Local Footprints of Global Politics

Khaleeq-Ur-Rahman, Irfan Khan, Amjid Hussain
Area Study Center, University of Peshawar

The paper highlights the role of Pakistani policy makers and intellectuals in compounding Pakistan's problems. It looks at the variations and divergences in approaches to the conflict in Pakistani society from two different perspectives. Interdisciplinary approach has been adopted which helps us show how Pakistani intellectuals and policy makers are repeating the narrative of terrorism as it is advocated by the 'Empire'. The causes of this intellectual submission to the narrative of Imperial hegemon are contrasted with insights from theorists and critics like Chomsky, Duffield, Wallerstein et al., to show why Pakistani policy makers and intellectuals have been unable to make any sense of the equation. The paper builds its argument by detailing the lapses in policies and informed scholarly discourses to the specter of terrorism from within Pakistan and how the same specter has been looked at from critical perspectives by renowned scholars. The causes of these two different responses give us the handle on understanding and contextualizing the obtaining environment in Pakistan. A subjective, interpretivist, and constructivist approach has been adopted to make the argument understandable from theoretical frameworks and perspectives that help us remove veil from the causes that perpetuate conflicts in Pakistani society. What the paper reveals is the total submission of Pakistani intellectuals and policy makers to the dictates of American Imperial agenda in the region. This, as the paper holds, compounds rather than resolving the conflicts. This peculiar mindset clouds the reality of the overall situation in South Asian region.

Keywords: terrorism, hegemony, conflict, empire

South Asia has become a theater of international conflicts again after the erstwhile Cold War involving many international powers. These evolving conflicts have many contours and Pakistani policy makers and scholars have responded to resolving these conflicts in a number of ways. In the context of Pakistan, two prominent approaches to conflicts in Pakistan and the South Asian region have been adopted. One approach looks at the faults created by imperial power and its end games whereas the second looks at the faults as local and inherent to our society. This difference in approach to the same problematic makes it very important to study the dynamics of this huge variation in their respective approaches to the same conflict. Pakistani policy makers have shown a remarkable knack for missing the elephant in the room and continue to be fascinated with the structure of global political thought. This, an otherwise flawed approach, has compounded Pakistan's local problems.

Method

Research method used in this study is a qualitative and exploratory. Data has been collected from primary and secondary sources i.e., books, articles, journals and report of a workshop proceedings.

Significance and Scope of the Study

The proposed research draws on insights that are foreign to contemporary indigenous scholarship on the South Asian region. It is, therefore, a potential trailblazer for any subsequent research on the dynamics and contours of conflicts in the region. It breaks fresh new ground in an attempt to make sense of the complexities that engulf and in a way threaten the security and future of Pakistan. It highlights the need for an alternative way of looking at the conflicts, the factors perpetuating these conflicts and outlines future course of action for a proper understanding of many layers of conflicts and their linkages with the global political regime.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mr. KHALEEQ UR RAHMAN, Institute of Peace & Conflict Studies, Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar

Literature Review
Contours of Conflicts in South Asia

The topic at hands demands an interdisciplinary look because it attempts to capture the facade that has been erected in Pakistani society which makes it unable to see beyond the constructed illusions. The footprints of global politics are visible in the inferences and conclusions from the conflicts facing Pakistani Muslim society. They are reading the situation exactly as they are pre-programmed to read, understand, and respond. This paper makes its point by juxtaposing the predominant inferences in Pakistani society from the conflicts it is facing and the insights provided by the leading theorists of our times, like Mark Duffield and Anne Norton for instance, reflecting on the same game-play from a different angle, from perspectives that shatter the myth of what we have inferred from our existential problematic. This helps us mount our central argument that these inferences from the threats facing us must be dealt with critically and from foundations of thought that are local to Pakistan to stop further erosion of the credibility of the state of Pakistan

Once the conflicts in the world and South Asia, in particular, are understood from a perspective non-existent in Pakistani scholarship, reflecting on the causes of terrorism in Pakistan and the world, it becomes obvious that it betrays great signs of the imprints that global politics have left on Pakistani society. In other words, freedom from colonialism, the white-man's burden, has not yet been achieved. Our responses to terrorism and the many conflicts faced within society give us up. They show a remarkable ability to miss the elephant in the room. This elephant of local foot prints is increasing in size and intensity whereas; our attention is diverted from it. The crucial mandate of policy makers in our country at this critical time needs to be our local issues rather than global. Measures when taken to root out these conflicts, foreign intervention especially from America has been observed; the forces they are fighting against in Afghanistan are asked in Pakistan not to be fought against, as according to Pakistan scholar Naeem Ahmed[1]:

Although the US-led Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan required Pakistan to stop the infiltration of militants into its tribal areas, its security forces conducted the first major military operation, called Al-Mizan (Justice).

This shows the biased approach towards the same problem in two different countries. Foreign intervention in local problems has increased beyond limits and led to the increase in issues rather than solving them.

Pakistan's Responses to South Asian Conflicts
Scholarly Discourse

In a Workshop on Terrorism, jointly organized in 2015 by Hans Seidel Stiftung, Germany, and the Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar, a vast spectrum of the intelligentsia was gathered together to discuss Terrorism. Report of the workshop (Department of International Relations 2015) is quoted at length because it encapsulates all those lapses that we want to focus on, in this research paper. It is, therefore, central to our argument and demands a thorough engagement and critical reflection.

The seminar opens with the following invocation:

Terrorism is at the top of global security agenda…there are certain sections of society who sympathize with the agenda of the so-called religious terrorists. Though, the level of approval of terrorist tactics varies among those sympathizing with their agenda. There is also an opinion, and one must add, a very strong one that sees various religious militant groups as strategic assets who need to be controlled but not eliminated. They are influenced by the Indian centric security threat perceptions and the Kashmir issue. The problem is compounded when suspicions are persistently expressed that some sympathy towards these terrorists exists even at state level even if partial and not officially sanctioned (Department of International Relations 2015, 01).

This is the first paragraph of the workshop report. It sums up the responses of Pakistani intellectuals to the problem of terrorism and other existential threats faced by Pakistani society. Who is explicitly blamed for the

---

[1] For further information read 'Pakistan's Counter-terrorism strategy and its Implications for domestic, regional and international security by Naeem Ahmed.'

situation in the region? Not the imperial great game that so many eminent thinkers like Chomsky, Tariq Ali, Duffield, and Howard Zinn are blaming for violence and international terrorism by turning the world into a surreal theater of war for a certain nefarious liberal agenda, but Pakistan and Pakistani institutions, responsible for safeguarding Pakistan's ideological and territorial boundaries. What magic trick makes the prime suspect invisible to the prying eyes of the Pakistani intellectuals and policy makers? Colonized mindset, as taught by NgugiwaThiango(Thiong'o 2011). We must decolonize our minds to be able to make sense of the existential situation. The very opening sentence reeks of the prevalent misunderstanding of the conflict, of the problem at hand.

Global security agenda encapsulates a certain *a priori* perception of the threat. This predetermined perception is imperial one through and through. It has assumed, albeit naively, that global powers have not created the grounds for these security issues but that they are rather benignly trying to solve this global specter of terrorism. What one witnesses here is the absence of perspectives that belie these naïve assumptions. They also give justified ground to Edward Said's(Said 2003) marvelous concept of "structures of attitude and reference" that 'Empire' fashions for its subjects.

Here are the conclusions from that workshop(Department of International Relations 2015) which included Pakistan's top policy makers, intellectuals, and academia. These conclusions were published in the Seminar proceedings:
We as Pakistanis shall have to:
- Question the typical Taliban/ Militant narrative that is embedded in the theory of Jihad and driven by conspiracy theories
- Develop counter-narratives that are premised on logic and not mere emotions or certain political ideologies
- Trigger critical and informed debate. This can reduce the ideological space and support for the militants
- Promote tolerance and acceptance of disagreements
- Exploit fault-lines within the ranks of the militants and those challenging the writ of state and our way of life. In other words, I mean deconstruction of their (Extremist/ Terrorist) view
- Find alternatives to the Madaris (plural of Madrassa, Religious seminary) system, rather directly attacking them. But at the same time, the state must also assert its authority over the Madaris and introduce harmonious curricula, as is the practice, elsewhere
- Counter insurgency also means fighting skewed religious ideologies through an all-encompassing strategic communication, backed up by improved service delivery, justice and economy

Where do they place the blame for terrorism in Pakistan and the region: on their own society and institutions. How does, one could argue, Duffield, Chomsky, structuralists, constructivists and Norton look at the possible fault lines of terrorism in the region and Pakistan? They look at it from an imperial technology of power with predominant eschatological shades/ perspectives. Is there even a mere reflection of this understanding of the conflict in Pakistan and the region among the participants of the workshop? They are the *crème de la crème* of Pakistani intelligentsia. What does this missing the elephant in the room signify? It signifies One-dimensionality of a constructed people and their society (Marcuse 1964).

Participants in the work shop have even blamed the very ideology of Pakistan to be responsible for the spread of radical Islamism in Pakistan.[2]

Baitullah is the direct result of Objective Resolution (Department of International Relations, 2015). They probably do not know their own cultural history; otherwise, they would have seen that the ideology of Pakistan had for the first time in the history of Islam united all major sectarian groups under a Shia leader.

---

[2]Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar. *Pakistan's Responses to Terrorism: Need for a Conceptual Framework.* Peshawar: Department of International Relations, 2015.

Radical Islam is our rendezvous with something far more deadly: an interpretation of Pakistan garnered from the categories of modernism. Secularism was an inherent part of the modern project. The learned scholars are harking back to this interpretation of religion, ignoring the fact, that the secularism project has been unraveled in the wake of critical social thought in the west. In other words, their understanding is outdated and factually, incorrect. The irony, however, of this kind of scholarship is, that it is mainstream and helps modernist structures to achieve their nefarious ends by isolating us from our true identities by employing false conclusions. Thereby, we miss the whole point and end up supporting the point of the oppressor against ourselves.

In the Foreword to his highly acclaimed book *Taliban: Islam, Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia*, Ahmed Rashid writes:

> Now as the US and its Western allies followed up their devastating attack on the Taliban and Al'Qaida by helping to bring about secular rule, the question was whether there would be a political and economic strategy to support a stable new government in Afghanistan, that could handle the alienation and economic crisis that had only helped to fuel extremism and terrorism(Rashid 2002).

Ahmed Rashid captures the essence of what is essentially at issue in this paper: the remarkable ability to infer flawed conclusions from the very well researched facts. Having seen as a journalist, the unfolding of American Empire after WW-II, he is still very naively expecting Empire to be 'just' to the people of Afghanistan as if he doesn't really know whether America is an Imperial power. Empire doesn't bring solutions nor does it solve problems of "alienation and economic crisis". Empire doesn't support stable governments, rather, only maintains satellites.[3] But what does it say about Rashid's missing the elephant in the room? He is structurally unable to read the game. He is wearing specific blinkers allowing him to conveniently see America as it wants to be seen by the world: liberators.

Pakistan has recently gifted another Islamist turned Islamic scholar, Hussain Haqqani, to the Imperial centre i.e. Washington. This scholar on political Islamism reminds one of Nasir Al-Din Tusi who had become Halaku Khan's Minister for Awqaf. The parallels between Halaku Khan and America are numerous and uncanny in all their deception and savagery. Don't forget how his father, the mighty Chengiz Khan, had deceived his captors(Lange 2002). Deception and savagery are the two hallmarks of these respective Empires. Hussain Haqqani forgets all about this when he lectures Muslims on political Islamism (Ḥaqqānī 2016). His books and interviews make it very clear that faults for the global terror must somehow be located in Islam and not in Empire's ideological underpinnings. The ignorance and poverty of Muslim thought is at its full and deeply rooted. It is fully entrenched in Pakistani society, which is living inside an artificial bubble. It has imperial blinkers making it forget its own roots.

David Ryan (*US Foreign Policy in the World History)* had made it very clear in the first part 'Construction' that third world countries were very easily trapped in the same trap, of which their forefather liberated themselves after making hard efforts. Close view reveals a trap woven around them which is not visible to them and they play the game of 'Name and Blame' amongst themselves proving themselves as easy preys and naively butchered at the hands of powers: apparent liberators.

Policy Makers' Lapses

Pakistani intellectual and policy makers act as if there is no imperial connection to the nexus being built around the South Asian region, especially in Pakistan given the eschatological inferences from Leo Strauss, who is considered to be the father of American Conservatism and ideologue behind the hawkish attitude towards Muslims and Islam. In Ali's words (Ali 2005), it is clash of fundamentalism but, in the context of Pakistan, one half of this clash of fundamentalism is forgotten, or made to forget through careful control of careers.

---

[3]See John Perkins*'Confessions of an Economic Hitman* for more details.

America as a bigger pirate is invisible to the keen perceptions of Pakistani scholars and this invisibility compounds Pakistan's problems. Scholars like Muhammad Feyyaz[4] negate even those civilains who believe that America and other foreign countries are the key members of exploitation and terrorism in Pakistan.

The Pakistani people, contrary to leaders in Islamabad, still believe America's war is against them and not the militants in the tribal areas. Suicide bombings and deadly violence are the subsequent backlash. This confusing narrative has resulted in widespread tolerance for the Taliban among commoners and elites alike.
It is, this fundamental lapse in understanding, which makes it difficult to make any progress on the pressing social issues holding us all hostages to Empire's hybrid games.

Richard Jackson (Writing War on Terrorism) clearly mentions it creating and maintaining a perennial _discourse of danger', is a key function of foreign policy, designed to enforce inside/outside, self/other boundaries and thereby construct or _write' collective identity.

We fail - in classic example of how Straussians want us to kill our own religion and culture -to build our nation and allow it to continue to slip deep into chaos. Whereas, local scholars of Pakistan fail to understand the dirty global game of politics and blame Pakistan for all the mishaps in the country like Muhammad Feyyaz:
The ideological nature of Pakistan also makes the country a suitable Islamic refuge for al-Qaida and the persecuted Muslims that further enhance its significance.

Global Political Dimension of South Asian Conflicts
America's War on Terror
In his highly important book, *Confessions of an Economic Hitman* (2016), John Perkins writes:
And we wonder why terrorists attack us?
This system, however, is fueled by something far more dangerous than conspiracy. It is driven not by a small band of men but by a concept that has become accepted as gospel: the idea that all economic growth benefits humankind and that the greater the growth, the more widespread the benefits. This belief also has a corollary: that those people who excel at stoking the fires of economic growth should be exalted and rewarded, while those born at the fringes are available for exploitation (Perkins 2016).

If we could read this passage from John Perkins in the light of Anne Norton's thesis(Norton 2004), we will be able to see what concept has become gospel truth for the drivers of Empire. It assumes eschatological contours that are completely missing from Pakistani scholarship on terrorism and its ideological planks. This exposes the insights of our scholars and policy makers dealing with the menace of terrorism and blaming Islam and Pakistan for the reign of terror in the world.

Duffield writes (Duffield, Global governance and the new wars: the merging of development and security 2003):

Development is thus central to the new or culturally coded racism that emerged with decolonization. Developed life is supported and compensated with a range of social and private insurance-based benefits and bureaucracies covering birth, sickness, education, employment and pensions. In contrast, the underdeveloped and non-insured life existing beyond these welfare technologies is expected to be self-reliant. Surplus non-insured life is the subject of development, while the stasis of basic needs and self-reliance is its bio-political object. Rather being development concerned with reducing the gap between rich and poor countries, or extending to the latter the levels of social protection existing in the former, as a technology of security it functions to contain and manage underdevelopment's destabilizing effects, especially in circulatory epiphenomena such as undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, trans-border shadow economies and or

---

[4] Why Pakistan Does Not Have a Counterterrorism Narrative by Muhammad Feyyaz

criminal networks. Since decolonization, the bio-political division of the world into developed and undeveloped species-life has been deepening. Today it shapes a terrain of unending war.

Perkins lends a practical side to Duffield's theoretical formulations. He shows how this division between the *insured* and *uninsured* lives is created and maintained for global Empire. He shows in much greater detail and clarity whatever is available in Duffield at a more abstract level. Perkins explains the modus operandi of the *Economic Hitmen*is is encouraging them to become part of network and eventually lead them into the webs of debt and enslave them atlast under the loads of these debts. John Hobson also affirm these ideas that large amount of capital is drawn out of third world countries through the lending process anf foreign trade. This also indicates the fate of Pakistan on the margins of the capitalistic world's economic structure.

How do we navigate out of this economic, cultural and intellectual *cul-de-sac* which seems so impenetrable? Duffield helps us see what we are stopped from witnessing because another 'liberal technology of power' in our social, political and religious thought is working through our educational system to reduce the impact of possible inferences by erasing all grounds for drawing such inferences. We are shackled to a system of thought, if we take Duffield's perspective forward to understand our dilemmas, which is bleeding us dry, engulfing us in darkness by designating us as 'surplus population', while perpetuating an "unending war" (Duffield, Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples 2010).

How this theoretical synthesis can be achieved following Duffield's insights for a fuller understanding and resolution of the conflicts afflicting South Asia in general, and Pakistan in particular, is a huge ask. Duffield (2010) could help us break the cycle of this 'unending war' while maintaining our cultural, religious and political identity. In the absence of alternative insights on our existential problematic, we are forced to follow the dictates of the 'hegemon' blindly at the cost of Pakistan. This is happening because our policy makers and scholars alike are unable to make sense of the game being played around them.

American Conservatism

America is *the* global player whose ideology empowers it to perpetrate the most heinous crimes one can imagine. The ideological underpinnings for this global imprint are provided by a powerful structure based in American Conservatism. This structure has branched itself out in numerous power tools to influence the shape of things ideologically: Council for Foreign Relations, a Jewish-Hindu-Christian/Conservative lobby, RAND Corporation, journals like Foreign Affairs, newspapers and television channels and a whole host of other small, ideologically driven, power apparatuses that help its military mask its heinous crimes and paint them, ironically, as acts performed for the protection of democratic values. The whole lot of America's post-World War II presidents have built their struggle for world dominance couched in lies and deceit. In *Pirates and Emperors: Old and New* (2002), Chomsky makes evident what has recently been resoundingly confirmed by political activists in movies like *The Post* and *American Made:* that America carefully inculcated excuses in the world for military intervention at an opportune time; and that these preparations were always couched in lies and deceit spearheaded by CIA. Chomsky writes about how America saw it coming. He makes no bones about America's terrorist acts:

…9/11...not the scale of attack, but the choice of the innocent victims (Chomsky 2016).

The sentence captures so many things together like a metaphor that unraveling it would be a fit study for a book. The inhumanity that the US has heaped upon the world makes the scale of the innocent victims on 9/11 a mere fraction of what they have committed in the world. America knew something like a 9/11 was coming because technology had made it possible (Chomsy 2016). RAND was conceived for one such purpose:

This face of America does not come before the Pakistani policy makers nor the intellectuals which means that they are raised in a certain structure that lobbyists like RAND control through USAID scholarships and incentives to indoctrinate them; they plan and control the trajectories of their professional development because they are going to make policies that would put countries like Pakistan in the lap of American Imperialism. It is these policy makers who were manipulated by the EHM. IMF, World Bank and other Capitalist

structures were religiously adopted at the very expense of Pakistani nationhood. It should be no secret now where the roots of this deception lie and how our policy makers are trained to miss the elephant in the room.

Christine Fair, a hawk connected with RAND and Council for Foreign Relations, has penned numerous books on Pakistan. All of them couched in anti-Pakistan rhetoric. For instance, she writes (Fair 2014) that:
[in] the long term, it is unclear how reliable Islamabad will prove to be as partner in U.S. counterterrorism efforts for at least two reasons:

-Pakistan's perceptions of its core security problems revolve around India, and especially, Kashmir. This is a serious point of divergence for Washington and Islamabad.

-Pakistan's fundamental stability and development (social, economic, and political) as well as the mixed attitudes of its populace toward the United States raise serious questions about its ability to meaningfully support U.S. counterterrorism policy over the long haul (p.6).

What Duffield, Chomsky, Wallerstein, constructivism, structuralism tell us is that the problems of Pakistan adumbrated by Christine Fair are the product of what Fair calls "U.S. counterterrorism efforts". What Fair is trying to do is to find an excuse for the Empire, run jointly by Washington and Pentagon, which would appear as strategic move but would in fact be based on *ideology more than strategy*, and which will eventually favour India, and which she eventually moves on to. This fulfills the requirement for a book worthy of publication by RAND Corporation. One should not be surprised because RAND is ideologically connected with a powerful lobby in Washington, spearheaded by Council for Foreign Relations, a Jewish lobby. Leo Strauss is appropriated along these eschatological strands by American Conservatism, which is Judeo-Christian interpretation of the world, providing guidelines to American Foreign policies in the world of Islam. This is the situation. Her rants bring out the sting in American foreign policies *vis-a-vis* Pakistan but her other structural associates are working in tandem with Pakistani policy makers to pacify its ideological opponent: Islam and Pakistan. Why cannot they make sense of the situation?

Henry Kissinger and David Ryan also does not hide the secret that America is an Empire. Kissinger justifies how Empire should operate under the sign of Globalization. He derives this hubris form the fact that America is an Empire that his hitmen help create to a large extent in the Cold War era. He writes and please notice where the blame is being laid (Kissinger 2014):

The world has become accustomed to calls from the Middle East urging the overthrow of regional and world order in the service of a universal vision. A profusion of prophetic absolutisms has been the hallmark of a region suspended between a dream of its former glory and its contemporary inability to unify around common principles of domestic or international legitimacy. Nowhere is the challenge of international order more complex -in terms of both organizing regional order and ensuring the compatibility of that order with peace and stability in rest of the world (p.96).

David Ryan clearly mentioned in his *US Foreign Policy in World History* that 'Imperialism lies at the heart of US foreign relations.' And for self-interest they adopted measures that were informal and reflected as aberration by other countries on the history of America. American expansionism brought the peace and innocence of Asian countries at stake, Ryan put it like; 'exercise of political hegemony beyond political sphere'.

The ideological roots of American Conservatism are important for our understanding of the situation obtaining in South Asia. They are, to begin with, based in a certain skewed interpretation of Leo Strauss's political philosophy. The Conservatives take Leo Strauss's formulation of "Athens and Jerusalem" to mean the abiding connection of a certain eschatological interpretation of Judaism and Christianity, of Zionist Israel and Christian America(Norton 2004). This interpretation is promoted through the structure already mentioned: through inflicting death and destruction on the *enemy*, on the one hand, and killing him culturally on the other.

The later happens through controlled scholarship. It can be taken as a classic example of hybrid war. If that is the case, then, we have already lost it a great deal. What we are left with is a mere skirmish.

This context of the conflicts in the region is hidden from Pakistani policy makers and academics. They are not only afraid to use the term Empire because it jeopardizes their careers but also because they have already adopted Empire's argument. This has not happened overnight. It has its own historical trajectory. This trajectory was to neutralize the capacity of our policy makers to make any sense of the situation. Where does this neutralization happen? This construction of the Pakistani mindset, through masterful deception (Dajjal's abiding trait), has given rise to the situation where Muslim intellectuals and scholars have started to find fault in their own cultures to blame it for the violence visited upon us by American Conservatism's ideological underpinnings. We examine this "structure of attitude and reference" in our next section.

Statement of the Problem

It is argued by Anne Norton(Norton 2004) that 'Straussians' (followers of Leo Strauss & his philosophy) have made a conscious and deliberate effort to shape politics and learning in the United States and abroad. This particular American mindset, as argued by Norton, is behind the current American foreign policy regime. This specific global political thought leaves deep footprints on Pakistan's local problems and aggravates them. Pakistani policymakers have never concerned themselves with an understanding of this ideological baggage of what is called American conservatism. Their fascination with the structure of global political thought has led them to infer wrong conclusions that have proved detrimental to Pakistan's national interests .This paper explores the possible reasons that go into our missing the point completely and thus perpetuating Pakistan's problems even more.

Research Questions

- Why are our policy makers and scholars unable to respond critically to the problematic?
- How does this compound Pakistan's problems instead of resolving them?
- What should inform our responses to counter this 'Straussian' driven foreign policy that leaves many an unresolved problems in its wake?

Limitations of the Research

This research is limited to reading the responses to the fault lines by Pakistani intellectuals and policymakers. It does not encompass the inferences of politicians because they mostly act on the advice of policymakers and the critical insights of intellectuals. The research limits itself to the scholarship produced under the sign of terrorism and radicalization as reflected upon by Pakistani policymakers and writers.

Conclusion

What one immediately gathers is this overwhelming sense of complete disconnect between facts on the ground and our perceptions of these facts as witnessed in the case of the intellectual lapses of both our policy makers and intellectuals alike. What also becomes available is a window to see the rot set deep in our psyche. What also transpires is the fact that these ignorant tendencies exhibited by our intelligentsia are potentially fatal for Pakistani state and society in the long run.

This ignorance is not conscious and it is this aspect which tells us how deep this rot has seeped in our society. A disconnect suddenly becomes available for reflection. It is this specific disconnect which increases Pakistan's existential problematic. In this respect, it becomes a classic case of *thecolonial hangover* that Pakistani intelligentsia is yet to recover from. It is, therefore, part of one of the recommendations of this paper that Pakistan's institutes of higher learning need a thorough overhaul. They are kept at an arm's length from organic knowledge by the mass produced plastic knowledge factories in Pakistan who are caught in deep set contradictions and, again, given the structure in place in Pakistan. However, it is not their fault as they have been raised this way. Herbert Marcuse (Marcuse 1964) had called such people as one-dimensional. This one dimensional man cannot build Pakistan as he is cut off from his own roots.

But, ironically, this is exactly what they are doing. They are modeling Islam to fit the Capitalist/American Conservative interpretation of the world. Islam cannot fit an idea already debunked by our contemporary western philosophy. Interestingly, what western philosophy is coming up with as possible alternatives to the eventual, predictable nihilism of the modern narrative,are Islamic in character. But we cannot make sense of this because we have been cut off from our cultural roots.

It is a fact that Pakistan society is currently faced with an acute identiterian crisis. But what does it signify? That our links with our national identity/cultural constants have been severed. With that gone, identity is also lost. Hence, an acute identiterian crisis in Pakistani Muslim society. Iqbal had been prophetic in his words when speaking of the future of Pakistan. Does Iqbal's absence from Pakistan's educational system not prove Iqbal to be extremely prophetic? The title of this particular ghazal by Iqbal is "*Iblis Ka Farman ApneSiyasiFrazando Kay Nam*" or *Satan's Address to his Political Heirs*. What has Satan's political heirs done to Iqbal's legacy? Iqbal, who could light fire of Pakistani Muslim nationhood, has been thrown out of the garden (Pakistani society/ syllabus).It also tells us about our society's drift towards narratives -Capitalist, Socialist, Secular, Modernist - in search of identity that are incompatible with the very essence of Pakistan. The experiments with foreign narratives for a definition of Pakistan and Islam have left us in our current identiterian crisis.

Pakistan is therefore the story of continuous struggle. Frantz Fanon, in his most influential book, The Wretched of the Earth (Fanon 2002)explains the two stages of decolonization: stage one is freedom from colonial master and stage two is freedom from national bourgeoisie or the infamous Brown Sahibs. The chaos and confusion about so simple a fact, as Pakistani identity is fed, nourished and cultivated through the national bourgeoisie who have played havoc with the very structure of Pakistani society. The struggle to bring back meaning to the word Pakistan is not over yet. And if we don't bring meaning to the word Pakistan, Pakistan's dream of nationhood would remain elusive. The only constant (Allama Iqbal/ Islam) who could bring order out of chaos is already checked at the door where Pakistani society is built. It cannot get more ironic than that!

References

Ali, T. (2005) *The clash of fundamentalisms: crusades, jihads and modernity.* New Delhi: Rupa.

Chomsky, N. (2016). Pirates and emperors, old and new: international terrorism in the real world.

Department of International Relations, (2015). University of Peshawar. *Pakistan's Responses to Terrorism: Need for a Conceptual Framework.* Peshawar: Department of International Relations.

Duffield, M. (2010). Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples.
  Global governance and the new wars: the merging of development and security. Vol. 87. London, 2003.

Fair, C.(2014). *Fighting to the End: The Pakistan Army's Way of War.*

Fanon, F.(2002). Constance Farrington, and Jean-Paul Sartre. *The wretched of the earth.* London: Penguin.

Ḥaqqānī, Ḥ.(2016) *Pakistan: between mosque and military.*

Kissinger, H. (2014). *World Order.* London: Penguin.

Lange, B.(2002). *Genghis Khan.* London: Chelsea House Publications.

Marcuse, H.(1964). *One dimensional man: the ideology of industrial society.* London: Beacon Press.

Norton, A. (2004). *Leo Strauss and the Politics of American Empire.* 2004.

Perkins, J. (2016). *The new confessions of an economic hitman: the shocking inside story of how America really took over the world.* London: Ebury Press.

Rashid, A(2002). *Taliban: Islam, Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia.* London: I. B. Tauris.

Said, E.(2003). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

Sullivan, O' Noel. *Political Theory in Transition.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Thiong'o, N.(2011). "Decolonising the mind: the politics of language in African literature." (J. Currey)

Timothy O'Leary, Christopher Falzon. *Foucault and Philosophy.* London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.