

## US POLICY SHIFT FROM 'PIVOT TO ASIA' TO 'FREE INDO-PACIFIC': IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN

Tatheer Zahra Sherazi\*

Amna Mahmood†

### Abstract

*Asia Pacific, which is extended Eastward to the states of Oceania, Westward to Pakistan, Southward to New Zealand, and Northward to Mongolia, is currently a pivot of the globe due to its economic growth. Since last two decades, it has got status of 'growth center' owing to its high economic growth rate. The United States (US) had been very active in Asia Pacific throughout the Cold War period, but in post-Cold War era, it was disengaged due to its pre-occupation in Middle East. However, the rise of China attracted US again with multiple arrangements at political, economic and social fronts. There are two world views about the US presence in Asia Pacific. The first one asserts that the Asia Pacific is more secure without the presence of US, while others takes the US presence as a patron for stability and solidarity within the region. The US policy of 'Pivot to Asia', 'Asia Pacific' commonly known as 'Rebalancing' ensured its new commitment of deep engagement in Southeast Asia. Policy shift under Trump administration from 'Pivot to Asia' to 'Free Indo-Pacific' has direct as well indirect implications for Pakistan. The study analyses the US strategies and policies under the theory of 'Offensive Realism,' where 'rational powers uncertain of intentions and capable of military offensive strive to survive'. Analytical, descriptive approaches are adopted in order to analyse US ongoing strategies.*

**Keywords:** *Asia Pacific, Cold war, China rise, Rebalancing, Offensive realism*

---

\*Visiting fellow at International Islamic University Islamabad. Email: tatheersherazi@gmail.com

†Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences and Professor of Politics and International Relations, International Islamic University Islamabad.  
Email: amna.mahmood@iiu.edu.pk (Corresponding author)

## INTRODUCTION

Over the last four decades, due to enormous economic growth and budding number of middle class, Asia Pacific has secured a position of 'emerging region'. Thus, it has taken a transition from low income stagnant economic region to more resourceful middle income region with advanced economy. In success story of Asia Pacific, the most striking factor was economic integration through economic trade, flow of human and physical capital in form of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and macroeconomic policies. Such growing and vibrant features of the region with the growing powers of China and India are not only creating prosperity but also speculations for the region and globe.

Consequently, assigning more responsibility to regional and global actors either to be part of ongoing developments in the region or otherwise. Out of those concerned actors, the US is fundamental in wake of rise of China. Ongoing research is addressing the multiple shifts of the US foreign policy during the Post-Cold war era with the lenses of 'Offensive Realism'. Besides that, a comparison of the US strategies in wake of the rise of China has also been made. The research probes into the following questions in order to get the actual picture of the US policies to deal the regional challenges. The paper addresses following questions:

- What is the historical background of the US engagement within the region?
- Why the US disengaged itself from the Asia Pacific region at the culmination of the cold war?
- How China is rising and why the US is concerned of it?
- Why and how the US is re-engaging itself in the region?
- What will be the repercussions of shift of US strategy on Pakistan?

The rise of China has attracted various response across the globe, for few, it is a peaceful while for others it is not peaceful. Multiple school

of thoughts have emerged and various theories are envisaged. In this regard, John Mearsheimer (2001) is a prominent name for giving various labels to rise of China. One of his ideas is about the 'Offensive Realism', which is the part of neo-realism with coherent features.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

John Mearsheimer is one of the pessimist critics of China's peaceful rise. Underpinning his scepticism of China's peaceful rise is a compelling system of offensive realism. His assumptions and theory of offensive realism are significant in elaborating status of China in future (Mearsheimer, 2001). However, there is a need to understand the rising patterns with win-win phenomenon. Meanwhile Inernational Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) has presented a detailed security assessment of Asia Pacific in '*The Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment 2019: Key developments and trends*' by focusing on geostatrgic security, geopolitical, financial, military and security topics. Its focus was much clear regarding Indo-Pacific strategy along with evolving issues including North Korea, Russia's evolving and security implications for the South Asia and South East Asian region;s role. However; implications for the Pakistan within South Asia was completely ignored particularly in wake of amplified role of India (IISS, 2019). According to Wallerstein, all through the Cold war, solidarity and security were the essential concerns for the US security organizers, concurring to them South East Asian states. So, under the dominos theory even the totalitarian regimes were tolerated in order to serve their purpose (Mearsheimer, 2001) despite of being favouring liberal democracy principles. This suggests how far states can go in pursuance of their own interests even to the opposite way to their ideology.

Castro (2009) explains the traits that have converted the nature of relation among the Philippines and the USA. He makes a focus on the US- the Philippines alliance, which is taking a shape of a hedge approach in opposition to rising China part of a larger local 'Quad'.

In the mild of the rising hazard, the US has determined no longer to delay initiate Beijing as an alternative to undertake a proactive hedging strategy to manage its competencies and conduct. To attain this intention, it should adopt a policy to counter China's spreading impact from the neighbouring nations of South East Asia. The ties were strengthened underneath specific agreements among Manila and Washington, however, the 9/11 scenario documented a brand new records of relations between both of those nations which paved a course in the direction of the hedge approach.

Policy guidelines with a deep analysis on China's economy have been prepared by the Economic Committee in the context of China-US relations, which is sizeable for its electricity to provide a guiding principle for the policy makers concerning China (Congress, 1997). The US government has found a way to meet President Trump's prioritization of the Indo-Pacific. Since the beginning of the Trump Administration, the Department of State and USAID have given more than US \$4.5 billion in unfamiliar help to the area. In the initial three years of the Trump Administration, meanwhile they expanded help to the locale by 25 percent contrasted with the most recent three years of the past Administration, speaking to a devoted move of assets to the Indo-Pacific.

By getting together with accomplices and partners to ensure the values and principles that made the Indo-Pacific region prosper, US will ensure the region stays tranquil, rich, and secure for quite a long time to come (Department of State, 2019). It has been analysed that there is a dynamic connection between all the above-mentioned literature from concept of John Mearsheimer to Indo Pacific Strategy which needs to be highlighted, that is a major concern of this research. Along with, it needs a neutral point of view regarding Indo Pacific Strategy and equivalent threshold of neutrality for studying its implications for Pakistan.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study is descriptive, analytical and explanatory in nature where available data has been analysed, evaluated critically. In the existing research, qualitative research method is applied along with all the fundamental additives of quality research for collecting and analysing the primary as well secondary data.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### **Historical manifestation of US in Asia Pacific**

The historical underpinnings of the US presence in South East Asia are very long but the origin of the involvement in the South East Asian affairs started when Theodore Roosevelt ordered to the Admiral George Dewey's East Asia Squadron to destroy the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay (Trask, 1996). Such a bold step against the South East Asian colonial power actually was in a revenge of the attack made on US Marine at Havana harbour made on February 1898. The purpose was to protect Manila port, which was the only way to China's market (Sprout, 1967). The US first entry in international affairs formally in Asia Pacific was so peaceful (Feber, 1989). Such a smooth and ease could not determine the other drivers of powers within region, which resulted into price paid by the US to hold a strong control on the Philippines. Like the other powerful states, the US engagement was also for resources otherwise it would be avoided from Japan during the Second World War (Fifeld, 1973).

### ***The US exposition in Asia Pacific in the cold war***

Throughout the cold struggle balance and protection had been the primary concerns for the US safety planners, consistent with them South East Asian states were authoritarian so were no longer in need of monetary assist to keep the order locally. Consequently, totalitarianism, authoritarianism despotism had been also tolerated to gain a long way away advantages and South East Asian states perceived the novel trend of economic improvement across the region

especially in Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Singapore, which worn out the socialist financial system no matter of Vietnam warfare (Wallerstein, 2010). During the same time the NATO, US-Japan defence organization (ANZUS) installed with Australia, New Zealand and the US, SEATO with Southeast Asian states had been installed by means of the US at the same time as Soviet Union installed the Warsaw pact and The Treaty of Friendship and Alliance with China. In contrast to its name, in Asia the cold warfare was not cold due to the fact of putting up with liberation war in Indochina, civil war in China and Vietnam war.

Prior to the cold war and during the World War-II, there happened a significant occasion inside Asia, which was the Japanese control over Vietnam. A paramilitary development drove by Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh was flung against Japanese occupation. After the division of Vietnam, the common war broke out. It caused monstrous changes at international and financial fronts, thusly the US needed to adjust its money related framework strategically. The US public slanted against the US polices, which made issues locally. The annihilation and related components drove the US towards a state which later was known as the 'Vietnam Syndrome' (Lawrence, 2010).

### *The post-cold war epoch*

As soon as, the Cold War ended the US shifted its core concern from geostrategic or security to financial interests including protectionism, trade balances sideways with other apprehensions like human rights, democratization of the states and arms supply by China. Even subsequent to the end of the Cold War, the region endured an important domain for the US interests nevertheless at the same time for China as well (Wayne, 1993).

Since 1970s to 2000 generally, the US strategy towards Southeast Asia stayed unfocussed with an intermittent reaction towards different political and financial disasters. The major emphasis of the US was on economic activity specifically on access to Asian markets and the free

trade. It is very exciting to note that in 1995 and 1999, the US response towards rising China and its maritime territorial intrusions, advancements expressly its prerogatives in South China Sea was very passive, neutral and muted which given China the status of strategic partner. This muted policy was tracked even in monetary crisis period of 1997 and 1998 (Kerrey, 2001). However, at the same time East Asian states kept remembering the presence of US as a necessary element for peace and development in East Asia. Rendering to Singapore the 'new world order' after the cold war is not so much safer for smaller states because major powers can behave indifferent to the interest of smaller states (Singh, 1999).

### *The Post 9/11 Era*

The US commitment in the post-cold war period in the region was distinctly in fields of common interests either at two-sided or multilateral echelons for innovation, exchange of arms deals to Taiwan (Wayne, 1993). The impacts of 'Vietnam Syndrome' were over when George W. Bush administration stated the region as a 'Second Front' for battle on terror since the relationship of a few terrorist militant associations were found in the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia.

Another purpose to declare it a second front was; the vicinity had already been sufferer of terrorist activities by multiple extremist groups. Out of other causes were manifestly continuation of economic policies, to access the free markets, army cooperation, to inspire hedging method in case of boom of any nearby competitor, to make certain the expansion and promoting of democratic values inside location (MsDevitt, 2007).

Meanwhile, participation was going on in various fields, from sharing of data of terrorists, freezing of their asset to upgrade military-to-military collaboration. There was a gap in public strategies and international strategies of the South East Asian states with respect to US approaches on war on terror between elite and public assessment.

Elite executives was working in close collaboration with the US anyway it was likewise noticing the predominant patterns. Subsequently, territorial authority was working for a gentle difficult exercise to persevere through the US rendezvous inside the region and to fend off the regional just as public dangers (Hamilton-Hart, 2006). As a whole, the US arrangement of dispensing consideration towards the region has been portrayed as commitment and withdrawal. It could be noticed that the US has consistently underlined more on upgrade of reciprocal connection and much dependence on two-sided supporting as opposed to on building multilateral foundations (Brian, 2007).

### **The Rise of China**

Since the opening up of Chinese economy to foreign trade, investments and opening up reforms China has been considered as one of the most growing economy, with real GDP annually growth rate averaging 9.5 percent through 2018 which is pronounced as 'the fastest sustained expansion by a major economy in history' by the World Bank (Analysis, 2019). Presently, China has been acknowledged the second largest economy of the world in terms of nominal GDP in comparison of the US According to a Congressional report such growth would enable China to double its GDP every eight years and help it to take 800 people out of poverty. Besides that 'China is also the largest foreign holder of the US treasury securities, which helps to fund the federal debt and keep US. interest rates low' (Analysis, 2019). With the maturity of the economic growth, although real GDP is slowed down from 14.2 percent to 6.6 percent in 2018 which is embraced by the China as the 'new normal'. IMF has projected for further slowdown lowest to 5.5 by 2024.

Economically, China has developed itself into an axis of the global market for its engineering skill, capability of production and trade. It has developed itself into a largest manufacturing economy as well as the largest exporter of the goods and second largest importer of the goods. Meanwhile it has taken a rise to the largest consumer market,

which is proliferating gradually and persistently (Analysis, 2019).

### *Multilateralism*

Since China is shown tremendous economic growth at domestic and global level, it is bringing together the states, opening up its trade and efficiency to the world via engaging them into various organizations, treaties, and agreements including FTAs (free trade agreements). China has achieved the mark after three decades of gradual but persistent reforms, consistency in policies and work hard. Successful approach of multilateralism has led China to be confident for crafting institution more effectively, China has taken multiple initiatives, which would ultimately change the world. In order to bring the states together China has declared the BRI in 2013 with six corridors passing across all the continents of the world via maritime and territorial routes termed as Belt and Road.

China remarkable development has SCO has been significant, which was established in 1996 under leadership of China along with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan formed the 'Shanghai Five' to promote regional peace. Later participation of other states Uzbekistan in 2001, Pakistan and China in 2017 endorsed the Chinese quest for multilateralism. Besides that, development of Asian Infrastructural Investment Bank (AIIB) and New Development Bank are substantial developments for being non-western monetary institution.

### *Self sufficiency*

Meanwhile China is enhancing its local capability as well, the 'Made in China 2025' Initiative is part of sufficiency plans to modernize and upgrade the hi-tech industry. It is basically a master plan to convert the country into a 'manufacturing super power' in the coming decades. The main target of the strategy is to manifest technology sector and particularly the hi-tech industry and its contribution for growth rate.

It is largely a master plan to convert the country into a 'manufacturing exquisite power' in the coming decades. The primary target of the approach is to manifest technology sector and specifically the hi-tech industry and its contribution for growth rate. The focal point in plan has been made on 10 key industries consisting of; the Aviation, Robotics, automotive, Railway gadget, Biopharma and medical gadgets, energy saving vehicles, Aerospace and aeronautical gadget, Agricultural gadget, New substances and excessive-tech maritime equipment and so forth, to lessen the dependency on other countries (State Council of the People's Republic of China, 2015). There are few considerable matters approximately the plan that the focal point is not the best on innovation as an alternative on the entire production technique, along with interest on self-created and global requirements. Except the initiative of 'Made in China', the country is adopting few other modern tasks such as the Belt and road and statecraft of Parallel establishments consisting of AIIB and plenty of others.

### **The reengagement of the US: 'Pivot to Asia'**

The rebalancing has been characterized as a US new pledge for unfathomable engagement in Southeast Asia. The term rebalancing has been defined into a couple of categories. Rendering to few analysts it is a 'hedging strategy' to counter the rise of China, possibly a take a look at on China's future dreams, a pledge for local peace, a fortification to allies towards assertive techniques of China, whereas others take a need of time to augment deeper relations with allies to be more coupled.

There are diverse elucidations for the initiative of 'rebalancing' though few analysts explain it no longer a meek matter of engagement or disengagement, extremely it is matter of priority of Asia and US ornamental relations with Asia. All through the history, US has been remained an active player in either manner but the Obama administration realized it to be extra engaged within the region. The need was felt in 2012 when accentuation was made in

military collaboration, which was later changed in late 2012 in context of China's ascent, financially, militarily especially its developing global diplomacy with different nations.

The rebalancing approach is cluster of numerous activities like transferring of military proficiencies from other regions like South Asia, Middle East to Asia Pacific, restructuring regional security arrangements, profound, enhanced financial cooperation at bilateral and multilateral level. In other words, rebalancing strategy is a protracted way of US diplomatic engagement at geostrategic and economic fronts. Rebalancing policy or Pivot to Asia produced miscellaneous reaction at regional level, China specifically has made a lot of criticism on initiative particularly on the military components.

As per some Chinese annotations US security game plans are meant to contain China in the Cold War style. At the same time, there are two suppositions; one is at local level where nations like Singapore, South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines and Japan in the region are mollified over US security responsibilities in the region. Other one is that none of countries in the region needs to pick either the US or China rather it needs to work in collaboration with both.

Other than that, rebalancing technique is fluid and adaptable, multidimensional reliant on the idea of changing power dynamics. Focal point of strategy is not exclusively on military collaboration within region rather on conciliatory and monetary exercises. As indicated by US authorities it isn't the Cold War as is declared by Chinese authorities rather President Obama said 'We welcome the peaceful rise of China' (White House, 2012).

It could be narrated that Pivot to Asia has been originated in face of China's assertive conduct to keep away from any imminent skirmish since the security rebalance can generate some confrontation, which can lead towards instability to regional peace (Panetta, 2012). The US is likewise mounting monetary connection with Asia Pacific nations, in such manner it has increased its aid by 7 percent, alongside FDI

inflow and financial arrangements. During 2011, President's National Export Initiative was removed resulting to it four from ten arising trade economies were focused on like Indonesia, India, Vietnam and China.

### **Shift of policy from rebalancing to free Indo-Pacific strategy**

Sense of responsibility to take care of the regional pursuits led US to intense engagement, penetrating at bilateral and multilateral level extending from protection, accountable governance, economic relation and sharing of social values including human rights. Purpose was the mutual partnership, otherwise the conditions of Asia Pacific would neglect to set up and save new liberal global order with free economy, liberal popular government, open society and collective security advanced by US:

- Along with expansion of liberal order, other areas of focus were also identified like strengthening of alliances,
- Intense bilateral and multilateral relation with major states of the region (Greenert & Welsh, 2013).

Sideways, intense relations at bilateral level, at institutional level were basically focused on. Numerous multilateral arrangements as of now are working in close coordinated effort like the East Asia Summit (EAS) including 18 Asia-Pacific states, ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), and a standard security discourse among 27 countries. That in larger interest of US since leaders of Asia Pacific mostly prefer its engagement more (Hagel & Chipman, 2013). Meanwhile, TPP (Trans Pacific Partnership) was proposed, an economic agreement of 12 states signed on 4, February 2016 (McBride & Chatzky, 2019).

However, with the change in administration in White House US withdrawn from TPP (Trans Pacific Partnership) by President Trump who signed a Presidential Memorandum and introduced an approach of 'Putting America First' (US Embassy, 2017). As indicated by Trump America needs reasonable, two-sided economic agreements to bring occupations and industry back onto American

shores. The choice of withdrawal from TPP met with immense criticism.

As of now, the US engagement with region is same with few significant changes. Significant changes have been made about China's trade, by forcing tariffs to control the trade imbalance, existed between the US and China. Trump made a visit in 2017 to five nations of the area and indicated his more extensive vision, to seek after American public interest through summitry, discourse and correspondence. In his visit, he offered a bunch of objectives and interests in type of a technique 'Indo-Pacific dream', which would be emerged in the coming a very long time by a shared agreement. He identified the US commitment at various fronts within region, including the security, freedom of navigation and business since the US presence in the area. His 'Indo-Pacific Dream' can be taken as the counter strategy to Xi's 'One Belt One Road'.

After honouring Asian economies, he recognized the contribution of all South Eastern states from developing economy of Vietnam, Indonesia and Thailand as quickest developing economies of G20, Malaysia made sure about situation in business, narrowing gender gap in the Philippines to Singapore's acceptable administration. His emphasis on the economic dimensions was the expression of the 'economic security is national security'. On abandoning Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), he underlined on more joint endeavours for trade, finance and investment throughout the time, his emphasis was on 'free and open Indo-Pacific', with a solid partnership with the strong states of the region and mainly 'to have partners throughout this region that are thriving, prosperous, and dependent on no one' (US Embassy, 2017).

### **US shift of strategy and implications for Pakistan**

The analysis of the rhetoric made through Trump, communications, the declaration and policies taken so far suggests that Trump administration is in favour of three matters; Firstly, make partners

and allies; such partners and allies who could pursue economic development; and look forward for geostrategic interests through those allies and partners.

The free and open Indo-Pacific' strategy has delineated the fundamental principles of the policies which Trump implied the alliance with Thailand and the Philippines while maintaining relations with Indonesia, Vietnam and Malaysia to contain China. Other than that Indo-Pacific Strategy has obviously been explained in 2017, 2018 and 2019 National Security Strategy. Specially in 2019 National Security Strategy, where all the core ingredients were identified and pledged with a rationale that 'the surest way to prevent war is to be prepared to win one'. On rebuilding military readiness Indo-Pacific Strategy focuses to strengthen alliances to attract new partners, and reform the business practices for greater performance and affordability or promotion of a networked region.

Here essentially, China has been declared as a strategic competitor and mainly under the section of 'trends and challenges' China has been taken a 'revisionist power' who wants to put an end to the ongoing world system.

Over emphasis on the partnership and allies has led it to expand its partnerships across the world to multiple regions, which includes Latin America, Africa, Middle East, Western Europe and Indo Pacific. Presently, the US is preserving the existing tradition and strategies with few new partnerships, within the region to preserve its influence strategically and to secure its own interest, being a guarantor to allies. Although during the first year of Trump administration, pivot thrust was kept, particularly regarding security matters, without iteration of rebalancing. However, there are strong assumptions that the US would go for a certain charter to be more specific and precise regarding its economic and strategic policies within the region (n.a., 2018).

The prime reason for the strategic shift is the changing dynamics of geo-economics and geo-politics of the world, which has led to emerging status of various states mainly Russia, India and China. China is significant for huge flow of trade between the Pacific and Indian Ocean. The US Strategic alliance with India has excluded Pakistan from the geopolitical stage of South Asia, at the same time it has inevitably attracted the China- Pakistan strategic alliance (Frank & Vernuccio, 2019).

Besides that, being a geopolitical alliance, Indo Pacific region contributes almost 60 percent of the global growth as consisted of three largest economies of the world. This region is the habituate of six fast growing economies including India, Cambodia, Burma, Laos, Nepal and the Philippines (Ali, 2020). Military cooperation is mounting anxiety in Pakistan particularly in context of anti-China, anti BRI narrative. It will allow India for more lethal security build up from military modernization to modern equipment and its applications. Under the strategy, India is emphasising on following goals:

- Accelerating its share in companies as well as its share in financial channels by
- Securing its position not economically but militarily by
- Establishing a deterrence against two nuclear neighbours Pakistan and China.

Such confidence has already emboldened India to act blindly in the revocation of article 370 and it will enhance India's capability of power projection to any limit. Pakistan's interests are being threatened directly as well as indirectly. Besides that, India is enough confident for being part of larger Quad, which can put a direct security threat to Pakistan;

- by escalating tension across the border
- by committing atrocities in Indian Occupied Kashmir (IoK)

- by threatening to launch a direct attack in Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK)
- by engaging militant elements from Afghanistan.

In the intervening time, India might effort to sabotage China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) projects by promoting terrorist activities, which are already going on. Besides that, under the cover of strategy, India would also rationalize and justify its irrational decisions within region and particularly against Pakistan.

The announcement of Indo-Pacific Strategy is not simply a symbolic gesture rather the manifestation of new strategic thinking and part of a larger 'Quad'. Meanwhile such partnership can have detrimental effect on region, which further can create a security dilemma in wake of divergent interests. Prevalent situation of US Pakistan relationship is symptomatic of an increasing ambiguity, which would work as counterproductive measure in long run. Chronology of events even in South East Asia and South East clearly suggest that it is matter of re-engagement and re-alignment than the unpretentious engagement. General Mattis at the IISS conclave states 'the US values the role India can play in regional and global security... based on a convergence of strategic interests' (Akram, 2018). In this larger power competition Pakistan is anxious about the range of military partnership.

Emboldening of India by US in wake of rise of China, to contain the China has intensified the regional status quo. Implications for Pakistan ranges from arm race to economic instability by engaging Kashmir issue and CPEC. It can complicate the situation political instability to deterioration of situation of law and order across the country.

China is working in close collaboration with Pakistan in security as well as economic matters particularly in context of CPEC, which has been taken as a flagship project for BRI. Indo Pacific strategy is one of the countering measure taken by the US, which has been elaborated by John Mearsheimer as an 'offensive measure' or which can be taken

as a 'Thucydides Trap' where a rising power challenges the status quo and the existing hegemon, subsequently a war becomes inevitable. However, China is behaving in a very responsible way while adopting a realist approach towards the situations in both regions of South East Asia and South Asia. However, Indian approach in this regard is unrealistic and offensive, which can drag the whole region into a security theatre by creating security dilemma.

## CONCLUSION

Throughout the history, the US relations with East Asia has seen many ups and down and various modes including the area of being 'low priority' and 'high priority', in any case, one factor has always been critical that is China. Even current phase of Trumpization 'Free and open Indo-Pacific' policy of the US is the continuation of the 'Pivot to Asia', with a major focus on counter elements against the China. Such geostrategic move will result into regional insecurity along with new partnerships and security arrangements among China and its allies. Meanwhile Indo-Pacific strategy has created tetragon competition putting the South Asia and South East Asia in a capricious situation. There is need to take the following policy choices under consideration by the policy makers in order to take constructive measures;

- There are no black and whites in diplomacy rather there are grey areas where states are needed to work in order to materialize the national goals, so Pakistan should work progressively on its foreign policy in order to get constructive results in order to have balanced relation between US and China.
- There is need to work for on mutual grounds in order to get harmony in relationships like governance, sustainable development, terrorism, Environment and Covid-19.

- Pakistan is in dire need of diversify its economic and well as security policies in wake of emerging power dynamics.
- Pakistan should work on materializing its own national interest rather than engaging unnecessarily into rifts and conflicts.
- By extending its role in Taliban Peace talks Pakistan can bolster its position in region to create harmony for enduring strategic stability.

## REFERENCES

- Akram, Z. (2018, June 12). The 'Indo-Pacific' and Pakistan. Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1732923/6-indo-pacific-pakistan>
- Ali, I. (2020). Indo-US enhanced naval cooperation: Implications for Pakistan. Retrieved from <http://southasiajournal.net/indo-us-enhanced-naval-cooperation-implications-for-pakistan/>
- Analysis, B. E. (2019). Direct investment by country and industry. Retrieved from <https://www.bea.gov/data/intl-trade-investment/direct-investment-country-and-industry>
- Baker, P. (2017, January 23). Trump Abandons Trans-Pacific Partnership, Obama's Signature Trade Deal. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/23/us/politics/tpp-trump-trade-nafta.html?auth=link-dismiss-google1tap>
- Castro, R. C. (2009). The US-Philippines alliance: An evolving hedge against an emerging China challenge. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 21(3), 399-423.
- Congress, J. E. (1997). *China's economic future: Challenges to U.S. policy*. London: Routledge.
- CRS. (2019, June 25). *China's economic rise: History, trends, challenges, and implications for the United States*. CRS.

- Department of State, USA. (2019). A free and open Indo-Pacific: Advancing a Shared Vision. Washington D.C. Department of States, United States of America. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Free-and-Open-Indo-Pacific-4Nov2019.pdf>
- Diane, K. M., & Brain, L. J. (2007). U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia: Limited re-engagement after Years of benign neglect. *Asian Survey*, 47(4), 622–641.
- Feber, W. L. (1989). *The American ate: United States foreign policy at home and abroad since 1750*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Fifield, R. H. (1973). *Americans in Southeast Asia: The Roots of Commitment*. New York. Best Sellers Rank.
- Frank V., & Vernuccio, J. (2019). Indo-Pacific challenge, part 5. Washington D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.usagovpolicy.com/tag/indian-ocean-challenge>
- Greenert, A. J., & Welsh, J. G. (2013). Breaking the kill chain: How to keep America in the game when our enemies are trying to shut us out. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2013/05/17/breaking-the-kill-chain/>
- Hagel, S. O., & Chipman, J. (2013). Remarks by Secretary Hagel at the IISS Asia Security Summit. Shangri-La Hotel, Singapore: International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- IISS. (2019, May). Asia Pacific Regional Security Assessment 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.iiss.org/publications/strategic-dossiers/asiapacific-regional-security-assessment-2019#:~:text=Launched%20on%2031%20May%2C%20the,%2C%20charts%2C%20tables%20and%20diagrams>
- ITC. (n. d.). List of products exported by China. <https://www.trademap.org/>

- Justin, L. & Wang, Y. (2012). China's integration with the world: Development as a process of learning and industrial up gradation. *China Economic Policy Review*, 1(1).DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S179396901250001X>
- Kerrey, J. R. (2001). The United States and Southeast Asia: A policy agenda for the new administration. Report of an Independent Task Force.
- Lawrence, M. A. (2010). *The Vietnam War: A concise international history*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McBride, J., & Chatzky. A. (2019). What is the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)? Council on Foreign Relation.
- (2018). Why ASEAN matters. *East Asia Forum Quarterly*, 10(1), 1-32.
- McDevitt, M. (2007). The 2006 Quadrennial defense review and national security strategy: Is there an American Strategic Vision for East Asia? *Issues and Insights* 7:1, pp, 1-3.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hamilton-Hart, N. (2006). Terrorism in Southeast Asia: Expert analysis, myopia, and fantasy. *Pacific Review* 18(3)303-325.
- Office of the Federal Register, USA. (2017, January 23). DCPD-201700064 - Memorandum on withdrawal of the United States from the Trans-Pacific Partnership Negotiations and Agreement. Retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/DCPD-201700064>
- Panetta, L. (2012, September 19). Speech to the PLA Engineering Academy of Armed Forces. Leon
- Singh, B. (1999). *The vulnerability of small states revisited*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

- Sprout, H. M. (1967). *Rise of American naval power*. Princeton University Press.
- State Council of the People's Republic of China (2015) Made in China 2025. Retrieved from [http://english.www.gov.cn/policies/latest\\_releases/2015/05/19/content\\_281475110703534.htm](http://english.www.gov.cn/policies/latest_releases/2015/05/19/content_281475110703534.htm)
- Trask, D. (1996). *The Spanish-American war*. Hispanic Division Library of Congress.
- US Embassy. (2017). Remarks by President Trump at APEC CEO Summit. Hanoi: U.S. Embassy. Retrieved from <https://vn.usembassy.gov/20171110-remarks-president-trump-apec-ceosummit>
- Wallerstein, I. (2010). What cold war in Asia? An interpretative essay. In Y., Zheng, L., Hong, & M. Szonyi. *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds* (Eds.) (pp. 15-24). Boston: Brill.
- Wayne, B. (1993.). Chinese policies and U.S. interests in Southeast Asia. *Asian Survey*, 33 (3), 317-332.
- White House. (2012, November 19). Remarks by President Obama at the University of Yangon.