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ABSTRACT

This research is an attempt to study the relations between Pakistan and the United States in the context of alliances of modern age. The study primarily discussing the need of alliances in modern times and suggests that even though there is a shift in power balance in the international state system, the concept still prevails in international politics. The study assesses the conditions that obligated Pakistan to join Western alliances and argues that Pakistan joined the US sponsored Western alliances for acquiring economic and strategic aid, while the US wanted to shape a defense system of non-communist states. The study further emphasizes that after joining Western alliance system Pakistan’s relations with Muslim countries and Soviet Union deteriorated. The study further dives into the intricacies of Pakistan’s deteriorated relations with the US in 1960s and revived in post 1979 period. The US after realizing its objectives into the region left Pakistan alone with unresolved issues, in the wake of disintegration of Soviet Union.

The study further elucidated that the event of 9/11 elevated the significance of Pakistan in the eyes of the United States once again. The findings in post 9/11 study reveal that this relation meant a lot to Pakistan while for the US is a marriage of convenience. Additionally, both the states are not on the same page regarding security issues as both views Middle East, India, issues of non-proliferation differently. Although the United States and Pakistan are allies, the US considered former Soviet Union more important during Cold War era than its ally Pakistan. And in the post 9/11 period is more focused on combating terrorism, while Pakistan since its inception till today is preoccupied with the perceived threats from India. The study argues that though the interests of Pakistan and the United States diverge, still the US cannot deny Pakistan’s significance for promoting regional security. This is one of the reasons why the US though tilted towards India does not want to lose Pakistan’s support in the region.
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INTRODUCTION

In the post-World War II, international politics entered into ideological conflict between communism and capitalism which not only influenced the entire world but the domestic politics of South Asian States as well. Being a newly independent state, Pakistan initially followed the policy of non-alignment. This policy was not an ideological choice but was an expression of isolation and non-commitment with either of the power blocks. In the beginning of 1948 the war in Kashmir between India and Pakistan over the accession of the princely state, induced fear and insecurity syndrome in the minds of policy makers in Pakistan.

This syndrome prompted policy makers in Pakistan to revisit Pakistan”s foreign policy and the emerging conditions registered Pakistan”s need to acquire economic assistance, political support and security through military equipment. Korean crisis proved the United States supremacy against communist forces in the peninsula. The USA was playing an important role in the economic and political reconstruction of European states through Marshall Plan. Ensuing to the World War II, the United States security policy towards Asia was based on preserving balance of power and shaping a defense network of non-Communist states. The most instantaneous and intricate phase of this strategy was military inhibition of Communist China and reducing former Soviet Union charm to minimum. The execution of this strategy required economic strength, man power and weapons which the US government could manage, on the other side the United States was seeking steady Asian allies to conduct the cold war.

On the other side, Pakistan that emerged after the partition of the sub-continent was confronted with multifaceted problems. During 1950s, when Pakistan”s agricultural economy began to decline with extreme food shortage, the US persuaded Pakistan”s government to join Western alliance system that would enable Pakistan to cope with energy problems, insecurity issues and crumpling economic. Consequently, Pakistan inclined towards the United States while the later showed its interest in Pakistan due to her geo strategic position to contain communism at the periphery of South Asia. Thus Pakistan”s
policy of non-alignment was replaced with alignment and unilateralism which finally placed her under US security umbrella.

This mutual interdependence opened new avenues of relations and cooperation between the two countries. Out of multiple avenues for Pakistan, the most essential were economic assistance and military support for her integrity and solidarity. In this direction, Pakistan joined Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954 to seek American support for the protection of Eastern Wing and in 1955 Pakistan joined Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) with the co-operation of Turkey to ensure the security of her Western Wing. The Sino-Indian war of 1962 induced bilateralism in Pakistan’s foreign policy and its relevancy appeared after Indo-Pak war of 1965 when the United States suspended military aid to Pakistan. Consequently, Pakistan denounced her membership of SEATO and CENTO which diluted Pak-US Alliance. The gap between both the states further widened due to Indo-Pak acceptance of former Soviet Union mediation in Tashkent Agreement. This event had not only dented US Cold War policy in South Asia but also inducted Pakistan with chaotic politics in 1970. Realizing Pakistan’s position in the region, USA tactfully converted Pakistan into a diplomatic bridge between Washington and Beijing that culminated into disintegration of Pakistan in 1971. The new administration in Pakistan revolutionized the politics with socialist economic measures and foreign policy with multilateralism. Apart from this, the nuclear controversy further widened the gap between Pakistan and USA.

Likewise Pakistan’s nuclear program hoisted security distress for the region. But the administrative change in Pakistan in 1977 and former Soviet Union military occupation of Afghanistan in 1979 reactivated Pak-US alliance by repairing the US Cold war policy in South Asia thus Pakistan became a front line state for containment of Communism by accommodating Afghan refugees and supporting Afghan Mujahedeen against Former Soviet army in Afghanistan. Hence, owing to her Geo strategic position again Pakistan became center of attraction for both the superpowers. Other numerous factors further enhanced this value i.e. Iranian revolution, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, its close ties
with oil producing states. With regional development of 1979, Pakistan emerged as the largest beneficiary of aid after Israel and Egypt. Military aid, technical training programs, and negotiation on regional issues culminated into diplomatic and military cooperation.

However, the US administration equated the resumption of economic and military aid to Pakistan with restoration of democracy and rolling back of her nuclear program but interaction between both the states continued with multiple reservations till the conclusion of Geneva Accord for the withdrawal of Soviet troops out of Afghanistan. In February 1989, Soviet withdrew its last troop from Afghanistan. After Soviet exodus the US lost its interest in the two adjacent countries of South Asia. Owing to poor law and order condition the US closed its embassy in Kabul. Likewise, its relations with Pakistan deteriorated due to its nuclear program. Resultantly, the US imposed sanctions against Pakistan that created massive problems for Pakistan.

The frequently changing governments in Pakistan since 1988 to 1998 decreased Pak-US understanding on International issues. This was further sparked by the highest degree of political instability, acquisition of missile technology from China and Pakistan’s attempt to assure balance of deterrence in South Asia through Nuclear tests in 1998, in response to Indian nuclear Weapons test in the same year, and a new wave of sanctions from world community and particularly the USA destroyed the atmosphere of cooperation, understanding and alignment with Pakistan.

The governmental change in Pakistan in 1999 clearly signaled subsequent change in her foreign policy particularly towards the USA because Government of Pakistan abruptly altered her Afghan policy towards Taliban administration in Kabul. The episode of 9/11 brought momentous change in global politics that brought the two old allies close again where Pakistan actively joined the US war against Terrorism without estimating multiple repercussions of the regional politics. Before the event of 9/11 the relations between Pakistan and the United States were stressed because of military regime in Pakistan but subsequent to the terrorist attacks President Bush advised the Secretary of state to bring Pakistan in the orbit. Therefore, Musharraf was asked to take side of the US or be ready to
face the outcomes of supporting Taliban. Consequently, the sequential history of Pak-US alliance recycled itself and in 2004, Pakistan earned the title of the US major non-NATO ally. In 2006, Washington agreed to develop “strategic partnership” with Pakistan and to develop collaboration in defense, trade, education, science and technology. Pakistan”’s decision to join US led war on terror opened new avenues for both the countries; with this decision Pakistan”’s standing for US regional security set up got elevated. Both the countries took decisive actions to take away all the hurdles that deteriorated their bilateral relations in post-cold war period and resolute to determine their relations on new lines encompassing terrorism, security and political and economic fields. A critical aspect of the relation was that the US military operations in Eastern Afghanistan in 2001-2002 led many Al-Qaeda members to abscond to Pakistan from where they led hit and run attack on US and allied forces in Afghanistan. Pakistan”’s decision of joining the US led war on terror was a premeditated response to get political and economic benefits coupled with improved security set up, while many of the political analysts in Pakistan regard this decision a major mistake since it has created lot of problems for Pakistan. The decision of joining the US led war on terror has direct impacts on Pakistan”’s domestic security as well since domestic terrorist activities have heaped on. The US strategy of drone attacks to combat terrorism is provoking strong resentment among the masses. The immediate impact of these drone strikes was radicalization of those who suffer losses because of these strikes. Beside radicalization of the sufferers, drone strikes are exasperating the modest and progressive faction of Pakistani society that was more compassionate to the United States. What annoying more to this faction about drone strikes is not attack on Pakistan”’s sovereignty but double standards of the US towards the importance attached to the lives of Pakistanis. Symbolic condemnations are made from time to time by Pakistani government of drone attacks in the tribal areas of Pakistan against Al-Qaeda and Afghan militants. To give its demand a genuine look Pakistan vacated its bases from the US that were utilized for this purpose.
Moreover, the evolving conditions of international politics after the unfortunate event of 9/11, converted Pakistan into a battle ground of proxy war of terrorism which damaged Pakistan’s economy, social structure, political institutions and international prestige. On the other hand many Congressmen regard Pakistan a treacherous ally because of Osama presence there and held that Pakistan is not sincere in its efforts in fighting against terrorists therefore Pakistan don’t be worthy of the US aid. The Pak-US alliances have another gloomy side for Pakistan as well, since the United States while not reckoning Pakistan’s sacrifices always gave penchant to India over Pakistan. Very often the US halted aid to Pakistan whenever it saw estrangement in its relation with India. This is the reason why Indian factor has always been dominating the Pak-US alliance right from the beginning in 1950s till the ongoing Pak-US nexus in war on terror. Despite of the dissatisfaction on both sides, these two allies expressed their content on the development of bilateral relations and declared that mutual collaboration is indispensable for regional peace and security and for obliteration of Al-Qaeda and all other form of militancy.

Though we can see divergence in Pak-US priorities still both the allies need each other to eradicate extremism and promote regional peace. This study is an attempt to estimate the implications of various military alliances between Pakistan and the USA to extract and explore better avenues and prospects of Pakistan’s foreign policy future discourse within regional and international politics.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This research confines itself to Pak-US strategic cooperation detailing the scope of this relationship. A brief description of the US inconsistent foreign policy towards South Asia also forms part of this study in order to put the subject in proper perspective. The economic side of this partnership also forms a part of this study. This enables us to see what, in fact, precipitated the relationship between Pakistan and the US. While determining the implications of this partnership, the study explores various avenues open for Pakistan. Finally, conclusion is drawn and suggestions are put forwarded.
This narration develops multiple questions but the most important question on which the study is based are:

- Which conditions forced both the US and Pakistan to enter into alliance relationship?
- Which gains and losses have been incurred by Pakistan after joining the Western pacts?

Other research questions answered in this research are:

- How far the alliance between Pakistan and the USA was important for the political stability, economic security of the region?
- How the alliance between Pakistan and the United States influenced the domestic politics of Pakistan?
- What were the essential conditions and requirements for the USA rapprochement?
- Will Pakistan and the USA be able to dissolve the menace of terrorism through war?
- What would be the implications of Indo-US nuclear deal for Pakistan?
- What are the available policy options for Pakistan?
- Which areas of cooperation between both the states need attention?
- What would be Pakistan’s approach to develop its relations with the United States in future?

These very important questions are carefully treated and critically viewed in this study.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The significance of the study can be established by highlighting and understanding the importance of Pak-US alliance. In the Post World War II the USA and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) emerged as the most powerful states. Some states joined communist block while some states joined capitalist block. Pakistan joined capitalist block for political support, economic assistance and national integrity. In 1954 and 1955 Pakistan and the USA entered into alliance. In 1979 after military occupation of Afghanistan by
former Soviet Union Pakistan became frontline state for containment of communism. The alliance became weak after nuclear tests by Pakistan in 1998. However, this alliance was reactivated after 9/11 incident and once again Pakistan became frontline state in the war against terrorism. This study is to focus on the convergence and divergence of the alliances between Pakistan and US. The significance of the study lies in the fact that it identifies the pattern for sound and stable alliances. The gains and losses emanating from such cooperation and lessons learnt, from this relation form an important part of this study. In the changing global environment, the USA has been playing the role of activating and deactivating international events. On the other hand Pakistan is facing number of challenges internally and externally. Apart from this, importance of the study lies in the fact that cooperation between Pakistan and the USA in political, economic, military and many other fields may contribute towards stability of the region. This study therefore, holds great importance from standpoint of regional peace and security.

**OBJECTIVES**

The study focuses on the following objectives.

i. To examine the factors compelling Pakistan to form alliance with the USA; ii. To analyze the impact of this partnership on Pakistan’s foreign relations and domestic politics.

iii. To evaluate the pros and cons of Pak-US alliance; iv. To review the different dimensions of this partnership;

v. To analyze the future prospects of this alliance.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Stephen M. Walt in his book *The Origin of Alliances* mentioned that recent survey identified some 270 books addressing different aspects of Pak-US Alliance. But the most important ones according to this study are listed below:

M. S. Venkataramani, *The American Role in Pakistan* (1982), the author writes about the development of Pak-US relation since 1947 to 1958. The book describes that since inception of Pakistan, her threat perception remained India centric. Therefore, to enhance
her defense, the leadership of Pakistan from the founding father Quaid-e-Azam to Zia sought assistance from the United States, where the later used Pakistan for realizing its own objectives in the periphery. Consequently Pakistan joined Western camp and became the largest recipient of the US economic and military aid. The antecedent and consequences of the decision of joining the Western pact have lasting impacts on the domestic politics and life and liberties of the people of Pakistan. Apart from these hard hitting facts, the book further analyses the role of the prominent people and leadership and their interaction with the United States. The author discusses various factors responsible for increased interaction between Pakistan and the United States, the Indian aggressive design in South Asia and threats to Pakistan. However, the study focuses on military dimensions of Pak-US relations and their political consequences. The book also analyzes the implications and developments, occurring during perpetual interactions between the two states. However, this work provides useful data to explore future prospects of this alliance.

Leo E. Rose and Noor A. Hussain, (Eds.) *United States-Pakistan Forum: Relations with the Major Powers*. (1985), this edited book consists of different articles. This work analyzes Pak-US interaction under multiple aspects but the most prominent are Pak-US security and economic ties. This work comparatively develops the theme of informal alliance between the two states on the basis of domestic politics, regional and international scenario. While exploring the aspect of Pak-US security relationship the book give brief description of how the United States and Pakistan became partner where Pakistan assume the status of frontline state against the containment of communism. It also describe that the initiative to forge security relations between Pakistan and the United States, was taken by the founding father of Pakistan, Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah. However, the initial response of the US was not so favorable since the United States was engaged in reconstruction of Europe through Marshall Plan. Later on, the changing dynamics of international politics, communist increasing influence and regional relativism with India brought evident change in the policy of the United States towards the region that elevated the significance of Pakistan in the eyes of the United States. From economic perspective
this book gives description of aid provided during different regimes and investment made by the US in Pakistan. The work is useful in the sense of future course of Pak-US relation as a reference. Various areas remain unexplored e.g. implication of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, post-cold war politics of South Asia, South West Asia and US the formal alliance.

M. Raziullah Azmi, *Pak America Relations: The Recent Past.* (1994), the author analyzes strategic role of Pakistan during Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and induction of Afghanistan factor in Pak-US relations and US economic and military aid packages to Pakistan. Besides, nuclear issue remained as a bone of contention in their bilateral ties. The book also dive in-depth detail about Pak-US bilateral relations during different regimes of the US. The book tactfully discuss Pak-US relations in retrospect, and explains how the decades of 1950s and 1980s are similar for the same reason i.e. containment of communism. Likewise, the decades of 1960s and 1990s are similar again for the similar reason i.e. improvement in American-Soviet/Russian relations. It also describes that how Pakistan faced the ire of President Johnson in mid 1960s owing to its relations with China and after few years earned the appreciation of President Nixon for acting as bridge between Sino-US relations. Since the main theme of this book is nuclear program of Pakistan and Pak-US relation, it provides detail of cutting of the US aid to Pakistan in the back drop of Pakistan”s nuclear program. The work presents regional and global imperatives of Pak-US relationship, particularly in the aftermath of Soviet disintegration, and Indo-US rapprochement that was circumscribing Pakistan foreign policy options. The work can be used as reference on the future course of Pak-US alliance, since the work very delicately gives details of Pak-US relations from different perspectives.

Verinder Grover and Rajan Arora, (Eds.) *Political System in Pakistan in Pakistan* (1995), this book consists of different articles. This work analyzes foreign policy of Pakistan with particular reference to Pak-US military cooperation and Indian response to the alliance. The author emphasizes upon economic factor of Pak-US alliance, as well as an irritant of Pakistan”s nuclear program and the US reservations. The work is an
authenticated referential source for researchers to explore implications of Pak-US military alliance as well as economic assistance in cold and post-cold war eras.

Moonis Ahmar, *The World after September 11: Challenges and Opportunities.* (2003), is an edited book comprises different articles. This work gives analysis of the tragic episode of 9/11 and its impacts on Muslim World. After the attack on world trade center on September 11, 2001, the United State took no time to declare Osama and AlQaeda as master mind of these attacks. The President George W. Bush in his address to the joint session of Congress stated that either you are with us or against us that left Pakistan with no option and Pakistan being the close ally of the USA agreed to become a frontline state in the war against terrorism. This book can be used as reference since it very deeply and comprehensively discusses the phenomenon of terrorism. It also analyzes an important issue of link between terrorism and religion since any kind of terrorist activity is equated with religious extremism and in this regards this work depicts the challenges faced by the Muslim World. This book also highlights that after joining the war, what challenges Pakistan is going to face, since the cooperation between Pakistan and the USA badly affected Pakistan”s domestic politics and economy. The work also analyzes terrorism in regional context of South Asia. However, this book does not explain the future prospect of war against terrorism, implications of war against terrorism on Pakistan.

Hafeez Malik *US Relations with Afghanistan & Pakistan: The Imperial Dimension* (2008), this work is a multidimensional analysis of US asymmetrical relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan since the rise and fall of Taliban. This book can also be used as reference since it describes an in-depth history of the United States emergence as an independent state and its journey of attaining superpower status to realize its imperialist design that culminate into disintegration of Soviet Union and emergence of the United States as a sole superpower thus transformed the dynamics of global politics. This work also analyzes the foreign policies of India, China and Russia as the main actors of regional politics. The description of the ideology and structure of Taliban has also been hashed out which highlights the trajectories of their future developments. This book also gives the brief
analysis of joint military operations launch against the militants in tribal belt of Pakistan. This work highlights that although the United States has a long lasting partnership with Pakistan and Pakistan has played and is playing the role of frontline state previously against communism and presently against war on terror, still not reckoning the sacrifice of Pakistan, the United States has shown tilt towards India. The work is very useful for the researchers as a reference but various arenas are still unexplored e.g. former Soviet Union withdrawal from Afghanistan and its repercussion on Pak-US relations, Pakistan response to the US inclination towards India, future course of war against terrorism and implications for Pakistan.

Dr. Abdul Sattar *Pakistan’s Foreign Policy 1947-2009: A concise History* (2010), gives exceptionally compact and precise details of different phases of Pakistan’s foreign policy. It deals in detail with Pakistan’s choice subsequent to its independence to join the western camp. In this book it is likewise discussed in detail that how and why Pakistan joined western camp particularly made for the containment of communism. Pakistan principle objective of joining these pacts was to upgrade its defensive capacities against India, where as the USA never meant these pacts to be against India but to contain communism. This is the reason Pakistan didn’t get any substantial backing against India from US in 1965 and 1971 wars. Abdul Sattar in this book has depicted, explicated and analyzed Pakistan’s impulse to become US ally as Pakistan’s security and defense policies are absolutely India centric and USA was sufficiently able to reinforce Pakistan’s military and economic potential against India. This book additionally gives details of financial and military support USA has provided to Pakistan as an ally. In the end however the author briefly described that how the „War on Terror” started and how Pakistan became a part of it yet he doesn’t give details of the Pakistan’s role in the „War on Terror”.

Daniel S. Markey, *No Exit from Pakistan: America’s Tortured Relationship with Islamabad.* (2013), the author discuss in detail the Pak-US relationships with emphasis on the events occurred after the incident of 9/11. The author analyzes that how Pakistan’s internal instability, its nuclear weapons and its relationship with China and India shape
relations between Pakistan and the United States. This work also illustrate the Pakistan’’s society to explore the anti-American sentiments following historical course from 19472001 and evaluate how the US designed its policy towards Pakistan after 9/11 episode. This work also made suggestions for the US to prepare for the future while not repeating the mistakes of the past. This book can be used as a reference to explore the Pak-US security relations particularly after 9/11 and its impacts on Pakistan.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Extensive literature of international relations concentrates on multifaceted dynamics, elements and proceedings of evolving relations between nations. Community of nation operates within systematic whole interacting within legal, social, cultural, economic and political factors. This framework is supported by multiple theories. This theory of cooperation underscores a particular dimension of cooperation within legal approach which may be termed as alliances. Alliances are the most vital facet of international approach. Alliances are also subjected to factors and theories that can be categorized as geographical, political and ideological.

Number of scholars presented their theories to scrutinize the dynamics of alliances between nations. Each theoretical framework further elaborates multiple aspects of geography, politics and ideology to rationalize the system of alliances between nations.

The decisive factor in regulating international politics is national interest of any given state that culminates into continuous competition among states. States are duty bound to provide protection to its citizens and assure the security of the state itself. Therefore, on world stage we can see states striving for power, enhancing their military stature and improving the economic capacity of state against others.¹ One of the renowned scholar of international relations argued that in global politics the eventual goal of a state is to increase its power that will assure its security and enhances its capacities.² While securing their national

interest states even join military alliances, though, every state has its own objectives of joining the alliances. Alliances are used by both the weaker countries and stronger countries to seek and cater the protection of its national interests. US invited Pakistan to join hands in the Cold war defense alliances since they had their own interest to serve while Pakistan had joined it to serve their own interest, thus two countries enter into alliance if their interest coincide. However, to George Liska, conflict is the cardinal factor that evolves alliance system in global politics. Nevertheless, other factors play their roles as well but they cannot be placed on the same footing. This is an obvious fact that asymmetrical alliances have their roots in conflict; otherwise such alliances are not feasible for both the allies. Alliances based on conflicts may be classified as domestic, regional and international. Domestic alliances involve third party from outside for adding credibility to their actions to become a part of international system. In asymmetrical alliances both the allies enjoy circumscribed benefits by mutual sharing of resources. One of the distinguished scholars categorized the alliances as balancing alliance and bandwagoning alliances. He further argued that balancing alliances are defensive while bandwagoning alliances are aggressive in nature. Most of the weaker states prefer bandwagoning since they add more to the aggressive threat by aligning with it. However bandwagoning enhances the leverage of great power since it protects its national security interest at regional as well as global level while the weak states adjoining its power to secure its national security interest in the periphery.

The illustration of alliance politics establishes the fact that the core objective of forming alliance is to ensure its state security therefore, every state try to mold the national and international conditions in such a way as to secure its national interest against any possible threat while, there are two different schools of thoughts that explain the concept of security i.e. realists and liberals. Realist thinkers like Stephen Walt equate the concept of security
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with deterrence of conflict via military means but also required legitimacy and integration. Therefore security or insecurity can be defined in terms of internal and external susceptibilities. Ayoob further held that global forces whether political, economic or military have deep impacts on the security problems of the LDCs.\textsuperscript{4} States entering into alliance for ensuring their security and protection of national interest do not require geographical contiguity, since the dearth can be overcome by ideological or economic facets. The life of any alliance depends upon the needs and interests of allies. A long-term alliance entails rational pedestal i.e. common ideology. The associative approach to ideology determines the nature of such alliance. Apart from ideology perspective formal agreement and informal consultations too affect the nature of alliance. The actions of states are restricted by internal and external forces working on it and if any state party to alliance fails to comply with the terms of alliance are posed to the threat of segregation.\textsuperscript{7}

**Conceptual Development of Theory of Alliance in Post-Cold War**

Subsequent to disintegration of former Soviet Union the concept of alliance is quite overlooked and lacked comprehensive and systematic analysis. Therefore, it is quite hard to know the overview of the changing trends in alliance theory. After the end of cold-war there is also lack of general discussion of the concept i.e. how to define and how to differentiate it from other correlated terms. The end of cold-war brought drastic changes in the concept of international relations that also altered the dynamics of conflict and cooperation thus changing the utility and usage of alliance theory that led the issue to be discussed from seven different perspectives. Firstly, the transformation in the dynamics of international politics altered the alliance pattern between the two states with indistinct definition.\textsuperscript{5} Secondly, with the transformation of global politics the phenomenon of ad hoc


coalition has become more relevant.\textsuperscript{6} Thirdly, after intensification of terrorist activities the concept of alliance suffered greatly. Fourthly, the proliferation of nuclear weapons has prejudiced the needs of alliance for the state. Fifthly, with the rapidly growing globalization the relevance of the concept of alliance enhanced.\textsuperscript{7} Sixthly, with the change of adversary after the end of cold-war the states needs for alliance diminished. Seventhly, the downward slope in the defense budget bears positive effects on alliance theory.\textsuperscript{11}

These aforementioned propositions can be said to have links with one another since it can be rightly said that transformation of global system after the end of cold-war made the phenomenon of ad hoc coalitions more relevant. Although there is general consensus on the change in global power distribution, threat perception and cumulative use of ad hoc coalitions; but there is still difference on how much the change occurred and what would be its ensuing effects.

One of the renowned scholar argued that the concept of alliances have no more relevance in contemporary politics giving way to ad hoc coalitions while some other scholars held that the concept of alliance is still alive but has changed a bit. Those who have taken a midway held that to deal with the security threat of both forms i.e. formal partnerships and ad hoc coalitions have relevance.\textsuperscript{8} In contemporary politics the relevance of military alliance can be establish quoting the example of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which is a very effective military alliance known as TransAtlantic Alliance i.e. Atlantic on one side and Europe on the other side. Therefore, it can be said that difference among scholars over the concept is thin and there is general consensus over the point that the phenomenon of ad hoc coalition is widely used in modern times, the only difference between them is on the issue that whether to consider the concept of alliance different from ad hoc coalition or to view ad hoc coalitions as a transformation in the concept of alliance. Empirically it can

be said that changes in global politics subsequent to cold-war, conditions for forming alliances have changed. In the back drop of change in the dynamics of international politics two different views emerged regarding the definition of alliance i.e. narrow and broad. If we focus on the narrow definition of the term the most suitable definition is “formal associations of the use (or non-use) of military force, in specified circumstances, against states outside their own membership.” Similarly, some other scholars while defining alliances underscored the importance of written document. Those who define the term narrowly focused on force like the writings of Louis Rene Beres concentrated more on commitment between the states party to alliance over the exercise of force against the foe. Although it is easy to codify the narrow definition but it overlooks the informal alliance patterns. Moreover, from the perspective of the evolving phenomenon of coalition it is too narrow to restrict alliance involving pledges of military assistance.

If we take a look to the broad view of alliance it can be apparently be realized that alliances do not necessarily involve formal pledge as narrow definitions demand. One of the most promising scholars defining alliance in broad sense is “formal or informal arrangement for security cooperation between two or more sovereign states.” Henceforth this definition is more comprehensive than narrow definition. Likewise the definition of Kenneth Walt does not focus on the level of pledge having the nature of defensive security directed against the state outside the orbit. Few other scholars while defining alliance argued that alliances incorporate commitment of prospective security based actions. In totality, broad
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10 Ibid.
definitions of alliance from the perspective of commitment can be formal as well as informal having no definite character except that of security. This research encompasses the broader aspect of alliance as explained by Stephen Walt with slight modifications. The advantage of this broader approach is that different security relations can be engulfed under it.

A prominent scholar of international relations argues that in the era of unipolarity, states can opt to stay neutral under the provided three circumstances, when they face multifaceted threats against their security, when they are not confronted with any kind of threat and when they don’t want to indulge in super power competition. However, in contemporary world politics the option to remain purely neutral is unachievable because the big power compels the other states to declare their status overtly. After the event of 9/11 the US President George W. Bush statement “either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists” is the clear indication of the fact that the United States wanted other states to align with it or be ready to face the consequences in case of opposition. Therefore, bandwagoning in such circumstances is more feasible since the states prefer bandwagoning when they grasp that confrontation with big power has certain repercussions for their security and by bandwagoning they can make themselves secure. The effect of unipolarity is it makes the weaker states concerned about abandonment. In unipolarity the big power compels the aligning states to follow its lead. In contemporary world most of the states align themselves with the United States by considering it a regional balancer but later on indulge in “soft balancing” to counter the US pressure as done by China by collaborating with US on certain issues and at the same time building relations to enhance its influence (reducing the pressure of United Sates). Being new phenomenon, unipolarity attracted the attention of many scholars and policymakers. The alliance system that was followed during cold war

16 Robert A. Pape describes soft balancing as measures that do not directly challenge U.S. military preponderance but use international institutions, economic statecraft, and diplomatic arrangements to delay, frustrate, and undermine U.S. policies.
seems likely not to exist in unipolar world because that alliance system demands to institutionalize mechanism depended on permanent deployment. In order to rely on these settings the United States prefers flexible deployment and ad hoc partnership that enhances its leverage. Though this will restrain the US power but will not offset the partnership until the US adopts any aggressive approach.\textsuperscript{18}

World politics underwent the process of change with the end of cold-war that not only transformed the concept of alliance but also diversified the concept of security. It also brought changes in the art of war. Trans-boundary crimes, trans-boundary threats and terrorism have emerged as a new form of wars confronted by states. These new emerging conditions transformed the concept of security identified by Barry Buzan as “enlarged security.” Moreover it is also important to analyze the concept of security from foreign policy perspective since foreign policy of a state promotes its national interest, conducts the relations with other states and works to create conditions conducive for state security. From security perspective one of the scholars expressed the utility of alliance by saying that military alliances are aimed for stability, at global level or at regional level if we focus on regional stability the original aims and objectives of any alliance are for those countries to which the military alliances represent. For example the principal aim and objective of NATO was to assure the security and stability of member states. However, during cold war era it was mainly concerned with the security and stability of Western Europe since the Eastern Europe was under the influence of former Soviet Union. Nevertheless, today most of the European countries are the member of NATO. Hence the fundamental aim and objective of any military alliance is to integrate the competence of member states in such a way as to promote their respective interests particularly their security.\textsuperscript{19}

Developing countries still equate security with enhanced military strength, therefore the United States plays decisive role in Indo-Pak relations since Pakistan security concerns

\textsuperscript{18} Stephen M. Walt. p. 119.
were/are India centric. It is not only Indian factor but also a geostrategic location of Pakistan that adds to the security problems of Pakistan. This is the reason why Pakistan while formulating its security policy always considers the US role in the region. Since its very inception Pakistan needed the US economic and military support and the support came that helped in enhancing the economy and military stature against India. On the other side the US needed Pakistan for containing Communism throughout the Cold War. Though in this bilateral relation the US played the role of dominating power but still there existed mutual dependency between these two states. In times of international crisis two asymmetrical powers come closer by agreeing on certain issues and form alliance but the asymmetrical alliance relationship will be that of domination of great power over the weaker state. In asymmetrical alliance relationship usually the weaker states have to make compromises on their foreign policy choices with regard to security they expect from the big power that eventually gives control to the bigger power over some domestic and foreign policies of weaker states that promote the interests of powerful state. In such relations the nature of alliance and behavior of the weaker state are determined by the powerful state. Similarly, the 9/11 episode made Pakistan an important stakeholder in regional security set up for the US. Consequently, Pakistan revisited its security policy of Afghanistan and had to support the US attack on Afghanistan. This US action against the terrorists in Afghanistan bears multidimensional security threats for Pakistan. Apart from the security threats faced by Pakistan on its Western border, there are some other factors that are generating further security problems i.e. growing militancy within the boundaries and the US tilt towards India led to ever growing security threats to Pakistan. Robert Gilpin expressed the same view that in asymmetrical alliances the powerful state determines the lines of security that have certain ramifications for the weaker state. The entire history of alliances relationship
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between Pakistan and the United States shows that the US always promoted its own national interest and decided the rules of the game for Pakistan particularly after 9/11 when the US acted as a hegemon rather than a partner. However, the cohesion in both partner”s threat perception at regional and international level cannot be overlooked. In post 9/11 scenario religious militancy in Afghanistan and its next door neighbor Pakistan posed threat to the global security. Consequently, fight against terrorism becomes the distinguishing characteristics of security relations between Pakistan and the United States. Nevertheless, the new partnership bears negative impacts on Pakistan.

Former President Pervez Musharraf categorized security threats to Pakistan from four different aspects i.e. protection from external peril, revivification of economy, safeguard of nuclear possessions and backing on Kashmir issue, but the utmost apprehension for Pakistan was the fear of being a target of US wrath earlier indicated by the later. Pakistan was left with no option but to bandwagon with the mighty the United States. Under new the United States security mechanism Pakistan acquired a pivotal place since no US strategy of hunting Al-Qaeda operatives could be possible without bringing Pakistan under its umbrella. According to Robert G. Wiring the mutual dependence of Pakistan and the United States on each other settles on the course of Pak-US alliance.23

METHODOLOGY

The research has been carried out by employing historical, descriptive and analytical approaches to proceed and draw the conclusion. For this purpose qualitative method has been used. Different resources like review of literature, primary and secondary sources have been consulted to get broader perspective to the cause of Pakistan”s membership to U.S sponsored Western pacts and its impacts on Pakistan. Primary data has been collected through interviews, agreements, and official document. Semi-structured personal interviews were conducted with scholars, government officials and retired and in service

military personnel. The Area Study Center University of Peshawar, Archive Library Peshawar, Central Library University of Peshawar, department of International Relations university of Peshawar, was visited to collect secondary data.

Historical perspective of Pak-US military alliance form substantial part of the study, since judgmental interpretation is possible if it is supported by historical evidences and estimations. The period of time selected for the study is 1954-2010, because in 1954 both the United States and Pakistan for the very first time entered into formal alliance relationship. This period witnessed the mutual dependence and cooperation that later on transformed into estrangement and embitterment and then again marched towards readjustment. Moreover, the study relies on the theory of alliance to analyze the nature of Pak-US alliance relationship and made suggestions to maintain balance in their relations. The alliance theory as explained by Stephen M. Walt is employed because it involves the broader perspective of alliance that not only encompasses the formal commitments but also informal alliance patterns.

SCHEME OF THE STUDY

The research thesis includes the following chapters:

Introduction
The first chapter introduces the topic and describes the purpose of the study including brief review of literature on the subject with the analysis of the concept of alliance and its relevance in modern times. It identifies research questions to be answered through this research thesis. It also encompasses the objectives and methodology adopted for the conduction of this study as well.

Chapter 1: Pak-US Alliance: Factors, Dynamics and Strategy of Pakistan

This chapter is an attempt to describe how a state can secure itself during odd environment of international politics and conditions forced both Pakistan and US to enter into alliances. Moreover, it estimates the benefits that Pakistan realized by entering into Western alliance
system. Effort is made to discern the losses incurred by Pakistan after joining Western alliance system and what were its impacts on domestic politics.

Chapter 2: US Cold War Politics in South Asia

This chapter evaluates different facets of the US policy towards Pakistan and assesses the ups and downs in their bilateral relations. It explains that how after being abandoned by the United States, Pakistan assumed the status of frontline state after Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. It also discusses in detail the mutual interdependence of these traditional allies and gains and losses incurred by Pakistan after revival of the alliance.

Chapter 3: Pak-US Security Relations in the Wake of 9/11

This chapter presents a historical background of Pak-US security relations. It further deals that how US preferred India over Pakistan by not reckoning the latter”s sacrifices. It tries to explore that what changes the event of 9/11 brought with it that again elevated the significance of Pakistan in the eyes of the United States. It further illustrates Pakistan”s response to the US security policy and how Pakistan came again on the track of alliance and domestic outcomes of this new journey.

Chapter 4: US Economic Assistance to Pakistan: Promises, Conditions and Benefits

This chapter provides information about the US economic assistance to Pakistan in different periods. It also provides analysis of the US conditional ties linked with economic support to Pakistan. It further explores that how the US assistance swelled up after the event of 9/11 and how the US assistance in the form of Kerry-Lugar bill opens a new debate in Pakistan. It further assesses the ever increasing dependence of Pakistan on the US economic aid and to whom this assistance is actually benefiting. It also tries to find out the significance of the assistance for Pakistan and to what extent this aid succeeded in attaining the desired objectives and what are the unintended consequences of this aid.
Chapter 5: Pak-US Alliance: Convergence and Divergence

This chapter discusses in detail the areas of cooperation and clashes between Pakistan and the United States with emphasis on their cooperation in war on terror, their mutual efforts for regional stability and their interest in Central Asia. It also presents a critical analysis of the US policy towards main actors of South Asian politics with particular emphasis on Indo-US nuclear cooperation and sanctions against Pakistan. It explores how the US expressed its reservations over Pak-Iran gas pipeline project and Pakistan’s links with the Taliban and how the US strategy of drone attacks of combatting terrorism invigorating anti-Americans sentiments in Pakistan.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This chapter focuses on the quick review of Pak-US alliance. In the end suggestions are made based on findings that what should be Pakistan’s approach while dealing with the United States and how Pakistan, not relying on the US, can adopt an independent approach domestically as well as globally.

After the analysis of the theme of the research now the study turns towards the historical background of the alliance relationship to explore the factors, dynamics and strategy that brought the weaker Pakistan and mightier the United States closer.
CHAPTER – 1

PAK-US ALLIANCE: FACTORS, DYNAMICS AND STRATEGY OF PAKISTAN

Alliances are defined as “A formal or informal relationship of security cooperation between two or more sovereign states”. It is primarily security dimension of the states that brings them more closely or keeps them apart. The factors that help the states to choose their ally form the international political system. The Cold War era was nothing but the competition of alliances. In the post-World War II, emerging balance of power compelled both Soviet Union and the US to establish such balance of power in international politics through political instrument and alliance system. Alliances have long been coupled with the balance of power. The intent of alliances is to maximize gains and share liabilities, the decision to

align or not to align in what form and with whom depends on national interests of the states. Security is the key component between the two uneven states. Weak states because of security evils aligned themselves with mighty state against the menace from another power.\textsuperscript{25} In theoretical sense, relations through alliance for balance of power are simple enough but in practice, states enter into alliance to enhance each other’s capabilities. Thus alliance is a means of sinking the impact of antagonistic power, which ever threatens one”s independence.\textsuperscript{26}

“Alliances are the obligatory business of the balance of power operating within a multiple state system. States competing with each other have three choices in order to maintain and improve their relative power position and they can increase their self-striking capabilities, self-power and the power of other nations to alter the power position of adversaries. The first choice, embark upon an armaments race while the second and third alternatives, pursue a policy of alliance.”\textsuperscript{27} Previously the foreign affairs were conducted by maintaining balance of power among Great Powers with the backing of small nations. Peace was attained by maintaining this balance and was troubled by shaking up this balance. However contemporary international politics has transformed the interest of Great Powers more global rather than regional. Therefore the supreme aim of Great Powers is to exert sociopsychological control over the leadership of the developing states instead of subduing through coercion and weapons. Therefore indirect interaction has become cordial principle of international politics than the direct interference.\textsuperscript{28} The core of alliance formation may further be evaluated in the historical perspective of Pak-US military alliance as a major theme of research.

\textsuperscript{26} Dr. Wilhelm G. Grew, the German Ambassador to the United States, in an address before the Ford Hall Forum in Boston in 1961. Quoted from Deane and David Heller. \textit{The Berlin Crisis: Prelude to world War III}. Derby: Monarch Books, 1961, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{27} Arnold Wolfers. \textit{Alliance Policy in the Cold War}. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1959, p. 185.
1.1 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF PAK-US MILITARY ALLIANCE

Emergence of Pakistan in the mid of 20th century witnessed ideological clash between two powers bloc led by the United States and its “allies” while the other bloc was led by former Soviet Union and its “Satellite states.” Subsequent to its independence, Pakistan pursued neutrality to play her reasonable role in global politics. The United States too at that time did not perceive Pakistan as a substantial state to promote her interest. Its attention was centering on the reconstruction of Europe. Due to oil resources the Unites States reckoned Middle East as its area of interest.

In the post-World War II, Poland, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania and Albania were considered as Soviet Union conquered countries and exposed to Soviet Socialist system under Socialist parties in these states. In order to contain escalating Soviet authority, the US president Henry Truman geared up a plan, which was appropriately commenced in March 1947, five months before the creation of Pakistan. Greece and Turkey were incorporated in the plan. Initially the countries included in this plan were termed as Western Allies. In March 1948, Belgium, France, Luxemburg, Holland and Britain signed the Treaty of Brussels. The Treaty was enforced on 25th August 1948. The treaty provided bulwark against Communist threat to the member states. After treaty of Brussels, Western Europe sought another powerful military defense pact involving the United States to be known as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and countries who signed the treaty of Brussels became a part of NATO. The organization instituted a defense system, and the member states agreed to reciprocate defense against peripheral aggression. This mechanism of defense umbrella gradually expanded to other continents and newly independent states particularly in Asian region. In this context South Asia became consensus in the US military and economic alliances and containment policy due to Indo-Pak sub continent central place

---

29 Ally: A state formally cooperating with another for a military or other purpose.
30 Satellite State: A small country or state politically or economically dependent on another.
in global politics for centuries. Geo-strategically Sub continent is situated at the junction of Middle East and Central Asia. The Indian Ocean becomes fundamental for patronage of East and West. It was for this reason that Great Britain emerged as a world power in 19th century. Emergence of the United States and Japan grounded the turn down of British power.\textsuperscript{33} Ensuing to the World War II, the United States security policy towards Asia was based on preserving balance of power and shaping a defense network of non-Communist states. The most instantaneous and intricate phase of this strategy was military inhibition of Communist China and reducing former Soviet Union charm to minimum. The execution of this strategy required economic strength, man power and weapons which the US government could manage, on the other side the United States was seeking steady Asian allies to conduct the cold war but Impuissance and incompetency of newly independent states of Asia was initial hurdle for proper execution of containment policy. The United States economic and military support to these states was to combat all sorts of instabilities in the state affairs. However, the emergence of China apprehended the other states too because of its bigger magnitude and quick economic development.\textsuperscript{34}

Initially the USA preferred Indian induction in Western alliance system simply to ensure strategic balance in the region against emerging Communist China. The US inclination towards India was also subjected to the nature of Indian political system and domestic affairs e.g. Indian parliamentary democratic system not only enhanced the prestige but altered the US outlook of South Asia with reference to Indian geo-political existence and role. The USA viewed Indian stability a leverage of peace and her instability as an opportunity – in the region. Therefore the US administration extended economic and military assistance to India. On the other side India tactfully materialized her geo-strategic position and successfully trapped Soviet Union political and economic support. Enhancing


her position in the two major actors of cold war, India adopted aggressive posture towards Pakistan.\(^{35}\)

Instead of perceiving the establishment of security relations between both the states in 1950s in fact during August 1947 in a meeting with Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah the US ambassador hoped that the US administration might assist Pakistan\(^{36}\) in resolution of freedom problems, therefore in October 1947 government of Pakistan desired the US administration to assist in reorganization and mechanization of Pakistan’s military.

During Cold War the United States policy towards Pakistan was based upon desegregation of non-communist Asia to encircle former Soviet Union and China. The United States alleged if any regional state was allowed to fall would ultimately boost communist might in the regional periphery which may lead to strapping response of other doctrines. Consequently, responding to the perceived threat, the US administration persuaded the regional states to join defensive alliance under the US umbrella. Korean War and German surrender of May 1954 from France instigated the US administration for containment policy.\(^{37}\)

During 1950s, Pakistan’s agricultural economy began to decline with extreme food shortage while on the other side the US persuaded Pakistan’s government to join Western alliance system that would enable her for military and economic assistance to cope with energy problems in security and economic affairs of the state. Consequently, Pakistan’s Prime Minister visited the US and both the states developed joint understanding on South Asian affairs and Pakistan’s policy of non-alignment was replaced with alignment and unilateralism which finally placed her under the US security umbrella where she was

---


declared full member of SEATO. This critical turn in Pakistan’s foreign policy towards Western alliance was subjected to multiple visible and invisible motives.

1.2  MOTIVES BEHIND JOINING WESTERN ALLIANCE

The most important visible motives behind Pakistan’s decision to join Western alliance system were diverse in nature but the most immediate were the dilemma of insecurity and survival.

1.2.1  Pakistan’s Security Quandary

Survival and independence are the essential ingredients of the existence of a community, society, nation and state. Both are being processed through security mechanism and policies by the nation’s status in international politics. Therefore, security is multifaceted phenomenon based on requirements, competence and qualms of intermingling entities.\(^{38}\) Parallel to national interest security of a state discern the intents of one state with the other. The core rationale of security is not only endurance of state but to endure devoid of any risk of external aggression.\(^{39}\) The security of the state largely depends on its geo strategic position in terms of global and regional setting in ascertaining the foreign policy of a state. The location of the state molds all other factors as it determines the potential enemy and allies. Similarly, Pakistan developed dilemma of insecurity immediately after independence in 1947 due to the aggressive postures and hegemonic designs of Indian foreign policy in the regional politics. It is principally for this reason that the issue of territorial boundaries has always been dominant in Pakistan’s relations with her neighbors, particularly India.\(^{40}\)

---


Territorial security had always been primary concern of Pakistan immediately to independence when the state was consisted of West and East Pakistan. West Pakistan shares boarders with Iran, Afghanistan, India and China. East Pakistan shared boarder with Burma (Myanmar) in the East and with India and Indian Ocean by three sides. Consequently, East Pakistan had been a bridge between South Asia and South East Asia and West Pakistan geographically connects Middle East with South and Central Asia. Therefore, Pakistan has always been endeavoring for her endurance since the very day of her independence. Among all the troubles the most essential was her defense policy of border, which was jeopardized by its adjacent states.

1.2.2 India as a Threat to Pakistan

Pakistan emerged out of the bloody partition of Indian subcontinent, that encouraged each to define itself hostile to other. Therefore, India not only opposed this partition but also threatened the Pakistan’s territorial integrity. In the back drop of this bitter history, Pakistan considered India as her foremost foe.41

After partition of Indian sub-continent, India opposed existence of Pakistan tooth and nail on every front. Many intimidating statements were issued by the leaders of Indian National Congress (INC) and they explicitly affirmed partition day as a day of devastation and grief. The first Indian Home Minister also uttered the hope for reunion. According to the first Indian Prime Minister Britain was a key support behind Jinnah”s idea of separate entity.4243 Maulana Abu Kalam Azad divulged that leaders of INC gazed Pakistan as infeasible state and acknowledged partition to edify a nipping lesson to Muslim League (ML). Mahatma Gandhi estimated that a day will come when Pakistan will solicit

India for enchanting them back. But they were ineffectual to prevent Quaid-eAzam from attaining his aim. After the establishment of Pakistan, India made perpetual and intensive efforts to encroach upon Pakistan’s territory and to create economic problem for newly state through refugee’s recuperation, property problems, and threat of distraction and hitch of water of Indus River.\(^{20}\) In short various social, historical, political and psychological factors pooled to rile the two states. However, Kashmir has been the main reason of face off between the two states. Through Kashmir attainment, Pakistan wanted to rationalize two-nation theory.\(^{44,45}\)

The Indo-Pakistan war of 1947 is reckoned as the first war on the princely state of Kashmir. This war was fought within the borderlines of Kashmir between armed forces of India and local belligerents from then NWFP. These local belligerents regard themselves as Azad Kashmir (AZK) Forces. Initially, AZK forces were not prepared for this outrage. These forces were deployed on the borders of Kashmir for the purpose of the security of the state. But the security crumples soon after the assault. With the Indian fortification conflicting AZK forces, the later ran away at the end of 1947. Through out 1948, many small skirmishes continued and the fronts gradually solidified along what would be well known as the Line of Control (LOC). A formal truce was affirmed on 31st December 1948.

An additional proof of India’s military access was her police action in Hyderabad state in September 1948. Hyderabad sought to continue her independent status under 3rd June Plan. Dialogue started between Nazims of Hyderabad and the government of India. But these negotiations couldn’t produce any fruitful results. India’s deputy prime minister stared “independent Hyderabad” as a hazard to union of India. Indian government highlighted Hyderabad as a land of plundering and slaughters. On September 1948, Mr. Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister demanded demobilization of volunteers, an organization of Hyderabad and return of Indian troops to Secuderabad, in order to re-establish law and

order situation. Nazims of Hyderabad starved of any breach of law and discarded the two demands of Indian government. On September 13th, 1948, the Indian government launched a full-fledged attack on state of Hyderabad. On September 17th, 1948, Hyderabad army surrendered after a strong resistance and Indian forces captured that area.

Another incident of Indian ruthless policy was the forceful seizure of the state of Junagadh. The majority of its population was Hindu but the ruler of the state was Muslim. After independence the state acceded to Pakistan as Arabian Sea connects Junagadh with Pakistan. India was also informed about this accession. Indian government sent a strong protest to Pakistan. They argued that since the state has Hindu majority and was transmittable to India therefore it should not accede to Pakistan, also Indian government organized a force that enclosed Junagadh and cut off its rail communication. Consequently, the state faced economic shortage. On October 1947 Prime Minister of Pakistan suggested Indian government to hold plebiscite for peaceful settlement of the dispute but government of India continued her aggressive policy. On November 7th Indian Forces equipped with modern weapons entered into Junagadh and after two days India occupied the whole area. Pakistan at that time was not in a position to defend Junagadh because her armed forces faced multiple problems originating from refugee’s movement.

The Eastern wing of Pakistan shared borders with India as well. East Pakistan was enclosed by India, with the exception of sharing a small border with Burma in the Southeast. Rad Cliff arbitrated all the borders of East Pakistan. After independence the Rad Cliff border required proper delineation to avoid border clash in future. However, disagreement between India and Pakistan erupted in the commencement of 1948 on East Pakistan Assam border. Indian government accused armed forces of Pakistan of occupying 43 Square Miles of territory. Indian prime minister affirmed that the dispute is over 22 Square Miles territory, which had been rewarded to India by boundary commission. Indian prime minister sent a hard protest to Pakistan and admonished that India might use

---

alternative. In response Pakistan alleged that it couldn’t be a quiet bystander and may take step if it senses that national integrity of Pakistan is endangered. However, both the states agreed to institute a commission to resolve the issue through peaceful means. Both the governments to avoid any unpleasant circumstances concluded an agreement on December 1948 for the resolution of dispute. The decision of the committee was publicized on February 1950, but the date of border demarcation was extended to August 1950. However, in the end of 1949 communal riots started, that made the implementation of this agreement quite hard.48

Indian government showed the similar kind of temperament in early 1951. On 15th March 1951, at the press conference Indian prime minister alleged that “it was the business of Indian armed forces to occupy the whole of Kashmir, if there was any danger to any part of it”. In June 1951 Indian prime minister quoted that “we will tolerate no nonsense about Kashmir”. These threats hailed with the massing of Indian armed forces on Pakistani borders.49 Hence it was the perceived threat from India that forced Pakistan to join Western alliance system that made them feel secured.50

1.2.3 Afghanistan as a Threat to Pakistan

Relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan are marked by mutual distrust. Both the states hardly had amicable terms. Afghanistan was the only state that cast vote against Pakistan’s membership in United Nations. Border demarcation and Pakhtunistan issue proved to be the irritants of mutual relationship.

i. Durand Line Issue

Pakistan shares border with Afghanistan of about 1200 miles. Previously it was a source of anxiety and headache between the two governments. British government in order to resist

50 Dr. Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, Dean Faculty of Contemporary Science (FCS), National Defense University, Islamabad. Interview with the author on March 20, 2014 in Islamabad.
probable Russian encroachment endeavored to reach border accord with Afghanistan. At last both sides agreed to form a mission consisting of representatives from both sides. British government designated Sir Mortimer Durand who had immense knowledge of boundary affairs. After discussion the mission concluded a boundary accord on November 12, 1893.\textsuperscript{51} The boundary agreement was acknowledge by the Amir of Afghanistan and his descendants by sustained reassertion of treaty via swapping letters between British Secretary of State and Afghan Minister in 1948-1949. However, Afghanistan by no means renowned the boundary as international frontier. Being a land lock state the key motive of Afghanistan behind this concurrence was to secure its entrée to Southern itinerary.\textsuperscript{52} In 1944 when partition became obvious the Afghan government clued-up the British Indian government their reservation about the status of Durand Line but British government discarded their concern stating that this is an international boundary.\textsuperscript{53} In 1947 Afghan government rebuffed to recognize border agreement on the plea that with the exit of British government from the periphery, the agreement would automatically expire. The Afghan government made it clear that their reservations about the agreement were not only based on the ethnicity of Pakhtuns but also they were concerned about the Sea channel which they measured essential for their trade purpose.\textsuperscript{54} This boundary was a major apprehension of succeeding governments in Pakistan. It was weakness on the part of Pakistan”s government that it had not drawn border with Afghanistan that made Pakistan insecure.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, the boundary issue with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Abdul Samad Ghaus. \textit{The fall of Afghanistan: An Insider’s Account}. Washington D.C: PergamonBrasseyes, 1988, p. 66.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Dorothea S. Frank. “Pakhtunistan-Disputed Disposition of a Tribal Land.” \textit{Middle East Journal}, No. 6, winter 1952. See also, Aslam Siddiqi. \textit{Op. Cit.}, p. 27.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Tariq Osman Haider, retired Ambassador is a Member of Oversight Board, Ministry of Foreign Affair. Interview with the author on March 20, 2014 in Islamabad.
\end{itemize}
Afghanistan remained significant element of country’s foreign policy. The land of Indian Sub-Continent particularly of Northwest seemed to be less protected by British government, where Soviet Union expansion to Central Asian states along with their attempt to control Afghan rulers pre-occupied their estimation. Pakistan after independence inherited the same problem of defending the same frontier. In early 1948 Afghan government demanded Pakistan for readjustment of borders but Pakistan rejected Afghan demand altogether. In June 1949 the government of Afghanistan denounced all of its treaty signed with British Indian government including Durand Line agreement that created tremendous problems for the newly emerged state.56

ii. Pakhtunistan Issue

Subsequent to independence of Pakistan, Afghanistan consistently opposed to recognize Pakistan’s control over Northern areas and demanded for the realization of their right of self-determination. The issue of Pakhtunistan always remained a bone of contention between the two conflicting states.

The government of Afghanistan foresaw the possibility of territorial extension and thought it convenient to hook up the Pakhtunistan issue, as it could productively put-upon to betray the Treaty of 1893 and to negotiate for new international border having an opening to Arabian Sea. The claim for Pakhtunistan was made in December 1947 when Indian army marched towards Pakistani border so that one country might divert the attention of Pakistan’s government while the other state finding opportunity hit it hard. In the same year Afghan government endeavored to reconcile border agreement with British Indian government but when all their efforts flunked to attain their goal they employed Pakhtunistan issue as a trump card and asserted their right over Northern areas of Pakistan.33

While they were busy in their efforts British government proclaimed referendum soliciting people of NWFP whether they wished to join Pakistan or India. This left Afghanistan with no alternative but to stipulate the formation of Pakhtunistan and appealed for their right of self-determination since for them people of NWFP were deprived of their right to decide whether they wished to stay autonomous or fuse with Afghanistan. In November 1947 Afghan Ambassador in Pakistan stipulated for configuration of new province comprising of tribal area and providing Afghanistan an outlet to Sea either through Baluchistan or Karachi. In 1949 Afghanistan deployed some of its military and air troops to Pak-Afghan border in the hope to give moral support to the Pakhtuns on the other side of Durand Line. In the same year a number of Afghan adherents in Pakistan affirmed autonomous Pakhtun state but they never enjoyed colossal support of Pakhtuns. Pakhtuns of Northern areas were often consulted for their yearning and they paid adherence to Pakistan. Therefore, Pakistan by no means pledged to the conjecture of autonomous Pakhtun state. In October 1950, the Pakistan”s government accused Afghanistan of crossing borders, which on confrontation from Pakistan, hurriedly withdrew. In May 1951 Afghan Ambassador; Sardar Najib Ullah made anti-Pakistan speech on radio. In March 1955 protesters in Afghanistan smashed up Pakistani embassy at Kabul.

Pakistan”s apprehension about her security is the basic factor of foreign policy. Every leader of Pakistan at that time deemed security as their basic objective. Pakistan”s first Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan quoted “The defense of the state is our foremost consideration. It dominates all other government activities.” Security maintenance required a great deal of resources which Pakistan lacked at that time. This economic reliance compelled Pakistan to develop links with those states that are in a better position to provide

assistance to Pakistan for the upgrade of her defense policy. During 1947-60 a single large slice of budget was allocated for defense.\textsuperscript{36}

1.2.4 Ineffectiveness of the Armed Forces

Connected with the problem of security, one of the most disastrous ill for Pakistan after independence was her flaw in military capabilities. This flaw was the outcome of India’s violation of partition agreement that deals with the armed forces of united India. India made evasion in the delivery of military hardware. The military troops that came to Pakistan belonged to contrasting units which meant Pakistan had to create unity out of diversity since military officers belonged to amalgamate of Hindu Muslim units. No doubt, in such circumstances Pakistan necessitated the reformation and recuperation of its armed forces. It can be aptly said that at the time of independence Pakistan had no army in terms of organized and well-equipped troops.\textsuperscript{59} Pakistan had to be consistent with the regional and global threat. Before partition, 80 percent of Indian army was placed at Afghan border. After partition, Pakistan felt more threatened by eastern neighbor. Furthermore 3000 miles of Sea separated the Eastern and Western wings of Pakistan. Both the wings had their own security problems. Geo strategic status of both the wings was also diverse. The hilly realm and the barren region of Pakistan entailed the Army, Navy and Air Force to encompass all sort of fighting tactics. To adjoin both the wings during hostilities and tranquilities the role of Navy was very significant, and the Navy was required to be well built up to be able to guard the marine courses. Closely associated with the problem of defense was the problem of well-equipped Territorial Army.\textsuperscript{60} A stern blow for Pakistan was unmerited division of military assets. On the other hand India had a structural and well built up secretarial system. In such a condition Pakistan was perhaps not able to wage war or to uphold the enemy. An independent Supreme Command had established under General Auchinleck to address the


problem of splitting up of army and military hardware between both states. A joint defense Commission was also installed to administer the whole matter. The Commission had to perform its functions till March 1948, but on Indian proposal the Commission was dismissed earlier in November 1947. The dismissal of Commission was a matter, which Pakistan could not easily digest because in its absence the fair division of assets was near impossible.\textsuperscript{30} Pakistan”s apprehensions of this dismissal came true when out of 163,000 tons of military stores Pakistan incurred only 30,000 tons. Pakistan received 8 infantry regiments, 6 corps unit, 8.5 artillery regiments and 34 engineers. Out of 48 vessels 16 were allotted to Pakistan out of 10 air squadrons the share of Pakistan was two. India got 26 ordinance factories while the share of Pakistan was none.\textsuperscript{61} In such circumstances Pakistan had incredibly restricted preference. The foremost state that could realize Pakistan”s need was the United States. Consequently, without losing any time Pakistan solicited for economic and military assistance. Nevertheless, at that time Pakistan was not at the apex in the priority list of the United States while Far East and Middle East were her center of attraction.

To realize its military needs Pakistan procured weapons survived of World War II from open market. Britain found that Pakistan was conferring with Czechoslovakia for the procurement of weapons and swiftly clued-up the United States. At the same time the United States was also pandering for securing air base on Pakistan”s territory. In 1949 the United States espoused relaxation policy for Pakistan and allowed her to procure weapons to engender good will and to make Pakistan willing for Pak-US cooperation in future if there arises some need. But this relaxation policy could not be analyzed as a major swing in the United States policy towards Pakistan.

\textsuperscript{61} Hameed A. K. Rai, Ibid, p. 23.
1.2.5 Economic Problems

Pakistan is an underdeveloped country and after partition of Sub-Continent there were three major concerns of Pakistan i.e. sanctuary of Pakistan, economic boom and Islamic culture as stated by first Pakistani prime minister. Economically Pakistan was not steady and efforts were made to wipe out its economy. In this connection those Hindus and Sikhs linked with the economy endeavored to lamed it monetarily. These immigrants deliberated that after their migration the economy of the newly born state will crumple and they would plead for reunion. When their efforts did not bear fruits other vicious efforts were made.

The economy of united India was standing on the notion of unanimity under British management. Consequently interdependence of different geographical entities amplified. But the condition abruptly changed after the partition of sub continent. During the preparations made for partition, the need was sensed that the separation should be made in gracious mode and economic possessions of united India ought to be alienated in such a manner that both the new states could make the most of it. But unfortunately this could not happen. Communal insurgence and massacres coupled with partition produced additional troubles. The trade which formerly subsisted between two areas moved toward closing stages. Partition created disorder in numerous fields i.e. major irrigation structure was disseminated by segmentation leaving India with the head works vital from Pakistan”s standpoint. The road specially designed to bring raw material from East Bengal to Calcutta for processing and exportation, also suffered because of this partition. The problems got deeper and deeper as the entire key positions in administration, business and commerce were occupied by non Muslims who after partition took off to India.64

---

At the time of partition, promises were made from Indian government that the trade blueprint between the two states would stay identical as Pakistan was utterly reliant on India for some imperative materials. This was also a critical time for the global economy. Pakistan economy was basically agrarian consequently Pakistan’s reliance on India and other states augmented. In united India non-Muslims commanded the entire commerce, but their migration created skill vacuum, which could be filled through import of merchandise.\(^{65}\)

In the newly born state food and raw material (cotton, hides and skins, raw jute, wool) were found in surplus but with no industry, whereas India had all the industrial infrastructure with food and raw material deficit. The reason was the areas that were rich with food and raw material had fallen to Pakistan whilst the industrial vicinity had fallen to India. East Pakistan was affluent in fabricating raw jute while more or less all jute processing facilities were left with India. Similarly, in irrigation system all the water head works of basic magnitude were left with India.

In the light of the distribution of food and industrial resources, we can say that the root causes in the hindrance of economic development of Pakistan were deficiency of resources. Since its inception Pakistan was confronted with capital deficiency and lacked technical know-how with small portion of minerals. Pakistan needed help in every field of life like engineering, shipping; technology etc. in such circumstances Pakistan’s dependence on the West was obvious.\(^{66}\)

**Coal**

Coal deficiency dislodged the economy of Pakistan for which it absolutely depended upon India. Very tiny amount was trickled from East Punjab which had adverse effects on Pakistan’s economy. The quantity of coal imported from India implicated extensive sea course involving transshipment at Calcutta and Karachi which resulted in increased cost of coal from Rs. 30 ton to Rs. 65 and yet on this cost the requisite amount was not accessible.


Under such circumstances import of coal from other countries happened to be indispensable. Soon Pakistan realized that in order to strengthen her economy, it required large number of producers and consumer goods which naturally necessitated foreign exchange.

**Sugar**

Pakistan also faced shortage in sugar and was exclusively reliant on India. The liberalization policy implemented by India created additional troubles for Pakistan. Before adaptation of this policy the cost of sugar was Rs. 20 per maund but subsequent to this policy, adopted in January 1948 the price of sugar went up to 40 to 50 per maund. Pakistan was not in a position to pay such a high price. India’s promise to keep intact the previous trade pattern was never materialized. Therefore Pakistan had to look for other countries for sugar supplies.\(^{67}\)

**Cotton Textiles & Yarn**

In cotton textiles and yarn Pakistan also faced shortage which could be covered by India. But in spite of all its promise India failed to realize the requirements of Pakistan. At that time the entire world was facing textile shortage but in Pakistan this deficiency was produced because of India. Due to all this it was apparent that India was making efforts to crumple Pakistan economically.\(^{47}\)

**Jute**

East Pakistan produced 80 % of overall jute produced in united India with no jute processing industry. As a result raw jute was sent to India through port of Calcutta where after it’s processing it was exported to other countries.\(^{68}\)

---

\(^{67}\) Economic History, pp. 156-157.  
\(^{47}\) Economic History, p. 157.  
\(^{68}\) Economic History, pp. 155-160.  
1.3 UNITED STATES MOTIVES BEHIND ALLIANCE

One of the major motives of this alliance for the United States was to reinforce armed forces of Pakistan in order to employ these forces against communism. Efforts were made by the United States to avert Pakistan from making use of weapon supplied by the United States against its mess with India.

Pak-US relations can be scrutinized as asymmetrical because since its inception the leaders of this newly born state went for economic and military assistance and wanted to become protectorate of the United States and until now Pakistan preserve the status quo. If one acutely analyzes this bumpy arrangement between Pakistan and the United States, it can be ascertain that because of Pakistan”s begging attitude, the United States did not take too much pain in bringing Pakistan under her area of influence.

However, a sudden change in regional scenario with the nationalization of Iranian oil in 1951 revolutionized the policy of great powers. This event exposed western military competence and made them grasp of power vacuum. Britain was neither in place to intrude nor had bases to mount pressure. Britain had bases in united India from where it swayed Middle East but after partition those bases came to an end. However British censured this policy of nationalization thus adopted double standard because on one hand they nationalized their key possessions while on the other hand raised objection on nationalization of oil resource of Iran. To prevent this nationalization British took every possible step. By the end of 1951, they retreat their recruits involved in oil production in Iran. British also took this issue to International Court of Justice (ICJ) and UN Security Council but with no fruitful results. All these events were the consequence of power vacuum created after British departure from the region. During this Anglo-Iranian variance the United States assumed neutral stance but it had reservations over nationalization policy like this dispute might result stoppage of Iranian oil to Western allies of the United States,
while collapse of Iranian economy might lead to Communist takeover, also Iranian oil nationalization might have adverse upshot on the United States oil interest in the realm.\textsuperscript{69}

To tackle this problem the United States worked out new strategy for West Asia based on military alliance with the local authorities in which Pakistan and Turkey had to play their role. To carry out their strategy the United States signed manifold treaties and military accords. Under these accords Pakistan embarked on providing armed forces for the assistance of the United States and her regional allies and reciprocally the United States would provide military assistance to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{70}

In 1951 the United States realized role of Pakistan”s forces in the new strategy. In those days there was no intercontinental ballistic missile system available, it was invented afterword and Pakistan”s geographic location was very important because it was next door to Afghanistan and the United States was looking for air bases in the periphery for protection of its oil interest.\textsuperscript{71} It made military arrangement with Pakistan in 1952 as well but it was administrative change in the US in 1953 that took this deal to next step ahead. To thwart further dent the United States put its association with India at stake. In 1953 Pakistan and the United States signed a military pact, which provided that Pakistan would fend for the US interest chiefly oil interest in the region. Under this military arrangements Pakistan could not employ military equipment for private use. To keep their program intact and to avert their military assistance to be used against India, the United States made some arrangements. Pakistani army was divided into two groups Military Assistance Program forces (MAP) and non Military Assistance Program forces. MAP forces were provided with the United States military assistance posted on Western border to step in West Asia on the United States lieu while the non-MAP forces were not provided with such equipments posted on Indian border. The United States officials screened all the activities intimately.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
This alliance had something in it for Pakistan but the regime at that time in Pakistan had not been geared up for such arrangements. For the relevance of this strategy administrative change became inevitability of the time.

The United States with the help of key administrators in Pakistan endeavored to undermine the government through insurrection, confrontation and catastrophe but the synthetic food crisis was concluding blow for the government. Government of Pakistan requested for Wheat. Canada and Australia gave positive rejoinder but there was strange silence from the United States. With the debacle of the regime in Pakistan, the United States endowed the new regime with food assistance.

Conversely the United States interest in the region can be classified under the following headings.

1.3.1 United States’ Strategic Interest

World War II crafted power vacuum in South Asia and there was no regional command to substitute British imperialism. British gestured the United States to fill up this space following her extraction. The United States entered the region sequentially to guard the free world commencing the nuisance of Communism. South Asia remained vicinity of interest for the United States because of inclusive pursuance. This significance fluctuated in the midst of the swing in the United States course of action. The major apprehension of the United States was preclusion of annexation of communist sway. The United States policy for the periphery was calculated not for the regional states but to congregate her objectives. The casual factor of the United States policy towards South Asia was up holding tactical equilibrium. The preliminary the United States interest in the region was aligned with the

---

encroachment of communism which afterward shifted to Soviet expansionism after Sino-
American squaring off. The United States was preoccupied with her policy towards oil and
sea course of Gulf. The proximity of South Asia with Gulf made it strategically more
important for meeting the United States desires.\textsuperscript{75}

1.3.2 Political Interest

The United States curiosity can also viewed in political facet. The United States had earlier
desire of accessing Persian Gulf oil resources and waned to have freedom of navigation not
only for herself but also for Japan in general and for NATO in particular. They took
measures for protecting European interest in strategically important parts of the world. The
United States political concern was to retain her presence in the region to preserve the status
quo. For this purpose economic, political, diplomatic, military urging like devices were
worn. The United States committed to provide her allies with economic and military
assistance in case of threat or aggression. The United States political interest in South Asia
was reverse to Soviet interest\textsuperscript{76}; Soviet endeavored to thicken her area of influence in Gulf
region and to generate turbulence in association with left wing forces.

1.3.3 Economic Interest

The United States global strategy in general and strategic policy in particular centered on
South Asia and Gulf region. In fiscal matters also the United States policy revolves around
South Asian oil possessions of the region and shipping itinerary that were used to lug these
assets to the West. The magnitude of this region rationalized the United States billion dollar
venture in the region.\textsuperscript{77} Due to up gradation of oil producing countries the United States
found affluent markets for their merchandise. The economic and commercial stakes of the

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{76} Rasul B. Rais “The Indian Ocean & the Superpower.” \textit{Pakistan Horizon}, Vol. 40, No. 3, (Third Quarter),
1987.
\textsuperscript{77} Moonis Ahmar. \textit{Superpower Rivalry in the Indian Ocean: Since the Withdrawal of Great Britain}.
United States made her military presence indispensable in the region. The geo strategic setting of Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf established to be unsurpassed for expansion of the United States submarine for deterrence against Soviet. Nevertheless the United States had multi faceted interests in the periphery.\(^{78}\)

### 1.4 CLIENT GARRISON STRATEGY

Since 1954 there followed a number of agreements which could be designated as client garrison strategy. According to this strategy Pakistan was anticipated to endow with its armed forces for the assistance of the United States and its regional allies. Reciprocally the United States would assist Pakistan for furnishing its forces. The strategy allocated major role for Pakistan and Turkey. By the end of 1953 dialogue for military arrangements began between Pakistan and the United States. Simultaneously Turko-Pakistan agreement of reciprocated collaboration was also signed.\(^{79}\)

The most fascinated obsession that deserves special mention about military alliance was that the assistance provided under the agreement was applied and controlled by the United States on one hand and secured its Middle Eastern oil interest on the other hand which evidently illustrated that the United States was on advantageous side.\(^{80}\) Pakistan army was reinforced by the United States with the view that reciprocally it would provide steadiness to political system of Pakistan which had to execute the compulsions under alliance. A report of the United States mutual security program published in 1957 illustrated that the US aid built up Pak army which according to the United States was the solitary soothing institution that facilitated Pakistan to participate in defense concurrence.\(^{81}\)

Tentatively these military arrangements earned Pakistan as a net recipient of the US military aid but if balance sheet of the military aid was scrutinized it made apparent that

---
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Pakistan was not net recipient of military aid since the United States offered only military hardware while rest of the expenditures for securing the US and Western oil interest were remunerated by Pakistan’s own pocket. This deal proved no sagacity on the part of Pakistan. Not only this but in pecuniary catastrophe the operating cost of MAP forces was also put on the weak shoulders of Pakistan. That means Pakistan had to reimburse heavy cost for securing the US and Western oil interest. These were very odd measures for any free state to embark on.\textsuperscript{53} 

The United States was very much thrilled with these arrangements. Many the US officials extolled this policy because the US had to bear very less expenses to accomplish its target likewise the policy was according to the requirement and wishes of the United States. The policy had pecuniary as well as political reimbursement for the United States. According to the strategy Iran would be undermined through insurgency and military intrusion.\textsuperscript{82}

However there were many opponents of this policy in the United States. According to them this strategy was neither feasible not viable since the key encumbrance in the realization of the policy was political wavering of Pakistan that thwarts it from realizing the US commitment assumed in the strategy. Consequently the Client Garrison Strategy was deserted.\textsuperscript{65}

\section*{1.5 MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT}

This agreement was signed between Pakistan and the United States in May 1954.\textsuperscript{83} The agreement was signed to expedite the efforts for international peace and sanctuary keeping in view the provisions of United Nations (UN) Charter. Both the states agreed to provide
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armed forces to UN to upshot the efforts of peace and security of the world.\textsuperscript{84} The salient features of the agreement are mentioned below:

The government of the United States will provide Pakistan with military equipment on the bases of the terms and conditions of this agreement and consistent with UN Charter. The assistance will be made available to Pakistan subject to the provision of Mutual Defense Act 1949 and Mutual Security Act 1951. Both the governments will negotiate the provision of the agreement from time to time.\textsuperscript{85}

The agreement further provided that Pakistan will make use of this assistance for security and defense of the state and for UN collective arrangements. Pakistan has to take prior permission of the United States for utilizing this assistance for the purpose other than mentioned above.\textsuperscript{86}

Under this agreement Pakistan is not entitled to relocate any equipment, material, services to any other nation without the prior authorization of government of the United States. Both the states will take such measures to keep people informed of all the activities under this agreement. Both the governments will swap over technical information for the maintenance of peace.\textsuperscript{87}

The government of Pakistan will not inflict any tariff upon the material, equipment, products imported in her terrain in correlation with this agreement. Tax relief will be provided on all expenses in Pakistan on behalf of government of the United States for collective defense efforts.\textsuperscript{88}

The government of Pakistan will receive the United States recruits allocated to monitor the advancement of the assistance. These recruits will work as a part of legation and work under
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the command of head of diplomatic mission. These recruits will be benefited from the identical civil liberties and immunities as enjoyed by the diplomatic agents.\textsuperscript{72}

The government of Pakistan will take all possible steps to eradicate the roots of international tension. The government will also take steps for her economic and political steadiness and expedite the efforts for preservation of her own as well as of free world”s guard. The government of Pakistan is also conscientious for the appropriate consumption of assistance provided by the United States. Pakistan”s government will render all sorts of services as may be agreed upon for effectual chipping in UN system of communal safety measures. On the principle of reciprocated aid the government of Pakistan will endow with the government of the United States such unprocessed and semi processed material as required by the United States as result of insufficiency in her own possessions and are available in Pakistan.\textsuperscript{89}

For the sake of the mutual security both the governments will lend a hand to each other in giving effect to the policy of calculating trade with the nations that are menace for world harmony.\textsuperscript{74}

For Pakistan the intent behind entering into alliance with the West was deterrence of threat from India.\textsuperscript{90} The United States signed Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement and encouraged regional alliance only to contain expanding influence of communism.\textsuperscript{76}

1.6 SOUTH EAST ASIAN TREATY ORGANIZATION (SEATO)

The parties of this pact documented the sovereign egalitarianism of all nations, right of self-determination and asserted the hope to live in harmony consistent with UN Charter. These states also aimed at affirming on the record their close co-operation and synchronizing their efforts for perpetuation of peace and security. All the states concur.\textsuperscript{91}
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The states parties to this contract assert to resolve their disputes through peaceful means devoid of jeopardizing the world peace and will abstain from the use of force in their dealings with other nations as declared in UN Charter. The states also agreed to endeavor individually and jointly to defy arm assail to preclude their territorial veracity. The parties also embarked upon intensification of their institutions and mutual cooperation in economic and technical fields to boost up economic development and material well-being and also individual and collective governmental efforts in the realization of these goals.\(^92\)

The agreement also provided that in case of attack on any of the state party to contract or intimidation to territorial integrity will be measured as attack on all the states and such aggressive state would imperil its own serenity and security. The agreement provide for communal defense and asserted that in case of danger to the territorial integrity of any state party to contact would straight away inform the other states to take measures of common defense.\(^79\)

The parties to contract also asserted to establish a commission characterized by all party members to thrash out issues regarded the execution of treaty and military and other scheduling as the time may entail.\(^93\)

The treaty further provided, that its provisions will not be interpreted in such a way as to endanger international peace and inconsistent with UN Charter. The treaty also put limitations on the parties that they will not sign any other contract at variance with the provisions of this agreement.\(^94\)

The treaty established the general area of treaty as Southeast Asia including the territory of Asian parties and Southwest Pacific excluding Northern Pacific.\(^95\)

---
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1.6.1 Pakistan & SEATO

The end of WW II marked the beginning of Cold war era, when the United States decided not to gratitude Communist states. Hennery Truman props up the policies against Soviet Union. These policies were look upon as Containment policies. George F. Kennan is measured as a father of this containment policy. He deemed communism as a detrimental syndrome that ought to be enclosed immediately by captivating all promising steps. This policy turned out to be the underpinning of National Security Act of 1947.96 Dreading the menace of Soviet atomic aptitude it was assumed that the United States policies were not up to the mark in terms of span and were not capable to meet the desired goals. Therefore the need was felt to categorize the energies of free world to diminish the Soviet sway and generate such circumstances to fine-tune Soviet Union. To decrease the efforts of Soviet Union to minimum to dominate free world, a well-developed set-up of the United States and free world was recommended. The suggested program visualized economic and political program to baffle Soviet Union. It was conceived that through substantive potency of free world it would be easy to transform Soviet scheme. In conclusion it was analyzed that by means of this scheme in the course of swift and prolonged military, economic and political potency of free world Soviet plan may perhaps be seized. In 1952 administrative change took place in the United States, which further modified the policy of containment and devised liberation policy. Formulation of different alliances was the important ingredient of this policy.84

The United States deemed Cold War as an actual war and reflected that the endurance of free world was highly jeopardized. Subsequent to its independence Pakistan was anticipated to enter into this war. Its nearness with Communist bloc, Middle East and Iran affluent in oil resources put her into crucial state of affairs. The elementary incident in South Asian periphery was conclusion of Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement between

Pakistan and the United States on May 1954 with the hope to oblige Pakistan in military field to block Soviet expansion and to endow with an air base to the United States against Soviet Union.85

SEATO was signed at Manila in September 1954 and it happened to be effectual in February 1955. Pakistan, Australia, France, Great Britain, New Zealand, Philippine, Thailand and the United States were the signatories of this treaty. Pakistan being a part of South Asia was made a part of Southeast Asian treaty. By entering in to these pacts Pakistan became the most allied ally of the United States in condition when most of the third world states refused to become a part of this war.97

Enduring its containment policy the United States secretary of state found generals and bureaucrats supportive and well groomed under British. Because of their acquaintance about the region these officers were given the charge to maneuver Pakistan towards the United States security pacts. In April 1953 administrative change took place in Pakistan to materialize the United States desire of Pakistan’s entry into Western block. The new administration also brushed aside the government of East Pakistan when it elevated against signing of Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement.

1.6.2 Pakistan Entrance into SEATO

The United States secretary of state instigated the notion for safety measures in Southeast Asia. The idea was publicized in Geneva Peace Conference in May 1954. In July 1954 he discussed his program that there was a need to fill power vacuum created by the departure of Great Power. He further affirmed that efforts ought to be made for military obligations to underneath Southeast Asia defense pact. Subsequent to Geneva Conference the United States together with United Kingdom affirmed their intent for conceptualization of security accord. The United States accorded that temptation should be issued in August and symposium supposed to be arranged in the commencement of September. Colombo Powers should be approached and insist on their chipping in symposium. On 24th July 1954 the

---
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United States clued-up all her Asian legations that the United States together with United Kingdom agreed to conceptualize a defense pact and London had assigned the task of inviting Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, Indonesia, India and Pakistan for the symposium. The invitation incorporated the transcript that proposal should be made for conclusion of accord. It was also apprehended in transcript that the Indian response was confined to be pessimistic and optimistic reply from Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon might also had positive effect on India. The foreign secretary of London also uttered the hope that regional power might play their due role in regional security. Concerned about the regional security he stated that there was need to guarantee its permanence. Three motives were given for arranging the conference. First, steps for economic and military backing, second measures for common action in case of intimidation to any of the regional power, lastly, action in case of evident antagonism.\footnote{Lubna Saif. Pakistan & SEATO. Retrieved from: http://www.nihcr.edu.pk/Latest_English_Journal/Pakistan_and_SEATO.pdf on 26/7/2011.} Green signal from Pakistan was welcomed and gazed at huge development. However Pakistan only confirmed their participation in Manila Treaty Conference but not yet geared up to turn out to be a member of treaty. On the other hand, as expected Indian response was pessimistic, they snubbed to be a part of any such association. Indian government was of the view that such association might cause distrust and likely to segregate South and Southeast Asia into two conflicting groups. While condemning the treaty Indian government claimed that the treaty would not serve up the cause of harmony as it was just a military alliance which would result in the configuration of counter alliance in the region. After this reaction it became crucial that either Ceylon or Pakistan supposed to be swayed to chip in the organization. Western powers found Pakistan more soft target than Ceylon to materialize their wishes. It was undemanding on the part of authoritative regime in Pakistan to tender categorical support to the organization. Both the Western Powers were making the most of Pakistan’s involvement with the organization for materializing their objectives. It was indicated to London that the United States Secretary of State had already invited the Colombo Powers. After knowing this London illustrated
that they were more concerned than the United States for Pakistan”s association with the organization and they were eager to see any Asian power to take action as a counter balance American recipient Thailand and Philippines. They illustrated their fear that the United States might overlook the organization therefore Pakistan”s participation in the organization was crucial. To sway Pakistan for membership in the organization they urged that East Pakistan”s concerns conferred them straight ingress in the organization. American analyses, that proximity of East Pakistan with Southeast Asia rationalized Pakistan”s membership in the organization.99

1.7 CENTRAL TREATY ORGANIZATION (CENTO)

Baghdad Pact or Central Treaty Organization was defense pact devised for endorsing reciprocated economic, military and political concerns. The pact was founded on the basis of mutual cooperation in defense and none meddling in one another internal affairs. Like SEATO, the main objective of the organization was containment of communism and building up of communal defense system along Southwestern border of Soviet Union.100 The alliance was taken on by Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Iraq and United Kingdom. The pact was the outcome of the United States efforts to erect a communal defense system.101 But Arab-Israel clash and Egyptian anti-colonial loom made it intricate to realize its aspiration. However, the United States crafted a stratagem to connect Turkey member of NATO with Pakistan member of SEATO in order to have larger vicinity under her area of influence. Both Pakistan and Turkey too signed an agreement of mutual cooperation in 1954. In February 1955 Iraq and Turkey devised a communal defense system and encouraged other regional states for participation. It was of vital interest that Persia, Iraq, Turkey and Pakistan joined the pact on their own initiative. In August 1959 the United States became associate member of the Pact since it could not participate in the organization
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due to nominal reasons. The United States stayed in contact with the alliance through signing bilateral agreements with the members of this alliance. British had higher expectation from the alliance as they were more concerned about the security of Middle East and were more anxious about the participation of Arab states to make it more feasible alliance. West allied steadiness of alliance with the membership of Arab states. It was deemed to be slightest triumphant alliance of Cold War. Initially organization had its headquarter located in Baghdad (1955-1958) and then shifted to Ankara (1958-1979).

The organizational composition of CENTO was based on three tiers the council of ministers, secretariat and economic committee with sub committees. The organization drew its authority from council of ministers.

A series of events led to disbanding of the alliance e.g. in 1956 Egypt took control of Suez Canal Israel while retorting occupied the periphery of Sinai in the same episode British and French forces intervened. This intervention of Britain culminated into disrespect of Britain in the region ultimately this waned British grip over the members of CENTO.

After coup d’etat in Iraq in 1959 the new radical government did not acknowledge the pact and indicted the Western powers for their imperialist design in Persian Gulf and withdrew from the alliance. Subsequent to Iraq’s withdrawal the alliance could not realize its objectives. Moreover the member states revised their relations with Moscow by 1970 as a result the alliance lost its aim for which it was formed in 1950s. Although it was a defense pact but it never provided communal defense system. After its failure in military side the pact focused on economic and technical sides. Later on it also became evident on the


Due to its inclination towards West this alliance remained a source of annoyance among Middle Eastern states that were searching for impartial block. Due to Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979 Iran withdrew from the alliance followed by Turkey and Pakistan. Formally it became defunct in 1979.\footnote{Daily News, February 17, 1979.}

\subsection*{1.8 BILATERAL DEFENSE COOPERATION AGREEMENT (1959)}

This agreement was flanked by Pakistan and the United States in which the United States stead fasted to shore up Pakistan in her defense. The accord granted that the defensive veracity of Pakistan was vital for world serenity and in case of threat to its constancy the United States will take apposite measures together with the employment of armed forces. The agreement further stated that the United States would assist Pakistan for perpetuation of its self-determination and endorsement of economic development. The agreement was publicized with the ceremonial note presented to foreign minister of Pakistan by the United States ambassador on April 15\textsuperscript{th} 1959.\footnote{Abdul Sattar. Pakistan’s Foreign Policy 1947-2009: A Concise History. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 50.} However India got assurance from the United States that the pact might not be used against India.

\subsection*{1.9 COSTS OF ALLIANCE}

The states enter into alliance to add to their aptitudes and to deter the perceived threat. However this policy leads to political costs in addition to financial one. These may take account of counter attack, counter alliance or other adverse response from other states. The weak states entering into alliance are cognizant of the fact that they have to face the
repercussions rather than any gains; same was the case with Pakistan. Its decision to enter into alliance fetched number of costs with it.

1.9.1 Political

The major consequence of participation in alliance was in the form of its deteriorated relations with India, Muslim countries and communist states. The major intent of Pakistan for joining the Western pacts was to acquire support on Kashmir issue and equipped with necessary arms but unfortunately Pakistan couldn’t succeed in attaining these objectives. Many of the political experts supported Pakistan’s decision of joining the Western pacts on the plea that it would bring the US support on Kashmir issue. But even Ayub Khan admitted that Pakistan remained abortive in getting support of the United States on Kashmir issue. Ayub Kahan also owned up that the US did not use its influence to deal the Kashmir issue. Initially the US gave assurance for solving Kashmir issue but the United States later on took a U-turn over Kashmir issue. Pakistan felt annoyed by US substantial aid to India. Even during border dispute between India and China in 1962 US military aid to India flabbergasted Pakistan. The continuous flow of arms to India by the United States upset regional power balance that was a sign of tension for Pakistan.

The alliance between Pakistan and the United States was not welcomed by India and accused Pakistan of bringing Cold War in the region and decided not to hold plebiscite in Kashmir as he pledged earlier. Nehru wrote to his counterpart in Pakistan that Pakistan’s participation in Western pacts is damaging Indo-Pak relations and affecting Kashmir issue. All this made clear for Pakistan that it cannot attain its objective i.e. Kashmir without others.

---


help; on the other hand the United States was not ready to solve Pakistan’s problem at the expanse of its own goal i.e. containment policy. In other words both the allies had diverse urgencies. In this manner it might be relevantly said that small state power in territorial concern is lost when small power obliges incredible force's backing for its regional approaches. Prime Minister Muhammad Ali Bogra also confessed that American aid contributed to the deteriorated relations with India. US flexible attitude towards India made Pakistan to believe that the US shows more respect to the non-aligned rather than allied states. When in July 1961 Ayub Khan paid a visit to the US he articulated that the US aid to India is compelling Pakistan to revisit its membership in Western pacts and adopt a neutral posture.

The United States closer ties and aid to India also affected Pakistan in the sense that the US reduced military aid to Pakistan. On this plea Z.A Bhutto made an ailment that Pakistan has been ditched by the United States since Pakistan has made more forfeiture for becoming western ally. Z. A. Bhutto accused “the American military aid to India increased in almost geometrical proportion to Pakistan’s protestations.” The United States’ military aid to India in 1962 was one of the major reasons for the dilution of alliance between Pakistan and the United States and removed all shadows of doubts that the United States only gives aid to the states against communism. Pakistan was justified over its discontent with SEATO because it was not feeling secure against perceived Indian attack.

Pakistan also did not get satisfactory response from Soviet Union over its alliance with Western powers, though previous stance of Soviet Union towards establishment of Pakistan was not favorable but later on it accepted Pakistan’s existence. However, it was Indo-Pak rivalry that opened the gate for Soviet in the region. Owing to Pakistan’s


105 Ibid.

illdisposed acts, Soviet overtly supported India”s claim over Kashmir in vengeance. They also supported Afghan demand of Pakhtunistan.\textsuperscript{115} This is the reason why when Pakistan provided the United States with communication facility at Badber in July 18, 1959 and provided airfields for U-2 flights over Soviet, Khrushchev told Pakistani ambassador in Moscow that a “Red Circle” had been drawn on the map around Peshawar. Although some positive signals were transmitted to Pakistan from Soviet Union in 1956 but unfortunately Pakistan did not respond auspiciously. Consequently the relations between Pakistan and Soviet Union remained cool and from 1956 onwards Soviet Union made use of its veto power over Kashmir to buoy up India.\textsuperscript{116}

Muslim states had serious reservation when Pakistan joined Western alliance because they thought it was against the essence of Muslim Ummah there were also many countries allied with USSR so in case of any confrontation that Pakistan would be fighting against their own brother countries.\textsuperscript{117} Egypt strongly reacted to Baghdad pact and identified it as an external imposition rather than the Arabs ambitions. Consequently, Egyptian government started persuading Indian government like the Soviet government and declared Kashmir as essential part of India.\textsuperscript{118} This hatred was also evident during Suez crisis when Egypt accepted Indian forces and decided to keep Pakistani forces out under the perceived threat that Pakistan might not leave Egyptian territory on its demand, being an ally in Baghdad pact. In this sense Pakistan was avowed as an enemy state.\textsuperscript{119}

Similarly Pakistan faced resentment from Saudi Arabia owing to Baghdad pact and that Pakistan has joined Turkey who feels privileged by cooperating with the Jews.

The response of Afghanistan over Pakistan”s entry into Western alliance was also hostile. It was Soviet Union who took full advantage of the situation and provided full support to
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Afghanistan over Pakhtunistan issue and provided Afghanistan substantial aid that made normalization of Pak-Afghan relation impossible.\textsuperscript{120}

1.9.2 Strategic

Pakistan couldn’t take advantage from these western pacts since it was subjected to authorization by the US administration while the US didn’t take any responsibility on itself and inflicting many on Pakistan comprising of facilitation to the US in the event of war. The agreement of Pak-US Mutual Security Assistance Agreement (MSAA) transformed the pattern of military training swapping British technique with new revised American training motif. The impact of this agreement was that it made Pakistan highly hooked on the US weapons and when the US put arms embargo during Indo-Pak wars of 1965 and 1971 Pakistan seemed like up the creek to tackle the menace. It was commonly perceived that when the weaker partner confronted with problems, the alliances with the US seemed to be sedentary to rescue the weaker partner.\textsuperscript{113}

Military alliance with the US affected its relations with all countries because India became our enemy number one once we became the part and parcel of the US led alliances India led a campaign against Pakistan India was already enemy of Pakistan but it became a staunch enemy of Pakistan after Pakistan joined these military pacts so India started concentrating on its military power. Disintegration of Pakistan in 1971 was basically attributed to Pakistan alliance with the west and the US. As far as Muslim countries were concerned Afghanistan is very important Muslim country for Pakistan and Afghanistan having close relations with India also turned against Pakistan even Afghanistan did not recognize Pakistan for quite some time and birth of Pakistan was issue for them but one

factor was Indian influence and Indian influence was against Pakistan alliance with the US so Pakistan alliance with the US and western countries increased its enmity. 121

Pakistan”s association with the western sponsored pacts brought the discontentment of Soviet Union. The negative impacts of the alliances intensified when the US U-2 Plane was shot down in the Soviet territory and in response Khrushchev imperiled to smash Peshawar. Additionally, Soviet augmented it sway in Afghanistan by providing it economic and military aid. Both India and Afghanistan governments beefed up their acquaintances with Soviet and became the beneficiary of Soviet weapons and the cumulative military might of India and Afghanistan eclipsed the benefits of Pakistan”s military assistance that it gets being a part of western sponsored military alliances.115

1.9.3 Economic

Pakistan did not succeed in attaining its desired economic objectives from the alliances since it was anticipated that after joining these alliances and signing MSAA military budget of Pakistan would decline but unfortunately it could not happen for Pakistan. Even many political analysts and President Ayub Khan articulated that the preliminary intent of joining SEATO was to get economic gains; similar concerns were expressed by Pakistan”s foreign minister in his statements made during 1959 and 1960. On the other hand USA was unwilling to match economic benefits of SEATO with that of other economic aid relations. Though it introduced some training programs but comparative to other aid relations it was inconsequential.

Undoubtedly, membership of these western sponsored military alliances brought much economic benefits for Pakistan which was vindicated by Pakistan”s stance towards the membership of these pacts.

Briefly, the major impacts of joining these western pacts appeared in the shape of amplified Soviet support to India, detrimental Pakistan’s Kashmir cause, maddening Afghan sponsored Pushtunistan issue and estrangement of nonaligned particularly Arab impartial countries.

1.10 DOMESTIC UPSHOT S OF ALLIANCE WITH UNITED STATES

Pakistan after entering into the US sponsored Western pacts, received massive military and reasonable economic aid from the US, but it is also an understood fact that nobody will give it to you free, they will consider their own interest, all they do will be according to their own interest and then that have impact on domestic politics. The economic gains from the alliance were not equated with the attainment of desired objectives by the United States. However for Pakistan, economic gains were enough since its import augmented from 6% in 1952 to 40% in the 1960s. In 1969 the US provided aid and loans to Pakistan mainly to contribute to Pakistan’s economic development. Nevertheless, this economic aid came to Pakistan with certain conditions mainly reassurance of capitalistic economy. To realize its objective under Harvard’s Development Advisory Service (D.A.S.) the US advisors came to Pakistan to mold economic policies of Planning Commission of Pakistan and other correlated agencies. The advisors played their part in introducing economic policies. To ease the capitalists Pakistan’s civil and military establishment started to follow the US dictates. Pakistan so loyally followed the US dictates that one of the advisors articulated about this development that government of Pakistan devised the whole economic system in such a manner as to maximize privatization while maintain government role to minimum.

Pakistan became so much dependent on the foreign aid that Pakistan’s first three Five Year Plans comprised 35%, 50% and 26% foreign economic support respectively. One of the
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interesting things was that least percentage of the third Five Year Plan was not a mark of self-reliance but was the evidence of stressed Pak-US relations owing to Pakistan’s closeness with China. However, Pakistan”s mounting economy was publicized in capitalist world, and Pakistan was often referred as “show-case” of capitalist expansion. Similarly Professor Edward Mason argued that one of the most significant contributory factors of Pakistan”s mounting economy was foreign economic assistance. Apart from impacts on Pakistan”s economy the US aid had deeply influenced the defense sector of Pakistan as well. Pakistan being an active ally of the US altered the domestic power balance since the US military aid made the military establishment powerful enough to play its part in collective defense agreements. Being a beneficiary of the US military aid armed forces of Pakistan emerged as vital political force once considered as a preventive force against communist revolution.

It is also evident that when these two states allied military establishment became powerful in Pakistan and because of this strength of military establishment political institutions getting weak and military establishment became so powerful that it started dictating political institutions and ultimately military take over took place therefore military alliance severely hit the domestic politics of Pakistan. For example when army launched a military coup in 1958 by ousting the democratic regime General Ayub person in charge of the coup exposed in his book that before launching the coup he talked to CIA chief Allen Dulles.

Right from the beginning the military alliance had one very direct impact on Pakistani politics and that is to add to the importance and stature of military in Pakistan. Domestically, army became so powerful that led to the larger dependence of eastern wing
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of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{127} Army not only ruled out the statistical representation of eastern wing in legislative chamber but also the growth of armed forces intensified their miseries. Moreover, 60% of budget allocation was made for this overgrown institution. Not only had this but it also used up the foreign exchange of eastern wing particularly after 1965 Indo-Pak war when weapons were purchased from black market. The impact on the society of Pakistan was very severe since society objected over these security pacts that what kind of pacts you have made with USA and European countries once they have not served the purpose because the country was disintegrated and what kind of pact they are that when they need you are used but once it comes to your security there is nobody to rescue you. Pakistani nation was demoralized, society was disappointed with these military pacts not only the society but Pakistan’s army was demoralized that what type of military pacts we have which have done nothing that is beneficial for Pakistan.\textsuperscript{128}

In sum the social cluster of Pakistan created gulf between the two wings of Pakistan that was further intensified by meddling from outside. Moreover utilization of aid received from the US was not satisfactory since it empowered the one institution powerful, enough as to endanger the democratic institutions and repeated marshal laws can be cited as evidence.

1.11 CONCLUSION

The history of alliance relation between Pakistan and the United States is filled with peaks and valleys. Subsequent to independence of Pakistan the government adopted a neutral posture keeping itself out of super powers rivalries. However, it was the economic needs and perceived threat of India that Pakistan revisited her policy thus officially became member of Western sponsored military alliances. One thing important to note is that Pakistan was by no means the first choice of the US and it was evident from the fact that the US invited Nehru on official visit of the United States in October 1949; however, it was
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Indian nonaligned posture that brought the United States and Pakistan closer to each other. In June 1949 Moscow invited Pakistan’s Prime Minister for official visit that was publicized in Pakistan on June 8, 1949. This invitation received an impolite response of India, while a month earlier i.e. May 7, 1949 Nehru publicized that he had accepted the US invitation of official trip in October 1949.129

Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan agreed to fly in Russian plane and also expressed his desire to visit Central Asian Republics. However, Pakistan received an invitation from the United States and accepted that was publicized on December 10, 1949, therefore Mr. Prime Minister visited the United States that made the chance of visiting Soviet Union dim. Pakistan’s Kashmir cause and defense needs forced Pakistan to join Western bloc.130 When Pakistan joined Western sponsored alliance system both Pakistan and the United States had their objectives to serve. On one side it was Pakistan’s economic needs and its desire to get deterrence against India while on the other hand the United States wanted to contain communism by ensuring its presence in the region. However, in the event of Indo-Pak war of 1965 and 1971 when Pakistan was disintegrated the United States was nowhere to come to rescue Pakistan.131

---
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CHAPTER – 2

US COLD WAR POLITICS IN SOUTH ASIA

The ailing alliance between US and Pakistan acquired new life in the wake of Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The determinate objective behind such timeserving alliance was to lessen the cost and enhance gains.\(^{132}\) Usually states enter into alliance with premeditated risks that have its impact on the policy makers of concerned party.\(^{133}\) Desperate attempt to enter into alliance may be ended by core or weaker state depending upon the conditions they are passing through.

United States being a core power strived to take advantage of Pakistan’s impuissance in order to have easy way into Pakistan’s air bases and other resources to pursue their policy of containment. On the other hand Pakistan perceived the situation as golden opportunity to build her weak economy and military resources, since United States provided pledge against any possible attack from Soviet Union and India. Consequently Pakistan built up her defense to develop sense of security vis-à-vis India.

2.1 RELATIONS WITH US 1972-1979

Pakistan withdrew from SEATO in 1972 but still had cordial relations with USA since it was a member of CENTO. US government publicized 300 armored carriers to Pakistan. It


resumed economic aid of Pakistan as well. But they altogether discarded expansion of Pakistan nuclear program.\(^3\) United States offered Pakistan the purchase of 120 aircraft stipulated with cancellation of her deal with France. On Pakistan’s rebuff US forced France for unilateral deferral of the deal. In 1976 Pakistani government set-up an active team of scientists and engineers and charged them with the responsibility of developing Uranium enrichment plant. Though this team faced troubles since the rules for transmitting nuclear technology were stiffened up but the enthusiastic team of loyalists thrived in their assignment by 1982.\(^{134}\) They created the first device by 1983.\(^{135}\) Nevertheless, they took their due time to explore different models of bombs. In the mean time they conducted some cold tests to scrutinize their upshot that alienated both the allies.\(^{136}\)

In July 1977, another military administrator toppled the elected government of Pakistan. This regime fetched additional sanctions against Pakistan from the US. Pakistan dissented against the dual-standard.\(^{137}\) Facing ups and downs, Pakistan reckoned the possession of nuclear deterrence but cast off the possession of nuclear weapons.

### 2.1.1 Policy Ups and Downs

In Sino-Indian war of 1962 Pakistan overtly supported China that stirred up distrust in Washington. Similarly US support to India was not welcomed by Pakistan as well and the relation between Pakistan and US continued to aggravate thenceforth. Sino-Indian war fetched India and United States closer to each other while for protecting her integrity and solidarity Pakistan developed cordial relations with China and Soviet Union.\(^{138}\)

---


\(^{136}\) Abdul, Sattar. p. 165.


During Indo-Pak war US imposed embargo on Pakistan and charged that owing to inimical policies war broke out between India and Pakistan while policy makers in Pakistan believed that the US had obligation under the agreement of 1959 to abet Pakistan in case of aggression. The US inferred that the agreement rendered for backing encase of communist assailment and if aggression crop up both the cohort will confer with each other and will take measures for mutual protection. The different elucidation ensued misunderstandings between them. CENTO did not recognize any such obligation but the US chipping in its military committee made it crystal clear that the US involvement to this alliance will only base on communist containment. Britain too elucidated the same thing. Pakistan failure to take the US into confidence about Kashmir policy and the US failure to assist Pakistan in her hard times amplified the chasm between two states. The US tilt towards India and Pakistan tilt towards China is also a contributory factor in deteriorated relations between Pakistan and United States. However administrative change in the US tranquillized their relations. In the second half of 1970s the US relaxed ban on military supplies.

2.2 **SOVIET INTRUSION IN AFGHANISTAN**

Administrative change took place in Afghanistan in July 1973 that developed suspicions among Pakistani leadership. After assuming power the new regime developed close ties with Soviet Union but soon the leadership grasped that Soviet Union had their own vested interest behind Afghan assistance. Consequently a sudden change took place in Afghan policy towards Pakistan and other Muslim states. Both Pakistan and Afghanistan exchanged visits in 1976 and their relations continued to develop even after administrative change in Pakistan in 1977. Nevertheless these policies were not very much liked either by Soviet Union or leadership of PDPA. The later led a coup against the existing regime. After taking control of the state, the leadership of PDPA adopted proSoviet policies for consolidation of their regime but this regime too met with the same fate. In September 1979 Amin took the charge of the reign but Soviet leadership expressed lack of trust in Amin government. On 26th December 1979 Soviet Union grounded on Afghanistan and toppled Amin government and placed Babrak Karmal as president. It was anticipated that Soviet might proceed in
Pakistan through Khyber and Bolan passes. Statements issued from Pakistani leadership were watchful because rather declaring the action as breach of UN charter they elucidated Pakistan reservations in the framework of geography and nonaligned policy and uttered the hope for the quick resolution of the issue. Pakistan hoped to find the solution of the problem through UN Security Council but that could not so happen because every time resolution was presented before Security Council for categorical departure of the troop was vetoed by Soviet Union. However the resolution then presented before and approved by UN General Assembly. Initially Indian government did not support the intervention but with administrative change in the beginning of 1980 their stance too changed on the issue. Pakistan fully supported the Afghan cause but not to the extent up to which it could due to scarcity of resources. The United States also provided aid to Afghan Mujahedeen to contain Soviet Union. While supporting Afghan cause Pakistan eradicated the impression that it is playing the game on the US behalf.

Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan sparked off the policy makers in the United States and obligated them to revisit their foreign policy and appraise the policy option available to them. The reciprocated action from the United States was rigorous on the question whether to continue the détente with Soviet Union? How can they defend their interest in Persian Gulf? What would be their character in war? And how can they improve their relations with anti-Soviet China?

2.2.1 Background

Afghanistan a land of diverse ethnic groups is historically ruled by external forces i.e. Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane and even twice by British. Afghanistan also played the role of buffer state between the Tsarist Russia and British Empire. However,
1919 brought political transformation in Afghanistan and it came under the rule of local monarch that sustained till 1973. The year of 1973 witnessed political change and Afghanistan after a coup d’état came under the rule of Republican Party led by Daoud. The ruling party of Afghanistan was pro-Soviet, but it received massive aid from United States. The total aid received by Afghanistan was $504.2 million from 1946-1978 out of which 80% was given as a grant. Apart from that Afghanistan received development aid from Eastern Europe and Soviet Union. Moreover, these states trained the Afghan forces and provided military equipment to them. Soviet Union also assimilated the two communist groups i.e. Khalaq and Percham under single rule. However, the ruling regime in Afghanistan regardless of any ramifications opposed the party to tooth and nail. Consequently, Afghan air force led a coup that ended with the installation of another pro-Soviet government under the leadership of Nur Muhammad Taraki and Babrak Karmal as his deputy. Owing to its inherent weakness the new government could not continue long that culminated into division of party into two blocks, Khalaq led by Taraki and Percham led by Babrak Karmal. These developments caused political instability in Afghanistan.  

2.2.2 The Soviet Role & Incursion

From the very beginning Soviet Union gazed Afghanistan very essential owing to her geopolitical base and ethnicity. Since Tsarist time Soviet sought to haul Afghanistan to communist gamut. British invaded Afghanistan twice and were assisted twice by the Soviet in gaining independence. Nevertheless Afghanistan kept herself distant from Soviet Union because of ethnic problems in 1930s. But they came close during 1950s while Afghanistan persisted to be a buffer zone till 1978. Prior to 1978 Soviet Union was Afghan trading collaborator. Soviet also endow Afghanistan with substantial economic and military aid. From 1954-1977 Soviet provided $1.3b in aid to Afghanistan.  

---
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In April 1978 Daoud government was toppled through a coup. There were some doubts that Taraki was able to topple Daoud government with Soviet support but these doubts never got the support of lucid facts. Daoud tilt towards United States disgruntled Soviet also Daoud was expected to ask for United States help during his official trip to United States in 1978. This coup proved to be favorable for Soviet because the new regime too took up pro-Soviet policies. But as far as Afghanistan was concerned these pro-Soviet policies proved to be detrimental for her as it culminated into political unrest domestically. Consequently Afghan government sought Soviet help which was a clear indication of Soviet involvement domestic politics.17

Soviet overtly support Amin government and endowed him with considerable amount of aid to deal with insurgents. Soviet government sent a military delegation led by deputy defense minister to Afghanistan to search out the cause of this turbulence and chalk out plan to cope with this challenge and perhaps this prepared the ground for Soviet invasion. In fact Soviets were not very much contented with Amin job but as last attempt they launched Soviet-Afghan maneuver against the insurgents. The operation with some preliminary accomplishment proved to be a breakdown in overall assessment. When Iranian revolution caught the eyes of whole world United States was very much apprehensive about the Soviet presence in Afghanistan because there was clear substantiation about the subsistence of Soviet forces alongside Afghan border.143

On 8th and 9th December of 1979 Soviet equipped forces landed on the north of Kabul in order to eradicate the radical groups present amid Soviet and Afghan border. The official invasion embarked on 24th December 1979 when 5,000 Soviet troops landed on Afghan soil. On the same day Amin escaped to Darulaman palace. The forces too moved in the similar direction and after a tiny quarrel between Soviet forces and Amin sentinels, Amin was detained and was executed. Subsequent to Soviet invasion the western

143 Ibid.
commentators commented that Soviet had intended this policy for long-run reimbursement. Western media indicted Soviet for using chemicals against guerrillas but Soviet authorities incessantly abnegated all such reports. Then the prospect of US-Soviet relation revolved around the question that why Soviet intruded in Afghanistan. However Soviet elucidation that the act was in cohesion with Soviet-Afghan treaty was not fair enough to convince United States and other nonaligned forces. They regarded this clarification senseless since Soviet Union was behind expulsion of Amin government.144

On 28th December 1979 US president made a statement that Soviet move induced him to give a fresh look to his views about Soviet Union. On 4th January 1980 while addressing to the nation US president stated that entrée to Persian Gulf and expanded control in South Asia was the basic idea behind Soviet move. Western experts ascertained two dimensions of Soviet move defensive and offensive. In defensive sense the intention was to protect her regional interest and in offensive sense the objective was fulfillment of her aged-long dream of having an outlet to warm water. But from Soviet standpoint the motive behind this intervention was that if Amin government was captured by Islamic extremists then it would have certain repercussions for Soviet Union. Islamic revolution further intensified Soviet reservations because the revolution might have adverse effects on Muslim Central Asia.20

The political upheavals in Iran were clear indications of susceptibility of Pakistan and Persian Gulf. While stepping in Afghanistan Soviet made their point that United States being in charge of political turmoil in Iran would be not in a position to raise question on her move. In Soviet perspective United States would not be bothered by this intervention since Afghanistan was not US area of interest. Some of the experts affirmed that United States easygoing response to Soviet prior moves in Afghanistan gave Soviet Union green signal for the invasion. Experts also commented on reimbursement of Soviet assessment that achievement in the invasion would place Soviet on beneficial place and would permit
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her to realize her aged long dream. According to Western experts close evaluation of the whole event would divulge that Soviet motives behind the invasion were neither defensive nor offensive but were somewhat amalgamation of both. Crackdowns by Soviet diminished overt demonstration in Kabul but persisted in rest of the country. On pleads from other states for departure of forces, Soviet posed for pledge for installation of pre-Soviet government. United States endeavored to gratify Soviet but those labors had no worth for Soviet.\textsuperscript{145}

2.2.3 The Intent behind Soviet Encroachment of Afghanistan

The Soviet Afghan war may be equated with US Vietnam war since both the wars proved to be pricey and futile. There were multifaceted objectives that Soviet wanted to achieve through this war viz. to deter US sway in Soviet ambience, to enhance its influence in Southwest Asia, to contain the effects of Islamic revolution emanating from Iran and to secure pro communist regime of Afghanistan that proved to be a landmark of Cold War.\textsuperscript{146} All through 1970s détente period, Soviet Union had whip hand on US due to the later Vietnam palsy. Soviet increasing role to protect the socialist regimes was the clear evidence of this dominant role. However, this policy was also driven by certain objectives. In the first place Soviet Union wanted to reinforce Red Army to deal with US iron handedly and secondly to prolong its support for national emancipation that was regarded by many forecasters as third world war. Soviet invasion of Afghanistan proved to be the end of all such policies. However, what factor motivated Soviet to invade Afghanistan raised questions in the minds of many people. On close analysis one can find that it was national interest not the ideology that led to Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Actually, they said to have confused interest with ideology.\textsuperscript{147} It is pertinent to note that Soviet Union found
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herself ideologically bound to protect communist regime in Kabul though they pretended that it was their tactical move to reinforce their position in Cold War.\textsuperscript{148}

In April 1978 a pro-communist government under the leadership of People Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) came into power. However, the leadership soon comprehended to be delimitated by Muslim sea; therefore, they found it convenient to ask for assistance from Moscow. Afghan president made a desperate request to Moscow to send military troops for consolidation of his rule.\textsuperscript{149} Initially Moscow felt hesitancy and send few troops to Kabul because of dread of nuclear boom with United States. The deteriorated conditions of Kabul in 1979 made Moscow out of static position and compelled it to officially send its forces to Kabul. Murder of twenty Soviet military advisors by fuming masses rationalized Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Soviet Union officially intervened under the guise of 1978 treaty of Cooperation and GoodNeighborliness with Afghanistan. Accomplishment of its aged-long dream made its advancement possible from Iran to Persian Gulf or into Pakistan. Nevertheless, it was a gambling policy on the part of Moscow since it invaded at the time when in Iran administrative change took place because of revolution and the new regime was unfriendly towards both the superpowers.\textsuperscript{150}

In 1993 the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) Robert Gates exposed that CIA straightaway got involved in Afghanistan six months before Soviet intervention. In July 1979 Washington decided to implicitly assist Afghan Mujahedeen. It was the US assistance that enabled Afghan Mujahedeen to deal with Soviet troops on solid footing. United States
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assistance plan to Afghan Mujahedeen magnetized financial backing from different states.\textsuperscript{151}

Security threat to Soviet triggered from revolutionary Islamist militants. These militants were backed by Iran and Pakistan. Muslims all-inclusively dissent against this invasion. Miscalculation of the situation and irrational decision by Soviet leadership could not be taken for granted. However the ultimate decision to invade Afghanistan was made by the potent triumvirate. This triumvirate comprised of Defense Minister, Foreign Minister and head of KGB.\textsuperscript{152} The most prominent out of this trio was the head of KGB. Apart from this trio Brezhnev too was guilty for engrossing Soviet Union in the absurd war. Some of the bystanders indicated the use of chemical against Mujahedeen by Soviet forces that bear a resemblance to the content employed by United States in Vietnam.\textsuperscript{153}

The decade long war against Islamic militants resulted discontent in Soviet Union that culminated into collapse of the union. Nonetheless Moscow through this war secured her geopolitical position but at the same time failed to anticipate the repercussions of the war on Muslim Central Asia. The official figure of Soviet soldiers who lost their life in the war was 14,833.\textsuperscript{154}

\subsection*{2.3 PAKISTAN SINCE SOVIET INCURSION OF AFGHANISTAN}

Geo strategically Pakistan became center of attraction for both the superpowers and numerous factors enhanced this value i.e. Iranian revolution, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, its close ties with oil producing states. Likewise Pakistan’s nuclear program hoisted security distress for the region. After landing on the soil of Afghanistan Soviet

\begin{flushleft}  \textsuperscript{151} George Crile. \textit{My Enemy’s Enemy: The Story of the Largest Covert Operation in History: The Arming of the Mujahideen by the CIA}. London: Atlantic Books, 2003, p. 142. \\
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid. \\
Union devised a policy bearing in mind key dynamics viz. foiling any menace from Pakistan, encumbering Pak-US amicable relations and most important of all admittance to warm waters. The instant menace that Pakistan faced subsequent to the invasion was Soviet intrusion in Pakistan. Special laws oversee the tribal areas of NWFP with the tribal Malik’s dealing with the affairs of the area. Federal and provincial government had neither direct representation nor control over these areas. The residents of both Pakistan and Afghanistan used to cross the border without fulfilling official formalities. Consequently two million Afghan residents registered themselves as refugees because of the civil war. Owing to past practices practically it became impossible for Pakistan to stop this tsunami. Moscow overtly admonished Pakistan not to shore up Afghan Mujahedeen and not to settle scores with United States. Moscow juxtaposed with this warning a bid to enter into negotiation for political solvent of the quandary. Nevertheless Soviet military action was of very cramped nature. The second year of the invasion proved to be very crucial for Soviet Union because Mujahedeen took control of larger area. Contentions within PDPA intensified the chaotic condition of the country that led to the destabilization of the government. The only way left for Soviet Union for controlling the situation across the border was to manipulate the critical situation between Pakistan and India rather to directly intervene because such an action might culminate into worldwide sympathy for Pakistan and would gave setback to Soviet reputation.155

2.3.1 Pakistan’s Security subsequent to Soviet Intrusion

Security threat to Pakistan from communist Soviet surfaced from the day Soviet forces landed on Afghan soil. Evidence also proved that after consolidation of its rule in Afghanistan Soviet might manipulate to subvert Pakistan. The invasion put Pakistan’s policy makers in intricate state since the circumstances intensified Pakistan’s hard knock with Afghanistan as well as Soviet Union. From Pakistani perspective the tribal areas of

---

NWFP and Baluchistan were threatened by Soviet Union which the potent opponent could exploit to subvert Pakistan. Since its inception tension persisted on its eastern border and the invasion made its western border insecure too.\(^{156}\)

As a result of this invasion Afghanistan lost its buffer status which it preserved for century. There was also prospect of breaking of capitalist chain in Pakistan by communist Soviet Union through insolvency by a single blow. At that time Pakistan felt like a political orphan not getting support even from Iran. Weak economy and lack of military equipment was a major setback for Pakistan. United States too was fretful about the situation since its interest in Persian Gulf was at stake. As far as Pakistan was concerned it was anguishing from fear syndrome i.e. Indian hegemonic designs against Pakistan as it sought rampant authority rank in the region.\(^{157}\) There was probability that Soviet might persuade India and Afghanistan for synchronized assault at eastern and western borders because by subverting Pakistan Soviet could have entree to Arabian Sea and India could realize its aged-long dream of reunion. Peter Duncan the Soviet expert on South Asian Affairs avowed that it was the abrasive stance of India towards Pakistan that placed Soviet Union in acceptable state since Soviet could use this attitude as a trump card against Pakistan in the form of Indo-Soviet pressure on Pakistan and it was this fear syndrome that curtailed Pakistan action with regard to Afghanistan.\(^{158}\) In February 1980 Moscow overtly admonished Pakistan that it will put its sovereignty at stake if it persisted to be a catalyst of United States interest. Soviet also indicted Pakistan of backing up and training Mujahedeen and admonished of volatile repercussions. In June 1980 Taraki regime fêted Pakhtunsitan day and affirmed

---


Baluches as a distinguished nation. Consequently Afghan government vanished her standing in Pakistan and fetched Pak-Afghan relations at the brink of closing stages. The escalating Soviet charm in Afghanistan elevated suspicions in the minds of Pakistan’s policy makers since they were browbeaten by Pakhtustan issue. Abduction of Wakhan hallway and Siachin issue in 1984 was evident clue of Indo-Soviet partnership to dissect Pakistan. The greater jeopardy to Pakistan as an effect of this invasion was arm and money smuggling to Pakistani tribal areas coalescing with impairment of the residents there. In such circumstances Pakistan was choice less and was in dire need of moral and material support.

2.3.2 Zia Rejoinder

The military regime in Pakistan foresaw her participation in the war as advantageous from economic and military perspective. Consequently they pursued the policies of the preceding regime. However both United States and Pakistan perceived the war from different angles. It was also comprehended that this war had long lasting implications for Pakistan. Policy makers in Pakistan alleged this war as their own and believed that for Pakistan’s sanctuary brawny opposition was indispensable. Pakistan received millions of refugees on its own soil without any vacillation and also arrived at levelheaded arrangements with the United States who guaranteed her vow to Afghan Mujahedeen and to national security of Pakistan. Nevertheless Pak-Afghan policy diverged from that of United States who sometimes owing to Pakistan’s firm approach belated her aid to Afghan Mujahedeen.161

Policy makers in Pakistan endeavored to preserve their nonaligned stance and shun Soviet aggravation. Many top officials communicated of their own to the United States

about Soviet hegemonic design against Pakistan but at that time US authorities hyperbolized Pakistan apprehensions though the same distress was revealed by some other states. Pakistan frequently admonished United States that devoid of any aid and vouch from United States Pakistan would contain itself to new power balance in South Asia. Evidence from CIA archive in Tehran embassy revealed that in order to prolong détente incessant United States calculatedly stayed hushed on Soviet invasion. An article “secret from CIA” also stated that to assess US response Soviet Union tacitly clued-up her five months ahead of the invasion. It is also argued that United States static stance on the invasion was taken as US recognition of Afghanistan as Soviet area of influence. Washington was condemned throughout Pakistan because of this unforeseen static attitude towards this invasion. People of Pakistan supported their local regime owing to her anti-communist policy. Many experts in Pakistan during Afghan war regarded Afghan policy as a rational move.

Subsequent to the invasion some of the experts stated that this invasion had intensified the regional dilemmas while some experts analyzed that after consolidating their rule in Afghanistan Soviet might broaden its magnitude to Iranian port Chah Bahar and then would budge towards Gawadar coast. The pro-communist forces in Pakistan were not in favor of any response from Pakistan because according to them such action might culminate into assailed on Pakistan from pro-Soviet bordering states. They also avowed that United States had done naught for Pakistan rather showed her tilt towards India and hence they labeled United States as erratic allay. While the anti-communist forces recommended to take this invasion as crucial contest with Soviet Union. Policy makers in Pakistan also gave a single thought to option of seeking support of international community and United Nations while maintaining her nonaligned posture but only thought were not enough to tackle the problem.
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When Pakistan became desperate with no alternatives the only feasible option for Pakistan was receiving assistance from United States. Although relations with the old ally were not so feasible owing to imposition of sanctions on Pakistan, but as the Afghan war proceeded the relation between the two got normalized. United States assured Pakistan for providing economic and military aid.\textsuperscript{165} Pakistan utilized US option because Pakistan alone could not handle the situation with short of resources. In such conditions Pakistan was reliant on United States and China to handle the problems. Later on Pakistan alone befell to be successful in mustering worldwide support. Pakistan also mobilized her channels to win the support of Islamic states. Fortunately Pakistan got support of Muslim states to compel Soviet Union by foregrounding the intensity of the issue for the whole region.\textsuperscript{166}

\subsection*{2.3.3 Pakistan Security Options}

To surmount her impuissance Pakistan sought security by entering into Western power block during 1950s while in late 1960s and right through 1970s Pakistan assumed non-aligned posture that engrossed support from Saudi Arabia, China and France. Now Pakistan had both the earlier experienced option. Notwithstanding of elite tilt towards United States Pakistan experienced sundry deeds from United States since Pakistan was being facade with sanctions, imposition of embargo during 1965 war and was let alone during 1971 war. The other alternative before Pakistan was acceptance of Soviet offer in the form of acknowledgment of Babrak Karmal regime with distinct area of Afghanistan under Soviet control. But the execution of this option could put Pakistan in unfathomable nuisance because Pakistan in that case could not question Soviet charisma in Afghanistan, it could also engender domestic crisis in Pakistan that might culminate into consolidation of Communist canon in Southwest Asia. Ultimately Pakistan went for the revival of Executive Agreement of 1959 in the form of treaty while United States was prepared to tackle all such
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demands. Therefore Pakistan had to accept economic and military assistance to be used against Soviet Union. Islamabad earlier denial of the United States assistance was not a manifestation of Pakistan’s demands that United States could not cope with but was the intuition that Pakistan would not hamper her nonaligned stance devoid of any security pledge. The United States aid was patronized to accomplish Pakistan’s air force (PAF) wants. Considerable portion of this aid was set aside for the procurement of F-16 since Pakistan looked upon these fighter jets feasible to air defense needs. Islamabad was also apprehensive about Soviet role in abusing of this deal consequently it was decided that the first six F-16 would be transported by December 1982 and the left over 34 jets would be delivered in the commencing of April 1984. To meet Pakistan’s arm and navel requirements United States promised to provide 100 M48, A5 tanks, 35 M88A1 recovery vehicles, 20 M901 I-TOW vehicles, 20 M901 A2 selfpropelled howitzers, 40 M110 A2 8’ self – propelled howitzers, 75 M198 Towed howitzers, 10 AH-IS attack helicopters. Additionally Pakistan made it crystal clear to United States that she will not enter into any explicit military arrangements with them as formerly established during 1950. Washington too assured Pakistan that she will honor her nonaligned status and would neither ask for air bases nor reallocate power equilibrium of subcontinent. Apart from the deal of receiving F-16 still Pakistan could not match her neighboring counterpart in advance air craft by 1986.¹⁶⁷

The 1986 presume the following aircraft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 Mirage III</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 MIG-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 F-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 Mirage 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Mirage V</td>
<td></td>
<td>85 Jaguar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mirage III recess</td>
<td></td>
<td>08 Harrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 MIG-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Nevertheless Pakistan happened to be proficient to tackle any outburst of belligerency along her Western border. The accord expressively too impart Pakistan an upper hand to endure Soviet pressure for the political settlement of the matter. This aid facilitated Pakistan to pursue self-determining foreign policy and to advance her arm forces on modern lines pedestal on three terms.

The first apprehension was Pakistan’s nuclear program that Pakistan began to acquire during 1970s because of political segregation. Now if Pakistan carry on her nuclear program and go afar the verge then such infringement might culminate into cut of the aid package. But once Pakistan had an access to United States weapon Pakistan would be competent enough to deter any security menace to her solidarity.168

The second theme that decides Pakistan aptitude of sustaining the ongoing course was Pakistan capacity of dealing her eastern neighbor. Since India outnumbered Pakistan in military capacity regardless of her aid package and can take any measure while anticipating future. Now it all depends on Pakistan to provide any opening to India for any stroke e.g. the way they make use of the military assistance they receive, their next step about their nuclear program, their rejoinder on any occurrence across the border and most important their stance over Kashmir. India would reciprocate in the like manner.169 The last issue of concern that might affect the prospect of Pakistan status outdoor is Pakistan’s capacity to surmount unstable domestic political milieu that would permit Pakistan to perk up her economic activities.46

2.4 REVITALIZATION OF ALLIANCE

The decades old allies Pakistan and the United States agreed equivalently and propped up Afghan war at the phase when the relation between both the states were not so good owing to nuisance of sanctions on Pakistan by United States. Although Soviet invasion bear out
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to be the decisive moment for the revitalization of the old alliance still things didn’t get better so soon. Without informing Pakistan, the United States devised a fresh policy for Pakistan but this time the policy was not within the parameter of nonproliferation.

The first step in the execution of this policy was proclamation of economic and military aid without conferring Pakistan. Nevertheless it was assumed that the aid would haul Pakistan in the gamut of cold war and might have repercussion for her nuclear program. Therefore Pakistan discarded the offer. This denunciation barred the aggravation of relations with Iran. The relations took the normal track when Pakistan affirmed United States action of attacking Iranian embassy as illicit and infringement of Iranian sovereignty. In 1981 administrative change took place in United States and the new administration reworked the assistance program. Nonetheless the new offer too neither could nor met Pakistan’s reservations. Negotiations were being conducted but on nuclear issue both the states preserved their earlier posture. However the United States guaranteed Pakistan that nuclear issue is not at the top of their priority list. Pakistan reciprocated by assuring United States that Pakistan will not take their nuclear program up to the next level. While accepting the offer Pakistan took care of her nonaligned status by accepting market rate interest rather than to opt conceding military loans.

2.5 PAKISTAN DRIVES BEHIND ALLIANCE

Being a weak state Pakistan faced grave threats from different dimension viz. from Soviet Union in Afghanistan and antagonistic India in the east. Though strategically located in very vital position but Soviet occupation put Pakistan in critical conditions. However, these developments in the region contributed in enlivening the old partnership.
United States was searching for anti-communist cohort while Pakistan had a quest for a strong power to tackle the regional developments.

### 2.5.1 Protection of State Ideology

Pakistan perceived Soviet invasion as latent peril to her state dogmas, particularly elite class was much anxious about the invasion since they found their interest at stake. Therefore, devoid of discrepancy, they supported martial law administrator and made him realize to reconcile all the issues with US to offset Soviet threat.\(^{173}\) Resultantly, Pakistan pursued anti-communist policy and being a Muslim state they supported Afghan Mujahedeen as their moral duty. Religious and military establishment in Pakistan adjudged Soviet invasion as assail on the entire Muslim community and believed that Mujahedeen are shielding Islam against communist attack. However, the pro-communist elements disparaged governmental policies because they gazed at the invasion as victory of proletariats over feudalistic order. They also believed that democracy and feudalism cannot provide solidity to the political structure of Pakistan and the only sensible way out to all the harms is communist revolution.\(^{174}\)

### 2.5.2 Economic Aims

The principal objective behind revitalization of this partnership was to attract ample economic support from individual as well as the whole world community. Soviet occupation reminded Pakistan of its history. At the time of independence tsunami of refugees put burden on its feeble economy, likewise after Soviet invasion millions of Afghan refugees drifted to Pakistan that put extra burden on her weak economy. Pakistan found it hard to handle millions of refugees hence it was convenient for them to reassess their older polices in order to secure economic assistance from outside to reduce burden on

---


One thing pertinent to note is that this time the policy was calculated particularly for the backward areas of NWFP and Baluchistan in order to create stability in these areas since stability of these areas was allied with the stability of entire country. It was believed that once these areas are alleviated it will produce sense of security both internally and externally. Ultimately the strategy worked since Baluchistan magnetized the attention of United States.

Efforts were made to bring up-gradation of transportation, mining, fiscal substructure etc. In this regard United States announced developmental aid of $1.6 billion; $250 million for the development of Baluchistan, $100 million for the improvement of coastal area of Makran, $70 million were owed for long-term ventures e.g. water retrieval plant. In 1985, road connecting Bela to Turbat was erected from US aid program. Likewise in 1987, 500 miles road connecting Karachi to Makran coast was erected from US funded program.176

2.5.3 Strategic Drives

Geo-strategically Pakistan occupied paramount significance in regional, continental and global politics. Pakistan always remained one of the important means for US in achieving its ends in Gulf region. Moreover, it occupied great importance in US defense policy. Considering its location policy makers in Pakistan started developmental projects from US aid program. Soviet presence in Afghanistan was a great sign of worry for both Pakistan and United States because both states have their vested interest in Gulf region. However, any crumple of oil supply harm Pakistan more because it has very restricted choices of energy resources. Moreover, these states are important markets for the commodities of both the states. Pakistan earns almost $3 billion annually from its human resource employed in Gulf States. Pakistan also shares spiritual and cultural knot with these states and all set to defy all the forces working against them. Gulf region is also important for Pakistan from

175 The Economist, January 26, 1980.
176 Ibid.
the point of view of military equipment since Pakistan was militarily weak and reliant on these states. Pakistan had links with these states for its defense and economic wants.\textsuperscript{177}

2.5.4 Counter Indo-Soviet Alignment

Pakistan perceived Soviet invasion as grave threat to its security therefore it decided to deal with Soviet iron handedly. Pakistan also sought that Afghanistan should acknowledge Durand Line as international border. Pakistan was also cognizant of Soviet intention as it backed up India in dismemberment of Pakistan. Soviet with the help of Afghanistan strived to subvert Pakistan by creating ethnic commotion and intensifying Pakhtunistan issue. Pakistan was all set to take every feasible step to level score with Soviet. Even military establishment of Pakistan was looking for an opportunity to smash up Soviet through US backing and Mujahedeen and ready to be a frontline state if get enough assistance. Pakistani government affirmed Soviet as persecutor because Soviet attempted to push Pakistan into forced isolation. Pakistan wished to see a stable political structure in Afghanistan and extended its support to Mujahedeen because they esteemed Pakistan’s sovereignty and opposed disintegration of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{178} Pakistan also made it clear to India and Soviet Union that it will not allow them to undermine and dismember Pakistan again.

2.5.5 Rejuvenation of Defense System

Another objective of revitalization of this alliance was to build up defense system on modern lines to deter all the threats to its territorial integrity and to enhance its solidarity.\textsuperscript{179} Pakistani government affirmed protection of its territorial boundary as their prime objective for which they are looking for peace loving nations. Different authorities in Pakistan

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
believed that the prime objective of Pak-US partnership is to deal with India on Kashmir issue rather than its defense against other states. No doubt, estimated assail from India remained a matter of great concern for Pakistan. It was normally believed that fragile defense system of Pakistan is the root cause of impuissance against India. Therefore, to meet this paucity they yet again join their Western partner.\textsuperscript{180} However, they explicitly declare that threat to Pakistan’s territorial boundary from non-communist assail is greater than the communist attack. Establishment of Pakistan was of the view that instead of defining the term aggression it is necessary to stop aggression where ever it comes from. Like previous alliance both the partners took advantage of each other for their own vested interest. Pakistan also employed this partnership to curtail the role of India in South Asian politics.

2.6 US INTENTIONS BEHIND ALLIANCE

2.6.1 Policy of Containment

Containment of communism remained the prime objective of US foreign policy since World War II. In the beginning of cold war United States grasped that it ought to take bold and instant steps to contain communism\textsuperscript{181} if not, US sanctuary and autonomy will peril. Additionally, it will seize susceptible states into its own orbit. United States too had its vested interests in Gulf States and they looked upon this region as crucial as Western Europe. US anxiety about this region after soviet invasion was obvious. Soviet presence in Afghanistan affected naval balance on northwest of Indian Ocean, thus testing US naval preeminence in the region. On 27\textsuperscript{th} March 1980, US secretary of state articulated Soviet presence in Afghanistan before foreign relation committee of senate as:

\begin{quote}“The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan increases and dramatizes the potential threat to the security of nations there and the world’s free access to natural resources and
\end{quote}
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On 4th January, 1980 US president recognized Soviet invasion as menace against Pakistan and Iran. He added by saying that this invasion is a latent threat to other regional states as well and their gratis entrée to oil resources and if they are not blocked they may extend their sway to the neighboring states, consequently upsetting the power balance of the entire world. US secretary of state too pointed out that Soviet invasion could be an irresistible catastrophe if it had entrée to oil resources of Persian Gulf that might lead to the crumple of world economy. According to the ballpark figure of congress budget committee and forecasters reports that hammering of Persian Gulf oil would lead to decline US GDP up to 13%, Europe 22% and Japan 26%. However, all these reports were just speculations and the genuine threat might be, that Soviet may have a deal with Pakistan, or deliberate it a safe haven of Mujahedeen or it may be a part of Soviet strategy to have access to Persian Gulf. It was believed that owing to these anticipated coercions United States and its Western partners must take some action.

2.6.2 Vengeance of Vietnam War

US viewed Soviet invasion as golden chance to give back Soviet, what they did in Vietnam War. Keeping in mind Afghan history they comprehended that the more Soviet stay in Afghanistan the more they bear. There was broad-spectrum consent in United States that this is the accurate time to take retribution from Soviet being overpowered by Afghan Mujahedeen. It was also firmed to overtly prop up Mujahedeen to craft Afghanistan, Vietnam for Soviets. During Vietnam War about 3 million US soldiers

played a part and more or less 50-58,000 died, while Soviet employed 2.1 % of its forces in Afghan War i.e. half million of Soviet soldiers chipped in and about 13-25,000 died and according to rough estimate 35-50,000 injured. They also bore loss of military equipment like jets, tanks, helicopters etc. However, US was not contented with these figures rather they wanted to amplify the outlay of war for Soviet as to match the cost faced by US in Vietnam War. On these grounds US showed reluctance to settle Afghan crisis through United Nations.

2.6.3 US Desire of Making Soviet a Bleeding Wound

In mid-1983, US president in his address to the congress underscored support to Afghan Mujahedeen. He avowed that economic and military aid to Afghan militants was in favor of both US and Pakistan because eventually it will force Soviet to depart from Afghanistan. He also estimated that United States has the command to thrive. Moscow can triumph if they are geared up to face hardship but we can raise the bar. US authorities believed that Afghan people can surpass because greater the force greater will be tractability from Soviet. According to them it was the effect of Afghan resistance that Soviets has condensed the time period of their departure. US president pointed out that since Afghanistan is nonaligned state no other state can fix on its fate. According to US government Soviet had calculated approach to withdraw from Afghanistan as to legitimize their actions as well as to wane confrontation and to hamper support to Mujahedeen. US anticipated that if support to Mujahedeen knocked out Soviet would be optimized to continue their support to the local regime. US also believed that Soviet Union was maneuvering to preclude Pakistan from supporting Mujahedeen. US endeavored that Soviet must face unremitting confrontation

and it must not permit Soviet to make it at negotiation table.\textsuperscript{187} US perception about Afghan crisis was that it is not a matter of two states since Soviet sought to withdraw after installation of communist regime that was deplorable for US. Soviet planned to depart after devastating all the resistance whilst, US aspired to extend its support to resistant till Soviet retreat. They also strategized to guard Pakistan against communist menace and to make Afghan war tougher for Soviet.\textsuperscript{188} In 1988, US state department also received directives from president to prolong aid program till the withdrawal of Soviet forces.\textsuperscript{189} US president inculcated all the pertained authorities in the US to vigilantly supervise Geneva talks and Soviet withdrawal. He believed that US must keep two things in mind and endeavor to realize both. Firstly, eviction of Soviet forces and secondly, self-determination of Afghan people since attainment of one is worthless devoid of other. They desired to negotiate with Moscow on their own provisos.

US aid program forced Soviet to draw back its forces from Afghanistan devoid of attainment of its chore since Soviet was persuaded that their encroachment in Afghanistan botched to fetch domino effect. They also grasped that they by no means can afford smack down with US so if they wish for growth in arm control and economic affairs the only elucidation for them was to withdraw from Afghanistan. Moscow censured US peace policy in Afghanistan as well. It was urged that US and Pakistan were not looking for political settlement in Afghanistan rather they wish Soviet out of Afghanistan. After 1983, Soviet made the most of its vigor to direct military boom in Afghanistan. Consequently, Soviet abridged the saturation of its military operations. Moscow endeavored to withdraw its forces by means of UN patronized negotiations. Soviet also uttered to withdraw its forces because maintenance of armed forces in Afghanistan for a longer time was costly and also spoiling Soviet image worldwide. However, Soviet Union did not provide any time frame


for withdrawal since there was vagueness that will Pakistan proffer abet to Mujahedeen or correlate it with time frame of Soviet withdrawal.

In mid-1983, Moscow pledge 18 months’ time frame as they avowed 95 % of agreement is done while Islamabad and Washington are showing unwillingness to that accord.\(^\text{190}\)

However, no melioration was observed in political concurrence of the crisis. After dashing hopes, Soviet did not lay any scheme; there was no development in Geneva talks, from August 1983 to June 1985 as well. Meanwhile Soviet positioned its forces in Afghanistan and compounded wallop across the border in Pakistan. After 1986 Soviet started to withdraw its forces but US sought to prolong the war. Moscow signified US intent of qualified resolution through negotiation. Moscow accused US for being culpable of the whole crisis. Moscow yet again gave time frame of withdrawal by uttering that they will pull back their forces within 6 or 7 months. This declaration was the apparent message for extinction of aid to Mujahedeen with the departure of Soviet troops. In a meeting in December 1987, between US and Soviet Union, Soviet president proposed withdrawal of troops within a year but snubbed to give time frame while US authorities rebuffed to accept pro-communist regime and qualified withdrawal of troops. Soviet military establishment preferred political settlement of the crisis.\(^\text{191}\) They dread that US might employ its advanced military strength to reconcile the issue on their own terms. Soviet military officials who remained the part of the operation accentuated political settlement of the issue rather to make use of military option. They grasped that they by no means can attain their target offensively. In spring 1986, Soviet president adjudged Afghan crisis, their strategic setback. On 29\textsuperscript{th} July 1987, Soviet president annunciated withdrawal of six brigades. However, Pakistan and United States extended uninterrupted aid to Mujahedeen. But this time Soviet put upon much less shot to deal the resistant. Soviet government in another statement correlated withdrawal of troops with halt in aid to Mujahedeen. But US authorities


altogether discarded Soviet claim and avowed that they will uphold aid to Mujahedeen till withdrawal of last troop and with the installation of non-communist regime.\textsuperscript{192}

2.7 BENEFITS TO PAKISTAN FROM RE-ALIGNMENT

2.7.1 Military Gains

Pakistan was in dire need to modernize its defense potentiality impelled her to US orbit again. Subsequent to its independence Pakistan relied on US for its military needs. Pakistan was in quest of sophisticated military equipment to dissuade Indian peril and apprehended Afghan crisis as the right time to build up her defense potentials on modern line. On the other hand United States was determined to offer modern weapons to its allies to dare Soviet military might. Like former alliances Pakistan and United States served harmonizing interests. United States desired to reinforce the policy of containment while Pakistan was exploring potential power to meet its economic, military and political needs against India and Soviet threat in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{193} President Zia explicated Pakistan’s objectives for the resumption of this partnership as; we aspire to keep Soviet Union out of Afghanistan and want to protect our territorial boundaries.\textsuperscript{73} US authorities’ bypass Pakistan dread of Indian peril since they were determined to thump Soviet.\textsuperscript{194} United States was very much clear about the fact that potentially Pakistan was far behind India and Soviet Union. Both the allies viewed this partnership from different perspectives. US wanted Pakistan potent enough to keep intact their strategic and commercial interest in Persian Gulf, while for Pakistan this partnership meant to accumulate modern weapons to dwindle gap between Pakistan and India. Consequently, Pakistan improved its defense capacity. Military equipment incorporated warning and communication system, anti-tank, missiles,
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tanks, ground attack aircrafts and armored personnel carriers. In 1981, US bestowed $3.2 billion as economic and military aid out of which $343 million were owed to procure 40 F-16, sparrow and sidewinder missile. It was conceptualized that to have a flange in the region acquisition of F-16 was the need of the time. Initially US showed reluctance for purchase of F-16 but later on Pakistani government boomingly persuaded US administration. On Pakistan’s insistence the aircraft were outfitted with modern technology ALR used by NATO. Pakistan also acquired AIM-9L sidewinder missile, harpoon anti-ship missile, M-48 tanks, tank recovery vehicles self-propelled field artillery, armed helicopters, radar used to give caveat to aircraft on western border. US also bestowed equipment to edify air force bases in NWFP and Baluchistan. For naval forces too US bestowed aid to edify harbors in Gawadar and Karachi.

2.7.2 Economic Gains

Afghan crisis proved to be right time for Pakistan to edify economic infrastructure as well. US promised more than $7.2 billion for military and economic purse of Pakistan. 1981-1988, Pakistan sprang up her economy by means of temperate business sector, swiftly mounting service zone, and perked economy. Consequently, inflation rate diminished to 9% that never slumped to single numeral since 1970. The intensifying economy certainly affected the balance of payment. Foreign remittances during 1980s reached $25 billion that really bestowed Pakistan’s mounting economy. In August 1981, US announced $3.2 billion as five year (1981-1985) assistance program. This aid program was evenly owed to economic and military spheres. This aid program graded Pakistan at fourth place after Israel, Egypt and Turkey as chief US aid beneficiaries. By means of this aid program US
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endeavored to keep up close political ties with Pakistan in the wake of Soviet occupation. Economic assistance was owed to agriculture, energy and social services and employed to prop up balance of payment as well. This assistance package incorporated comestible oil, phosphate fertilizers, agricultural items and insecticides. From 1982-1988 Pakistan incurred $954.2 million as developmental aid and $205 million for irrigation, energy and water management from USAID. Pakistan obtained $1.7 billion as financial support in the beginning of 1983.

In the first three years 1982-1984 approximately $50 million were owed to PL 480 comestible oil once a year. The whole five year financial support program was divided into two halves, 2/3 grant and 1/3 concessional loan. Consequently, state economy grew in general and NWFP and Baluchistan in particular. In 1985, US sanctioned four year package of $4.02 billion ($670 annually) as monetary and military backing. This aid ranked Pakistan as the second major beneficiary of US aid after Israel. This four year program lent a hand to meet the money depreciation. USAID was the principal benefactor of Pakistan. US also facilitated Pakistan in acquiring loans from IMF and World Bank. Pakistan obtained credit from Asian Development Bank for different ventures with conditions attached to it. During 1986-1987 US sanctioned $25 million for extraction of brown coal to fulfill energy needs. In the same year US sanctioned $94 million for the developmental projects of NWFP and Makran.

198 Dr. Pervez Khan Khalil, Executive Director National Development Support Program. Interview with the author on April 25, 2014 in Peshawar.
2.7.3 Flagging of Pakhtun Racial Nationalism

Pakistan relations with Afghanistan are patchy as well. While Afghanistan had close ties with India and Soviet Union. However, Afghan war altered the regional scenario as Soviet Union disintegrated and Mujahedeen in Afghanistan for the very first time befallen as contesting party to install their regime. Pakistan rationalized the policy of supporting Mujahedeen since it didn’t wish for any single incident to perk up Afghan jingoism and wished to install anti-communist reign that renowned Durand Line as an international boundary. Likewise they rebuffed the proposal of secular Pakhtunistan. 201 In 1985, communist regime in Afghanistan convened tribal chief of both the countries that aspired establishment of Pakhtunistan on Pakistani territory to distress the entire administrative system in Pakistan. In Geneva talks 1989, both Pakistan and Afghanistan were asked to abstain from exercise of force and intervening in internal affair of one another. During Geneva talks Pakistan alleged that this accord documented Durand Line as international border and Afghanistan accepted this border line. On the other hand government of Afghanistan endeavored tooth and nail to omit this word but couldn’t succeed. Pakistani government explicitly stated that being a frontline state Pakistan put her security at stake, therefore, Pakistan ought to have affable regime in Afghanistan. They avowed that Pakistan will not acknowledge Indian and Soviet persuasion in Afghanistan and they would like Afghanistan as wholesome Islamic state. 202 Keeping in mind earlier experiences Pakistan wanted decentralized system in Afghanistan so in future any regime opponent to Pakistan might not come in power. Subsequent to administrative change in Afghanistan in 1992, president of the new regime paid a visit to Pakistan and renowned Durand Line as international border. The Afghan diplomat in Pakistan also affirmed that Pakhtunistan issue will never crop up again because government and nation of Pakistan shored up them in

Afghan war. He also elucidated that influx of Afghan refugees will not hoist Pakhtunistan nationalism since Afghan people are not admired in Pakistan. Consequently, it will diminish and then conclusively finish Pakhtun nationalism.203

2.7.4 Feat of Pakistan’s Afghan Policy

Pakistan’s Afghan policy fetched change in regional scenario as Soviet invasion escorted the emergence of Mujahedeen that transformed this political war into Jihad. However, this invasion posed a direct threat to Pakistan’s security that was inescapable. Pakistan was too frail and susceptible to defend herself from entrenched power. Under these circumstances the options left before Pakistan were restricted and Pakistan had to take concrete step because it was estimated that after consolidation of its rule in Afghanistan Soviet might extend its influence to Pakistan. Pakistan was not in a position to afford unrest on her western border. It was also believed that being a Muslim state it was the moral responsibility of Pakistan to defend Muslim state against communist threat. Pakistan extended overt support to Mujahedeen and condemned Soviet deed, while Soviet imperiled Pakistan of erratic results if Pakistan pursues the same policy. Pakistan’s Afghan policy under martial law administrator brought Pakistan again in the lime light in global politics. This policy compelled Soviet Union to repel all her odious policies against Afghanistan.204

2.8 IMPLICATES OF THE ALLIANCE ON PAKISTAN

2.8.1 Afghan Refugees Burden on Pakistan

Every policy has positive as well as negative effects; likewise Pakistan’s decision to be a frontline state fetched some serious consequences with it. When Soviet forces landed on

Afghan territory in 1979, outsized Afghan refugees migrated to Pakistan. Afghan pro-communist regime and Soviet troops mutually launched military operation through aircraft and ammo across the border in Pakistan. Resultantly, 1.5 million Afghan died, approximately 3 million injured about 1.2 million handicapped and 4 million migrated to Pakistan. Half of the handicapped lost their eye sight and were victim of mental retardation. Comparative to death ratio experienced by Soviet Union in World War II death ratio exceeded in Afghan war.

However, historical records illustrate that Afghan migration embarked on 1978, because of impulsive policies of pro-communist regime, and the number of refugees hit to one fourth of entire Afghan population after Soviet invasion. Subsequent to migration, Afghan refugees settled on the border areas of NWFP and Baluchistan that are connected with Afghanistan. Consequently, air and ground assail began on the western border of Pakistan that obviously had its impact on Pakistan as well. In these crucial moments government of Pakistan had to deal with multifaceted tribulations. Pakistani role in the war, moral responsibility and domestic pressure compelled Pakistan to welcome Afghan refugees with open arms. Pakistan paid the cost of this vital decision in the form of wallchalking in favor of Mujahedeen in NWFP and Quetta, bombing, drug trafficking, sectarianism etc. that put Pakistan in deep trouble in general and NWFP and Baluchistan in particular. Moreover, Pakistan faced the problem of local economic assets division between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Influx of Afghan refugees badly affected the weak political structure of Pakistan and effects of Afghan crisis became a vital ingredient of policy making in Pakistan. Domestic problems of Pakistan particularly its security problems were coupled with Afghan crisis. From 1981-1988 millions of refugees migrated to Pakistan that touched the highest number in world history. Nevertheless, these refugees found the opportunity to
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go back to their native towns after Soviet withdrawal but this withdrawal left civil war behind it in Afghanistan among those who wanted to take the reign of government in their hands. Consequently, more and more refugees migrated to save their life.

The Afghan refugees settled in Punjab moved to viable cities of the province i.e. Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Lahore etc. for earning their bread and butter. According to official record, approximately 175,000 Afghan refugees settled in Punjab. It was ascertained that Afghan refugees were welcomed by local population of Punjab because of the benefits associated with it.

As match up to NWFP and Baluchistan, Sindh was less affected by Afghan war since Sindh is far from Afghan border, however; the province faced up with some communal and political consequences. The local population here indicted that Afghan refugees are culpable for weapon proliferation, drug trafficking, traffic problems, roaming and sign of worry for law and order bureaus. In short Afghan refugees created numerous tribulations for Pakistan while in NWFP and Baluchistan they upset demographic balance and caused soil corrosion.

2.8.2 Refugee Burden on NWFP

The repercussions of Afghan war for NWFP were graver since it was the foremost outlet of overseas artilleries to Mujahedeen. It doled out as training hub of guerillas as well. Incursion of millions of refugees fetched more gloom for feeble vicinity because subsequent to refugee’s migration military operations and detonation intensified that had its repercussions for the province in short as well as in long-terms. About 68 % of total migrated refugees came to NWFP that moved to the settled areas and FATA as well. The local people did not receive them with open arms and kept aloofness from them as they

---
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believed that they are responsible for all the aggression that sabotaged the law and order situation, and after some time they started demonstrations and even called for the ejection of refugees. Without any deliberation to common religion, culture and values the local population professed themselves to be finer in socio-economic position. People in tribal area too had their reservations about the refugees because they were not convinced with the amenities provided to them relative to those of refugees. They believed that refugees are facilitated at the expense of expenditure reserved for local developmental schemes for them. The authorities of provincial government too accepted the fact that local people do not want to gel with refugees and wanted them to leave their territory as soon as possible. Despite of all the fact, refugees effectively aggravated optimized reaction among the people of NWFP.

2.8.3 Refugee Burden on Baluchistan

Like NWFP, Baluchistan had some stern repercussions of Afghan crisis as well. Approximately, 80,000 Afghan refugees migrated to Baluchistan that acutely affected the wherewithal of the province. Here too, local population did not hail Afghan refugees because they believed that their standard of living is affected by the presence of bulk of refugees. Likewise, presence of Pushtu speaking upset the ratio of Pashtun and Baluchs adapting the Baluch into minority. Because of the disparity in ratio Baluch could not realize their reverie of Great Baluchistan.

2.8.4 NWFP & Baluchistan under Soviet Menace

Pakistan’s support to Afghan Mujahedeen was not cherished by Soviet Union therefore, Soviet started to pressurize Pakistan at three fronts viz. pressure on border, political pressure and mutual pressure by India and Afghanistan. Moscow charged Pakistan for being a safe haven of terrorists and also damned Pakistan’s nasty policy and in that way responsible for devolving relations with Moscow. In 1980, Soviet foreign minister paid an official visit to New Delhi where he censured role of Pakistan in Afghan war and indicated India of US strategy of tapping Indo-Pak relations. Moscow too made an effort to subvert Pakistan by distressing the densely populated areas of refugees in NWFP and Baluchistan. They also intended to upset the law and order of Sindh through secessionism. Their intent behind this strategy was to back up those who aspire to have their separate identity. Similarly Soviet elicited Baluchs to enhance their influence over the federal capital. Soviet too strategized to intervene in Pakistan’s internal affairs by developing pro-Soviet feelings among the separatist elements who wanted Soviet help in instituting Great Baluchistan. However, traditional Baluchs came in their way and did not let them realize their goal because they were well aware of Soviet plan.

2.8.5 Soviet Air Raids & Radical Activities

Soviet made encroachment in Pakistan jointly with Afghanistan to topple the military regime and create chaos in the country. While disregarding sovereign status of Pakistan they started air and ground attacks and by 1987 they made border violations more than 700 times and about 95 % of air attacks were made against NWFP. In 1987, US Defense Department in its report illustrated that Pakistan was victim of 90 % of terrorist activities
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committed worldwide. In the same year, US State Department estimated that 540 terrorist activities, 574 air, and 517 ground attacks were launched against Pakistan from across the border in Afghanistan. The intent of Soviet was to spring up abhorrence against refugees and Mujahedeen and to make Pakistan militarily weak. In 1988, tribal areas and densely populated areas remained target areas of Soviet forces that caused civilian causalities. Guerilla training centers were also targeted by Soviet forces. Thus from 1980-1988 Pakistan befell to be the target of 2,730 air attacks and 2,599 ground attacks. 1,355 civilian died or injured in air while 1,000 died in ground attacks. US authorities estimated that in 4,500 terrorist activities 5,000 civilian died. Public properties were also targeted in these attacks. There is some substantiation that indicated Soviet involvement in murder of military dictator of Pakistan because Soviet believed that he wanted to incapacitate the Geneva talks.

2.8.6 Economic Cost of Afghan Refugees

After migration Afghan refugees were absolutely reliant on Pakistan relief program. Regardless of its weak economy Pakistan bestowed them with basic necessities of life and little sum of money. Pakistan alleviated 4.2 million listed and 540,000 unlisted refugees. Majority of refugees were settled on the border areas of NWFP and Baluchistan. Here refugees were carved up in refugee hamlets each hamlet encompassed 1200-1300 ménages. Pakistani government hailed them with warmth and munificently owed its own economic assets to look after Afghan refugees. In mid 1980s the official responsibility of 45% of refugees was given to Pakistan, UNHCR and World Food Program (WFP) took the responsibility of 25% each and the responsibility of remaining 5% was shared by Saudi
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Arabia, Kuwait and Red Cross. Pakistan also paid for channelizing the aid from outside. After some time world community sanctioned $1 million as relief program for refugees while Pakistan spent the same cost daily from its national purse and the total aid program costs $419 million.

Apart from socio-political problems refugees overburdened Pakistan’s feeble economy since they fetched domestic animals with them that too had harmful impinge on terra firma because of over browsing. According to UNHCR estimates, refugees carried 45,000 camels and 25,000 donkeys for business purposes. Consequently, bitterness developed among local population of NWFP and Baluchistan and refugees because uninhibited browsing by herds devastated meadows and obliterated environment of NWFP and Baluchistan that ultimately contributed to soil corrosion. Likewise, forests of Dir, Chitral and Hazara division faced setback because of the extreme use of wood for catering and firing up by refugees. Refugees had an easy entrée to the forests of NWFP and Baluchistan so they not only slashed the trees but excavated the roots of the trees. Resultantly, mountainous areas of the region suffered from landslide affecting all sectors coupled with forests. With the migration large number of adroit and un-adroit refugees came that lend a hand in the growth of marketplaces in less developed areas that too offered inexpensive human resources. These human resources brought fortune for local entrepreneurs since they did not balk in acquiring low profiled jobs. They also worked on the wages much lower than the wage rate of local workforce; therefore, many owners hired refugees on preferential basis. Likewise, affluent
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refugees made investment in different enterprises like bistro, transportation and realty etc. They also procured realty that flourished this business in NWFP, Baluchistan, metropolitan areas of Punjab and Sindh. In this regard they found the way to purchase property without any condition all the way through managers by offering them attractive amount of money. Local people also faced trouble in getting houses at rent because the Afghan refugees were ready to give even high rent that made these houses beyond the reach of common man. Similarly refugees involved in transportation created problems for local transporters. In NWFP about 1705 registrations were provided for refugees.  

2.8.7 Decay of the Tourism Industry

Afghan war not only impaired political infrastructure and economy of Pakistan but it had repercussions for tourist industry as well. Majority of tourist came from Western countries but Afghan war impeded the flow of tourists. Dir, Chitral, Hazara, Kaghan, Naran, Swat etc. lingered as the center of attraction for tourists while all these centers are located in NWFP, the province that was most affected by Afghan war. The worse law and order situation badly hit this industry that encumbered country development.

2.8.8 Kalashnikov Culture

One of the crucial blows of Afghan war over Pakistan’s social setup was augmentation of Kalashnikov culture. Development of this societal sin found up its roots in US arm supply to Afghan mujahedeen via Pakistan. The wild supply of arm rendered the chance to the opportunists in Pakistan who started up business of illicit arms in NWFP and thus happened to be the launching of the AK-47 Kalashnikov culture. Slowly and gradually Dara Adam Khel village of FATA in NWFP emerged as one of the larger illicit arms market. In these markets multitude of experts and labor are functioning in 2600 arm shops and 5 gun factories that have the potential to manufacture 100 AK-47 daily. In these markets
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Russian and Chinese mode Kalashnikovs, hand grenades and rifle etc. are manufactured and vended.\textsuperscript{224} Everyone can find any kind of arms and ammunitions in these markets. Though Afghan war ended with the withdrawal of Soviet troops but the after effects of the war on Pakistan can be sighted since Pakistan experienced the nastiest law and order situation where crooks and activists rambling in the boulevard with machine guns and other weaponry that was drained off from US military aid to Mujahedeen.\textsuperscript{225} Those involved in weaponry business smugly exhibit that they are vendees and retailer of weapons devoid of considering who is buyer and sellers with the addition that they are adept in weapons. From 1986-1990 US granted $ 8.7 billion as military aid to Mujahedeen that culminated into anarchy and corruption because activists and crooks had an easy access to these weapons who challenged the writ of government by arousing sentiment of secession within the country.\textsuperscript{226}

2.8.9 Denominationalism

It is not wrong to say that sectarianism is fatal for the internal sanctuary of a country. Zia Islamization and US approach to use religion as a weapon against communism provided boom to sectarianism in Pakistan. In this regard US spent huge amount of money while prologue of new Shariah law by Pakistani government, fully disregarding Islamic perception of democracy, liberty and parity etc. segmented the society into many sects that led to mayhem and chaos making conditions uncontrollable for government. Iranian revolution had already induced religious zealotry that put one sect against the other. The deteriorated relations between Saudi Arabia and Iran fetched further misfortunes for Pakistan because a specific lobby was working to undermine Iranian influence. US exploited Madrassas and mosques working as pressure groups in Pakistan since Afghan

war had been transformed into Jihad. Consequently, clashes between different sects particularly between Shi’a and Sunni became frequent in different areas of Pakistan making Pakistan an easy prey to core power. This is evident from the fact that within few years’ number of madressahas multiplied i.e. in 1950s number of madressahas were 137 that increased in 1971 to 900 and multiplied many times and reached 45000 in 1980s in the same period registered madressahas were 4000. In Punjab there were 7050 madressahas that were serving as military training centers while in NWFP number of such madressahas was 10000 out of which 50 were in Peshawar that was regarded as heart of all such activities. Students from different countries were also trained in the name of Jihad. In 1990s Punjab paid the price where 2000 people died, 561 injured in 234 events. This trend continued and extended to other parts of the country where 529 people died in 862 events. The ratio of violent activities increased because neither any sect had patience nor they were ready to solve the matter peacefully.

2.9 US DEPARTURE FROM AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

In February 1989, Soviet withdrew its last troop from Afghanistan. After Soviet exodus the US lost its interest in the two adjacent countries of South Asia. Owing to poor law and order condition US closed its embassy in Kabul. Likewise, its relations with Pakistan deteriorated due to its nuclear program. Resultantly, US imposed sanctions against Pakistan that created massive problems for Pakistan.

2.9.1 Geo Strategic Milieu

The period from 1989 to 1990s inhabits fundamental place in global history since Berlin wall pulverized in this period while Soviet abandoned her moral right of military intrusion


in neighboring countries of Eastern Europe. Similarly, on 4th February 1990 Soviet president acknowledged the panorama of political parties other than communist that culminated into disintegration of Soviet Union and appearance of Boris Yeltsin as a president of Russian federation. Subsequent to Soviet collapse, Russia inherited the condense assets of Soviet Union. It acquired 90 % oil, 80 % natural gas, 70% gold and skilled human resource 62% electricity resources 80% industries, 60% of Soviet territory along with diverse problems.229

After Soviet collapse US did not feel any threat from communist China because there was an ample gap between the economy of US and China. GNP of US was in trillions while that of China was in billions. Moreover, US had too developed diplomatic relations with China. Both the countries developed trading relation as well. From 19831993 China export to US reached $40 billion while trade superfluous reached $15 billion.230 By 1996, China acquired the membership of World Bank, IMF, Asian Development Bank (ADB), Pacific Economic Co-operation Conference because at that time the prime objective of China was to craft laissez faire economy.231

After Soviet collapse it became foreseeable for India to revisit its non-aligned policy because Soviet was the key purveyor of weapons to India. It was also estimated that Indian army was 80% dependent on Soviet Union. India also benefited from swap trade with Soviet Union. But in 1991 the situation got entirely changed because Russian federation was not in a position to offer weapons to India nor it could afford swap trade.

In these circumstances India was compelled to mull over US option. However, India had some reservations regarding some of the US policies e.g. the US relations with Pakistan’s military regime, its improved relations with China, its Kashmir policy, and it snubbed to Indian needs of weapons. Indian government regarded that if the US addressed these

reservations then the US will find a new partner in South Asia i.e. India. But Indian tilt towards Soviet did not let the US to enter into alliance with India. However, the US did not feel any threat from India.

In these conditions the US saw in her interest to withdraw from Afghanistan and leaving Pakistan with certain matters unsolved. The US departure created power vacuum in the region.

### 2.9.2 Pak-US Tautness

The ruling regimes in Pakistan whether military or civil wished to have cordial relations with the US even the founding father of Pakistan too articulated the same hope when he sent clandestine mission to the US for economic aid and procurement of military equipment in October, 1947. The geostrategic location of Pakistan provided her the prospects to realize its ends and facilitated Pakistan in forming alliance with the US in the past on the basis of harmonizing interest with the US. However, like earlier alliances this alliance too diluted owing to some significant developments like (1) Pakistan quest for nuclear power (2) imposition of sanctions on Pakistan by the US regarding its nuclear program (3) the US apathetic stance over Kashmir Issue (4) support extended to Taliban and recognition of their government in Afghanistan by Pakistan.

### 2.9.3 The Nuclear Issue & Sanctions

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is gazed at as the originator of nuclear culture in Pakistan. Consequently, nuclear weapon to deter Indian nuclear threat was regarded as ultimate goal by political leadership, policy planers and even general public. In 1974, nuclear test by India compacted Bhutto fortitude to get hold of nuclear weapons. In this regard Pakistan rebuffed to sign Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The US reciprocated, by cutting off its aid program under section 699 of Foreign Assistance Act 1961. However, in 1979 Soviet

---

occupation of Afghanistan fetched the two allies closer and US champion of democracy for its own interest kept all democratic norms aside and extended its support to military regime in Pakistan. On the other hand Pakistan guaranteed US authorities that it will not resort to nuclear detonation. In 1985 the US congress passed Pressler Amendment that, it is mandatory for US president to endorse congress yearly that Pakistan did not own nuclear devices before granting economic aid. Subsequent to Soviet withdrawal all US calculated ends accomplished and the US began to pressurize Pakistan to roll back its nuclear program. On Pakistan snub the US president failed to comply with Pressler Amendment although Pakistan gave some pledges in this regard like (1) it did not own nuclear weapons (2) would not conduct nuclear tests (3) would not develop weapon grade uranium (4) would not reassign this technology to any other country. But these assertions were not enough to gratify US congress while under Pressler Amendment US president did not enjoy power to waive sanctions. These developments created endless problems for Pakistan since its relations with US got strained, there was civil war in its western neighboring country, there was volatility in Central Asia as well and there existed anxiety between India and Pakistan over Kashmir issue. In such tough conditions US president Clinton endeavored to minimize effects of Pressler Amendment by passing Brown Amendment that empowered US president to find new avenues for Pakistan and to find key concerning Pakistan’s procurement of F-16 for which Pakistan had already paid for. On diplomatic front Pakistan endeavored to get waiver of sanctions. In the meantime, on 11th May, 1998 India conducted nuclear test in Rajasthan, 70 miles distant from Pakistani border. Two weeks later on 28th May, 1998 Pakistan responded with six nuclear tests in Chaghi, Baluchistan.\(^{233}\)

In the same year sanctions were evenly inflicted on India and Pakistan under Brownback I amendment of 1998. However, in 1999 Brownback II was conceded that asked for waiver of sanctions. The US lifted almost all the sanctions from India while Pakistan got respite in only 2 sectors i.e. agriculture and lending by the US marketable bank.

Brownback II enthroned power in US president to waive Pressler amendment. Government of Pakistan and the Pakistani inhabitants in the US pleaded president for waiver of sanctions but US president rebuffed to make use of this power. Pakistan dissented against the disparity and insisted for waiver of sanctions to ensure egalitarianism. From 1998-2000 a series of strategic dialogues were demeanor between India and US, in these dialogues both countries hashed out about security and NPT, prospects of Indo-US and cooperation in strategic and economic fields. US insisted India to sign Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) but India brusquely snubbed to realize US aspiration. Pakistan was pleased with these developments and anticipated that its nuclear issue would remain intact. The new US government sent secretary of state on 11 August, 2001 who elucidated that dictatorship and nuclear issue barred the US from establishing cordial relations with Pakistan and sanctions inflicted on Pakistan concerning democratic issue could only be waived off after restitution of democracy in Pakistan. He added that US former as well as the government in power supported dialogues between the two traditional rivals. The episode of 9/11 brought momentous change in global politics that brought the two old allies close again. Consequently, US president lifted sanctions that disallowed the US to export arms to Pakistan. Critics argued that US champion of democracy gave up their norms when their own interests are at stake.

2.10 CONCLUSION

The relations between Pakistan and United States never remained smooth. Whenever United States needed us we shook hands with them but when Pakistan needed United States it was nowhere and we can see many times US did this to us for example we got a big setback in 1971 even in 1965 then on our nuclear program and its development that Pakistan was trying to continue US imposed many sanctions we can see in the entire process 100 times US did that raising eye brows and even conspiring and once again we become partner
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of US once it needed us in 1962 US asked Pakistan when there was a Sino-India war not to interfere with India otherwise that was a right time Pakistan could have invaded it or could have attacked India for Kashmir that was a time India was defeated against the hands of Chinese so that was the right time for Pakistan to achieve its objective we did not then thereafter we served the purpose of US we did not react in 1965 we could not do much in 1971. Pakistan remained isolated in 1979 when Russia invaded Afghanistan then the US came to Pakistan and asked for the help that we provided.\textsuperscript{236}

By joining hands with the US no objective has been attained by Pakistan. Pakistan’s basic objective was to secure the country that could not be attained and in 1971 we lost half of our part which means our dependency made our objective attaining only a dream. There are three principles of realism that is self-help, state and survival what we were looking we had a state its survivability was a problem for us and rather depending upon our own self that is self-help we were looking here and there so sovereignty and integrity of the state was the objective but we could not maintain that because of the alliance the weapons given to us by USA those didn’t serve the purpose what we were looking for.

CHAPTER – 3

PAK-US SECURITY RELATIONS IN THE WAKE OF 9/11

\textsuperscript{236} Dr. Muhammad Khan, Head of the Department (HoD) International Relations, National Defense University, Islamabad. Interview with the author on March, 20, 2014, Islamabad.
The cluster implications of 9/11 event rapidly engulfed the US foreign policy processes when geo-economic and geo-political instruments of foreign policy were coated by power politics under international relations wherein power dissolve every issue of nation/state. The event of 9/11 also brought the two traditional allies closer once again, transforming Pakistan into frontline state. After considerable appraisal Pakistan decided not only to objure the terrorist attacks but to facilitate the US in its attack on terrorists. Additionally, Pakistan decided to keep itself standoffish from direct involvement in the attack on Afghanistan. The US demanded Pakistan to let her for over-flight and transportation, to stop militants across Pakistan’s border.

However, the predicted fallouts of closing Pak-Afghan borders proved to be quite different since Pakistan didn’t deploy its forces enough and the US didn’t bring enough forces to Afghanistan to avert the laid-back outflow of Al-Qaeda units. Since it has always been problematic to seal the mountainous border between Afghanistan and Pakistan even the former Soviet Union could not do so during 1980s. However, the task for Pakistan was even more challenging because of the autonomy given to the tribal areas. Subsequent to the US and allied forces attack on Afghanistan extensive number of militants ran away to sanctuaries in the border area earlier used by them against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. After the US incursion Pakistan deployed its forces on Pak-Afghan border to contain the militants in Afghanistan. The preliminary outcome of this attack favored the US since over thousand militants were killed and hundreds of the accused were caught. Washington publically esteemed Pakistan’s role in this regard. Pakistan’s decision to join the US led war on terror transformed its Afghan and Taliban policy. During Soviet-Afghan war Pakistan played the role of frontline state, while the alliance diluted due to nuclear detonation and then military coup. However,

---


9/11 again elevated the Pakistan’s position in the eyes of the US policy planners. Domestically, Pakistan’s government faced denunciation because it was common perception among the masses that Pakistan was fighting a proxy war. Pakistan’s remarriage with the US fetched lot of criticism from religious groups and even some of the members of security establishment. Pakistan’s security agency ISI still in charge of state Afghan policy made it quite difficult to suddenly change Afghan policy based on “Strategic Depth” vis-à-vis India. These circumstances demanded new the US policy towards Pakistan considering Pakistan’s strategic preferences. Pakistan’s forces and security establishment were unwilling to revisit its Afghan policy since they gazed at Islamic fanaticism as tool to lessen the military gap between India and Pakistan. Although Pakistan made compromise on its short-term policy objectives by discerning terrorism as a security threat but overall Pakistan’s threat perception remained India centric.239 The decision made President Musharraf ostracized among the masses as well, still Musharraf persisted the policy of fighting against the terrorism. The US on the other side avowed Pakistan a “pivotal state” and its leadership “a voice of moderation and reason in the Islamic world.”240 To understand security arrangements between Pakistan and the United States it is however necessary to have understanding of the history of Pakistan’s security environment.

3.1 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF PAK-US SECURITY RELATIONS

Since Pakistan’s creation Pak-US relations are watched over by vested interests on both sides primarily dealing the issues of national security, regional constancy and strategic interests. To be more accurate, the major objectives of Pakistan’s foreign policy in general and with regard to the United States in particular are its territorial integrity,


feasible politico-economic system and regional constancy. One can envision many other epitomes in tracking down of these objectives such as equilibrating ties with the major neighboring giants and concerted ties with the Muslim world. Contest, face-off and of late collaboration have categorized among the South Asian collaborators. In totality, Pakistan”s engrossment with its national security has been the assay-mark of its discreet account.

Likewise the United States followed up its own interests in the region depending upon the vacillating regional and global happenings. The US objectives in South and Southwest Asia can be characterized as filling power vacuity, containing communism, regional steadiness, single state security, promotion of regional cooperation, manifestation in Indian Ocean, facilitation of forces and bases between Pacific and Atlantic, conserving regional power balance, and promoting Westernization and prowestern influences. If one closely analyzes the objectives tracked through foreign policy by both Pakistan and United States he will find apparent convergence of interest on many issues. Since inception of Pakistan its leaders are engaged with regard to the issue of state security and regional stability. It is the state security that remained the focus and policy domineering for Pakistan also reflected in country”s foreign policy.

3.1.1 Regional/External Constituent

Regional factors play more pivotal role in security environment of Pakistan sometime this role might exceed than the domestic factors. Global and regional happenings have been harmonizing such as in 1971 tragedy of East Pakistan Indian factor proved to be critical one. Similarly the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan proved to be a crucial factor in revival of its alliance with the United States. In the revival of alliance the geostrategic location of Pakistan cannot be ignored. Factors like geography, history and culture have transmuted South Asian regional security system that remained mostly imbalanced and susceptible. Pakistan”s security environment can be seen both in South Asian and Southwest Asian standpoint mainly owing to the geographical factor. Until 1970s Pakistan”s security was endangered by India but Soviet intervention in
Afghanistan invigorated threat on its western border. Such hazardous situation occurred when military ruler was at the helm of affair. Again when the incident of 9/11 occurred Pakistan was facing the same situation as it was facing during 1980s. However, the security quandary of Pakistan can be understood through varied facets.

i. The Sub-continental Panorama

India holds vital position in South Asia due to number of factors including its size and resources that gives it upper hand over its other South Asian neighbors. It always tried to endorse British legacy in its relations with Soviet Union, Afghanistan and Iran alongside its aspiration of naval supremacy in Indian Ocean. Disintegration of Pakistan in 1971, Indian nuclear test in 1974 and the role played by it in Sri Lanka are few examples in the long list of accusations against India. India”s muffled policy during Soviet intervention and despite of Pakistan”s heightened security quandary, adopted an intimidating stance over Pakistan”s nuclear program and equipped military force. It is because of this reason that Pakistan perceives that India is a bigger threat than Taliban, terrorism and extremism. They had calculated their risk factor terrorism risks are acceptable to them whereas Indian aggression or hegemony is not acceptable to Pakistan so it was a calculated decision by the military establishment to go into military alliances with USA because in the long run the impact of those alliances can be minimized whereas if Pak let India to override Pakistan”s interest it would be irreparable loss for Pakistan because Pakistan security policy is India centric there is no other target for Pakistan against whom its security paradigms is established but India.241

ii. Kashmir Issue

Kashmir issue is an evident mark of territorial estrangement overlooking Muslim majority aspirations. All efforts to reinforce regional amity and constancy cannot be
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realized until relations between India and Pakistan are not regularized, and, the only way of attain ing this objective is hidden in the resolution of Kashmir issue. It is because of this issue that the two countries antagonized each other many times. The worst part of this confrontation is that it brought endless arm race and trust deficit.

iii. Afghanistan Crisis

Pakistan estimated and deserved a better gratitude from India with regard to its boosted geo-strategic susceptibility earlier in view of Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and high influx of refugees and presently in its efforts in Global War on Terror (GWoT). Previously India’s cordial relations with Afghanistan and warm political and military ties with former Soviet Union heightened Pakistan’s qualms of this strong triangle. Even presently there are evidences of Russian and Indian military support to militants against Pakistan. Because of its tumultuous geostrategic location Pakistan felt itself squashed in by security risk all around it.

iv. Meddling in Domestic Affairs

Since its inception Pakistan’s relation with India remained deteriorated and characterized by trust deficit and mutual confrontation. Both the countries have put accusation of meddling in the internal affairs of each other. In fact India never accepted the existence of Pakistan rather always anticipated that Pakistan would knock off bit by bit by abrasion. The articulated role of India in Pakistan’s segregation in 1971 substantiated such security threats when Pakistan faced security problems on both its eastern and western borders in 1980s and when its internal susceptibilities were ostensible. The unrests in Sind in 1983 hampered all the efforts of regularizing the relations between the two states. Pakistan’s domestic susceptibilities seem to coincide with its external intimidations. Likewise in 1980s when Sikh separatist movement added to the qualms of Indian government, New Delhi immediately put culpability of this internal distress on Pakistan. The ethno-nationalist movements in South Asia have not
been meek authenticities, and external factors have overlain the national boundaries of South Asian states.\textsuperscript{242}

\textbf{v. Arm Race}

One of the bitter realities of Indo-Pak contention is arm race that put the regional stability and security at stake. It is one of the harsh facts that the region where one-fifth of humanity is determined for the existence, the precedency has been summoning up of arms even at the expense of basic provisions. Pakistan”s security engrossment is essentially for self-sustaining defense while India”s objective is building-up of strong arm and naval force that forced Pakistan to strive for power balance in the region that could guarantee its endurance.\textsuperscript{243} It is also obvious that if India wants to play a role of regional power, this aspiration of India might lead to regional volatility. Consequently, it will culminate into stepping up of arm race and militarism with the addition of foreign encroachment. One answer to guarantee regional stability is to condense Indo-Pak tension and exasperation. By plummeting it defense budget India can lead the region towards serenity. Allocation of major portion of budget upsurges not only its technical base but its manpower as well. By doing this India has abridged the security level of its neighbors though the major intent of India is increasing its own security.\textsuperscript{244} When Afghan crisis begun in 1980 the traditional allies came closer in reciprocity India increased its warmness in its relations with Soviet Union since India started blame game and uttered that Pakistan is the key factor in superpower competition in South Asia.\textsuperscript{245} When Pakistan offered no-war pact on September 15, 1981, India misapprehended this and grasped it a Pakistan”s tactic to convince United States to approve aid package for it. Pakistan like its other South Asian states contemplate that India essentially wanted to contain and
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institutionalize the ties of external power with South Asian states. Number of happenings like India’s occupation of Siachin Glacier in 1984, conglomerating its troops on Pakistani borders for “Operation Brass Tacks” in 1986-87, Kargil episode in 1990s gave sever bombshell to the efforts of regularizing relations between traditional foes.

vi. Southwest Asian Panorama

The loss of buffer status by Afghanistan after Soviet invasion left long lasting traces on security developments of South Asia. Pakistan of course reluctant was dragged into the crisis that ultimately put burden of millions of refugees on Pakistan, also the turmoil brought security threats to its territorial sovereignty besides its own tempestuous history of ethno-nationalist movements. Pakistan being situated at the junction of South and Southwest Asia could do nothing but be regulated by the external happenings. Pakistan’s support to Afghanistan cause and efforts for peace culminated into Geneva Accord in April 1988. Withdrawals of Soviet forces from Afghanistan can surely be a result of Afghan resistance backed by Pakistan. However, Pakistan had to pay and is still paying the cost in terms of financial loss as well as loss of manpower. The War on Terror can truly be accredited to a second season of Afghan crisis.

3.1.2 Politics of Insight/Muddle

When it comes to discussing Pak-US bilateralism the role played by their mutual perception and spitting image cannot easily be ignored that accentuates the convergence and divergence of the interest. United States link with this region owing to the geographical, cultural factors and British legacy leads to gap of information of the region. Additionally, Indo-Pak rivalry seemed to be a tough link for US policy makers, since the complexities of subcontinent were inexplicable for US policy planners. Similarly South
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Asian states gazed at United States as the most unpredictable and fly-by-night power whose relations with the regional states oscillate with its own global interests. India gazed Pak-US alliance in 1950s, 1980s and post 9/11 as irritating factor for India while Pakistan alleged that from the very beginning United States is endorsing the interests and hegemonic designs of India. India was/is considered as “the darling” state of Asia for superpowers despite its initial stance in Cold War and then in Afghan crisis, as it was vowed by both the superpowers during Cold War and now by United States. Pakistan has some reservations about the nature of US pledge, since Pakistan is not in US urgencies rather its precedence list includes Europe, Southeast Asia and reinforcing an “extra-South Asia factor” in its goals. Pakistanis felt deflated because of imperturbability shown by United States during second half of 1960s and 1970s. In 1980s Pakistan was discriminated by US on nuclear issue.

Since its engagement in South Asia United States has shown interest in India, this is the reason why most of the South Asian specialists have been expert of Indian Studies. However, US never contemplate any external force a threat to South Asia rather it kept itself aloof from Indo-Pak rivalry. It has some economic interests in the region that are clearly imitated by Indo-US commercial, technical and military ventures over the past decades.

3.1.3 Bilateralism Reentered

The security arrangements between Pakistan and United States commenced in 1950s and ended in the mid of 1960s when United States put arms embargo against Pakistan. The divergence between their interests left Pakistan with the feeling of being dumped by

---


United States. US-Soviet rapprochement, US engagement in Vietnam War and its intimacy with Moscow and New Delhi against China became another irritant between Pak-US relations. Pakistan’s closer ties with Peoples Republic of China (PRC) were not welcomed by United States. The broken security arrangements between United States and Pakistan in 1965 continued for next 15 years. In 1970s Pakistan felt discriminated by US for making its nuclear program a theme. Even Z.A. Bhutto’s regime was deemed to be under strong pressure of United States.\textsuperscript{250} The decade of 1980s marked the new beginning of the sour relations by reappraisal from both sides. Revival of the relation in 1980s stemmed from security arrangements in domestic, regional and global perspective. Security threat amplified for Pakistan from its western border that made the situation in Middle East unstable coupled with security threat from eastern border. Likewise its domestic susceptibilities coincided with US assessments of new developments in the region. Though there still existed some divergence of interests but their bilateral relation continued efficaciously. The things to see of this bilateralism are: variegation of channels, military and economic aid, regional congruence, agreement on nuclear issue and democracy.\textsuperscript{15} The gap of about 15 years created disconsolateness and estrangement on both sides. Pakistan felt dumped by its partner by supporting India. The Nixon Doctrine bucked up the regional power to play a leading role that made Pakistan feel a tiniest significant state of the region. These feelings coupled with Carter administration efforts to compel France to pull back its commitment of providing Pakistan reprocessing plant gave rise to anti-American sentiments. During this period US assistance to Pakistan touched its lowest level.\textsuperscript{251} With regional development of 1979 Pakistan emerged as the largest beneficiary of aid after Israel and Egypt. Military aid, technical training programs, and negotiation on

regional issues culminated into diplomatic and military cooperation. This gave rise to American writings on Pakistan, communal conferences, joint visits, convergence of interests and increasing part played by US agencies that supported Pakistan both in short and long-term ventures. Such cooperative measures in civil and military fields continued, when Pakistan was confronting with ethnologically assorted military regime, and was trying to engross the US cultural “assault” along with its own grave problem of urban violence.252

American aid package was provided keeping in view the heightened security fears. However military aid dominated the aid package during 1980s. Pakistan’s complaint over ever increasing regional threats to its security led to its military upgradation. It is astonishing to note that India being powerful in all three forces in terms of weapons, manpower and hardware felt jeopardized by the US military aid to Pakistan. It was quite clear for Pakistan to have defense at its priority in relations with the US but it was by no means intended to intimidate its eastern neighbor. Afghan penetration in Pakistan, violation of Pakistan’s air space, presence of Soviet forces on its western border rationalize Pakistan’s decision to acquire F-16s, AWACs, armored carriers and frigates. By 1990 many foreign policy experts both in the US and Pakistan were of the view that this aid would continue even after the changes befell in regional scenario.253

By 1980s Pak-US bilateral symmetry endeavored to deal with regional power balance structure. There were mounting concern of Indian role of regional policeman; even superpowers were subjected to criticism for its support to India. Whenever Pakistan raised its voice against India it was identified as the “typical cry” or a tactic used to pull strings of the external powers. However, India’s intervention in Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and blockade against Nepal in 1989 was the similar instances as earlier raised by Pakistan. Geo- military situation of South Asia favored India but at the same time made the region
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precarious leading to India’s own internal problems. The approach to deal with regional problems is unvarying adopted by Pakistan from the beginning and by United States lately.\textsuperscript{254}

Though Afghanistan situation is posing a great threat to regional security yet it is a point of convergence between Pakistan and United States. Mujahedin brawl against Soviet force backed by Pakistan at the expanse of its relations with Soviet Union\textsuperscript{255} have been the trademark of 1980s. The extended war in Afghanistan generated pressure in Pakistan for overt support to Mujahedin and to discern their Interim Government (AIG).\textsuperscript{256}

Bhutto was under grave pressure domestically to recognize AIG while jeopardized by the Soviet Union of spill out of Afghan embroilment. In the meantime different circle analyzed impact of Afghan crisis on Pak-US relations. In 1989 Bhutto paid an official visit to United States where leaders of both the states decided to devise a strategy to resolve Afghan crisis.\textsuperscript{22}

During 1980s the major irritant between Pak-US relations was nuclear program of Pakistan; the decision to “go nuclear” was taken to deter Indian peril. Therefore while considering aid package for Pakistan, the United States felt pressure domestically as well as externally. However taking into contemplation its regional and global interest, the US government agreed to provide aid to Pakistan with certain legislative check and balances. Sanctions imposed on Pakistan under Symington Amendment were also lifted under certification provided by the US President. The United States was in quandary because if it halts aid package Pakistan will continue a policy individually and it will undermine its posture on Afghanistan. Similarly if the US continues to support Pakistan while overlooking its nuclear programs it would be like upsetting Congress and other group
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opinion. Thus US had to find a midway to deal the issue. However, the United States who regarded Pakistan’s nuclear issues a major irritant to their bilateral relation slowly but surely consented regional constraints of Pakistan’s security dilemma in 1980s. Despite of all the US understanding of Pakistan’s security dilemma nuclear issue will remain bone of contention in their bilateral relations. Though the treaty signed between India and Pakistan for not attacking each other’s nuclear installations is an optimistic measure for regional security but it would be immature to think that all delicate issues have been resolved. Nevertheless, the US tilt towards India is not a good sign for Pakistan that may have its implications on regional security. Earlier Indo-Nepalese and Indo-Sri Lankan dispute didn’t get any response from United States and China justified South Asian states critical of Indian role as regional policeman.

The issue of democracy is another aspect that dragged US grievances against Pakistan, though the two consecutive democratic governments successfully assuaged US reservations. No doubt Pakistani people want steady, peaceful and affluent country, and they are aware of the fact that it could only be possible if democratic governments continue to work. The worst law and order condition of Sind, constitutional impairment, grave economic problems, and issue of unemployment, inflation and terrorism can only be solved if democratic process continues. It may be hasty to pass any judgment against the present democratic set up. Pakistan being a prey of domestic and regional security threats needs time, determinate efforts and vibrant policies to resolve the security issues.

3.2 9/11 BOUTS & PAK-US SECURITY RELATIONS

3.2.1 9/11 Occurrences & United States

The terrorist attacks of 9/11 had deeply affected the security policy of United States that is clearly reflected in Washington campaign against Taliban and Al-Qaeda. United States
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took no time to recognize Osama Bin Laden and Al-Qaeda mastermind of these attacks. Shortly after the attacks Bush addressed the nation on television and said “an apparent terrorist act, and those who committed it will be taken to task and terrorism against our nation will not stand.” In his meeting with the Vice President he said that “we are at war.” Immediately after that, President Bush called for a meeting at air force base Nebraska where director Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) gave him briefing that only Al-Qaeda can do such things and their chats are eavesdropped commending each other after attacks. President Bush then went back to White House and addressed the nation. He said

“Today our fellow citizens, our freedom and our very way of life has been attacked by deliberate and deadly attacks, freedom will be defended. Thousands of lives have just been ended by the evil despicable act of terrorism. Our country is strong, great people have been moved to defend the great nation. Our military is powerful and prepared. The search is under way for those who are behind this, make no mistakes the US will hunt down and punish those responsible for these acts. No distinction will be made between the terrorists and those who harbor them. Today we and our allies stand together to win this war against terrorism.”

Similarly US Secretary of state while issuing a statement said that it is to make clear to Afghanistan and Pakistan that “this is the show time.”

At that time Taliban were at the helm of affairs in Afghanistan that took power in 1996, now providing protection to Al-Qaeda in reoccurrence of financial backing, while Pakistan’s intelligence institution played its part in consolidating Taliban regime.

To deal with the situation and to get the maximum benefit out of it, President Bush summoned a meeting of his war cabinet to ponder that what would be the next step of US administration. It was the Bush decision that set the beginning of war on terror.

---

Bush held that US by no means will tolerate any terrorist activity and will target the terrorist with global reach. However, US Secretary of State Collin Powel from the very beginning emphasized the need to make Pakistan ally due to its geostrategic position, while Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld expressed the need to utilize all available resources to their very best.

On 16th December, 2000 before taking oath of his office, President Bush was briefed about the biggest challenges the new government is confronted with; these challenges are Al-Qaeda, increasing tension between the two nuclear giants of South Asia and Pakistan’s closer ties with Taliban.261

3.2.2 Bush Doctrine

The terrorist attack changed the entire defense policy of United States and war on terror became the main concern of Bush administration. President Bush in his meeting with British prime minister on January 31, 2003 stated “we now recognize that oceans no longer protect us that we are vulnerable to attack and the worst attack can come from someone with weapon of mass destruction and using them on the American people.” Keeping in view National Security Strategy (NSS) 2002, the principle features of Bush Doctrine were declared to be preemption, unilateralism and military supremacy. US Vice President before Council of Foreign Relations explained Bush Doctrine as “Only we (USA) can lead, we can rally the world in a task of this complexity, against an enemy so elusive and so resourceful. This responsibility does not come to us by chance. We are in a unique position because of our unique assets, because of the character of our people, the strength of our ideals, the might of our military, and the enormous economy that supports it.”262 A document released by White House on September 20, 2002 expounded the Bush Doctrine that declared state power focal point of the strategy. The document


depicted that the face-off between liberty and absolutism came to an end with the triumph of liberty, and by developing good relations with major power US will target the terrorist and will preserve world peace. Bush idea was to regulate the world by utilizing country’s peerless economic and military power. Perhaps this was an ostensible shift in US foreign policy.\textsuperscript{263}

3.3 PAKISTAN’S RETORT TO US SECURITY POLICIES

The role played by Pakistan for US during Cold War earned a name of “the most allied ally” for her. However she lost her worth in 1960s that again elevated after Soviet invasion of Afghanistan but again Pakistan met with the same fate with the fall of Soviet Union in 1991. In fact, this unpredictability in relations has not only hurt Pakistan but was debated many times by Pakistanis that how US knock down Pakistan once its expediency was ended. There are number of factors that depict that why United States cast off Pakistan i.e. its worsened relations with India, political instability, amalgamation of Islam in state identity and tracking down of the policy of uranium enrichment. Nevertheless it is the geo-strategic position of Pakistan that coincided Pakistan’s national interest with the US policy essentials of the day.

The latest strategic partnership between Pakistan and United States is proving to be an acid test for Pakistan. US identification of Taliban regime in Afghanistan as patron of terrorist attacks in United States and in retort its first target in Afghanistan put Pakistan in grave catastrophe. Again it was the Pakistan’s geographical factor that led to the revival of alliance. Pakistan acceptance of US offer to join the war is not an astonishing decision. Pakistan’s partnership in the war ruptured its ties with Afghanistan. Domestically too Pakistan is feeling the heat since the debate of Pakistan’s joining war on terror is passing by all the other issues among the common masses.

Change in global security settings in general and in South Asia particular has deep impact on Pak-US alliance. Stephen P. Cohen argued “no part of the world was more affected by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 than South Asia.” 264 US identification of Osama and Al-Qaeda mastermind of the terrorist attacks was the clear indication of the fact that Afghanistan is surely going to face the fierce policy of US and since Afghanistan is a landlocked country therefore it is the territory of Pakistan that provides an outlet for attack on Afghanistan.

3.3.1 Pakistan: Yet again on the Track of Alliance

With the inception of 9/11 event things have been changed a new kind of phenomenon has been replacing last time ideological incapability previously it was communism that Western world was fighting against now communism has been replaced by terrorism and communist has been replaced by terrorists. Al-Qaeda and Taliban have emerged now as new enemies and therefore importance of military alliances has been augmented. 265 Before the event of 9/11 the relations between Pakistan and United States were stressed because of military regime in Pakistan but subsequent to the terrorist attacks President Bush advised the Secretary of state to bring Pakistan in the orbit. Therefore, Musharraf was asked to take side of US or be ready to face the outcomes of supporting Taliban. On September 11, 2001, the director of ISI in his meeting with the chairman of Senate Intelligence Committee and other law maker elucidated Pakistan”s position by saying that Pakistan is striving hard to win over Taliban to fork out Osama to US. 266 He further added by saying that all US efforts to target terrorist and capture Osama are inadequate without Pakistan”s assistance. 267

On September 12, 2001 the deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage mustered up director ISI and Pakistan”s ambassador to US, to his office to know the Pakistan”s
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standing in war on terror. In response director ISI bluntly said that Pakistan is always on US side it was US that always left Pakistan alone in the crisis situation. In response Armitage said that not thinking of the past decide future, and eventually the director made pledge to US that Pakistan will support US in its war on terror.268

Musharraf in his meeting on September 13, 2001 with Corp Commanders of Pakistan held “The US will strike like a wounded bear and it will attack Afghanistan.”269 Despite of the divergence by some of the supporting Generals Musharraf persisted to extend support to United States rather than Taliban. In his book Musharraf wrote that he did this in the interest of the country and that other decision might hurt Pakistan’s interest.270 On September 13, 2001 Armitage fork out list of US seven demands on Pakistan to the director ISI. These demands were; not to support Al-Qaeda forces along its border and halt them logistic support as well, provide US States with over-flight and landing rights for military and intelligence activities, provide US with territorial entrée for intelligence and military operations against Al-Qaeda, share intelligence information with United States, openly condemn terrorism, to stop fuel shipment to Taliban, and breakdown link with Taliban government if indication are found that they are protecting Al-Qaeda.

These demands provoked very strong reaction of the Generals disagreeing with Musharraf, they held that it is only a one-sided deal and there is nothing for Pakistan in it, also it will provoke strong reaction domestically. It will also carry wrong message to Kashmiris if we play foul game with Taliban.271 On September 14, 2001 US Secretary of State in his telephonic call to President Musharraf said “the American people would not understand if Pakistan was not in the fight with US.” On September 15 simultaneous meetings of cabinet and National Security Council were called and subsequent to these
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meeting on 16 September Pakistan’s foreign minister proclaimed to fight against terrorism within its geographical limits. Perhaps this was the most crucial decision from Pakistan to join hand with United States. On 20th September President Bush reprimanded that “every nation in every region now has a decision to make: either you are with us or you are with terrorists. From, this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by United States as a hostile regime.”

It was a kind of indirect threat to Pakistan that if you turn down to join the war on terror then you will be gazed as a terrorist. Bringing Pakistan under US umbrella for its fight against terrorism was the important constituent of US policy. However, Musharraf demanded for waiver of sanctions inflicted during 1990s, resumption of arm supply, giving debt relief and proviso of loans from IMF and World Bank. Although CIA was not in favor to show so much conviction in ISI but the later intelligence network in Afghanistan left CIA with no choice.

A day before Bush pronouncement Musharraf had made his address in which he called it “wrong decision” in such critical situation of a country that have its repercussions for Pakistan’s national interest. He related revival of economy, safeguard of territorial integrity, country’s nuclear possessions and Kashmir cause with the country’s interests. He held “these have to be safeguarded at all costs. Any wrong judgment on our part can damage all our interests.” Pakistan was seeking tradeoff, that in retort of Pakistan’s alliance its interests will be safeguarded. By this he meant that (1) Pakistan forces would not be obligated to fight across the borders i.e. Afghanistan and Iraq (2) this coalition would curtail assassinations of innocents (3) the next government in Afghanistan will be well-disposed to Pakistan (4) Kashmiri fight for self-determination will not be branded as terrorism and the freedom fighter will not be targeted under the wide-ranging of regional terrorism (5) there will be made no effort to neutralize Pakistan of its nuclear and missile possessions. Certainly Musharraf articulated his trepidation.


often during his regime that generated negative impacts of public opinion in Pakistan about the war. He went on saying that “Pakistan comes first.”  

3.3.2 Transformation in Bilateral Relations

Pakistan’s decision to join US led war on terror opened new avenues for both the countries; with this decision Pakistan’s standing for US regional security set up got elevated. Both the countries took decisive actions to take away all the hurdles that deteriorated their bilateral relations in post-cold war period and resolute to determine their relations on new lines encompassing terrorism, security and political and economic fields.

Pakistan’s status of frontline state for containing communism in the initial phase of Cold War and later on Soviet intervention in Afghanistan followed by a series of sanctions inflicted against Pakistan that soured its relations with US as well.  

Prior to 9/11 Pakistan was facing four sets of sanctions. The first set of sanction was inflicted by President Bush under Pressler amendment that suspended economic and military assistance to Pakistan. Under this sanction US president was required to certify that Pakistan didn’t own any nuclear devices before releasing economic aid. In October 1990 US President failed to certify the Congress that led to the suspension of economic aid together with military assistance.

Next set of sanctions were inflicted against Pakistan after nuclear detonation of May, 1998 followed by the third set of sanctions after army chief Musharraf took over the democratic government in October 1999. In November 2000, fourth set of sanctions were
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inflicted on Pakistan”s Ministry of Defense and Pakistan”s Space and Upper Atmosphere Research Organization on the charge of receipt of missile technology from China.  

Subsequent to terrorist attack of 9/11 Pakistan”s decision to join US led war on terror led to the waiver of first three sets of sanctions. Consequently, US security agencies were permitted to operate in the border areas of Pakistan to hunt down Taliban and Al-Qaeda operatives. Resultantly considerable numbers of Al-Qaeda and Taliban suspects were caught. In return of the services rendered by Pakistan in war on terror US endowed Pakistan with economic, military and technological assistance.

3.3.3 Joining War on Terror and Indian Factor

Indian factor seems to be dominant in Pakistan”s decision to become a frontline state in US led war on terror. India antagonist to Pakistan wanted to get maximum benefit out of the situation blamed Pakistan for everything. Indian political analysts on CNN said “The Taliban is the creation of Pakistan”s ISI.” In an interview Dr. Maleeha Lodhi said “the 9/11 attacks interrupted India”s dream to isolate Pakistan internationally. Indian frustration intensified when Pakistan became a front line state in the War against Terror.” India remained a bigger threat to Pakistan”s security and after 9/11 India offered US all kind of support needed by them. The situation might get worst for Pakistan if India being ally of US in war on terror, fly with all sophisticated weapon over Pakistan”s airspace. Pakistan to take maximum benefit from its new status in war on terror could not pay for continuous tension with India because deployment of its troops on Indian border did not match with its standing in war on terror. In his address to the nation President Musharraf tried to assure that he made this decision just to guarantee

---
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Pakistan’s security. However, the ice between Pakistan and India melt a bit with US interference in the matter since it was in US interest.\textsuperscript{280}

3.3.4 Pakistan’s endeavor for Taliban to stay in Power

Pakistan’s decision to join US led war on terror was a major shift in Pakistan’s policy, giving the impression of deserting Taliban still it didn’t want Afghanistan to fall to Northern Alliance, patronized by US and India. Pakistan wished that after demise of Taliban Pashtun should stay in power. US had doubts about ISI that they were under the sway of conservatives within ISI but United States was left with no choice but to be dependent on them owing to their intelligence network in Afghanistan. ISI on the other hand vindicated its role on the ground that they be terrified of NA patronized by India might take control of government after fall of Taliban.

3.3.5 Revivification of Terrorists

The situation became complex for US since they didn’t deploy enough troops in Afghanistan to surmount this paucity they opt for Afghan chieftains. These chieftains linked with Tajiks-dominated Northern Alliance led operations against Pashtun Taliban instead of fighting against Al-Qaeda who first blot out in mountains in Afghanistan and then outflew to Pakistan. Consequently, Pashtun majority disaffected since Tajik dominated allies” snapped up power in Kabul and formed defense and police force. Apart from losing power, Pashtun also agonized with heavy “collateral damage”\textemdash a term introduced to camouflage the causalities of civilians, woman, children and loss of property. Taliban remained sedentary since 2001 staged renaissance. Al-Qaeda too recuperated because of the unresponsive policies of US.

\textsuperscript{280} \textit{The News}, Islamabad, 14 May, 2004.
3.4 TERRORISM MENACE & RETORT

Regardless of Pakistan alliance with US in war on terror, links of Pakistan’s religious factions and some of security personnel with terrorist groups not only troubled the new relations between Pakistan and US but also is a source of intimidation for India, since Pakistan has seen an “epicenter of global terrorism”. Pakistan’s support of Islamic militancy in Pakistan and Afghanistan has also its influence on Kashmir proindependence movement and also reflected in Zia policies in 1980s. Pakistan’s disassociation with Taliban began with Musharraf’s speech of January 2002 in which he avowed that land of Pakistan will not be used for any terrorist activity and also criticized religious immoderation. Consequently, many terrorists were halted although many of them were released thereafter.

The December 2001 attack on Indian parliament complex elicited violent reaction since the assailants were identified as member of Lashkar-e-Tayyiba (LT), recognized by US as foreign terrorist organization (FTO), prompted Pakistan to adopt modest stance because India deployed its forces on Pakistan’s border. The stressed relations between the two traditional foes continued for next 10 months giving the sense that the tension might not take the form of nuclear war.

Another critical aspect was that US military operations in Eastern Afghanistan in 2001-2002 led many Al-Qaeda members to abscond to Pakistan from where they led hit and run attack on US and allied forces in Afghanistan. It was also reported that top leadership of Al-Qaeda and Taliban have taken sanctuary in distant areas of Pakistan that resulted terrorist attacks on foreigners in Pakistan, one of such attack was abducting and killing of Wall Street Journal Daniel Pearl, after a few days wife and daughter of US ambassador were killed in grenade attack near US embassy, other such attacks were car

bombing outside Karachi hotel slaying 11 French defense technicians, car bombing outside US consulate in Karachi slaying 12 Pakistanis. All these happenings provided General Frank who was on the visit of Pakistan, an opportunity to pressurize President Musharraf to allow US forces for military operations against Taliban and Al-Qaeda in tribal areas of Pakistan leaving Musharraf with no alternative but to endorse the request on March 27, 2002. Therefore Pak-US mutual operations became more frequent.284

With the religious parties coming into power in the then NWFP and Baluchistan and India still encircling Pakistan’s threat perception allowed the radical to operate from FATA populated with hardliner Pashtuns sharing religious and cultural ties with Afghan people. Although 2003 witnessed warmness in Indo-Pak relations still both India and United States pressurized Pakistan to stop its support to Kashmir nationalist movement and seal its training camps in Azad Kashmir.285

War on terror changed the course of international relations that also had impacts on Pakistan’s security policies. When US ambassador expressed his reservations on the functioning of banned organization Musharraf sent 25,000 troops to capture the operatives of these organizations and wrapped their offices. These government actions were responded by highly explosives. On December 14, 2003 remote control bombing was plotted against Musharraf followed by two suicide cars bombing, while these bombers were identified as the members of Jaish-e-Muhammad, another FTO, which according to US had ties with Al-Qaeda.286

---

The success of religious political parties in elections consolidated Musharraf rule thus enabling him to take crucial decisions, like receiving Indian Prime Minister in Islamabad both the leader agreed for conducting “composite dialogue” for “peaceful settlement of bilateral issues, including Jammu and Kashmir, to the satisfaction of both the sides.” Musharraf ensured the Indian Prime Minister that Pakistan will not allow any terrorist group to fulfill their interests by using our land. On Western border Musharraf conducted military operations to eradicate foreign terrorists and Taliban. These efforts coupled with US and Afghan forces across the border led to ferocious fights in 2004, provoked strong denunciation from MMA but Musharraf on his firm resolute underscored that religious
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extremism by no means will be tolerated; he also requested the religious groups to play their part in rooting out religious militancy.  

3.5 EVIDENT AND CLANDESTINE MILITARY OPERATIONS OF PAKISTAN AND UNITED STATES

One dimension of ensuring regional security was operation against the militants within the territorial boundaries of Pakistan particularly directing on the tribal areas of Pakistan. CIA and special US forces worked in collaboration with ISI to chase Osama and top leadership of Al-Qaeda. However the role of ISI was not highlighted so that Pakistan could get easy way out. US National Security Advisor to President Bush, Stephen J. Hadley in an interview on CNN snubbed to give statement on joint operations and said “the relationships we have are very sensitive. They are a matter of domestic politics to these countries, and it would not help our effort against terror to be talking publicly about these relationships.”

These joint activities proved to be successful since Abu Fajar Libbi was arrested on May 2, 2005 in Mardan. Similarly CIA air craft targeted Haitham-al-Yemeni another Al-Qaeda leader on May 7, 2005. In his statement on May 14, 2005 Pakistan information minister denied all such things by saying that “no such incident occurred on the soil of Pakistan.” On one side Pakistan denied such operations, while on the other hand US appreciated Pakistan’s role in counterterrorist operations. US administration was aware of the fact that Musharraf was facing anti-Americanism and his political necessity not to recognize CIA and US Special Forces presence in Pakistan. However, till 2006 Pakistan had forked out about 500 militants and Al-Qaeda operatives to US. In January 2008, US top intelligence officers visited Pakistan and entreated for permission for hunting the militants within the territorial boundaries of Pakistan. Though Pakistan didn’t honor the
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request but it was reported that officials of both the countries reached to certain understanding. K. Alan Kronstadt, an expert of South Asian affairs wrote in April 2008 that “three Predators are said to be deployed at a secret Pakistani airbase and can be launched without specific permission from Islamabad government.” In February, 2008 CIA Predator fired two missiles in Pakistan. 59

3.5.1 Pak-US Operations in Waziristan

Initially it was formally declared that there are no foreign forces within territorial boundaries of Pakistan with the exception of logistic support groups. However, on April 30, 2002 US started operation named Mountain Loin. British, Australian and US troops participated in this operation. Nevertheless, it was not known that where these troops were searching the hideouts of terrorists, but later on the presence of US forces in tribal areas of Pakistan was confirmed. The plan was that United States and allied forces will enter into Waziristan from Afghanistan while Pakistan forces will give backing from border side to build pressure. 290

In the late 19th century British introduced two policies for tribal areas, namely, masterly inactivity and forward policy. Masterly inactivity that kept the British distant from the affairs of tribal areas while forward policy called for regulating the political affairs of the tribal areas while left the interior policy to be dealt by tribal chiefs with the help of political officers. 61

The tribal chiefs were given freedom to regulate tribal activities according to tribal cultural values. These tribes were also financially assisted by the British in response these tribes pledged for the security of British posts. British army officers prepared a tribal levy and gave those military training that became a principal economic source of the tribes.

The decade’s long relation between British and these tribes gave rise to the forward policy. Firstly, boisterous tribes attack on the tribes under British control. Some of them were caught while most of them flew the coop. According to tribal customs fines were inflicted against the tribes of the culprits. The second stage arrived with the loss of government forbearance when the government warned the tribes to establish government writ over the raiders’ tribes and collect the preordained fine and if they failed to comply with the government demands then be ready to face the consequences. The third phase of the policy arrived when tribes failed to comply with government demands. Consequently, expedition was conducted in the hilly tribes with burning some of their houses, seizure of their weapons and then comeback. Now the tribes are well-ordered and prepared for fresh attacks, expeditions and sentence.291

After the conquest of Taliban and Al-Qaeda the remaining elements took refuge to the tribal areas of Pakistan. Pakistan and United States following the forward policy produced the same results. Amongst all the tribes Wazirs were the more inclined to Taliban and venerated the governmental set up established by them in Afghanistan.

3.5.2 Pak-US Excursions in the Pretext of the Forward Policy

Since the inception of Pakistan till 2002, Pakistan’s troops kept distance from the tribal belt that was governed by local chiefs. However, after 9/11 things completely changed and because of growing militancy the US pressurized Pakistan to launch undifferentiated operation in Waziristan. In this regard a policy with three directions was assumed; pursue forward policy to hunt Taliban and Al-Qaeda in South and North Waziristan; if the policy failed to produce the desired results then conduct military expeditions; and thirdly launch some developmental ventures in collaboration with US to win the support of Wazirs. To pursue this policy Rs. 563 million were appropriated in North Waziristan during 2004-

2005. In 2005 there were 18 ventures of education for which Rs. 102.285 million were appropriated, 12 in health division, 10 in communication, 7 in irrigation, 6 in livestock, 5 in forestry, 5 in agriculture and 4 projects of new industry and technology were under construction. For irrigation RS 149 million was appropriated likewise a 4 year college for women was also under construction.292

Along with these developmental projects military operations were launched to hunt Taliban and Al-Qaeda elements. However, Pak-US joint operations were not welcomed domestically. Religious political parties i.e. Jama”t-i-Islami and Jamiat Ulemai-Islam were disallowed in tribal areas.

Pakistan forces along with US launched leastways 7 marauds in Miranshah with no productive results. In South Waziristan 48 marauds were launched while some of the marauds riveted on the area of Durand Line that detached Pakistan from Afghanistan where about 160 people were caught while some of them were released after interrogation. Also the two training camps and communication networks were demolished the militants had set up a sophisticated system of administration comprising budget office, finance office and media center. The militant”s office was also equipped with the electronic devices, computers and other communication devices. The entire system was regulated by foreign activists.293


US forces started to remunerate the influential Waziris $200 per month. By January 2003, 400 Al-Qaeda operatives were arrested by Pakistan’s forces. In May, 2005 government efficaciously reach a contract with a group of 150 tribal chiefs in Bajur where these tribal chiefs agreed not to harbor the Al-Qaeda and Taliban elements and those who failed to do this will be fined Rs. 5 million and would be thrown from the area along with their families. All these actions would be taken according to tribal customs and values. Before this contract the government caught dozens of accused in Bajur.294

In 2004 military operation was conducted in South Waziristan in which two military camps of the militants were smashed, 300 foreign militants and local tribesmen were

slayed or caught. Likewise Pakistan forces lost their 200 men. During operations it was thought that most of the militants fled to North Waziristan therefore in 2005 US administration forced Pakistan to launch military operations in North Waziristan. Therefore, targeted operations were launched on the basis of intelligence since fullfledged operations proved to be an expensive mistake in 2004.²⁹⁵

All round 2010, arm forces conducted operations in Aurakzai and Ba-jur Agencies. However US insisted Pakistan”s government to launch military operation in North Waziristan, a sanctuary for Jalaluddin Haqqani, a standout amongst the best extremist strengths testing U.S., NATO, and Afghan constrains in Afghanistan, but the later refused from propelling military offensives in North Waziristan. Rather, almost 40,000 Pakistani troops in North Waziristan participated in just little operations or stayed inactive on their bases. The Pakistani Army stated it is overstrained with deluge alleviation and military operations in Swat, South Waziristan, Aurakzai, and Bajaur, and can't handle militancy in North Waziristan.²⁹⁶

3.6 WAR ON TERROR & ITS BEARINGS ON PAKISTAN

It is quite hard to determine the costs and benefits of this new partnership; however it is the widely accepted fact that in asymmetrical relations it is the interest of the stronger that carries the day. Weaker nations align themselves with the stronger to get benefits from the relations by securing its crucial interests. Pakistan”s decision of joining the US led war on terror was a premeditated retort to get political and economic benefits coupled with improved security set up, while many of the political analysts in Pakistan regard this decision a major mistake since it has created lot of problems for Pakistan.

²⁹⁵ Carlotta Gall, US Training Pakistani Units Fighting Al-Qaeda, New York Times, April 27, 2005
3.6.1 US National Laws & Its Bearings on Pakistani Community

The direct victim of the 9/11 attacks was the Muslim community since US administration introduced such laws that curtailed their civil rights, legitimized ethnic distinctions, interrogation, pre-emptive confinements and disavowal of the permissible rights of the suspects and those who entertain the uncongenial to United States.

According to the figures of Islamic Advocacy Group (IAG) “hate crimes and discrimination against Muslims rose by 52% to 141 in the United States since September 2001 and civil rights violations jumped by 49% to 1,522.” Likewise, according to the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) “rising Islamophobic rhetoric in American society and Pakistani community were the main targets of administration’s inhuman treatment.” World Islamic Council too held “Muslim in general and mostly Pakistani citizens were the main victims of the US laws and rules.”

In November, 2001 US Senate passed the “Patriot Act” by overwhelming majority, US Attorney General while talking about the act said that “Patriot Act” eradicates all those hurdles that decelerated the process of inquiry of the terrorists. Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) “fingerprinted, photographed and interviewed” the Pakistani community since they were the main target of the measured taken by the United States. The impact of these measures was that almost 3,000 flew to Canada out of which 1100 were deported while about 50,000 planned to come back to Pakistan. Also the Arab-Americans and Pakistanis grumbled about the maltreatment with them by police and immigration authorities. Although it was commonly observed that assailants of “twin tower” didn’t have any connection with Pakistan.

3.6.2 Discernment by US Administration

Subsequent to 9/11 attacks US society has become critical to Muslims predominantly those belonging to Pakistan. The event had also led many Americans to think that Pakistani community in America can say nothing about the event. The environment of

distrust and hunch still persists even after a decade of the attacks. There are about 2.35 million Muslims and 450,000 Pakistani in the United States that are living in US only earning for existence. The notable measure taken by Bush Administration to victimize the Pakistani community was the immigration policy. The intended policy inflicted on migrants specifically Pakistanis was devised to augment country”s security was a clear indication that Pakistanis are no more welcome to United States.\textsuperscript{298}

3.6.3 Immigration Dealings of Justice Department

Due to the changed immigration rules the number of students for higher education, residential areas of doctor, and those seeking jobs in different fields of life, fell sharply. US Justice Department”s Inspector General Glenn A. Fine issued a report that stated “law enforcement agencies had mistreated hundreds of immigrants detained under the new federal laws.” The act authorized the justice department to info sharing between law execution and intelligence agencies. In accordance with the federal law police arrested extensive number of foreign nationals while bulk was Pakistani nationals. The records show that those arrested by police 531 were deported while majority belonged to Pakistan. It was also found that investigation of Glenn Fine didn”t wrap up all the cases of émigrés and prisoners that were projected between 4,000 to 5,000 people yet again majority belonged to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{299}

3.6.4 Newfangled Registering Policy

The newly introduced Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) have directly affected the Muslim community particularly Pakistani since the act required to meet the deadline of reporting to immigration consultants devoid of any previous record of screening. Likewise, security checkout executed on visa applicants hurt Pakistani students as well, that come to US for conducting research and other education. Association of American
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Universities and Association of International Educators (AIE) conducted a survey that tells that “the selective registration program for Muslim male inside the United States has had little success in finding actual terrorist, even while causing great distress and offense to Muslim visitors.”

3.6.5 Furtive Confinements

US policies intensified antipathy among the Pakistanis living in United States since hundreds of them were clandestinely incarcerated and registration process of 25 Muslim countries majority belonging to Pakistan “alienated a lot of these communities, causing great deal of fear and reinforcing the tendency of immigrant communities to huddle together and not trust authorities, which worked against intelligence gathering by law enforcement, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).” Vincent Cannistraro referred “the idea that you stigmatize whole classes of people and profile them because you think this is going to prevent the next terrorist attack is exactly the wrong way [to go about it].”

3.6.6 Visa Screening Knottiness & Social Estrangements

Subsequent to 9/11 event new visa screening procedure was not efficiently dealt by US administration that demanded name check of those who want to come to US. It was in the record that the fresh visa quester number fell sharply and bulk of it belonged to Pakistan. European embassies in Islamabad and consulates in Karachi barred visa dispensation that led to the loss of fresh students to US and European educational institutes. Likewise it is also on the record that the chief lab researcher belonging to Pakistan and other Muslim countries were forced to return to their native countries. The incident of 9/11 intensely affected the Muslim community by dragging them towards

social alienation since in many Western countries dyslogistic views were given about them; moreover Pakistani community was degraded by calling them “Pakis” while in United States possessions of Pakistanis were assailed by the native people. Under these circumstances where other religious minorities were enjoying protection Muslims being discriminated in public and private sectors were insecure.

3.7 DOMESTIC OUT COMES OF 9/11 IN PAKISTAN

War on terror not only changed the nomenclature of South Asian region but also affected Pakistan. Since Pakistan has been rooting out members of Al-Qaeda, foreign terrorists and local Taliban elements, she is confronted with multidimensional threats. Although people in Pakistan has putative the rationale behind joining the war but their sentiments against the US as treacherous ally has not been changed much rather increasing demands from the US has made these sentiments more firm. People of Pakistan too objurgated the attacks of 9/11 but the US response to these attacks couldn”t gather good response of Pakistanis. The strong wave of terrorism in Pakistan can be cited as the impact of Pakistan”s decision.
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When Pakistan joined the US led war it provoked robust reaction of the religious groups who strongly dissented against Musharraf’s decision in the streets. Thousands of innocent people and security forces personnel have lost their lives in the terrorist activities even Musharraf was fortunately saved in suicide bomb attack plotted against him in December 2003. The plot made the security establishment concerned about the amalgamation of Islamic militants and Al-Qaeda in Pakistan. Pakistan was confronted with stern security threat by the militants that were suspected to be foreigners. To deal with the extremism 140,000 troops are deployed in different areas of Pakistan. Despite of all the efforts thousands of people and security officers lost their lives in suicide bombing.\textsuperscript{305} United States tried hard to land its forces in tribal areas of Pakistan to hunt Taliban and Al-Qaeda but Pakistan snubbed to honor the US demand. To deal with the ever deteriorating security environment in Pakistan a Counter Terrorism Cell (CTC) has been established within ISI that worked in collaboration with FBI and CIA to hunt the
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terrorist operatives. National Crisis Management has also been established that work in collaboration with FBI to counter the security threats. These arrangements produced some productive outcomes since many high profile terrorists have been caught from FATA and different cities of Pakistan.⁸⁰

Pakistan”s decision to join US led war on terror has direct impacts on Pakistan”s domestic security as well since domestic terrorist activities have heaped on. Musharraf government launched military operations in tribal areas of Pakistan in 2002-2003 that put Pakistan security and safety at wind and widely provoked mass bitterness. Consequently, local tribes began to fight against the security agencies of Pakistan that led to heavy loss of security forces. Director General ISPR Maj. General Athar Abbas said that “from September, 2001 to 2010, 30,452 people have been killed or injured out of which 21,672 were civilians and 8,785 were military personnel.” Director ISPR further held that “alone in 2009 when Pakistan”s armed forces launched military operation against militants in restive northwest death rate were 10,000 out of which 78 were military officers while 2,273 were soldiers also 6,512 were injured.” Now every terrorist activity by the militants is deterred by heap on military operations. Mass resentment against these military operations were clearly reflected in the general elections of October 2002 where MMA, alliance of six religious parties won substantial number of seats in the provincial assembly of Baluchistan and the then NWFP and formed government there since the agenda of MMA during elections was opposition to US led war on terror and evacuation of air bases from US that gathered huge mass support. Ahmad Rashid said that the Generals with whom he met were annoyed with ISI role in elections where they facilitated MMA candidates in NWFP and Baluchistan in winning their seats.⁸⁰ Likewise, Zalmai Rasul, national security advisor to President Karzai expressed his reservations on the success of MMA whom they considered friends of Taliban.⁸² Despite of reservations expressed by different factions on the success of religious group, the results of the elections are the
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clear indication of the fact that the misperception and emotionality of the 9/11 has given way to the Islamist vindicator, among others once recipient of US aid during Cold War. US strategy of drone attacks to combat terrorism is provoking strong resentment among the masses. According to the stats from 2009 till 2013 more than 242 drones were stuck by US administration in Pakistan. The immediate impact of these drone strikes was radicalization of those who suffer losses because of these strikes.**307** Beside radicalization of the sufferers drone strikes are exasperating the modest and progressive faction of Pakistani society that were more compassionate to United States. What annoying more to this faction about drone strikes is not attack on Pakistan’s sovereignty but double standards of US towards the importance attached to the lives of Pakistanis.

### 3.8 CONCLUSION

The security relations between Pakistan and United States saw many peaks and valleys but the relations go through its most downcast level since the two traditional allies agreed to tie knot against war on terror, jeopardizing the counterterrorist activities which according to the official of both states demands cooperation of both the allies. According to the officials of both the countries the Pakistan’s army is feeling the heat within its rank because of the remarriage between the old allies, and army chief is making its efforts to mollify them. The officials additionally held that the magnitude of pressure he is going through cannot be ignored. Similar pressure is also mounting on the other side as well. Lawmakers in United States uttered their trepidations on the seizure of those Pakistanis who collected facts for CIA about Bin Laden compound. One among them was army doctor Major Amir Aziz who lived next to Osama compound and soon after the raid he was found missing. Officials held that Aziz and other were remunerated for spying Bin Laden and now even their families are incognizant of these people. US officials uttered that CIA tried to get access to these informants but in vain. On the other hand the
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Pakistan’s army spokesperson abnegated all the reports of the confinement of these persons.

After years of intermittent tension between the traditional allies the instantaneous reason of this cleavage is Abbottabad episode, since the operation was kept undisclosed that not only shocked but abased the military and intelligence. Symbolic condemnations are made from time to time by Pakistani government of drone attacks in the tribal areas of Pakistan against Al-Qaeda and Afghan militants. To give its demand a genuine look Pakistan vacated its bases from US that were utilized for this purpose. Visas of CIA and army personnel were also kept back.

Although significance of Pakistan in the war cannot be abnegated but still the United States is feeling a pressure at home to take some tough decision in this regard. Many Congressmen regard Pakistan a treacherous ally because of Osama presence there and held that Pakistan is not sincere in its efforts in fighting against terrorists therefore Pakistan don’t be worthy of the US aid. The US Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates reckoned the intelligence provided to Pakistan of insurrectionary bombs factories in tribal areas that were deserted before military foray.

On the question of detention of Pakistani informants of US Gates replied “even some of the US closest allies send a person to spy on us… that’s the real world we deal with.” US official agreed that their relations with Pakistan are thought-provoking but some of the criticisms are out of question. Many top ranked US officials visited Pakistan and received positive response on some of their demands encompassing CIA entrée to Osama compound and his family in Pakistan’s custody. Pakistani Prime Minister signaled for the recommencement of strategic dialogues as well after his meetings with Deputy Secretary of State. No doubt both sides are cognizant of existence of a deep cleavage between them. After Abbottabad episode there was a series of events that exasperated Pakistan’s military, comprising Wiki Leaks’ report of unofficial meetings between Pakistan’s army chief and US officials and release of Raymond Davis. Similarly the issue of drone attacks is a source of trouble and in this regard Pakistan’s parliament passed a
resolution. US officials uttered their belief that they could linger the drone strategy devoid of Pakistan’s partnership from the bases in Afghanistan. But it is also expected that this strategy might lead to more ferocious response from common masses and armed forces. Before this tension Pakistan criticized the escalating drone attacks targeting low and mid level militants rather than their commanders along with the killing of hundreds of acquitted people.

CHAPTER – 4

US ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN: PROMISES, CONDITIONS AND BENEFITS

Three constituents of economic relations amongst countries are:

- International trade
- Drift of production factors, and
- The economic aid offered at the government level

It is then palpable that economic relations between any two countries are overseen by the general discernment each has about the socio-economic and political setting of the country. It has been the US policy en route for developing countries in general and towards Pakistan in specific, which has presumed supreme meaning.³⁰⁸

During cold war the world was bipolarized and the leaders were trying more and more people for their team, so for this purpose they gave them aid and assisted them, now the time has changed earlier there were political considerations but after the death of cold war political considerations have given place to the economic considerations the states

now opt for those policies that give them economic benefits now with the change in international politics economic alliances are formed.\textsuperscript{309}

As is true of all types of bilateral relations, economic relations between Pakistan and the US have administered by mutual gain which exceeds the dominion of economics. Their bilateral relations are strappingly prejudiced by the political, social and economic requirements. Like other bilateral relations, the economic relations between the two have swung in due course with the United States interests and objectives in the region.

Foreign affairs experts regard Pakistan as strategically momentous state for the US policy makers. The 113\textsuperscript{th} US Congress is pressing the need to balance Pakistan standing with monetary pressure. The US government endeavors to create steady and democratic Pakistan to combat terrorism while regional stability and serene Afghanistan is the prior concern of the US. The tenacious anti-American sentiments among common masses in Pakistan coupled with weak economy and uncertain political environment present serious gainsay to the US. Largely held surveys depict the similar kind of expressions.\textsuperscript{3}

Similar views are held by the US about Pakistan. In a survey held after May, 2011 Bin Laden raid, merely 2\% Americans categorized Pakistan as an ally.\textsuperscript{4} Consequently, the US provided huge sum of assistance to Pakistan in grasping its short and long term objectives.

The US has provided significant amount of aid since its inception but the amount provided swung over the time that developed a sense in Pakistan that the United States is an unswerving ally. Over the issue of providing aid to Pakistan, questions are raised that Pakistan is not a trustworthy ally in counterterrorism efforts since Osama took refuge in Pakistan for several years while there are substantiation of Haqqani network links with Pakistan. Also Pakistan appeared to be impotent in attaining economic development and security to its own nationals and is inexplicable to the US for aid fallouts. While there are few in Pakistan who believe that aid has positive impacts.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{309} Dr. Pervez Khan Khalil, Executive Director National Development Support Program. Interview with the author on April 25, 2014 in Peshawar.
Pakistan is frail, insecure and susceptible state that presents challenge to the US and other donor countries. Pakistan’s per capita GDP of 2012 is appraised $ 2,881 (at purchasing power parity) and itemized it 141st out of 187 countries of the world (by assessments, the US figure is $51,248, and India’s with seven times as many citizens as Pakistan is $4,063). From 2008-2010 inflation rate of the country is 50% against GDP growth rate less than 13%. Likewise education system of Pakistan is unproductive; country is suffering from severe energy crisis that is upsetting business cycle. Likewise common masses lack basic health amenities. The country is also facing security challenges and people have lost their lives in terrorist and fierce activities.6

The US humanitarian assistance for 2005 earthquake and 2010 flood is distinguished accomplishment for Pakistan. US aid abetted to recover energy, education,

---

3 A June 2012 Pew Global Attitudes poll found that 74% of Pakistanis considered the United States an —enemy (a 5% increase over 2011), while only 9% considered it to be a —partner.1 A May 2013 Pew survey found only 11% of Pakistan’s hold a favorable view of the United States, the lowest percentage in a decade (see —Pakistani Public Opinion Ever More Critical of U.S.,1 June 27, 2012, at http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/06/27/pakistani-public-opinion-ever-more-critical-of-u-s. see also, —On Eve of Elections, A Dismal Public Mood in Pakistan,1 May 7, 2013, at http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/05/07/on-eve-of-elections-a-dismal-public-mood-in-pakistan).

4 Another 11% called Pakistan —friendly,1 while 38% called it —unfriendly1 and 23% identified Pakistan as —an enemy of the United States (see http://today.yougov.com/news/2011/05/23/2-call-pakistan-ally-us). 5 A May 2013 Pew Global Attitudes poll found only 8% of Pakistani respondents saying the impact of U.S. economic and military aid was —mostly positivel; roughly two-thirds said the impact was —mostly negativel (see —On Eve of Elections, A Dismal Public Mood in Pakistan,l May 7, 2013, at http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/05/07/chapter-3-attitudes-toward-the-united-states-and-American-policies). 6 —Pakistani Victims: War on Terror Toll Put at 49, 000.1 Express Tribune, (Karachi), March 27, 2013.
health sector and boosted infrastructure. US aid also contributed to enhance deterrence aptitude of peril that culminated into successful military operation launched in tribal areas of Pakistan and healthier assistance to US led military operations in Afghanistan. Despite of the continued aid program botched to realize its intended objectives particularly extremism has been increased, political environment is still unsound while economic condition is disappointing. In a study of June, 2012 a representative said:

—International, particularly U.S., military and civilian aid has failed to improve Pakistan’s performance against jihadi groups operating on its soil or to help stabilize its nascent democracy. Lopsided focus on security aid after the 11 September 2001 attacks has not delivered counterterrorism dividends, but entrenched the military’s control over state institutions and policy, delaying reforms and aggravating Pakistani public perceptions that the U.S. is only interested in investing in a security client. This and other critics are of the view that US put condition on military aid and let US Agency of International Development (USAID) and its partner to catalog their efforts. Some are finding US liability of not putting security and development aid on distinct path. The view that Obama and Congress have overrated the pace for broadening assistance program and have been too cooperative about US agencies to swiftly implement Kerry Lugar Bill (KLB) efficiently.

4.1 HISTORY OF US AID TO PAKISTAN

Pakistan is situated at the northwestern part of the Indian subcontinent. It lies at the junction of three important regions, South Asia, Central Asia and the Middle East, and hence it occupies huge worldwide strategic implication during the cold war and is now a
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—frontline state‖ in the US-led —War on Terror.‖

Recently, the country has been recipient of some aid from the United States as its partner in the alleged —War on Terror.‖ Nevertheless, it has been a testing relationship: from one standpoint, the assistance has been petite, Pakistan has been obtaining in the war; and then again, the US has been supercharging, endlessly asking Pakistani government to —do more.‖ Even with the harsh conditions that Pakistan has agonized in the war, and yet it identifies the necessity to offer assistance to its partner, the US administration has given the feeling that Pakistan is not honest in its efforts equal to the aid given to it; to be eligible for more aid, it has to do significantly more.

Pakistan has been a donee of US aid since its inception; the deliberation has once more raised the question that up to what magnitude the US aid has been of any sustenance in raising the political institutions in Pakistan. Keeping in view the existing US aid to Pakistan, it is fair enough to view the US objectives of aid in historical setting and the specific drives implicit in its proviso to Pakistan.

When apportioning aid to donee, all donors, both mutual and multilateral, fasten some strings, every so often signified as —benchmarks,‖ with their authorized aid assurance. These aid strategies imitate the benefits of the donors and are indebted to transformation dependable on national and worldwide proceedings regarding the benefactor. As time goes on, numerous bilateral benefactors, comprising US, have reconsidered and readapt their aid policies in the wake of new gainsay and requirements by integrating economic and political restraint. Most benefactors lined up their particular foreign policy considerateness, for instance political, security and geo-strategic predilections.
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4.1.1 1950s: Pakistan Allied with the US

Geo-strategic location of Pakistan enhanced its significance in the eyes of US policy makers thru Cold War; they grasped that the country could play a cardinal part in the containment of communism. All around these years, Pakistan signed number of accords either incorporating the United States or engraved under US condescension. Consequently, the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement was signed between the US and Pakistan in May, 1954. Pakistan was in addition, member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), which was instituted by the US to contain communism. In 1955, the US patronized Baghdad Pact to block Soviet effect (in 1958, its name was changed to CENTO—Central Treaty Organization). As Pakistan came forth as a crucial state to guard Western interests in the region, US provided aid munificently to Pakistan in mid1950s.316

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>73.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>697.8</td>
<td>286.23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>146.4</td>
<td>152.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>683.3</td>
<td>477.18</td>
<td>247.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>992.9</td>
<td>700.89</td>
<td>1,012.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,005.40</td>
<td>619.90</td>
<td>407.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>901.5</td>
<td>589.59</td>
<td>496.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 1960s: An Appropriate Takeover and More Aid

Democratic process in Pakistan was first derailed by General Ayub Khan (1958-69) was evidently welcomed with earnest assuagement by the notable mass of the people.\(^{317}\) It was comprehensively visualized that the takeover was endorsed by the US to get backing of pro-Western military.\(^{318}\) US upheld for the military ruler protracted his illicit administration as well as further invigorated his hold on power. Pakistan was generously provided with economic and military assistance mostly, during this period. Not only Pakistan received massive aid all around Ayub Khan’s period but there were approximately 8,000 American professional operational in various fields in the


country. Then again, US military assistance turned down precipitously after the India-Pakistan war of 1965 and remained paltry for a decade and a half.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,572.90</td>
<td>1,181.35</td>
<td>214.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>920.8</td>
<td>780.04</td>
<td>242.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2,172.10</td>
<td>1,446.28</td>
<td>510.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,922.90</td>
<td>1,063.68</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2,067.90</td>
<td>1,334.16</td>
<td>174.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1,795.80</td>
<td>1,041.58</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>759.7</td>
<td>691.28</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,128.90</td>
<td>719.38</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1,396.90</td>
<td>672.50</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>504.1</td>
<td>504.31</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1.3 1970s: Pakistan’s Nuclear Determinations and Authorizations

Pakistan had stumbled upon unparalleled mayhem and bedlam in 1971. American aid to Pakistan had started falling in owing to Bhutto’s pursuit of nuclear development at the closing years of his rule. General Zia ul Haq not only sustained the chase for nuclear arms, he trod down democracy and led human rights abuses; Pakistan transmuted into an outcast state during the early years of his administration.

US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger at first paid a visit to Pakistan to sway Islamabad to roll back its nuclear program and later to Paris to sojourn it from providing the material it had decided to deliver to Pakistan.\(^{320}\) Carter administration inflicted the Symington Amendment on Pakistan in April 1979, thus lopping off most economic and military aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount 1</th>
<th>Amount 2</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>900.2</td>
<td>570.93</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>644.3</td>
<td>261.87</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>664.9</td>
<td>387.63</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>354.9</td>
<td>219.13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>571.2</td>
<td>326.02</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>598.7</td>
<td>336.78</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>296.7</td>
<td>209.40</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>199.8</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 1980s: Military Dictatorship and More Aid

Nevertheless, the geo-political backdrop was to transmute later that year, culminated into striking changes in US aid policies. At that juncture, the Soviets occupied Afghanistan. The tactical criticality of Pakistan changed instantaneously: the US needed Pakistan once again to halt the Soviet forces inside Afghanistan; all of a sudden, Pakistan was seen as a frontline copartner against communism.

In December 1979, only a few months later their infringement, all sanctions against Pakistan were waived by Washington and swapped with substantial aid. By 1981, the US and Pakistan were talking over a $3.2-billion aid package. By 1985, Pakistan was the fourth major beneficiary of US aid, after Israel, Egypt and Turkey. With the countersignature of a $4.02-billion military and economic aid in 1987, Pakistan turned out into the second major beneficiary of American aid, after Israel. Watching its

heightened geo-strategic standing in Cold War, the US completely ignored Pakistan’s nuclear program or absence of democracy, or the human rights abuses of its military administration.¹⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>200.07</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>383.29</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>528.6</td>
<td>415.84</td>
<td>517.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>447.53</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>580.1</td>
<td>460.91</td>
<td>507.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>557.6</td>
<td>469.53</td>
<td>497.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>716.4</td>
<td>635.00</td>
<td>401.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>521.3</td>
<td>421.27</td>
<td>341.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15 1990s: Post-Cold War Aloofness

Soviet forces drew back from Afghanistan in 1989. With the breakdown of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the cold war was over and Pakistan’s backing was no more called for. Nevertheless democracy was restored in Pakistan and a suitable prospect for consolidation of democratic institutions; it was all over again Pakistan’s nuclear program that the US revolved about. Washington inflicted prejudice and country specific Pressler Amendment on Pakistan, in addition to the harsh step taken, left the incipient democratic regime with severe economic crisis.322

In May 1998, Pakistan followed through nuclear tests coherent with India’s attempt of nuclear detonation. Later on, a military rule was executed by General

---

Musharraf. The global community, comprising the US, loathed these steps; relations between Pakistan and the US worsened more, American aid touched the insignificant level, and stern sanctions were inflicted on Pakistan to reinstate democracy.\textsuperscript{323}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>510.3</td>
<td>422.37</td>
<td>263.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>141.78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.1.6 US Aid to Pakistan after 9/11

After a decade of disinterest the traditional allies came closer to each other with terrorist attacks on US on September 11, 2001 and US gratitude of Pakistan as crucial partner in counterterrorist activities. US post 9/11 aid all of a sudden rose up and comprised $600 million cash transfer in September, 2001. In 2003 Pakistani president visited Camp David where he negotiated $3 billion aid package based on five years that began in 2005 consistently dispersed between economic and military aid.324

After terrorist attacks US aid augmented from FY2000 at $36.76 million to FY2001 at $187.7 million that further enlarged to FY2002 at $2,000 million. In FY2007 Bush administration approved $750 million as developmental aid for tribal areas of Pakistan based on five years period. In FY2010 US aid projected $4.3 billion while $2.1 billion in FY2012. From FY2002-FY2012 Pakistan received more than $7.8 billion as economic aid.325

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Coalition Support Fund (CSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

324 Ibid.
325 See CRS Report, July 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Economic Aid through USAID</th>
<th>Military Aid, US$ M</th>
<th>Coalition Support Fund (CSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>212.1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>875.8</td>
<td>744.74</td>
<td>1,739.70</td>
<td>1,386.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>362.7</td>
<td>284.81</td>
<td>1,760.23</td>
<td>1,450.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>406.12</td>
<td>316.56</td>
<td>891.39</td>
<td>794.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>490.42</td>
<td>374.04</td>
<td>1,397.06</td>
<td>1,050.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>689.43</td>
<td>488.46</td>
<td>1,246.10</td>
<td>916.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>688.62</td>
<td>498.91</td>
<td>1,079.72</td>
<td>755.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>614.48</td>
<td>392.05</td>
<td>1,378.32</td>
<td>1,014.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,353.65</td>
<td>1,076.25</td>
<td>1,114.26</td>
<td>685.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,867.13</td>
<td>1,529.53</td>
<td>2,524.61</td>
<td>1,220.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Bilateral Economic Development and Humanitarian Assistance

US bilateral economic, development and humanitarian aid is made available to Pakistan through ESF, IDA, MRA and Child Survival Accounts. In Pakistan ESF is working to provide well-being services to the people. ESF is serving Pakistani government in its economic reorganizations such as refining taxation system, reinforcing border management, building communicational links and promote constancy. For furtherance of economy ESF also supported private sector competitiveness. Food aid to Pakistan remained inconsistent reliant upon the need of aid. Global Health and Child Survival (GHCS) provided fund that ranged from $14 million in FY2002 - $34 million in FY2009. The GHCS aid from FY2002-FY2012 equaled $249 million. This scheme helped Pakistan through Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).326

ii. FATA Development Plan

The tribal areas of Pakistan are distant, inaccessible, deprived and orthodox in cultural activities. The social and economic life of the populaces made it catchy for ferocious and radical activities for fanatics. In 2003 US set up development plan for FATA for ameliorating health facilities, education and economic growth.327 One of the USAID officials assessed that out of total aid from FY2001 – FY2007 6% of economic aid was employed in tribal areas.328 US allotted more than $280 million for developing communicational links and substructure projects in tribal areas of Pakistan.329 However, corruption level is very much high in these areas. Most of the aid is utilized for administrative purpose still no strings have been attached to aid package. Moreover corruption is detrimental to the efforts of elevating of living standard. Even in 2009

326 CRS Report, p. 11-12.
328 Ibid.
governor of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) grumble that very little amount is reaching the tribal areas.330

James Bever, former USAID Afghanistan-Pakistan Task Force Director also asserted that limited comportment of federal ministers is a limitation in developmental cause of FATA. Pakistani analyst too articulated the same reservations and held that until economic and political reforms are not made in FATA, US and other international donors must not handover control of development program to Pakistani government. With such restrictions USAID is to develop assurance in Pakistani government to work on small plans with relatively sheltered areas.331

iii. The Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act (EPPA) 2009

The initial approach of Obama administration towards Pakistan was to upsurge nonmilitary aid to three times with particular emphasis on war affected zone and to augment aid package with the strings of effectively combating radicalism and democratization, attached to it. The 110th Congress, President, Vice President and Secretary of State all supported EPPA and sought it to be passed by the next session of Congress.332

Initially the 111th Congress passed parallel Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009 and 3 months later passed EPPA of 2009 popularly known as Kerry Lugar Bill. Both the acts endued to multiply aid to three times. President Obama signed EPPA in October 2009. Senate Foreign Relation Committee Chairman and Secretary of State reckoned the legislation as consequence of two-tier, dual-party and inter branch discussion that was a smart move towards consolidation of relation between people of both the state. House Foreign Affair Committee Chairman

331 Ibid.
accredited the legislation as move towards the direction of factual strategic partnership.\textsuperscript{333}

iv. Economic & Development Assistance under EPPA

EPPA approved $1.5 billion annually for economic and development purpose from FY2010-FY2014. The act support democratization, rule of law and maintainable economic development. The act provides that funds will be made available on the compliance of Pakistan Assistance Strategy Report by administration to specific Congressional Committee. The act also limits aid to $750 million till the authorization by President's Special Representative to Afghanistan and Pakistan that reasonable development has been made in the direction to attain the anticipated US objectives. However these strings can be relinquish by the US Secretary of State in US interest. A November 2011 State Department report assert that the approach of KLB is groundbreaking in four ways;\textsuperscript{334}

1. It attached standing with Pakistan penchant
2. It emphasis on communication links and dams (energy sector)
3. Attention on the areas susceptible to radicalism
4. Government toil that taps mastery from an assortment of American organizations

v. Security Assistance under EPPA

The act provided for each year from FY2010-FY2014 the amount as be essential for security assistance. The act did not let for security assistance and arms transfer except Secretary of State certifies that government of Pakistan is working effectively to combat extremist activities and political and judicial courses are going unimpeded. Such strings can be waived if Secretary of State considered it required in the state interest. Such

\textsuperscript{333} Ibid, p. 13.

certificates were first issued by Clinton in March 2011.\textsuperscript{335} vi. \textbf{Deliberations in Pakistan over the Kerry-Lugar-Bill}

Many sections in Pakistan pick apart the bill as meddling in foreign policy and security issue of Pakistan. The strings attached to the bill were predominantly foregrounded. The then opposition party PML-N raised its concern over the bill and necessitated for parliamentary endorsement. The secular partner of coalition government also called it meddling in the affairs of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{336} Lahore High Court Bar Association passed a resolution against law, asserting that the strings attached to the law are against Pakistan’s sovereignty.\textsuperscript{337} One of the commentators called the bill — treaty of surrender! and that it will upsurge — national humiliation. Another expert regards the bill as confining security establishment.\textsuperscript{338} However President Zardari excluded all the complaints.

The sturdiest reproach came from military establishment. It also raised reservation on the clause related to national security. Army Chief sounds off to United States visiting commander of civilian control over military.\textsuperscript{339} Pakistan’s reaction stunned many in US and Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a refutation that strings are attached with $7.5 billion in nonmilitary aid and that the bill does not loom the territorial sovereignty and condition on military aid strengthen policies of government and military and US has no design of interfering in internal affairs of Pakistan. On Hilary Clinton visit to Pakistan she was asked about Pakistan reaction she said

For the United States Congress to pass a bill unanimously saying that we want to give $7.5 billion to Pakistan in a time of global recession when we have a 10

\textsuperscript{336} —PML-N Asks Govt to Present Kerry-Lugar Bill in Parliament.\textsuperscript{1} News, (Karachi), September 29, 2009; —Kerry-Lugar Bill Interference in Pakistan’s Affairs: ANP.\textsuperscript{1} Daily Times, (Lahore), October 11, 2009.
\textsuperscript{337} —LHCBA Passes Resolution Condemning Kerry-Lugar Bill,\textsuperscript{1} Daily Times (Lahore), October 1, 2009.
\textsuperscript{338} Ayaz Amir. —Kerry-Lugar: Bill or Document of Surrender?! Daily Times, (Lahore). See also —Intiaz Gul.
—Kerry- Lugar Aimed at Dispiriting the Army?! Friday Times, (Lahore), both October 2, 2009.
\textsuperscript{339} —U.S. Aid Package Riles Pakistan’s Army.\textsuperscript{1} New York Times, October 8, 2009.
percent unemployment rate, and then for Pakistani press and others to say we
do n’t want that, that’s insulting—I mean, it was shocking to us. So clearly, there

Many of the observers view the reaction being fueled by the military establishment and
opposition party in an effort to wane the ruling party.

\textbf{vii. Security Assistance}

Pak-US Defense Consultative Group (DCG) invigorated during Bush administration, as
a result discussion started on military collaboration, security assistance and
counterterrorism. It sustained its deeds during Obama administration. US officials were
not contented with Pakistan’s counterterrorist efforts. Reports depict that US officials
got irritated by Pakistan’s sluggish efforts to reorient its army for counterterrorism since
Pakistan forces were not eager about the chore achievement. In an effort to channelize
security assistance US shaped Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) later on branded
as Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF).\footnote{Appearing before both Senate and House panels in May 2009, Secretary of Defense Gates urged Congress to quickly provide significant new counterinsurgency funding for Pakistan, arguing that the newly authorized PCF/PCCF should be overseen by U.S. military commanders rather than by State Department civilians. Yet many in Congress voiced doubts about the wisdom of creating a major new stream of military funding under Pentagon oversight, as such aid traditionally has been subject to Foreign Assistance Act restrictions. When the House Appropriations Committee took up the issue, its members determined to place PCCF oversight in the hands of the State Department after FY2010, a plan then endorsed by the full House (—Gates Pushes Congress to Boost Pakistan Aid.| Washington Post, May 1, 2009.)} Apart from the strings
attached to EPPA Pakistan has to face more strings e.g. it came into US notice that in
spring 2010 Pakistan army has coddled in some merciless activities particularly in Swat
that comprises extrajudicial killings and accused unfixed confinement culminated into
—Leahy Amendment‖ that delimited future aid. The act provided that no aid will be
made available to any foreign country if Secretary of State found testimonies that the
country has committed merciless activity. Later on Obama administration recognized the act. viii. Coalition Support Fund (CSF)

During Bush administration, Congress in FY2002 set aside millions of dollars to pay back Pakistan and other countries easing US in counterterrorist activities. Since 2001 half of financial transfer from Coalition Support Fund (CSF) established for the purpose, is made to Pakistan and till June 2013 the total amount laid out was nearly $10.7 billion. Out of the amount only 2% was provided for navy and air force while rest was paid for Pakistan army under CSF. Source of Defense Department provides that CSF was used for 1,00,000 troops engaged in North West of Pakistan for their food, Clothing, housing and armament. Pakistan is also paid for coalition use of air bases and seaports. US document depicts that of $672 million repaid to Pakistan army during June-November 2011, $212 million was for food and $116 million was for armaments.

In next year Bush comprehended that Standard Accounting Procedure was not followed by US treasury in expenses. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) was given the job to deal with superintendence issue of CSF. In 2008 reports illustrated that until one year before only few of Pakistani demands were excluded. In 2007 the number amplified though not so much. This scrutiny culminated into the visit to Pakistan by US Defense Representative who played vital role in the course. GAO determined that superintendence and answerability is desired in compensation for CSF.

According to the sources of State Department, Pakistan entreated for CSF is intensely scrutinized by executive branch agencies, approved by Secretary of Defense and can be withheld by Congressional action. But most of the funds have been misused by
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negligence owing to the lack of omission. In 2008 Bush administration also determined that Pakistan is distracting most of the funds towards consolidating its military vollar against India.\footnote{346\textsuperscript{347}}

One of the US high officials claimed that steps have taken to prudently scrutinize the recompense and aid program to Pakistan. The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2008 demands design of coalition support reimbursement from Secretary of Defense. In 2010, Richard Holbrooke Special Representative for Afghanistan-Pakistan Ambassador asserted that 60\%-65\% of Pakistan’s request under CSF are realized (an official document depicts that $688 million remunerated in December 2012 signify 68\% of total request made).\footnote{348} On the question of omission issue he said that the representative in Pakistan is very cautious.\footnote{349} Press reports also advocate that auditors in US have become more attentive on Pakistani requests.\footnote{350}

ix.  **Defense Provisions**

Since 2001 most of the arm sales and aid to Pakistan incorporate the items that are valuable for counterinsurgency activities. Major acquisitions are made with Pakistan national fund. From FY2002-FY2011 the amount under Foreign Military Sales agreement totaled $5.2 billion. Despite security assistance, reproaches have elevated

\footnote{346}—Pakistani Military Misspent Up to 70\% of American Aid.\textit{Guardian}, (London), February 28, 2008; —Revamping Aid to Pakistan is expected in Bush Report.\textit{New York Times}, December 7, 2008. In mid-
\footnote{347} , the leader of Pakistan’s ruling party, now-President Zardari claimed, without providing evidence, that, as president, Pervez Musharraf had been passing only a fraction of the funds over to the Pakistani military, leaving some $700 million of reimbursements per year —missingl (quoted in —Where’s the Money?l \textit{Sunday Times}, (London), August 10, 2008.

\footnote{348} See the State Department’s March 2, 2010, release at http://www.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rmks/2010/137693.htm
\footnote{349} Ibid.

\footnote{350} By some accounts, Pakistan has —routinelyl submitted —unsubstantiatedl or —exaggeratedl claims, and denial rates climbed from less than 2\% in 2005 to 44\% in 2009. See also, —U.S. Balks at Pakistani Bills,l \textit{Wall Street Journal}, May 17, 2011.
against the program that Pakistan is diverting all the assistance in solidification of its army against India and pay less consideration towards the bulls that US wanted to see.\textsuperscript{351} During operation in South Waziristan in late 2009 US provided transport helicopters, parts of helicopters gunship, infantry equipment and intelligence and surveillance videos. In projected counterinsurgency operation Pakistan obtained 1,000 quarter-ton bombs and up to 1,000 kits for making gravity bombs. The State Department argued that FMF are exploited only for counterterrorist activities.\textsuperscript{352} These are just cynics for those onlookers and analysts who are in favor of Indo-US strategic partnership and call US military aid to Pakistan barren. US officials are anxious that Pakistan altered US furnished weapons in a manner that abuses Arm Export Control Act, but Pakistan emphatically excluded all the allegations.\textsuperscript{353} Pakistan’s official complaint that defense equipment from US are coming at very sluggish pace that obstructed military operations, while US claimed that it has provided Pakistan 50 helicopters since 2006 out of them 12 Cobra model and delivery of some attacking helicopters have overdue owing to Pakistan’s procrastination.\textsuperscript{354}

\textbf{x. Military Training and Law Execution}

Bush administration set out program of enhancing the potential of Frontier Corps (FC) the primary obligation of which is to sentry the borders that Pakistan shares with Afghanistan. In 2007 US instigated to utilize its funds for grooming and outfitting FC and compounding its engrossment in backing up Pakistan’s counterinsurgent efforts.

\textsuperscript{352} F-16 aircraft are reported by some to be effective in Pakistan’s counterinsurgency efforts, with improved training and enhanced capabilities allowing for more precise targeting resulting in fewer civilian casualties (see the December 17, 2009, statements of a Pentagon official at http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/ transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4528)
United States has also been giving training to Pakistan’s elite Special Service Group Command. All this lingered during Obama administration. The scheme of training FC has been trammeled frequently owing to its need for crucial operations to a different place. Analysts are of the view that US can better train Pakistani soldiers than private contractor.

Other security related programs include cooperation in counterinsurgency, border safety, infrastructure building, training to PAF for reconnaissance on extremists and to the army on increasing their competence and awareness on human rights and rule of law etc.355

The funds set aside for civilian security meant at ameliorating and underpinning law execution system by providing police training and setting up of counterterrorism Special Investigation Group. US efforts are shackled by Pakistan's faintness that contain putridness, underpay and meager training etc. some of the experts associate this with democracy in broader sense and call for US and global emphasis on enhancing Pakistan civilian sanctuary.356

4.2 SIGNIFICANT ISSUES AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

4.2.1 The Shakil Afridi Case & US Assistance

Shakil Afridi was a physician who worked with CIA in an effort of amassing Bin Laden DNA sample before May 2011, the US raid of Abbottabad. On May 2012 he was penalized 33 years in prison for conviction of sedition. Congressmen responded sturdily on the sentence and revised the US aid. Many Congressmen were of the view to withhold all the aid till the release of Shakil Afridi and allegations being cast off.
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On April 2013, during house hearing of FY 2014 budget proposal one of the member asked Secretary of State John Kerry that for how long US will employ —quite diplomacy rather than just cutting off their aid\textsuperscript{357} to free Shakil Afridi. In retort Kerry said

Cutting off aid to Pakistan would—would not be a good move, certainly at this point in time, for a lot of different reasons. We are working with Pakistani with respect to nuclear safety and nonproliferation. We are working with Pakistan to get our supplies both in and out of Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{55}

4.2.2 Assistance to Pakistan Energy Sector

One of the prevalent tests to the new seating government of Pakistan is figurative electricity dearth. Associated with it is a problem of $ 5 billion —circular debt owing to non-payment of bills. The electricity shortage became severe over a past span. The country demand is 15,000 (MW) while power generation is 50% less than required.\textsuperscript{358}

State Department’s Congressional Budget for FY 2014 prioritize energy sector and approved $256 million for FY2014 that is one third of all civilian aid. The major intent is to device such a policy that will entice private sector investment and upsurge cost retrieval, shrink technical and commercial fatalities, and augment megawatts to the network thru noticeable ventures.\textsuperscript{359} By the end of 2013 900 MW will be added to the system by aid and additional 300 MW would be added by the end of FY2014. Most of the latent would be developed by improving the proficiency of dams. In March 2013, 3 dams were refurbished that added 128 MW to power network. US released $16.5 million

\textsuperscript{357} CRS Report, July, 2013, p.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid, p. 5.
for the dams. In mid-2012 US released $ 280 million for energy sector. All these funds help to support ventures at Mangla, Tangi and Kuram.360

4.2.3 2012 GLOC Reopening & Coalition Support Fund Release

In response of 24 soldiers killing by NATO361 Pakistan closed ground lines of communication (GLOC) that bar NATO entraée to Afghanistan. With the closer of ground line the relations between the two partners worsened and this tension sustained till the mid of 2012. In July 2012 finally the negotiations thrived when Secretary of State Clinton called foreign minister MS Khar and said —we are sorry for the losses suffered by the Pakistani military.362 Nevertheless, the civilian aid persisted nonstop throughout that period. US administration proclaimed to release $1.8 billion in Coalition Support Fund (CSF) for the period July 2010-May 2011. US took no action to withhold the payment.363 At the end of 2012 US administration released another $688 million in CSF for the period of June-November 2011. At present demand of CSF for the period of July 2012 and beyond is under deliberation.364

4.2.4 Flooding & Humanitarian Assistance

During last three summers Pakistan faced seasonal flood that results into hundreds of deaths. As result of these floods total 750,000 people displaced. UN office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affair pledged $91 million for respite and harmonization purpose. State Department and USAID humanitarian and compound emergency fund for Pakistan for FY2012 totaled $135 million while the total assistance

360 —US-Funded Restoration of Tarbela Dam Complete— Olson.‖ Dawn, (Karachi), March 5, 2013.
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in funds and in kinds for FY2010-FY2012 totaled $735 million. During first half of FY2013 another $77 million as humanitarian aid has been paid out.\textsuperscript{365}

Despite decades long economic relations between US and Pakistan, Pakistan’s persistent dependence on US aid raised the question that what happened if US suddenly stops its aid to Pakistan or it stop providing aid to Pakistan if its objectives in the region are realized? To be in a position to answer this question it is necessary to know the degree of Pakistan’s dependence on US aid.

4.3 PAKISTAN DEPENDENCE ON US AID

Many of the scholars and intellects hold that uni-polarity is transmuting into multi-polarity with the emergent economies of China and India. The foremost weapon to get the leading status is to acquire more and more allies. The approach to bring more countries into their orbit diverges from country to country thus foreign policy is calculated keeping in view the perspective ally.

Although Pakistan is an underdeveloped country with nothing ample to offer, many countries want Pakistan to be their ally. Pakistan is to be found at the junction where three key regions meet i.e. South Asia, Central Asia and Middle East. Pakistan is located in the region that is geo-strategically important with respect to military and trade etc. that’s why United States and China want cordial relations with Pakistan. To realize this objective the approach used by these countries is giving Pakistan —AID\textsuperscript{366}.

United States is using aid as weapon as it was used by Germany after World War II to upkeep democracy in the post war areas. Thus the notion of aid instigated on the principled ground of democracy, human rights, good governance and poverty alleviation etc. In recent times foreign aid has been used to accomplish the foreign policy objectives only.\textsuperscript{367}

\textsuperscript{365} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{366} Keezia Haseeb. The Dilemma of Foreign Aid to Pakistan. Retrieved from: http://www.utrade.co/Magazine/Utrade-Magazine.aspx?Key=328&Title=The+Dilemma+of+Foreign++Aid+to+Pakistan
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Colonel Rifatullah Khan argued that right from the beginning in 1950s I would say when we were part of the alliances, USA and European countries made Pakistan dependent on them so we became dependent and if those pacts not been there Pakistan would not have signed those pacts would not have part of those pacts then we could have been an independent nation we could thought of our own ways we could have developed our own technology we could have developed our manpower expertise we could have found 100 ways of protecting our self. We are getting parasitic and dependent on the West. Unfortunately we could not develop as a free and sovereign nation we are having our eyes on the aid we are receiving from Europe and America, because of which we are puppets in their hands, whatever they ask we obey it.368

Our importation from US contains convoluted weaponry, arms, fighter jets, helicopters and other modern tools employed by Pakistani forces. Pakistan and India are the two super power of Asia are traditionalistic adversaries. To daunt Indian thereat Pakistan is at all times necessitated foreign aid. Dependency theory asserts that —the dependence of less developed countries on prime product export put them at mark disadvantage369 if US recoup its assistance Pakistan will certainly be on back foot and the relation between the two will be strained. Dependency theorist like Andre Gunder Frank held that external factors linked to global political economy are principally liable for tightening up of development in South.

Dependency theory proclaims that DCs keeps the periphery underdeveloped to take inexpensive raw material and labor, and there be existent relationship of victimization thru Western ascendancy370 this is the reason that since its inception Pakistan is in receipt of aid from many countries and other international monetary agencies. The aid Pakistan accepts is in the form of grants, tied aid, project aid intended to deal with mechanization

368 Colonel Rifatullah Khan interview with the author on March 10, 2014 in Peshawar.
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linked ingress policy\textsuperscript{371} as avowed by the dependency theorists that there is a global system of capitalism in which DCs overwork the LDCs.\textsuperscript{372} to achieve its objectives US wants Pakistan to be steady, democratic and economically booming. Pakistan is given economic, military and developmental aid from US. According to US their intent behind providing aid to Pakistan is to endorse democracy, human rights and poverty reduction. However the fact portrays total conflicting depiction. This is the pure indication that US intent behind providing aid is realization of its own interest and endorsing democracy is a hoax.\textsuperscript{373}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{dependency-diagram.png}
\caption{Dependency Model}
\end{figure}

In the words of dependency theorists typically DCs give loans to realize their interest. Nevertheless it has very petite effects on the economy and long-term development.
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Consequently interest cultivates and over takes the initial loan. It is the matter of the fact that donor provides foreign aid to realize their strategic and economic interests. They provide aid to value the enormous interest groups or acquisition of allies or endurance of conflict or wars. If we are to analyze the connection between foreign aid and economic growth in case of Pakistan number of questions arises whether it stimulates economic growth or not? Alleviate poverty or not? Certainly there are no marks to show that foreign aid augmented economic growth and that it has alleviated poverty. Professor Deaton, expert of economic growth and foreign aid stated that foreign aid does more damage than good. It leads to subversion and by a hair's breadth overextended to a society. Though Pakistan received massive aid but Pakistan couldn't reach nourishing economic growth. Most of the aid has been spent to diminish debt burden. Donor countries repossess compressed loans back since the strings are attached in credit agreements.

According to some of the dependency theorists dependency relationship is fixed by inequality of power somewhat than the precise features of economic system that is coherent with the analysis of international relations such as realism. In the contemporary world, economic and financial assistance are driven by political contemplations. This is political contemplation that fixes that which country receives how much aid. Since 9/11 it is political objectives of United States that Pakistan is being paid massive aid.

According to Andre Gunder Frank, the principal dependency theorist that LDCs keep on underdeveloped because DCs calculatingly made them and Pakistan’s choice to
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take economic aid led to the deferral of structural transformations obligatory for firm and steady economy. Most of the aid provided is provisional with the omission of benevolent and humanitarian assistance that too every so often is conditional. It is obligatory that Pakistan must first deliberate these conditions before receiving aid as beforehand done by Malaysia and India but in Pakistan’s case they take entirety etcetera comes in their way. Dependency theorists are of the view that the elite class upholds the hooked on relationship because their own interest concurs with the interest of leading states. Thus in real sense dependence relationship is —voluntary‖ relationship. Peter Boone of London School of Economics and Center for Economic Performance says —long term aid is not a means to create growth because aid does not promote economic development for two reasons: Poverty is not caused by capital shortage, and it is not optimal for politicians to adjust distortion policies when they receive aid flows. Same can be observed when we take a glimpse of severely affected economy because of endlessly swelling terrorism due to off beam policies and helping hands of outer world that fill the empty pockets of avaricious politicians at the expanse of Pakistan’s concord, affluence, sovereignty and the lives of impeccable people. Economists in Pakistan employed for the government greeted the current aid on the ground that it stretches foreign exchange but this validation undervalues economic and political repercussions of the assistance by or short of conditions. The aberrant and extravagant use of aid in the shape of sleaze and negligence is common and that it intensifies dependence on aid and averts the government official to take needed economic and financial reforms. Since the government is receiving massive aid so it does not get nuisance of taking hard choices like swelling taxes, dropping the fiscal deficit and growing savings and
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investments. Such kinds of choices lead to unemployment; exacerbate poverty and deserts land reforms. It is this short-term nature of the aid that generates additional dependency. The ventures in social sectors are lunacy and ostracized because of their timing and affianced domestic resources in the projects that are not at government main concern.\textsuperscript{383} In this regard the dependency theorists are of the view that apportionment of resources of dependent states is fixed according to the economic interests of overriding states and not according to the interest of dependent states.\textsuperscript{384} The Social Action Program can be cited as instance of this.

When the benefactor provides aid they have certain intent behind it that may be expressed in the form of domestic urgencies, and the eyes of recipient government scintillate at this free money. Every so often governments receiving aid are not attentive in health care and infrastructure building program but the sponsors do not look up the recipient that results in global landscape, with partially erected donor funded school, roads and hospitals. Still aid receiving countries like Pakistan are extremely reliant on aid because for them it is the only accessible choice to ponder.\textsuperscript{385} Here dependency theorist prove right that LDCs find it problematic to reach economic independence because they are too much dependent on aid. In the light of these facts it can be truly said that conditionality are not bothering for Pakistan.\textsuperscript{386}

It is one of the thought-provoking facts that thru the long course of alliance relation between US and Pakistan United States did naught to lend to Pakistan's good fortune and development. There is even no single mammoth scheme that is measured to be the witness of the traditional relationship. This makes people of Pakistan fair to reason that US is not a trustworthy ally. After the event of May 2\textsuperscript{nd} Western media created ballyhoo

\textsuperscript{383} S. Akbar Zaidi — The Problem with Aid.\textit{ Dawn}, 19 October, 2009.
\textsuperscript{385} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{386} http://revisionworld.co.uk/a2-level-level-revision/sociology/world-sociology/sociological-explationdevelopment-under-development/dependency-theory#sthash.oFZFeDVe.dpuf retrieved on 10/9/2012.
that we cannot give blank cheques and gigantic amount of American taxpayers to Pakistan that elevated number of questions in the minds of our leaders. The press release by ISPR gave the accurate datum that government of Pakistan received $12.5 billion since the origination of war on terror under Coalition Support Fund (CSF), while Pakistan suffered the fatalities more than $68 billion in war on terror but always received aid with strings attached to it. According to dependency theorists aid frequently aids the benefactor because they give forthcoming aid tied with certain strings attached to it. Domestically, mishandling, sleaze and bad law and order situation leads to billions of fatalities to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{387}

According to dependency theorists manipulation is a product of interdependence where natural resources are dealt with metropolis. Consequently the satellite involve in relationship of pseudo-servitude. Similarly Pakistani government has become dependent of counting on aid by US thus verifying Chaudhary Mohammad Ali words right that massive foreign aid culminates into moral and mystical waning of a nation. The dependence on foreign aid prejudiced the foreign policy as well. Now Pakistan has become so addicted of foreign aid that for entirety Pakistan looks-to aid from the outer world and United States that wants to strike at the foundations Pakistan to get hold of nuclear weapons of Pakistan. Presence of black water is the straight product of dependence on US aid and it seems that we are becoming strivers of United States and US is free to do etcetera it wants inside the territory of Pakistan without any authorization from government of Pakistan. This is the ground that Pakistani government is repudiating the presence of black water in Pakistan.\textsuperscript{388}

Hayter held that debt led to dependency. LDCs feel themselves being supercharged by the DCs to make inner political changes and certify its support for western strategic
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interests. Pakistan is/was receiving foreign aid and foreign loans that triggered ever swelling foreign debt. Pakistan being a one of the larger aid beneficiary country pays no heed to device a policy for developing their economy by making use of their own resources. It has become so much habituated to the aid that at times it looks that Pakistan is not sanctified with any sort of resources since most of the funds are embezzled by the government. United States being a benefactor country meddles in the inner matters of Pakistan. United States provide project knotted aid loan to Pakistan as well but on occasion it so happen that these schemes are not at the right of way level of Pakistan that put weight on country’s economy since the principle total plus interest has to be remunerated. One of the intent of Pakistan behind getting foreign aid is to reduce the opening amid saving and investment and to retrieve balance of payment condition but so far Pakistan is not successful in attaining these purposes rather the opening is further flared. With the passage of time Pakistan is finding it tough to acquire aid because of the interest rate and short time period of reimbursement.

Frank’s theory proposes that LDCs remain underdeveloped _til and unless they remain part of capitalistic economy. For Frank development and underdevelopment is the share of world course in which DCs developed at the expanse of LDCs. LDCs are so much knotted in the system that they find no exit. The only explanation before them is segregation. Dependency theorists further argue that —the development of capitalistic economies in the central obligated the underdevelopment of the periphery. Dependency theorists assert that —LDCs may have been under developed in the past; they only became underdeveloped as a result of their involvement as peripheral countries with countries in the corel. LDCs persist to be underdeveloped unless they are under the effect the core. Similarly after 9\11 episode war on terror started and Pakistan came on forefront again and was considered the most allied ally since US believe that many Taliban are blotting out in Pakistan. Consequently military aid augmented many times
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at the expense of the compromise of Pakistan’s sovereignty since drone attacks are obliterating terrorist along with number of acquitted people. Not only has this but United States also imperiled Pakistan for wraps of aid if Pakistan does not team up.  

Today, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has been involved in number of schemes i.e. health, education, good governance, energy economic development and natural catastrophes relief activities. But a single person does not give a thought to the fact that they are living in the classy areas of Islamabad. They are remunerated much higher than the usual market wages. It doesn’t seem an appropriate way of using aid for the purpose it is envisioned. Because when aid is given there is no space for prodigality and even a single a penny is used with through provision.  

The analyses of Pakistan addiction on US aid shows that US aid to Pakistan is similar to the necessity of blood in human body but it is also necessary to grasp that what would happened if US aid suddenly comes to halt?

4.4 CAN PAKISTAN SUBSIST WITHOUT US AID?

It is widely believed in West that endurance of Pakistan be contingent upon the economic aid of US. US legislators burlesqued that Pakistan accepts economic aid from US but each time failed to live up to the expectations of US. The US economic and military aid to Pakistan had long history stretched over decades during which US endowed Pakistan with billions of dollars. However, the matter of concern is that why US abetted Pakistan and what was the money destined for?

The British newspaper Guardian has cited a catalogue of six decades of US assistance. According to the catalogue US provided $61.7 billion (in constant 2009 dollars) as aid to Pakistan since 1948 to 2010 that is mostly meant for civilian purpose. Out of this
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assistance $40 billion were provided for military needs. The decade of 1960s witnessed the eminent pour of assistance when $2 billion were provided annually to Pakistan.\footnote{Murtaza Haider. — Can Pakistan Survive without US Aid? // Dawn, February 15th, 2012.}

**Title: US Aid to Pakistan, 1948-2010, (millions, constant 2009 US$)**

Source: Guardian.

Since 1982, US provided $17 billion as military and $13.5 billion as economic assistance to Pakistan. Pakistan received such colossal aid owing to unconcealed and clandestine US military operations in late 1970s, while the aid package precipitously plummeted in 1990s. After 9/11 US rejuvenated its aid package for Pakistan. It is widely believed that due to military assistance of US democratic and civil institutions of Pakistan have debilitated while it reinforced military establishment and its control over sociopolitical domains of Pakistan. In such an assessment one cannot perceive US military assistance as privilege to Pakistan somewhat military aid of US played a vigorous role in derailing democracy.\footnote{Ibid.} This US military aid during Zia and Musharraf
regime can be sited as a best example when we associate it with the decade of civil government in 1990s where US aid substantially plummeted.\textsuperscript{395}

In 2010, US economic assistance stretched to $1.8 billion. If we compute this amount in per capita basis it fallouts in sheer amount of $10.3 for 18 million people. Is it logical to contemplate that Pakistan survived on mere $10.3 per person in non-military and civil aid of US?\textsuperscript{396}

Pakistan is having $175 billion economy. US economic assistance to Pakistan since 2002 is around $825 million per annum. While expatriates transmittal averages $ 1 billion each month in 2011 that made transmittals much higher than what we gladly agree to take as handouts from US. To be sure, US taxpayers underwrote billions of dollars to Pakistan; furthermore US put lot of effort in rescue operations after deluge in 2011. On the other hand US war against terrorism in the region ascertained to be a greatest disaster for Pakistan’s economy and social setup. According to the figures given by government of Pakistan the cost of war in Afghanistan has stretched to $68 billion that is much higher than what US offered as economic and military assistance. And most outstandingly who to account for 36,000 Pakistani who lost their lives because of NATO’s war in the region. Unprejudiced reparation could be made only if UN get involved and corroborate all the entitlements and remunerate for all those entitlements.\textsuperscript{397}
In the budget of 2013 US administration determined to endorse $2.4 billion for the issue related to Pakistan. Out of $2.4 billion, $800 million are boarded upon intelligence operation in KP, FATA and supplementary security operations. $200 million would be disbursed on Pakistan but in reality such amounts seldom reach Pakistan. Take the example of Kerry Lugar Bill (The Enhancement Partnership with Pakistan Act 2009) that publicized $7.5 billion as succor to Pakistan spread over 5 years. The disbursement was decided to inaugurate in 2010 but still that amount is not arrogated. Nevertheless US legislators pressurize Pakistan for taking funds but fail to deliver their jobs.\(^{398}\)

Since its inception Pakistan is receiving massive aid from United States. The whole scenario depicts the very bright picture of the benefits that Pakistan is getting from aid but it is also essential to show other side of the coin.

### 4.5 INADVERTENT COSTS OF US AID TO PAKISTAN

After WW II US determined what policy it should adopt for the poor and densely populated countries of Asia. US picked Pakistan and provided millions of dollars to support its economy equipped it military to make it a loyal ally with strong democratic

---

institutions. Though Pakistan received aid from US since its inception but the proper
flow began in 1950s when Pakistan joined the Western alliance system. After Indo-Pak
war of 1965, the US reinstated economic aid but withheld the military aid to Pakistan.
In 1979, the US halted its aid owing to Pakistan’s nuclear program and military coup.
However, Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan again brought the traditional allies close
and President Carter in a fright offered $400 million as economic and military assistance
to Pakistan but president Zia disallowed the offer by calling it — peanuts.l

During Ronald Reagan administration, U.S. aid multiplied: roughly, three billion dollars
as economic support and two billion as military aid. In 1990, President George H. W.
Bush knapped military aid to Pakistan. Seemingly, this was rejoinder to Pakistan’s
pursuance for uranium enrichment, yet it is also a fact that, after the Soviets were obtrude
of Afghanistan, in the late eighties, the U.S. lost interest in the region.

The tragic event of 9/11 reactivated the Pak-US alliance, transforming Pakistan into
frontline state in the — war on terrorl. During George W. Bush regime Pakistan received
billions of dollars, comprising mostly unimpeded funds to combat terrorism. Pervez
Musharraf, who remained President from 1999 to 2008, confessed that all through his
regime he hived off a substantial portion of the funds to equip Pakistan arm against its
goblin foe, India. Musharraf in an interview to Express News held — Whoever wishes to
be angry, let them be angry—why should we bother? We need to administer our
security.l After installation of democratic government, there has been slight sign that the
U.S. provided $4.5 billion in 2010, one of the principal sums ever given to a foreign
nation is, certainly more appropriately utilized.

In 2009, Senators Richard Lugar and John Kerry, be acquainted with that American
military aid had imparted the Army and the I.S.I. jagged power in Pakistan, aided pass

legislation in Congress authorizing seven and a half billion dollars in civilian assistance, to be allocated over a period of five years. Pakistan’s the then Foreign Minister, evidently at the instruction of the military, went to Washington, and entreated that his country might not be intervened. The Pakistani military, in the interim, succumbs out of expenditure each month to the U.S. Government office in Islamabad; Guardian reports illustrate, receipts are not entreated.402

Now the question arises, what may perhaps ensue if the Pakistani military truly seize or slayed Al Qaeda's influential? The simple answer is that the unparalleled current of dollars possibly will come to halt; congruently as it happened in Afghanistan after the Soviets hobbled away. It can rightly grasped that, even with all the miseries of war on terror that it had transported to Pakistan, the military has been habituated on the money it produced.

Pakistan has certainly agonized over its authorized alliance with the U.S. In 2006, there were six suicide bombings in the country; the subsequent year there were fifty-six, with six hundred and forty people slayed. A year before, twelve hundred people were slew by suicide airborne assailters. More than three thousand Pakistani soldiers and officers have been slew in the war, comprising eighty-five members of the I.S.I.403 Yet great sums of these lesions have been auto-initiated, for the military and the I.S.I. formed and cultivated the groups, for example the Taliban—that have double-crossed the Pakistan. Moreover the money used to finance these radical associations came generally from American taxpayers.404

Various foreign policy specialists sustain that America can’t, at this point, chop off military aid to Pakistan. There are two projections to this debate. One is that America

---

needs Pakistan's backing in whipping out the Taliban. On the off chance the U.S. draws back its aid, then, Pakistan might refuse to fly drones over tribal areas. Not just American military aid has been misapplied and distorted; it may well have destabilized the Pakistani military, which has eaten up enormous bequests however is far-off feeble than its adversary, the Indian military. Encase the degree of assistance is the appreciation of the Pakistani people and the commitment of their government then it has undoubtedly been a letdown. A year back, a Pew Research Center review exposed that half of Pakistanis conceive that the U.S. gives petite or no assistance whatsoever. 405

Eradication, or else plummeting, military aid to Pakistan may have some repercussions, but might not be as grim as we contemplate. Lessening the power of military may unfold avenues for civilian rule. Various Pakistanis prefer less U.S. aid; their shibboleth is —trade not aid.‖ Such a tactic may authorize the civilian working population. India may perhaps welcome impoverishment in military aid to Pakistan, and the U.S. could use this as force to supercharge India to allow the Kashmiris to decide their future, which might be in favor of independence. These two moves culminate into Pakistan's solidity and would assure its amity, than the billions of dollars that we accept as imbursement. Though US aid gave military, enormous power but it is also a fact that if the aid comes to halt it will not affect the military. 406

After scrutinizing the key issues and US aid to Pakistan it is necessary to take a look that to whom the aid is actually benefiting. Regardless of some benefits that Pakistan incurred from US aid there are number of incidents that can depict the losses incurred by Pakistan because of US assistance to Pakistan. It is also contemplated that the benefits of aid directly goes to Pakistani forces. But actually US aid is contributing not much to the military and the following brief sketch will justify the fact. 407
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4.6 US AID & IT INPUT TO PAKISTAN ARMY

White House Chief Staff William Daley in New York Times reported on Sunday 10th July 2011 substantiated that Obama withheld $ 800 million of military aid to Pakistan to evince the annoyance over Pakistan’s act for snipping of US military trainers, issues regarding visa policy for US personnel and other nuisances.408

Former ambassador to US Rt. Maj. General Mehmood Durani articulated his opinions on deferral of aid by US that it might have some somber repercussions and would mutilate the partnership of both the countries. He further added that Pakistan is fighting for the US therefore it is mandatory that US must recompense the cost and if they don’t then it would be breach of covenant and persuasion as well.

4.6.1 Descending Helix

US secretary of state, Hillary Clinton in her statement made in June 2011 affirmed that Washington cannot linger military support to Pakistan in the same level as upheld in bygone till some positive development in US Pak relations. Moreover, it was necessitated that Pakistan army must cut its entire acquaintances with militants that it has nurtured in the past and sought that Pakistan must unveiled ground operation in North Waziristan, a safe haven of militants round the world.409

In retort Pakistan claimed that it is doing all what it can to combat the militants at the expense of the lives of thousands. Ayesha Siddiqa an expert on Pakistan US affairs uttered that by incising its military aid US is inducing Pakistan to do what they do not aspire otherwise and forcing Pakistan to contemplate about negotiation rather than pugnacious with militants.

---

4.6.2 Economic Impact

While commenting on the issue she added that deferment of aid was merely indicant and if they cutoff economic aid it would have far more grave impacts on Pakistan. It might distress Pakistan negotiation with IMF concerning $11 billion loan that is shoring up its economy. Asif Qureshi director at Invisor Securities Ltd stated that the most immediate bearing of the cutoff aid would be political since it is gesture of tautness between US and Pakistan.

US played imperative part in locking agreement between Pakistan and IMF in November 2008. In August 2010 IMF clogged release of fund because Pakistan's government fails to meet pledged fiscal reforms. 410

4.7 THE ACTUAL BENEFICIARY OF US AID

The mystery of US-Pak strategic partnership is unfolding after the demise of Bin Laden. The states entering in strategic partnership normally bear equivalent sufferings but in case of US Pakistan, US is providing aid to Pakistan to further its objectives that instigated ever-increasing deficit in revenue. Since the event of 9\11 the rapport is turning to be much more intricate and even perplexing. The Abbottabad operation by US gave the impression that they are playing double game with Pakistan. 110

US want Pakistan to be democratic and unwavering state. The civilian government in Pakistan too shares the similar opinions. As far as the phenomenon of US aid to Pakistan in post 9\11 is concerned it is muddy. No doubt, US wish that Pakistan must continue the proxy war to overthrow Al-Qaeda and Taliban in Afghanistan and Pakistan, preserve armistice in periphery and install democratic government in the country. However if we analyze the aid program closely, we will find that surprisingly the prime beneficiary of US aid is Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate (ISI). Therefore, we can say that instead of supporting Pakistan US has beefed up the intelligence establishment that serves only

its own interest. Now the alarming situation demands that, both the states must determine the future course of this partnership.111

4.7.1 Five Decades of Aid to Pakistan 1950-2001

i. From Independence to Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

Since its inception, Pakistan persisted at the mercy of aid from different states. According to some rough approximations from 1960-2002 Pakistan received (in 2001 price) $73.1 billion as aid from different sources.411 Out of this aid about 30% comes from US, the principal solitary bilateral benefactor by far.412

This immense aid was made possible by aligning itself with US by civilian and military establishment. By joining SEATO and CENTO Pakistan anticipated to acquire benefits in economic and military divisions while US gazed Pakistan as a ramparts against the menace of Communism.

The decade of 1960s witnessed the heavy flow of aid from USAID and other sources.114 By 1964 US aid touched around 5% of its GDP that abetted Pakistan in industrial development and growth in GDP up to 7% annually.413 Owing to Indo-Pak war in 1965 US cut back its aid to Pakistan which recommenced after few years though at much lower level.414

4.7.2 From Soviet Incursion to 9\11

The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan fetched much more aid to Pakistan being a frontline state against communist attack. Huge sum of money and military equipment
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were sent to Mujahedeen by means of Pakistan's military and its intelligence agencies like ISI. However this assistance was not meant for Pakistan though some indications depict that many of these were illicitly bagged by Pakistan’s officials.\textsuperscript{415} Pakistan also received assistance from US but that was meant for the reclamation of Afghan refugees and expansion of communication links between Pakistan and Afghanistan. However US image in Pakistan became shaky owing to its failure to assist Pakistan in 1971 war and US stress to contain Soviet rather than backing Pakistan.

The spike in US aid during Soviet occupation suddenly falls when President George W. H. Bush failed to manifest before Congress that Pakistan did not own nuclear weapons as mandatory to Pressler Amendment. Consequently, assistance chopped down from $452 million in 1989 to 1% of that in 1998 due to infliction of sanctions from US.\textsuperscript{416} US aid to Pakistan during Soviet invasion provided benefits in short-run, but its impacts were devastating in log-run since it prepared ground for terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

The terrorist attacks on 9\11 entirely change the mechanism of aid to Pakistan. The earlier years were dominated by aid on economic and humanitarian ground. During 1980s US aid was meant for bracing military establishment and other intelligence agencies. Aid that benefited in the past generated uninvited ills for Pakistan in later years. Since —development aidl and —war aidl are different in category therefore the later produced serious consequences as it up brings such entities for which Pakistan had to pay after three decades.\textsuperscript{417}

4.7.3 The Complex Issue of US Aid 2001-2010

\textsuperscript{416} Ibid, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{417} Ibid, p. 5.
9/11 and Military-Centric Aid

US sanctioned circa $19 billion or average of $2 billion annually, while this allocation was twice in 2010 ($3.6 billion) in 2007. From 2002-2008, 10% of overt aid was allocated for developmental purposes while 75% was allocated for military, though the ratio of economic aid has elevated recently but still less than half to the ratio of military aid.\(^{418}\)

US gazed Pakistan as the most allied ally in war against terrorism and had wooed Pakistan military for operations against the militants. To indemnify military US had established Coalition Support Fund (CSF) that is meant only for the cost of fighting against terrorists rather than any other military disbursement. About 2\(\frac{3}{4}\)-60% of money is remunerated to Pakistan from CSF.\(^{121}\) According to US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates that about 90 Pakistan’s army operations and deployment of 100,000 soldiers on Afghan border were sponsored from CSF.\(^{419}\)

Since 2009 another category of security fund has been set up i.e. Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) or Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF). This category has been established with the objectives parallel to CSF but the only alteration is that funds are exploited for military operations against insurrectionaries in Pakistan like Swat operation in 2009. This is productive for both the states as the masses in Pakistan support such operations as well for combating vehemence in the country.\(^{420}\)

Till 2009 the share of economic assistance in overall assistance to Pakistan remained much low. The tenacity of reanimating the partnership was counterterrorism not growth of other sectors. Out of total aid from 2001-2008, 25% was owed for economic
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assistance. About $5.8 billion of US aid were depleted in FATA, the hub of all terrorist activities, out of which 96% was exploited for military operations and only 1% for development.\textsuperscript{124}

The ratio of economic aid provided by US is even less than other donors. Typically such funds are provided for literacy, health, food, democracy and governance. However, this aid comes through USAID; cash transfer is also handy for Pakistan with no conditions attached to it.\textsuperscript{421}

Lately, US have calculated a policy for the development of tribal areas but due to some palpable whys and wherefores the strategy could not yield anticipated fallouts, since Pakistan is fighting a proxy war so any program deliberated by US cannot work, even Pakistani government is not enthusiastic to ripen tribal areas so they can make best possible use of economic aid.

\begin{verbatim}
4.7.4  Kerry-Lugar-Berman and Reconsidering of US Aid

Since 2008 there is an evident change in the nature of aid program. The paramount effort in this direction was made in the form of Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act 2009 that guaranteed to provide $7.5 billion economic aid overextended period of five years. However, there exists uncertainty over the release of the aid program. According to newspaper report that in 2010 and 2011 about $1.5 billion has been released on annual bases. According to US embassy in Islamabad only $285 million has been spent till May 2011. The rundown till yet is $32.16 million for two dam projects, $45 million on flood relief recovery, $39 million for students to study in US, $45 million for higher education, $75 million for income support to poor Pakistanis and $ 10.43 million for small infrastructure projects.\textsuperscript{422}
\end{verbatim}


Though United States is accentuating the importance of economic aid but still it is eclipsed by military aid. In October 2010 US sanctioned $2 billion as military assistance with the stipulation that the money will be utilize for the acquisition of arm and other supplements within a time period from 2012-2016, to combat insurrectionaries. The recent aid strategy from US is —qualified aid‖ e.g. Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill that asked for military accountability with reference to the usage of funds. The bill demands that secretary of state has to manifest to US that its military establishment has cut off its entire links with militants and had torn down their bases. Besides, it is also accentuated that the aid is meant for operations against terrorist not for up gradation or purchase of F-16 or ramping up its military competences against India. The utmost imperative clause of the bill is that aid will be available for only civilian government and will not appreciate any military coup.

Nevertheless, the strings attached with the bill gave birth to some crucial questions. Why so much military conditions are attached on non-military aid that has to be executed by civilian government that is often under the control of military? how it will be guaranteed that the conditions imposed on non-military aid will be cherished by the army since the history depicts that civilian government have less control over military and that military is behind all the vital judgments made by civilian government.

The pact has not been amply operational; therefore it’s not easy to conclude that what would be the bearing of the strings and how both the state will redress the question as it would be vital for determining the imminent course of this partnership. Even now, many in US are marvel about the statement of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that Pakistan meets the conditions obligatory by the bill as well as —sustained commitment to and….significant efforts towards combating terrorist groups. If both the partners are


fantasizing that the conditions attached with the bill have met which essentially not, by what means we can say that we are moving ahead?

The aid package of 2002-2008 was predestined for Republican administration in US and military regime in Pakistan where US got entrée to Afghanistan while Pakistan got military benefits. However, administrative change in both the countries has tilted the standing of aid program. There are less one-on-one exchanges between the higher authorities of both the states while other personnel are involved on their behalf. President Barak Obama sent number of officials to deal with their counterparts in Pakistan. Notwithstanding of its flaws one encouraging development in Pakistan is that this time elected government is involved in these deliberations.425

An encouraging movement befell in their relations when US abetted the deluge affected in 2009 in Pakistan on humanitarian ground and provided $400 million as aid. This act of US was highly appreciated by the people of Pakistan but all lasts for few days since large number of people in frontier perished in drone attack by US therefore it is obvious that any assistance in non-military sphere is overshadowed by military aid and action.

4.8 HAS AID BEEN EFFECTIVE?

US has endowed huge sum in assistance to Pakistan. Now the question is that what is the quotient of feat? If we analyze the whole scenario since 2002 it is evident from the fact that it has been failed to achieve the common objectives. Even both the states have common objective is exaggerated despite of the fact that they are receiving the aid. US motive behind aid is counterterrorism while Pakistan military view the game plan is quite a different matter.

It is hard to accurately assess the impact of aid. Both the countries are jointly working hard to root out the terrorists since past ten years but it’s even hard to detect the results. Questions like have Ai-Qaeda been rooted out can be answered easily but to what extent
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is difficult to answer. US effort of killing Bin Laden has raised number of question for Pakistan military and their role in war against terror and impact of aid.

Subsequent to six years engagement in war, in 2007 Defense Department of US analyzed that they paid out high magnitude of aid devoid of any objective realization. These developments obligated the Defense Department to set up anti-insurgent force and also give training to Pakistani troops in FATA. The CSF is established with the objective to disburse Pakistan’s military only the cost of operations against terrorism. However, till early 2009 no such objectives attainment attached with the funds release are made by US. From 2002-2007, $9.7 billion have approved by US for the rummage sale to be used for the operations against fanatic and insurrectionaries.

In the face of all these determinations, there is not as much of consideration on how this aid is exploited since Pakistan utilizes a major percentage for up gradation and procurement of conventional weapon rather than furtherance of US objectives. It is said that both the countries are affianced in billing disputes as US overruled more than 40% of Pakistan’s entitlement as —uncorroboratedl or —hyperbolizedl entitlements. An illustration of such discrepancy is that Pakistan forces used helicopters provided by US in Sudan on UN peace keeping mission. There are other legion instances where Pakistan used US aid for its peculiar pluses rather than the tenacity for which it is meant for, while some of the US officials reported that huge sum of aid is used by Pakistan to deal with it traditional rival India.

It is not only maladministration of funds that irritated US but proof in black and white form proposed that pursuit of US objectives is not first primacy of Pakistan. It was also signposted in recent press release that Pakistan is playing double game with US. Chairman of Committee on Intelligence Dianne Feinstein stated —it is commonly believed that Pakistan is walking on both sides of the roadl. Nicholas Kristof wrote that
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even after receiving aid of $18 billion since 9/11 Pakistan is still shielding Taliban enervating US assets.\textsuperscript{428} A former US Ambassador to Afghanistan stated that US government reprimand to cut off its entire links with insurrectionaries or else they will be vindicated to launch military operation against these messy elements even devoid of Pakistan's acquiescence.\textsuperscript{429} US diplomat articulated that US is exasperated over its fading endeavors to coax Pakistan to cut its entire associations with activists.\textsuperscript{430}

The demise of Bin Laden provoked apprehensions amongst US policy makers who marveled that either the institutions are shamefaced or ineffectual that Bin Laden lived for years in Pakistan. Nevertheless, it elevated some important questions like what was the motive of aid if such hiatus or treachery happens. Some of the Congressmen and one of the signatory of Kerry Lugar Bill evinced that US aid failed to yield fallouts for which it was meant for; therefore, aid is not efficacious. Another Congressman Jim Moran who participated in Defense Appropriation Sub-Committee proposed that US should recoup military aid and extend economic aid and it should be avowed that aid must be consumed for non-military purpose.\textsuperscript{431} Former US Ambassador to Pakistan Anne Patterson inscribed in secret review that Pakistan’s military and its clandestine agencies are condescending four militant groups i.e. Haqqani’s HQN, Mullah Umar QST, Al-Qaeda and Let and will not halt supporting them at any cost paid by US.\textsuperscript{432}

Bearing in mind these grievances US deferred $800 million in military aid.\textsuperscript{433} The New York Times reported that the aid will recommence only after development in their relations, but how it can mend is ill-defined.
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Both the countries are feeling suffocation in this partnership as war progresses. In Pakistan it is generally assumed that this is America’s war and Pakistan has haggard to war because of America. Most of the Pakistaniis contemplate that owing to enhancing role of US in the region Pakistan is the only country that is suffering a lot. It is appraised that in 2003, 189 people died owing to terrorist related actions while the number multiplied many times and reached to 3,599 in 2007 and since then it’s increasing as the time passes on. According to official sources 35,000 people lost their lives since 2001. It is also argued that this numeral is greater than the troops who died in Afghanistan. It has struck Pakistan’s economy since Pakistan suffered loss of $ 68 billion since 2002. It is also commonly believed that Pakistan's assistance to US in her war fetched the war across the border and this collaterally results in the assassination of Pakistan's former Prime Minister Benazir as well. However it is not easy to access the bearing of war from drawn hypotheses but it is also a fact that such urgings cannot be overlooked. US is indicted for fetching the war into Pakistan and not containing to Afghanistan, consequently all this acidifying the relationship.

A number of clusters in Pakistan have confidence that underneath the concealment of US gravity civil and military establishment can eradicate extremism; drone attacks can be sighted as example of the point. Though they overtly denounce these attacks but actually they regard these attacks as the most potent weapon against terrorism.

From the perspective of both the countries the post 9/11 aid is more engrossed on military assistance rather than development aid. This aid too miscarried to attain the anticipated effects for both the countries; even it is reckoned that the objectives are unclear. However, aid has induced the virus of military coup which US austerely condemn.

Though efforts have been made to revise the nature of the aid program through Kerry-Luger-Berman Bill but still queries linked to aid are ambivalent. However, if we look at

---

Abbottabad operation it looks like that this is not a matter of and has nothing to do with aid program but a matter of autonomous action against terrorism. Kerry-LugarBerman Bill accentuate upon infrastructure than building civil society which shows the change in strategy which provide ease in disbursements on and validating the infrastructure. However, there have been some indigestive questions like there are other worthwhile ventures to be sponsored rather than the new with more money, there is no development concerning inducements nor are they compelling to employ money on the designated zone. No doubt, US can ruminate that in what manner it can use the money in best possible way and to the best of its advantage. Actually, America is so much focused in war against terror that it is overlooking the fact that they can fetch regional peace and constancy by altering its strategy. By making use of rational means it can curtail waste of money and can capitalize on the fallouts by refining its relations with NGOs in Pakistan.\footnote{S Akbar Zaidi. —Who Benefits from US aid to Pakistan?‖ \textit{Economic and Political Weekly}, Vol. 46, No. 32, 2011, p. 14.}  

In Pakistan most of the scholars and high brows who accept the fact that military is the most eclipsing and robust institution. It is also believed that US military aid is liable for making military commanding that laterally or collaterally made democracy and democratic institutions feeblish. US less vehemence on economic aid is a clear signal that how much it is genuine in edifying Pakistan‘s economy and social sector. This is a time for Pakistan to take some strong step if they want to take advantage of US open handedness to be in a position to combat terrorism in a true sense.\footnote{Ibid.}  

Regarding US aid to Pakistan different question has elevated both in US and Pakistan. After Abbottabad operation the question is elevated that what US has attained after providing $20 billion as aid? The answer is —not very muchl. Likewise in Pakistan the question is elevated that what US aid has chipped in for the people of Pakistan? The answer is matching —not very muchl apart from consolidation military institution.
4.9 CONCLUSION

Foreign aid is key source of capital that has the potential to flourish economy.\footnote{Foreign aid may be defined as the transfers of all governmental resources from one country to another country. In other words, foreign aid is one that encompasses all official grants and concessional loans, in currency or in kind, that are broadly aimed at transferring resources from developed to less developed nations, on development or income distribution grounds [Todaro (2000), p. 591].} Extensive literature on economic growth underscores the part played by foreign aid in economic development. It also culminates in relocating of technology. Pakistan has extremely been dependent on foreign aid for its economic development. This strategy has increased dependency on foreign resources. Pakistan has received massive foreign aid since 9\textbackslash{}11 but the benefits of this aid have not overreached to the entire society. Consequently it failed to underwrite to ameliorate economic condition of Pakistan. The literacy rate is still 52% while other social indicators such as education, health and employment etc. present gloomy picture. Foreign aid has not been employed for economic development rather it is utilized for vested interest of the elite class.\footnote{Dr. Pervez Khan Khalil, interview, Op. Cit., April 25, 2014.} Foreign loan taken in 1990s at commercial rate aggravated the foreign debt. Therefore it can be said that foreign aid as a tool of economic growth failed to prove the desired results.

Both Pakistan and United States have some whys and wherefores to be thwarted that massive aid produced trifling auspicious fallouts. Still United States is enthusiastic that military aid emboldens Pakistan’s military to combat terrorism. Though it is uncertain that Pakistan army contemplate on the same line or Pakistani government is sincere in its efforts to root out Al-Qaeda and Taliban. US soldiers are dying in Afghanistan by that group whose leader has taken shelter in Pakistan.

It is hard to estimate the consequences of war but one thing is for sure that Pakistan has been the dupe of the war. Keeping aside the cost it bear, effort has been made by civilian and military institutions about deracinate domestic terrorism and they have been bit successful in their efforts, even though issues like fundamentalism and pugnaciousness in pre 9\textbackslash{}11 and drone attacks in post 9\textbackslash{}11 have severe consequences on Pakistan.
Hitherto, it is probable that US intentionally overlooked the aid relationship and snubbed the procedures. There are also some facts that Pakistan used US aid for acquiring conventional weapons rather than utilizing it for the purpose for which it is meant for i.e. counterterrorism.

The proportion of military aid is greater than economic aid that reinforced military by sidestepping civilian government. However, in 2009 steps has been taken to reverse this balance.

Now the fundamental question is that why US keeps aiding Pakistan when it is not getting the anticipated fallouts, where unscrupulousness and fraudulency is involved? From Pakistan’s perspective it is not entirely at the mercy of US since they are not getting the most out of this aid. It can be said that it is only the military that is getting maximal from this aid.

It is quite clear that US is paying high cost for getting a bit of its accomplished objectives and determined to continue to aid though flagging the democratic institutions. United States has taken assent for NATO supplies and drone attacks but still the soul of collaboration between the two allies is lost. Drone attacks in Pakistan are damaging the simulacrum of US in Pakistan. Kerry-Lugar-Berman Bill is a step in the course to make best use of its aid. Though it will take time to get things done rightly but in long terms it might have some fecund outcomes for both the countries.
CHAPTER – 5

PAK-US ALLIANCE: CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE

Since international politics is an amalgamation of diplomatic delicacies which promote, enhance and protect national interest in international community, therefore, national interest has become ethical core of relations between states wherein enmity and friendship are expediencies of time frame while national interest is something permanent which folds and unfold interaction between developed and developing states. This process may be termed as convergence and divergence of national interests between states and this is time tested history of Pak-US alliance mechanism.

Convergence of interest in the relations between US and Pakistan is an outcome of Pakistan seeming menace from India, counterterrorism and its yearning to have enough capacity to deter intimidations. After 9/11 India made efforts to

---
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augment its defense relationship with US, but global war on terror and Operation Enduring Freedom made Pakistan a central ally of US.438

General David Petraeus the US commander of CENTCOM specified that every single country has the right to guard its national interest and other state necessarily collaborate with it if their national interests congregate. The US and Pakistan interest converge but they also have their own core national interests.439

The tragic episode of 9/11 marked the new foundation of the old alliance. Consequently interest of Pakistan and US converged though there is divergence in their interest. Before 9/11 Pakistan was under US sanctions. Another nuisance between the two states was Pakistan’s upkeep to Taliban in Afghanistan who were supporting Al-Qaeda in the name of—Global Jihad440 particularly against US. US measured this support against its economic, political and security interests. However, 9/11 brought the two traditional allies close to one another. The event of 9/11 transformed South Asia into combat zone in general and Pakistan and Afghanistan in particular. Nicholas Burns US State Department under Secretary specified US war on terror would be wrestled and decided in Afghanistan and Pakistan.441

Pakistan grasps 9/11 incident as an opening to resuscitate its alliance with US that was diluted due to 1998 nuclear tests and 1999 military coup. Since Pakistan inception both the allies are tracking their national interests though the

440 According Islamic traditions and religion_‘Jihad’ means a Holy War against anything un-Islamic or evil in the name of God by the puritans.
approach to track them often diverges. US acted otherwise to deal with the perception of extremism. Apart from using power US is employing socio-economic and political transformations to deter zealotry.

After 9/11 there are copious ends which Pakistan and United States reciprocally want to realize. In the US now there is inclusive understanding that the US needs Pakistan in its war on terror. US want to conserve good relations with Pakistan to accomplish its multiple objectives like war on terror, nuclear non-proliferation and entrée to Central Asia. US Department of State and Department of Defense affirmed that Pakistan drawnout unparalleled support to US. Pakistan army realized that its support to Taliban was hard to pursue. Because of its immobilized financial framework Pakistan require political will and assets to undertake assailants. US provided Pakistan with both, and incurred Pakistan's support in war on terror. Weak domestic environment obligated Pakistan to join US led war on terror. Musharraf while resuscitating alliance with US, want to reinforce his control over state power. Prime Minister Shukat Aziz asserted in Council of Foreign Relations in New York that this alliance is imperative for regional solidity. Pakistan has been the most allied ally and the most sanctioned ally of US. This time this partnership looks as if to be long-lived. When the President of both the countries met in New York in 2001 they hailed the resuscitated alliance and elucidated new image for this association. Both the

---

443 Ibid.
countries anticipated that this association might be noteworthy for persevering peace, firmness, and budgetary development at regional and global level. This chapter highlights different issues on which their mutual interests converged and contrasts particularly subsequent to war on terror.

After revitalization of this partnership the relations between the two countries upgraded and reservations have been detached by staying in touch frequently. The resuscitated partnership is found on more ripe level. United States is global power while Pakistan has its regional interests, therefore both countries can realize their corresponding interests with the support of one another. US Secretary of Defense uttered that the partnership between Pakistan and US is —strategic1 and reciprocally —beneficial and US would endeavor to make it resilient. For better understanding now we will discuss one by one some of the major issues on which their interests converge.

5.1 CONVERGENCE IN THE INTERESTS

5.1.1 Joining the War on Terror

The magnitude of terrorist attacks can be made certain by the US hasty response since President Bush affirmed —Terrorism against our nation would not stand. Within six days of attack Bush decided to attack Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan thus stigmatizing the beginning of war on terror. Momentarily US comprehended that it cannot wage war in Afghanistan on its own and it needs the jam-packed support of Pakistan. According to Carnegie Endowment report

---

if US want Pakistan's genuine support than it has to advance and reinforce communal trust.\textsuperscript{450}

Due to juxtaposition with Afghanistan, Pakistan was the finest choice to be taken up by US. On the Pakistan’s part the core motivation for joining the war was that if Pakistan snubbed to join war then it might face global segregation and that India would take the place as ally that would be detrimental for Pakistan's security.\textsuperscript{451} If we relate the interest of both the allies we can grasp that Pakistan has very narrow interests in joining the war like Kashmir cause, economic interests and preservation of its resources while US had broader interest that ambit from regional to global. Some of them have upshots for Pakistan. In retort to US support in war US relinquish the sanctions inflicted owing to nuclear tests and military coup and provided economic and military support to Pakistan. This also augments openings for Pakistan to have lingering dealings with international community.\textsuperscript{452} Pak-US security interest congregated at the theme of hammering extremist and culprit of 9\11 since Pakistan itself was a dupe of extremism since 1980s, and the General Zia Ul Haq policy of Islamization can also be accredited as a cause for this extremism. In backing of his pronouncement of joining the war Musharraf wrote —the benefit of supporting the war were many. First we would be able to eliminate extremism from our society and flush out the foreign terrorist in our midst. We could not do this alone; we need the technical and financial support of US to be able to find and defeat these terrorists.\textsuperscript{453} 


\textsuperscript{452} Rehman Fazal. —\textit{Pakistan and the War on Terrorism}.\textit{ Strategic Studies} Islamabad, Vol. XXIII, No. 30, Autumn, 2003, p. 58.

General Musharraf in a press conference with President Bush at Waldorf Astoria stated that he saw the — dawn of a new era of relationship between Pakistan and US.\textsuperscript{454} Condoleezza Rice US National security Advisor in an interview to CNN expressed her views that Pakistan is a most important partner in war on terror and it is absolutely in disparity to the policies pursued by Pakistan before 9\textvisibletext{11}. She further added that Musharraf and his government are copiously backing up US in war on terror.\textsuperscript{455} In 2004 the relationship got prescribed gratitude when US used the term the — most allied ally for Pakistan.\textsuperscript{456}

\textbf{i. Collaboration in Operation Enduring Freedom (Incursion of Afghanistan)}

The operation in Afghanistan on the go on 7\textsuperscript{th} October 2001 in retort to air attacks of 9\textvisibletext{11} with determined objective of hammering Al-Qaeda and to make them impotent to use Afghanistan as base for launching pad for terrorist snipes. US too determined to flush out Taliban regime in Afghanistan. For this purpose it required logistic and intelligence support that could be made available from Pakistan because of juxtaposition to Afghanistan. US Assistant Secretary of the State for South and Central Asian Affairs Richard A. Boucher affirmed Pakistan’s support as crucial for US policy goals in flushing out terrorists. Pakistan’s support is critical in Operation Enduring Freedom because without Pakistan it would be tough to match Al-Qaeda. Pakistan is also vital country in the sense that its permanency is vital for the constancy of the region and it links noncoastal Central Asia to the international market. This is why long-lived,

multi-faceted and robust partnership is indispensable with Pakistan.\textsuperscript{457} The US State and Defense Department also acknowledged the point that Pakistan’s support helped in categorizing and impeding the radicals and it deployed its own security forces to care for Pak-Afghan border.\textsuperscript{458}

US Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld in Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) report presented a new stance of US defense. The report was in reality equipped before 9/11. It documented —new strategic environmentl wrapping up —particularly antiaccess and area denial threatsl where US forces were not permitted by juxtaposing state to function, the report necessitated for change of direction of US forces. The two very central offers were;\textsuperscript{459}

a. Cultivate a "basing system" with extra bases that gives more excellent malleability for U.S. forces in crucial zone of the world

b. Deliver enough versatility, incorporating airlift, sealift, and elective focuses for new logistical thoughts of operations, to lead expeditionary operations in remote auditoria against foes outfitted with weapons of mass decimation and different intends to repudiate entrée to U.S. forces.\textsuperscript{460}

The incident of 9/11 provided platform for the implementation of these proposals. For this purpose it looked-for air bases juxtaposing Afghanistan for logistic and other activities in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

\textsuperscript{457} Richard A. Boucher, Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs, Statement before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs Washington, DC. Available on http://islamabad.usembassy.gov/pakistan/h07071301.html retrieved on 29/1/11.

\textsuperscript{458} In January 2004, the Commander of the U.S. Central Command, Gen. Abizaid, said, —Pakistan has done more for the United States in the direct fight against Al Qaeda than any other country.‖ Ron Laurenzo, —Abizaid: Pakistan Best Ally in War on Terror.‖ Defense Week, February 2, 2004.
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Notwithstanding of the existence of Islamist groups, Musharraf gave the rights of air bases at several places.⁴⁶¹

**ii. Supply of Logistics by Road**

Pakistan is also a countersigner to an indenture with US in which it sworn to give chockfull backing in logistics. In the light of this contract approximately 75% of US and NATO supplies passes through Pakistan. But the topical development in tribal areas in which the supplies are impaired obligated US to contemplate over alternate routes.⁴⁶²

**iii. Placement of Troops on Pak-Afghan Boarder**

Pakistan shares a long border with Afghanistan where Pakistan has deployed its forces up to 90,000 and established 1000 check posts to block any insurrection. But irrespective of all these pains Pakistan is often blamed for supporting insurgency that is not utilitarian. If comparative analysis is made it can be determined that Pakistan is doing more than what it can. If we gaze at across the border we can grasp that there are not more than 200 check posts and 70,000 total forces. This can evidently show Pakistan's efforts in counter-terrorism that US must own up.²⁸

**iv. Intelligence Support**

In his speech before Georgia Public Policy Foundation at Georgia President Bush alleged that he has erudite lesson from 9/11 i.e. to defend US, for this drive they will smash Al-Qaeda and its proxies. This time US approach would be much different. Parallel to military tools US would employ financial tool to contain pecuniary sustenance Al-Qaeda. They also use diplomatic pressure to dismantle Al-Qaeda network.⁴⁶³

---


ISI have substantial amount of evidence of Afghanistan, Taliban and radicals along both sides of the border and US is cognizant of the fact that devoid of intelligence sharing with Pakistan it cannot be sure-fire in its war on terror. ISI paid much of time in 1990s dealing with Taliban and ultimately congregated adequate gen of Taliban and AlQaeda network. Therefore, it would be adequate help for US.\(^{464}\) Imtiaz Gul writes in his book that — the CIA and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) have been heavily dependent on the human assets of ISI for operation and surveillance with regard to war on terror.\(^{465}\) According to CRS report about Pak-US anti-terrorism activities that there are frequent anti-terrorist agencies of US and FBI are backing-up Pakistan in their riposte fanatic deeds since 2002.\(^{466}\) Musharraf on Pak-US nexus in war on terror uttered that — there is total coordination at intelligence level between the two forces; there is coordination at the operational level, at strategic level, even at tactical level. So therefore we are working together, and when the situation arises, we need to take right decisions to strike.\(^{466}\) The Hindustan Times quoted that both US and Pakistan are working to reinforce their military bonds and intelligence sharing in the war on terror.\(^{467}\) Likewise Jerusalem Post quoted concerning the role of intelligence of the seizure of key Al-Qaeda leaders in Pakistan, that after use of substantial military force in Afghanistan it is contingent on Pakistan’s police and intelligence to eradicate the left over militants. Nab of Bin Laden top comrades Abu Zubaydah and Khalid Sheikh from Pakistan is the principal instance of

intelligence support.\textsuperscript{468} The gradation of collaboration can be calculated through the fact that after 9/11, President Musharraf determined to join the war while some of the ISI officials were indisposed to join the war hence Musharraf swapped ISI Director General Mahmood with Lt. General Ehasn-Ul-Haq and was given the chore to refurbish ISI by eradicating the radical adherent from ISI. Consequently 40\% of ISI officers were swapped. In this regard list of pro-Taliban was provided by US.\textsuperscript{469} The gen provided by ISI shown to be vigorous for realization of Operation Enduring Freedom and other activities against Al-Qaeda. Similarly 9/11 fetched fundamental variations in ISI now has an anti-terrorism department with the title of Counter Terrorism Cell (CTC) with proficient personnel. ISI is liable for all intelligence activities but this time their involvement is quite different than that of 1980. This time FBI is their companion who certainly not launched operation in this region. They have steered about 2000 operation in Pakistan since 9/11.\textsuperscript{470}

v. Provision of Air & water routs

Pakistan not only provided intelligence support to the US but also conceded its three bases of Pasni, Jacobabad and Dalbandin to support aligned forces in Afghanistan. It is also maintained that drones fly from Pakistani air bases though these assertions have been abnegated by Pakistan to evade mass extreme antipathy and reproach. Daily Times Pakistan’s English newspaper quoted Rand Corporation report of 2004 that —Pakistan provided the US access to numerous military bases and helped establish facilities including Intermediate Staging Bases at Jacobabad, Pasni, Dalbandin and Shamsi; predator basing at

\textsuperscript{468} Jerusalem Post, March 4, 2003.


\textsuperscript{470} Pak, US decide to Enhance Intelligence Sharing. The Hindustan Times. May 5, 2006.
Jacobabad and Shamsi, and access to other bases used by over 50 aircraft and 2000 coalition military personnel at these locales. Apart from providing air bases to US, Pakistan is also facilitating them for mooring of ships at Pasni. At sea, Pakistan Navy condensed its activities and preparations. According to the US Marine Corps Gazette of June 2002, the Coalition Naval Operations at Pasni were the largest amphibious operations in size, duration and depth that the Marine Corps had conducted since the Korean War. In all, 8000 Marines, 330 vehicles and over 1350 tons of equipment/logistic were off loaded at the beach and later flown to Kandahar from Pasni.

All the bases were tactically situated in the South West of Pakistan nearby the Pak-Afghanistan border from where the coalition forces were provided technical help in their operations against Taliban in Afghanistan. However, despite the fact that both are partner in war on terror and Pakistan extended support to US, Pakistan and United States for strengthening their bilateral relations started strategic dialogues.


For the better acquaintance and harmonization towards a unwavering relationship between the two cohorts straightforwardly fighting the War on Terror Pakistan and the US started ‘Pak-US Strategic Dialogue’ as a stage to talk over and authorize projections of interest between the two in a more formal manner. The Administration of President George W. Thorn had begun a —Strategic Dialoguel process with Pakistan in 2006. The two countries decided to hold talk in March 2006. The aberrant consultations happened in 2007 and 2008. Former Pakistan’s Ambassador in Washington Mahmud Ali Durrani held

---

that Pakistan and the US have decided to hold the talk after as consistent as a Timex and undoubtedly it is an —excellent vehicle to the progress of overall bilateral relationship.\textsuperscript{1} The Strategic Dialogue succors the two sides to deliberate methodologies to make advancement and nurture synchronized effort in locales of shield, education, science and technology, economy and energy.\textsuperscript{474} The Obama conglomeration restored this forum in March 2010.\textsuperscript{475}

5.1.2 Shared Desire for Peace in South Asia

This is another issue upon which they share same view point and both the allies are plying their role in bringing peace and tranquility in the region since both the states realize the significance of the region and that peace in South Asia is essential for ensuring global peace.

i. The Nuclear Sub-Continent: Bringing Stability to South Asia

In response to the published —Nuclear Apartheid Pakistan’s foreign secretary affirmed that Indian nuclear test upset the strategic balance of South Asia and to reinstate this balance nuclear tests from Pakistan became obligatory. India by now enjoys the plus in customary weapons and it started subversive test that was a disturbing situation for Pakistan. Pakistan’s nuclear tests are conducted chastely with the intent of selfpreservation. In fact these tests are obligatory for the peace and stability of South Asia.\textsuperscript{476} ii. Pakistan’s Suggestion for Peace

While entering into nuclear club Pakistan was aware of the fact that this entry into nuclear club brings lots of obligations with it. India’s nuclear tests of 1974 were answered by Pakistan with much effort to make South Asia nuclear free


\textsuperscript{476} Shamshad Ahmad. —Nuclear Sub-Continent: Bringing Stability to South Asia.\textsuperscript{1} Foreign Affairs. Vol. 78. No. 4. (July-August, 1999), pp. 123-125.
zone because Pakistan is acquainted with the upshots of nuclear race in the region. It proposed a nuclear weapons free zone in South Asia; a joint repudiation of procurement or production of atomic weapons; shared appraisal of atomic offices; observance to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and International Atomic Energy Agency shields on atomic offices; a two-sided atomic test boycott; and a missile-free zone in South Asia.\footnote{477} iii. Disincentive & Regional Constancy in South Asia

On 18\textsuperscript{th} October 2011 the Stimson Center Organized a program having the title —Deterrence and Regional Stability in South Asia while Pakistan ambassador to UN Zamir Akram was a part of this conference. Apart from debating the matters linked to Pakistan and regional stability Pakistan's ambassador stressed upon Pakistan's —fear of encirclement and the requirement of —credible deterrence in South Asia. Zamir Akram fortified specifically Pakistan's nuclear program and it's ascent in retort to India's ever building customary weapons. In addition he told about Pakistan's predilection of IAEA and international community for adopting —objective, criteria-based scheme to deal with proliferation plus credence of Pakistan nuclear status. While systematically reiterating the term —credible deterrence he failed to describe the conditions essential for such environment. This elevated number of questions like does South Asia face deterrence credibility problem especially between Pakistan and India? And if yes, then what would be the outcome of arm race between Pakistan and India on this preventive relationship?\footnote{478}

\footnote{477} Ibid
Akram asserted that regional security is under relentless peril predominantly because of Indian conventional arms. India has supplemented and upgraded conventional arms and additionally developed a doctrine called —Cold Startl that stressed upon attacking —blitzkriegl-esque capacities to move swiftly and preventively in conventional clash. Moreover Indian security agreement particularly nuclear deal sign between India and US made India hegemonic power. Akram claims that these agreements are giving imprints that there is no check over Indian fissile technology. This is one of the reason Pakistan is obstructing tête-à-tête over FMCT since it leaves the problem of prevailing fissile material unaddressed. India seeks —full spectrum deterrence —that put
Pakistan in a situation to face up doctrine like Cold Start. He uttered —we need to pay a price for something, no matter what the price is| stressing that the foremost predilection of Pakistan is its national interest and security even at the par of other latent policies.\footnote{Stephanie Spies. Deterrence & Regional Stability in South Asia: A Recap. Oct, 2011 Retrieved from http://csis.org/blog/deterrence-and-regional-stability-south-asia-re-cap on July 6, 2012. } There is still a question mark on the reliability of nuclear dissuasion of South Asia. Even if Pakistan own nuclear proficiencies to daunt the antagonist may not observe it so and use of nuclear deterrence may occur within the territorial boundaries of Pakistan predominantly in the occurrence of attacking doctrine Cold Start. Akram stated that in the wake of reliability problem Pakistan would have to pledge that impact of the use of nuclear weapon should contained but —greater objectivel is to contain Indian nuclear extension. He further added —it is not secret that [Pakistan is] working onl ramping up nuclear preemption that is momentous ingredient of credible deterrence. In response to the question of Pakistan inclination to use nuclear potential Akram uttered —as long as you have weapons that carter to certain gaps [insecurity], use of those weapons will not be required,l affirming the fundamental principle of deterrence Akram uttered that there will develop further disproportionateness if Pakistan does not attain nuclear potentials. If India is not ramping up nuclear potential with hostile intention still it is infuriating Pakistan and Pakistan has to deal with it particularly with the doctrine of Cold Start. Akram supported the development of mutual discernment to seek out the matter. In this regard CBMs are the vital module but frequently —credible| and —minimal deterrence is relative to the potential and intents of both sides making obligation and stipulations difficult to achieve.\footnote{Ibid.}

How deterrence in South Asia could be possible where the two adjoining states are regulating their volumes to match and then overcome each other? Pakistan is regulating its potentials to deter India while Indian intent is to deal with lower
level hostility that may not necessitate using nuclear weapons and is conventional ramping volume. Although Akram did not go into the detail that under which condition Pakistan will go for the option of using nuclear weapons in conventional conflict. But his argument is clear denotation of the fact that Pakistan is keen to recuperate support the global community being acknowledged as nuclear state with the safety device of IAEA. Use of nuclear weapons in conventional conflict when other side is not threatening to use it would be out of bounds and would be harmful and push into further isolation.  

Though India has originated the doctrine Cold Start but yet it did not carry out it even in the low level conflict and if it is attacking and source of tension for Pakistan it did not challenge regional security up to the extent that Pakistan would go for nuclear weapons. The CBMs both the countries are using to evade conflicts it would be dissimilar if any state go for nuclear option. If it is presumed that their potentialities are not reliable yet the testament of Akram and history of Indo-Pakistan relations depicts that they can follow —effective deterrence. Though India is ramping up abilities but it has maintained good relations with other nuclear power. On the other side Pakistan is regulating it competences to make use of it only if the need arises. Although both the sides are reproachful to each other that they have challenge the regional stability but the datum shows else.

iv. US Quest for Hegemony and Regional Stability

General Kayani went to Sri Lanka on Thursday 27 June 2013 where number of military agreements was reincarnated between the two countries. He uttered—Desire for peace is our greatest strength, which places us at a high moral ground and affords us the poise and confidence to exercise restraint, even once
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incited or provoked. Pakistan will endure to assist Sri Lankan forces in attaining distinction, he added.\(^{482}\)

He said while addressing the passing out parade ceremony of the Sri Lankan cadets at Sri Lanka Military Academy located in Diyatalawa, Sri Lanka —the armies of Sri Lanka and Pakistan have enjoyed the highest degree of mutual trust and cooperation and have proved as committed partners in the face of challenges; for the larger cause of preserving peace in our respective countries and the region at large. I am certain that this trust and collaboration would further strengthen in the times ahead.\(^{483}\)

According to the sources of GHQ military field-training commanded by Pakistan army was at the top priority agenda during the visit. The other points deliberated during the visit were their corresponding military role in UN peace keeping forces and communal intelligence and tactical collaboration in defense sector.\(^{484}\)

Pakistan army also played a key role during Sri Lankan war against Tamil insurrectionaries. Pakistan army also upheld handy links during hard times of Sri Lanka. This intimacy in ties could be evidently seen when he said —Sri Lankan Army has proved its mettle under the most trying circumstances and has emerged victorious not only in the context of purging the menace of militancy and violence but also in pursuit of post conflict peace and stability.\(^{485}\)

—During this entire period i.e. approximately three decades of conflict and the ensuing rebuilding phase, Pakistan always stood by and wholeheartedly supported your great nation and its armed forces, both in moral as well as material realm. Pakistan has proved to be a true friend of Sri Lanka in your hour


\(^{483}\) Sikander Shaheen. —Quest for Hegemony to Harm Regional Stability: Kayani.1 The Nations, June 30, 2013.
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of need. I believe this provides a very strong foundation for a sincere friendship and genuine goodwill that exists between our two nations and armed forces.1486 Speaking to the news reporter, Brigadier(r) Asif Raza said that during Musharraf regime Pak-Sri Lankan military relations marked the new heights. He added —The military, then, had actively jumped into the fray to help Sri Lanka defeat the Tamil Tigers. There is a kind of appreciative cognizance within the Sri Lankan government and military ranks that Tamil insurgents would not have been defeated had it not been for Pakistan’s support. This very factor guides the course of diplomatic and military ties between the two states.155 Every twelve-month, military sources held 20 to 25 Sri Lankan troopers and cadets get registered at Pakistan Military Academy (PMA) Kakul for midcareer courses (MCCs) and long courses. In a flash, the same number as seven Sri Lankan cadets are getting military training at the PMA, the authorities informed. Throughout his Sri Lanka’s visit, General Kayani is reported for to have gone by the Sri Lankan military’s Institute of Peacekeeping Support Operations Training, Infantry Training School and Combat Training School separated from going by the Sri Lanka Military Academy. He furthermore met with the top government, military and defense authorities throughout the visit.487

v. Pakistan’s Desire for Regional Peace & Stability

President Zardari went to Iran to attend the oath ceremony of 7th president of Islamic Republic of Iran. During his meeting with his counterpart Hassan Rouhani President Zardari accentuated upon the need for socio-economic improvement of their people and endorsing regional peace and stability. The two leaders deliberated different issues of mutual interest that vacillated from

1486 Kayani want Regional Balance of Power, Ibid.
155 The Nations, June 30.
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bilateral relations to the issues challenging the region. President expected that bilateral relations will not only grow but will gain the momentum for further strengthening during the tenure of Rouhani and Pakistan’s newly elected government.  

The president also stressed the need of putting economic agenda on front position. He grasped that the prevailing trade between the two countries does not validates the trade potential and political ties existing between the two countries. He said that there is a need to take accurate decisions in the direction to deal with the incongruity.

During the meeting different joint projects like Pak-Iran gas pipeline, electricity, import, wheat export, and rail and road connectivity were deliberated and stressed upon their early conclusion. President also stressed upon the need of developing communication links for bringing people of the countries closer to each other and generating economic prospects for the people.

Both the presidents also deliberated the issue of regional stability while president Zardari said that Pakistan is stakeholder in regional peace predominantly in Afghanistan.

South Asia inhabits dominant position in the world. Its importance has been enhanced in the present world predominantly for US. South Asia is the most fickle region facing up the challenges like terrorism, Kashmir issue, nuclear proliferation etc. India and Pakistan are its two contending countries have long history of antagonism and cosset in nuclear arm race. These issues tied with other

---

events have further enhanced its significance and inhabit important position in US agenda.

End of Cold War marked the opening of new era of Indo-US relations, and USA has shown more interest towards India considering its economy, size and political structure and hoped to endure this partnership in future. However US vested interest in Central Asia and other adjacent states to Pakistan force it to continue to maintain its presence in the region. And as a founder of New World Order its alliance with any of regional actor would be of great significance.\footnote{Jan, Tarik et al. \textit{Foreign Policy Debate: The Years Ahead}. Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies, 1993, p. 130.}

With this viewpoint a new era of Indo-US relations begins. \textit{—The United States visibly displayed its marked indifference towards Pakistan and moved closer to India. United States is supporting India, out of all proportions to enable it to play the role of a regional surrogate.}\footnote{Rais Ahmad Khan. \textit{Forty Years of Pakistan – United States Relations}. Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1990, p. 7.}

\textbf{vii. Bilateral Relations a. Pakistan-US}

\textit{—There have been twists and turns. The relationship has been characterized, at different times, by indifference, friendship, intimacy and downright hostility. However, the remarkable thing is not its checkered history which probably is a common feature of most of the bilateral relationships but the fact that even during the worst times; the two countries have managed to sustain a working relationship.}\footnote{M. Raziullah Azmi. \textit{Pakistan American Relation: The Perfect Past}. Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1994, p. 62.}

During Cold War era Pakistan persisted to be a focal point of US foreign policy agenda.\footnote{Though it left Pakistan alone enclosed with problems but it had to come back and aid Pakistan when its interest in the region is at stake.}

Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 transformed Pakistan into frontline state. But even during the times of need an anti-Pakistan lobby remained lively in US
Congress. Pressler amendment was the evidence of the fact. In 1990 Bush deferred aid to Pakistan that was the clear echo of the point that it has attained its interest. The alliance between the two again diluted with US sanctions on Pakistan because of nuclear detonation and military coup. But after September 11 attacks history repeated itself and the USA had to come back to seek Pakistan's help and Pakistan came on the forefront in war on terror and Pakistan has been given the status on non-NATO allied ally. —The history of Pakistan's relations with the US has been a chequered one. American connection has constituted a fundamental factor in Pakistan's foreign policy for the greater part of its existence.

**b. India-US**

Though India joined communist block during Cold War era still it persisted on top preference of US because of its size, its huge population, its market capacity and global occurrence. —The India factor has always played a decisive and crucial role in the formulation of US policy in this region. Now the two countries have two things in common ideology and objectives. By March 2000 Clinton paid a week-long visit to India and by 2001 US took measures to reinforce its relations encompassing dual military exercise. Both the countries share same views vis-à-vis terrorism. India efficaciously persuaded US that Pakistan must halt cross boarder penetration in occupied Kashmir. Another

---


interest which US want to achieve thru India is the threat of ever mounting
Chinese might

viii. **Intensions behind US Intensive Involvement in South Asia**

Following are the main reasons behind US engagement in South Asia.

a. **Nuclear Proliferation**

Nuclear non-proliferation persisted on top foreign policy agenda of US that retains

US engaged in South Asia. India started to attain nuclear technology much before than Pakistan but 1998 nuclear tests by India and Pakistan heightened regional significance for US. The traditional antagonism and unsettled issues between India and Pakistan elevated its worries. Moreover USA is acting as an observer of nuclear developments of both the countries.

In a statement of November 12, 1998 US Deputy Secretary, Strobe Talbot talked about three reservations of US government.

1. Averting nuclear arm race in the region.
2. Consolidation of non-Proliferation regime.
3. Endorsing dialogues between Pakistan and India to recover relations.\(^{499}\)

Number of factors catches the eye of US towards nuclear non-proliferation. These encompasses that technology must not be transported to other countries and probable outbreak of nuclear war between India and Pakistan.\(^{500}\) In case of nuclear war it would have its impacts far-off South Asia. Similarly nuclear program of Iran is also a constant irritant for US that might keep US engaged in the region in future.\(^{71}\)

---


b. **Kashmir Issue**

—South Asia provides the regional context for one of the world's most intractable international disputes, the India-Pakistan conflict over Kashmir. Two countries have fought major wars over Kashmir in 1947-1948 and 1956, as well as a limited war there in 1999.[501] Kashmir is a root cause of hostility between India and Pakistan. It is aptly said that without cracking this issue enduring peace between India and Pakistan cannot be attained. Realizing the gravity of issue US is now screening some interest in resolving the problem. Kargil crisis of 1999 proved to be a wakeup call for US and made its presence in the region inevitable.73

USA is trying to bring the two countries on negotiation table for deciding the problem because the issue caused immoderation that lead to terrorism. USA is aware of the fact that for the solution of the issue it is obligatory that the two countries along with Kashmiri population must be contented.

c. **Economic Investment**

This is another reason that made US presence in the region inevitable. Indian economy was opened up in 1991 that also opened up prospects for US investment but this could only be possible in a safe environment for which US involvement in bilateral struggles is required. Protection of Indian market is decisive US policy. Similarly economic prospects can only be further sightseen if US presence in the region is certain. To protect economic interests of US in the region US is striving to create such an environment that is conducive for it.

d. **Terrorism**

US is the producer of Jihadist to contain USSR and now these Jihadist are well trained and well equipped to pose threat to the region. Being producer of the

---

militants US is well aware of their potentials. These militants have even threatened US economic and political future in the region. Now US can attain its interests by linking the two key players of the region.

ix. Propositions for US Involvement

For regional stability unintended US engrossment in Pakistan is healthier since Pakistan’s government does not want direct US engrossment. For this purpose the tool of public relations campaign can be effective. USAID’s activities in Pakistan can be underscored. USAID educational program benefited 3.2 million children. This is an easy way to reach directly to Pakistani population without engaging into contentious issues of Pakistan. Similarly by offering assistance against militant organization, heightened trade and tenacity of issues affecting their bilateral relations could be valuable for their bilateral relations.502

US should support international corroboration machinery while left it to be led by Pakistan and India in South Asia. Such tactics would be obliging in fetching India and Pakistan closer. Moreover US should appreciate Pakistan efforts for regional stability.75

x. US Sanguinity for Peace and Stability in South Asia

Despite of persistent tension between India and Pakistan US hope that both the countries will play effective role in regional stability.

Pentagon Press Secretary George Little addressing to reporters said —We all hope — our Pakistani and Indian partners — that we can maintain peace and stability in the region. The Secretary (of Defense) has affirmed that on visits throughout that region, including to India.503

503 The Hindu, February 9, 2013.
He further added —On the issue of terrorism, let me say that we stand with everyone in the world to include those in India and in Pakistan who take a very hard line against terrorists who want to kill civilians, whether it’s Pakistani, Indian or American civilians. We have all been affected by terrorism, and we believe that there needs to be a united front against terrorist groups operating in that region of the world and in others.

State Department spokesperson Victoria Nuland held —We urge both sides to take steps to end exchanges of fire and to resume normal trade and travel across the line of control.\textsuperscript{xi} \textbf{xi. Pakistan Anticipates US Help towards Regional Stability}

On July 2010 Pakistan’s ambassador to the US Hussain Haqqani said Pakistan’s government would not allow anyone to challenge the writ of the government. He also expressed the hope that US will play a handy role in regional stability. In an interview with The Washington Examiner he stated —We are sure lessons have been learned and there will be no walking away this time.\textsuperscript{505}

He went on saying that Pakistan will continue its association with US and Afghanistan till the downfall of the militants.\textsuperscript{506} He also underscored Pakistan’s forces antiterrorist role that the forces has done marvelous job in its operation of Swat, Malakand and tribal areas. He further stated —Our people and security personnel have paid a huge price, in terms of human lives, in this fight.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{504} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{506} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid.
5.1.3 Economic Interests in Central Asia

Presently Central Asia occupies more prominence in global politics in general and in politics of South Asia in particular. It also left behind Middle East in its oil and gas reserves. Moreover it owns the some rarest metals in the world. The land of the region is conducive for irrigation. Western countries are now showing their interest to feat the resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Proven</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>9-40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>0.55-1.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.55-39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>0.3-0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3-2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td><strong>560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only Caspian area oil production

Note: The Caspian Sea Region's proven oil reserves of between 17.2 billion and 49.3 billion barrels are comparable to Qatar's Oil reserves on the low end and US reserves on the high end.


NATURAL GAS RESERVES IN THE CASPIAN SEA REGION

Trillion Cubic Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Proven</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td><strong>560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only Caspian area gas production

Note: The Caspian Sea Region's proven natural gas reserves of 232 trillion cubic feet are comparable to Saudi Arabia's natural gas reserves.


i. US Interests in Central Asia

Before the 9/11 incident Central Asia did not enjoy primacy in US strategy. The region was contemplated as landlocked, vulnerable, despairing, Muslim and autocratic. After 9/11 the entire situation changed and Central Asia emerged as an imperative region as far as US global strategy was concerned. Therefore US
took complete benefit of its tragic situation to control the area politically as well as militarily.  

US engagement in Central Asia is affected by radicalism, peril to energy supply, it is also non-coastal that gave further setback to US entrée there. US have assorted interests in the area. The periphery occupies imperative place in US global strategy due juxtaposition with Russia, China, Pakistan, India, Iran and other key players of the region.

Of course the natural resources are another reason for US interest in the peninsula.  

The key US interest in the region can be beheld as security, energy and democracy. The chief security issue is branching out of energy sources and the Caspian region is the imperative supernumerary source of fossil fuels. Though the region is not in an easy access still it is important geopolitically and geoeconomically as well. Majority of oil export routes of Central Asia and Caspian are operated by Russia but western oil companies particularly Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline and existing and deliberate investment by India and China created non-Russian export routes. These expansions may end Russian domination but it may culminate into acute competition over energy reserves for other energy-starving economies. Policymakers can calculate how energy issue appropriate in US global strategy and frame a strategy that allow US to engage in the region up to the extent that it required.

Following factors catches the attraction of US policy makers

---

507 The Times of Central Asia, December 5, 2002, p.4.
Substantial extent of fossil fuel of a fine quality

Mammoth investment openings in hydrocarbons sector since US Company of Chevron had accomplished a decent share in this regard.\textsuperscript{511}

Assay to make certain nuclear non-proliferation in the region since the area has several nuclear locates.\textsuperscript{512}

Assist CARs in mounting oil and gas industry, enhancing their economic growth by abnegating flow of oil and gas thru Russian pipeline link.\textsuperscript{87}

Undermine Russian politico-economic sway.\textsuperscript{513}

Succor CARs in endorsing democratization process and bout against religious fanaticism.

Succor CARs in innovation of armed forces and boost Turkish sway in the region.\textsuperscript{514}

In the light of above mentioned view, it can be evaluated that US is contriving for elongated stay in the region that can be depicted by US military bases in the countries that are regarded as strategic regional partner of US.\textsuperscript{515} This is the reason it is contemplated that US will stay in the region for elongated time. This was also corroborated by Pentagon representative on January 3, 2002.\textsuperscript{516} It is also probable that US military intrusion in Central Asia has short-range goal and is interconnected with the given objectives.\textsuperscript{517}

Wide-ranging command over the state of affairs in Afghanistan.

\textsuperscript{511} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{513} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{514} Ibid, p 26.
\textsuperscript{515} Ibid, p 233.
\textsuperscript{516} \textit{The Times of Central Asia,} January 10, 2002, p.4.
\textsuperscript{517} \textit{The Times of Central Asia,} January 17, 2002.
Conceivable extension of anti-terrorist operations by target area operation parallel to Iraq. In such surroundings US military bases in Central Asia are anodyne than in Middle East.

ii. Pakistan Interests in Central Asia

Central Asian states are in need of foreign exchange and advance technology that would not be conceivable from Pakistan. However, Pakistan dexterously developed diplomatic relations with these states. The Quetta Plan of Action composed by the members of ECO would culminate into sought after objective if copiously executed.518

One of the pre-requisite to achieve its economic interest is to develop communication link with Central Asia. In this regard renewal of air flights to Tashkent and Almaty is inspiring step. Gawadar port connection with Central Asian Republic would enhance trade and commercial activities in the region. To secure its economic interest, it is essential to grow and expand transference linkages to and from the region to expedite trade precisely of energy and minerals. Fruition of survey of 140 km long railway track between Chaman and Kandahar are worth mentioning step in this course.519 Fruition of this venture in time might lift the business activities in the region.520

iii. Pakistan & the Post 9/11 Geo-Politics of Oil & Gas Pipeline

Afghanistan enjoys geo strategic prominence in global politics since it provides an outlet for oil and gas transference routes for Central Asia.521 The mounting energy needs of the developed world further enhance its standing and would fetch investment in Afghanistan in near future. Pakistan is cognizant of the

---

518 Ibid.
520 Ibid.
whole state of affairs and knew that any transference route passing through Afghanistan must pass through Pakistan that will bring investment for Pakistan as well. The incident of 9/11 provided reincarnated importance to the energy resources. Pakistan and Central Asia are important for each other because Pakistan is a cheaper and economical route that fixes Central Asia energy reserves to the outer world through Karachi and Gawadar port. That is why Pakistan wants to outspread its influence on the region through new approaches. On December 27, 2003, Pakistan, Turkmenistan, and Afghanistan signed oil and gas pipeline agreement that would be the first outlet for Central Asian reserves. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) swore to provide 1.5 billion as technical assistance and give $1 million for the next year.  

5.2 DIVERGENCE IN PAK-US INTERESTS

The terrorists struck on September 11, 2001 made South Asia the principle theater for the ‘War on Terror‘ and the rearrangement of US relations with the territorial states. The most crucial progression was the influx of the US forces in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Central Asia. This new plan was part of the crucial change in the US policy which was readapted to counter the jeopardy of terrorism. This new connotation with the US furthermore carries tests for Pakistan. Even though there are further issues that Pakistan had to confront because of frontline state in the ‘War on Terror‘. Pakistan dreads that once the US strategic and security ends are realized in the region, US preference and provisions might change as they did after the Soviet’s withdrawal from Afghanistan. The engagement between both states have been reliant on solo subject for quantified


terms between the military eclipsed legislature of Pakistan and the policy makers in the White House, the Pentagon, and the CIA.\footnote{Touqir Hussain. —The US-Pakistan Engagement: The War on Terrorism and Beyond.1 Special Report by (USIP) United States Institute of Peace, Washington DC. Autumn 2005, p. 2. Retrieved from http://www.usip.org/publications/us-pakistan-engagement-war-terrorism-and-beyond on 1/12/2011.} After 9/11 Pakistan was in an enigma. The United States wished to associate with Pakistan to get the rudimentary back in the \_War on Terror\_.\footnote{Ibid.} It was the dynamic junction for Pakistan and it needed to reorganize to the new set-up in the region by caring its security interests in the backdrop of extremely adapted US arrangement in South Asia.\footnote{Moed Pirzada. —Kashmir: Indian Strategic Initiative since 9/11 and Imperative for US Policy in the Region, \textit{IPRI Journal}, Vol. 11, No. 1, Winter, 2003, p. 126.}

5.2.1 Nuclear Developments in Pakistan

The history of Pakistan’s nuclear program is very attention-grabbing. Out of multiple complex webs Pakistan managed to be globally recognized as nuclear power on 28\textsuperscript{th} May 1998 with technical explosion of six tests.


The first step towards the development of nuclear technology was migration of Prof. R. M Chaudhri in 1948 who trained number of students in nuclear field who later on played their part in making Pakistan’s nuclear power. Prof. R. M Chaudhari set up nuclear research laboratory in government college Lahore and in 1954 set up 1.2 Mev Cockcroft-Walton accelerators there that served as a landmark in the early development of the program. The training given there facilitated the young scientists in making their base robust. Therefore, Prof. R. M Chaudhari can rightly be called as a father of nuclear Pakistan.\footnote{N. M. Butt. Nuclear Developments in Pakistan. IPRI Paper 5, 2004. P. 44-45}
During this decade another name came on the glare of publicity i.e. Dr. I. H. Usmani who provided his services as a chairman of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) from 1960 -1972 the era that occupied momentous position in the development of nuclear technology.  

Dr. Usmani along with the then science advisor to the president of Pakistan Prof. A. Slam propelled a training of young students for Ph.D. abroad. Several hundred young talented students were sent in developed countries. The training operation was conducted in the laboratory established by R. M. Chaudhari. Consequently when these talented scientists came back they provided a coagulated base for nuclear development. In 1962 Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission set up 5 megawatts research reactor with the assistance of US. Moreover, Dr. Usmani trained nuclear engineers to plan and operate nuclear power reactor. He also installed power reactor of 137 MW at Karachi made by Canada. In 1960s it became apparent that India was mounting nuclear technology. Z.A. Bhutto the then foreign minister intuited the peril and indicated that Pakistan can reciprocate to this act.

Establishment of nuclear agriculture center, nuclear medical center and nuclear mineral center for detonation and enhancement of Uranium are also contribution of Dr. Usmani. But the most imperative contribution from his side was giving Pakistan exceedingly competent human resource in nuclear program by acutely

---


529 If India has the bomb, that does not mean we are going to be subjected to nuclear blackmail, said Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, on 13th August 1966. For details See Stanley Wolpert. *Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan: His Life and Times*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1993, p. 112.
following the system of merit. In short the period of his leadership can be termed as golden period in nuclear history of Pakistan.


The era of 19 years from 1972-1991 was also very vital for nuclear program of Pakistan. Moreover, fabrication of nuclear weapon was in full swing during this period. Nuclear test by India in 1974 compelled Pakistan to go for nuclear technology. However, nuclear tests were conducted in 1998 as reciprocity to Indian detonation with full responsibility of PAEC.

iv. Pakistan Nuclear Program & the US

When Bhutto acquired political power he made a futile effort to get security assurance from US on diplomatic front in case of antagonism. US rebuffed Pakistan’s entreaty on the plea that US encouraging retort cause it to do the same good turn to other allies. Furthermore no sanctions were inflicted against India and the countries who vended nuclear technology to it. Bhutto was of the opinion that reasonably to be betrayed by deceitful tactics it is better that Pakistan must endeavor to acquire nuclear technology. For this purpose Bhutto hired the services of Dr. A. Q. Khan. It is also believed that if US agreed to Pakistan’s entreaty the history of Pakistan might be change and it might never joined nuclear club.

US offered to peddle 120 fighter planes on the condition if Pakistan abandons its contract with France but Pakistan refuse to accept this deal. Again in February

---

532 Ibid.
1976 US made an offer to Pakistan to stop its reprocessing project and for that US would make it available the facility that it established for Iran. They reasoned that it would fulfill Iran’s energy needs. Pakistan rebuffed the US offer again.

v. Pakistan under US Sanctions

In mid 1970s sanctions were inflicted against Pakistan in her effort to retort to Indian secretive test of 1974. However, fractional renewal of aid was made by US by 1975 and was on the back burner again in 1979 under Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) section 699 for developing Uranium facility.

Nuclear tests by Pakistan in May 28th 1998 brought worldwide denunciation and United States economic sanctions under Arm Control Act (AECA) popularly known as Glenn amendment and Export –Import Bank Act of 1945 that streaked economic and military aid to all those countries that are not party to Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and involved in importing or exporting Uranium.

US law obligated to inflict sanctions: termination of foreign military financing; abjuration of most US government sponsored credit or financial assistance; US disapproval to loan or assistance from any international financial institution; proscription of most US bank sponsored loans or credits; proscription on accrediting exports of —specific goods and technology; and abjuration of credit or other Export-Import Bank provision for exports to either

535 While Henry Kissinger was offering the deal, which he admitted in private that US was crazy to Make this offer and Bhutto would be mad to accept. In the state department meeting in May 1976 Kissinger admitted that he is no more for this offer, he said he has supported it publicly, but in any sense it is a fraud. USA is fanatical and unrealistic enough to do things which are contrary to its national interests. The State department Memorandum of Conversation, proposed cable to Tehran on Pakistani Nuclear Reprocessing, 12 May 1976. Adrian Levy, Catherine Scott-Clark, Op. Cit.,


country. Consequently, $162 million of annual aid was gridlocked. In spite of all these discouraging tactics Dr. A. Q. Khan with his team efficaciously put up separator indigenously in 1982 for making volatile device. The first of such device was made in 1983 for which Pakistan piloted a number of cold tests to check its exactitude.

Since 1990 Pakistan persisted under strict observation as obligated by Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) 196 popularly known as Pressler Amendment that necessitated US president to issue determination that Pakistan does not own nuclear devices. This projected US assistance would avert Pakistan to procure such equipment. After Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in October 1990 President Bush imposed sanction on Pakistan since he failed to endorse to the Congress as per obligated by Pressler amendment. Consequently, most of the economic and all the military aid were put off. In 1992 fractional slackening was given for P. L. 480 food assistance and food assistance for FY 1997-1998 calculated $5 million. An amendment was introduced for FY 1996 in Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (FOAA) by Senator Brown that permitted issuance of $368 million in military hardware ordered afore 1990 aid cutoff.

vi. Sanctions Are Relieved: During the Clinton Administration

Soon after the imposition of sanctions in 1998 Congress passed Agriculture Export Act on July 1998. This Act made some adjustments in AECA that lead to the immunity of certain Departments of Agriculture from the perusal of sanctions. Congress later on voted for India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998 that took the form of law on October 21st 1998. This Act accredited US president for

---
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relinquishment of sanctions for a period of one year relating to non-military dealings, foreign assistance.  

On 25\textsuperscript{th} October 1999 another law Defense Appropriations Act FY2000 approved. This Act accredited the US president to relinquish all economic sanctions inflicted as a result of nuclear test. This Act obligated the president to verify the Congress that this waiver is not against the national security interest of US. Making use of this authority US president waive most of the sanctions on India while gave Pakistan concession on US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Commercial Bank loans and transactions. \textsuperscript{vii. During Bush Administration}

In the first eight months of 2001, US administration signposted that it is going to slacken some of the inflicted sanctions.\textsuperscript{vii} In June 2001 US secretary of State met Pakistani foreign minister in Washington where they deliberated issues like Afghanistan and Taliban, democracy, terrorism, nuclear proliferation and sanctions.\textsuperscript{viii}

However, Pakistan persisted to be underprivileged of US foreign assistance under Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that ban all foreign assistance to those states where democratic government is derailed by non-democratic forces. Similarly Pakistan faced problems in getting assistance since it cascades into debts.

To deal with this problem US government took some steps: on September 24\textsuperscript{th} 2001 US ambassador signed an agreement in Pakistan to carry over $ 379 million of its debt to US. Later on a bill was passed by Congress that immune Pakistan

\textsuperscript{viii} Ibid

\textsuperscript{viii} Fidler, Stephen and Edward Luce, —A Fine Line: The Bush Administration Has Signalled That It Wants to Forge Closer Ties With India, \textit{Financial Times}, June 1, 2001
from the section of the law that bans Foreign Assistance to the state where civil government is toppled by military coup. On 27th October 2001 US president signed S. 1465 law that accredited the US president to waive sanctions related to debt and democracy.

Prior to S. 1465, president used the authority granted to him in S. 614 of Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to grant $50 million to Pakistan on 28th September 2001. Another $50 million granted on 16 October 2001. He also granted $25 million in Emergency Migration and Refugee Fund to Pakistan. $73 million were released for boarder security between Pakistan and Afghanistan. In October 2001, president released $100 million for Afghanistan crisis, $50 million for food assistance and $50 million for Migration and Refugee Assistance administered through UN. On September 26 2001 declared eligible for $135 million to complete $600 million loan.

viii. Security Quandaries of Nuclear Armed Pakistan

The proclamation of nuclear power status by Pakistan's government fetched histrionic transformation in its security environment. Consequently, the bar of tautness between the two traditional contenders elevated high. It was most plausible that this tautness may transmute into nuclear war. However, Pakistan's intent was to avert arm skirmish rather to dissuade any probable assail from India.

To attain the eminence of nuclear power, Pakistan concealed beneath the shadow of haziness. This equivocal status shielded Pakistan from the gravity of non-proliferation. However, the time chosen for the announcement of nuclear

power status was not accurate since Pakistan was internally frail and it made Pakistan externally vulnerable. The core attention of Pakistan’s security manager was to contain Indian influence in the region and dent its sanctuary. Nevertheless, it proved to be an expensive boo-boo on the part of Pakistan since Pakistan confronted external pressure and global quarantine.549

Astonishingly, policy makers in Pakistan did not exhibit any apprehension about the external pressure. Global actors exhibited their apprehension about the strike at the foundations of the regional environment.550 Now Pakistan’s sweat to recuperate the trust of international community upon which it is reliant for its endurance comprises the promise of containing its uranium enrichment.551 Nuclear detonation was the course of reciprocity to Indian nuclear detonation.

ix. Pakistan’s Nuclear Choices

Pakistan’s decision to opt for nuclear weapons came from its comprehended menace from India since both the countries went for war, quite a lot of epochs.131 Though Pakistan underway to develop its nuclear program after few years of its inception but uttered its full determination after the dismemberment of Pakistan and Indian nuclear test in 1974.552

Pakistan afore and subsequent to announcement of nuclear state status concomitant its nuclear program as retort to Indian nuclear weapon competencies. Pakistan’s government uttered its reservations on Indian nuclear program and avowed that Pakistan’s failure to respond had transmuted it into susceptible state against hegemonic neighbor. Tension between the two states amplified owing to number of factors predominantly on Kashmir. When Indian

550 Ibid.
131 Colonel (Rtd) Ashfaq Ahmad interview with the author on April 29, 2014 in Peshawar.
government adopted bellicose stance over Kashmir by conducting nuclear test, Pakistan cognizant of Indian intents gave vengeful retort. Nevertheless, it cannot be abnegated that domestic as well as regional pressure obligated Pakistan to go for nuclear test. But Pakistan was very much anxious about the unlike treatment given to South Asian states relative to Iraq and North Korea. India had been successful in developing nuclear technology because international community calculatingly overlooked it owing to its geo-strategic position, democratic IDs and economic growth whereas Pakistan got concession due to its alliance with US.

Emblematic denunciation of international community of Indian nuclear tests invigorated Pakistan to conduct nuclear test since G-8 and P-5 failed to come to an understanding on one point.553 Diverse forces in Pakistan, hostile to India were apprehensive about Indian nuclear detonation hence decided to abandon the equivocal posture.

For security managers in Pakistan, acquisition of nuclear power boosted its dickering power with international community vis-à-vis India. Internally, different political leadership portrayed acquisition of nuclear power as a source of smugness to distract the attention of people from domestic glitches.554

India conducted nuclear test at the time when civilian government was installed in Pakistan. However, the civilian government was still under the influence of military. But when India made its way to nuclear club, civilian-military bureaucracy in Pakistan pressurized civilian government for reciprocal response.555

554 —Nuclear blasts have added to country’s pride: Qadeer.1 Dawn, 1 January, 1999.
555 Lt Gen (retd) K Matinuddin. —Nuclearization of South Asia: implications and prospects.1 Spotlight on Regional Issues, 17, 1998, pp. 33-34.
Nuclear Pakistan’s Security Predicament

Pakistan confronted grim security challenges after nuclear detonation since it frazzled relations with India, whereas Pakistan tried to rationalize these tests as security measures. In the meantime, democratic process in Pakistan derailed and another military general toppled civilian government. Acquisition of nuclear weapons by the key players of South Asia too sabotaged regional stability since it posed threat of nuclear war. In the ambiance of bilateral tension, Pakistan lingered at prejudicial situation because if the war is confined to conventional arm conflict Pakistan’s conventional inferiority complex place it at detrimental place while if the war turned into nuclear arm conflict Pakistan could be thrashed owing to India’s cutting-edge nuclear weapons.

Moreover, if Pakistan entered into war with India, this time it will no longer find Chinese sustenance due to number of factors like anticipated connection of Pakistan’s sub-state actors in ethnic turbulence in Xinjiang. Furthermore, after 1990s China enter into dialogue to put on a normal footing, its relations with India. At present, Chinese approach towards Indo-Pak issue is that, it wanted both the South Asian neighbors to settle down their matters serenely.

Though subsequent to nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, China was more critical to India but on multilateral forums China called for both the neighbors to sign Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as non-nuclear state. China was also antiphonal to US call that not to supply ballistic missiles technology. But if these demand of China turned up, it would have adversative effects on Pakistan’s

---

nuclear program and would further develop disproportionateness vis-à-vis India.\(^{559}\)

However, to meet this deficiency Pakistan tried to branch out the sources of external supply. After India conducted nuclear tests Pakistan was pressurized by international community not to go for a reciprocal retort. But it cannot be repudiated that the international community failed to give any sanctuary pledge to Pakistan that further amplified domestic pressure to go for explicit tests.\(^{140}\) It is also true that no serious efforts were made by international community to avert Pakistan from nuclear test.\(^{141}\)

Espousal of nuclear bearing by Pakistan had some serious implications on Pakistan’s weak economy as well, since Pakistan hinge on foreign aid and loans. Many of the benefactor states like Japan inflicted sanctions on Pakistan. Consequently, domestic as well as foreign stakeholders shifted their investments from Pakistan. Though some of the sanctions were waived but Pakistan failed to recuperate its economy.

Apart from economic repercussions, sectarianism intensified in Pakistan particularly after military coup as autocratic leadership closed boulevards of representation for multi-ethnic population. Rather they employed this issue as a trump card for waiver of sanctions and getting concession from international community on the supplication that external default would inspire the growth of Islamic militancy that poses direct threat to the steadiness of the country.

**xi. US Role: Past & Present**

India’s explosion in 1970s made US concerned about the security of the region and US began to pressurize Pakistan not to follow this precedence. However, when Soviet Union occupied Afghanistan, US deliberately overlooked nuclear

program of Pakistan though it imposed sanctions on Pakistan but these were not broader in scope and did not sustained for long.\textsuperscript{560}

Pakistan and India received assorted rejoinder from US administration. However, the foremost objective of US was to construct South Asia a nuclear free zone. But US did not spell out any direct threat from India and Pakistan, hence, did not take any castigatory measures against them. For South Asia US determined to adopt the policy of engagement in order to affect India and Pakistan's nuclear deeds.

US conceding to Pakistan in the shape of Brown amendment in 1996 and HarkinWarner amendment substantiated the point that US was much more apprehensive about region's geo-strategic standing than its non-proliferation intents. Moreover, US did not take any steady steps for averting China to desert its nuclear association with Pakistan since US had its trade relations with China. US only inflicted sanctions on the use of nuclear technology that in its eventual sense embolden in becoming an unconcealed nuclear power in 1998.\textsuperscript{143}

Subsequent to Indian nuclear tests US used diplomatic pressure on Pakistan. Apart from diplomatic pressure US blatantly admonished Pakistan about the costs of choosing for nuclear tests. Pakistan did not take these admonitions earnestly and assumed that it will get concessions like before or will take the assistance of China, Saudi Arabia and UAE. But this time US took the matter to international medium and even acquired Chinese support for sanctions on multifaceted offering from international pecuniary institutions. These castigatory measures came with conditional bids for both India and Pakistan for facilitation in sanctions: sign CTBT, chipping in in Fissile material cut off treaty; abstain from positioning delivery system; infliction of restraints on transferal of nuclear technology; enter into dialog for stabilization of relations.

\textsuperscript{560} M Reiss. —Safeguarding the nuclear peace in South Asia.\textit{ Asian Survey}, Vol. 38, No. 12, 1993, p. 11-10. \textsuperscript{143} See Samina Ahmad.
On the verge of economy's crash Pakistan concocted legislation for curbs on the transferal of nuclear technology.\textsuperscript{561} Pakistan settled to US terms to get relief in sanctions.

Keeping in view Pakistan's crashing economy US relinquished sanctions on multilateral offering and also supported to catch postponed $ 33 billion external debt from international pecuniary institutions and aided in receiving supplementary $ 4 billion in loan.\textsuperscript{562}

Formally US proclaimed for relinquishment of more sanctions from India and Pakistan, but infect US administration sought to privilege India.\textsuperscript{563} Precipitously US goals in South Asia transformed from non-proliferation to peril evading. Pakistan still believed that US will agree to take its nuclear power standing.

xii. Nuclear Weapons & Regional Stability

As far as solidity of South Asia was concerned it was apparent from the fact that both India and Pakistan after becoming nuclear power entered into war in Kargil. Since 1980s Pakistan also reinforced anti-Indian rebels in Kashmir that further worsened their bilateral relations. Pakistan avenging retort to Indian nuclear detonation shook the regional temperature but in order to get ease in multilateral lending both the countries entered into dialogue, however, standardization in relations proved to be short-lived. Since 1989 Pakistan compounded its anti-Indian war in Kashmir with the optimism that they have well-adjusted the Indian preeminence through their nuclear program. A former Pakistan's army chief quoted that —despite having massive strength in conventional arms, India dare not to attack Pakistan because of the fear of a nuclear strike that will render the
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vast portion of [its] conventional army ineffective.‖\textsuperscript{564} Pakistan’s security managers contemplate on the same line as well.

In May 1999, in an arm conflict across Line of Control (LOC) in Kashmir a senior Pakistan’s military official quoted — the Indians cannot afford to extend the war to the other areas in Kashmir, leave aside launching an attack across the international boundaries because of the risk of the nuclear conflagration\textsuperscript{148} on the other side India believed that its superior strength is enough to deter Pakistan’s nuclear program. These divergent views brought both the countries at the brink of war. In this tensed environment US intervened and pressurized Pakistan to roll back its support in Kashmir so that this fight may not take nuclear dimension.

xiii. Pakistan’s Nuclear Commands

In Kargil episode US implicitly exhibited its tilt towards India in the expression of asking India for restraints on its nuclear weapons rather to roll back or eliminate this technology.\textsuperscript{565} This attitude of US towards Indian nuclear program can be deduced as recognition of this program by US.\textsuperscript{566}

India comprehended US response without infliction of castigatory economic and military sanctions as US recognition of Indian deployment of nuclear weapons. In order to check the response of international community India issued a draft of nuclear guideline on 19\textsuperscript{th} August 1999 that envisions that Indian nuclear weapons would be transported by land base missiles, air craft and submarines.\textsuperscript{151} With the publication of this draft Indian government publicized that

\textsuperscript{564} P. Hoodbhoy. — Pakistan’s Nuclear Future.\textsuperscript{1} S Ahmed & Cortright (Eds.). Pakistan and the Bomb: Public Opinion and Nuclear Options. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998, p. 78.\textsuperscript{148} Quoted in Z Hussain. — On the brink.\textsuperscript{1} News line, June 1999, pp. 24-25.

\textsuperscript{565} The News, 31 May, 1999.

\textsuperscript{566} S Talbott, —Dealing with the bomb in South Asia.\textsuperscript{1} Foreign Policy, Vol. 78, 1999, pp. 111, 119.\textsuperscript{151} The Hindu, 29 November, 1999.\textsuperscript{152} Statesman, 18 August, 1999.
this is an authorized policy hitherto and anticipated that US will admit the
unavoidability of deployment of nuclear weapons in South Asia.
Pakistan rebuffed to desert this technology as well without asserting its
intension about its nuclear program since it had diverse routes before it like all-
out weaponization, a more vigilant approach, development of system but not
deploying it or it can maintain status quo. Keeping in view its political, economic
and technological constraints the finest route that could suit Pakistan was the
expansion of the program under the umbrella of obscurity.

Since Pakistan nuclear program was antiphonal in nature it follows the course
of Indian nuclear program. This fact was also acknowledged by senior official
that if India lingers to deploy its nuclear program then Pakistan will take possible
obligatory steps to preserve the credibility of its program. The military regime
in Pakistan endlessly stated Indo-US nuclear dialogues in order to make decision
for prospect of Pakistan nuclear program.

xiv. Pakistan’s Security in Nuclear South Asia

Pakistan’s nuclear direction and its security are contingent on manifold aspects
like defense decision making, its relations with India and Indian nuclear
direction. Internally, military establishment have firm control over nuclear
decision making. Infect Kargil episode underpin military ascendancy in political
scenario. Pakistan’s catastrophe in Kargil and its categorical military withdrawal
raised number of questions and instigated discontent in military ranks. To pledge
domestic discontent the civilian government put all the culpability on the
military chief. Consequently, civilian government was ejected by military
coup.
Subsequent to military take over the decisions concerning nuclear policy
grounded on military mistrust of India and its responsive tendency. Relations

---

between India and Pakistan subsequent to military coup further worsened. Moreover, there was no such notion as diplomatic communiqué. Decision makers in India believed that regardless of the presence of nuclear weapons limited conventional arm clash can befall. On the other hand decision makers in Pakistan agreed to use nuclear weapons if the territorial reliability of their state is at peril.

Pakistan’s decision makers overlooked domestic problems while opting for deserting equivocal nuclear status since it brought itself with sanction that affected its weak economy and upstretched internal tension. The civilian government too became the prey of officious policy such schemes are likely to grow thus intimidating the constancy of weak state. However, the situation can be turn in favor of Pakistan if Pakistan deserts nuclear competition with India. In that case Pakistan can ask for assistance from international community like economic and technological assistance, the best policy that could suit to augment security of state and citizen as well.

**xv. The Pentagon’s Surreptitious Tactics to Secure Pakistan’s Nuclear Arsenal**

Presence of Osama, neighboring the military academy was the most ill-starred for Pakistan’s military since the military chief had to deal miscellaneous problems after Abbottabad episode. On one side the army chief had to pledge the US tax payers who provide $2 billion per annum to Pakistan’s army, that they are as steadfast to US as before and they had no preceding information of Osama’s whereabouts. On the other side, the chief had to persuade his ranks that tumult over the blatant infringement of Pakistan’s territorial sovereignty.

---
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Likewise he was correspondingly apprehensive about the safety of the nuclear weapons.\footnote{Azeem Ibrahim. US Aid to Pakistan-US Taxpayers have Funded Pakistani Corruption. Retrieved from http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Final_DP_2009_06_08032009.pdf on 23/6/2012.}

This incident precipitously raised questions on the safety of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons in the world for some good reasons like Pakistan is look upon to be a hub of terrorist goings-on and Pakistan is a foremost purveyor of nuclear technology to Iran and North Korea. President Obama in nuclear security meeting in Washington held in 2010 stated — the single biggest threat to US security, both short term, medium and long term, would be the possibility of terrorist organization obtaining a nuclear weapons.\footnote{Al-Qaeda trying to Secure Nuclear Weapons, says Barack Obama. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/barackobama/7583173/Al-Qaeda-trying-to-secure-nuclearweapons-says-Barack-Obama.html 13/4/2010.} He further added — Al-Qaeda is trying to secure a nuclear weapons….a weapon of mass destruction that they have no compunction at using.\footnote{Jeffrey Goldberg and Marc Ambinder. The Pentagon Secret Plans to Secure Pakistan’s Nuclear Arsenal. Retrieved from http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/the-pentagons-secret-plans-to-secure-pakistans-nucleararsenal/ on 2/12/2012.}

The character of Pakistan is surmised in the world because the sagaciousness of international community about Pakistan is that it is a safe haven for the entire terrorist so they can have an easy entrée to the nuclear weapon and since it is the single Muslim state that efficaciously developed nuclear weapon. Its civilian government failed to rheostat law and order situation. Its security services are permeated by those who have acquaintances with Jihadists while some of the government officials too have acquaintances with these Jihadists.

Graham Allison, the director of Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard signposted three threats to nuclear weapons first these weapons might be retrieved by the terrorists, second transfer of nuclear
technology to other states and third nuclear weapons might fall in the hands of extremist in political mayhem.

Pakistani spokesperson absolutely excluded any testimonial articulating any reservations on the safety of nuclear arsenal on the ground that these weapons are —demented— means there warheads are separated from nuclear weapons and delivery system therefore there are no likelihoods of larceny of these weapons. An Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) official in an interview to National Journal emaciated US qualms about the safety of Pakistan's nuclear program and stated —of all the things in the world to worry about, the issue you should worry about least is the safety of our nuclear program. It is completely secure. It is in our interest to keep our bases safe as well. You must trust us that we have maximum and impenetrable security. No one with ill intent can get near our strategic assets. However, Pakistan's military chief was apprehensive about the approach of Strategic Plan Division to keep nuclear weapons out of the reach of long arm of US. It is also surmised by US that Pakistan is keen to give entrée to the militants to pelt it from them so they concocted a clandestine plan to secure those weapons that intensified Pakistan's apprehensions.

xvi. Unfastened Weapons

Strategic Plans Division (SPD) is deemed as one of the utmost reliable organization in Pakistan. Pakistan's spokesperson acclaimed the determinations of the organization that is emblem of religious and political intemperance. It is also determined to keep its officers unprejudiced and scrupulously examine about their life style. The spokesman went on saying that this department is heedful and has stern screening of civilian scientists associated with nuclear complexes. This screening was made sterner after the buzzes that two emeritus nuclear scientists met with Bin Laden in the summer 2001. However, the ex-president issued a statement that —I think it's over stated that weapons can get
into bad hands in an interview to National Journal. But this statement was not enough to satisfy US Intelligence expert especially after Abbottabad episode. After few days of the raid a popular text read —if honk you horn, do so lightly, Pakistani army is asleep.

Some of the misfortunes signposted these qualms like in 2007, felo-de-se assail on bus near Sargodha air base, assail on school bus outside Kamra air base, likewise in 2008 suicide attack near Wah cantonment. All these places assumed to be nuclear stowage sites. Similarly, a major security lapse befell on Pak naval base near Karachi where combative blown, two P-3C Orion Surveillance planes and slayed 10 people. Number of security officials in an interview to National Journal articulated that it is surmised that these radicals might have support from inside complex.

According to senior US intelligence official Pakistan is using squat security approaches for moving its nuclear component even in regular traffic flow. They are using this method for transmitting not only —de-matedl but also —matedl nuclear weapons. Western nuclear expert alleged that Pakistan has developed trivial technical nuclear weapons for swift deployment on the combat zone. These experts are also alarmed that tension between India and Pakistan might take nuclear course or it might ensue that the scoundrel elements in Pakistan might take it upon themselves to launch nuclear attack. Though the nuclear posture of Pakistan is blurred still US has questions in mind about the delegation of authority to the use of nuclear weapons.

Some of the experts believe that Pakistan is on the verge of collapse since civil government is considered to be one of the most immoral governments of the
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world. Inflation rate and unemployment increase with every day pass that have its bearing on per capita income.

xvii. Pakistan’s Suspicion

Dr. A.Q. Khan father of nuclear program on the second anniversary of nuclear detonation uttered the visiting Americans reporters and devotees that Western did not welcome Pakistan’s entry in the nuclear club. The West has been leading a campaign against the Muslims for a thousand years. US would do no matter what in its power to nullify Pakistan’s nuclear assets. Another scientist on the same meeting affirmed —why do the Americans want to destroy Islam. A military official in an interview to National Journal echoed the point: —who one ever speaks of the danger of Hindu bomb.

Common masses in Pakistan share the same view: US tilt towards India and sentence for the most allied ally Pakistan, it always take advantage of Pakistan’s feebleness and left it single-handedly when its interests are satisfied. A retired chief of army staff expressed his views: —America is a disgrace because it turns on its friend when it has no use for them.

Similar kind of views has been shared by security elites in Pakistan. Dread of US hegemonic design on Pakistan’s nuclear weapons tied with common mass ire over military standing generated feeling of uncertainty in the entire country. Abbottabad operation has traumatized the confidence of the military as well.

It is normally believed in Pakistan that US is scheduling to get hold of Pakistan nuclear weapons since US dislikes their country or they want to keep Muslim states out of nuclear club. On rational grounds this paranoia cannot be totally overlooked since in the words of Graham Allison —it is not delusional for
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Pakistan to fear that America is interested in de-nuking them. It is prudent paranoia.\textsuperscript{576}

\textbf{xviii. US War Strategies}

Although sanctions has been imposed on Pakistan to inhibit it from Uranium augmentation but there are no mark that can prove that US government is in view of the option of —de-nuking! rather government officials identified that Pakistan army and SPD are the unsurpassed choice available for securing Pakistan's weapons safe and secure. In the recent past US spent $ 100 million to kit SPD with enhanced amenities and security system. In David Sanger’s book —The Inheritance, it was cited that Pakistan has not permitted US to conduct audit to inspect that how this money has been spent. US former chief of joint staff alleged that his discourses on nuclear weapons with his Pakistani counterpart created some constructive fallout. One of his associate stated —when he would bring up a concern about nuclear weapons in a meeting, the Pakistanis would usually deal with it\textsuperscript{577}.

Pakistanis are much more apprehensive about the fact that US does not trust Pakistan and SPD might nose-dive in its labors and that nuclear weapons might go lost. They are anxious that owing to corruption, terrorism and ethnic rivalries US has concocted a line of attack to deal with Pakistan's nuclear weapons timidity. Former deputy director of counterterrorism under Clinton and George W. Bush, told NBC News —it’s safe to assume that planning for the worst case scenario regarding Pakistan nukes have already taken place inside the US.

\textsuperscript{576} Ibid.

government. The issue remains one of the highest priorities of US intelligence community—- and the White House.

On several instances US signposted that they have made certain measures in the occurrence of nuclear crisis in Pakistan. In one of the similar instance Condoleezza Rice said —we have noted this problem, and we are prepared to try to deal with itl. These and other such kind of statements had also been made by US military and intelligence. Joint Special Operation Command (JSOC) has erstwhile understanding of grabbing and remotely incapacitating WMDs. However, this time it would be much more perplexing for US to capture and nullify Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal in case these weapons fell into wrong hands or in case of civil war in Pakistan. One of the senior special operation planner call the nullification crusade a hard-hitting call of all such kind of campaign which they prior had, an operation much more demanding and affluent than Abbottabad episode. Therefore, the campaign would be led by US Central Command that led campaign in Middle East and Central Asia and runs operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, in collaboration with US Pacific Command.

In case of operation JSOC would lead of course with the help of civilian experts. These teams are preparing for years to find nuclear arsenal and defuse them. At Nevada Security Site, northwest of Las Vegas Delta forces and SEAL Team Six Squadrons are practicing with highly fitted out detector devices to have exact site where fissile technology is fixed. For this purpose they have erected burlesqued Pashtuns villages on the Eastern Coast.578

Likewise, they are locating the essential paraphernalia in the periphery so in case of any mishap they can hastily get hold of identified and assumed nuclear sites. According to Senior Special Operation Planner, their prime task is to incapacitate premeditated nuclear weapons because they can effortlessly move than the long range missiles. In the next step JSOC would be escorted by army
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team to annul long range nuclear weapons, for this purpose they had extensive preparation of professed trigger mechanism of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons while the final stage comprise precision missile strike on nuclear dugout.

However, it is not clear that US intelligence agencies can detect all the sites specifically afterwards of Abbottabad episode. General James president Obama’s first national security advisor said —anyone who tells you that they know where all of Pakistan’s nukes are is lying to you. Another official asserted —we don't even know, on any given day, exactly how many weapons they have. We can get within plus or minus 10, but that's about it.

xix. Reduced Priority

Pakistan’s security officials are cognizant of the fact that US has a plan to destroy their nuclear weapons in case of crisis. This feeling of timidity forced Pakistan to tie knot with China as expressed in the recent statement made by Pakistani Prime Minister that Sino-Pak relations are —higher than the mountains, deeper than the oceans, stronger than steel and sweeter than honey. Of course this statement was made for US to realize them that Pakistan has alternative options as well. However, their bilateral relations are not as heartfelt as expressed owing to Uighur separatists operating in Western China.

US takes pain to make Pakistan believe that these plans would be put into action only when all other options flop and that these plans are made with good intent to secure weapons falling into wrong hands. In fact, some of Pakistani officials welcome these plans.


Though the policy intents of present US administration official stated that —our core goal is to disrupt, dismantle and eventually defeat Al-Qaeda. This is very clarifying way to think about what we are doing and why cooperation with Pakistan is important. US for security reasons keep watch on Pakistan’s nuclear program and get information about Al-Qaeda and this can be done through engaging itself with Pakistani government. Similarly, they cannot find way out of Afghanistan if Pakistan becomes their open foe. On Pakistani part, it cannot endure devoid of US financial support and help that it render in international lending agencies. Both the countries have mutual dependence due to which they are still allies.  

5.2.2 Issue of Terrorism

i. The Ascendant of the US Pakistan Conflict: The US Tactics towards South Asia before 11 September 2001

The event of 9/11 befell at the time when US was essaying to readapt its relations with India due to its interests in South Asia. In 1997 US decided to start strategic dialogues with India that guided President Clinton visit to India in the spring of 1998. However a twist in relations with India came for US when BJP won 1998 elections under the watchword of national security and development of nuclear capability. But Prime Minister Vajpayee tried to bring relations on track by recounting US about his government pragmatic policy. In the face of some qualms US administration determined to conduct compact strategic dialogues with India led by US deputy secretary Strobe Talbot with Indian foreign minister Jaswant Singh. They held bilateral dialogues several

times that made India to stigmatize its non-aligned stance and assumed the policy of strategic partnership with US. To reinforce their relations further President Clinton paid an official visit to India in March 2000. Bilateral dialogues between Talbot-Singh culminate into joint IndoUS statement signed by Indian Prime Minister and US President with the rubric India-US relations.  

Relations between India and US under Clinton administration keeping in mind his unwavering stance on NPT were not less than any amazement. Nevertheless his unwavering stance fastened their bilateral relations. When Bush took the charge as President, he determined to revisit certain International commitments e.g. Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty that provided a prospect to India to compound its ties with US. In the initial time of his Presidency Bush discerned strategic vitality of India. Actually he sought to retreat from Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty so was desperate to have India as ally. Ashley J. Telis role was imperative in restructuring the bilateral relationship at the RAND Corporation; he put forward the guiding principles for the new administration. Telis DE hyphenated policy of South Asia had three trenchant features. First, this policy will detached India and Pakistan in the sense that US will conduct its relations with both the countries on the basis of interest calculation with each country rather on the basis that US relations with one country will shake its relations with the other country. Second, US made out India as incipient power of South Asia and be worthy of engagement than before and appreciate its efforts to collaborate and repel in South Asia. Third, US discerned Pakistan as a fragile state engaged with assorted problems that could be figured out through engagement with its society, and —soft landing that slacken social and economic problems.

---
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After adaptation of this policy US send Blackwell as emissary to India who designated Telis as his advisor. The summer of 2001 was dominated by the perusal of DE hyphenation policy. To make robust defense ties US interagency waive sanctions imposed on India due to nuclear tests of 1998. Pakistan too suffered the imposition of GlennSymington Amendment but by 2001 Pakistan faced superfluous sanctions like Pressler Amendment, sanctions due to violation of Missile Technology Control and sanctions due to military coup. US interagency calculated that Pakistan went for nuclear test because of India so Glenn-Symington Amendment must be waive from Pakistan. However this was only symbolic waiver since other sanctions remained intact. Now this shift in US policy towards South Asia was going to be announced in UNGA on 13 September 2001 but before it could happened US had to face gigantic cataclysm on 11 September 2001.\(^\text{586}\)

ii. Early US Miscalculations in the Wake of 11 September 2001

From 2004 onward Pakistan recommenced its support to Taliban that anguish the cause of US, and abetted Taliban to reorder by 2005. After 2004 Pakistan too started operations against Islamic militants. Pakistan unremitted to support Taliban to realize its interests in Afghanistan and India but after the incident of Pakistan terrorist attack on Indian parliament in December 2001, US hassle Pakistan to restrain the activities of these terrorists. Consequently, Pakistan’s president adopted temperate stance towards these activities i.e. these groups can exist, train, and employee but restricted their activities.\(^\text{587}\) Some of these groups observe while others not. One of the impacts of the policy was that some of the militants started targeting Pakistan. By 2006 many leaders of these militant

---


groups started to call themselves as Pakistan Taliban. These militant groups started to work in two proportions. Some of the militants insisted to deter the foreigners coming from Afghanistan while some other groups started attacking their own country. These groups are reinforced by Lashkar-e-Jhangvi in Punjab. Many leaders of these militant groups systematized themselves under Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP). Initially these militant groups assailed the tribal areas but later on these groups in affiliation with TTP stretched to Swat and other areas of KPK and Punjab. To contain the activities of these groups Pakistan army launched military operations with variegated upshots. Pakistani media claimed that about 35,000 people lost their life during these vehement activities.

Now the answer to the question that Pakistan’s withdrawal of its support to Taliban was symbolic or it was unaffectedly keen to modify the policy is still not known. But president Musharraf speech clearly illustrated that this shift in Pakistan’s policy was not only due to traditional alignment with US but Indian factor was also involved. In his speech to the people of Pakistan he asserted that

—They want to isolate us, get us declared a terrorist state...... in this situation if we make wrong decision it can be very bad for us. Our critical concerns are our sovereignty, second our economy, third our strategic assets (nuclear & missile), fourth our Kashmir cause. All four will be harmed if we make the wrong decision. When we make these decisions they must be according to Islam.

US welcomed the speech of Musharraf so that Pakistan would liaise with US in its war while Pakistan's cause was to take its position back from India in the wake of 9/11 global order. Pakistan certified that it would shift its policy concerning Islamic militants. Nevertheless, this time US did petite for attainment of the assurance. In fact this time US gave three pledges to Pakistan.

First, Northern Alliance would not grab Kabul. Northern Alliance was a mercenaries association that meritoriously contested with Taliban. At that time US had few hundred Special Forces that could not avert Kabul being fallen in the hands of Northern Alliance. At that time Pakistan envisaged that Taliban are their onetime allies and with the help of Pakistan they will capture almost all the Afghanistan. The Northern Alliance was clandestinely buttressed by India, Iran, Russia and Uzbekistan. For Northern Alliance assistance India posted personnel to Uzbekistan and its aviation department abetted them in helicopter fleet. With the confiscation of Kabul in December 2001 India tried to take benefit of US position and became enable to magnify to the border with Pakistan.592

The second pledge given by US to Pakistan was resolution of Kashmir issue, since for Pakistan two nation theory remained unfulfilled there so partition was not complete, on the other side India does not think so. Though Secretary of State Colin Powell took acute interest in the matter but all efforts went futile.593 In mid of 2002 US uninhibited all those promises.594 US adopted serenity over

the discrimination issue faced by Indian Muslim outside the territory of Kashmir.

Thirdly, US also pledged that Pakistan nuclear assets will remain unaffected. But this guarantee too was short lived when strategic deal was signed between India and US that provided India military and civilian succor. In fact through this deal US sought to realize its long-term objectives with regard to its apprehensions of cumulative might of China.

It was hard to believe for the authorities in Pakistan that its strategic interests are hampered by global war on terror. In 2004 Pakistan also determined that the developing mechanism in Afghanistan is not benign for Pakistan even Afghans are apprehensive regarding Pakistan because of its deleterious impact on Afghanistan’s solidity. The importance of Pakistan’s assistance to Afghanistan was counter balance by problem of insurrection, volatility and radicalism. Moreover, Pakistan also supported groups like LeT that assailed US and its allies in Afghanistan in 2004.

However Telis DE hyphenation policy could not realized its desired objectives due to constraints of US national power. US decision makers miscalculated its dual dealing of getting support of Pakistan to counter terrorism and pledging India of making it a global power. US also failed to calculate Indian involvement in Afghanistan without considering Pakistan’s apprehensions and Indian

quantified activities. In fact both India and Pakistan are engaged in proxy war at the expanse of Afghanistan.599

iii. Pak-US Relations: Harmonious & Inharmonious Interests

The year 2001 proved to be an acid test for the Pak-US nexus, since a series of events overwrought the already tensed relations. The first such instance was killing of two Pakistanis by American national. Then the Abbottabad episode further aggravated the tension, as on one hand United States expressed it reservations on Pakistan’s efforts in combating terrorism, while on the other hand the incident annoyed Pakistan and struck army’s image in Pakistan regarding handy defense performance. Tension between the two states augmented when Pakistan refused to launch operation in North Waziristan against Haqqani network. However, after firm efforts on diplomatic front, the relations between the two states put on a normal footing, but after NATO forces attack on Salala check post temperature again raised high. Consequently, Pakistan put off NATO supply and ostracized Bonn conference held in December.600

This nerve-racking year incited deliberations in both the countries. In US some members of congress and some administrative officials are of the view that by kicking downstairs Pakistan, the identical role should be given to India to endorse US cause while other are of the view that US should be extra vigilant and Pakistan cannot be kicked downstairs so easily. In Pakistan some people are of the view to end its partnership with US in its war on terror while others are assertive for new rules of the game.


These are essentially two dynamics that exasperated the relations between the two countries. Firstly, both the states security concerns spotlighted around war against Taliban and Al-Qaeda. In this regard General Jahangir Karamat articulated his view that, ―US-Pak relations were at their worst because relations are between the Pentagon and the Pakistan army was unstable. The relations are further overwrought due to clash in security interest vis-à-vis Afghan Taliban. However, these two nuisances cannot get fixed on diplomatic front so effortlessly. Efforts should be made by going presumptuous and developing more cooperation over war against terror and containing qualified aid structure.

The Afghan war can be ascribed as fading bonds between US and Pakistan since US has been accommodating different strategies to have obvious and innocuous exodus by pushing Taliban to negotiation table. To meet these goals US established special funds to make available inducements to Taliban.

Pakistan had to play vital part in this strategy where International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) beleaguered Taliban and successively Pakistan had to liftoff operation in North Waziristan. But Pakistan did not live up to the expectancy of US and didn’t liftoff operation premeditated by US. Still there are petite substantiations of Pakistan’s links with Taliban e.g. studies connected in London school of economics divulges that ISI representative’s chipping in the major council of Taliban. Pakistan’s writer Ahmad Rasheed wrote that members of Taliban group even travelled on Pakistani passports.

Both US and Pakistan employ diverse ploys en route for Afghan Taliban since Pak deliberates them a tiniest peril to their interest rather Pakistan comprehends them as a resilient element that can slab Indian sway subsequent to US exodus from Afghanistan. However it is hard for US policy makes to admit the fact that they could pay off security fixation only for 1.3 billion a year in aid. The US held surreptitious meetings with Taliban in Doha, Germany and Qatar and kept

---
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Pakistan out of all these dealings that elicited the frame of mind among Pakistanis that US is overlooking Pakistan’s interest in Afghanistan endgame. US is centering all its consideration for fetching Taliban on negotiation table for making easy way out for its security forces and building fortification shell around the government in Kabul by leaving few troops in northern and western part of the country for accomplishing partial operations against Al-Qaida. This approach was also caught in time magazine as —counter insurgency is so 2007……All the cool kids are into counterterrorism now. Moreover Taliban and America are more engrossed for entering into stern discourses. Some of the steps carried out in this regard are opening of Taliban Pol. Office in Doha, and release of Taliban convicts from Guantanamo. Pakistan is also aggravated of US move of chipping in Taliban council meeting devoid of taking Pakistan into confidence. US exercise of sway over Taliban in expatriate and release of Taliban on some conditions and yielding also elevated reservations in the mind of Pakistani leadership. In the meantime Taliban kept extending their terrorist activities without any pledge that whether they kept it going or not but any attack from them cause tension between US and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{602}

Dialogues with Taliban is not an easy route for US, however, they are trying their level best to grant as petite power and control as possible, while Pakistan coveted to pull off power from US and Northern Alliance. Furthermore Pakistan does not want US to persist in the region for elongated period. Apart from making Political defrayal with Taliban US is acute to squeeze Al-Qaida and avert its sway in Pakistan and Afghanistan again. This can be understood as a point of convergence between US and Pakistan since Pak is hurling operation against Al-Qaida in its tribal area in which it also detained the senior members of the organization. However, war against Al-Qaida gave birth to another nuisance between US and Pakistan i.e. drones attacks. Since 2004 CIA is piloting drone
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attacks inside Pakistan in which key cream of the crop of Al-Qaida were slayed.\textsuperscript{603} Drone attacks are cradle of tautness between US and Pakistan because they don’t enjoy any acceptance among the common masses in Pakistan. In this regard different surveys are conducted in Pakistan like Pew survey in 2011 recorded that 61% people don’t contemplate it an obligatory gizmo while 89% people contemplate that in drone attacks death ratio of civilian is more than the terrorist. Similarly New American Foundation in its survey conducted in tribal areas recorded that 76% of people don’t favor these attacks while 48% are of the view that majority of civilian became victim of these attacks. On official level civilian and military establishment denounce these attacks overtly but upkeep these attacks behind the scene. The former prime minister also quoted as saying —I don’t care if they do it as long as they get the right people. We’ll protest in the National Assemble and then ignore it.\textsuperscript{604} Apart from change in policy both the partner corresponded on drone program in which number of imperative and senior member of AlQaida, TTP and Al-Qaida allied group are slayed. Though tension be existent between Pakistan owing to Salala instance but the approach on the subject of drone attack remain intact and both countries agreed for unremitting collaboration in the field.\textsuperscript{604}

The ensuing matter of worry between US and Pakistan is aid program that has been la-di-da owing to the declining relation between them. US argued that it has rendered $20 billion to Pakistan even with of its dwindling pledges. According to the statistics amassed by Congressional Research Service, from 2001-2011, Pakistan received $5.7 billion as security aid, 7.47 b dollar as economic aid and 8.9 b in coalition support fund transfer. Originally out of this $ 22 billion $13.2 billion is provided as aid in ten years while $8.9 billion is recompense to the cost that Pak has already assimilated in its war against
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terrorists. Moreover, this payout is frequently overdue by US. Similarly, the aid also botched to earn benevolence for US since most of the Pakistanis identify this aid as a gizmo to force Pakistan to combat for US cause which Pakistan would not otherwise.\textsuperscript{195}

After Abbottabad episode the aid relations are further tensed. Recently, in July 2011, aid package of $700 million was recouped by US along with acclimatizing economic and security aid. Though Pakistan was endued with Kerry-luger bill, but many of the connoisseurs are of the estimation that aid program of Pakistan may evaded in the near-term. At this time there is a bill in House of representative titled Pakistan Accountability Act that purports for cutoff all aid to Pakistan excluding money for safety of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{605}

Both the allies are not contented with one another on their determinations in war on terror. US alleged Pakistan of playing double game while Pakistan deliberates US deeds as abasement. Najam Rafique a proficient of US affair at the institute of Strategic Studies, in Islamabad quoted —Pak has been treated with contempt by the US; it’s been mistreated and ordered aroundl. Sadly, but both the arguments and allegations cannot be neglected. After 9/11 Pak was forced to join the war and sometimes to act against its own interest while Pak put hurdles in the way of US for achieving its objectives from the war by providing refuge to terrorists on its own land/territorial boundaries\textsuperscript{v}.\textsuperscript{606} iv. Pakistan’s Role in Global War on Terrorism & Divergence with USA

Pakistan inhabits crucial position in global war on terror since its contiguity with Afghanistan has transformed it as a frontline state. This is the reason why US has taken Pakistan for intelligence support and Airbase operation in Afghanistan. Hereafter Pakistan assumed an eminence of pivotal state for US. —Pivotal states

\textsuperscript{605} Ibid.
are those countries which have potential sway substantial or detrimental effects on their region. While Pakistan has all the potential to exercise influence over the key players of south Asia since it shares boarders with India, Afghanistan, Iran, and China. Its proficiency of nuclear power clasps the eye of the major International player. After attack of 9/11 the then Pakistani president re-joined in a manner —US will react like a wounded bear and it will attack Afghanistan. Therefore he determined to upkeep US. Consequently, US made some demands on Pakistan, like —Over fight rights, access to Pak air, naval, and land bases, crush the domestic elements who are in support of terrorism against Americans and its allies, and every logistic an domestic support to Taliban. Pakistan without levitating any question agreed to these demands. Pakistan's support at that time meant a lot for US. Despite of domestic pressure, Pakistani president tailed US policy that has stern insinuations for Pakistan. To Pakistan the only way out now could be find out through dialogues with the radicals.

v. Targeting & Hunting Al-Qaeda Operatives

Pakistan is a key player in war against terror for US, and it is also a fact that US cannot win this war without Pakistan. Its contiguity with Afghanistan made it distinct in the eyes of US. Pakistan underneath US compression started military operation in tribal areas that bumping at the door of melancholy period. In 2004 under US extreme pressure Pakistan started operation in North Waziristan. Government of Pakistan confronted antipathy from local tribesmen and other

---
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general masses and faced massive human and material fatalities. This portrays
the unabridged story of Pakistan’s agony which it is taking for the US, but still
the US is not contented with Pakistan’s exertions. You can never ever bring peace by the use of force only; along with the use of
force there are manifold routes to bring concord and constancy. Therefore, apart
from employment of force Pakistan tried its level best to use other channels to
bring peace and stability in long-run. In this regard Pakistan has signed number
of peace accords that are discussed below;

a. Shakai Agreement 2004

The first move en route for the peaceful settlement of the issue was made at
Shakai with Nek Muhammad. But this peace accord ached as Nek Muhammad
was slayed in an air attack by US since US was edgy with any kind of pact with
Taliban. Thus
Pakistan’s stand for figuring out the matter was incapacitated by US. After Nek
Muhammad death Taliban started attacks on military troops and their installation
in retaliation.\textsuperscript{609}

b. **Peace Agreement with Baitullah Mehsud at Sararogha 2005**

The next step taken in the same direction was the second peace agreement with Mehsud tribe at Sararogha in 2005. This agreement called for that Taliban must not attack on government installations and will not accommodate any foreign
militants. But this agreement too miscarried to meet the objective since Mehsud tribe desecrated the agreement. In short this agreement has grim reverberation for Pakistan since there are infinite clashes between Taliban and Pakistan forces. There is need for compact approach that may result in long-term solution. However all this needs political support to have some positive developments.610

c. Miranshah Agreement 2006

Another effort from Pakistani government to bring peace and stability in tribal areas of Pakistan was the agreement of 2006 made with elders of North Waziristan. The terms and conditions of the agreement were that government will draw back its troops from the area, will release 165 scoundrels and recompense to the military operation affected, inversely tribal elder promise that they will not allow any penetration from Afghanistan. But this pact too sabotaged due to frequent permeation. But one can easily evaluate that government proved to be a weak party in the contract since withdrawal of troops gave them the opportunity to reorganize, release of the scoundrels gave them confidence over government and economic recompense allowed them to develop their valor and vigor.611

d. Bajaur Agreement 2007

Another accord in this regard was made with Mohmand tribe in 2007 but judicial crisis led this accord in the same direction of earlier accords. But despite of only peaceful mean government should also use coercive means to balance peace process.205

vii. Factors Hampering Pakistan’s Efforts in Global War on Terror
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There are number of factors encumbering Pakistan’s efforts in counter terrorism these are

a. **Lack of Funds**

The notable obstacle in the way of fighting against terrorism is a meager economy of Pakistan and ever swelling global inflation rate. To affectively fight against the terrorists Pakistan needs solid economic base. Therefore the call of the time is that all the developed countries including US must provide Pakistan with categorical aid so it might compete with the potency of the militants.

b. **Lack of Training to Fight Guerilla Warfare**

Another reason why Pakistan is step down from militants is lack of guerilla training by the arm forces. Likewise, our police and FC are oblivious the tactics use to fight in mountainous terrains. So there is an edge to the extremists in this regard. There is need for providing proper training to the arm forces, police and FC so they may fight with these scoundrels with more ardors.\(^{612}\)

c. **Trust Deficit with US**

Though war on terror is not only Pakistan’s war it is the revival of the old alliance between Pakistan and US and US gave Pakistan the title of the most allied ally but in spite of these warmth words there exist a wide gulf between the allies on the basis of trust because US always suspects army and ISI efforts to counter terrorism. So it can be aptly said that they are allies only by name. The dissension of the two allies gives opportunity to the militants to spring up more knock-down. In such a situation there are slightest chances for the allied forces to win over the war. So efforts must be made from both the sides to develop
trust, US must appreciate Pakistan’s efforts with least of the resources to counter terrorism only then they can achieve mutual goals.\textsuperscript{613}

d. Drone Attacks\Civilian Causalities\Resentment

Drone attacks are one of the most ill tactics used by US to counter terrorism because in such attacks you never know how much efficacious you are in hitting your target rather it slayed more civilians than the militants. Consequently these attacks are fabricating more militants and terrorists. Moreover the militants have disseminated among the local population. This makes it more challenging to target militants among the civilian population. Resultantly these attacks are putting Pakistan in worse condition and pushing Pakistan towards gloomy future. Therefore there is a need that US must change its tactics to target the militants.\textsuperscript{614}

f. Lack of Human Intelligence

Though technological advancement and possession of latest weapons win the half war but to win the war absolutely another important thing which cannot be overlooked is human intelligence. Unless you have acquaintance about the target that is the job of human intelligence you cannot make use of those advanced weapons, lack of effective human intelligence is another problem faced by Pakistan and Afghanistan. Pakistan forces are working hard to bring peace and stability in tribal areas with ineffectual human intelligence that leads to the casualties of arm forces whereas these militants have the support of powerful human intelligence. If these spies are publically executed no other person will


dare to spy against Pakistan’s forces. vii. Pak-US Deadlock and Insinuations for Regional Stability

US shifted its policy with an option to die away all combatant operations; on the other side the other regional power i.e. India was playing its own game to exploit its position for its own benefit. There existed three groups in India that had their own views regarding India’s engagement in Afghanistan. One group was of the view that if India botched to achieve its goal in the backdrop of Afghanistan war by a whisker it can became a regional power, and by a hair’s breadth a global power. While there are those who believe that Indian interest did not be existent in Afghanistan and loss of life cannot be recompensed at any cost. There is also a group that argue that India does have interests in Afghanistan because through this engagement policy India can ascertain its prerogative of regional and extra regional power but it must also guard its security interest there and also care for the life of personnel engaged there.

After calculation of all the state of affairs Kashmir issue turns out to be no more a first priority for Pakistan, now its leading distress is to rebuff Indian regional supremacy. However, the things did not remain same for Pakistan after 11 September 2001. The newer commanders of mid and lower rank of group of Mullah Omar are abhorrent to US\NATO as well as Pakistan so the lone hope remained for Pakistan is Haqqani network proxies. This spectacle that Pakistan is much more desperate to affect the proceedings in Afghanistan than US and its allies and cannot be unruffled until it realizes political temperament that capitalizes on its influence and curtail that of India. Also this is a sporadic opportunity for Pakistan to be on same standing as it was before 9\11.

---
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Absence of compact partnership can be accredited as a root of trust deficit between both the countries. In fact both are funneling in their partnership en route for a single track i.e. security concern, in which even they lack harmonization in approach. A former CIA officer Bruce O Riedel in New York Times magazine quoted —I can see how this gets worse….and I can see how this gets catastrophically worse…….i don’t see how it gets a whole lot better! Similarly Pak retired diplomat Zafar Hilaly expressed his view by saying —this relationship is not headed anywhere- our ways part, our paths are divergent!618

Pakistan engrossed and attached great importance to use militants as device of foreign policy but it put Pakistan’s domestic security in jeopardy because being devoted with them in Afghanistan for deterring India, they are inept to control Taliban domestically because all these share same philosophy of vehemence.

Policy makers in US are forecasting for decrement its reliance on Pakistan since it is also shrinking its presence in Afghanistan. Some US decision makers call it a hardhitting call for Pakistan to deal with the militants, Pakistan rejected to give access to Dr. A. Q. Khan, black marketing of nuclear weapons. Some of the US decision makers recommended withholding aid to Pakistan. Pakistan's domestic crisis, civil-military deadlock encourage military and civilian elite to take stern stand on US.

Regardless of divergence in interest, some degree of coalition can be in their favor. But the essential thing to note is such relationship will realize only short-term goal and will not realize mid and long-term goal. Therefore US should grasp its necessities and must revisit its policy en route for Pakistan. US coveted to have its ground presence in Afghanistan afar 2014. Similarly, it too has interest in Central Asian Republics (CARs) because of its oil reserves and other resources. On the other hand Pakistan is a susceptible state led by immoral politicians, scrawny economy and ever growing population with resources

paucity and maladministration. Moreover it will need means to provide constancy to the war affected areas of its territory. US must engross Pakistan in multidimensional ventures to comprehend the government, corporate, and pecuniary sectors, and civil society.  

5.2.3 US Strategic Slant towards India

The South Asian region always fascinated global power predominantly US. In South Asian region principally Pakistan and India are the utmost momentous countries for US. Though with the passage of the time US had varied interest in the region but US each time feel India more near to its heart. Pak-US relations have seen many peaks and valley but its geo-strategic location has continually boosted its position in regional and international politics. Although Pakistan has made many forfeiture but it went wrong to fill the ever widening trust gap between Pakistan and America. All this elicits two questions in mind that — Is Pakistan indeed an ally of US? Or brands it as ally only in times of need? 

In May 2000 President Clinton paid an official visit to subcontinent. This visit can be gazed at as an indicator for India that US visualize India as long strategic partner. This can be described by highlighting certain points i.e. President Clinton visited India and stayed there for five day while spent only five hours in Pakistan. He exhibited great balminess towards India while adopted official posture for Pakistan. He urged for transmutation of relations with India in multifaceted field while in contrast Clinton only proposed Musharraf to take steps for restoration of democracy.

Bush administration was very much anxious about Chinese growing valor that posed a direct peril to US tactical interest. US secretary of state Colin Powell did
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not esteem Clinton discerning astute of seeing China —Strategic Powerl. On January 17, 2001, he portrayed China a sturdy contender and peril to US economic and sanctuary interest.622 US mounting trepidations about China and other discrepancy in their relations developed avenues for Indo-US partnership. This was very much obvious from UN Security Strategy (UNSS) of September 2002.623 US waived many of the sanctions inflicted against India, pledged to develop technical assistance, revise its stance of supporting Pakistan on Kashmir issue and rationalized the calculation of their relations.624 Condoleezza Rice in her visit to India affirmed that US sought to have closer ties with India since both the countries are global and regional partner.219 She too recognized that US would adjust its policy with regard to India and Pakistan.625 Hence it is quite clear that USA choose India as its strategic partner though they have to pay them handsomely, they relieved all nuclear sanctions rather they provided further help in nuclear field in the form of civil nuclear agreements and this partnership served the interest of USA against the extending influence of China, and to some extent may be the reawakening of Russia in future.626 On the other side this partnership annoyed Pakistan since it enhanced Indian national power that disturbed the balance of power between India and Pakistan.627

622 The Clinton administration viewed China as a strategic partner, and emphasized expanded trade rather than disagreement over Taiwan. See John Isaacs, _Bush II or Reagan III?_ Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, May/June 2001, p. 31.
626 Colonel (Rtd) Ashfaq Ahmad interview with the author on April 29, 2014 in Peshawar.
627 Dr. Shahid Khattak, Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar. Interview with the author on March 11, 2014 in Peshawar.
The event of 9/11 changed the whole scenario. Consequently, US shifted its policy towards South Asia where once Pakistan was on low priority and all US policies were Indian centric as in the words of Stephen Cohen —The Bush administration built upon Clinton’s —discovery of India and set out to create comprehensive and positive relationship with New Delhil. Bush himself asserted that —9/11 changed America. This incident culminates into US dependence on Pakistan and put Indo-US strategic agenda on hold though momentarily.

Since US is planning for departure from Afghanistan and when they are asked about their strategy of 2014, the riposte was economic uplift of the country through New Silk initiative. As regard to Indo-US relations Henry Kissinger had made his calculation a decade ago that —US and India have no conflicting interests in the traditional and fundamental sensel. Since last decade their relations has been sprung up to manifold dimensions. Indian mounting military power and flourishing economy are the main coinciding points of their relations. It has sprung up economically at an average of 7.7 since last decade. It is not only the leading market for US but have all the latent to become dynamo in the approaching two decade.

US also played imperative role in Pak-Afghan Transit Trade Agreement (PATTA) on July 19, 2010, that conceded Afghanistan the right to export its good via Wagah border and in retort Pakistan can use Afghan soil for trade with Central Asian Republics (CARs). Close analysis spectacles that US took all the pains for making India part of PATTA, yonder this endowed Most Favored Nation (MFN) status to India. US is now making exertion so India is endowed for transportation of merchandize goods to and from Afghanistan without any yielding except for delusory pledges that trade with India would be valuable for

Pakistan. But it will have its bearing on Pakistan local industry and will undesirably affect its trade with CARs and Afghanistan.\(^{629}\)

US Assistant Secretary on South Asian Affairs Robert O. Blake during press conference on US Policy Priorities in South and Central Asia on September 23, 2011 gave outline of Indo-US areas of cooperation as —President Obama has called (Indo-US relations as) one of our defining partnership for the 21\(^{st}\) century.\(^{226}\) The areas of cooperation between the two countries comprise extremism, job opportunities, developing infrastructure, investment, trade, economic partnership and energy etc. They are also planning to launch Investment Forum, Foreign Direct Investment and network of Chamber of Commerce. While US was\(\text{is}^*\) not in a mood to enter into such deals with Pakistan. Owing to Indian strong suit US deliberates it the only regional power to poise Chinese cumulative might. On the other side Pakistan is a feeble state, have crumbling economy, at the mercy of aid with wobbly and crooked political structure.\(^{630}\)

Above all US may have an entrée to oil rich Persian Gulf states via Indian Ocean, another strong point that earn favor of US to India.

i. **Indo-US Strategic Agreements**

One of the first worth mentioning deal signed between India and US was made on April 17 2002. This deal endowed India with 8 Raytheon Co long range weapons spotting radars the deal worth’s $146 million. These radars had the potential to detect long-range mortars, artillery and rocket launcher.\(^{631}\) On May 22 2003 US approved to vend to India
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Israel’s Phalcon airborne early warning system that cost $1.2 billion.\textsuperscript{632} In June 2004, US signaled for transference of missile technology to reinforce Indian defense system.\textsuperscript{633} On July 18 2005 Bush administration proclaimed civil nuclear collaboration with India.\textsuperscript{634} On March 2006 both the countries affirmed for sustenance of defense relation to upkeep their mutual tactical interest.\textsuperscript{635} This deal proved to be beneficial for the cause of Indian nuclear development because it empowered India to attain nuclear reactor and enriched uranium and chip in in International nuclear research and development.\textsuperscript{636} Another important agreement that signed between US and India on June 28 2005 was a 10 year Defense Pact to reinforce the relations between the two countries. This agreement eases Indo-US dual weapon manufacture, assistance on missile defense and transferal of civil and military technology to India.\textsuperscript{637} The US motive behind this pact was to deter global safety gainsay and secure US tactical interests in South Asia.

ii. Pakistan Insight about Mounting Indo-US Strategic Partnership

Pakistan did not appreciate Indo-US strategic deal and had expressed its reservation on 30\textsuperscript{th} June 2005. Before this, Pakistan communicated its reservations to US about new weapon system i.e. missile defense that would dislocate regional power balance and would spark off arm race between India and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{638} Foreign Minister of Pakistan while explaining Pakistan’s position stated —I believe that the government’s reaction over this issue was not
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sufficient to match the gravity of the situation. Pakistan should convey its serious concern to US as a non-NATO ally. He further said that the US should make it clear, that its enhanced and close military collaboration with India will not have threatening effects for the national security of Pakistan.\(^{639}\) This deal would have repercussions on nuclear dialogues between Pakistan-US and between Indo-Pakistan. One of the topmost issue within Pakistan’s security and intelligence establishment was that it fought three war with India since 1947 and now again its security was jeopardy by India since India has tactical superiority and US contemplate India its strategic partner in respect of Pakistan and China on the post 9\11 situation. Pakistan cogitates itself to be girded from eastern side by India and on western side by mounting Indian sway in Afghanistan. India is providing finance, weapons, secret and intelligence support to antiPakistan groups to subvert it. With this new nuclear deal between India and US and US tilt towards India developed sensing in Pakistan that along with terrorism a major security threat to Pakistan is post 9\11 security policy of South Asia.\(^ {640}\)

It is evident from Indo-US strategic deal that US does not deliberate India and Pakistan the identical contenders somewhat it regard India a principal regional power. Pakistan is a frontline state in war on terror and non-NATO ally still US unheeded Pakistan’s trepidations of delivering India up to date defense system that would not only imbalance regional power but also would imbalance power equation between India and Pakistan. Pakistan was concerned about the Indo-US deal that India might use nuclear fabric for edifying nuclear arm which would have stern security insinuations for Pakistan. However US vindicated the deal on the plea that the deal was made to meet Indian energy requirements for


emergent economy. On the other side US did not respect Pakistan’s demand for opening out nuclear power plant for peaceful purpose. Pakistan too claimed two power plants to meet its energy requirement through power generation. Indo-US strategic partnership in post 9/11 enhanced Pakistan peril sensing from India and elevated a question on US credibility. Many critics are of the view that US being Pakistan’s ally is persuading India at the expanse of Pakistan. Indo-US relation further spoiled the image of US in the eyes of common masses of Pakistan. China too was not pleased with this deal whereas for US China is a latent menace with respect to US economic and security stratagem. America was very much swift to swear Pakistan and China that agreement was not against them. US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice stated to Pakistani President that there was no any clandestine deal with India and the deal was made just to assist India to meet its energy needs.

iii. US Policy Swing & Trust Deficit with Pakistan

Former President of Pakistan Pervez Musharraf pointed out that —a strategic shift of US policy towards Indial for an —acute deficit of trustl between the traditional allies, for that reason there is awful need to reinstake this trust instantaneously. And it is because of this shift that we can see disappointment in Pakistan’s ranks.

Musharraf argued that today Pakistan is under the grab of terrorism. —The situation demands a clearer understanding of ground realities in South Asia, bridging the acute trust deficit and developing a unity of thought and action among all coalition players,l he went on saying, —Blame games, rigidity,
arrogance and insensitivity towards others' interests will always remain counterproductive. He added that Pakistan is undoubtably a dupe of extremism rather a guilty party. He uttered that —Pakistan's national and social fabric was torn apart.

He also impugned Indo-Afghan role by calling it the —malicious role of India and the Afghan government in maligning Pakistan's military and intelligence, Musharraf alleged: —We know what Indian consulates are doing, especially in Kandahar and Jalalabad. —We also know that Afghan intelligence, military and Foreign Service personnel go to India for training, and —not a single Afghan official comes to Pakistan, despite Pakistan's longstanding offer of free training since my time in office.

—The continuing US military presence and operations in Afghanistan, indiscriminate drone attacks with increasing collateral damage in the Tribal Areas of Pakistan, and finally the violation of Pakistan's sovereignty in a cross-border strike against Osama bin Laden are all now seen most negatively by the people of Pakistan, Musharraf alleged. His statement regarding Kashmir issue was that —dispute needs an urgent, amicable settlement. That is a key to stopping militancy in the Indian-held Kashmir. Musharraf confessed that there is need from Pakistani side to explain why it is not taking action against Haqqani network.

While determining future course with US, Pakistan must focus on its own security interests. In this regard there are two groups' neo-realists and neo-liberalist. Neo-realist believes that state must pursue —relative gain while neo-liberalist believes in —absolute gain. So Pakistan must go for absolute gain and
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646 Ibid.
647 Ibid.
648 See Arun Kumar.
try to abridge trust deficit and realize their common interests.\textsuperscript{650} \textbf{iv. Pak-Iran Gas Pipeline: An Irritant for USA}

The estimation was conceptualized by a vernal civil engineer in mid 1950s, when one of his articles was released by the Military College of Engineering, Risalpur. His name was Malik Aftab Ahmed Khan. The article —Persian Pipelinel likewise specified the technique for it’s along the dangerous domain by securing little contingent estimate cantonments along its projected way thru Baluchistan/Sind, serving various capacities, to curb dacoits and terrorists and so on and to give security to the pipeline. The task was abstracted in 1989 by Rajendra K. Pachauri in company with Ali Shams Ardekani, previous Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran. Dr Pachauri offered the arrangement to both Iranian and Indian governments in 1990. The administration of Iran reacted decidedly to the proposal. At the yearly meeting of the International Association of Economics Energy, 1990, Dr. Ardekani upheld Dr Pachauri’s scheme.\textsuperscript{651}

On March 11, 2013 Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad launched the construction of a much-delayed section of the gas pipeline with his Pakistani counterpart Asif Ali Zardari at a ceremony on the border of the two neighbors.\textsuperscript{652}

Iran and Pakistan want the finished pipeline that will carry 21.5 million cubic meters (760,000 million cubic feet) of gas for every day to Pakistan from its mammoth seaward South Pars field in the Persian Gulf by December 2014. Iranian builders will develop the pipeline, which crosses Pakistani region. Tehran has consented $500 million as loan to Islamabad, one-third of the
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evaluated $1.5 billion expense of the 750-kilometer pipeline, consistent with Fars news organization.²⁵¹

Iran has finished 900 kilometers of the pipeline’s section on its side of the outskirt with Pakistan. Monday’s function denoted the starting of finish up the Pakistani section, which will begin at the Iranian town of Chahbahar close to the border. Pakistan grasps the pipeline as a mean for maneuvering extreme energy deficiencies, which have started shows and battered a feeble government. In the meantime, Islamabad needs the money related help it accepts from the US.²⁵³

Iranian state television exhibited recordings of Ahmadinejad and Zardari shaking hands and offering prayers subsequent to inauguration a cornerstone to label Pakistan’s connection. The two presidents asserted in a joint statement ―The completion of the pipeline is in the interests of peace, security and progress of the two countries … it will also consolidate the economic, political and security ties of the two nations." Anthony Skinner, a director of British-based Maple croft risks consultancy said —The Pakistani government wants to show it is willing to take foreign policy decisions that defy US, particularly when such crucial issues as energy security are at stake.²⁵³

The US has debilitated Islamabad with authorizations over Pakistan’s organization with Iran to build a segment of a gas pipeline that will transmit gas from Iran to Pakistan to meet its energy crunch. Washington said that the tremendously deferred $7.5-billion venture defiles authorizes on Iran, a case denied by Pakistan.²⁵⁴ US State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland uttered —We have serious concerns, if this project actually goes forward, that the Iran Sanctions Act would be triggered. We’ve been straight up with the Pakistanis about these concerns.‖ Nuland added: —We’ve heard this pipeline

announced about 10 or 15 times before in the past. So we have to see what actually happens. She repeated that the US is working to expand Pakistan’s vigor supplies through other means: —This pipeline project, if it actually goes forward – we’ve seen that promise many times – would take Pakistan in the wrong direction right at a time that we’re trying to work with Pakistan on better, more reliable ways to meet its energy needs.\textsuperscript{654}

The United States had been looking for alternate strategies, saying the move with Iran would aim at —in the wrong direction right at a time that we’re trying to work with Pakistan on better, more reliable ways to meet its energy needs.\textsuperscript{1} Nuland went on saying that US was —supporting large-scale energy projects in Pakistan that will add some 900 megawatts to the power grid by the end of 2013.\textsuperscript{1} Those ventures involved refurbishing the power plants at Tarbela, the Mangla Dam, as well as overhauling others plants and edifying new dams at Satpara and Gomal Zam, she articulated.\textsuperscript{655}

With Pakistan at present confronting vigor deficiencies, Washington seems hesitant to keep its promise in spite of its affirmations. RT’s Tariq Mahiyuddin stated —The Americans have only given promises and signed some kind of memorandum of understanding on this issue, but nothing has been implemented on the ground.\textsuperscript{656} According to Voice of America report, —That [the IP project] is of concern to the United States, which is backing international sanctions against Iranian energy exports because of its nuclear program.\textsuperscript{657} The report further added that considerable amount of work has been done on Pak-Iran gas pipeline where Iranian contractors has concluded 900 km from Iranian side and is underway work on Pakistani side. The report quoted American Professor
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Akbar Ahmad enunciating — It’s in the interests of the Pakistani government to have access to energy and Iran is promising that through this gas pipeline. At the same time the United States is doing everything to block this.\textsuperscript{658}

The 1996 Iran Sanction Act permitted US to bar importation of non-American company that capitalizes more than USD 20 million a year in oil and gas sector. President of Pakistan asserted that it is crucial for our crumbling economy. He went on saying — We’ve got to be economically sound, and therefore this pipeline is a life pipeline as far as Pakistan is concerned.\textsuperscript{659} Pakistani President accentuated that Pakistan will keep enduring this project irrespective of US intimidations and pressure.

According to Washington’s dangers of assents, President Ahmadinejad denounced — outside componentsl of utilizing Iran‘s atomic project as an excuse to foil Iran-Pakistan relations, platitudenum they have no grounds to contradict the pipeline task since it manages regular gas. — With natural gas you cannot make atomic bombs. That’s why they should have no excuse to oppose this pipeline,\textsuperscript{261} Reuters reported, quoting a translation of a televised statement by Ahmadinejad. — I want to tell those individuals that the gas pipeline has no connection whatsoever with the nuclear case.\textsuperscript{261}

v. Pipeline Sabotage US Control in the Region

The Iran-Pakistan pipeline could undermine US hegemony in the Middle East and South Asia, Eric Draitser, a self-determining geopolitical forecaster and creator of StopImperialism.com wrote for RT: — The pipeline brings the two
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countries closer together and, in so doing, helps to solidify a relationship united by a common mistrust of the US.\textsuperscript{660}

Anthony Skinner, director of British-based Maple croft dangers consultancy, resounded the thought that Pakistan needs to reveal its place on the global stage by setting out to settle on choices that—defy the US.\textsuperscript{661}

—The Pakistani government wants to show it is willing to take foreign policy decisions that defy the US,\textsuperscript{1} Skinner said, according to Reuters. —The pipeline not only caters to Pakistan’s energy needs, but also lodges brownie points with the many critics of the US amongst the electorate.\textsuperscript{662}

Draitser also conceives that the—peace pipeline will be an accomplishment, particularly if China chooses to get involved: —In this very plausible scenario, China would finally get the _holy grail_ it has sought for years: land-based access to energy imports from the Middle East. For China, an energy-starved economy that continues to grow, this would greatly enhance their regional position.\textsuperscript{663}

He went on saying —It would also transform the balance of power in Asia, as the era of US domination of energy resources in the Middle East would be over.\textsuperscript{1} —So, were the project to be extended to China, the pipeline would become the focus of a new power paradigm, making it one of the most important economic development projects in the world.\textsuperscript{1} \textbf{vi. Iran Gas Pipeline: Pakistan Employs US Disagreement as Trump Card}

In recently held strategic dialogues between Pakistan and US, US absolutely winnowed out Pakistan’s idea of importing gas from Iran and even it can inflict sanctions against Pakistan if it did not drop the idea.

\textsuperscript{661} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{663} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{664} Ibid.
Sources of water and power minister informed that Pakistan determined to use US disapprobation in Pakistan’s favor by urging on US to reason out civil nuclear deal parallel to that signed between India and US. The delegation was leaded by water and power minister. The sources informed —The US did not respond to Pakistan’s demands, I nevertheless it is not clear whether or not Pakistan would retreat from pipeline project if US render succor for nuclear power plant.665

Pakistan experiences severe dearth of energy that further intensified due to insufficiency in national reserves. In 1990s last gas reserves were found out that was not ample to swap the paucity of the gas fields found out in 1950s. US suggested for pursuit of gas pipeline deal with Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and India known as TAPI. Pakistan hailed US succor for the project, but observe it as a scarce to meet the Pakistan’ mounting needs. According to government stats energy crisis condense economic growth up to 22.5 % of GDP annually while supplies from Iran might benefit to moderate the difference. There are some other solid grounds why gas import from Iran is much feasible than that of Turkmenistan.666

The Iranian gas pipeline would colligate Pakistan gas hub at Nawabshah with South Pars gas field that is one of the prevalent gas reserves of the world. Larger gas fields are inexpensive to extract gas that involves petite assets. Though Turkmenistan gas reserves are imperative but they are not as bigger as Iran and are not at parallel in scope as of South Pars fields.

Another problem was the indemnification cost of pipeline since the pipeline passes through Afghanistan that is under the grab of Taliban insurrection. Other problem embrace that the countries have not yet settle the gas sale and purchase

665 The Express Tribune, September 19th, 2011.
agreement. The Pakistani official told the US official that gas and nuclear energy are not the lone foundation of power. The official informed that —Islamabad also asked the US to extend support to exploit coal reserves. The Thar coal are the third leading reserves of the world and Sindh government is seeking to develop them since 1990s and recently developed partnership with private sector firm like ENGRO Corporation to accomplish the task.667

5.3 CONCLUSION

Pak-US strategic partnership after 9/11 has become the much debated issue for political and security experts of the world. The fields in which both the countries diverge mentioned above are those on which their mutual interests are in not coherence. The present alliance between the two countries with regard to war on terror in which Pakistan assumed the role of frontline state have much undesirable upshots for Pakistan. US to achieve its regional interests, whether to counter Chinese sway or defense and security objectives in South and South West Asia it shows slant towards India is by no means tolerable to Pakistan. Pakistan is at detrimental position regarding Afghanistan condition i.e. fall of Taliban and rise of Northern Alliance and then election of Hamid Karzai as President of Afghanistan whom Pakistan deliberates pro-Indian US chosen man. Thus Indian mounting sway in Afghanistan would not be tolerable to Pakistan since Pakistan don’t want to be delimited from Eastern and Western boarder by India. The war on terror has been imposed on Pakistan with petite instances to say NO after 9/11 attacks. USA deliberates Pakistan to be devotee of Taliban in Afghanistan. Under US pressure Pakistan has to render support in the war. But with the passage of time deviation seems to appear in their security and defense interests. Taliban and members of Al-Qaeda took sanctuary in Pakistan to attack Pakistani forces as well as US and NATO forces. Pakistan has been suspect by US for supporting numerous militant groups. US also alleged that Pakistan is

667 The Express Tribune, September 19th, 2011.
playing double game with US being an ally in war on terror. Pakistani government failed to take concrete action against extremism and launched restricted operations against militancy. The issue of Dr. A. Q. Khan of assisting North Korea, Libya and Iran in developing nuclear weapons strained bilateral ties between US and Pakistan. Pakistan is suspect for not employing US aid in war on terror somewhat money is used for developing defense potentials. Similarly Pakistan agreement with Iran for fulfilling its energy needs is also an issue on which the views of both the allies diverge. USA is constantly pressurizing Pakistan to withdraw from the agreement. It has also threatened Pakistan that Pakistan can face sanctions if it continues with the agreement. On the other side Pakistan wants early completion of pipeline project. Though their exist divergence in Pak-US priorities still both the allies need each other to eradicate extremism and promote regional peace.

Though there are different issues on which the both sides disagree but no state can attain its objectives alone in global politics, likewise US come closer to Pakistan when it needs Pakistan's help. To attain its objectives in war on terror US need Pakistan's help while Pakistan needs US help to support its booming economy because of sanctions imposed by US. Similarly Pakistan needs US help to increase its military might to get regional power balance against India. There are certain other areas where interests of both the allies converged i.e. economic development, regional peace and stability in general and Afghanistan in particular, defense cooperation and economic interests in Central Asia. Gas pipeline from Central Asia will not only benefit Pakistan but also other regional states. Investment in these projects will promote their mutual objectives.

---

commonly believed in Pakistan that joining war on terror caused lots of troubles for Pakistan rather than what it gains from it which seems to be quite logical if we analyze the present scenario. In these conditions it is essential that both US and Pakistan must enter into evocative dialogue process and unite their energies to overthrow extremism. There is a need to fill the gap created by trust deficit and must base their relationship on ground realities. They must cooperate where they share common objectives and try to resolve the issues on which they disagree.

CHAPTER – 6
CONCLUSION

Pak-US military alliance cum ad hoc coalition over last six decades have been categorized by fear syndrome induced in the mind of policy planners of Pakistan owing to super power rivalry and then war on terror. Moreover, Moscow”s reservations over the idea of Pakistan and setting off Afghanistan to challenge the legitimacy of Durand Line added more to the apprehensions of Pakistan. Likewise, Pakistan didn”t get its due share from the assets of united India. Therefore, we can say that basis of this alliance relationship was found in the inherent problems of Pakistan.

Whenever Pakistan came in contact with United States keeping in view its security objectives Pakistan has always suffered the heavy losses, which means history of Pak-US alliances crammed the acrimonious reminiscences for Pakistan. The primary objective of Pakistan of aligning itself with the United States was\vis ensuring its security vis-à-vis India by acquiring substantial economic and military aid from United States. However, all the time it is Pakistan who has to compromise its security objectives, also the aid that come to
Pakistan has always been attached with certain strings which now and then were not beneficial for Pakistan’s interests.

The military alliance between Pakistan and US has never served the purpose of Pakistan it has never meant for the benefit and security of Pakistan, and today we are aligned again because Pakistan is considered to be a major Non-NATO ally but we have been serving the purpose of NATO and US. In the past, US wanted to use Pakistan’s territory, soil, and military for the containment of communism and the alliances were not meant for Pakistan’s security. Against India in 1965 and 1971 US weapons were used by Pakistan that annoyed US so much so that US stop the support of Pakistan in 1965 and 1971. It is also a hard fact that whenever Pakistan shook hands with United States to promote her interests in the region, it created multiple problems for Pakistan, thus making Pakistan more vulnerable to internal and external threats like we has the example of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1979 and after Soviet disintegration and withdrawal of its forces from Afghanistan Pakistan found itself in deep trouble since US left the region with many issues unresolved.

The Pak-US alliances have another gloomy side for Pakistan as well, since United States while not reckoning Pakistan’s sacrifices always gave penchant to India over Pakistan. Very often the US halted aid to Pakistan whenever it saw estrangement in its relation with India. This is the reason why Indian factor has always been dominating the Pak-US alliance right from the beginning in 1950s till the ongoing Pak-US nexus in war on terror. Institutions like CIA, Department of Defense, Department of State and think tanks in United States are agreed on the point that India should be the partner of US in promoting her long-term objectives in the region. However this fact cannot be denied that US don’t want to lose Pakistan as well.

Although United States and Pakistan are allies in war on terror still there prevail hunches on both sides. United States accused the security forces and intelligence agencies of Pakistan many times for having their links with the Islamic militants. Rehman Malik the
former Interior Minister of Pakistan on one similar occasion stated that since Pakistan joined war on terror it had suffered incredibly. He further held that “We are not just fighting for Pakistan; we are fighting for the whole world. If Pakistan is destabilized, the whole region is destabilized. We are victims, not part of the terrorism.” Pakistan is more concerned about US drone strategy to counter the terrorism, not making Pakistan part of Afghan settlement, and despite of it sacrifices asking Pakistan to “do more.” Moreover, US blamed that Pakistan is not serious in combating Al-Qaeda and Taliban, rather they are providing them hideouts, from where they operate against the US and NATO forces in Afghanistan.

Strong anti-American sentiments are prevalent in Pakistan owing to US polices towards Pakistan. Drone attacks are objurgated for “collateral damage” and infringement of Pakistan’s territorial sovereignty. The most serious repercussion of drone attacks for Pakistan is that the terrorist groups easily influenced the sufferers and recruit them for attaining their objectives.

6.1 RESEARCH FINDINGS

If one tries to study the relationship thoroughly, four important aspect of this relation will attract his attention.

At first instance, the alliance between Pakistan and United States is partial since every state has its own objectives and interests that are more significant than the coinciding interests. In the same manner during Cold War era for United States former Soviet Union remained more imperative than its ally Pakistan, and following the same course presently United States is more focused in combating terrorism. On the other hand Pakistan since its inception up till now has always been preoccupied with the threat obsession of India. This is the reason why we can see frequent peaks and valleys in their bilateral ties. We cannot see any vital common interests that bind these two states like we can see in case of India

and Pakistan (both the states have common objective of keeping foreign states out of the region).

Secondly, the alliance between the two states is lopsided. This relation means a lot for Pakistan while is a marriage of convenience for United States. We played in the hands of USA against former Soviet Union, we were instrumental in the disintegration of former Soviet Union today we should not feel proud of this fact because at that time world was bipolar and we were instrumental in the uni polarity of the world the purpose of US was served not of the Pakistan we again and again when US needed us we shook hands and when Pakistan needed US and west no one was there and now after 9/11 event they needed Pakistan and we welcomed them despite the fact that it has been a bad experience we are continuing. In case of any loss United States has the option to draw back from the region while Pakistan has no such option. In such circumstance Pakistan has more chances to incur heavy loss while United States would only be bothered.

Thirdly, regarding security concerns both the states are not on the same page. Pakistan regards United States a source of economic and military assistance. For United States, Pakistan is a tool that it employs whenever its interest demands. Despite of convergence in their interests both the states diverge on many issues. Both the states view Middle East, India, issue of non-proliferation and human rights differently.

Fourthly, the unique feature of this relationship is trust deficit and fallacy on both sides. United States gazed Pakistan a state being their most allied ally having soft corner for and links with the Islamic militants. On the other hand it is common perception in Pakistan that United States is an unreliable ally which cannot be trusted since United States recurrently left Pakistan alone with unresolved issues after attaining its objectives. Although, there exist divergence in the interests but for working relationship between the two states there is need of change in policies of both the states so that without hurting the interests of one another and without interruption both states continue their association in future.
6.2 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

US led war on terror has affected Pakistan in many ways. Lack of knowledge, education, vigilance, Islam being used as tool for achieving the political ends have deeply affected Pakistan. In the beginning, the war was limited to regions in KP but as rightly commented that “this fire will not be limited to the KP but soon will encircle all of Pakistan. At present, one must not disregard the menace of Talibanization of Pakistani society. The mullah-culture and the looming social retrogression is a serious threat.” Although targeted operations and surgical strikes are launched against the terrorists but with much low success rate. These efforts may be fugacious if the root cause is not addressed.

We need to take major decision on this issue so that we help Afghanis for promoting peace and stability in Afghanistan and at the same time borders of Pakistan, we need to address the domestic threats we are facing but that should not be at the cost of state sovereignty, and possession should be upheld and that might not be compromised so we should be looking at sovereignty of Pakistan integrity of Pakistan peace in Pakistan and supporting peace in Afghanistan but main focus should be domestic peace. There is a need on the part of government to take appropriate measures to efficaciously deal the issue of terrorism on urgent bases. Pakistan’’s policy planners must address the internal problems that are denting her image as sovereign state and as peace loving nation. Measures taken in the right direction and determination of tackling the issue is the only way to get rid of the militants. It is also essential that religious scholars play their part in countering the menace of religious radicalism and declare the suicide bombing haram.

Pakistan should amplify its links whosesoever conceivable with all the people of Afghanistan. There are certain chances that after withdrawal of US/NATO forces the consequential power vacuum will encourage Taliban in both side of the border. Therefore there is a need to draw defense line on the border and inland.

It is assessed that after US exodus from Afghanistan some 200,000 containers and 50,000 vehicles would also be drawn out from Afghanistan for which course through Pakistan is petite and cost-effective.\(^5\) Now the policy planners in Pakistan are required to adopt such measures as to take maximum advantage of this dependence.

Military alliances with US prove very costly all the time. Pakistan got isolated with the other countries and majority of the states consider Pakistan as a puppet of US, therefore, Pakistan should avoid these things and should make an economic alliance with US to get benefit from it. Being a part of military alliance United States gave Pakistan only weapons they didn”t provide us hard ware that reduced the benefits of those provided weapons. From military alliances Pakistan took less benefits and paid more cost, benefit that Pakistan must took from US with respect to military alliances are very least.

Pakistan should not be bent on one country totally, definitely if you become dependable on one country then you have to accept the repercussions also, and then you have to accept the demands and the obligations from the other side also, therefore, Pakistan should try to maintain a balance in having its relationships with all the countries of the world, specially the four points of Pakistan”s foreign policy are pertinent; relations with the neighbors, relations with the neighbors, relations with the Muslim countries and relations with rest of the world. It is therefore necessary that these principles should be looked and observed in a balanced manner.

Since US has developed strategic partnership with India, therefore, there is a need on the part of Pakistan to revisit its policy and develop other channels for giving boom to her economy. For this purpose, there is growing need to develop links with China, Russia, Gulf and other countries. There is also a need to normalize relations with India so as to sightsee new developmental projects through trade with Afghanistan, India, Iran and Central Asian Republic (CARs). Consequently, economy of Pakistan would flourish and Pakistan would be able to stand on solid footing.

\(^5\) Tariq Osman Haider, retired ambassador is a member of Oversight Board, Ministry of Foreign Affair. Interview with the author on March 20, 2014 in Islamabad.
Pakistan should develop its relations with United States on the basis of equality i.e. no minor and major state, it should promote relations following the policy of tit for tat. There should not be a concept of subordinate power. The relations with US should not have the imperial impact on the Pakistan, it should give them redlines that they should not cross and also put down begs and don’t beg also, developing relations on the basis of equality is only possible when you put down your beg so Pakistan should safeguard the national interest, have an upright approach, nationalistic approach and should take into the confidence the people of Pakistan then no power can defeat her and for doing all this Pakistan is in dire need of strong, honest and patriot ruler.
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APPENDICES

MUTUAL DEFENCE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENTS OF PAKISTAN AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Government of Pakistan and the Government of the United States of America,

Desiring to foster international peace and security within the framework of the charter of the United Nations through measures which will further the ability of nations dedicated to the purposes and principles of the Charter to participate effectively in arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in support of those purposes and principles;

Reaffirming their determination to give their full co-operation to the efforts to provide the United Nations with arm forces as contemplated by the Charter and to participate in United Nations collective defense arrangements and measures, and to obtain agreement on universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate guarantee against violation or evasion;

Taking into consideration the support which the Government of the United States has brought to these principles by enacting the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

Desiring to set forth the conditions which will govern the furnishing of such assistance;

Have agreed:
ARTICLE I

1. The Government of the United States will make available to the Government of Pakistan such equipment, materials, services or other assistance as the Government of the United States may authorize in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be agreed. The furnishing and use of such assistance shall be consistent with Charter of the United Nations. Such assistance as may be made available by the Government of the United States pursuant to this Agreement will be furnished under the provisions and subject to all the terms, conditions and termination provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, appropriation acts there under or any other applicable legislative provisions. The two Governments will, from time to time, negotiate detailed arrangements necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

2. The Government of Pakistan will use this assistance exclusively to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area, or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and Pakistan will not undertake any act of aggression against any other nation. The Government of Pakistan will not, without the prior agreement of the Government of the United States, devote such assistance to purposes other than those for which it was furnished.

3. Arrangements will be entered into under which equipments and materials furnished pursuant to this Agreement and no longer required or used exclusively for the purposes for which originally made available will be offered for return to the Government of United States.

4. The Government of Pakistan will not transfer to any person, not an officer or agent of that Government, or to any other nation, title to or possession of any equipment, materials, property, information, or services received under this Agreement, without the prior consent of the Government of the United States.

5. The Government of Pakistan will take such security measures as may be agreed in each case between the two Governments in order to prevent the disclosure or compromise of classified military articles, services or information furnished pursuant to this Agreement.

6. Each Government will take appropriate measures consistent with security to keep the public informed of operations under this Agreement.

7. The two Governments will established procedures whereby the Government of Pakistan will so deposit, segregate or assure title to all funds allocated to or derived from any program of assistance undertaken by the Government of United States so that such funds shall not, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, be subject to
garnishment, attachment, seizure or other legal process by any person, firm, agency, corporation, organization, or government.

ARTICLE II

The Governments will, upon request of either of them, negotiate appropriate arrangements between them relating to the exchange of patent rights and technical information for defense which will expedite such exchanges and at the same time protect private interests and maintain necessary security safeguards.

ARTICLE III

1. The Government of Pakistan will make available to the Government of the United States rupees for the use of the later Government for its administrative and operative expenditures in connection with carrying out the purposes of this Agreement. The two Governments will forthwith initiate discussions with a view to determining the amount of such rupees and to agreeing upon arrangements for the furnishing of such funds.

2. The Government of Pakistan will, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, grant duty-free treatment on importation or exportation and exemption from internal taxation upon products, property, materials, or equipment imported into its territory in connection with this Agreement or any similar Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of any other country receiving military assistance.

3. Tax relief will be accorded to all expenditures in Pakistan by, or on behalf of, the Government of United States for the common defense effort, including expenditures for any foreign aid program of the United States. The Government of Pakistan will establish procedures satisfactory to both Governments so that such expenditures will be net of taxes.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Government of Pakistan will receive personnel of the Government of the United States who will discharge in its territory the responsibilities of the United States under this Agreement and who will be accorded facilities and authority to
observe the progress of the assistance furnished pursuant to this Agreement. Such personnel, who are United States nationals, including personnel temporarily assigned, will, in their relation with the Government of Pakistan, operate as part of the Embassy of the United States of America under the direction and control of the Chief of the Diplomatic Mission, and will have the same privileges and immunities as are accorded to other personnel with corresponding rank of the Embassy of the United States who are United States nationals. Upon appropriate notification by the Government of the United States, the Government of Pakistan will grant full diplomatic status to the senior military member assigned under this Article and senior Army, Navy and Air Force Officers and their respective immediate deputies.

2. The Government of Pakistan will grant exemption from import and export duties on personal property imported for the personnel or of their families and will take reasonable administrative measures to facilitate and expedite the importation and exportation of the personal property of such personnel and their families.

ARTICLE V

1. The Government of Pakistan will:
   a) Join in promoting international understanding and goodwill, and maintaining world peace;
   b) Take such actions as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;
   c) Make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world;
   d) Take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities; and
   e) Take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States.

2. a) The Government of Pakistan will, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, furnish to the Government of the United States, or to such other governments as the parties hereto may in each case agreed upon, such equipment, materials, services or other assistance as may be agreed upon, in order to increase
their capacity for individual and collective self-defense and facilitate their effective participation in the United Nations system for collective security.
b) In conformity with the principle of mutual aid, the Government of Pakistan will facilitate the production and transfer to the Government of the United States, for such period of the time, in such quantities and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon, of raw and semi-processed materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources, and which may be available in Pakistan.

Arrangements for such transfers shall give due regard to reasonable requirements of Pakistan for domestic use and commercial export.

ARTICLE VI

In the interest of their mutual security the Government of Pakistan will co-operate with the Government of United States in taking measures designed to control trade with nations which threaten the maintenance of world peace.

ARTICLE VII

1. This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of signature and will continue in force until one year after the receipt by either party of written notice of the intention of the other party to terminate it, except that the provision in Article I, paragraph 2 and 4 and arrangements enter into under Article I, paragraph 3, 5 and 7, and under Article II, shall remain in force unless otherwise agreed by the two governments.
2. The two Governments will, upon the request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the application or amendment of this Agreement.
3. This Agreement shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations.
Done in two copies at Karachi the 19th day of May one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four

For the Government
of Pakistan:
Zafrullah Khan
Minister of Foreign Affairs
and Commonwealth Relations.

For the Government of
United States of America
John K. Emerson
Charge d’ Affaires a. i., of
The United States of America

SOUTH EAST ASIAN TREATY ORGANIZATION (SEATO)

The parties to this Treaty recognize the sovereign equality of all the parties.

Retain their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments;

Reaffirming that in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and declaring that they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose people’s desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities.

Intending to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that any potential aggressor will appreciate that the parties stand together in the area, and desiring further to co-ordinate their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I
The parties undertake as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes, in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations, from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive act directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

ARTICLE III

The parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to co-operate with one another in the further development of economic measures, including technical assistance, designed both to promote economic progress and social well-being and to further the individual and collective efforts of governments towards these ends.

ARTICLE IV

1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack or threat against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
2. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the Treaty are, or of any other state or territory to which the provisions of Paragraph I of this Article from time to time apply, is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which would be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement under Paragraph I of this Article or on any territory so designated be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

ARTICLE V

The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider the matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty.

The council shall provide for consultation with regard to military and any other planning as the situation obtaining in the treaty area may from time to time require. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

ARTICLE VI

This treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.
ARTICLE VII

Any other state in a position to further the objectives of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the area may, by unanimous agreement of the parties, be invited to accede to this Treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. The Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall inform each of the parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ARTICLE VIII

As used in this treaty, the "Treaty area" is the general area of Southeast Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian parties, and the general area of the Southwest Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The parties may, by unanimous agreement, amend this Article to include within the Treaty area the territory of any state acceding to this treaty in accordance with Article 7 or otherwise to change the Treaty area.

ARTICLE IX

1. This Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the other signatories.
2. The Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall notify all of the other signatories of such deposit.
3. The treaty shall enter into force between the states which have ratified it as soon as the instruments of ratification of a majority of the signatories shall have been deposited, and shall come into effect with respect to each other state on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.
ARTICLE X

This treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but any party may cease to be a party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall inform the Governments of the other parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

ARTICLE XI

The English text of this treaty is binding on the parties, but when the parties have agreed to the French text thereof and have so notified the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, the French text shall be equally authentic and binding on the parties.

UNDERSTANDING OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The delegation of United States of America signing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article 4 paragraph 1, apply only to Communist aggression but affirms that in the event of other aggression or armed attack it will consult under the provision of Article 4.
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