht Treaty. The settlement of the Bosnian conflict was much more a NATO solution or an American solution than a European one, but this failure led to a success reflected by the Saint-Malo process when in December 1998, at a Anglo-French summit, the British did not oppose the acquisition by the EU of an autonomous military capacity. It has been the starting point of the European defence project bringing together a European identity and commitments to NATO. This did not preclude nevertheless crises from happening as in with the Iraq war in 2003 where France and Germany sided on one side against the war and on the other side Britain and other European members supported a pre-emptive war. It certainly showed that it is difficult to build a political identity on foreign policy, particularly in relation to trans-Atlantic relations. However, we have to take notice of the fact public opinions were less divided than the governments. A majority of British, Italians, Spaniards, Polish were against the intervention of Iraq whereas their governments favoured it. Another recent crisis was when in 2005 the referendum on the European constitution was rejected in France and in the Netherlands. The same year, there was in France the urban rebellion of young people, often French citizens, but belonging to families coming from sub-Saharan Africa or North Africa. Does that mean that there is, in a country like France, a crisis of both national identities and European identity? In fact, the feeling of belonging to the French nation is not at stake, the uneasiness comes mainly from the difficulty of many groups in integrating French society, and



this issue requires a social treatment. It would also be a mistake to draw the conclusion that if almost 55% of the French voters said no to the constitution, it meant that they now believe less in a European identity. It shows however that they are not happy with the European policy of integration.

Some say that there is another difficulty: how to build a process of European identification for European Muslims? Saying so, they confuse legacy with identity. It is not because there was a Christian legacy in the European identity that means that the European identity *is still now* a Christian identity. Identities change with History. The Christian legacy is only one of the legacies which indeed also include the anti-Christian debates which occurred in Europe in the past, and the actual European Islam which is now the second religion in the continent. The management of identity in Europe brings us also to the question of Turkey's accession to the EU. Of course, you have some who oppose it because Turkey is not Christian. But this is not necessarily the mainstream opinion. We just said that the religious criteria is not the good one and it does not come into the picture when some advocate that Bosnia, Albania, Kosovo should first be brought into the EU for the sake of stability in Europe in spite of the fact that they have predominantly Muslim populations. In fact for Turkey, besides the conditions of democratisation, you have the issue of identification to a European space: are Europeans ready to admit a huge 'space', Turkey, since it would mean a very large Europe with very weak institutions and an EU with a common border with the Iraqi chaos when you do not have yet a common government nor a common foreign policy?

It is now relevant to deal with another discrepancy in the management of national identity and European identity. This is a significant discrepancy because it may lead to a democratic crisis in Europe. In the EU the fully democratic space is the national one, but for many issues it is not the relevant space for decision. The relevant space for decision in economic matters is the European one, but the EU is not a direct democratic space. If it was, there would be less national sovereignty. Here is today the contradiction between national identities and European identity: a majority of Europeans feel European enough to ask for more democracy at the European level, but as patriots they are reluctant to lessen the national sovereignties which would result from a more democratic European decision-making mechanism. If one does not solve this contradiction, it may lead to more abstentions in elections or more votes going for extremist parties. In European elections, is it worth voting and electing someone who will not have a real power? And in national

elections, is it worth voting for someone who has power, but not on a relevant level for the larger economic issues?

To conclude and, in spite of the reservations mentioned above, the Europe integration has one thing which could teach a lesson. Europe is now a space of multiple and open identities. It means that there is no exclusive identity and this is a novelty in European history. One can speak of 'appeased national identities' and the entry into the EU is in many respects conditional to this desiderata. Finally, being European is to have several identities and it is on this point that the EU may stand as a model. The difficulty is no more in the existence of antagonistic identities, but in the way of managing different feelings of belonging, even if compatible. There is not so much an *identity crisis* in Europe than a *management crisis* of multiple identities.

### **THIRD SESSION: DEALING WITH THE NEIGHBOURHOOD**

---

#### **PAKISTAN'S REGIONAL DIPLOMACY**

*Ms. Fahmida Ashraf\**

---

Strategically placed at the crossroads of three important regions of the world, namely South Asia, Central Asia, and West Asia, Pakistan's regional diplomacy is guided by the principles of its overall Foreign Policy. The main focus of Pakistan's foreign policy is the promotion of international and regional peace, in keeping with the guideline set by the father of the nation, Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah. On August 15, 1947, in his message while inaugurating the Pakistan Broadcasting Service, the Quaid-e-Azam said:

“Our object should be peace within and Peace without. We want to live peacefully and maintain cordial and friendly relations with our immediate neighbours and with the world at large.”

The main guiding principles of Pakistan's foreign policy are summarised as:

- Sovereign equality of all countries;
- Non interference in the internal affairs of other States;
- Respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States; and
- Non aggression and peaceful settlement of disputes.

In view of its unique geographical location – as an important link between three vital regions – Pakistan's regional diplomacy has focused on improving stability and enhancing confidence and cooperation with the neighbouring countries. Pakistan has been playing an active role in various regional organisations, including South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Economic Cooperation Organisation (ECO), the Central Asian Cooperation Organisation (CACO), the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC), the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) of which it has been accorded the Observer status, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), and as a Sectoral Dialogue partner in ASEAN.

Post-9/11 changes in the international environment and the international war against terrorism provided opportunities and challenges

---

\* *Ms. Fahmida Ashraf is Director (South Asia), Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad.*

for Pakistan. In this context I will be discussing Pakistan's relations and challenges it had to deal with as a vital link of the three important regions in the world.

## **Afghanistan**

The most immediate challenge was the impact on Pakistan's policy towards Afghanistan – the strategic western neighbour. A stable Afghanistan is in the national interest of Pakistan and therefore, Pakistan has always pursued a policy of supporting durable peace in Afghanistan, as a frontline state during the period of Soviet invasion; after Soviet withdrawal by supporting the Afghan Mujahideen government; and later by supporting the Taliban government. It is in this context that in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks and subsequent US war against terrorism, Pakistan's Afghan policy witnessed a U-turn, as it decided to support the war against terrorism in Afghanistan against the Taliban government. Also, the change in policy was taken to prevent Pakistan being labelled as a country sponsoring terrorism.

Pakistan has extended support to the Karzai government and is cooperating in reconstruction and capacity building of institutions in Afghanistan, since the renewal of bilateral relations in 2002. Pakistan has committed to provide \$250 million for reconstruction in Afghanistan and the volume of trade between the two countries is \$1.2 billion. Meetings of the various joint forums such as, the Joint Economic Commission, Pak-Afghan-US Tripartite Commission for Border Security, and Tripartite Commission for Refugees Repatriation are being held regularly. Various agreements and MoUs have been signed covering diverse fields such as, culture, tourism, media cooperation, and combating organised crime and narcotics. A bus service between Peshawar-Jalalabad began in May 2006 and the Torkham-Jalalabad road was opened in September 2006.

Moreover, Pakistan's security forces have been engaged in search operations against Al-Qaeda operatives in the Pakistan border region with Afghanistan. The Director General of ISPR, Major General Shaukat Sultan, confirmed in April 2006 that the Army in its operations since July 2005 in North Waziristan had killed 324 militants. According to a report by Pakistan Institute of Peace Studies (PIPS) in May 2006, Pakistan's security agencies arrested more than 1,000 Al-Qaeda suspects between January 2002 and May 2006. The Pakistan government in September 2006 signed a peace agreement with the tribal leaders in North Waziristan, where by it has been agreed that cross-border movement for militant activity in Afghanistan would be prevented. The Pakistan government has

been criticised by some sections of the society for the search operations in the tribal region.

However, despite all such cooperative steps taken by Pakistan, because of its past relations with the Taliban government, the level of mistrust in relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan has not reduced. The Karzai government continues to blame Pakistan for supporting the Taliban and Al-Qaeda activists, and has been insisting that Pakistan should do more to counter terrorism in Afghanistan. President Musharraf during his visit to Kabul on September 6-7, 2006, categorically stated that Pakistan government is following a policy of “absolute non interference” in Afghanistan. Moreover, NATO officials have also accused that militant infiltration into Afghanistan from Pakistan is continuing. Example is that of the statement made by NATO commander, General James Jones, on October 28 at the end of his visit to Afghanistan.

On the other hand, Pakistan suspects Indian infiltration in the tribal region and Balochistan from bordering areas of Afghanistan. These fears were conveyed by President Musharraf during his meeting with Afghan President during his visit to Islamabad in February this year.

### **India-Pakistan Relations**

The second challenge that Pakistan faced in the post-9/11 environment is regarding its relations with India. Taking advantage of the US war against terrorism, India increased its propaganda of accusing Pakistan of sponsoring cross-border infiltration in Occupied Kashmir in order to pressurise the US and the international community for declaring Pakistan as a terrorist state and also to malign the legitimate Kashmiri struggle for self-determination as a terrorist movement. India Pakistan relations deteriorated to its lowest ebb when after the terrorist attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001, India accused Pakistan of involvement in the attack. India moved its armed forces along the international border with Pakistan and cut off diplomatic ties with Pakistan by recalling its High Commissioner and blocked the rail and air links. Pakistan had to respond in defence, however, on its part Pakistan made efforts for defusing the tense situation. For example, Pakistan’s Foreign Minister (Abdul Sattar) in March 2002, while speaking to Indian reporters expressed Pakistan’s willingness to hold military level talks with India for withdrawal of troops from the border. On June 4, 2002, in his address at the Almaty Conference, President Musharraf stressed that India should “return to the path of dialogue and negotiations.” However, Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee in his address at the Conference accused Pakistan of

sponsoring terrorists into India. As part of its efforts to promote international support for defusing the stand-off with India, high level delegations were also sent to various important countries. In view of the support expressed by international community for defusing the situation the tense situation between Pakistan and India was finally defused by December 2002 after the withdrawal of military deployment along India-Pakistan border. However, the process of rapprochement towards the normalisation of relations between India and Pakistan began in April 2003, when former Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee during his speech in Srinagar extended the “hand of friendship” towards Pakistan. Former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Zafarullah Khan Jamali, welcomed the offer and invited Mr. Vajpayee to visit Pakistan. Some immediate steps taken by India and Pakistan to improve the politico-diplomatic atmosphere included: the appointment of High Commissioners; exchange of prisoners; resumption of New Delhi-Lahore bus service (July 2003); ceasefire along the Line of Control (declared by Pakistan in November 2003); ceasefire along Actual Ground Position Line (AGPL) in Siachen (declared by India in November 2003) and resumption of air links and over flights (in January 2004).

However, it was after the successful twelfth SAARC Summit held in Islamabad in January 2004, including the informal meetings between the two Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India and also the meeting between Prime Minister Vajpayee and President Musharraf, held on January 6, 2004, that both sides agreed to resume the composite dialogue process. In the joint statement, issued at the end of the Musharraf-Vajpayee meeting, both leaders emphasised that “constructive dialogue would promote progress towards the common objective of peace, security and economic development for our peoples and for future generations.” President Musharraf also categorically stated that Pakistani territory would not be allowed for the use of terrorism. Since then three rounds of composite dialogue (June-September 2004, December 2004-September 2005, and January-May 2006[inconclusive]) have been held. The achievements made so far include: restoration of the original strength of the High Commissions; establishment of hotline between the Foreign Secretaries of the two countries; opening up of various communication links, such as the Lahore-New Delhi bus service, Lahore-Amritsar bus service, Poonch-Rawalakot bus service and Khokropar-Munabao train service; establishment of hotline between Director Military Operations of the two countries; unilateral moratorium on conducting further nuclear tests by both countries; pre-notify each other on missile test; agreement on advance notice of ballistic missile tests; and revival of the Joint Economic Commission.

Despite the atmospherics of the bilateral India-Pakistan peace process, India has shown little inclination of moving forward on the core dispute of Jammu and Kashmir and other outstanding issues – Siachen, Sir Creek, and water issues. As regards the Jammu and Kashmir issue, in relation to its efforts for finding an amicable solution Pakistan has shown flexibility and has suggested various proposals as interim measures for achieving the final solution of the dispute based on the wishes of the Kashmiri people. These include: the proposal of demilitarisation, self governance, joint control, and region wise assessment of the wishes of the Kashmiri people. India has not given any proposals in response, instead the Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh has categorically stated that there is no question of the revision of borders as the Kashmir state is an integral part of India. Also, India has been reiterating the allegation of cross-border infiltration and terrorist activities being sponsored by Pakistan not only in Occupied Kashmir but also in other parts of India, for example India has accused Pakistan of being involved in the July Mumbai bomb blasts, though on October 22, Indian National Security Adviser, M. K. Narayanan, during an interview to the *CNN-IBN* television channel admitted that Indian investigators do not have strong evidence regarding Pakistan ISI's involvement in Mumbai blasts.

Even after the three rounds of the peace process it seems that India is not willing to give up its efforts of maligning the image of Pakistan. This can be assessed by how Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has interpreted the understanding reached with President Musharraf in Havana on September 16, 2006, regarding the devising of an India-Pakistan anti terrorism institutional mechanism. As reiterated by Mr. Manmohan Singh it would be “a test” only for Pakistan.

Pakistan regards the emerging Indo-US nuclear partnership, as part of the developing Indo-US Strategic Partnership, as a threat to regional peace and stability.

## **Iran**

As regards relations with Iran, Pakistan has regarded Iran as an important neighbour because of its geo-strategic location. However, Pakistan's Afghanistan policy after the Soviet invasion and later Pakistan's support to the Taliban government in Afghanistan resulted in deterioration of relations between the two countries. Also, the developing Iran-India relations were a cause of concern for Pakistan. Still, it is to be noted that despite political differences cooperation at the economic level has continued. The Pakistan-Iran Joint Economic Commission (JEC),

established in 1986, held its meetings regularly for identifying areas to promote economic and commercial cooperation. Still, the level of bilateral trade between Iran and Pakistan is not satisfactory. There is room for improvement and in this context during the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JEC in Islamabad in May 2006 Pakistan and Iran have the target of increasing the bilateral trade to US \$1 billion in the next two years.

Post-9/11 developments resulting in the change of Pakistan's Afghanistan policy has had a positive impact on Pakistan-Iran relations and past years has shown increased diplomatic exchanges. During the India-Pakistan military stand-off in 2001-2002, Iran supported restraint and resumption of dialogue between the two countries. Pakistan is interested in the Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) gas pipeline project and has been cooperating with Iran for its implementation. In April 2006 during the meeting of Iran-Pakistan Joint Working Group, Pakistan and Iran agreed to build the pipeline even if India backed out under US pressure in view of Iran-US nuclear stand-off. However, there are certain technical details to be finalised for which negotiations are continuing. (agreement on the gas price etc.)

The US policy of regime change in Iran and the Iran-US nuclear stand-off is a cause of concern to Pakistan. On Iran's nuclear programme, Pakistan supports Iran's right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under IAEA safeguards and supports the policy of peaceful dialogue for resolving the nuclear issue.

## **Middle East**

As regards the Middle Eastern region, Pakistan values its relations with Middle Eastern countries having historical, cultural, religious, economic and strategic basis. Pakistan maintains a balanced approach in its Middle East Policy and strongly supports stability in the region.

Pakistan respects the territorial integrity, political sovereignty, and independence of Iraq and supports the return of peace and normalcy in the country.

Pakistan supports the right of the Palestinian people for a separate homeland. Pakistan regards the victory of Hamas in the Palestinian elections as the democratic verdict of the Palestinian people. Palestinian Foreign Minister, Mahmood Al Zahar, visited Pakistan in June 2006. Pakistan announced \$3 million humanitarian aid to the Hamas government.



Pakistan condemned the Israeli military offensive in Lebanon in July 2006. President Musharraf, in his address on July 20, called for immediate ceasefire in Lebanon and stressed for a negotiated settlement of the crisis. During the OIC meeting in Putrajaya (Malaysia) in August 2006 Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz stressed for immediate ceasefire in Lebanon and the constitution of a UN force for Lebanon. Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz visited Lebanon in August and September 2006, when he announced that a Pakistani Army contingent would be sent to Lebanon for demining exclusively on bilateral and humanitarian basis. He also emphasised the need for full implementation of the UN resolution on Lebanon.

## **Central Asia**

As regards the Central Asian region, Pakistan has concentrated in developing cooperation in areas such as, trade, tourism, culture, economic and commercial field and building of communication links. Pakistan has established Joint Economic Commission with all the Central Asian states. Pakistan is party to the quadrilateral agreement with China, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan (effective since May 2004), which aims at promoting regional trade by utilising Karakorum Highway. (Trade with Central Asian state is around \$26 million)

Pakistan is also party to the Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan (TAP) pipeline project for building two parallel gas and oil pipelines. As reported in August 2006, the Asian Development Bank, as coordinator is finalising a report for development of a complete energy corridor which besides the pipelines includes building of railway tracks, roads and optic fibre system. (Dawn Aug 23, 2006)

Pakistan has also signed agreements for cooperation in combating terrorism with Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan had expressed concern about the presence of militants belonging to Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IUM) in the tribal region of Pakistan. During its operation in tribal region Pakistan Army arrested some Uzbek militants and Pakistan government handed them to the Uzbek government. Moreover, during Uzbek President's visit to Pakistan in May 2006 both countries have agreed to coordinate their anti-terrorism efforts.

The Central Asian states along with China played an important role by supporting Pakistan's membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). Pakistan has been admitted in SCO as an Observer in 2005. Pakistan would play an important role in promoting economic and

commercial linkages between SCO members by providing access to its seaports of Gawadar and Karachi.

## **Conclusion**

In the post-9/11 changed international environment providing challenges and opportunities, Pakistan has been trying to maintain a balanced regional policy for promoting its national interests.

## **FOURTH SESSION: PAKISTAN-FRANCE RELATIONS: THE BILATERAL**

### **DIMENSIONS**

---

#### **FRANCE-PAKISTAN RELATIONS THROUGH THE QUAI D' ORSAY ARCHIVES**

*Dr. Gilles Boquérat\**

---

Working on bilateral relations through diplomatic records gives an incomparable insight when it comes to foreign policy in the making and to study the rationale behind political decisions. One also gets the additional advantage of occasionally coming across remarks which are anything but diplomatic. Studying the material available in the archives of the French Ministry of External Affairs, which follows the 30 years rule prescription, gives a fair account of what drove the French policy vis-à-vis Pakistan, how diplomats conveyed this policy to their interlocutors and one can even get some clues about how the latter reacted to this policy. This unidimensional and necessarily subjective approach could only be corrected with access to the diplomatic archives on the Pakistani side but here, as in other South Asian countries, secrecy is the rule. There is little on bilateral relations in written memoirs, if one excepts a chapter on the aborted nuclear deal with France in the seventies in Iqbal Akhund's autobiography (*Memoirs of a Bystander: A Life in Diplomacy*, Karachi, OUP, 1997). This paper will look at the major factors affecting the relations between France and Pakistan during the first twenty five-years of their existence, from independence to the eve of the India-Pakistan war of 1971.

#### **The Broader Picture**

When Pakistan became independent in 1947, France had no special interests in a region which had been largely excluded from its colonial empire if one except five French settlements located on Indian territory. Yet a call for an early establishment of diplomatic relations was made and justified by the fact that Pakistan was, in demographic terms, the most important Muslim state in the world and it wishes to play a significant role in the United Nations and vis-à-vis the Arab League and other Muslim states.<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic relations were officially established in November 1947.

---

\* Dr. Gilles Boquérat is Research Associate, Centre for Indian and South Asian Studies, and presently he is a visiting scholar at the ISSI.

<sup>1</sup> Dispatch from the Ambassador of France in the United Kingdom to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), 5 November 1947. *Série Asie 1944-1955, sous-série Pakistan*, E 57-6, vol. 28.

It is only in February 1965 that a French Prime Minister, Georges Pompidou, visited Pakistan during a trip to the subcontinent (the first visit to France of a Pakistani leader was Iskander Mirza as President in October 1957).

Both countries were yet on the same side of the geo-strategic divide during the Cold War, which at least allowed for more interaction through participation in SEATO meetings. During the Fifties bilateral relations were cordial but it was lacking in commonalities and there was some irritants as explained hereafter. It was admitted that the chaotic political situation prevailing in France at the end of the Fourth Republic did certainly not reflect positively on its image abroad. It so happened that in both countries, it is during the same year – 1958 – that a general took charge of the affairs of the state with the declared intention of reforming the parliamentary system. The fifth republic with its semi-presidential system was introduced on 5 October 1958 only three weeks before Ayub Khan staged his coup against Iskander Mirza. If Charles de Gaulle denied any possibility of becoming a dictator at such a late stage in life (he was 68), the 51 years old Mohammad Ayub Khan was prepared to bend democratic norms for personal expediency.

The bilateral relations changed for the better in the sixties as the two countries explored ways out of the American shadow. It was de Gaulle's foreign policy of grandeur and independence which for instance led France in 1966 to withdraw from the integrated military command of NATO but not from the alliance itself. De Gaulle's cutting remarks at American foreign policy found an echo in Pakistan where there was much disillusion with the Kennedy and Johnson administrations' benign attitude vis-à-vis India, especially when, in the wake of the 1962 conflict with China, the United States aided to rearm India. The Pakistani government looked beyond its membership to US-led military pacts for protecting the nation's integrity and developed relations with China, starting with the 1963 border agreement, much to the displeasure of Washington. It happened at the time when France was considering recognizing the People's Republic (it eventually occurred in January 1964).<sup>2</sup> Bringing Communist China centre-stage was a common concern to those obstreperous US allies. In fact, after the India-Pakistan war of 1965, when the proposal for a four-powers commission (bound to ensure the implementation of the September 20 UN resolution ending the conflict) was made, it was cold-shouldered by France for the reason that a commission excluding China would not make sense considering Beijing's role in the region as shown by the border

---

<sup>2</sup> Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wished that the French emissary, Edgar Faure, on an exploratory mission to Beijing in October 1963, had stopped in Karachi on its return journey (E. Faure stopped in New Delhi).

arrangements with Pakistan or by the ultimatum addressed to India during the recent war.<sup>3</sup>

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, then Foreign Minister, had met de Gaulle in July 1964 and on this occasion mentioned a number of convergences like the attitude vis-à-vis China and the willingness not to submit to a division of the world in American and Soviet spheres of influence. Bhutto recalled that Pakistan supported the French proposals regarding the escalating Vietnam war and also believed that their respective countries had common interests in the Middle East and in the Muslim world. A political cooperation within SEATO and in the UN would be beneficial since “a solidarity more or less strongly shown would lead the Americans to be less blinded by their own positions and to see others more objectively.”<sup>4</sup>

In October 1967, Ayub Khan paid a state visit in France (he already had the opportunity to meet de Gaulle twice on private visits, in September 1962 and November 1966). At the end of 1968, the French ministry of Foreign Affairs characterized the relations between the two countries as very good. “The policy of independence pursued by the French government and the evolution of its relations with the Muslim world contribute to generate the sympathy of the ruling circles towards our country of which the correct attitude on Kashmir is furthermore acknowledged”.<sup>5</sup> Reference was made to the widely appreciated arms embargo imposed on Israel on the eve of the six-day war of 1967 and to the French position regarding the Vietnam war. De Gaulle favoured a policy of neutrality for the Indochinese nations based on a negotiated peace, of which a necessary preliminary was to be the withdrawal of American troops. A similar evolution was found as far as Pakistan was concerned with a progressive disengagement from military blocs (SEATO and CENTO). Without renouncing to the alliance with the USA, Pakistan was for instance trying to build up good relations with the Soviet Union mirroring France’s rapprochement with Moscow (both heads of state conducted ground-breaking visits to the USSR, Ayub Khan in 1965, de Gaulle in 1966).

Disagreements were largely restricted to divergences on disarmament and on the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Yet, de Gaulle had himself its own reservations about the enforcement of the NPT, considering that it will only deter these countries which voluntarily

---

<sup>3</sup> Telegram of Roger Seydoux, French representative at the Security Council, 22 September 1965. *Nations Unies et Organisations Internationales (NUOI)*, S 50-2-A 14, vol. 743.

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum of a meeting between de Gaulle and Ali Bhutto, 24 July 1964. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, 27-23-4, vol. 1430.

<sup>5</sup> *Série Asie 1968-1971, sous-série Pakistan*, 27-23-4, vol. 1751.

renounce to have a nuclear military capability or those which do not have the technological ability. The French president's resignation in April 1969 was sincerely regretted by the Pakistani government. In fact Ayub Khan had rejoiced that de Gaulle's party won the elections which followed the May 1968 uprising.<sup>6</sup> Clearly the hope was that his successor would also champion the cause of small and middle powers countries in their quest for justice and independence.

Relating a conversation with Bhutto in January 1971, the French Ambassador to Pakistan quoted the then chairman of the Pakistan Peoples Party as saying that his country cannot get too close to the USSR, China, or the USA. Also close relations, by feelings and by necessity, would have to be pursued with France and possibly Germany.<sup>7</sup>

### **The Colonial Impediment**

The bilateral relations had not always been so encouraging. During the Fifties, French diplomats were hard pressed to convince local interlocutors to dilute their criticism on the colonial issue. When the new state of Pakistan dawned, France was confronting the Vietminh in Indochina. The French government was quite satisfied with the relative indifference displayed by its Pakistani counterpart. It was analysed as a result of the fact that no Islamic solidarity was at stake and that the communist orientation of the Vietminh was not to Karachi's liking. If the Pakistani government did not recognize the Associated States of Indochina *de jure*, it did not oppose their participation in the San Francisco conference (September 1951) and even supported their candidature to the UN in November 1952. A secret agreement was signed in August 1952 allowing French military planes en route to Saigon to fly over Pakistani territory and to refuel in Karachi. Regarding the French settlements in India, Pakistan's government saw a link with the Kashmir issue: as long as they continued to exist, it gave weight to those who argued that the process of unification in India was far for over and it had implications for the status of Kashmir. Besides, the insistence by the French government that a plebiscite – constitutionally required for any transfer of territories – was needed to decide the fate of those settlements had also obvious entailments.

---

<sup>6</sup> Craig Baxter (ed.), *Diaries of Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, 1966-1972*, Karachi: OUP, 2007, p. 238.

<sup>7</sup> Dispatches from the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Michel Legendre, to the MFA, *Direction Asie-Océanie et Direction des Affaires Economiques et Financières*, 31 December 1970 & 13 January 1971. *Série Asie 1968-1971, sous-série Pakistan, 27-23-4, Asie*, vol. 1751.

The French were on the other hand concerned about Pakistan coming strongly in favour of their Muslim brothers in North Africa, especially when in early 1952, Pakistan became a non permanent member of the Security Council. But the position of the Pakistani authorities regarding the situation in Morocco and Tunisia was on the whole considered moderate, apart from the occasional outbursts of Zafrullah Khan (Foreign Minister, 1947-1954) in the UN about France repressive stand and slow-moving attitude regarding the transfer of power to the nationalists.<sup>8</sup> With the mounting tensions in Algeria from the mid-fifties, it clearly became more and more difficult for the French diplomats to ward off criticism, especially coming from the members of the Afro-Asian group at the UN and locally from opposition parties and religious organisations. Yet, it was considered that as long as the Kashmir issue was on the UN Security Council agenda and France's support needed, the Pakistani government would restrain the public opinion outcry even if it will have to officially go along the Afro-Asian group and occasionally appease the mullahs. To influence the latter, the idea was put forward to discreetly send pro-French emissaries from the Algerian Muslim brotherhood.<sup>9</sup>

The feeling was also that the French could have one more card to play, it was the apparent hostility to communism. A victory for the rebellion in Algeria would play into the hands of the Communist bloc and the forerunner of communism in the Arab world was no one else than Nasser who was also involved with Nehru in promoting the despised non-aligned idea. "The support given [by Nasser] to the Algerian rebellion has made Pakistani leaders sit and think. They see a threat which might someday be directed on those who did not acknowledge the moral authority of the Colonel."<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, their sympathy for Habib Bourguiba, the Tunisian leader, was a positive factor since he could be one of the statesmen able to oppose the rise of Nasserism in the Muslim world. At that time, only a very small group of people seemed to matter in the foreign policy making process. It numbered only four persons: Sikander Ali Baig, the Foreign Secretary, M. Feroze Khan Noon, the Foreign Minister, H.S. Suhrawardy, the Prime Minister, and, last but not the least, the President,

---

<sup>8</sup> A senior Navy officer, Commodore Chaudhury, even proposed in the autumn of 1951 than a French warship, on its way to or from Indochina, called at Karachi. The opposition to this proposal came from the French Ambassador himself who was worried about the media reaction at this point of time considering the situation in North Africa and in the Middle East. Dispatch from the Ambassador of France, Pierre Augé, 19 December 1951. *Série Asie 1944-1955, sous-série Pakistan*, E 57 bis 6, vol. 38.

<sup>9</sup> Dispatch from the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Bernard Dufournier, to the MFA, 3 May 1957. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, E 27-23-4, vol. 1129.

<sup>10</sup> There was so little love lost on Nasser that Feroze Khan Noon and Iskander Mirza might have possibly regretted that the Anglo-French intervention in Suez had failed. Telegram from Bernard Dufournier, 11 September 1957. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, E 27-23-4, vol. 1130. If street protests occurred against the Anglo-French intervention, the Pakistan government's restrained attitude on the Suez operation was appreciated, especially compared to India's virulent criticism.

Iskander Mirza. Fortunately all of them were seen as a moderating force able to keep in check a public opinion forcefully in favour of the Algerian fight for independence.<sup>11</sup>

This moderation evaporated. The French Ambassador's restlessness over any signs of open support to the Algerian nationalists came to a head when in April 1959, Ayub Khan met Ferhat Abbas, the President of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic (PGAR). As Pakistan was taking a tougher stand on the Algerian issue, notably at the UN, Paris conveyed the message that it was unbecoming behaviour from a partner to a military alliance (SEATO) and, considering French support on Kashmir and to Pakistan's economic development, Karachi could be more considerate of Paris sensitivities. Again, according to the French Ambassador, there was definitely a link between the Algerian and Kashmir issues: "While defending in such a way the need for self-determination, the Pakistani government is probably thinking more about Kashmir than about Algeria. Self-determination, plebiscite, UN intervention in the settlement of a dispute, these terms could easily be transposed from Africa to Asia (...) While pleading with pungency the cause of the Algerian rebels, General Ayub Khan thinks first about the Muslims brothers in Srinagar who, for twelve years now, had been spending their time waiting for their 'liberation' ".<sup>12</sup>

The hardening of Pakistan's stance was also seen in connection with the necessity to act as a leader of the Muslim world. The Bizerte affair added fuel to the fire.<sup>13</sup> In August 1961, the Pakistani government officially recognized the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic under the pretext that France, with the start of Evian negotiations in May 1961, had itself recognized the representativeness of this organisation. In November 1961, a representative of the PGAR submitted its credentials to Ayub Khan whereas the Pakistani Government accredited its Ambassador in Cairo to the PGAR. Even India had not gone so far as recognizing the Algerian provisional government.

Zafrullah Khan, then Pakistan's permanent representative at the UN, presented to the General Assembly a draft in the name of the Afro-Asian group about the ongoing hunger strike conducted by jailed Algerian nationalists. The French government resented what appeared as an

---

<sup>11</sup> Dispatch of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Bernard Dufournier, to the MFA, 20 August 1957. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, E 27-23-4, vol. 1130.

<sup>12</sup> Telegram from Bernard Dufournier, to MFA, 15 December 1959. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, E 27-23-4, vol. 1131.

<sup>13</sup> After Tunisia gained its independence in 1956, the French kept a military base in Bizerte. When Bourguiba sent troops to recover the base in July 1961, the French army fought back and more than 1,000 Tunisians were killed. The French finally abandoned Bizerte in October 1963.



unfriendly step which did not match the commitments made under article 2 of Southeast Asia collective defence treaty.<sup>14</sup> Paris recalled its Ambassador for consultations and as the result it was not considered opportune to arrange a meeting with the President or the Prime minister when Bhutto visited France in December 1961. Bilateral relations were at their lowest ebb during the period under consideration. They again went upwards when, few months later, the crisis over Algeria's independence was settled with the Evian agreements signed in May 1962. The Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Manzur Qadir, welcomed this development as a victory for liberation forces and a lesson to learn for countries suppressing them as it was currently happening in Kashmir.<sup>15</sup>

In an epilogue to the colonial crisis, Ayub Khan sent on 20 April 1962, a letter to de Gaulle congratulating his management of the Algerian affair and the "supreme act of renunciation" involved. Consequently, he expected, for the Kashmir issue was again discussed at the United Nations in New York, that the strengthening of France's moral authority and political influence in international affairs would also benefit the demand for self-determination of the Kashmiris.<sup>16</sup>

### ***The Kashmir Imbrolio***

Kashmir being a major concern in the conduct of Pakistan's foreign policy, it necessarily carried weight on relations between France and Pakistan. The first French Ambassador was quite clear that the evolution of the Kashmir issue (*l'affaire*) would have "a profound influence, even being a decisive factor, on the orientation of Pakistan's foreign policy".<sup>17</sup> His successor even commented that "for Pakistan, the loss of this geographical heresy that East Bengal is, with populations so different from those inhabiting the Western part of the country, would perhaps be more easily acceptable than a permanent partition of Kashmir".<sup>18</sup> If the French

---

<sup>14</sup> It says : "In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and affective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability .

<sup>15</sup> Telegram of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Ghislain Clauzel, 20 March 1962. *Série Asie 1956-1967, sous-série Pakistan*, E 27-17-2, vol. 1134.

<sup>16</sup> *NUOI*, S 50-2-A 14, vol. 742. De Gaulle strongly objected to the word "renunciation" since self-determination had always been his policy as witnessed by the accession to independence of 14 sub-Saharan colonial territories.

<sup>17</sup> Telegram from the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Léon Marchal, 4 May 1948. *NUOI*, S 50-2-A 14, vol. 238.

<sup>18</sup> Telegram of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Pigeonneau, 31 March 1950. *NUOI*, S 50-2-A 14, vol. 239.

position was officially not to take sides, France was committed to support a plebiscite as the only way to resolve the issue. In this regard, in March 1951, France voted in favour of an Anglo-American resolution which was favourable to Pakistan. In a conversation with the Ambassador of France in August 1951, Claude Auchinleck, the former Commander-in-Chief of Indian forces prior to Independence, expressed the opinion that it was the responsibility of the countries whose concerns and interests really lie with the Muslim world – i.e. the United Kingdom and France – to jointly work for preventing a perilous situation from degenerating. This endeavour should play in favour of Pakistan. In exchange for this support, and as conveyed by Liaquat Ali Khan, the Pakistani government would have no hesitation in siding with the Western powers.<sup>19</sup> It could be a mere coincidence but, few days later, the US Department of State remarked that the French Foreign Office expressed a wish to associate itself with the USA and UK on the Kashmir 'dispute' after supporting the most recent Security Council resolution related to this issue. The Americans speculated that "it is possible that the basic motives for increased French interest are a wish to assert France's position as a great power and to enhance French prestige in Muslim countries by a display of friendly concern with the problem of Pakistan, the largest and most populous of Muslim states". Yet, stronger interaction with France on Kashmir was flatly rejected: "We believe it is undesirable to encourage the French to enter into the same relationship with us on Indo-Pakistan affairs as that we now have with the British. We question the usefulness of support for our policies and close association with us in actions to further our policies in India and Pakistan by France, which is generally considered by Asians as devoted to unprogressive colonialism. On the other hand, we wish to maintain French support in the UN for our policies in the Kashmir issue".<sup>20</sup>

Paradoxically, the French Ambassador in India, Count Stanislas Ostrorog, was not the last, after returning from Srinagar, to question India's attitude vis-à-vis Kashmir in terms which no doubt would have pleased the Pakistani leadership even if he had no kind words when it came to qualify the situation on the other side of the border:

Having called upon the UN when recourse to an international action was indispensable to denounce and stop the aggression, he [*Nehru*], once the danger gone and the Indian Army on the inside, was only interested in deferring any international solution leading to a plebiscite. There we are. Indians think that time is on

---

<sup>19</sup> Telegram of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Pierre Augé, 9 August 1951. *NUOI*, S 50-2A-14, vol. 238.

<sup>20</sup> Memorandum by William L.S. Williams of the Office of South Asian Affairs, 22 August 1951. Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1951, vol. VI, pp. 1820-1821.

their side. Some of the reasons on which their conviction is based upon are valid. Situation in Pakistan is getting worse. This country, where the only person exercising significant authority is struck down with paralysis and can hardly speak in human language, becomes the sick man of Asia (*reference to the Governor General, Ghulam Muhammad*). Everything seems in a shamble: the economy, the finance, the polity. The military assistance given by America cannot do much in this regard. Nehru is following this decay attentively, with the hope of gaining enough time for a solution in favour of India to become a *fait accompli*. He should nevertheless have neither illusion on the uncertainties of the future, nor believe that a population largely Muslim will readily accept the accession to India. On top of this religious argument, so powerful in Asia, comes the geographical factor (...) By its physical constitution, Kashmir belongs to the Northern region of Pakistan of which it is an extension. Srinagar, built on water as Venice, gain access to the outside world through the river flowing across the whole area southwest-wise onwards to Rawalpindi. It is the natural communication link between Kashmir and India. But the Jhelum flows into the Indus and Rawalpindi is not an Indian city.<sup>21</sup>

When the Kashmir issue was again raised by the Security Council in January and February 1957, France voted along with the UK and US on resolutions which in particular reiterated the need for a plebiscite in Kashmir. For the French Ambassador, a quick solution to the issue – and Nehru was holding much of the cards in this matter – was absolute necessity otherwise “both countries will continue to wear each other down in an arms race and will increasingly become – as a consequence of their lesser economic resilience - mere pawns in the hands of the two major military powers of our times”.<sup>22</sup>

In January 1962, Pakistan seized the opportunity, after the UN condemnation of the Indian invasion of Goa, to bring forward the Kashmir issue for consideration by the Security Council, expecting notably a reactivation of the Graham mediation. Personally informed of this demarche by Ayub Khan, de Gaulle did not object to it but he was himself very sceptical about the UN ability to act decisively. Temporally adjourned because of India’s general elections, the Kashmir issue was reintroduced in the United Nations in April. When in June a resolution urging resumption

---

<sup>21</sup> Dispatch from the Ambassador of France in India, Stanislas Ostrorog, to the MFA, 6 July 1955. *NUOI*, S 50-2-A-14, vol. 239.

<sup>22</sup> Dispatch from the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Bernard Dufournier, to the MFA, 6 April 1957. *NUOI*, S 50-2-A-14, vol. 237.

of direct negotiations was put to vote, France agreed to it but it was made clear by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the official policy was not to deliberately favour one side at the expense of the other in a debate “which concerns mainly the United Kingdom since it opposes two member countries of the Commonwealth”.<sup>23</sup>

Few months later the Sino-Indian war started. The Pakistani leadership wished that the ensuing military assistance given to India by the Western Powers, and to a very limited extent by France, should be used to apply pressure on New Delhi to solve the Kashmir issue. Direct negotiations between India and Pakistan had started but in the end failed to bring any positive result. France’s delicate balanced position was not always easy to sustain, ensuring both satisfaction and dissatisfaction from the two adversaries. When Kashmir was again taken up by the Security Council in 1964, the French representative, Roger Seydoux, mentioned in a speech, to the delight of the Indian delegation, that among others conditions, “legitimate interests of both countries” should be taken into account. It was inevitably interpreted by the Pakistani delegates as a compromise on the self-determination principle. But, few months later, Bhutto was pleased to hear the same French representative referring to a more potent involvement of the UN and its Secretary General in finding a solution to the issue and recalling also that past resolutions and UN principles remained applicable.

When the India-Pakistan war of September 1965 was brought to the United Nations, the French stance was rather sympathetic to the Pakistani viewpoint in the sense that it opposed sanctions and pointed out that a cease-fire should be followed by the conflicting parties opening a dialogue on Kashmir. Yet the will to maintain a non adversarial balance vis-à-vis Pakistan and India was reiterated. It was the case for instance when, at the end of the sixties, Pakistan raised the issue of the construction by India of the Farakka dam in West Bengal, close to the border with East Pakistan. This balancing act was also applied to military supplies with mixed results as Pakistan took a larger share.

## **The Military Component**

Arms sales featured prominently in bilateral relations and this topic was regularly addressed during visits of Pakistani dignitaries to France. Right from the start and as a result of the first Pakistan-India war, the military dimension of the relationship was significant. Requests for arms

---

<sup>23</sup> Telegram of the Director of Political Affairs, Charles Lucet, MFA, 30 April 1962. *NUOI*, S 50-2-A 14, vol. 742.

and ammunitions were soon made. A positive response was difficult. First, British officers were still serving on both sides. Second, there was a reticence at appearing partial even if Pakistan was arguing that it had been deprived of its due share of military assets after Partition. Third, there was the logistical importance of India for the reinforcement of French troops in Indochina. Ironically, support for the supply of arms to Pakistan came from the then French Ambassador in India whose reasoning was that it would be good if India “which tends to consider us as a second-rate power internationally and which is very conscious of our vulnerability vis-à-vis the situation in our Establishments, realise that we could also have the means to put pressure on her”.<sup>24</sup> With the ceasefire, the reluctance to supply arms to Pakistan faded.

It was felt that the arms connection would contribute to soften Pakistan’s position on the colonial issue. In return the French government admitted that Karachi’s tactful attitude made easier the sale of military equipment. This was also acknowledged by the Pakistani military establishment. A French military attaché informed Paris that Lieutenant-Colonel Mirza, the then Defence Secretary, told him that no particular importance should be given to what could come from Pakistan on the colonial issue: “all these vociferations that you hear are only the sound of the steam coming out of the safety valve ... We are happy with your arms deliveries and when they go too far, I tell them: Go easy otherwise it will compromise fresh supply of French arms.”<sup>25</sup>

There was of course the occasional complaint on the Pakistani side that French armament was too costly, and on the French side that there was tough and sometimes unfair competition coming from Britain, who did not want to lose a traditional client, and from the USA since the military alliance meant good bargain for Pakistan. Still orders remained significant and even raised the fear that part of it was in fact re-exported to Arab countries. The French decision not to impose an arms embargo (contrary to the USA and the UK) following the India-Pakistan war of September 1965 was valued. Requests started pouring for various ammunitions and for the sale of Mirage III fighters, Alouette helicopters, tanks, mortars, to compensate for the continuous military assistance given by the Soviet Union to India. In 1966, an agreement was signed for the sale of three Daphné submarines of which the first two were delivered at the end of 1970. These large purchases cast doubt on the creditworthiness of the

---

<sup>24</sup> Memorandum from the *direction Asie-Océanie*, MFA, 18 December 1948. *Série Asie 1944-1955, sous-série Pakistan*, E-57bis-6, vol. 38.

<sup>25</sup> Dispatch from the Military Attaché at the Embassy of France in Pakistan, le commandant Boussiquet, to the standing secretary at the Ministry of Defence, 12 March 1952, *Série Asie 1944-1955, sous-série Pakistan*, E-57 bis-6, vol. 38.

buyer. The latter indeed proposed a kind of tripartite arrangement under which the French would supply arms to Pakistan at a reasonable cost and in return Pakistan would assist French sales to Gulf countries.

## **Conclusion**

Looking in 1970 at what could be Pakistan two decades ahead, the Embassy of France in Pakistan predicted that “it is towards the Muslim countries that it [Pakistan] will turn to develop its presence and influence (...) This is ‘written’ in Pakistan’s destiny that it will try to assert itself, always more, as the ‘leader’ of the Muslim countries”. The need to secure some natural resources and to gain access for its large manpower and military expertise will be also a significant element in this quest. The consequence for France should be to “get used to define a policy vis-à-vis Pakistan, not only in relation to India, but in relation to the role that Pakistan intends to play in Islamic countries. In the policy vis-à-vis the Muslim world, at every step and increasingly, we will meet on our path a presence and an influence coming from the Indian world of Islam, that is a world which has remained unknown to us till now (...) Also it appears desirable to develop and deepen our presence in Pakistan, which remains up to now relatively superficial, in order that this country exerts an external influence consonant with our interests and our wishes”.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Dispatch from the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, Michel Legendre, to the MFA, 27 March 1970. *Série Asie 1968-1971, sous-série Pakistan, 27-23-4*, vol. 1751.

## **FOURTH SESSION: PAKISTAN-FRANCE RELATIONS: THE BILATERAL**

### ***DIMENSIONS***

---

#### **FRANCE AND PAKISTAN: PERCEPTIONS AND POLITICS IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT\*\***

*Dr. Jean-Luc Racine\**

---

After having paid attention to the relationship between the European Union and South Asia<sup>1</sup>, I would like to address here the more limited topic of the Franco-Pakistani bilateral relationship. True, the French policy regarding Pakistan cannot be evaluated in its entirety without paying consideration to the French contribution to the EU policy in Pakistan, and to the French involvement in multilateral frameworks, be they economic institutions such as the Paris Club, or strategic engagement with the NATO-led ISAF in Afghanistan. However, the bilateral approach deserves attention for at least two reasons. Firstly, because particularities are attached to the relationship between the two countries — the traditional importance of defence deals and perhaps also France's specific foreign policy towards the Middle East for instance —. Secondly, because choosing a more focussed scale of analysis may have its own value for understanding the processes at play today.

In fact, the present time is particularly interesting, for we observe simultaneously, on the global stage, two types of comments related to Pakistan. The first one addresses the "struggle against terror" which developed after 9/11. It takes note of Pakistan's engagement made clear by General Musharraf immediately after the attacks on New York and Washington. It takes note as well of the positive declarations emanating from the White House in this regard, but it questions also the efficiency of this engagement, particularly after recent developments in the FATA and in Afghanistan. Quite a few adverse press comments published in the US during the last visit of President Musharraf to Washington may illustrate

---

\*\* *The views expressed in this paper have been drawn from conversations and meetings with diverse academics and officials from France and from Pakistan, and from several years of bilateral meetings of various formats. They are however entirely mine — shortcomings included —, and do not convey any official position or perceptions.*

*Jean-Luc Racine is Senior CNRS Fellow at the Centre for South Asian Studies, School for Advanced Studies in Social Sciences, Paris. His research is focussed on India's dynamics of change, on Pakistan's regional policies and on the geopolitics of South Asia. His latest books, authored, edited or co-edited, deals with the issue of identity in South Asia, Kashmir (both in French, 2002) and Pakistan, Contours of State and Society (co-ed with Imran Ali & Soofia Mumtaz, Oxford University Press, Karachi, 2002).*

<sup>1</sup> See bibliography

this pattern. Some analyses published in the French medias are eventually on the same tune, if not always as vocal. The second type of comments on Pakistan heard in France is quite different, and more positive. Without forgetting the security parameters at play, nor the ambiguities of some Pakistani policies, these comments highlight Pakistan's potentialities, her economic opportunities, and the official dogma of "enlightened moderation".

These are the different points I would like to address here, with a clear focus on the most recent years and on the French perceptions and policies. The ups and downs of the bilateral relationship in 1998-2003 will be recalled first, at the light of the legacies of the past. The main fields of the new expanding co-operation, which materialized from 2004 onwards, will be then analyzed. They cover trade and business on the one hand, education and sciences on the other hand. The nature of the political and security dialogue now under way will finally come under scrutiny.

## **I. The Legacies of the Past and the Turn of the Century**

The present trend to revivify and enlarge France-Pakistan relationship is to be understood at the light of diverse legacies. The French Government has always considered Pakistan as a State deserving attention. It has also developed with Pakistan a policy of weapons procurement which had a major impact on the bilateral relationship. On the whole, between 1994 and 2003, Pakistan has been the third buyer of French defence equipment (for an aggregative figure of 2.1 billion €, far behind the United Arab Emirates (6.3) and Saudi Arabia (5.3), but clearly above Qatar (1.6), Russia (1.4) and a pack of five countries (the United States, Turkey, Greece, Spain and India) having purchased to France for 1 to 1,1 billion € in ten years.<sup>2</sup>

France has been for long an important partner, particularly for Pakistan's Air Force and Navy. In 1967, Pakistan bought its first Mirage fighters, a fleet greatly expanded during the Seventies, and further increased by second-hand Mirages in 1990. A contract was signed again with France in 1996, for 40 reconditioned aircrafts. In November 2005, an inventory listed 185 operational Mirage in the Pakistani Air Force: a figure seconds behind the 225 Chinese F-7, but far ahead the 32 American F16.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Délégation Générale de l'Armement : *Rapport au Parlement sur les exportations d'armement de la France en 2002 et 2003*, Paris, décembre 2004. See *Annexes* : annexe 12 : « Détail des livraisons depuis 1994 », pp. 104-106

<sup>3</sup> [www.pakistanidéfence.com/PakAirForce/PAF\\_Inventory.html](http://www.pakistanidéfence.com/PakAirForce/PAF_Inventory.html) : Pakistan Air Force inventory, as of November 2005. Accessed on 1st November 2006. A recent French Senate report mentions that French



Pakistan has bought as well, in the past, Alouette and Puma helicopters. The Navy has also an established connection with France, the best known recent deal being the three Agosta 90-B submarines contract signed in 1994 with a clause of technology transfer (the third submarine has been launched in April 2006). This long defence relationship has developed a spirit of trust and reciprocated knowledge, as many Pakistani officers have been trained in France. The durability of the relationship has been confirmed when Paris did not revise the running contracts after Pakistan conducted nuclear tests in May 1998.

From a geopolitical perspective, France's Foreign policy has been noted for decades for its special Gaullist flavour, which was not much altered under the long Presidency of socialist leader François Mitterrand (1981-1995). Certainly, French Presidents have visited India and not Pakistan, and Paris has never met the expectations of Islamabad regarding the U.N. resolutions on Kashmir. But the sustained Arab policy of Paris, its search for balance between Palestine and Israel, its noted relationship with Yasser Arafat — who died in a French military hospital — and the clear opposition of Paris to the war on Iraq in 2003 have not been lost in Muslim countries, so believe at least the successive French Governments.

This legacy suffered a setback however, by the turn of the century. In tune with the common assessment of global powers, Paris saw the Kargil episode as a dangerous Pakistani initiative, considering the new nuclearized regional context. On Kashmir, the official French policy has always been to encourage dialogue between India and Pakistan, without offering mediation in such an intricate issue. There was some impatience in Paris decision-makers circles when the Line of Control was crossed above Kargil in an obviously well prepared operation. A few months later, in October 1999, the fall of Nawaz Sharif and the Army take over were not in tune with what Paris preferred choices for elected governments. In some circles however, General Musharraf was up to a point given the benefit of doubt, due to the disappointing fact sheet offered by the civilian governments who had ruled Pakistan for eleven years.

The choice made by Islamabad to part with the Taliban after 9/11, and to support the coalition effort in Afghanistan was much appreciated, but soon after the attack on Indian Parliament, in December 2001, the spectre of limited war under the nuclear umbrella was unleashed again,

---

companies would eventually provide, if the French Government agrees, avionics to the new Chinese JF 17 expected for 2007 and 2008. Rapport du Sénat, n°316, 2005-2006 : *Le Pakistan, un équilibre difficile au cœur d'une région fragile*, p. 23

and highlighted furthermore the question of terrorism in South Asia. General Musharraf's address to the nation, on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2002, raised expectations, particularly his statement that "no organisations will be able to carry out terrorism on the pretext of Kashmir", and his call to the nation for becoming "an example for the Islamic world", and "a responsible and exemplary member of the international community". However, the final appreciation of the Chief Executive's policies would we drawn from facts, not from statements alone.

In this context, the killing in May 2002, by a suicide bomber, of 14 staff members of the French DCN company working on the Agosta submarine project in Karachi was, if not a turning point, a time to think afresh about where Pakistan, and the bilateral relationship, were going to. The French Defence Minister arrived soon in Karachi, and French investigators were at a time associated to the enquiry launched by Pakistan authorities on the attack, with not much result. The four Alliances Françaises were closed around the country, and the French Consulate in Karachi limited its activities. Most of the new contracts under negotiation were suspended. This could be interpreted as mere security measures, but the political dimension of such an attack, coming after other actions against Western diplomats in the country, and after the killing of US journalist Daniel Pearl<sup>4</sup>, abducted in Karachi in January 2002, could not be missed : how the Pakistan leadership would be able to change its course after having instrumentalized for years radical militancy for the sake of its foreign policy, be it through the Taliban in Afghanistan, or through Pakistani jihadis operating in Kashmir? What was at stake was the credibility of the regime new line against the jihadis and their mentors, across the Line of control or in Pakistan itself.

The year 2002 was therefore a time of evaluation and uncertainty. The French government did extend its support for multilateral aid offered to Pakistan at a time when the US were lifting sanctions imposed upon Islamabad as a retribution for her new anti-Taliban and anti Al-Qaeda policy, but serious concerns remained in Paris amongst Pakistan observers about the regime policies, on the regional chessboard as well as in the country, particularly after the 2002 elections ended with the

---

<sup>4</sup> In 2003, the publication of Bernard Henri Lévy's book in French (*Qui a tué Daniel Pearl?*, Grasset, Paris, 2003) and in English (*Who killed Daniel Pearl?*, Melville House Publishing, Hoboken, N.J., 2003), eroded further the image of Pakistan. Not because everyone took seriously all the allegations made by the author. The French press (and the US press as well) discussed the book, and eventually criticised not just the concept of mixing enquiry with novel writing, but more importantly the limitations of the enquiry itself. The sharpest reviews against the book have been published in *Le Monde diplomatique*, December 2003 issue, including the translation of William Dalrymple's review "Murder in Karachi" published in the *New York Review of Books* the same month. Nevertheless, the book contributed to raise uncomfortable questions about terrorist networks in Pakistan.

unexpected success of the Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA), both at the national Parliament and in the North-West Frontier Province, not to mention the Pakistan Muslim League-Q/MMA coalition government in Balochistan.

By 2003, the reappraisal of the French policy on Pakistan was in a way over. There was in Paris a clear recognition that the stakes were too high for downgrading the bilateral relationship. Five stakes were top listed: i)- the future of Pakistan herself, a nuclear State of 150 million population located in a very sensitive zone; ii)-the legacy of radical Islam unravelled in some of the madrassas in the NWFP and elsewhere; iii)- the issue of terrorism ; iv)- the intricacies of Pakistan policies in Afghanistan and in Kashmir, and v)- the suspicion about proliferation. All that made dialogue a must, in order to try to understand what was happening really, and to convey to Islamabad French expectations, which were much more in tune with the slogan of "enlightened moderation". President Musharraf paid a three-day visit to France in July 2003, as a part of a four-nation trip that took him also to the United States, Great Britain and Germany. Regional and global issues were discussed with President Chirac, as well as the struggle against terrorism. General Musharraf was said to have also pleaded for new weapons sales in order to help "ensuring conventional military balance between Pakistan and India"<sup>5</sup>.

Attempts on General Musharraf's life in December 2003 were seen as a matter of grave concern, but also as a testimony that the President's policy was seriously hurting a section of pro-jihad nexus connected to Al-Qaeda. The General's statements on Kashmir, marked by a new flexibility during the fall of 2003, and the formal opening of a composite dialogue with India, announced by the joint declaration made with Indian Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee on 6th January 2004, were received with satisfaction in Paris. Several high level visits confirmed the reactivation of the political dialogue with Pakistan : in December 2003 Prime Minister Zafar Khan Jamali was in Paris, in February 2004 Dominique de Villepin, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, made his second visit to Islamabad in two years. In September 2004, on the sidelines of the UNGA in New York, Michel Barnier, the new French Foreign Minister in Villepin's Government, confirmed his Pakistani counterpart that the French supported fully the dialogue now engaged with India. The visit of French Foreign minister Douste-Blazy in November 2005 had a different meaning: after the tragic earthquake which had affected so much Pakistan on October 8<sup>th</sup>, attending the international conference for reconstruction was a testimony to

---

<sup>5</sup> Report by Salim Bokhari from Paris, *The News*, 3 July 2003

solidarity, and as a French engagement to carry on long term aid after emergency operations.

In December 2004 President Musharraf was again in Paris, for meeting President Chirac. The agenda of talks was broad as usual, with a greater willingness to engage Pakistan from the French side. Paris was eager to deepen and diversify the bilateral relationship. A field of special attention was now the economic opportunities offered by Pakistan.

## **II. The Expanding Fields of Cooperation: Trade and Higher Education**

During his visit to Paris in 2003, General Musharraf had requested the French Government to help Pakistan to get special provisions from the European Union for exporting there textiles, an important item on the balance of trade. Ultimately, the concessions were granted. On the bilateral front, the year 2004 confirmed the French Government willingness to redefine its business policy in Pakistan, which materialised significantly in 2005.

### *Trade, Business and Investment*

In the late Eighties, Pakistani-French trade was modest, but growing. It reached US.\$ 500 million in 1990, then jumped between 700 to 800 million in the early Nineties, with a peak at 829 million in 1994. From 1995 onward, however, the total trade balance went down between 600 and 700 million (even below 600 in 1997 and 1998). In 2003, there was a quantum jump in Pakistani exports, which crossed the US.\$ 400 million line for the first time, but the total balance remained below 700 million. The real turn came in 2004 : exports from Pakistan crossed 500 million US\$, while the total balance raised to 838 million. In 2005, the increase of French exports pushed up the total trade volume above 1 billion US\$ for the first time. Pakistan, which traditionally enjoys a trade surplus with France, exports mostly textiles. In 2005, textiles in various forms, from cotton fabrics to garments, clothing and carpets accounted for around 60% of total exports, a figure raising to 80% if leather and leather products are added. The other way around, France exports mostly industrial equipment (47%), intermediate goods (23%), and consumer goods (22%).

The revival of Pakistan economy has not been missed by French organisations working for expanding business abroad, be they professional associations or government facilitators. In September 2004, the French

Embassy in Islamabad signed a cooperation agreement with the Pakistan France Business Alliance — a body established in Pakistan in 1991-in order to help "reinvigorating the relations between the private sectors of the two countries", not without making an appreciative statement about Pakistan's policy :

"France highly appreciates the commitment of President Musharraf in promoting a moderate and enlightened Islam, in fighting extremism and terrorism, in promoting democracy, peace and stability in the region and good relations with its neighbours India and Afghanistan. France is following with particular interest the process of détente between India and Pakistan. The series of confidence building measures taken by the two neighbours are liable to boost their mutual relations (...). Pakistan possesses now the internal stability required by the foreign investors. The proof of this is that the direct foreign investment crossed the one billion dollar mark last year." <sup>6</sup>

In April 2005, a thirty-member delegation from the French Business Confederation, the MEDEF, came to Pakistan for a fact-finding mission. Representatives from key business houses were there, working in fields as diverse as telecoms, power, public works, water treatment, pharmaceuticals, etc... While welcoming them, the French Ambassador recalled what had been the ups and downs in economic bilateral cooperation, before giving finally emphasis to the new political and economic climate offering fresh opportunities:

"During the mid-90's, the French governments have been offering very high values of soft loans, contributing directly to infrastructures development in hydroelectricity and electrical equipments, hospital equipment, rural telecommunication, and civil aviation, and helping the French companies to enter this market for the first time. During the past 30 years the French treasury has financed protocol worth more one million \$, being one of the three major lenders of Pakistan. However, as everybody knows, due to some very unfortunate events, the French had to withdraw from Pakistan during the late 90's and the early 2000's; the French Overseas Development Assistance and the guarantees of the French export credit agency COFACE were suspended; the French exports to Pakistan were cut down by two, almost every head from the Pakistan-France joint-ventures left the country. But in less than three years, the global picture has changed a lot and confidence has come back outside

---

<sup>6</sup> see : [http://www.ambafra-pk.org/article-imprim.php3?id\\_article=418](http://www.ambafra-pk.org/article-imprim.php3?id_article=418)

and inside Pakistan. France has demonstrated her commitment on numerous occasions, particularly the debt rescheduling benefiting Pakistan. In 2004, our exports to Pakistan increased by 42%, as a result of a heavy local demand for industrial equipments. And now COFACE is back (...). A "New Pakistan" is emerging. Tremendous efforts have been achieved by Pakistan in order to get such a result: discipline in policy making and restoration of the macro-economy within a context of permanent reforms; confidence in the micro-economy moves (...). You are right to have decided to come on this occasion to evaluate this market, the second in South Asia and one of the most promising in the whole of Asia." <sup>7</sup>

Soon after, a Pakistan Committee was established inside the MEDEF. In June 2006 another initiative was organised in Paris this time by UBIFRANCE and the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Industries, in order to assess Pakistan's opportunities "beyond the clichés".<sup>8</sup> The Economic Mission of the French Embassy in Islamabad prepared a very detailed file about the macroeconomics of Pakistan, the increase of Foreign Direct Investments in the country, and the identification of "promising markets": information technology was ranked first, followed by energy, public works, agro-industries, global retail stores, consumer goods, water and environment, textile machinery. More than forty companies, including majors, were listed as either already present in Pakistan, or considering investment there.<sup>9</sup> Three weeks before, UBIFRANCE's weekly had published a piece titled: "Quasi-Chinese Growth in Pakistan", referring to the 84% rise of the GDP in 2005. The introduction of the paper ran that way: "Despite its reputation as a dangerous country, Pakistan offers real business opportunities, mostly tapped by US and British investors. A solid growth and deep reforms made the country a promising market." <sup>10</sup>

Things are therefore moving, and large French companies settled in Pakistan for years (such as Alcatel in telecoms, Alstom in electrical equipment, Sanofi-Aventis in pharmaceuticals, Rhodia in chemicals or Total in petrol servicing) have been joined recently or will be joined soon by other global corporations such as the Carrefour stores, the Accor hotel group, and perhaps the car making company Renault and banker

---

<sup>7</sup> Speech by Ambassador Charasse to the MEDEF delegation, 13 April 2005, Islamabad.

[http://www.ambafra-pk.org/article-imprim.php3?id\\_article=440P](http://www.ambafra-pk.org/article-imprim.php3?id_article=440P)

<sup>8</sup> UBIFRANCE et Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris : *Pakistan et Afghanistan : au-delà des clichés*. Dossier séminaire. 7 juin 2006. UBIFRANCE is the name of the French Agency for the International Development of Enterprises. The Agency is a subsidiary of the French Ministry of External Trade.

<sup>9</sup> Jean-Philippe Quercy : *Pakistan. Les perspectives pour les entreprises françaises*. Trade Commission. French Embassy, Islamabad. June 2006

<sup>10</sup> Sophie Creusillet : "Croissance quasi chinoise au Pakistan. Intérêt des investisseurs redoublé". *Le Moniteur du Commerce Extérieur* n°1754, 11 mai 2006, p. 18 (my translation).

BNPParibas. In the meantime, Pakistan's willingness to develop infrastructures attracts the attention of French leaders in this sector. However, the Franco-Pakistani economic connection remains limited. As a buyer of Pakistani products, France comes behind Great Britain and Germany but ahead of Japan: it stands in a category which includes China (Hong Kong excluded) and Saudi Arabia. As a seller of goods to Pakistan, France accounts for much less, albeit its exports are quickly progressing (+42% in 2004; +45% in 2005). Pakistan accounts now for 16.5% of French exports to South Asia. But the market share of French companies, around 1% of Pakistan's imports in 2005, remains behind the West Europe average of 1.8%. Similarly, France's share of FDI in Pakistan remains small, with just 2 million US\$ in 2005 (financial operations excluded) and US \$ 81.5 million accumulated on 1.1. 2006: just 0.8% of the total FDI in Pakistan.<sup>11</sup> To sum up, if the absolute figures are still modest, a new climate is now emerging. Both the Governments and the private sector have put in place instruments for a stronger relationship, and growth is promising. The decision taken in March 2005 by the French Government to apply to Pakistan what is called the "Emerging Countries Reserve Procedure" is only an additional testimony to a political willingness to interact more with Pakistan, on the economic front. This is true as well as in the field of cooperation related to culture, education, science and technology.

### *The New Focus on Higher Education*

For observers and decision makers, in France as elsewhere, a central element of the process of reform in Pakistan is education. Education, as well as local governance, is one of the fields privileged by the European Union cooperation programmes with Pakistan, to which France contributes. On the bilateral agenda, however, Paris appreciates the new emphasis given by Pakistan authorities to Universities, science and technology, and has chosen to focus its contribution to higher education. The scope of action is however much wider.

For long, France has set up a network of Alliances Françaises in the main cities of Pakistan : Islamabad, Karachi, Lahore and Peshawar. Closed in 2002 after the terrorist attack on French engineers in Karachi, the Alliances have reopened in 2003. Beyond the Alliances, cooperation is extended to Pakistani schools and universities where French language is

---

<sup>11</sup> Ambassade de France au Pakistan. Mission Economique d'Islamabad. *Fiches de synthèse*: "Les échanges commerciaux France-Pakistan en 2005" (2 mars 2006) et "Les investissements étrangers directs au Pakistan" (3 mars 2006).

taught. Archaeology is also a field of well established — thirty-year old — cooperation. After incidents in Balutchistan a few years ago, the site of Turbat on the Makran coast, remains investigated.

On issues of governance, two fields are privileged. The first one, through police cooperation, addresses sensitive issues such as terrorism, drugs and illegal immigration. The second one seeks to contribute to the process of administrative reform in Pakistan: a few Pakistan high civil servants join each year the French top Ecole Nationale d'Administration, and Paris is eager to contribute, amongst others, to the National School of Public Policy Islamabad is planning to establish.

For the future, emphasis is however given to higher education and research. The flagship initiative in this regard is the decision, taken in April 2006, to establish in Karachi by the end of 2007 a University of Technology, with the strong support of a consortium of French universities and Engineering schools, led by Troyes University of Technology. The French partners will play an active role in co-defining the curriculum, teaching, and settling research laboratories. This is to be understood in the larger framework of growing cooperation in higher education and research, which include attracting Pakistani students (almost 250 of them are studying in French universities in 2006), promoting scientific cooperation in various fields: engineering sciences, geology, and biotechnology. Cooperation in medical sciences and social sciences has started as well. A new generation of French scholars specialised on Pakistan is emerging. The seminar circuit favouring the dialogue on security issues and global perceptions is now well established, either bilaterally or in a triangular set up, between Pakistan, France and Germany. It involved mostly academics and experts attached to governments think tanks. Besides the benefits of cooperation in sciences and technology, this regular dialogue on mutual perceptions of bilateral, regional and global issues wishes to contribute to a better understanding. This is an element to pay attention to, when developments in and around Pakistan have attracted attention — and concern — for years.

### **III. Perceptions, Security and the Political Dialogue**

At a time of expanded global information systems, political perceptions are not the preserve of political parties, legislators and governments. They have never been a monopoly in fact<sup>12</sup>, but it is always

---

<sup>12</sup> Remember the past: the secession of Bangladesh in 1971 has been largely commented upon in France, and has gained sympathy. Eight years later, in a totally different context, private initiatives from France



difficult to assess the impact of non-government structures on government perceptions and government policies. Views disseminated in the medias contribute to building a country image, be it correct or biased. But it would be too easy to simply put the blame on one side or the other. It is important to note that beyond stereotypes, much of the concerns expressed from abroad about Pakistan reverberate debates which are conducted within Pakistan herself, in the press, in Parliament, and in publications and websites of diverse organisations.

On the whole, mainstream views of Pakistan in France are not very positive, for reasons which are basically political — and geopolitical. It would be erroneous to label these views as simply resulting from an anti-Islam ideology. One should remember the packed halls when Nusrat Fateh Ali Khan was on tour in Paris, or note the unabated success of present day qawali singers to put the point in the right perspective. On the other hand, the protests, in Pakistan and elsewhere, against of the so-called "French headscarf law", miss the intricacy of the case if they simply resent it as mere attack on Muslim identity.<sup>13</sup> If opponents to Islam exist, and eventually express themselves (and are being criticised for their views as well), the real stake is more related to radical Islam, to the kind of extremism regularly denounced by General Musharraf, since his very first address to the Nation, on October 17, 1999. In comments reiterated along the years, the Head of State has emphasized the need for moderation, as the tool for the emergence of "a progressive Islamic State" and, secondarily, for rebuilding Pakistan's international image, "tarnished" by religious extremists."<sup>14</sup> It is no surprise that such issues are commented upon abroad as well.

Seen from abroad, the matters of concern can be listed in four items. I shall mention them first, before commenting upon the way they are part of the Franco-Pakistani political and security dialogue.

---

called for mercy for Zulfikar Ali Bhutto before his execution. In October 1975 Bhutto had made an official visit in Paris at the invitation of Jacques Chirac, then Prime Minister. The joint statement issued at the end of the visit praised the "climate of trust and friendship" and the "spirit of cooperation and understanding" between the two countries. See French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, document 28571/30426, dated 22.10.1975

<sup>13</sup> The French "headscarf law" passed in 2004 should be interpreted in the specific context of the French tradition of secular government primary and secondary schools —a century old legacy of the struggle between the Republic and the Church. The law is not applicable to Universities. Interestingly, it was strongly debated in France itself, across established lines of political divides. Those who opposed the law pleaded for the right to express oneself in a multicultural context. Those who supported it said that the headscarf was not something inscribed in the immigrant Muslim tradition, but a new practice often imposed by the male members of the family and by new radical ideologies. As a matter of principle, they argued also that schools have to remain a neutral space, and that the Republic is based upon individual citizenship, not separated communities. The most vocal critics of the French law, in Pakistan and elsewhere, labelled it as anti-Islam, but usually failed to comment upon the laws in practice on this point in Turkey (where they are much more severe than the French new legislation) or to recall the anti-veil policy of Habib Bourguiba, the founding father of independent Tunisia.

<sup>14</sup> Quotes from General Musharraf's address to the Nation, on 12 January 2002, page 2.

- The regional instability, due largely (but not only) to the geopolitical choices which have guided for years Pakistan's regional policy, be it in Afghanistan or in Kashmir.<sup>15</sup> The future of Pakistan-India relationship, the successes or the challenges of the composite dialogue engaged with New Delhi are one of the points of this agenda, besides the renewed tensions in Afghanistan.
- The challenge of terrorism and radical militancy. The issue is intricate, for it includes four dimensions : (i) the rebirth, under other names, of the Lashkar e Taiba and Jaish e Mohammad organisations, banned in 2002 but not dismantled, and their programme of action in Kashmir and beyond; (ii) the emergence of a nexus between the most extremist Pakistani organisations and Al-Qaeda targeting the regime and its policy of reform; (iii) the revival of the Taliban in Afghanistan, and the rise of "Pakistani Taliban" in Waziristan — a point which raises the sensitive issue of the level of efficiency of the operations conducted by the Army in the FATA, a matter discussed between Pakistan and Afghanistan leaders, but also discussed with Washington; (iv) the internationalisation of radical networks, with Pakistan appearing as a route for young Westerners, including some Frenchmen, appealed by the call for jihad.<sup>16</sup>
- The nuclear proliferation conducted by A.Q. Khan's network, and its international ramifications, a point revived by the North Korean nuclear test conducted on 9 October 2006
- The future of Pakistan. Here again, the issue is intricate. If we leave aside the gloomy hypotheses of national collapse, which do not have much credibility amongst observers of Pakistan, three points are questioned : (i) where is the regime heading in term of democracy, and what will happen in the 2007 elections? (ii) what is the future of radical Islam in Pakistan, a large issue which raises many more pointed questions: could the "talibanisation" of Waziristan expand beyond the FATA ? How sharpened sectarian conflicts may affect the warp and weft threads of the nation? How will evolved the

---

<sup>15</sup> Subtitles of books and reports on Pakistan offer examples of this concern : see C. Jaffrelot (ed) : *Pakistan. Au cœur des tensions régionales*, 1999, updated 2002, or the French Senate report : *Le Pakistan: un équilibre difficile au cœur d'une région instable*, 2006.

<sup>16</sup> In July 2006 six young Frenchmen released from Guantanamo have faced a French court, on suspicion of having been part of "an association preparing terrorist action" : most of them had followed in 2001 a well established route, to Finsbury Park in London first, then to Pakistan, then to Afghanistan. The few French young Muslims (eventually converted) tempted by jihad go nowadays to Iraq, where some of them have been killed in Bagdad and Falujah. Some others have been arrested in Syria before entering Iraq.

"mullah-military alliance"?; (iii) will the move to "enlightened moderation" be successful, and is the Army its most effective proponent ?

In this context, how to define the current Franco-Pakistani dialogue on politics and security?

The dialogue is pretty regular, and might become more structured in the future. It is not a full-fledged strategic dialogue, but opportunities to discuss regional and global issues, as well as bilateral relations, are offered. Besides the visits of General Musharraf to France, exchanges of views are usually conducted through ministerial visits, and at the level of top civil servants. Parliamentary missions must also be noted. In 2006, a Parliamentary mission from Pakistan came for presenting its views on Kashmir (they were surprisingly less innovative than those of General Musharraf). Both the French Senate and the French National Assembly have sent as well in 2006 a delegation to Pakistan, in order to assess the overall situation in the country. On the whole, a few issues top the agenda.

The first one deals with the ways to tackle extremism and terrorism. The French authorities believe, as does the Pakistan Government, that the struggle against terror cannot be confined to military and police operations, and that structural changes would be needed on many accounts, be it general issues such as access to resources for the poor, reforms to be implemented at all scales, from local to global, or specific problems which remain to be solved, such as the Israel-Palestine crisis. For Paris, the dialogue with the Muslim world is decisive for a better mutual understanding, far from the belief in a "clash of civilisations". As far as Pakistan is concerned, the French would be happy if "enlightened moderation" could be implemented in Pakistan, but the road to it seems a hazardous one. To many observers, Islamabad policy appears ambiguous on many accounts, while for others, the Government of General Musharraf and the Pakistan Army are doing their best, in difficult circumstances.

Since 2002, Paris has certainly taken note of the successes of Pakistan's operations against Al-Qaeda top operatives, from Abu Zubeida in 2002 and Khalid Sheikh Mohammad in 2003 to Abu Farral al Libbi in 2005, to name only a few high ranking names. French Government officials have never publicly commented upon the failure to track Osama bin Laden, Ayman al Zawahiri (and Mollah Omar for the Taliban), but the poor results of the heavy operations engaged in Waziristan by the Pakistan Army raise concern on their own, in the context of the revival of Taliban forces in Afghanistan. The official Pakistani positions on these issues are

well known, and they have been reiterated by Foreign Minister Mahmood Kasuri during his visit to France in July 2006. Celebrating a "close relationship of friendship and confidence" between the two countries, the French Foreign Minister made however the following statement at the end of the visit:

"This proximity allows us today to talk frankly about our respective concerns: the fight against terrorism – Pakistan has made a courageous choice –; non-proliferation – Pakistan has special responsibilities here; Pakistan's contribution to stability in Southern Asia, with a Pakistan who must go on positively using her influence in order to contribute, alongside her partners, including the European Union, to the emergence of an Afghanistan where peace has been restored and who is making further headway towards her goal of security and prosperity."<sup>17</sup>

This is to say, in diplomatic language, that France is expecting more on these three points, particularly on non-proliferation (an issue revived in 2006 due to Iran and North Korea, two countries having benefited from the A.Q. Khan network) and on the stability of Afghanistan, where France has both special forces engaged in what has been labelled "Operation Enduring Freedom" in 2001, and troops serving the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force, now deployed in the whole country. In July 2006, while visiting Kabul three weeks after Mahmood Kasuri had come to Paris, the French Defence Minister Michèle Alliot Marie made the third point clear, when speaking about Taliban crossing over the border from Pakistan, if Associated Press is to be trusted: "We need real cooperation from Pakistan, but it seems very difficult for them. The border is a very difficult region and we ask Pakistan to make some more effort to control it".<sup>18</sup> If the French pay less attention to Kashmir as such than to Afghanistan —except as a point of tension between India and Pakistan, and thus as an important challenge to regional stability — the resilience of jihadi groups remains a matter of concern as well. The judgments passed on the credibility of official statements vary, from those who believe here again that Pakistan authorities are doing their best, to those who think that the political willingness to confront more resolutely the Lashkar-e-Taiba or the neo-Taliban and the forces who support them is lacking, not by ideological choice, but for geopolitical reasons and/or political calculations.

---

<sup>17</sup> Press briefing by Philippe Douste Blazy, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, 4th July 2006.

[http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/country-files\\_156/pakistan\\_504/visit-of-foreign-minister-khurshid-kasuri-4-6.07.06\\_5105.html](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/country-files_156/pakistan_504/visit-of-foreign-minister-khurshid-kasuri-4-6.07.06_5105.html)

<sup>18</sup> "French Defense Minister visits Afghanistan, urges Pakistan to stop Taliban infiltration" Associated Press, Kabul, 30 July 2006

On nuclear issues, two topics deserve attention. The first one, as noted above, is related to the history of proliferation. For most observers, it was hard to believe that the nuclear proliferation from Pakistan could have been conducted by a team of individuals led by A.Q. Khan, without the knowledge of the military. The point today for Paris, as for other capitals, appears to be less focussed on the past — without forgetting it — than to exchange views with Pakistan for promoting more secure controls on nuclear-related items, and on conventional weapons as well. The second issue is related to civil nuclear energy, and more precisely to the US-India deal technically finalised during George W. Bush's his visit to India in March 2006, but still pending in the US Congress at the time of writing, before being eventually submitted to the deliberations of the Nuclear Suppliers Group. The French view on that matter — a clear approval of the deal — is different from Pakistan's position. Islamabad would have appreciated more nuanced comments from Paris, and advances its own point of view: such a deal should not be made India specific, as any exception would weaken the Non Proliferation Treaty (which Islamabad, in fact, has not signed). If changes should occur, suggests Pakistan, they should affect the international regime as such, on criteria applied to all. In other words, Pakistan contests the validity of the criteria advanced by Washington (and supported by Paris and London), which emphasises the democratic factor and a history of non-proliferation in favour of India.

More generally, faced by India's growing status, her increased resources and hence her expanded defence budgets, Islamabad calls for having access to more updated weapons "to foster stability and peace in the region", say official statements. The French answer to this request is still carefully considered. The trend would rather be to suggest to Pakistan, whose concern for security is seen naturally as legitimate, that the constant comparison with India is not always operational. The French don't talk about a willingness to "de-hyphenate India and Pakistan" in term of foreign policy or weapons procurement the way the US administration uses this concept, but they believe that the expanded cooperation with Pakistan has to be assessed on its own merit, without under-evaluating in the process the logic of a regional approach in an area marked for long by a legacy of tensions and conflicts, and by diverse trans-border networks.

## **Conclusion**

When a leading French strategic think tank organised a workshop on "Where is Pakistan going to?", in 2005, issues related to security came

unavoidably to the forefront.<sup>19</sup> However, beyond Kashmir and the Pakistan-India relationship, beyond the Afghan uncertainty, beyond the jihad proponents, beyond nuclear issues, the way the future of Pakistan will be shaped will ultimately depend upon the internal transformations under way or still expected. In a long interview to a French academic journal, General Musharraf, in 2005, gave emphasis to this dynamics of change, on many fronts : the society and education, the relation to extremism, the pattern of institutional reforms and the transition to democratic governance, and of course the economy. On a number of these points — the first ones particularly — many doubts remain, in Pakistan and abroad. But what is at stake is clear to all. To quote General Musharraf: "to create a modern and powerful Pakistan" (...) whose importance will depend upon the capacity to appear as a "pole of stability, moderation and prosperity".<sup>20</sup> The success is not guaranteed, and the way — even the willingness — to move in is strongly debated in Pakistan herself. Seen from Paris, however, and the latest Senate report underlines it, beyond "a chaotic history" and matters of concern, particularly radical ideologies, "many potentialities appear", and the West should "if possible comfort them."<sup>21</sup> This seems to be a pretty adequate definition of what the French relationship to Pakistan stands for today : not denying the concerns, but decided to comfort the potentialities on all fronts, with a specific emphasis presently given, as we have seen, to trade and investment, higher education and political and security dialogue.

## References

1. Joint Press Conference by Foreign Ministers Mahmoud Kasuri and Philippe Douste-Blazy, Paris, 4 July 2006.
2. Le Pakistan à la table des grands. Interview of President Musharraf *Politique internationale*, n°119, automne 2005 (see: [www.politiqueinternationale.com](http://www.politiqueinternationale.com)).

---

<sup>19</sup> Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, Paris : *Où va le Pakistan?* 16 November 2005

<sup>20</sup> "Le Pakistan à la table des grands". Entretien avec le Président Musharraf, conduit par Alexis Debat. *Politique internationale*, n°109, Automne 2005

<sup>21</sup> French Senate report n° 316, 2005-2006, op. cit., p.5

3. Ahmad, Anees-uddin (Ambassador) : "Discours lors de l'inauguration du séminaire UBIFRANCE", Embassy of Pakistan, Paris, 7 June 2006.
4. Blom Amélie & Jaffrelot, Christophe (ed) : *Le Pakistan, carrefour de tensions régionales*, Editions Complexe, second edition, Bruxelles, 2002.
5. Délégation Générale de l'Armement : *Rapport au Parlement sur les exportations d'armement de la France en 2002 et 2003*, Paris, décembre 2004.
6. Jaffrelot, Christophe (ed) : *A History of Pakistan and its origins*, Anthem Press, London, 2002.
7. Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique : Seminar "Où va le Pakistan?", 16 November 2005, Paris. Full report available on [www.frstrategie.org/barreFRS/publications\\_colloques/index.php?annee1=2005#3](http://www.frstrategie.org/barreFRS/publications_colloques/index.php?annee1=2005#3)
8. François-Poncet, J. et al. *Le Pakistan. Un équilibre difficile au cœur d'une région instable*. Rapport du Sénat. Commission des Affaires étrangères et de la Défense, n° 316, 2005-2006.
9. Guillard, Olivier: *Le Pakistan de Musharraf, enfin respectable?* Lignes de repères, Paris, 2005.
10. Quercy, J.-P. : *Pakistan. Les perspectives pour les entreprises françaises*. Mission Economique. Ambassade de France à Islamabad, June 2006.
11. Racine, Jean-Luc : "European Union and South Asia : an Appraisal", in Jamshed Ayaz Khan (ed) : *Major Powers and South Asia*, Institute of Regional Studies, Islamabad, 2004, pp. 131-162.
12. Racine, Jean-Luc : "Europe and South Asia", *South Asian Journal*, Lahore, n°3, 2004.
13. Racine, Jean-Luc : "The case of Pakistan. A Strategy for Europe", in Ivo Daalder, Nicole Gnesotto & Philip Gordon : *Crescent of Crisis. U.S.-European Strategy for the Greater Middle East*, Brookings Institution and the EU Institute for Security Studies, Washington DC, 2006.

14. UBIFRANCE & Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris : seminar on *Pakistan et Afghanistan. Au-delà des clichés*. Seminar file, 7 June 2006.



**FOURTH SESSION: PAKISTAN-FRANCE RELATIONS: THE  
BILATERAL  
DIMENSIONS**

---

**FRANCE AND EUROPE AS SEEN BY PAKISTAN**

*Ms. Fauzia Nasreen\**

---

My brief discourse on the bilateral dimension of Pakistan's relations with France is in the framework of France and Europe in the perspective of Pakistan. Even a cursory analysis of this theme will have to be seen in the backdrop of France's projection in global politics, its standing in Europe, policy objectives in the European Union and transatlantic context, France's role in the developing countries, response to regional and global challenges as well as French aspirations and ideals. Naturally the domestic compulsions; would underpin the aforementioned features. I understands that these have either been covered or will be, covered by other speakers.

Before I delve into the specifics of the relationship let me draw your attention to some of important aspects of the changed contemporary world that impact both Pakistan and France and bilateral ties between the two countries.

First, in the globalized world of today, it may be borne in mind that the linkages go much beyond the traditional spheres of bilateral activity into the realm of non tangible and invisible factors. The impact of such non-identifiable and non-recognizable elements sometimes causes disruption in the normal state to state activity and at times plunges the relationship into a state of uncertainty. However, this was not true in the case of smooth collaboration between Pakistan and France in the aftermath of the tragic terrorist attack on the French technicians in May 2002. Comprehension about the tactics of the detractors strengthened the resolve o the two countries. I am sure you will agree with me that normalcy in day to day activity and business as usual is crucial in fight against terror. I view the statement of the then French Foreign Minister that, "If certain people had hoped to strain links between France and Pakistan, they were mistaken" in this light.

---

\* Ms. Fauzia Nasreen is Director General, Foreign Services Academy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Islamabad.

Second, France a country that has traditionally been an active player in diplomacy and international relations has generally taken an independent position in global affairs. It is sympathetic to the Muslim world and its active engagement in the Middle East on such issues as Palestine and Lebanese-Israeli conflict has enjoyed appreciation among the Muslim and in particular the Arab world. French have not hesitated from questioning Israeli policies and have at times expressed reservation on US approach to the problems in the region. Ostensibly apart from economic considerations the French policy is driven by historical connections especially with the Francophone Muslim countries and their desire to remain relevant in their traditional sphere of influence.

Third, paradoxically the French handling of the large Muslim immigrant community and the vagaries of security paradigms have introduced a fresh element in France's relations with some of the Middle Eastern countries. The largest Muslim community of around six million in the French secular society seems to have become a source of discomfort and concern. Let me clarify that there are only 50 to 60 thousand Pakistanis living in France and most of them are well integrated in the French society.

Nevertheless the issue of integration is compounded by the demands of the secular disposition of the system and the French desire to have a semblance of uniform national values and identity. Aggravated by the threat of terrorist attacks in other parts of Europe, French fears have been manifested in both containment and engagement. Among some of the French foreign policy priorities issues of counter terrorism measures, immigration, non-proliferation and development assistance to promote stability would have relevance for Pakistan. Viewed in this backdrop, France seems to be aware of Pakistan's geo-strategic importance and the major role that Islamabad can play in the areas of concern, such as, nuclear non-proliferation, terrorism, curbing the spread of extremism, global and regional security and stability including Afghanistan.

For Pakistan, France has been an important partner in Europe and the two countries have enjoyed multifaceted ties. These relations are characterized by shared perceptions on major global and regional issues especially those of peace and security as well as regular exchange of visits. More importantly France with its outlook that is less dependent on trans-Atlantic concerns has been fairly supportive of Pakistan in phases of estrangement in Pakistan's relations with the West. Bilateral cooperation in the security and defence spheres has been an important facet of Pakistan-France relations. France is also one of Pakistan's major economic partners

in Europe, an active member of the Paris Club, and has also been a member of the Pakistan Development Forum, which was formally Aid-to-Pakistan Consortium, since 1961. Over the years Pakistan-France relations have grown in the political, military, economic, cultural and other diverse areas.

In the 1990s France as many other countries in the West, viewed Pakistan through the prism of internal instability and religious extremism. Pakistan's perceived unqualified support of Taliban slowed down cooperation during this period. However, President Musharraf's bold and courageous decision to fight terrorism after 9/11, disassociation with the Taliban and unswerving commitment to fight religious extremism, sectarianism and obscurantist forces had a salutary effect on Pakistan-France relations. Progress in the democratic process with 2002 elections and Pakistan's economic structural reforms had also met with approbation. France has started appreciating more the intrinsic value of relationship with Pakistan and appears inclined towards helping it in meeting the enormous challenges of stability and development. This is particularly true in the context of stabilization of the region as a whole and in the post-October 2005 earthquake.

I will now briefly enumerate the broad features of the relationship. At the political level Pakistan-France ties are rooted in history. President Ayub Khan and President De Gaulle had met at the early stages of Pakistan's history. During the Cold War, post-Cold War and war against terror, Pakistan and France have been on the same side. Therefore, both countries have shared a common world view. In recent years political relationship has been strengthened by high level visits. In the last four years the President has visited Paris three times, former Prime Minister once and Foreign Minister several times. It clearly reflects Pakistan's vision of future partnership with France.

High level interaction has also promoted institutional linkages. Bilateral consultations - a mechanism put in place in 1967 - have been held at reasonable intervals and to date nine rounds have taken place, the last being in July 2006.

Strategic Dialogue has also been instituted which took place for the first time in 2001. The last meeting was held in November 2005 which focused on stability and security as well as international terrorism.

In our view Pakistan's central role in the region and in the international balance and equilibrium has due recognition in the French

hierarchy. We feel that it is very essential for Pakistan to affirm itself as a strong nation and that a moderate Pakistan is crucial for ensuring stability in the region and beyond. The French, therefore, would understand and share our fight against extremism and terrorism. Continued progress in economic and social sector, reforms agenda and the on going democratic process has added significance. Therefore, capacity building, development, and institutional support are important areas of French engagement with Pakistan.

In the context of security French, like most other countries are cognizant of our emphasis in maintaining a minimum credible deterrence both in the conventional and non-conventional spheres. Defence capability of Pakistan aimed at promoting secure environment is an important corner stone of any comprehensive security arrangement in the region given the past history of South Asia. While Pakistan has no desire to enter into an arms race with any country it remains committed to safeguarding our national interests and integrity. France broadly recognizes our stance and appears ready to meet our requirements in conventional defence equipment. In order to work out sustainable and stable defence cooperation it encourages an engagement that would promote export control of conventional weapons.

Viewed in the background of future objectives, economic relations assume special priority. The fruitful and high economic growth as well as assiduous efforts of the government towards the revival of the economy has been recognized by France. It also acknowledges the inextricable link between poverty reduction and human security. France has therefore been forthcoming and positive towards economic and trade opportunities and in enhancing bilateral cooperation. Over the years Pakistan-France trade has steadily increased, more steeply in recent years with a balance in Pakistan's favour. The trade crossed \$ 1 billion mark in 2005. Institutional linkages with key partners have been established, such as setting up of Comite Pakistan in French Business Confederation; collaboration with French Investment Agency UBI France; Affiliation with French Association of Agriculture Technologies; MOU with the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Industry; MOU with French Ready to Wear Garments Association and arrangement with French Textile Union.

Pakistan is also a significant buyer of French products including defence hardware, civil aircrafts, telecom equipment, and power generation machinery, which is acquired by the public sector.

On the investment side France has a fairly good profile in FDI. From 1989 to date the total French investment has been \$ 80.3 million. However, all that is likely to change for the better as French companies can now tap the French public fund for emerging markets and for business in Pakistan. The credit insurer COFACE has begun underwriting investments in Pakistan. French Business Confederation delegations that have visited Pakistan recently have shown interest in investing in Pakistan. French automobile company, Renault, is also planning to set up a manufacturing plant in Karachi for its Logan.

On the development assistance side France has been dormant as a development partner since 1996. It may be recalled that as a matter of policy, France stopped providing direct financial aid to a number of states including Pakistan in 1997. However, money in the pipeline was not frozen. The on going projects include Chashma Hydropower EM-II involving 24.87 million euros and Sewerage Treatment Plant allocated under 1996 protocol for refurbishing and installation of a sewerage treatment plant of CDA.

As a member of Aid to Pakistan Consortium France has provided significant amount of funds in the form of project and commodity loans from 1961 to 1996. It is understood that the French government is considering cooperation in South Asia under the concept of "Emerging Markets". This might mean that French cooperation would be commercially oriented rather than on the lines of development assistance. Pakistan is increasingly looking for trade related preferences and support. The emerging trend in economic cooperation could take this factor into consideration.

The tragic earthquake of October 2005 and the enormous devastation and hardships caused by it galvanized the entire international community in the spirit of world solidarity against a natural calamity. French response to this disaster was swift. The French Foreign Minister attended the Donors' Conference held in November 2005 and President Chirac spoke to the President. They exchanged views on the challenge to peace and security and the situation arising from the earthquake disaster.

During the Donors' Conference the French government pledged 81 million euros for reconstruction and rehabilitation of earthquake areas. 40 million euros each would be utilized for housing and environment sectors, specifically clean water supply and sanitation. Financing Agreements were being finalized with ERRA. French government has also shown interest for interventions in the environment sector again for water and sanitation in Muzaffarabad and Balakot. In addition the French government also

provided grant assistance of \$30 million for emergency relief assistance for the earthquake hit areas. The total contribution made to date amounts to \$124 million. To streamline development assistance the French Development Agency (AFD) is setting out long term priorities in consultation with the relevant authorities.

Another significant feature of bilateral cooperation has been in the field of education. It demonstrates France's long term interest in Pakistan. Presently 150 students are pursuing Masters and PhD programmes in France. In addition in collaboration with the French educational institutions the Higher Education Commission is setting up the University of Engineering, Science and Technology of Pakistan in Karachi under the aegis of Troyes University and many other universities as well as French enterprises. The UESTP project is at an advanced stage of implementation. This will be a long-lasting French contribution to the human resource development of Pakistan.

As we know France is greatly admired for its contribution to civilization, culture and arts. There has been active and persistent collaboration between Pakistan and France in the field of archaeology. French archaeologists have shown keen interest in survey, exploration and excavation of various sites in Pakistan such as areas on the west of River Indus, Amri in Dadu district, Nandowan in Kalat and Pirak in district Kachhi. The French researchers have thrown fresh light on various aspects of pre-historic Pakistan. French interest in archaeological collaboration has enjoyed patronage at the highest level. French contribution in this field has won praise and an award of Sitara-e-Imtiaz was given to one of the outstanding archaeologists from France.

In terms of foreign policy, France has sought to play a serious role in international affairs, and has actively cast itself into a constructive role of defending peace, moderation, the rule of law and respect for cultures and dialogue. France favours interaction among various regions based on mutual respect for democratic values, cultural diversity and pacific co-existence. France also places great emphasis on its relations with the EU and believes that the economic future of France lies in Europe. France is aware of the European perspective of reconciling religion and freedom of expression and has recognized that there is a need for dialogue. Hence from all aspects its role in promoting cultural understanding and inter civilization dialogue is important. This is an area which is of immense significance to Pakistan and has a direct bearing of international stability, peace and security.

Given Europe's espousal to fighting “discrimination, racism and Islam phobia” France could act as catalyst in promoting harmony and a purposeful dialogue between EU and the Muslim world and among various civilizations. Pakistan would welcome such a role and offers itself for promoting this goal.

In my concluding remarks I would reiterate that in the interdependent world of today security, like other aspects, are interlinked. A comprehensive regional security environment is essential. Pakistan's geo-strategic location makes it pivotal in the security paradigm. Since development is fundamental to any political and military strategy in the region, the Reconstruction Opportunity Zones (ROZ) jointly mooted by Pakistan and the US is - fairly important. Economic engagement that incorporates adjacent Pakistan-Afghanistan border areas would go a long way towards building security. Market access is an essential part of ROZ. Countries interested in this initiative may work out an arrangement that would meet this requirement.

I am confident that the future of Pakistan-France relations is healthy. We have shared ideals and have deepened our cooperation in areas that are of immediate interest and concern to us. Interactions such as the current one jointly arranged by the Institute of Strategic Studies and the Embassy of France with participants from French think tanks and other institutions, are important in promoting understanding and sharing views. I would hope that this would not only become a regular feature but would also be expanded to include media and scholars from diverse areas.

## **FIFTH SESSION: *REGAINING THE EDGE POST-COLD WAR: THE SEARCH***

### ***FOR NEW WAYS AND MEANS OF INFLUENCE***

---

#### **FRENCH FOREIGN POLICY IN A TURBULENT WORLD**

*Dr. Pierre Grosser\**

---

The objective of this contribution is to emphasize the possible directing courses of the French foreign policy, with respect to the manner in which perception of the world evolution and international problems are “framed”, at this instance at the centre of political and administrative elites, and in the public debate. Three basic postulates exist: that the world did not really change, that the world always evolves towards more progress, and finally that the world has completely changed from the 1970s. A forthcoming work would specify how the three grids of analysis help understand the history of the twentieth century, that of the cold war, the end of the Cold War and recent developments. This analysis will therefore be brief, emphasizing the stakes of the foreign policies of a country like France.

#### **1. The World did not Really Change**

It has hardly changed, because the rules of the game and pathologies still exist: on one hand, power as an organizing principle, on another, the conflicts and domination as permanent problems.

- Power would be always the foundation of international life. The problem therefore is to know what power means today: Military power? Economic power? Status (as a permanent member of the Security Council at the United Nations, as a recognized nuclear power)? The radiance of a model, of ideas, of a language? The capacity to influence, particularly the “structural power” on the agenda, the definition of problems, the vocabulary, the norms ... Would the European Union increase the power of France: but what kind of European power do we mean? And how to direct this power? In France, the problem of decline is obsessional, since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, even though this decline was always exaggerated and if the question is before everything used by political entrepreneurs or intellectuals.

---

\* *Dr. Pierre Grosser, Science-Po, Paris.*



- The power distribution remains equally an obsessional question: what is this distribution currently (is the world unipolar), what will this distribution be tomorrow (the future of great powers), and what should this distribution be (is unipolarity more stable than multipolarity, is multipolarity fairer than unipolarity?). France is said to fear the destabilizing effects of the rise of new great powers, and wishes to accompany this trend and therefore co-opt the new great powers. Unipolarity resembles dictatorship. If France promoted plutocracy (the creation of the G6 in 1975), its preference goes towards an aristocracy, a concert of historical responsible powers, searching by enlightened cooperation to maintain a certain order. Like the other states, it has to manage relations with the American “hyperpower”. The range of strategies, analyzed systematically today (for example by Stephen Walt in *Taming American Power*), were already largely experienced by France after 1945.
- Or, inter-state conflicts have diminished. But in the strategic thinking, the vocabulary used to analyze these conflicts was recycled, often in an abusive manner, to describe conflicts that are called “geo-economical”, “geo-civilizational”, “ethnic”. France struggles with this vocabulary and strategies that reify identities, even in its own internal affairs. It struggles also with the “creation” of “new” enemies, or equivalently “the war against terrorism”, and yet more with “green totalitarianism”, even though certain political tendencies use this vocabulary.
- In a leftist vision, the world is structured around centers and peripheries. The problem is knowing the forms of hegemony: that of the north, of which France is a constituent, that of the United States who imposes on Europe, that of mobile transnational finance, that would break the social pact in France, with losers and winners like everywhere else in the world. It is the orientation of economic policies and economic diplomacy that depend on this analysis.

## **2. The World Evolves Towards More Progress**

It is an entirely teleological history that is rewritten today: progress is the triumph of democracy, the alternatives having been defeated; progress is the development of international institutions and forms of solidarity and of a sense of community (Franco-German reconciliation and European integration being something like a model for the world)

- While the Cold War confrontation was the exclusive focus of much analysis, a democratic, peaceful and prosperous community coalesced in the aftermath of World War II: it was called the “West”, and was not just built because of the Soviet threat. Since the 1980s, this community, founded on common values but that was equally a community of security, flourished, with for example the enlargement of Europe and the NATO. The debate is knowing how to facilitate this evolution, while respecting the cultural order and specificities. This is one of the crucial debates for France’s foreign action: in what way can the philosophy of the will “accelerate” history? The risk is that a divided world is created between included and excluded, friends and outcasts, resulting in either withdrawal into oneself, or a complete isolation of outcasts, with numerous “police” operations against them. France is not at ease with this crusading way of seeing the world, but one part of its identity is to be at the forefront of democracy and human rights, with an universalist discourse.
- France promotes multilateralism, the collective treatment of global issues, (particularly in the health sector), the orientation of development aid through the financing of global public goods, etc. Its vision of “regulated” governance is at par with its traditional self-image: privileging institutions and the sharing of competence among international organizations, so that global governance is a “jardin à la française”, and not a liberal jungle. Its tradition of a strong state makes it distrust the disorderly mobilizations of NGOs. Nevertheless, the risk is the development of global forms of “governmentality” (with the kind of totalitarian effects that were pointed out by the French philosopher Michel Foucault), intergovernmental organizations and NGOs imposing norms on all aspects of life in the south. Another risk is that global regulation is solely the globalization of American norms, whether they affect economics or security.

### **3. The World would have Completely Changed**

The high modernity from the 1880s until the 1960s favored a world of vertical organizations and homogenous identities. Its dark side being totalitarianism, total wars and ethnic cleansing, and the destructive or dishumanizing power of scientific innovation. Since the 1970s, this world is questioned. The collapse of communist regimes was the collapse of this

kind of modernity. It is a question now of networks and not hierarchies any more, of post-modern concerns and values. In fact, political and social sciences, being developed to describe past realities, deprive us from the vocabulary to describe the present world: so we are to speak of the “end of” (history, geography, the nation, etc...), of “de-“(dewesternization, deterritorialization, dis-order ...), of “post-“(post-modern, post-national, post-industrial ...). We see the rehabilitation of multinational empires, diasporas, regions, cosmopolitan cities, nomadism... that is the world before the modern “Westphalian” system.

For many, this new world is a world of opportunities, of mobility, hybridity, fluidity, clear of the pathologies of modernity. For others, it is a world of collapsed states, religious fanaticism, tribalism, smuggling and trafficking, privatized violence and so on... without the disciplining role of the state and of the state system.

France is criticized, from within and from without, for its incapacity to adapt to this new world. With its emphasis on a strong state, on a strong national identity; it is sometimes compared to Japan. However, France elites promoted financial globalization and has been willingly transformed by it. In return, this new world worries it. The global echo of certain questions of its domestic politics (the “modèle français” of “laïcité” in particular) affects its foreign policy. Behind the crisis of the State (“fragile” or failed states), it sees the civil conflicts, the return of primordial identities, and in France, the rise of “communitarisme” ; behind the “transnational”, it fears religious fanaticism, nuclear proliferation, unmanageable immigration, new pandemics ... It apprehends that particularistic claims lead to a “proliferation of States”. The ideal remains a capable State and a national identity going past the particular interests and identities. So, France is said to belong to the old world of the core nation-states, when there is, in the North (in the US for example) as in the “emerging” countries, something like a return of the state and of the nationalistic discourses.

The majority of international stakes could be understood as functions of these three grids of analysis at this instance. The evolution of France as an international actor (state, nation, political practices) can also be understood based on these three grids. Constructivism taught us that the units of the system are not predetermined. France and the world are bound together, once more.

## **FIFTH SESSION: *REGAINING THE EDGE POST-COLD WAR: THE SEARCH***

### ***FOR NEW WAYS AND MEANS OF INFLUENCE***

---

#### **PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY POST-BIPOLARITY\*\***

*Dr. Rasul Bakhsh Rais\**

---

Dr Rais began by saying that he was going to look at some of the important configurations of the emerging world order and how it has impacted Pakistan's foreign policy and how in future it is going to influence it. End of the Cold War has been very transformative in terms of new structure of power and emergence of new forces that clash with the dominant Western powers. This new phase in human history has both elements of continuity and change. The continuity is in the process of modernity that we may define in terms of democracy, human rights and representative government and the globalizing of trade, investment, flow of capital and ideas. The change is essentially in the coming on global scene of non-state actors with vague ideology but very clear political purpose of challenging western domination. This is truer of Islamic societies than others.

Those who live in the post-colonial world look at changes and new trends in the world system from a different perspective, and as a result their reading of the implications is different from those scholars situated in the Western world. One may find lot of common ground between them on number of issues, but on question of military power, use of force, views on globalisation, integration and autonomy they differ widely. Let us consider three important perceptions from the global periphery that may not reflect unanimity of views but are widely shared among the intellectual classes and political activists there. Firstly, the military power has concentrated in the American core and that is what unipolarity is all about. There are implications for the world of unipolarity as we look at the American history and messianic self-image that the dominant class of Americans hold. They believe that it is their moral responsibility to order the chaotic world, if they don't do it, there will be no other power in the world that would assume this responsibility. Americans tend to think that the burden of global peace and security has fallen on their shoulders. They are right in citing the example

---

\*\* *This is a transcribed version of Dr. Rais's presentation.*

\* *Dr. Rasul Bakhsh Rais is Professor Political Science, & Head, Social Sciences Department, University of Management Sciences (LUMS), Lahore.*

of European countries when they failed to take a collective action against Serbs and Serbia when they massacred tens of thousands of innocent civilians and committed some of the worst atrocities of 20<sup>th</sup> century in the Balkans.

The second feature of the emerging world order is globalization. He said that he would not be talking about the economic globalization, though the cultural aspect of globalization is closely linked with economic globalization. While making his point clear that he was not against all international values that were emerging as the result of globalization, but what was being promoted to the rest of the world by the West was impacting lives in the developing countries. He gave the example of his students and many families who have started celebrating Halloween festival which is purely an American cultural product. He said that the way people in Pakistan were subscribing to these values and ways of life many people might end up celebrating Halloween one day. He was surprised to know when he was told that Halloween parties were organized by certain sections of the society. He commented that the scale at which globalization was taking place was unprecedented in human history. Talking about the third aspect of emerging world order, he said that it was not about interdependence but about hegemony. There was a centre and the periphery and the centre might have been shifting and it may not have a fixed place but it was irrelevant. What was relevant was that there was a periphery. The hegemony was not about military and economic power alone, it was also about the dominance of ideas, ideologies and marketing of a particular culture.

With hegemony comes certitude about democracy, human rights and constitutionalism. It was important to understand the way different societies were responding to the hegemony of ideas. Muslim scholars, political scientists and thinkers since 18th century have been trying to understand their situation in the modern world and have been trying to figure out as to how they could be integrated into the modern world while being rooted in their own culture. However, the west wants them to join the modern world and embrace modernity according to their own image of what is modern. We have not seen major political resistance by the periphery, but there have been efforts in terms of self-definition and to discover the heritage and making it relevant to the modern world.

The big question Muslims pose to them is: How can they be democratic without losing individuality and identity? Resistance to the hegemony is there by the social forces from within the core or centre and the periphery are relatively weak to challenge it.

Talking about the specifics of Pakistan's foreign policy in a bipolar world, he said that Pakistan had lost an important leverage with the West when the Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan. During the Afghan resistance, Islamabad had exercised reverse influence over the US policy toward the region. But all that changed with the end of the cold war. As soon as the Soviets left the Afghan scene, Pakistan once again came under pressure for its nuclear programme. It was difficult for Islamabad to deflect increasing pressure as it used to do by sheltering under its Afghan policy. The question was posed to Pakistan's policymakers by Washington as to whether they wanted American friendship or retain the nuclear program. Pakistanis had learnt important lessons about the dynamics of international relations the hard way. They rightly thought that the maintaining nuclear programme and developing it as a deterrent against India was better guarantee of security than relying on the United States that had ditched Pakistan twice.

Relations of Pakistan with three countries will continue to pose a challenge for it the coming years. First is it is ties with the United States. Relations between the two counties have swung from one extreme to another; from close security cooperation to sanctions. Pakistan by 1999 faced three layers of sanctions; first on pursuing nuclear path to security, second for conducting nuclear tests and third when military took over power. He said that it was important for the academicians to debate whether Pakistan had entered into American alliance in its war on terror because of convergence of interests or because it had no other option.

Referring to post-Taliban political developments in Afghanistan, he said that what is happening today is that Pakistan is being totally neutralized in Afghanistan. Its role has been to share intelligence, apprehend Al-Qaeda and Taliban operatives and control the borders. Pakistan could be more constructively involved in restoring peace and stability in Afghanistan. It is due to lack of trust in the country and antagonism of the leaders of Northern Front who have greater influence on foreign policy than other ethnic groups that Pakistan has been sidelined.

Americans playing by unilateralism in Afghanistan have messed up things. They are not culturally sensitive. Nor are they used to reaching out to local communities. Their heavy reliance on use of force has earned them an image that is no different from other occupiers this tragic country. Their operations have caused enormous collateral damage that has alienated vast majority of populations. They have been bombing mosques, weddings parties and funerals.

When things go wrong they accuse Pakistan for weak control over porous border. For Pakistan, American presence in Afghanistan is a temporary phase. Pakistan has abiding and long term interest in this country and beyond in Central Asia. Pakistan share with the United States a common interest in the unity, stability and peace of Afghanistan, but does differ how these objectives can be achieved.

The West has failed to learn from Pakistan's experience of Afghanistan. You need to look at ethnic fragmentation of Afghanistan. He said that Afghanistan has fought wars with three great powers: With the Britain twice in 19<sup>th</sup> century, with the Soviets and now with the United States. Pushtuns have always taken up the responsibility of defending Afghanistan whenever it has been attacked by the outsiders.

He also said that Pragmatism, flexibility, accommodation and readjustment are the four choices which the policymakers in Pakistan have and should be exercising them in their foreign policy in a vastly changed regional and global structure of power.

Responding to the question as to what would be the reaction of France if Israel attacked Iran on the behest of US the French speaker said that France had always maintained there should be a negotiated settlement of all issues including the one with Iran over its nuclear plans.