

Pakistan's National Security Advisor M.A. Durrani said, "attacks by predators are very distracting for us and at some stage Obama as president might have to step in to decide whether there Predator strikes should continue.... They have become spoilers, rather than helping us."

Considering his out look of life, his politics and his personality traits as reflected in his speeches and writings, Obama can't ignore the preceding factors which are causing trouble to large part of the world. During his election campaign he strived to project himself as man of peace and not as man of war. It is logical therefore to expect him to play the role of peacemaker. Choosing the path of war will not only amount to betraying his voters but also will deny him the second term.

In case of Pakistan Bush has done this land unlimited damage. Three times did he pronounced from the White House lawns last summer that "Pakistan is the most dangerous state in the world." In the same breadth he described Pakistan as the "closest ally", of the U.S. in the war against terror. Mr. Obama's upcoming team should know that such statements and almost daily bombing of Pakistani territory by the U.S. drones, have largely destroyed the good will between the two countries. Deterioration in relations has occurred to such an extent that people of Pakistan are beginning to consider President Bush and his country as enemy rather than friends. Basically there are two reasons for the alienation. One, a perception has been built up that U.S. regards Muslims as their enemy. Two, the retaliation caused by U.S. air raids and drone attacks in Pakistani territory, is often directed against innocent citizens of Pakistan. America is just too far for the insurgents to go after. Their propaganda line says that they attack Pakistani targets because Pakistani government is helping the Americans. Ironically Pakistan receives beating from both combatants, Americans as well as the militants.

Obama like the military experts from NATO, will soon realize that war against Afghan and Pak tribesmen is unwinnable and divert the American resources toward peace through dialogue. In any case he just can't ignore the reaction to drone attacks in Pakistan.

Talking about the subject soon after the Strategic Dialogue in Washington in second week of November,

Commander in Chief", Casey said, believed in an attrition strategy of simply eliminating the bad guys. The Vietnam War had established that that would not work. No matter how many insurgents they killed or arrested, more would follow. The United States had killed tens of thousands of Iraqis. The classified operational summaries showed that 1000 Iraqis defined as *Al-Qaeda* insurgents, or other violent extremists were being killed each month.

The Iraqi and before that the Vietnamese, experience show that the policy of eliminating insurgency through killing does not succeed. There would always be a fresh pack of insurgents around to replace their dead comrades. The indiscriminate killing also spreads a wave of hatred against those who wish to conquer. Besides, the possibility of winning hearts and mind of the rebels, which was expected by Bush when his troops entered Baghdad, is invariably lost.

As he goes through transition selecting White House staff and his cabinet, Obama would also be going through policy review. Usually the actors are chosen according to requirement of the script. At this juncture the script requires performers who could work out peace in Iraq and peace in Afghanistan. The war in the traditional sense can't be won through military might; only by accepting rights of the people could bring about peace. Obama must realize that not just his own people, but the whole world waits for him to deliver peace. Much will depend on the actors he picks up for the required role.

would bring their youngsters home from the killing fields of Iraq as soon as possible. This segment of the American society saw no sense, first in starting the Iraq war and then continuing it without any clear cut objectives.

The Republicans attempt to shift the focus from *al-Qaeda* in Mesopotamia to *al-Qaeda-Taliban* Axis to Pak-Afghan border made some but not much sense to the American voters. The slogan of “compassionate conservatism” had since long lost its validity.

Thus the first thing Americans expect from Obama is to call off the war in Iraq and withdraw U.S. troops from that unfortunate country. As far as the insurgency in Pak-Afghan sector is concerned, Americans are not fully aware about the political background of *Taliban* and their goals in Afghanistan. Regrettably American Drones are launching almost daily air attacks on the alleged *al-Qaeda* men and causing an average of twenty casualties of civilians per day.

Obama certainly differs with Bush on the Question of strategy in Pakistan. Bush believed in the “elimination” of each and every *al-Qaeda* and *Taliban* men while Obama talks in terms of carrots and stick policy. Fight the insurgency if necessary but keep open the doors for talks, a diplomatic engagement that is. Pakistan welcomes this policy and is ready to lend a helping hand.

According to generals Casey and Abizoid, both veteran of Iraq war, and quoted in Bob Woodward book “The War Withen”, say that they failed to sell to Bush the path of dialogue combined with anti-insurgency operation. “The

Hamid Alvi

WILL OBAMA CHOOSE WAR OR PEACE

Mr. Barack Obama has been chosen by his nation to preside over world's most powerful office in order to bring about change, a change not imposed from without but campaigned by Obama himself. Interestingly the dimensions of the change were never defined either by Obama or his supporters. Asked once in his long drawn out campaign to define change, Obama pointing to the crowd around him replied, "we are the change." In the absence of a universally accepted definition, every one went around giving one which suited to his or her views. For instance a segment of U.S. public understands by the word change racial equality, end of Republican rule and withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq.

Many thought change would mean radical transformation of the American socio-economic system, a Roosevelt style reform. A new, New deal which would herald the dawn of new era in the domestic and world affairs.

However, an overwhelming number interpreted the change in the context of war and peace and they were perhaps correct. They viewed Obama as man of peace who