

BOOK REVIEWS

P.R. Chari, Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema & Stephen P. Cohen, *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (Washington DC: Brookings Institute Press, 2007), pages 252.

In the words of Strobe Talbott, the book under review: *Four Crises and a Peace Process*, is a testament to the knowledge, prescriptive persuasiveness and collaborative skill of P.R. Chari, research professor at the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies; Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, President of the Islamabad Policy Research Institute and Stephen P. Cohen of the Brookings Institute. These renowned scholars have produced this well-researched book on South Asia.

This book primarily focuses on four contained conflicts on the sub-continent since 1971. These conflicts relate to Brasstack Crisis of 1986-87, the compound crisis of 1990, the Kargil Conflict of 1999 and the Border Confrontation Crisis of 2001-02. The distinctive feature of these crises is that each had the potential of escalating to large-scale conflict, but luckily, the danger in each case was somehow averted. In addition, each crisis was linked to the introduction of nuclear weapons into the arsenals of India and Pakistan. In this context, the authors have discussed the policy implications of each conflict and drawn lessons and explained the American role. Also, the authors have explained how these crises had affected regional and international policy. In the process, they have evaluated the current prospects for lasting peace in South Asia.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that both India and Pakistan are currently engaged in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues, including Kashmir. However, concurrently, they are also trying to acquire more and more advanced conventional weaponry and also to improve their arsenals and delivery systems. They are also tempted to toy into ballistic missile defence technology (BMD).

After these broad generalizations, the authors take up the examination of four major conflicts. First on the list is the Brasstack Crisis of 1986-87. Launched in November 1986, Brasstack, was a year-long Indian military exercise that had sparked a serious three-month crisis. Although, war was somehow averted, it certainly helped accelerate India's and Pakistan's nuclear programmes. Incidentally, launching of Brasstack was so awesome that many Pakistani officials were alarmed by the scale and scope of this exercise, especially in view of its proximity to the India-Pakistan border. To aggravate matters, Indian forces were positioned in a way that they could bisect Pakistan, if they so desired. Pakistan's Prime Minister, Mohammad Khan Junejo protested against India's threatening posture, but, in turn, he was assured by

his Indian counterpart, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, that the exercise Brasstack, would be reviewed. However, its scale and contours were not altered.

The overview of the Brasstack crisis indicates that states in an asymmetrical situation to each, always run an obvious risk in conducting large military exercises near their borders. To ensure that these fears are allayed, such exercises must be conducted in an area, well removed from the border. Also, all the while, full transparency must be ensured about their details, such as employment of troops and involvement of armour and so on.

Next, the authors dilate on the Compound Crisis of 1990. In that context, it is worth-mentioning that only three years after Brsstack, India and Pakistan had again locked horns with each other – this time in a rapidly changing and complex environment. Trading accusations and threats, they appeared preparing for war. India accused Pakistan of supporting the Kashmiri militant separatist groups, while Pakistan criticized India for the crackdown in Indian administered Kashmir and called for a plebiscite there. These were all alarming signs but as a result of intense diplomacy from both sides, a number of developments reduced the prospects of war between India and Pakistan and helped defuse the crisis.

With regard to the outbreak of the Kargil conflict, we learn from the narrative that three months after the Lahore Summit of February 1999, the armed forces of India and Pakistan clashed along the Line of Control (LOC) in the Kargil Dras region of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Apparently, it was a small war but it had resulted in numerous casualties and had generated global interest in its outcome. Here, the authors maintain that the crisis atmosphere was heightened by concern that it might expand geographically from the remote vastness of Kargil to the rest of Kashmir or across the international boundary, or that it might escalate to higher level of violence, even a nuclear exchange.

Next chapter deals with Border Confrontation 2001-02. The point to note in this context is that on December 13, 2001, Indian Parliament was attacked by some unknown terrorist groups resulting in many casualties. At this, the Government of India concluded the Pakistan-based terrorist groups were responsible and their main impression was that Pakistan had refused to take action against them. Islamabad, however, claimed that the allegation had lacked evidence. Hence, no action was taken.

The striking feature of 2001-02 Crisis, was that it had contained the seeds of a major war and as in Kargil, foreign intervention had played a significant role as each side had attempted to influence the other side through the good offices of outsiders, notably the United States.

In the last chapter: *Peace and War in South Asia*, the authors bring out that the overall atmosphere of India and Pakistan relation, has gradually improved since 2003, despite political turmoil in Pakistan and a new

government in India. These talks have incorporated discussion on peace and security, confidence building measures and Kashmir.

The authors are convinced that although recent events do not augur well for the future, it is hard to ignore South Asia's overall success in maintaining a modicum of democracy, while understanding radical economic and social reforms. When all is said and done, one should hope that India and Pakistan will not only learn from the mistakes of others, but more important from their own mistakes and successes.

In the end, the authors conclude that maintaining throughout a balanced, objective approach and combining their knowledge of the inner workings of the three governments involved, the authors have taken full account of the changing international environment from the late cold war to the onset of Bush's "War on Terror". The author's research and conclusion help us better understand the dynamics of the fraught relationship between India and Pakistan. ■

Ghulam Sarwar, Consulting Editor, *IPRI Journal*.

Pamela Mountbatten, *India Remembered*

(London: Paviion Books, 2007), pages 240.

The work of Pamela Mountbatten, daughter of Lord Louis Francis Albert Nicholas Mountbatten, deals with the crucial period of the partition and independence of the Indian Subcontinent. The book is divided into two parts. Part I narrates the events when her father was the last Viceroy of British India (March 22, 1946 - August 14, 1947) and Part II covers the period when he was the first Governor-General of the Dominion of India (i.e., Hindustan) from August 15, 1947 to June 21, 1948. Pamela gives details of various social and political functions and events in a chronological order. She also records her observations about Indian leaders, especially Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, President of the Indian National Congress, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, and Mohammad Ali Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League. She frankly admits that the "immediate attraction between my mother [Edwina] and Panditji blossomed into love", and Mountbatten himself had approved of it (p.21). The authoress is all praise for Nehru for his "tremendous warmth" and "wisdom" (pp.70-71). Mountbatten considered Gandhi "on a par with Christ and Buddha" (p.69). Mountbatten's bias against Jinnah and Pakistan is apparent in the work. He considered Jinnah as "very clever and queer", and Lady Mountbatten thought that Jinnah had become "meglo-maniac" (p.130).

While describing their visit to Peshawar on April 28, 1947, she states that about sixty to one hundred thousand Pathans had gathered, shouting Pakistan Zindabad (*Long Live Pakistan*) and that "every one was acutely aware of the fact that my parents [Mountbatten and Lady Mountbatten] could be

killed” (p.82). She refers to the destruction of Sikhs and Hindus in Kahuta and the refugee camp in Wah (pp. 84-85). “Until I went to Kahuta, I had not appreciated the magnitude of the horrors that are going on”, she quotes Mountbatten. She, however, could not appreciate that partly it was the fear of an impending civil war that had forced the British to agree to the establishment of Pakistan.

The authoress refers to the original Mountbatten Plan dividing India into three states that was sent to London on 2 May. On 6 May, Mountbatten family left for their summer headquarters in Simla, where, on their invitation, Nehru and V.P. Menon, Secretary to the Government, had arrived. Nehru gave “bombshell” letter, dated May 11, rejecting the Plan, which according to him was “Balkanisation” of India. Thereupon, the “incredible and brilliant V.P. Menon, redrafted the whole plan and resubmitted it to London” (pp. 91-92). From her accounts, it is obvious that the final Mountbatten Plan was prepared by Menon and Nehru in May and was shown to Jinnah on 3 June, after it had been finally approved by the British Government. Mountbatten had asked princely states to accede either to Pakistan or Hindustan taking into account their geographical position and wishes of their people. “From the geographical, historical, demographic, economic and geo-political points of view, Kashmir should have acceded to Pakistan”.¹ In all fairness, she should have brought out that Kashmir’s geographical location as well as seventy-seven percent Muslim majority had dictated its accession to Pakistan, but Mountbatten, conceding the wish of Nehru, worked for its accession to India. She, however, admits that Mountbatten had advised Nehru not to visit Kashmir realizing “the dangers inherent in that plan” and instead visited himself for five days (June 18-23, 1947) “to convince the Maharaja to accept the plan – and save Nehru humiliation” (p.106), but he was disappointed to find Maharaja not agreeing to join either Pakistan or Hindustan (p.111). However, later Mountbatten sent Indian armed forces to occupy Kashmir.

Mountbatten was against the division of the Indian Army and wanted it to remain united but that was “too optimistic” (p. 113). Similarly, he wanted to be the joint governor-general of both the dominions of India and Pakistan. He was accepted as the first Governor-General of India but not of Pakistan. She has, therefore, rightly observed: “Indeed his later acceptance of the governor-generalship of India did tarnish his impartial reputation and kindled persistent rumours that he was anti-Muslim League (p.115). As for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal, the League had strongly advocated that an impartial body like the UN be assigned this task but Nehru disagreed. The Boundary Commission, under Sir Cyril Radcliffe, a British lawyer, was given the job. She did not bring out that the Commission arbitrarily gave away some

¹ Noor ul Haq, *Making of Pakistan: The Military Perspective* (Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1993), p. 200.

Muslim majority territories of Ferozepore and Gurdaspur districts to Hindustan. Ferozepore headwork facilitated Bikaner's accession to India and Gurdaspur provided land route to Hindustan for entering into Kashmir.

According to Pamela, on August 13, in Karachi, everything was "chaotic and poor" and Lt Syed Ahsan, a Naval Officer was "to run the whole show" (p. 133); and, on August 14, there was the ceremony at the Constituent Assembly for the transfer of power. After a cursory description of Karachi ceremony, she gives a detailed account of ceremonies for transfer of power held in New Delhi on August 15.

Part II of the book covered Hindu-Muslim riots especially in the Punjab and Bengal, Kashmir War (October-December 1947), Mountbatten and his family's tour of the provinces (December 1947-January 1948), Gandhi's assassination (January 30, 1948), the last Provincial Governors Conference in Delhi (February 1948), Mountbatten family's trip around remaining India (February-May), and finally their departure to England (June 1948).

There are references to carnage in the Indian Punjab, but the conditions in Indian Bengal were better because of the efforts of Gadhiji. The social work which Lady Mountbatten and Pamela did to look after the refugees is vividly described. By the end of August 1947, in the Purana Qila (old fortress in Delhi) refugee camp, thousands of Muslims who had fled their homes in terror of Hindu attacks, were struggling for life so that they could move to Pakistan. In Amritsar city of Indian Punjab, cholera epidemic had broken, perhaps due to carnage. "There are horrible stories around of trains which set off with thousands of passengers arriving with merely hundreds alive", she wrote. She has also added a photograph (p.171) where bodies of those who were killed in riots in New Delhi, were being loaded in a truck during the lull in the fighting (p.171). Food was the "immediate and major problem", she said (p.165). Major General Pete Rees had established an Emergency Committee (September-November 1947) to help the government deal with the prevalent turmoil. She omitted to point out that earlier the British General was commanding the Punjab Boundary Force responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the riot affected border areas of the Punjab. The Force was disbanded on September 1, 1947 on the recommendation of the senior most Hindu Officer Brigadier K.S. Thimayya, who later became the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army.²

Mountbatten family's extensive tour of India (December 1947 - May 1948) was followed with "what seemed to be hundreds of farewell parties". During the official farewell at Palam Airport, overwhelmed by emotions, Raja

² For details of killings in the Indian Punjab, see Brigadier R. C. B. Bristow, *Memories of the British Raj, A Soldier in India* (London, 1974).

Gopalachari, the Governor-General of India “was weeping and Mummy and I were finding it very hard to hold back our tears”, she wrote (pp. 228-229).

Overall, she has given an eye-witness account of personalities she met; places she visited; description of dinners, lunches and garden parties in Viceroy’s house; and recollected both colourful as well as harrowing events. She was a witness to the establishment of two independent states of Pakistan and Hindustan. The book contains numerous photographs covering this eventful and historical period. She has mainly relied on her own diary; the diaries of her parents; and her father’s photograph albums kept in Broadland’s archives; a few letters written in India; her interviews as well as her own memories, while she was in the subcontinent for about 15 months (March 22, 1947 – June 21, 1948). The book is at once interesting and informative, especially for those who are interested in the history of the subcontinent. ■

Dr Noor ul Haq, Research Fellow, IPRI.

Robert Ayson & Desmond Ball (Eds.), *Strategy And Security In The Asia-Pacific*

(New South Wales: Allen & Unwin, 2007), pages 343.

Policymakers face enormous security challenges in today’s world. *Strategy and Security in the Asia-Pacific* provides a comprehensive account of strategic themes and complex security challenges being faced from Canberra to Beijing and from Tokyo to Islamabad in the 21st century. The book draws readership from Americas to the Asia-Pacific. Editors of the work, Robert Ayson and Desmond Ball are working at the Australian National University's Strategic and Defence Studies Centre (SDSC), Canberra. Both of them have a vast knowledge in security and strategic issues as they largely affect the Asia-Pacific. They argue that the strategic landscape has been influenced by information technology, globalisation, and interdependency, and more recently, the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in the United States of America, and the importance of non-state actors such as *Al-Qaeda* (p. xxi). Resultantly, all states were affected by such new security challenges that led to re-define and re-evaluate security.

The work, therefore, makes efforts to re-examine security in global context as well as with a particular focus on the Asia-Pacific. Contributors of the book, mostly working for the SDSC, make analytical analyses of several vital issues related to the post-9/11 security scene. The work is divided into two sections. The theoretical framework of security is defined in eleven essays by explaining themes, concepts, and parameters of security. Issues related to security are defined region-wise such as Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, Australasia, South Pacific, and Americas. By covering such a large

regional security set up in a cutting-edge analysis, work becomes extremely valuable by painting a panoramic snapshot of a variety of issues.

Hugh White explains the reasons for doing this work by saying that when Australian Southeast Asian neighbourhood climbed out of the Cold War crises, SDSC was set at the Australian National University at Canberra in 1966. It is with the same token, he says, that the leading Australian security and strategy analysts contributed this work by explaining a wide range of issues affecting the Asia-Pacific security in the 21st century. By reading this work, one may realise that global security is too sharply divided and one has to go beyond non-state actors to understand security in today's complex world.

Precisely speaking, contributors portrayed cutting-edge analyses on the theme of security. For instance, Coral Bell surveyed historical perspectives of security in a unipolar world and finds US invasion of Iraq as a pre-emptive war. Robert Ayson explores the classical concept of strategy with reference to present situations. Alan Dupont looks at transnationals security threats in the post-Cold War period. Clive Williams reviews terrorism and says that people are confused as to who is fighting against terrorism. He is of view that war on terror is something war on nature and a war on *Tsunamis* (p. 71). While Ramesh Thakur explains the international community's response to human rights violations, Alan Stephens and David Connery look at the transformation of military organizations and argue that defense transformation is dominated by technology and Western way of war. Michael Evans describes nuclear proliferation and highly unpredictable globalised security. Anthony Burke defines how security shapes and distorts domestic politics. Brendon Taylor and Bruce Luckham deal with nexus between the economy and security.

The second section of work deals with the issues of security and strategy in the Asia-Pacific region. Paul Dibb looks at America's role in the Asia-Pacific security and says that "America has swung from one extreme to the other in recent decades" (p. 173), i.e., from the containment of Communism to global terrorism with one-eyed view of international security. Dibb sees how American power will unfold during the present century. Ron Huisken says that the United States is linked to Northeast Asia through alliances erected with Japan and South Korea and with substantive security obligations to Taiwan (p. 191). He argues that Northeast Asia's security shows no sign of abating and America's war on terror has diverted its attention away from Northeast Asia (p. 208). David Wright-Neville argues that Southeast Asia, which remained in conflict for so long, turned to peace in the 1960s and continuously resolved differences on the basis of collective wisdom. The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) emerged as a guarantor of regional security (p. 240). Sandy Gordon reviews security environment of South Asia in an historical perspective and briefly looks at post/11 situation, by surveying major events affecting Pakistan and India. Robert Ayson analyses Australasian security by saying that both Australia and New Zealand do not

face any security challenge as such because of the benefits of sea and air distance to other countries. He maintains that, however, weaknesses of other neighbours such as Indonesia's secessionist movement in West Papua and Aceh, and communal violence in Moluccas, the East Timur crisis, the Sandline affair in Papua New Guinea, and the civil war in the Solomon Islands could be seen as disturbing points for Australasian security (p. 250). David Hegarty and Anna Powles describe the South Pacific security from the Indonesian province of Papua to the Chilean territory of Rapa Nui by stating that security in South Pacific is extremely complex as are the characteristics of the people of several of these islands (such as Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Tahiti & French Polynesia, Tonga, Tokelau, Samoa, American Samoa, Cook Islands, Tavalu, Niue, Pitcaim, and Easter Island). Desmond Ball and Brendon Taylor, while debating on regional security, maintain that some fifteen years ago, there was almost no cooperation, a region-wise mechanism, or multilateralism for security in the Asia-Pacific region (p. 270). They say, hitherto a bilateral security structure existed in the Asia-Pacific. But now, besides a multilateral approach, which they term as track-one, is working toward regional security in the form of the ASEAN-Regional Forum (ARF), Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO), Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group (TOCOG), and the Six Party Talks. Track-two involves think-tanks such as the ASEAN Institute for Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) and IISS-Shangrila Dialogue. They suggest that track-three, involving humanitarian organizations, should also forge closer relations with track-one and track-two to promote human dimension in security. In sum, this work deals with the vital question of security and adds new dimensions in understanding security in the 21st century in the Asia-Pacific context. ■

Dr Ahmad Rashid Malik, Research Fellow, IPRI.

Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema and Maqsudul Hasan Nuri (Eds.), *Quest for Energy Security in Asia*

(Islamabad: Islamabad Policy Research Institute, 2007), pages 113.

The book under review: "Quest for Energy Security in Asia", opens with the remarks that the domestic political environments of Pakistan and geo-political environments of the world as a whole, remain highly explosive. With each passing day, new factors are constantly evolving, which generate challenges, shape new courses and influence public perception and state policies.

The book under review is based on papers presented at an international seminar held in Islamabad from 13-14 February 2007. A number of Pakistani and foreign scholars, deliberated on this topical issue and arrived

at the conclusion that sustainable economic development primarily depends upon energy supply and security under the changing circumstances. To them, energy security is a means of fostering economic development and as such, it should, be geared to economic uplift and prosperity of the common man. It is high time, Pakistan should learn from the experience of its closer neighbours that have undertaken the route to fast economic development. For us, China and the ASEAN countries serve as fine examples to emulate.

Dr Cheema, in his opening address, succinctly brought out that oil demand in Asia has increased as a result of high economic growth. In Asia, Japan is most concerned for its energy dependence and China, too, is now getting increasingly dependent on the oil supply. To meet their demands, it is the Persian Gulf which remains the most important source of supply of energy, especially oil. In addition, both Indonesia and Malaysia are the energy exporters.

With regard to energy security in the context of its transportation and its demand and supply, Dr Sarfraz Khan Qureshi, holds that increased energy efficacy, more reliance on renewable energies and low carbon technologies will be required to play a larger role in meeting energy demand in a sustainable way. In this context, he suggests that industrialized countries, in general, and those in the Asia region, in particular, should take a lead in the development and deployment of such technologies. Also, the developed countries should transfer the newly developed technologies to the poor countries, so that they could also improve the use of clean energy.

Next, Tanvir Ahmad Khan sets out to determine the role of energy security. In this context, he says that Asian countries are keen to make an early start in exploring alternative sources of energy. These countries are however, unimpressed by NGO – driven return to traditional sources of energy. On the other hand these countries seek a proactive international effort that should engage the best of minds and technologies for reducing dependence on hydrocarbons. The writer believes that such cooperation would help round off the sharp edges of competition and conflict.

Alisher Komilor, maintains that strategic nature of relations between Central Asia and South Asia can have profound influence on regional balance of interests in Central Asia. To him, although the pace and scale of cooperation between Central and South Asia are still far from utilization of their full potential, South Asia will remain a high priority partner for Central Asian nations, given the economic growth of South Asian states.

Talking in terms of China's modernization visa-a-visa its energy needs, Hongtu Zhao maintains that China's economy is undergoing rapid transformation. To deal with energy challenges, it needs to speed up marked economy's reformation transition. He is impressed by the Western experience which shows that the best way to ensure energy security is to develop an effective energy market. To him, the Chinese energy market and the price

system are underdeveloped. To overcome the drawback, China must push forward the liberalisation and diversity of energy market, so that it could act more efficiently. He is convinced that a full transition to market economy will alleviate all energy issues that China faces today.

Zafar Altaf in his well-researched paper, brings out that in a world that is going to be ever more competitive, there will have to be a need for providing energy to the export sector. Energy has a strong bearing on the management of resources. The management leads to competitive advantage. So the efficiency in the two resources and management must go together. He holds that power generation, transmission and distribution is a challenge in both urban and rural areas. Further he states that energy income and good governance is reflective of each other. To him, energy income is dependent upon good governance. He lamented the fact that the real issue of Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA) in Pakistan has been the inefficiency and wastage in its operation. With fuel prices going up and with gas increases being passed on to WAPDA, the inevitable results led to the increase in cost of generation.

To conclude: the main purpose of this seminar was to examine the issues, related to energy security in the larger Asian context, with particular focus on Pakistan. The deliberations tried to offer some sound policy options that could help streamline energy security for sustainable economic development in South Asia, Central Asia and East Asia. ■

Ghulam Sarwar, Consulting Editor, *IPRI Journal*.

Jules Stewart, *The Savage Border – The History of the North-West Frontier*

(U.K.: Sutton, 2007), pages 240.

The book "The Savage Border", by Jules Stewart is a running account of the British engagement, spread over a century, in the areas that today form Federally Administered Tribal Areas (F.A.T.A.) and the North West Frontier Province (N.W.F.P.) of Pakistan. It, however, deals with the post-British withdrawal period as well. Jules Stewart, London based journalist, has previously authored: "The Khyber Rifles – From the British Raj to Al Qaeda" and "Spying for the Raj – The Pundits and the Mapping of the Himalaya," published in 2005 and 2006, respectively.

Chapter one of the book under review, "People of a Lost Origin" traces the history of the tribes that inhabit the Frontier (F.A.T.A. and N.W.F.P.). He describes the folklores linking Pathan origin to the Lost Tribes of Israel, however, reaching on the conclusion that "Pathans' ethnic origin is destined to be left unresolved for the foreseeable future," because "no comprehensive anthropological study" has ever been carried out about them,

due to their hostility to the outsiders. The writer also relates the war-loving and tough nature of the tribal people to the extreme climatic conditions in which they inhabit, and the hard economic living that they face. The author discusses the areas, characters, history and origin of various Pathan tribes and sub-tribes including Afridi, Daur, Khattak, Mehsud, Mohmand, Orakzai, Turi, Yusufzai and Wazir.

Chapter two, "A Frontier is Born", discusses the First British War on Afghanistan and the subsequent humiliating departure from Kabul. This chapter also deals with the situation in Frontier, where the local tribes carried on a "cat-and-mouse game" with the British for almost a century. The British made several efforts to pacify the tribal people; however, to no avail. The tribal resistance continued till the British departure in 1947. Portraying the situation, Stewart notes: "It was like plugging leaks in a dyke. The force of water behind the barrier was so great that no sooner had one hole been filled than another burst open to flood the plains." The tribes could at best be pacified temporarily. In the same chapter, pondering upon the methodical and systematic nature of tribal revolts, the author concludes that it was the so-called "Hindustani Fanatics' Movement" that was galvanizing the Pathans into launching attacks on the British. He also highlights the role of these fanatic "Wahhabis" in the 1857 Mutiny. The chapter also discusses the events of 1857 Mutiny and how the British successfully prevented its impact on the Frontier. It also discusses various military campaigns of the British in the Frontier and apprises the readers that in the first three decades of their presence in the Frontier, the British had to launch forty punitive expeditions to pacify the Pathans. These expeditions were in addition to hundreds of minor skirmishes.

Chapter three, "Poachers Turned Gamekeepers", deals with the creation of various Pathan levies to deal with the threat emanating from their kinsmen. This development coincided with the formation of political agencies. The chapter also discusses the events of Second Afghan War and the Great Pathan Revolt of 1897. The author also notes the rationale for Durand Line Agreement, while quoting Amir Abdur Rahman's prophecy who, despite being a party to the Agreement, opined that these tribal regions should be part of Afghanistan, not of British Indian empire, and that at any time of trial on the British, these tribes will be their worst enemy. The author acknowledges that the subsequent years proved the Amir's words to be prophetic.

Chapter four "The Hundred Years War", discusses in detail the cat and mouse game between the tribesmen and the British. Discussing the 1897 Pathan uprising, the author highlights the influence of the events in the Middle East, Sudan, Turkey and Central Asia, where the Muslims, at that time, were making gains against the Christians. Stewart opines that the propagation of the line "the soldiers of Islam had put Christianity on the run", created a spirit of fanaticism in the Frontier in 1897, which played an important role in the creation of the Pathan uprising. The chapter also notes the activities of Mullah

Sayyid Akbar in the Khyber region, Mullah Sadullah in Swat, Hadda Mullah in Bajaur and Mullah Powindah in Waziristan. The British had to mobilise seventy-five thousand troops to counter the Pathan revolt, which took more than two years to be suppressed.

Chapter five, “A Most Superior Person” deals with the Viceroy George Nathaniel Curzon, who assumed the highest office in India at the age of thirty-nine. Stewart discusses in detail the “Forward Policy” of Lord Curzon, along with other policies, namely “Closed Border Policy”, and “Masterly Inactivity”, to tackle the Frontier problem. The author apprises the readers that under Curzon, the Frontier’s defence system was re-organised, “Khyber Jezailchis” was re-raised as the “Khyber Rifles”, and regular troops were withdrawn from the British India’s “most vulnerable invasion point”. Under Lord Curzon, in the year 1901, the tribal territory and the administrative districts were severed from the Punjab to form F.A.T.A. and N.W.F.P. Stewart, in this chapter, also discusses Pakhtunwali and sheds light on its principles of “badal” (revenge), “melmastia” (protection) and “nanawati” (seeking forgiveness).

Chapter six, “The Red Shirts are Coming”, deals with Abdul Ghaffar Khan’s politics. It discusses Khan’s politico-religious movement, the Khudai Khidmatgar. Khan struggled for Pakhtunistan throughout his life. He, along with the majority of Khudai Khidmitgars, did not participate in the referendum that decided N.W.F.P.’s future status at the eve of partition, on the ground that it does not have an option to create an independent Pathan state. The author also discusses the coming into prominence and the activities of Mirza Ali, the Faqir of Ipi. Interestingly, the author attempts to draw parallels between the hunt for Faqir of Ipi and Osama bin Laden.

Chapter seven, “Did We Not Fight Well?”, discusses Pakistan’s withdrawal of forces, after its creation, from the tribal territories. It sheds light on the tribal people’s war effort in Kashmir, in October 1947. Stewart also observes the negative role of Afghanistan in destabilising Pakistan through its overt and covert support for Pakhtunistan. However, he acknowledges, “there was little tangible evidence of broad-based popular support amongst the Pathans for the idea of a separate Frontier state...”. The chapter also discusses the issues of Talibanisation in the N.W.F.P. and MMA’s coming into prominence. The author opines that the MMA does not pose any threat to stability. He asserts that perceiving MMA as a threat to stability and overly reacting to this may only place “a halo of martyrdom on the mullahs’ heads.”

In the epilogue, Stewart discusses West’s much-liked topic: the whereabouts of Osama. While observing that Pakistani authorities seem to subscribe to the theory of Waziristan as the safe haven for Osama, Stewart notes that, regardless of the outcome, the Pakistani offensive in these areas would badly impact the relationship between Government and the Pathans of Waziristan, and it would take long to be rectified. The author stresses that

more is needed than treating F.A.T.A. as a military problem. He stresses to take tribesmen's sensitivities into account to forestall the spread of Islamic radicalisation in the North West Frontier.

For anyone desirous to know about the resistance the Pathan tribes put against the British, the book by Stewart is a solid and priceless source of information. Decision makers and analysts, dealing with the subject, can benefit a lot from the book. However, the readers must keep in mind that the author is a British, and not immune to the natural tilt towards his countrymen. He frequently praises the Pathans who joined the British in levies or other forces, but pummels hard on those who, in their own right, were proud defenders of their homeland, culture and values. ■

Mustansar Billah, Assistant Research Officer, IPRI

Sigrid Faath (Ed.), *Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World*
(London: Hurst and Company, 2006), pages 305.

The book is edited by Dr. Sigrid Faath, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at the University of Hamburg and Scientific Director of the Middle East Research Programme "Menavision 2012" of the German Institute of Middle East Studies, Hamburg, Germany. Drawing on the typology of "anti-Americanism," of two noted US political scientists, Alvin Z. Rubinstein and Donald B. Smith this book is a compilation of case studies of Islamic countries in North Africa, Middle East, South and Southeast Asia.

The book traces the roots, forms and manifestations of "anti-Americanism" as a phenomenon. Although "anti-Americanism" started taking root after World War II and was surfacing since the 1960s throughout the globe, it is only after September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the US mainland that this phenomenon has become pervasive. Hence, there is need to review it as reflected in Islamic countries that cover a wide swath of territory from Maghreb, Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East, West Asia to South and Southeast Asia. However, according to writers, this sentiment varies in its causes, nature and manifestations, according to locale and circumstances.

"Anti-Americanism," in fact, has become a buzzword with a mix of emotions, feelings and sensitivities. In the last six years or so, the Western media and press have given it a wide coverage. Interestingly, "anti-Americanism" has become almost synonymous with being "anti-West", insofar as most of European nations are seen as appendages/followers of the US. This is despite the fact that Europeans tend to distance themselves discreetly from the US policies. Also, a muted form of "anti-Americanism" prevails there. Also, Europeans differ in many ways with the US on issues of unilateralism, military adventurism, trade, global warming and nuclear

proliferation. This is understandable, given their proximity to the Islamic world, historical connectivity and increased trade and economic links.

As a concept, “anti-Americanism,” can be differentiated from “anti-US” policies. While the latter is mostly rationalistic and directed at some specific issues of US foreign policy, the former, as Herbert J. Spiro, remarked is a “harsh criticism of the core values of the US Constitution.” Also, “anti-Americanism” is different from “anti-Westernism.” The former is specifically directed at the US culture, lifestyle, values, while the latter is more of a generic term.

The writers in the above volume highlight the fact that while “anti-Americanism” is a prevailing reality, the counter-concept of “Americanism” is co-existing, too. Generally defined as acceptance of American values as defined in US Constitution (freedom, equality, justice and democracy), “anti-Americanism” is a “non-rational position born out of passion and instinct.”

However, as the writers point out, the concept needs more sophisticated analysis. It seems that four broad types of “anti-Americanism” exist. First, is “issue-oriented,” implying that there are more or less spontaneous reactions to certain US policy measures; secondly, “ideological,” which is derived from nationalism, anti-imperialism, socialism, Marxist-Leninism, and from certain Islamist groups, governments and organizations; thirdly, “revolutionary,” in the sense of overthrowing pro-US governments; and fourthly, “instrumental,” tending to stoke “anti-Americanism” for attaining policy goals and legitimacy by certain regimes and groups. In other words, attaining mass support, neutralising opposition, shifting blame from own failings, finding scapegoats and providing rationale to move closer to other powers. After 9/11, many religious groups and organisations have used these tactics to rally sympathy and support for their cause.

In the views of the authors, expressions of “anti-Americanism” operate at two levels: governmental and public. At the governmental level, it takes the form of criticism only but “anti-Americanism” is expressed through religious parties, Islamist groups and others. The way and form of “anti-Americanism” is expressed, depends upon whether forums exist for articulation of criticism; if the state promotes or bans this criticism; how significant is the social influence of those levelling criticism; what are dominant mechanisms of protest; and, what frustrations and emotions exist to mobilise these feelings.

The writers observe that while “anti-Americanism” is expressed by certain religious groups and one or two religious/ideological governments, generally the governments have exercised restraint in openly criticising the US. In fact, the phenomenon of “Americanism,” has also co-existed and is symbolised by “soft power” of the US.

“Anti-Americanism,” as a feature in global politics, became pronounced after the Iraq invasion in 2003. In addition, US’ dual and

hypocritical policies, unilateralism and certain objectionable actions by its intelligence agencies exacerbated these feelings of anger and hostility. Earlier, the world was bipolar, where nations distrusted the US and opted to align with the Soviet Union as an alternative. Now, the US as a self-confessed unipolar state, and unabashedly following a policy of unilateralism, has created general resentment.

It seems that “anti-Americanism,” at least in the Muslim world, will remain a feature of international politics for the foreseeable future. This would depend upon: future military interventions, how the situation in Iraq unfolds, how regional countries perceive Iraqi developments, and the US global policies on nuclear, energy, trade and ecology. The potential for “anti-Americanism,” according to the contributors, is much greater in the Middle East and in countries like Pakistan. Perhaps, this can be attributed to direct US military interventions in the region. Moreover, dire economic conditions such as unequal distribution of wealth and poor governance, provide a good opening to Islamist groups and Islamic political parties to flay the US and the West.

All said and done, “anti-Americanism,” as exemplified by certain radical fundamental groups globally and within certain Islamic countries, has not resulted in any installation of radical Islamic governments. However, certain militant and terrorist attacks sponsored by transnational religious outfits are still occurring. If the US has to counter the surge of “anti-Americanism,” it will have to rely increasingly on policies of multilateralism, balanced policy in the ME conflict, strengthening of the UN, reduction in military presence abroad and setting rules for future interventions. Also, use of “soft power” over hard power is essential in winning the “hearts and minds” of people.

Ironically, the US dismisses its failings in the Islamic World as mere “image problem,” that could be rectified by good public relations. On the contrary, the image has taken the form of deep distrust and antipathy. In this regard, the Europeans generally have fared better than the Americans. However, they also share the odium of “anti-Americanism.” But at present, they cannot do much in convincing or veering the US away from unilateralist policies.

Perhaps, the rise of newly emerging powers [China, Russia, Western Europe], together with recession of the US from global scene could mitigate “anti-Americanism.” After all, today, it is the US forces that are occupying the Muslim lands: Palestine by Israel [duly propped by the US], Iraq by the US and Afghanistan by US/NATO-led ISAF. Further, occasional threats are hurled at some Muslim countries on their nuclear programmes.

Nevertheless, to assert that “anti-Americanism” is irreversible is not true. There is potential for narrowing this deficit of trust and goodwill, in case the US and the Islamic World learn to base their relations on mutual respect.

That would greatly help in dissipating the wave of “anti-Americanism,” now palpable in the Islamic World. ■

Dr Maqsudul Hasan Nuri, Senior Research Fellow, IPRI.

Samir Amin, *Beyond US Hegemony? Assessing the Prospects for Multipolar World*

(London: 2006), pages 191.

The author of this book, Samir Amin has served as director of IDEP (the United Nations African Institute for Planning), and director of the Third World Forum in Dakar, Senegal. Also, he worked as a co-founder of the World Forum for Alternatives. His published work in English includes, *Eurocentrism* (1989), *Capitalism in the age of Globalisation: The Management of Contemporary Society* (1997), *Obsolescent Capitalism: Contemporary Politics and Global Disorder* (2003), and *Europe and the Arab World: Patterns and Prospects for the New Relationship*. In 2005, he co-authored the *Arab World: Patterns and Corpect*, with Ali Eli Kenz.

This book under review is divided into seven chapters. These include: apart from Introduction, (1) The Triad - America, Europe and Japan: united or fragmented, (2) Does the rise of China challenge the imperialist order? (3) Russia out of the tunnel? (4) India, a great power? (5) Can solidarity be rebuilt among the countries of the South? (6) Reform of the UN as part of a multipolar globalization, (7) Conclusions and Annexes.

In the book under review, the author has basically presented the idea of “alternative hegemonic blocs”. While elaborating his thesis, Samir Amin rejects the notion that the current form of neo-liberal capitalism is an inevitable future for humanity. He analyses tendencies within the US, Europe and Japan, takes stocks of the potentials of China and India, and envisages the likely future of Russia, and prospects of the developing world. He explores whether other hegemonic blocs may emerge to contain American power or hegemony, and compel free market capitalism to adjust to the demands of the other rising powers. He identifies the imperative global trends vis-à-vis his own assumptions and understanding of the global politics. He raises the point that in case, the US policy is to unite all those countries or blocs that can potentially be used to counter the extremism and wage a “war on terror,” how is it that the US does not look toward India, Russia and China, for major partnership? As opposed to the hegemonic bloc constituted by the U.S. and U.K, Amin elaborates in his introduction that “other hegemonic blocs are possible”, a formulation that owes some potential to “another world is possible.” He refers to Asia and Africa while using the term “another world.” According to him, “Such alternative blocs will not necessarily be called upon

to make a radical break with the requirements of capitalism, but they may very well force capitalism to adapt to certain demands that do not conform to its peculiar logic.”

In the manner Amin describes Europe, at times, it appears that he is getting more utopian and idealistic, while discussing its potentials. For instance, at one place he writes:

Since the French Revolution, the political cultures of France and continental Europe, though existing within a perfectly capitalist framework, have been considerably different from the one we have just described. [U.S. racism, inequality, etc.] Here, the values of liberty and equality have from the beginning been placed on an equal footing, and this has required social management of the conflict between the two, and state action to regulate the deployment of capitalism in that light. This different approach opens up the possibility - if social struggles make it necessary - of making a start on participatory democracy.

While unfolding history of Europe Amin forgets the existing realities, such as increase in racism in European countries, and the European nations taking pride in their race, while undermining the respect of other European races.

While reading the book, one gets the impression that Amin lives in a utopia of a “supposedly” racist America and comparatively the more enlightened Europe. His own words are supporting this argument and he writes, “The other formative elements of American political culture - slavery and its racist legacy, the Indian genocide and the contempt for other peoples that it expressed - are equally specific and have no parallel in Europe.” Historical facts do not favour this whole argument as America itself was a colony of UK, France and many other countries.

In the first chapter, the author describes “The Triad” which he explains as “collective imperialism” of US, Japan, Canadian external provinces, Europe, Australia and the New Zealand. According to him, this collective imperialism manages the economic dimension of capitalist globalisation through WTO, IMF, World Bank, OECD, and the political military dimension is managed by NATO. After this, the author evaluates the differences between these states and foresees if there are any probabilities for fragmentation of this triad. While doing this exercise, his pro-EU mindset becomes quite obvious which affects the academic value of his argument. For instance, he writes that “American ideology is a protest against EU enlightenment.” He also writes that the “geographical position of Japan makes it a prisoner of the United States.” Such arguments agitate the reader and he think that this book is the result of author’s personal whims and prejudices.

The second chapter, “Does the rise of China challenge the imperialist order?” takes stock of the potential threat that China may pose to the existing

world order. The basic question raised by the author in this chapter is “Is China evolving towards a stable form of capitalism, or there is still a possible perspective of a transition to socialism?” The author has discussed this issue by analysing the contradictions and struggles which have taken place in China, while evaluating the weaknesses of capitalism, and the strong cards of anti-capitalist and socialist forces. As per author’s assumptions, the future of China will remain uncertain, in terms of struggle, going on between socialist and capitalist forces.

In the third chapter, “Russia out of the Tunnel?,” the author’s main focus is on the challenges that Russia has faced since the emergence of former USSR. As per his perception, the transformation in Russia during last 15 years is the result of the acceleration of underlying trends, which were existing within the Soviet system in 1930s and have been gathering trends since then. He proposes the analysis of the characteristics of the Soviet system such as social system, a power system, and a method of integration in global system and their continued deteriorated forms in contemporary Russia. The author articulates the basic characteristics of Soviet system which are: a corporatist regime, autocratic power and a military and political superpower. One part of this chapter discusses the new forms of capitalism in Russia. These details are quite interesting.

“India a great power?” is the fourth chapter, in which the author expresses his doubts regarding the conditions necessary for India to succeed in becoming a great power. He writes that “India becoming a great power seems far behind the present.” Until now India does not qualify that criterion. He wrote historically India is agriculturally capitalist country. He described caste system as a hurdle in the development of India. The author compared the Indian political system and the Communist system of China which detract the reader from the actual issue. This is based on the assumption that China and India are competitors and the author is trying to prove that socialist system is the more appropriate way to achieve high standards of progress and development. The author describes four challenges faced by India to move forward. These challenges are: to find a solution of radical Indian peasants, to create a united workers front to integrate the segments of working class, to maintain the unity of the Indian sub-continent, and to focus international political options on the issue of the solidarity of South Asians.

The fifth chapter is “Can solidarity be rebuilt among the countries of the South?” appears quite idealistic. Here the author discusses the prospects of an alliance of African and Asian states, which are victim of US hegemony, as per his perceptions. While elaborating this argument, he mentions the key foundations for a broad alliance of solidarity among the peoples and states of south. He is of the opinion that establishment of united political front of South can overcome the existing divisions among the states of South, while accusing the US for these divisions.

The sixth chapter is “Reform of the UN as a part of multipolar globalisation”. The idea of the author is to utilise UN as a tool to maintain multipolar globalization. The author starts the chapter by giving a description of multipolarity, which is “commitment to different principles.” He believes that multipolarity will strengthen the institutional framework in world’s political system.

The seventh and the last chapter is “conclusion” where the author again justifies his ideas presented in the book. He also gives some suggestions and recommendations. Some times the book under review, appears as if it is a policy paper rather than a well researched book.

While going through the book, one must take into account that Samir Amin, himself was, at one time, a Maoist. So, his deep rooted prejudices are overshadowing the neutrality and the academic value of the book. At places, it appears as if it were a political monograph written by one, belonging to a latest political party. The author admits in the beginning that the book under review, reflects his personal political views, and he himself stands for a multipolar world. So, he develops his thesis around the idea of a multipolar world. On the whole, the book does not meet the requirement of well-researched objective account. It lacks depth and sound scholarship.■

Asma Shakir Khawaja, Research officer, IPRI.

William Maley, *Rescuing Afghanistan*

(London: Hurst and Company, 2006), pages 176.

Afghanistan has become a classical example of an unfulfilled, forgotten vows laced with power politics of the flawed US polices, resulting in domestic political instability and interference. It has been marred by lack of coherence, trust and commitment by the wider international community. Conflicting interests of “kaleidoscopic array” of different interest groups, have caused major loss to the momentum at the beginning of the “rescue mission” by foreign forces. The Operation Enduring Freedom commenced with the objective to “rescue” Afghan nation from the clutches of a catastrophic war in Afghanistan but it has been far from realising a “humanitarian” venture. Critical and detailed analysis of events and situations, as they affected Afghanistan from 2001 and 2005, is the main objective of the book *Rescuing Afghanistan* by William Maley, Australian Afghan specialist.

William Maley has been a long time observer of Afghan politics and has produced informed and authentic books on Afghanistan. Currently, he is working as professor and director of the Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy at the Australian National University. He has served in various institutes and universities as a visiting professor and research fellow, which includes Russian Diplomatic Academy, Center for the Study of Public Policy at the University

of Strathclyde, and Oxford University. A regular visitor to Afghanistan, he has authored profound books on Afghanistan, such as *The Afghanistan Wars* (2002); edited book *Fundamentalism Reborn? Afghanistan and the Taliban* (1998, 2001); co-authored *Regime Change in Afghanistan: Foreign Intervention and the Politics of legitimacy* (1991), and *Political Order in Post-Communist Afghanistan* (1992).

The book under review has an analytical framework by first establishing and explaining the functions of a state, then giving an in-depth analysis of the deficiencies of the Afghan state in the post-Taliban period. The writer, then, systematically examines the progress in functions and reconstituted fundamentals of the state of Afghanistan. This includes the much-desired urge to develop a sound nexus between security and development in “knife edged” political scenario of the troubled country. Further, the book demonstrates that decades of conflict have created an extensively challenging set of problems for the Afghan people and the wider world. It shows that only a determined, credible and long-term commitment from the international community would result in lasting salvation. But most of these promises have yet to be honoured. The writer is of the view that it is better to make promises, which one does consider to be fulfilled, otherwise “it is better not to make promises” (p.97).

While setting the context, the writer explains what he means by “rescue”. According to him rescuing means to intervene on a humanitarian objective in a state, where its nationals are entangled in a threatening situation. Critical evaluation of the action taken by super power in Afghanistan to provide the taste of emancipation, which Afghans had forgotten in three decades of endless war of attrition, shows that the world has become much insecure and unsafe, as it has never been before (p 10-11). It is significant to note here that in this wider framework of “rescue” mission, what has been lacking so far is the active involvement of Afghan people who are the real sufferers.

In the following chapters, the writer gave at length the problems faced by the allied forces in general, and Afghans in particular, regarding the building of a sound political system, impediments in security and problems of human development. The Bonn Agreement, although laid a solid foundation for security and legality for the Afghan state, but all that was merely on paper. Security structure remained without proper “organizational character” and, instead, it has become “part of the problem rather than part of the solution” (p.76) due to the active participation of the corrupt “American warlords” in parliament and elsewhere (p. 23). The development sector seems quite promising and flourishing but ground realities portray some harsh facts, which explain that glass is not half full but half empty (p.82).

It is also worth noting that violence and terrorism has become a “marketable good” (page 87) as poverty has reached much higher level- thus, resulting in a humanitarian disaster. Profoundly eclipsed by “Operation Iraqi

Liberation”, this forgotten war theater should not lose significance because of interests of various groups. An interesting part of the book is regarding the Afghan relations with the outside world. Its relations with the US have been that of “rescuer” and of “rescued” and US acts as a “sole guarantor to the solutions to Afghan problems” (page 103). As far as Afghanistan’s relations with Pakistan are concerned, they have always been problematic. The writer opines that unless and until Pakistan learns to address its internal problems, it would not be able to act as a “constructive” regional power. Afghanistan’s relations with Iran have been complicated as a result of some “exogenous factors”. And as far as its relations with India, they are cordial but this significantly complicates its relations with Pakistan.

The book under review helps us to understand the context and extent of the problems faced by Afghanistan today. The author sets out the formidable challenges faced by the government in Kabul. Balanced and sober account of events, failures and shortcomings are organised into sections on the state building and reconstruction efforts. Thus making this book distinct from other stereotypical discussions on the Afghan affairs. A similar kind of work has also appeared in *Foreign Affairs, January/ February 2007* by Barnett Rubin “Saving Afghanistan” which follows the same approach as that of Maley, explaining the dichotomy of words and deeds of foreign coalition forces that has created trust deficit.

Most of the book was written in late 2005, following the September elections for the new parliament. This was four years after the terrorist attacks on the US, which prompted the invasion. However, at the end of the book, the writer has given a brief epilogue referring to subsequent events. He points out that despite the glowing vows and promises Afghanistan has been facing a threat of insurgents at home and waning support from abroad. The loss of interest from international community to put Afghan on the path of development has made the risk of relapsing into dangerous insecurity. For him, it is not too late to turn things around, but time is running short. He remarks at the end of the book “if we manage to do so, the Afghan people will have reasonable prospects of reasonably decent future. If we fail to do so, it will tell us very little about the Afghans, but a great deal about ourselves” (p. 138).

The language of the book is lucid and the writer has dealt with the subject in a state of healthy appraisal. He has not only critically evaluated the post-Bonn development but has also given some fruitful suggestions on various areas to achieve the objective, which the “summit” has not yet been able to achieve. ■

Farhat Akram, Assistant Research Officer, IPRI.