

## References

*\*In the attached file you can find the following documents: rules, rule change, instructions, judges' files, litigants' requirements. Notice the double standard, and why CASA exists. This calls for more research on this topic.*

**Download:** [Cook County, State of Illinois, Judges Financial Records & Rule of Conduct \(RAR File 67MB\)](#)

# The International Security Environment Relevant to Pakistan (A Historical Perspective)

## Abstract

Pakistan came into existence amidst one of the most tumultuous times of the Cold War which suddenly escalated unprecedentedly in a manner where small, newly freed out of the colonial clutches, administratively fragile, economically unsustainable and, most of all, poorly led nations were caught in a sheer state of insecurity. Mentioning Pakistan precisely, it had not even emerged on the world map when prominent world leaders especially Pandit Nehru and other leaders from his party embarked upon an exhaustive campaign against its survival. Their propaganda hinged on a widely publicized conviction predominantly furthered by the western media which doubted Pakistan's sustenance as a state rather they predicted its re-amalgamation into India due to its highly remote administrative infrastructure, absence of sound economy, and lack of pragmatic political leadership. This scenario was aggravated by almost the entire Muslim religious hierarchy in the sub-continent which fiercely opposed the creation of Pakistan, thus posing formidable existential threats to the newly born Muslim state.

An earnest effort, therefore, has been made to evaluate the international security environment within the ambit of international relations where Pakistan as an ideologically Muslim state commenced with its role as a responsible nation contributing to world peace.

**Keywords:** *Pakistan, International Security, International Relations*

## Introduction - Comprehending the Conceptual Nature of International Security

International Security: the most sought term in the field of international relations in the post- World War II era (since 1945) can be characterized as a ‘comprehensive security’ infrastructure with a predominant culture advocating concrete measures for the shared protection of interests and assets by states, communities, organizations, institutions and multifaceted groups against a number of anticipated threats (Schmid, 2007). The foundational objective of these measures is to ensure the nation's survival, stability in the region, peace among citizenries, and geo-political harmony among states (Eroukhmanoff, 2017). Theoretically, an ideal structure of international security is spearheaded by the political leadership intimately supported by diplomatic channels while military and other law enforcement agencies function within their prescribed areas of responsibility as a consolidated component of the whole security mechanism in order to ensure the accomplishment of assigned goals pertaining to protection and peace (Irondelle, 2013).

Under the prevalent geo-political scenario, the academic field of international security, especially within the realm of international relations has turned out to be an excessively complex phenomenon that has been further compounded by an outdated mindset nourished by the heaps of obsolete texts and, exhaustive preoccupations of researchers, scholars, and practitioners to keep themselves oblivious with the tectonic changes at the global level that impact safety and security, both guaranteeing the survival of a state and its citizens (Kolodziej, 2005). However, paradoxically, there exists an unbridgeable gulf between the proponents of state-centric practitioners in the arena of global diplomacy (international relations) and the citizen-centric academicians, the advocates of human well-being as the foremost priority (Paris, 2004). Moreover, the people-based concept of security (international or otherwise) seeks an outright departure from a redundant notion that is based exclusively on physical aspects where psychological aspects of a human are straightaway ignored. The most notable in this case is the dichotomy in defining the universal concept of international security with its boundaries. Although, every divine order in the world abundantly explains almost all aspects of human security commencing from domestic abuse to state-sponsored genocide, the concept of

international security within the fold of international relations is construed with vested objectives and interests, thus curtailing citizens' psychological as well as physical freedom of expression and actions. This atrocious environment was, however, already prevalent since time immemorial, but has intensified beyond any proportions since the advent of the Cold War in 1945.

Undoubtedly, the cloaked empirical, as well as normative discourse in conceptual persuasiveness, deliberately amplifies the polarities and disjunctions (Baldwin, *The Concept of Security*, 1997). This particular scenario is developed to privilege the state-oriented school of thought while denying the same to the human-centric counterparts under the pretext of national security; yet another unexplainable concept in the domain of international security which is predominantly based on Structuralism. The custodians of this notion of national security comprising political, military, and civil bureaucracies supported by the elite hailing from every quarter of state structure, especially the religious tentacle explore, formulate and implement the policy which is legitimized for targeted objectives; at times, devoid of public interests (Krebs, 2018). This is the foremost reason to curb human rights, an independent individual will, and a non-coercive environment (Baldwin, *The Concept of Security*, 1997). This conception turns out to be chaotic when geo-political scientists perceive it with acute divergence. There exists a perception that the crux of international security within the fold of international relations rests on defending the core value system based on the ethics, morals, and beliefs of a state (Nandan, 1945). But this is a totally outdated concept that is found in tired texts highlighting the US foreign policy related to Isolationism under the Wilsonian thoughts. However, subsequently, the so-called core value system encompassing ethical and moral aspects was superseded by another realistic system that advocated the preservation of national interests by employing any foreseeable means under the garb of international security (Baldwin, *The Concept of Security*, 1997), a scenario which converted the world into an insecure and unpredictable arena for the whole world, especially politically fragile and economically dependent states like Pakistan. But there is an argument that advocates that international security is an imminent means to reduce vulnerability. This concept of security is pointedly relevant to the state while relegating its citizenry earned popularity through extensive propagation by all means at a state's disposal coupled with justification under the international relations' umbrella of Machiavellian political thoughts (Ullman, 1983).

Notwithstanding, Professor Emma Rothschild extends the all-pervading notion of security (based on an evolutionary process of the 1990s) into four distinct components that amalgamate into one compact structure (Rothschild, 1995). Their origination is fundamentally human-centric and, is categorized as under:

- Firstly, the security of a nation is descended downwards to incorporate communities, groups of people, and even individuals.
- Secondly, the security of a nation is elevated to an international system (comprising a number of nations) which is defined as the supranational infrastructure.
- Thirdly, the idea of security is stretched horizontally within a state, community, and organization in which components of social, political, economic, and military are incorporated into one structure.
- Fourthly, the security of every segment within and outside a state is the foremost responsibility of the political hierarchy as a prime invigilating component.

Pragmatically, the state government engages every component of national security which is intensely coupled with its international counterpart in a comprehensive but extended mechanism. Proceeding upwards, it starts from national to international organizational and institutional levels while moving downwards, it commences from national to sub-national, communal, and geographically regional levels. The most important component is the lateral extension of security which comprises the citizenry, especially engaging its psychosocial state (mental health), opinion based on freedom of expression, liberty of actions, and sovereign thought process, all assured by the state is devoid of any fear of reprisal and persecution. In the same context, non-governmental organizations, media, press, private institutions, associations, organizations, and working groups are also incorporated into an extended spectrum of security (Rothschild, 1995).

Conceptually, the geometry of principles of ‘Comprehensive Security,’ or may appropriately be termed as ‘international security’ proposed by Professor Emma Rothschild, shuns the confusion arising from any complexity in debates. Historically, the course of peaceful revolutions in East Europe in the 1990s predominantly emphasized the top priority of sovereign thought. According to Vaclav Havel, the sovereignty of a state, a nation, or a community can

only be considered genuinely sovereign provided it emanates from a human's independent thought process, free expression of ideas, and freedom of actions (Havel, 1993). This notion can only prevail when citizens in a state are guaranteed a secure and peaceful environment by means of security.

## **International Security's Alignment with Dominant Socio-political Theories since the Emergence of Pakistan (1947 to present)**

However, the hard fact remains that a false image of national security concocted by the malicious mindset misled the world which ultimately turned into a dangerous place. However, according to a considerable number of experts international security can be termed as normative in nature; a theory in the discipline of international affairs which pursues efforts to ensure peace and harmony among communities by aligning normativity with idealism, realism, liberalism, Marxism, globalization, and constructivism; all within the fold of political science (Baylis, Smith, & Owens, 2011). So, under the pretext of normative theory, states enforce their particular form of international security as a measure of expediency as well as the self-conceived ethical code which, in other words, is a cogent measure poised to achieve an end acceptable to the majority irrespective of negative impact on the people (Wolfers, 1952). This particular phenomenon has created unscalable barriers in the thought processes among nations, communities, organizations, and institutions, thus converting the world into a lucrative place for wars and conflicts.

The Ukraine crisis is the most glaring example in the prevalent geo-political scenario which has set the southeastern part of Eurasia at ablaze. People with varied mindsets possessing highly divergent perceptions of threats, their nature, types, and, most of all, priorities to deal with them in various parts of the world are trapped in the most chaotic scenario with regard to international security within the domain of international relations. This is a dilemma at the global level where nations and communities find themselves incapable of reaching a consensus on the nature of a particular threat, its intensity, and suitable modus operandi to eradicate it up to a certain extent where it no longer exists as a threat. However, it again depends upon the thinking

nurtured by a particular nation or community (Newman, 2010). Yet, another aspect that geopolitical scientists argue is that international security in the international arena can either be projected as an instrument of power or merely be employed to restore order and maintain peace. However, it pursues the state policy destined with specific goals.

The deployment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Afghanistan with a mission to ensure peace in the region is a befitting example to support this point of view (Buzan, 2008). This particular case proves that international security has turned out to be a global phenomenon exercised by multinational organizations and institutions to further their states' national interests. In this regard, non-governmental organizations have played the most strategic role by employing clandestine operational techniques masked by their designated functions in the target country, community, and organization (Rothschild, 1995).

Foregoing in view, there are some prominent socio-political theories that serve as the foundational part of a structure of international security in contemporary international relations:

- Realism (Classical Realism). It is out rightly considered the most dominant socio-political theory (within the realm of international security) commencing from the epochs of Sun Tzu (544-496 BC) and Thucydides (400 BC) to Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Thomas Hobbs (1588-1679) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) (Elman, 2008). This period is stretched over 2300 years which distinguishes its strength and efficacy in international affairs. However, it is 20th-century classical realism that transformed international security which advocates that the ambition for power infused in human nature, though ethically fallacious, prompts communities, institutions, organizations, and states to remain engaged in pursuit by all foreseeable sources and strategies to enhance their potentialities. In addition, the non-existence of an analog of the state power in the international arena inculcates a laissez-faire attitude thus allowing appetites to extend its domain and influence. This particular category of Realism explores conflictual responses and attitudes based on which hostile environments are deliberately crafted by hawkish statesmen corroborated by the state's cardinal organs; legislature, judiciary, and military to pursue its vested interests under the garb of deceptive narratives. According to classical realists, international politics may be described as iniquitous due to

reasons that, at times, wicked people at the helm of affairs resort to villainous policies (Spirtas, 1996). This particular theory emanating from classical realism has been elaborated by Professor Morgenthau in his unequalled classic work on the political realist approach; *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* which is still thought to be relevant by socio-political scientists (Elman, 2008). In addition, the theory of realism with its distinct multiplicity furthers the point of view that international relations are categorized by the inexhaustible and ineluctable spell of belligerence and hostility leading to armed conflicts (Elman, 2008). In brief, realism along with its multiplicity within the realm of international security in international relations stresses that:

- The most pivotal player in the wholesome international order is a nation-state.
- International institutions and organizations are of less priority than a state.
- Communities, groups, and individuals do not have preference over a state.
- Divergence of focus from the state's interests would disturb the balance of power.
- International institutions have the least interference with the state's sovereign matters.
- The international order is anarchical in nature while implementing it.
- The most cardinal objective of a state in the international arena is its survival.
- The factor of survival is analogous to the maintenance of national power.
- States operate on a rationale that dictates the primacy of the national self-interest.
- National power is an indispensable factor for influence in the international arena.
- Power in the international order is the direct outcome of force in human nature.
- Humans depend on anarchical ways for survival in many ways including war.



- Neo-realism. This theory can be characterized as the contra classical realism. Discussing classical realism, Hans Morgenthau assumes that it is the leadership of a state which is influenced by ambitions to clinch power. Kenneth Waltz, who has replaced Morgenthau in this academic field of realism, contradicts this assumption by omitting leadership's driving ambitions coupled with the state's aspirations, rather he ascertains that primarily, it is an urge for survival (or probably the maintenance of status) which dictates a state and its leadership to pursue measures for security in the international arena. According to classical realism, the state strategies and policies are predominantly rationalistic in nature which neo-realism confronts, explaining that states' responses and their conduct are dictated by nature and the degree of competitiveness among them. States opt for courses of action which yield them an edge over their competitors. Neo-realism explores, yet another characteristic of geopolitics in international relations; its 'dismal constancy' despite fast-changing geo-political environments coupled with fluid political conditions within as well as among nations. This peculiar aspect amply leads to the conclusion that whatever strategies and policies are applied by states in the international sphere, are aimed at their survival (or to maintain their status) (Waltz, 1979). According to neo-realists, the international political arena depicts a gruesome scenario instead of being belligerent and confrontational (Spirtas, 1996). They envisage that multipolarity is more complicated and burdensome than bipolarity. Moreover, the degree of interdependence among states in the international political system is inversely proportional to the stability in a peaceful world environment. According to Waltz, interdependence among nations will be less in bipolar geopolitical environments as compared to the multipolar global system (Waltz, 1979). However, it has been observed that Waltz's theory of polarity has proved utterly short of pragmatic expectations. The era of the Cold War (1945-1991) presents an unmistakable example in which two superpowers reigned supreme as hegemony within their respective sphere of influence at the cost

of the sovereignty of other states. The focus on international security in international relations was at its peak that receded colossally after Russia's strategic downsizing which is popularly termed its demise. The absence of a belligerent in the international theater made way for fissiparous tendencies in big powers and their allies in the capitalist west. The search for an adversary was already in progress for decades which culminated in the shape of Islamic terrorism; a scenario that heralded the renaissance of classic realism. In contrast, Neorealism contradicts classical realism's arguments about human nature which is thought to lead to the entire spectrum of a state's affairs in international relations. It ascertains that the particular structure of an international system determines the behavior among states exclusively based on the nature of the institution or organization (Rosenau & Durfee, 1999). Although it does not outrightly discard the role of human nature in the international sphere arguing that the human psyche does have an important character on the stage, it does not directly impact the state's behavior which is predominantly under the immense influence of international order. It is primarily the lack of authority to supervise and monitor the international system which creates environments where states act keeping their national interests as the top priority over other obligations. This tendency of self-interests among states is augmented by another factor in which one state acts to prevent another, though an ally or otherwise, from serving its national interests (Baldwin, 1993). The United States' pressure on Pakistan to abandon China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) coupled with its alleged involvement in the country's internal affairs is the most obvious case in point which has destabilized the political and economic systems of the nation. Historically, it is abundantly clear that within the domain of an interdependent international system, states covertly as well as overtly resort to deprive, deny or prevent their competitors, despite being partners and allies, from gaining an advantage at the cost of their own national gains. The Russia-Ukraine War (2022) presents it as another glaring example: the United

States, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and European Union (EU) have developed their gains at the cost of miseries suffered by the Ukrainian people. This war has furnished an opportune moment for the United States to pump its armament industry with billions of US Dollars for arms supplies to Ukraine, to NATO for its expansion, and to the EU for generating businesses in terms of hundreds of billions of US Dollars (Castle, 2015). According to neorealist theory, Russia's military operations against Ukraine are distinctly rationalistic in nature aimed at safeguarding its geo-strategic objective in the region while, at the same time, preserving its geo-political edge over the US-led NATO and EU. This entire phenomenon is based on the anarchical international mechanism (Cook, 2016).

## **The Multi-sum International Security Structures under the Umbrella of Traditional Security Systems**

The domain of traditional security adheres to the theory of realism with its wholesome multiplicity in which the cardinal factor of international security within the realm of international relations is a state while relegating the citizenry to the subordinated slot. The pervasiveness of these theorems dominated the Cold War era (1945-1991) during which nations, especially major powers invested unprecedentedly in international security under the pretext of national sovereignty and interests, and balance of power aimed at maintaining state's geo-political influence (Bajpai, 2000). In nutshell, traditional security is overwhelmingly the classical realist-centric component within the domain of international security (Owen, 2004).

### ***The Multi-sum International Security Structure***

With the advent of the 21st century, technology developed at a mammoth scale which altered the whole global geo-political scenario. Traditional theories, if not rendered redundant, surely fell short of their efficacy in confronting the latest advancements in every field, specifically the latest trends in modern warfare. With this notion in mind, Dr. Nayef R. F. Al-

Rodhan asserted that the concept of international security under the 21st century's scenario of international relations could never be applied as a zero-sum game in which states are the exclusive dominant players and, moreover powerful states exert their influence over the weaker nations in order glean the maximum advantages under the shelter of their national interests while literally abandoning others in a chaotic situation. The United States' withdrawal from Afghanistan which shocked the whole world especially NATO in that country is an unprecedented example that realist scholars would continue to quote until the same episode is repeated by some states.

Dr. Nayef suggests that international security within the realm of 21st-century international affairs should comprise of five integrated components to establish a security cauldron in the following order of priority:

- Human Security (Psychological and physical)
- Environment Security (Social, political, economic, and physical)
- National (incorporating communities, ethnic groups, religious sects)
- Transnational (based on Panchsheel Principles)
- Peaceful and harmonious coexistence

Dr. Nayef stressed that the concept of international security under the prevalent geo-political scenario is wishful thinking without efficient governance encompassing at lateral and horizontal tiers of the governmental structure whose preferences must commence from the citizenry (along with their psychological, social, cultural, political and physical aspects), environments, national till their culmination at the international arena (Al-Rodhan, 2007).

### ***International Security and Pakistan***

Having studied the historical perspectives of international security within the domain of international relations coupled with colossal changes due to technological developments in the 21st century's international relations, it is comprehensively understood that the sphere of international security has also transformed itself to meet the prevalent geo-political world's security needs. Based on highly remarkable work conducted by scholars, researchers and

practitioners referred to in this research paper, there exists no ambiguity that a state like Pakistan must refine its national security mechanism with the objective of bringing it in line with the concept proposed by Dr. Nayef advocating the Multi-sum International Security Structure which has gained the worldwide acceptance. However, the foremost prerequisite to implementing this concept is efficient and stable administration which can only be achieved when there is political stability in the country and all the state institutions realize their sense of responsibility and work collectively for the welfare of the nation.

***Dr. Ahmed Raza***

[Raza998@gmail.com](mailto:Raza998@gmail.com)

## References

- Al-Rodhan, N. R. (2007). *The Five Dimensions of Global Security - Proposal for a Multi-sum Security Principle*. Geneva Centre for Security Policy.
- Bajpai, K. (2000, August). *Human Security: Concept and Measurement*. New Delhi, India: Kroc Institute Occasional Paper #19:OP:1.
- Baldwin, D. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Neorealism and Neoliberalism - The Contemporary Debate*. Columbia University Press.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1997, January). *The Concept of Security*. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), 5-26 (22 pages). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20097464>
- Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (2011). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. United Kingdom : Oxford University Press.
- Buzan, B. (2008). *People, States & Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Colchester, United Kingdom : ECPR (European Consortium for Political Research) Press.
- Castle, D. (2015). *Can Neorealism Explain the Ukraine Crisis?*  
[https://www.academia.edu/22040732/Can\\_Neorealism\\_Explains\\_the\\_Ukraine\\_Crisis](https://www.academia.edu/22040732/Can_Neorealism_Explains_the_Ukraine_Crisis).
- Cook, S. (2016, April 19). *The Crimean Crisis and International Law: A Realist Perspective*.  
[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2765574](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2765574)
- Elman, C. (2008). *Realism*. In P. D. Williams, *Security Studies - An Introduction* (pp. 15-26). Routledge.
- Eroukhmanoff, C. (2017). *Securitisation Theory*. In S. McGlinchey, R. Walters, & C. Scheinplflug (Eds.), *International Relations Theory* (pp. 104-109 ). Bristol, England: E-International Relations Publishing.
- Havel, V. (1993). *Summer Meditations*. Vintage.

- Irondelle, B. (2013, April). The New Parameters of International Security: Conceptual Introductio. *New and Evolving Trends in International Security*, 4-6. (A.-M. Le Gloannec, B. Irondelle, & D. Cadier, Eds.) [https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/TW\\_WP\\_13.pdf](https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/TW_WP_13.pdf)
- Kolodziej, E. A. (2005). International relations and international security: boundaries, levels of analysis, and falsifying theories. In E. A. Kolodziej, *Security and International Relations* (pp. 11-47). Cambridge University Press. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614903.002>
- Krebs, R. R. (2018, March). The Politics of National Security. (W. C. Wohlforth, & A. Gheciu, Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of International Security*, 2-12 (11 pages) . doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.42
- Nandan, V. K. (1945, January). Reviewed Works: US Foreign Policy by Walter Lippmann. *India Quarterly*, 1, 1, 89-93 (5 pages) . Sage Publications, Inc. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45067249>
- Newman, E. (2010, January). Critical human security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 36(1), 77-94 (18 pages). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40588105>
- Owen, T. (2004). Challenges and opportunities for defining and measuring human security. *Disarmament Forum* 3, 15-24.
- Paris, R. (2004, September ). Still an Inscrutable Concept. *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), 370-372. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26298651>
- Rosenau, J., & Durfee, M. (1999). *Thinking Theory Thoroughly - Coherent Approaches To An Incoherent World*. Routledge.
- Rothschild, E. (1995, Summer). What Is Security? *Daedalus*, 124(3 (The Quest for World Order)), 53-98 (46 pages). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20027310>
- Schmid, M. T. (2007, December). *The Concept of Comprehensive Security: A Distinctive Feature of a Shared Security Culture in Europe?* Monterey, California , United States : Naval Postgraduate School.
- Spirtas, M. (1996). A house divided: Tragedy and evil in realist theory. *Security Studies*, 5(3), 385-402.

Ullman, R. H. (1983, Summer). Redefining Security. *International Security*, 8(1), 129-153.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2538489>

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. California : Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Wolfers, A. (1952, December). "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4), 481-502 (22 pages). doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2145138>