

TPP, China and South Korea, turn their endeavor to forging and consolidating a triangular free-trade agreement among China, South Korea, and Japan.

Duality between Economy and Security. Most pronounced in the Pacific dynamics is the duality between economic and security interactions in the region. Economically vigorous and alluring is China, whereas in terms of security the United States is reassuring to many Pacific Asian countries. Thus, in terms of trade, investment, and aid, China has been number one. Not only vis-à-vis Japan and Korea but also vis-à-vis most ASEAN members, China is the number-one trade partner, surpassing the United States. Even vis-à-vis the United States, China is the number-one trade partner. China has been vigorous especially to those countries that had not been treated well by the United States or those countries that had been considered to be useful in terms of breaking the anti-China encirclement. What is no less important to note is that Chinese economic advances are not only government-driven but also nongovernmental entrepreneur-driven. Given the increasing inequality between rich and poor and the hardships shouldered by the poor, the latter seek opportunities everywhere. Given the increasing wealth the rich have accumulated, they seek the expansion of profits and power, thus the ubiquitous barrage of Chinese products, Chinese migrants, Chinese investment, Chinese aid, Chinese tourists, etc. It is not surprising to find that Americans cannot think about living without Chinese products. Nor is it surprising to find that in the African continent as many as 1 million Chinese reside and work.

This economic ubiquity of China makes the US security presence in the Pacific region more difficult to be singularly appreciated. The US security presence in the Pacific region is challenged by China. Starting with China's coastal areas like the East China Sea and the South China Sea, China goes far beyond the coasts to the oceans. Most important are the western Pacific, where China wants to deny the United States access to security-sensitive areas, and the Indian Ocean, where China needs access to the petroleum supply through the South China Sea, the Malacca Strait, and the Indian Ocean to the Middle

East and beyond. It looks like a new Cold War. But for the United States to regulate economic flows from China is counterproductive as American consumers cannot survive without Chinese products and as US dollars collapse when China-held US Treasury bonds are withdrawn en masse. The US security presence in the Pacific region has been weakened by the US military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq as well as the general economic difficulties from the 2008 economic bubble collapse. Those countries that have benefited by the hegemonic US security presence in the Pacific region are perplexed. While economic benefits keep increasing from interactions with China, those with the United States are declining. While Chinese self-assertiveness is heightening, the US security presence in the Pacific region is suspected to unnecessarily provoke China when the US strategic posture may not be fully implemented given the nationwide economic hardship and political uncertainty.

Creeping Democratization. Whereas the United States declares its return to the Pacific region with warm words of reassurance, the Pacific countries may be thinking about their subtly increasing freedom to maneuver as well as the need to take care of themselves. Using this window of opportunity to loosen the hegemonic order combined with the rising Asian affluence, political liberalization and democratization seem to be moving forward.

Most dramatic is Thailand. The resounding victory of Yingluck Shinawatra in the free and democratic election in 2011 after the 2006 military coup d'état is a case in point. Also, no less reassuring is Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Indonesia, which registered high scores from Freedom House in terms of civil freedom and political liberty, nearly commensurate with those in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries. Also reassuring are Benigno Aquino's Philippines after the corruption-ridden and military-dominated administration of Gloria Arroyo and Lee Myung-bak's South Korea after the weak president Roh Moo-hyun. No less important are the subtly creeping moves in those tight internal security countries like Singapore, which has tolerated parliamentary

opposition, if marginally; Malaysia with Dato' Sri Mohd Najib's business-as-usual style and Cambodia's post-1997 coup d'état gradual moderation under Hun Sen's helmsmanship. Most dramatic of late are Myanmar's Thein Sein announcing the cancellation of a Chinese-assisted dam-building project and Aung San Suu Kyi's announcement to rejoin the political system of the military-backed government, which has taken steps to moderate its paranoid authoritarianism and state-controlled economic management. Less noticed is Vietnam's self-transformation to one of the most reliable high-skilled workforce suppliers in the region. Laos has more tightly regulated bureaucratic politics, which Kaysone Phomvihane denounced, leading to improvement. Brunei restricts politics, preferring free economic transactions and large government revenue accrued from natural resources.

Uncertain Powers in the North Pacific. The United States, China, Japan, and Russia face uncertainty of an extraordinary kind. The United States, determined to hold primacy in the Pacific region as well as globally, has been beset by an extraordinary economic setback and stagnation of its own making. Cutting short massive military budgets is in itself a task entailing enormous difficulty. Resisting temptation to intervene in foreign affairs and yet keeping the world safe from war needs extraordinary military strength and diplomatic savvy. Yet cries for smaller government and disentanglement from foreign affairs keep undermining the power to execute such grand strategies.

China is no less plagued by economic setback and social unrest. Seeking a harmonious society while enabling a peaceful rise in the world are China's goals under Hu Jintao. With Xi Jinping to be appointed leader in 2012, China seems to be adopting an approach more authoritarian at home and more self-assertive abroad than that of Hu Jintao.

Japan, hard hit by the great earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear disaster in 2011, has been recovering remarkably fast. Yet the great economic difficulties confronting both the United States and the European Union make the Japanese yen a favorite, if temporary, target for keeping one's assets. This makes

Japan's economic recovery slower and manufacturing businesses have fled from Japan. At home, Japan under Yoshihiko Noda has searched for ways to fix consumption tax hikes and social policy expenditure cuts that are agreeable to most political parties while citizens are wary of indecisive politicians without leadership.

Russia under Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev faced citizens' protests over fraudulent Duma elections in 2011. Putin determined to push through all the way, seeking to build Russia with the slogan Exploit New Opportunities in the East (Pacific Asia) while Resting Peacefully with the West (Europe) and Finding New Equilibrium in the South (central Asia and the Caucasus). All four powers seek ways to revitalize their countries, albeit under conditions of great uncertainty.

[See also Australia; China; Indonesia; Japan; Korea, Republic of; Obama, Barack; and Singapore.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Drysdale, Peter, ed. *Reform and Recovery: The Role of the State and Economic Enterprise in East Asia*. (London, 2000).

Takashi Inoguchi

PAKISTAN

In Urdu, Pakistan's national language, the word "Pakistan" means "the land of the pure," a reference to faithful Muslims. The word "Pakistan" is also an acronym, for Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sindh, and Baluchistan. Pakistan came into existence as a country on 14 August 1947 when Viceroy Louis Mountbatten, the representative of the king of England, George VI, transferred power to Governor General Mohammed Ali Jinnah before rushing off to New Delhi to transfer power to an independent but truncated India.

At its creation, Pakistan consisted of two discontinuous territories, the Muslim-majority areas of British India. With the creation of Bangladesh out of East Pakistan in December 1971, after a horrendous nine-month civil war, the territory of West Pakistan

became Pakistan. Present-day Pakistan is bordered by China to the northeast, India to the east and southeast, the Arabian Sea to the south, and Iran and Afghanistan to the west and northwest. Pakistan has a long-standing border dispute with India, which dates from the partition of British India into the independent countries of India and Pakistan and the questionable ascension of the princely state of Kashmir to India. The Line of Control forms the disputed border. The Durand Line, which has been contested by governments in Afghanistan, marks the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Territorially, Pakistan consists of four provinces—Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (formerly the North-West Frontier Province), and Baluchistan (listed in order of size of population)—and four “autonomous” territories—Azad Kashmir, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, Islamabad Capital Territory, and the Northern Areas.

Growth of gross national product has been high, but that wealth has not been converted into general well-being. Pakistan’s original development program was based on the view that economic growth provided a “functional justification for inequality of income” (Haq 1963, p. 2). Pakistan has had difficulty transforming a human extraction-based economic development model into a human capacity-oriented economy.

Pakistan has one of the world’s largest standing armies. It has contributed more troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions than any other country.

More Muslims live in Pakistan than in any single country other than Indonesia. That Pakistan’s population is overwhelmingly Muslim—more than 95 percent—gives rise to the mistaken notion that Pakistan is culturally and religiously monolithic. The reality is that Pakistan is extraordinarily culturally and religiously diverse.

Scholarship on Pakistan. Some scholars hold that Pakistan predated its de jure creation in 1947; the All India Muslim League’s Pakistan Resolution in 1940, which first expressed the demand for the creation of “separate Muslim states” within a federated India; and the invention of the name by Choudhury Rehmat

Ali in 1931. The Urdu poet Muhammad Allama Iqbal advocated a separate Muslim state within northwest India in 1930. The national educational curriculum teaches that Pakistan has its origins in Muhammad bin Qasim’s eighth-century conquest of Sindh for the Umayyad dynasty. Islam was the unifying identity of the Pakistan Movement, but there was no explicit proposal within the All India Muslim League to bring government or law into conformity with Islam. Some have argued that the creation of Pakistan was the unintended result of Jinnah’s gambit to persuade the Indian National Congress to accept a federated structure in which Muslim-majority provinces in the northwest and the northeast would have substantial autonomy.

The partition of British India affected Pakistan deeply. Kushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan* shows the full entanglement of religious and other identities and how they are managed and torn by government authorities. By the early 1950s more than 10 percent of the population had fled to Pakistan from India or from India to Pakistan. Most urban centers quickly became refugee-majority towns. The territory of Pakistan lost many of its business and industrial classes and had little economic infrastructure, even in East Pakistan where British rule in the Indian subcontinent began. Important economic connections—between Sindh’s cotton farms and Bombay’s mills, for example—were severed and financing was disrupted.

Constitution and Judiciary. The Constituent Assembly took more than eight years to write the first Constitution, which in March 1956 proclaimed Pakistan as an Islamic republic. Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan suspended that Constitution in 1958 when he declared martial law. Ayub Khan promulgated a new Constitution in 1962. A nationwide protest movement against martial law, similar to those of the Arab Spring, persuaded Ayub Khan to hand power to General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan, who arranged for Pakistan’s first direct national elections. Pakistan’s third Constitution was enacted in 1973 under the government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. In 1977, General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq suspended that constitution, when he overthrew

Bhutto and declared martial law. Zia-ul-Haq revived the 1973 Constitution only in 1985 and suspended it again in 1988 shortly before his assassination.

The Pakistani Constitution requires that elections to the National Assembly be held within five years of the previous election. But martial law has been in effect for almost half of Pakistan’s short history, from 1958 until 1971, from 1977 until 1985, four times in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and from 1999 until 2002. Even when elected governments have been in place, as under the latter half of General Pervez Musharraf’s rule, from 2002 to 2008, the military has maintained decisive influence in governance.

In 2007, a vibrant lawyers’ movement and assertive judiciary began to demand accountability from the government and military, requiring the elected government to reinstate dismissed judges and to pursue corruption cases and requiring the security forces to produce in court individuals whom they had detained.

Politics and Parties. Governor General Mohammed Ali Jinnah died in office in September 1948. In October 1951, an Afghan national assassinated Pakistan’s first prime minister, Liaquat Ali Khan. The death of Pakistan’s two most senior national leaders was followed by the breakup of the Pakistan Muslim League in 1958. Seven political parties now claim the legacy of the All India Muslim League.

The first general election, held in 1971, a quarter-century after the creation of Pakistan, led to the breakup of the country as the Punjabi-dominated military under General Yahya Khan would not permit the Bengali-dominated political party, the Awami League, which won the election, from forming a government. Bhutto, cofounder of the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP), became the chief martial law administrator of a truncated Pakistan in 1971. Chief of Army Staff Zia-ul-Haq removed Bhutto from office in July 1977. General Zia-ul-Haq’s eleven-year rule had disastrous effects on Pakistani politics and society. In addition to suspending the Constitution, he prohibited elections, banned political parties, promulgated antifemale laws in the name of Islam, authorized illegal drug trafficking, and provided weapons and training for the anti-Soviet Mujahidin,

whom US president Ronald Reagan claimed to be the moral equivalent of the American Founding Fathers. Under an agreement with the US Central Intelligence Agency, Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence provided most of the weaponry and funding to the deadly Mujahidin, including those who would burn the faces of women who did not observe *pardah* (“covering”). Some of the Mujahidin would become the Afghan Taliban and fight their erstwhile US benefactors in Afghanistan.

In the 1990s, the Pakistani military, through the office of the president, which it controlled, and through the authority of the Eighth Amendment, which General Zia-ul-Haq had promulgated, terminated the PPP governments of Benazir Bhutto and the Islami Jamhoori Ittehad (Islamic Democratic Alliance; IJI) government of Nawaz Sharif. The PPP and the IJI each took two turns at government at the center. Pakistan’s was the exemplary case of an “overdeveloped state” and weak political party system. Since then, political parties have developed more committed constituencies.

National and provincial elections are decided using a single-member constituency principle introduced by the British. The candidate who receives the largest number of votes in a constituency becomes the sole representative of that constituency. The Pakistani national legislature is bicameral. The National Assembly is elected directly. The members of the provincial assemblies and the national assembly elect the members of the one hundred-seat Senate for six-year terms.

Gender and Human Development. With a population of more than 180 million people and a growth rate of 2.3 percent per year, Pakistan is the sixth most populous country in the world. The population is expected to increase to 350 million by 2050, when Pakistan will be the fourth most populous country on earth.

The most recent census (1988) estimates the ratio of females to males at 0.925. The natural rate appears to be 1.06 females per male. Thus, an estimated 5 million Pakistani girls and women seem to be missing from the Pakistani population. This is attributed to pervasive discrimination against females.

Pakistan, like much of the world, is marked by the persistence of colonial institutions of governance; declining trust in government; population growth rates that are unsustainable; demands on government expenditure that exceed government capacity to raise revenue; underinvestment in public education and public health; conspicuous consumption by a minority who have massive disposable income; privation and servitude by a majority who have little or no income and crushing debt; unsustainable exploitation of natural and human resources by the rich and poor; and rising income inequality and social exclusion.

Foreign Relations. The defining element in India and Pakistan relations is the sovereignty of the territory of the formerly princely state of Kashmir and of the Northern Areas. Azad ("Free") Kashmir is a strip of territory bordering the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Pakistan has fought three wars with India: in 1947–1948, 1965, and 1971. Pakistan initiated the wars in 1947 and 1965 to gain control of the Muslim-majority Kashmir. In 1971, India intervened in Pakistan's civil war in East Pakistan. India and Pakistan fought a major battle in Kashmir in 1999 (near Kargil), orchestrated by then chief of army staff Musharraf, and mobilized troops for war with India in 2001.

Although Pakistan was a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement, it has long been a loyal ally of the United States. Pakistan joined the anti-Communist Central Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization in 1954.

US President Jimmy Carter authorized military training and weaponry for the Mujahidin before the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Zbigniew Brzezinski, then US national security advisor, warned the US president that support for the Mujahidin might precipitate the Soviet intervention. Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev decided to send Soviet troops to Afghanistan to support one faction of a fratricidal Communist People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. The Soviet intervention had far-reaching consequences for the Soviet Union and for the United States, but nowhere outside of Afghanistan

were the effects of the war more pronounced than in Pakistan.

Pakistan's experience in international relations suggests that there are high costs to being a front-line state for the US military. Pakistan provided surveillance access to the Soviet Union and access to large groups of willing fighters among the more than 2.5 million refugees in Pakistani camps. To many, Pakistan's experience as an ally of the United States seems to confirm the quip attributed to former US national security advisor Henry Kissinger that to be an enemy of the United States is dangerous, but to be a friend can be fatal.

Pakistan's reputation in nuclear nonproliferation is poor. Pakistani metallurgist A. Q. Khan stole and sold enrichment and missile technology. Pakistan has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The US "War on Terror" has strained US–Pakistani relations severely. Bombing by unmanned aerial drones and the activities of US Special Operations Forces in Pakistan violate Pakistani sovereignty and international law and are deeply unpopular in Pakistan. Each of Pakistan's four provincial assemblies and the National Assembly have condemned the US bombings and covert activities.

[See also Development and Underdevelopment; India; and Islam.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alavi, Hamza. "The State in Postcolonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh." In *Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia*, edited by Kathleen Gough and Hari Sharma. (New York, 1973).
- Ali, Tariq. *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*. (New York, 2008).
- Embree, Ainslie T. "The Burden of Islam." In *Pakistan: From the Rhetoric of Democracy to the Rise of Militancy*, edited by Ravi Kalia. (New Delhi, India, 2011).
- Haq, Mahbub ul, *The Strategy of Economic Planning*. (New York, 1963).
- Jalal, Ayesha. *The Sole Spokesman—Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*. (Cambridge, UK, 1985).
- Singh, Kushwant. *Train to Pakistan*. (New York, 1981). First published in 1956.

Christopher Candland

PALESTINE

There have been both continuity and change in the meaning of the word "Palestine" for over two millennia. Broadly, the word has consistently referred to the geographical area on the eastern Mediterranean separating the lands of Phoenicia and Egypt. "Palestine" comes from the Greek *Palaestine*, a name used extensively by Herodotus in his *Histories* (fifth century BCE). The Greek word was itself likely derived from Semitic languages, including the Hebrew word for the land of the Philistines. Romans likewise adopted the term, *Palaestina* in Latin, and, beginning in the second century CE, used it on coins, documents, and official records.

With the seventh-century Arab-Islamic conquest of Palestine, the word was incorporated into Arabic as *Filistin* and likewise referred broadly to the region from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. During Muslim rule from the seventh century to the twentieth century CE, "Palestine" was often used to denote a geographical area but rarely codified as a distinct administrative unit. Rather, its common usage across several languages was akin to "holy land," where the general area was clear but not sharply delineated. During the crusader interregnum, the lands of Palestine were roughly equivalent to what Europeans called the "Kingdom of Jerusalem." Under four centuries of Ottoman rule in Palestine (1516–1917), the region was divided administratively in several different ways. During late Ottoman rule, the northern areas of Palestine were ruled from Beirut, while much of the remainder was constituted as the independent *sanjak* (district) of Jerusalem.

Britain conquered Palestine at the end of 1917 as part of its efforts in World War I. As the victorious allies, Britain and France set about delineating the boundaries of their new conquests. The now familiar shape of the Mandate of Palestine was established by Britain and France in December 1920. The Arab–Israeli War of 1948 split Palestine into three units: an independent state of Israel, the "West Bank" annexed by Jordan, and the "Gaza Strip" administered by Egypt. The 1967 Arab–Israeli War

brought historic Palestine back into a single geographic unit, albeit with distinct legal statuses for Israeli and Palestinian areas.

In contemporary usage, "Palestine" has two distinct geographic meanings, each of which often has political connotations. The first usage refers to historic Palestine, coterminous with the boundaries of British Mandatory Palestine. Current references to the whole of Palestine are often used by political groups opposed to the creation of Israel. The second contemporary geographic meaning of the word refers to the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, that is, lands occupied by Israel in the 1967 war. These are the territories claimed by the Palestine Liberation Organization for a new state of Palestine. If such a state were to be created, it would consist of about 23 percent of historic Palestine, as defined by Mandatory Palestine.

Palestine and Palestinians. While the term "Palestine" is ancient, the word "Palestinian" is a twentieth-century invention. British Mandate policy was to identify all residents—Jewish, Arab, or other—as Palestinian, both on legal documents and otherwise. This brief period of inclusive Palestinian identity gave way to a more narrow definition as the conflict between Zionists and the local Arab population of Palestine intensified.

In the sense of a growing identity and collective action based on specific national claims, Palestinian national identity dates to the 1930s. Such parochial national identities (*wataniyya*) tended to be weaker than the broader Arab nationalism (*qawmiyya*) through much of the twentieth century. The revolt of 1935–1939, against both British colonial rule and the expanding Zionist presence in Palestine, represents the iconic birth of Palestinian national identity, although the actual dynamics of the revolt were much more complex than the nationalist tale generally allows.

The construction of Palestinian national identity differs from the construction of other national identities in the region in that it was primarily reactive in orientation. Without Zionism, there would likely not have been Palestinians, or least not in the same manner as that concept actually evolved. The fact of

EDITORIAL BOARD

- SERIES EDITOR Joel Krieger
Wellesley College
- EDITOR IN CHIEF Joel Krieger
Wellesley College
- AREA EDITORS Margaret E. Crahan
Columbia University
Craig N. Murphy
Wellesley College

THE OXFORD COMPANION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Joel Krieger
EDITOR IN CHIEF

VOLUME 2
Korean War–Zionism
Index

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS