

**I I NDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS
STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN**



**Maryam Siddiqa Lodhi
37-FSS/MSPS&IR/F08**

**Department of Political Science and IR
Faculty of Social Sciences
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY,
ISLAMABAD
2010**

**INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS
STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN**



Submitted by

**Maryam Siddiqa Lodhi
Reg. No.37-FSS/MSPSIR/F08**

Supervisor

**Dr. Syed Qandil Abbas
Assistant Professor**

**Department of Political Science & IR
Faculty of Social Sciences
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY,
ISLAMABAD
2010**

INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN



Maryam Siddiqa Lodhi
37-FSS/MSPSIR/F08

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
MS in Politics and IR at the Faculty of Social Sciences,
International Islamic University,
Islamabad

Department of Politics & IR
Faculty of Social Sciences
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY,
ISLAMABAD
2010

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my beloved parents, my teachers and my
colleagues

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost my all acknowledgements go to imperious elevational help of Almighty **Allah** who knows my deprivations and enigmatic capabilities, Who guided me in the grisly and ordeal path of my life. I convey my heartiest tribute to paramount struggle of my beloved parents from the day I born to today in achieving this goal. . I would like to express my sincere thanks to my respectable supervisor **Dr. Syed Qandil Abbas** for vigilance support and guidance that was needed me to complete my dissertation in time.

Maryam Siddiqa Lodhi

List of Abbreviations

CIA	Crimes Investigation Agency
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
ECO	Economic Cooperation Organization British Broad Cast
CAS	Central Asian States
FATA	Federally Administrated Tribal Areas
FC	Frontier Core
IPI	Iran-Pakistan-India
ISI	Inter Services Intelligence
KLB	Kerry Lugar Bill
LT	Lashk-re-Tayyaba
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSG	Nuclear Supply Group
RAW	Research and Analysis Wing
UNO	United Nations Organization
US	United States
SEATO	South East Asia Treaty Organization
TT	Tehrik-e Taliban
TTP	Tehrik-e- Taliban Pakistan
WOT	War on Terror

Abstract

The present study is conducted to explore the overt and covert impacts of the Indo-US nexus on Pakistan. India, soon after getting the independence claimed to be the neutral state and took a leading role in the Non-Aligned Movement. It did not lean towards the USSR openly while it remained reserved towards the US due to its pro-Pakistan policies. The stalemate seemed to be ended in the late 1960's as the US started keeping itself neutral in the Indo-Pak conflicts. The Indo-US relations again reached to their lowest ebb when the Cold War was about to reach at its climax. The USSR's attack on Afghanistan became a source of making Pakistan as the most reliable ally of the US. Pakistan and the US joined hands and they defeated the USSR's forces on the Afghan soil together with their allies. India favoured the USSR openly throughout the Afghan crisis. The Indian policy makers started re-evaluating their foreign policy when the uni-polar structured world appeared soon after the demise of the USSR in 1992. The US' policy started seeming to be neutral regarding South Asia as it treated India and Pakistan equally in the early 1990's. Although there seemed to be some closeness in the Indo-US strategic ties and contrary to that Pakistan faced sanctions but the onset of the War on Terror had made their nexus remarkably long lasting. The study focuses on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal, transfer of technology for military purposes, allegations on Pakistan for the cross border terrorism, their joint propaganda against Pakistan's nukes, their joint efforts in formulation of the Kerry Lugar Bill, their nexus on Kashmir issue, their joint policy regarding the Gwadar Port and Iran-Pakistan-India Gas Pipe Line Project and their nexus in Afghanistan. All of these had direct strategic implications for Pakistan that included the tilting of the balance of power towards India in the region, arms race in South Asia, threat of a nuclear war and internal instability in Pakistan. Their nexus had been defaming Pakistan as a terrorist state having insecure nuclear arsenals since 9/11 and they blamed that Pakistan was transferring the nuclear technology to the other states too. As a result of their nexus Pakistan's stance on Kashmir issue had become weak. Pakistan could face a huge economic loss in case of the failure of the Iran-Pakistan-India Gas Pipe Line Project and the operational activities of the Gwadar Port. Some suggestions are given to direct the foreign policy of Pakistan to cope with the current situation that

include improving Pakistan's relations with China, efforts should be made to declare South Asia as a nuclear free zone, compensation should be given to Pakistan for the loss it suffered in the War against Terror. The Iran-Pakistan-India Gas Pipe Line Project and the construction of the Gwadar Port must be carried out. Pakistan must try to revive the Economic Cooperation Organization in order to get economic benefits. The US should weigh India and Pakistan equally in order to maintain the balance of power in South Asia. In order to counter balance the Indo-US Nuclear Deal, the US should sign same with Pakistan or Pakistan should sign the nuclear deal with China. Kashmir issue should be resolved by following the United Nations' resolutions or any third party should play a neutral and a fair role to help both the states to resolve the Kashmir issue in order to shatter the threats of the nuclear war in the region.

List of Abbreviations

CIA	Crimes Investigation Agency
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
ECO	Economic Cooperation Organization British Broad Cast
CAS	Central Asian States
FATA	Federally Administrated Tribal Areas
FC	Frontier Core
IPI	Iran-Pakistan-India
ISI	Inter Services Intelligence
KLB	Kerry Lugar Bill
LT	Lashk-re-Tayyaba
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSG	Nuclear Supply Group
RAW	Research and Analysis Wing
UNO	United Nations Organization
US	United States
SEATO	South East Asia Treaty Organization
TT	Tehrik-e Taliban
TTP	Tehrik-e- Taliban Pakistan
WOT	War on Terror

Table of Contents

Abstract.....i

List of abbreviation.....iii

1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK 1--15

1.1 Background Of The Indo-US Nexus1

1.2 Statement of the Study6

1.3 Literature Review.....7

1.4 Hypothesis.....11

1.5 Objectives of the Study.....12

1.6 Research Methodology..... 13

1.7 Detailed Outline..... 13

2. DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF INDO-US NEXUS.....16-42

2.1 Indo-US Military And Defense Cooperation17

2.2 Indo-US Nuclear Deal.....20

2.3 Reasons Of India's Reluctance To Join the IPI Project.....24

2.4 Indo-US Joint Activities In Afghanistan 25

2.5 Indo-US Nexus and the Kashmir Issue.....32

2.6 Indo-US Nexus and the Gwadar Port34

2.7 Indo-US Joint Media Campaign Against Pakistan's Nukes.....38

2.8 Indo-US Nexus and the Formulation Of The Kerry Lugar Bill... 41

3. INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS MILITARY AND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN 43-63

3.1 Military And Security Implications Of The Indo-US Nuclear Deal for Pakistan.....44

3.2 Implications Of The Indo-US Military Ties for Pakistan.....50

3.3 Indo-US Nexus Against The Gwadar Port: A Threat To Pakistan’s Security54

3.4 Indo-US Activities in Afghanistan: Challenges for Pakistan.. 55

3.5 Kerry Lugar Bill and Indo-US Joint Ventures against Pakistan’s military.....61

4. INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN.....64-68

4.1 Background of the Political Implications of the Indo-US Nexus for Pakistan.....65

4.2 Indo-US Nexus: A Great Set Back to Kashmir Issue70

4.3 Indo-US Joint Allegations against Pakistan.....75

4.4 Indo-US Joint Efforts to build up the Internal Pressure on Pakistan’s Government.....83

5. INDO-US NEXUS AND ITS ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN..... 87-103

5.1	Economic Sanctions On Pakistan Before 9/11.....	88
5.2	Economic Implications Of The Indo-US Nexus Against The Gwadar Port For Pakistan	90
5.3	IPI Gas Pipeline Project and its expected Impacts on Pakistan’s Economy.....	95
5.4	Pakistan’s Economy and Indo-US Nexus in Afghanistan.....	97
	CONCLUSION.....	104
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	110

CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND FRAME WORK

1.1 Background of the Indo-US Nexus

India, one of the biggest countries of South Asia, has a population of more than 1.2 billion people. It got independence in 1947 and since then it had been struggling to strengthen its economy. When it emerged there was bipolar system prevailed in the world and the states that got independence from the colonial rule preferred to join any of the two blocs in order to retain their existence. India though did not openly lean towards the USSR but its relations with the US had no warmth too. Professor Stanley Hoffman's statement remained very vital in that context. He said that of all the major countries, India was the one whose relations with the US had been baffling the American policy makers. The relations between both the countries were based on mutual irritation and lack of trust. During the initial stages of the cold war, their divergences of opinions were much obvious. There was much ignorance about India even in American bureaucracy. It was a general impression that higher the status of man in the US, greater was his ignorance about India.¹

The relations between India and the US were somewhat frozen following the Indian independence. Few of the reasons behind the Indo-US cold relations following the independence of India were:

1. India took a leading position in the Non-Aligned Movement and got enough military and economic aid from the USSR;
2. America's attitude towards the Kashmir issue was pro-Pakistan;
3. America's liberal arms aid to Pakistan.

¹ Shri Ram Sharma, *Indo-US Relations*, (New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House, 1999),61

Besides the other factors there were some psychological implications that contributed a lot in directing the Indo-US relations to their lowest ebb. Both sides struggled to come close to each other but failed. T N Kaul had analyzed the reasons of the failures of Indo-US to reach an agreement in 1949 that included:

There was a lack of mutual respect and understanding between both the states. Both the states had too many expectations from each other and all those were based on wrong assumptions and the USA's perception that being financially weak country India would be in dire need of aid, and by pressurizing, it could trail the US adjusted lines for its foreign policy.²

India and the US were far apart from each other in their policy towards the Communist China. In Korean crisis, the US considered China as aggressor while India did not agree with it. Pakistan came close to the US in 1954 by joining SEATO and CENTO as India strongly opposed that. In 1962's Indo-China war, the US supported India and both the countries came close to each other but even then India did not abandon its non-aligned policy. India did not support the US when the latter involved itself in the war against Vietnam.³

The stalemate seemed to be ended in the late 1960's as the US kept itself neutral in the Indo-Pak war in 1971. But when India conducted nuclear tests in 1974 the Indo-US relations suffered a great damage. Indo-US relations suffered a great set back during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan when India openly supported the Soviet Union. The other differences emerged in their policy over recognition of Kampuchea and establishment of Diego Garcia which was an American military base in the Indian Ocean.

Throughout the Indo-US relations before the Cold War Era, Pakistan had been the biggest obstacle and a source of drawing both the states apart from each other. By joining SEATO, CENTO and getting the membership of the Baghdad Pact, Pakistan got the status of a reliable ally of the US and India's position on all the political issues of the international importance was suspected as anti-Americans. Pakistan enjoyed the flow of arms through out the Cold War Era and it reached at its zenith when the

² N Jayapalan, *Foreign Policy of India*, New Dehli: Atlantic Publication, 2001. p. 146.

³ibid.

Russian forces invaded Afghanistan because the US considered Pakistan as the best option to stop the communists' influence in South Asia.

When the Cold War ended, the US attached more importance to South Asia. It was interested in establishing good relations with countries like India and Pakistan but it was very obvious that any gain for India would be a loss for Pakistan as both the states were rivals to each other. But for the US India's favour was more vital than Pakistan's favour⁴ because India had a pre-eminent position in South Asia due to its size of population, natural resources, economy, industrial, military and technological power. The US weighed India as the major global power that could protect American interests in the region.

Since the end of the Cold War, India had re-evaluated its foreign policy and improved its relations with the US to earn more for its interests. Both the states strengthened the economic ties between them and that had laid the foundation of the strong Indo-US relationship. During the Gulf War the economy of India went through a difficult phase and India in order to recover that, liberalized its economy and turned towards new allies and tried to improve diplomatic relations with the members of the NATO particularly the US. It did not start any conflicting policy towards Russia but maintained such a balanced policy that it got benefits both from Russia and the US.

India tested nuclear weapons in 1998, the US imposed economic sanctions in response to those tests and that seriously damaged the Indo-US relations. Pakistan also faced the same economic, political and military sanctions after the nuclear tests. It was the time when the US gave almost equal importance to both India and Pakistan. The slight shift of the US towards India could be analyzed after Bill Clinton's visit to India and Pakistan. At the end of his visit, he very candidly declared that the US would treat India and Pakistan according to the merit⁵.

After the 9/11 incident, India not only offered but also rendered its services and provided logistic and intelligence agencies' support to facilitate the US for its intended invasion of Afghanistan in the onset

⁴ Manas Chatterji, B M Jain, "Historical and Contemporary Perspective on South Asia", *Conflict and Peace in South Asia*, vol 5, (2008) 23.

⁵ Rahul Bhonsle, *US strategic engagement of India in the Underlying theme of Indo-US Nuclear Agreement* (New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007)107.

of the War on Terror (WOT). It was an active party to occupation forces and was vying to become a key player in Afghan affairs. On March 2, 2006, India and the US signed the Indo-US Nuclear Pact on cooperation in civilian nuclear field for setting up and upgrading its nuclear program. That was the time period when the discrimination of the US with Pakistan was quite obvious. India was given the economic benefits, who developed consensus with the US leadership over all matters of international politics. It enjoyed strong military ties with the US and both the states started working together on the long term projects beneficial for them in one way or the other.

The sole purpose of the US in the region was to contain China, as the US felt the growing Chinese influence in the region a threat to its hegemony. In order to limit the Chinese influence, it strengthened India but their nexus proved to be very dangerous for Pakistan's security and interests. Indian leadership had much of their focus on harming Pakistan's strategic interests. As a result of their close ties, US-Pakistan relations had reached the coldest point ever in the history.

The people of Pakistan had a common perception that the countries close to India could never think the betterment of Pakistan as their reaction on the Kerry Lugar Bill confirmed that assumption. The US leadership tried to create the image that their country gave importance to Pakistan equal to that of India, but the facts and figures clearly showed the tilt of the US towards India which had resulted in their nexus.

1.2 Statement of the Study

The Indo-US nexus was stretching in all the fields and it had negative implications for Pakistan's strategic interests including military, economic, political and psychological interests. This research focuses on the implications of the Indo-US nexus for Pakistan's strategic interests. This research seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What are the factors that motivated the US to have strategic relations with India?
2. Why is the Indo-US Nuclear Deal a threat to Pakistan's strategic interests?
3. Why and how is the transfer of an advanced technology and arms sale by the US to India a serious threat to Pakistan's strategic interests?

4. Why Pakistan is declared responsible for the cross border terrorism in Afghanistan and India by the US and India?
5. How is the Indo-US nexus a great setback to Kashmir issue?
6. Why do the Indo-US nexus target to stop the Gwadar Port from being operational?
7. How are the Indo-US joint activities in Afghanistan a great threat to Pakistan's strategic interests?
8. What is the purpose of the Indo-US media campaign against Pakistan's nukes?
9. What should Pakistan do to cope with the current situation resulted in the Indo-US nexus?

1.3 Literature Review

The answers of the above questions have been given in the study in the light of the columns, books, and articles etc of the different writers. The review of the work of few of writers is:

Asif Haroon a very well reputed writer in his article "Indian dangerous designs against Pakistan" published in Asian Tribune clearly points out that Indian leadership fully supported the US and welcomed its instructions in the region but when the US provided military aid to Pakistan for the War against Terrorism, the Indian leadership raised objections⁶. The writer has not given any account and analysis to provide that the expenses on the war on terror are far beyond the calculations and the US aid to Pakistan cannot be used against the interests of India. In other words, the reality was that if ever the US provided aid to Pakistan, it was far beyond the safe level of harming the interests of India.

⁶ Asif Haroon, "India's Dangerous Designs Against Pakistan", *Asia Tribune*, vol 9, no 16,(2009)

The renowned writer Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema in his article “Missile Race and Peace in South Asia” wrote that the recent Indo- US deal was likely to enable India to produce more fissile material for its nuclear weapons. The deal allowed India not only to continue producing more fissile material for its nuclear weapons arsenal but the expected change guidelines for the nuclear supplies group would give India access to dual used technologies which, in turn, help India enormously in increasing its strategic arsenal. It would surely tilt the balance of power towards India in South Asia. Pakistan needed to do something urgent to counter the imbalance⁷.

Geoffry Hudson in his column “US deal with Asia” published in the Washington Post expressed his view that the US wanted to be more influential in Asia. The best choice for the US had been India in the post Cold War Era. It wanted to retain its hegemony in the world while, on the other hand, India was ambitious to be the regional and global power too. The writer ignored the way Pakistan had contributed to retain the US hegemony in the Cold War Era.⁸

Shamshad Ahmed and Dr. Maliha Lodhi were of the opinion that the Indo- US nexus was not very deep and long lasting as it could take a U- Turn with the changing situation of the International politics. They evaluated ManMohan Singh’s visit to US very fairly with the perception that it did not produce any big agreement announcement. India got no confirmation that could be a ray of hope for her quest for a permanent seat in an expected United Nations Security Council’s expansions.⁹ One should not forget that ManMohan Singh’s visit to the US laid the foundation of strong ties between both states. They signed the nuclear deal and indulged themselves in transference of the nuclear technology. India’s desire to pressurize Pakistan was fulfilled as the US pressurized Pakistan all the time after 9/11 to take more actions against the terrorists and stop cross border terrorism in the neighboring countries.

Aakar Patel in his article titled “Kerry Lugar Bill is good for Pakistan” published in “The News” defended the bill that it did not infringe upon Pakistan’s sovereignty as asserted by Pakistan army. He had cunningly tried to enhance the figures of the Kerry Lugar Bill lovers in Pakistan and claimed that army had

⁷ Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, “Missile Race in South Asia”, *IPRI Journal vol.6, no 2*. (Summer,2006)

⁸ Geoffry Hudson, “US Deal with Asia”, *The Washington Post*, (December 9, 2006).

⁹ *The News* (Dec 13,2009).

no reason to get upset and to make its concerns public. He had deliberately ignored the harsh and insulting language of the Kerry Lugar Bill that aimed to get hold of the ISI by the US and that would surely pave the way of India's dream to be the emerging super power¹⁰.

Edward Kolodziej and Roger E Kanet in their book "From Super Power to Besieged global power: restoring world order after the failure of Bush Doctrine" expressed their opinion that Pakistan had been playing the double game since the start of the War on Terror (WOT). It was supporting the war against terror half heartedly, on one side, and, on the other side, it was busy in fanning the terrorism in India. The intelligence reports confirmed that the terrorists were supported by the elements in Pakistan.¹¹ All that showed that the opinion expressed by the writers was based on their mere assumptions. Pakistan had already suffered a huge loss after being indulged in the war against terror. Being the front line state in the war against terror, it had faced the reaction of Al-Qaeda and Taliban in the form of terrorists' activities. All the major cities of Pakistan remained on the hit list of the terrorists and not only security personnel, but also common people were targeted by the terrorists. So to blame Pakistan for playing the double game was just the creation of imagination as it had nothing to do with reality.

G. Santosh in his article "Importance of Indo-US Nuclear Deal" wrote that the deal would enhance India's profile in the region. According to him that deal would surely de-hyphenate India and Pakistan and India would be considered as the Asian Tiger which could implement its decisions on the surrounding countries including Pakistan.¹² It could be acceptable that the deal would de-hyphenate India and Pakistan. But to be the Asian Tiger for India would surely be a dream because the economic condition of India was not in a position to challenge other countries like China.

A renowned defence analyst Zahid Malik in his column "US objectives" published in the *Pakistan Observer* gave the reference of the intelligence reports that confirmed the Indo-US involvement in the terrorists' activities in Pakistan. According to him when the operation by the Pak Army was at a crucial stage, the US evacuated all the check post near Pakistan's bordering areas and let the terrorists to flee safely

¹⁰ Aakar Patel, "Kerry Lugar is good for Pakistan", *The News* (Oct 18,2009)

¹¹ Edward A Kolodziej, Roger E Kanet, *From Super Power to Besiege Global Power: Restoring World Order after the Failure of Bush Doctrine* (Georgia: University of Georgeon Press, 2008).

¹² G Santosh, "Importance of Indo-US Nuclear Deal", *Pratiyogata Darpan*, vol. 2,no 21,(March, 2008):3-20

to Afghanistan. He said that the interviews of the leaders of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan were given due importance on the Indo-US media. The purpose behind that support was very vivid as to push Pakistan Army into domestic turmoil within the country¹³. His analysis was based on facts as the US was also supporting India's destructive activities in Afghanistan against Pakistan. The Indian consulates near the bordering areas had been working against Pakistan under the cover of the US forces.

1.4 Hypothesis

The fast growing Indo-US nexus on political, military and economics levels has resulted in great strategic threats for Pakistan.

1.4.1 Operational Definitions

“Nexus” means a cooperative relationship between people, groups or states who agree to share responsibility for achieving some specific goals. It has also been defined as to have a strapping ties or connection. When the term is used as a nexus between two countries, it is used on a broader level that means economic, political and military ties between the two countries that are a threat to the interests of the target party or parties¹⁴. In the case of Indo-US nexus, one of the target countries was Pakistan. The Indo-US nexus had strategic implications for Pakistan.

The term “strategy” had been interpreted differently in different ages. The classical definitions related it and applied it in the exercise of the military power. The recent definitions of strategy had absolutely changed in immense dimensions. The US Joint chiefs of Staff Dictionary of military terms for joint usage defined the strategy as:

¹³Zahid Malik, “US Objectives”, *Pakistan Observer* (December 16, 2009).

¹⁴ Abu al Kutab, *US-Israel nexus and the Arab World*,(Caira: Cairo Publication 1979) 6.

“The art and science of developing and using political, economic, psychological and military forces as necessary during the war and peace, to afford the maximum support of policies in order to increase the probabilities of favourable consequences of victory and to lessen the chances of defeat.”¹⁵

Murray and Grimsley defined strategy as:

“Strategy must be understood as nothing less than the overall plan for utilizing the capacity for armed coercion- in conjunction with economic, political and psychological instruments of power to support Foreign Policy most effectively by overt, covert and tacit means”.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

Following objectives will be attempted to achieve:

1. To find out the factors that motivate the US to have close relations with India.
2. To analyze the impacts of the transfer of advanced weapon technology and arms sale on Pakistan’s strategic interests.
3. To evaluate the impacts of the Indo-US nuclear deal on Pakistan’s strategic interests.
4. To analyze the purpose of the Indo-US nexus on allegations against Pakistan to stop the cross border terrorism in Afghanistan and India and its position on Kashmir issue.
5. To scrutinize the reasons of close cooperation of India and US in Afghanistan.
6. To chalk out the purpose of the Indo-US allegations against Pak-nuke.
7. To suggest new directions for Pakistan’s foreign policy to counter balance the impact of the nexus.

1.6 Research Methodology

Research will be done through secondary sources. It will be basically qualitative. It will be descriptive and analytical. The available secondary sources that provide analysis of the Indo-US nexus will be used that include internet sources and document

¹⁵ US Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Dictionary of US Military Terms for joint usage*, (1964)135.

analysis. Books, articles, national and international journals and magazines, online sites will be consulted to explore the overt and covert strategic implications of the Indo-US nexus for Pakistan.

1.7 Detailed outline

The thesis will comprise of these chapters:

Chapter One

“Introduction: Background and Frame Work”. In this chapter the background of the Indo-US nexus and the reasons behind the nexus will be explained. The importance and scheme of study will be discussed. This chapter also includes the literature review and framework of the study.

Chapter Two

“Different Dimensions of Indo-US Nexus”. The chapter will cover the basis of the Indo-US nexus that include the Nuclear Deal, transfer of technology for military purposes, allegations on Pakistan for the cross border terrorism, nexus on Kashmir issue, and nexus in Afghanistan. The objectives and interests of both the countries behind the agreements and their mutual support will also betaken into account.

Chapter Three

“Military and Security implications of the Indo-US nexus for Pakistan”. This chapter will reveal the essence of the cooperation between India and the US in military and defense fields, which has disturbed the balance of power in South Asia. The direct and indirect impacts of those agreements on Pakistan’s security and internal stability will be discussed.

Chapter four

“Political implications of the Indo-US nexus for Pakistan”. The chapter deals with the consensus of both the states over different political issues including terrorism. The hidden purposes of their allegations against Pakistan’s nukes and cross border terrorism will be dissected. Their political nexus has really harmed Pakistan’s stance over Kashmir issue and they have tried to defame Pakistan as a terrorist state.

Chapter Five

“Indo-US nexus and its economic implications for Pakistan”. The chapter will evaluate the Indo-US nexus against the Gwadar port, Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) Gas pipe line, the arms race in South Asia and their impacts on Pakistan’s economy

Conclusion

In this section, Indo-US nexus and its strategic implications for Pakistan will be concluded and the psychological implications of the nexus will be discussed. Besides that some suggestions will be given to direct the foreign policy of Pakistan to meet the emerging challenges efficiently.

CHAPTER-2

Different Dimensions of Indo-US Nexus

The Cold War ended with the demise of the USSR in 1992, one of the reliable partners of India that supported it not only morally but also materialistically in all the hard times including 1965 and 1971 wars against Pakistan. The transition from the Multipolar to the Unipolar structured world also compelled India to re-evaluate its foreign policy directives. On the other side, the US started formulating the policies for South Asia through the prism of its own interest. As a result of these parallel developments, both the states came close to each other and started line streaming their own priorities. Among those priorities, the US wanted to contain China while India's focus was to outdo Pakistan in all the fields. For both India and the US their nexus was the best choice to meet all those challenges and to attain their interests. As India was the USA's partner to retain its hegemony in that region so it was fulfilling its demands in return of the services rendered for the US which proved to be quite detrimental for Pakistan.

2.1 Indo-US Military and Defense Cooperation

Military cooperation includes all the areas that are indispensable to strengthen the army of any state. Military and defense are interrelated terms. Military and Defense cooperation had been multidimensional terms in the contemporary world that included sale, purchase and joint development of military equipment, transfer of technology, intelligence sharing and coordination for counter terrorism and counter proliferation, cooperation in providing relief to the calamity stricken areas, joint patrolling at the sea lanes, terrorism etc¹⁶.

India joined the USSR's camp in the Cold War, since then the Indo-US defense relations were almost stagnant as India preferred the USSR's military equipment and it was fully reliant on the USSR and then on Russia for its military supplies. But in the post Cold War Era, both the states had come close to each other and their nexus was not confined to just supply of arms but it extended to transfer of weapons technology and joint military exercises that included air and naval exercises too.

The turning point between the Indo-US military ties came in April 1991 when the Commanding General of the US Pacific Command Lt. General Claude Kicklighter visited India. He gave proposals which were known as "Kick Lighter Proposals" which suggested increasing service to service contact between the two states and laid the foundation stone of their military nexus. The purpose of those proposals was to strengthen the military cooperation between the two states by the end of the prevailing

¹⁶ Gurmeet Kanwal, "Indo-US Defence Co-operation Full Stream Ahead" *IPCS*, www.IPCS.org/./Indo-US-defence-co-operation-full-stream-ahead-2378.html (accessed on March 19, 2010)

decade. In return to show a positive gesture, the Indian Army Chief also paid visit to the US Pacific Command in August 1991¹⁷.

In January 1992, the first meeting of the Indo-US steering Committee was held in New Delhi. Some of the decisions taken in the meeting included considerable increase of funds for India under “The US’s International Military Exchanged Training Program”. The exchange of the military officers was decided and for the first time after 1964 both the states held joint naval exercises¹⁸. Their ties were further enhanced in 1995 as a result of Agreed Minute on Defense, but even then they lacked the strategic depth. India tested its nuclear bombs in Pokhran and that act was condemned all over the world by all the world powers including the US. Military and economic sanctions were imposed on the state and the condition of their ties went even more loosened than it was during the Cold War. The supply of the equipment to India was disconnected.

The current strong military ties had a strong base laid during Bill Clinton’s visit to India. The 9/11 incident gave it a further depth. Since early 2002, the US and India held a series of unprecedented and substantive joint military exercises. Those exercises allowed the US to have a deep glance on the Russian built fighter. Again the Indian pilots joined military aviators from other countries including the US’ in 2008. Indian special soldiers held at least 5 “Vajar Prahar” joint exercises and almost 133 US special soldiers also participated in those exercises¹⁹.

¹⁷ Shams ud Din, *Perspectives on the Emerging World Order*,(New Dehli: Gyan Books, 1995)65.

¹⁸ *ibid*

¹⁹ K. Alankronstadt , “CRS Report for Congress”, *Headgoal Journal NewDehli* (August, 2008).23-44

The US was also flexible in transferring weapon technology to India. Few of the defense cooperation group had been established to keep the momentum of that mutual beneficial coordination. Military coordination group was working to keep on the growing ties between Army to Army, Navy to Navy, Air force to Air force and exchange of the training techniques. Defense Procurement and Product Group was established in order to make the relations sustainable. A joint technical group was established to transfer technologies. Senior technical Security Group was set up for the safety of maritime assets and to help in natural calamities etc.²⁰ The first major arms sale to India came in 2002 and as a result of that India got 12 counter battery radar sets of worth \$ 190 million. India also purchased the counter terrorism equipment having worth \$ 29 million that included the US made electronic ground sensors.²¹

In June 2005, the US and India signed a ten years defense pact that aimed to ensure multidimensional cooperation including the expansion of defense trade, availing the opportunities of the technology transfer and co-production and to advance their missile defense. Another agreement was concluded between both states in 2006, which committed them to “comprehensive co-operation” in the maritime security in order to have a protection against piracy, illegal transfer of weapons of mass destruction and other related material. In 2006, India purchased the military equipment of worth \$ 49 million that comprised of a ship which later commissioned as the INS Jalashwa, the second largest in the Indian Navy. The ship which set sail for India was also carrying six

²⁰ Kanwal,.op.cit

²¹ ibid

surpluses Sikorsky UH- 3H Seaking Helicopters which India purchased from the USA for \$ 39 million.²²

In August 2007, the commander of the US Pacific command Admiral Tim Keating briefed a Senate Panel that Pentagon was focusing on expanding military to military cooperation with India. He visited New Delhi in August 2007 and his visit was also followed by Secretary of Defense Robert Gate who had almost the same sentiments towards India²³.

Briefly it could be said that Indo-US military ties were extended to all the areas including the manufacture of light combat Air craft, joint military exercises, joint patrolling, selling of artillery radars system, submarines, multi mission aircraft, fighter planes etc. Both the states had established a joint counter terrorism group to share new technologies and techniques to combat terrorism. RAW had contacts with CIA at high level. The intelligence sharing between the two states was done on the regular basis²⁴. All those had direct military and economic impacts on Pakistan.

2.2 Indo-US Nuclear Deal

Deterrence had always been the basis of the US nuclear policy. It had always claimed to limit the number of powers possessing nuclear weapons as a cap stone of its deterrence policy²⁵. But the history confirmed that the sole hegemony of the contemporary world kept on reshaping and redesigning its policies through the eyes of its own interests. The overt interest of the US in South Asia in the post Cold War Era

²² Kronstadt, op.cit

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Parakash Karat, *Sub ordinate ally in the Nuclear Deal and India-US Strategic Relations*,(New Dehli: Left Word Books, 2007) 48.

²⁵. Rahul Bhonsle ,*Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal* (New Delhi: Atlantic press , 2007) 126.

was to maintain stability in the region while its covert interest was to retain its orbit of influence in the region.

The US president Bill Clinton visited India in March 2000. That was the milestone of the new beginnings of the Indo-US relations. The strategic link was enhanced under the Bush administration as the US found the accomplishment of its ambitions more imperative in the region. It needed a very dominant actor in the region to retain its hegemony in the world.²⁶ Shamshad Ahmed and Dr. Maleeha Lodhi were of the opinion that the Indo-US nexus was not very deep and long lasting as there could be a possible U-Turn as a result of the changing situation in the international politics. They argued that ManMohan Singh's visit to the US failed to produce any big agreement.²⁷ But it should not be ignored that the US provided India an opportunity to flourish as a global player by signing the nuclear deal which meant its recognition as a nuclear weapon state. The uncertainty and suspicions regarding the finality of the deal ended when the world was revealed to the essence of the deal for the very first time on July 8, 2005 through a joint statement:

“India with its strong commitment to preventing WMD proliferation and as a responsible state with advanced nuclear technology should acquire the same benefits and advantages, reciprocally assuming the same responsibilities and practices as other nations with advanced nuclear technology were enjoying such as P-5”²⁸.

The Indo-US nuclear deal was signed on March 2, 2006 by the Indian Prime Minister and the US President at New Delhi. It was named as Henry J Hyde US India peaceful Atomic Energy Act of 2006 on December 18, 2006. The deal's upshot was to ensure smooth, uninterrupted fuel supply to India from the member states of the Nuclear Supply Group (NSG). The Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh declared that the successful conclusion of the deal meant that Indian could produce 40,000 MW of nuclear power within a decade. As a result of that deal, India would have an entrance to global resources in order to

²⁶ Geoffrey Hudson, “US Deal with Asia”, *The Washington Post*, (December 9, 2006).

²⁷ The News(November 16,2009)

²⁸ MV Ramana, “the impact of Indo-US Nuclear Deal on the NPT and the Global Climatic Regime”, *Hein Rich Boll, Stiftung, the Green Political Foundation*, (Dec 8, 2009) <http://www.greenwood.com> (retrieved on April 22,2010)

expand and enrich its civilian nuclear program. The ban of nuclear trade was lifted on India by the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) and it could get nuclear fissile material free of constraints.²⁹

Apparently it was declared that the deal would be to assist India to generate more electricity for the domestic purposes but the deal also seemed to smooth the progress of its nuclear arsenal allowing it to buy fuel for the nuclear power reactors by underlying Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). There were fears that India could buy Uranium Ore Concentrate and refuel its civilian ones with imported uranium and consume their local uranium fuel for weapons grade plutonium production. As the operations of Indian nuclear reactors remained limited in the past and few were even shut down.³⁰ Along with those statistical gains, it had been a ray of hope for India to get a permanent seat in the UN Security Council.

The US government officials after their long visits to India often came to Pakistan on their short stays and that showed the vast discrimination done by the US with Pakistan. The unforgettable sacrifices rendered by Pakistani people on the Afghan soil during the Cold War were ignored ruthlessly by the US. The government authorities of the US claimed that growing Indo-US relations aimed to maintain peace and stability in the region. That deal had nothing to do against Pakistan. The White House released the statements of its neutrality regarding the matters, differences and conflicts between India and Pakistan. But a very close up of the reality was that Washington had been just fascinated in short term development projects in Pakistan because it believed them as a no gain, no loss cooperation. Their nature and intentions seemed to thwart Pakistan for creating any possible hurdle between the upcoming remarkable ties between India and the US. While on the other hand, it was engrossed in deepening long term strategic relations with India. The nuclear deal signed between the two states had far reaching implications for Pakistan's security and had a great blow for Pakistan's military. A very fair analysis showed that Pakistan had paid more than India in order to get America thrive in the WOT. The current instability in Pakistan was due to its closeness with the US and molding the directives of its foreign policy in order to meet the US' interests.

The US government officials often gave statements that their country always treated Pakistan and India equally. But the practicality of the statements was beyond the reality. India the arch rival of Pakistan

²⁹ Hudson, op.cit,34.

³⁰ Rudy Foilage, *Nuclear Age*,(London: Oxford ,Publication, 2008) 131.

was strengthened by the US by fulfilling its shortcomings and utmost requirements even Pakistan had a scarce of same things and its needs were corresponding with that of India³¹.

2.3 Reasons of India's Reluctance to join the Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) Gas Pipe Line Project

The IPI gas pipe line project was also known as peace pipeline and it aimed to fulfill the energy requirements of India and Pakistan. Iran proposed the export of the natural gas from Iran to India first in 1993. The proposed plan was also to give natural gas to Pakistan. It was suggested by the Iranian government that the pipe line would be originated from Asabuyeh or its south Pars Field from its Persian Gulf to Pakistan's major cities of Karachi and Multan and to further on to Delhi, India. An agreement was signed in 1995 between Pakistan and Iran, later India also showed interest. Again a preliminary agreement was signed by Iran and India in 1999 for a bilateral collaboration.

Again in 2001, all the three states decided to sit together to give the final shape to the agreement. It was decided that the 2775 km pipeline would be supplied from the South Pars Fields. It would originate from Asalouyeh and stretch over 1,100 km through Iran, 1000km in Pakistan and 600 km in India. The size of the pipe line was estimated to be 56 inches. Iran had signed few agreements with India and Pakistan regarding the supply of the gas pipe line but the project did not seem to be accomplished due to few hurdles.³² The Indo-US nuclear deal had surely a great impact on the delay of that IPI gas pipe line project. India and the US did not want the completion of any such type of project that could possibly be beneficial for Pakistan.

India was reluctant to join the gas pipeline because of the transit money that it was supposed to pay to Pakistan and partially due to the American dictations. Although Indian leadership off and on gave statements that they would not take any dictation from the US over the matters of their own interests but the reality including the IPI Gas Pipeline Project was that they fell in America's temptation. The US offered

³¹ Hussain Ahmed , "The US- Pak Ties are Temporary". *The Dawn*, (April 09, 2009).

³² Ligia Noronha, Anant Sudarsham , *India's Energy Politics*, (India: Banglore Publications, 2009) 89.

the civilian nuclear technology to India in 2007 and motivated India to back away from the IPI Gas Pipeline Project. India all the time came out of the deal when it was about to be concluded. The apparent suspicion raised by India was that the pipe line would pass from Pakistan's territory which was not safe. So, if in case the terrorists attacked the gas pipe line the gas supply to India would be cut off and India would be bound to pay the money to Pakistan as a transit fee even if the supply was disconnected. In order to prove it true it boasted off the Baluch separatists to attack the gas reservoirs.

2.4 Indo-US Joint Activities in Afghanistan

When the Russian forces captured Afghanistan, the US did not lose any opportunity to defeat the Russian forces on the Afghan soil with the help of Pakistan and Afghan Mujahideen. When the Russian forces evacuated Afghanistan the US left Afghanistan without establishing any government there that could represent all the sects of Afghanistan, the civil war broke out in Afghanistan as soon as the Russian forces evacuated it and people suffered a lot till the Taliban government replaced them. After the 9/11 incident, the US came to Afghanistan searching the 9/11 suspect Osama Bin Laden. The Taliban rule was blamed by India as a Pakistani backed government which ended as a result of the US deadly attack on Afghanistan in 2000. India found it a golden opportunity to enter in Afghanistan under the umbrella of the US³³.

India was a key supporter of the Afghan forces that threw Taliban regime with the assistance of American forces. It was also the prime supporter of the Karzai government pledging aid of about \$ 400 million. On February 22, 2005, Indian Foreign Minister met the Afghan Foreign Minister and donated 50 trucks to the Afghan Army. When the US appealed the world community to contribute for the welfare of Afghan people, India took

³³ C. Raja Mohan, *Afghanistan – a buffer Zone* (New Dehli: Delhi Publications, 2003) 109.

the lead to win the hearts of the people of Afghanistan. It contributed generously by providing millions of dollars to Afghan government, assisted in setting up their railway system; education system was established on the modern basis. Actually New Delhi government was the first to open its consulate in Jalalabad, Herat, Kandhar, Mazar-e-Sharif.³⁴

At one time Jaswant Singh announced arrogantly that the word India was passport in Afghanistan. New Delhi, along with the American assistance trained Afghan diplomats, judges and lawyers in Indian institutions. Internet service was provided to the Afghan parliamentarians.³⁵ The foundation stone for the Afghan Parliament was laid down by the Indian Prime Minister ManMohan Singh during his visit to Afghanistan. The US Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice praised the Indian government and investors that they had helped the allies in winning the hearts of the common people of Afghanistan and they were also helpful in removing the misunderstandings created by the Taliban government against the West and America.³⁶

It was all due to American protection to India that both states launched a number of programs jointly in order to maintain their influence in Afghanistan. The US forces, along with their allies brought disaster in Afghanistan and India provided logistic support including the intelligence services. As a result of Indo-US nexus, the Afghan soil had become a serious threat to Pakistan's strategic interests. The allegations against Pakistan reached at its zenith since the US and its allies had started the war on terror. Pakistan had been blamed for the double game, as supporting the WOT in Afghanistan and sponsoring

³⁴ Aunohita Mojumdar, "India to Give all the help to Kabul" *Times News Network*, (24 Dec 2001).

³⁵ Praful Bidwai, "For a Creative 'Near-West' Policy", *Front Line, Chennai* (10 Sep 2005).

³⁶ Mojumdar, op.cit.

the terrorism and extremism directed against India. On a broader level they suspected that Pakistan had a great interest in supporting Taliban and Al-Qaeda which on the other side had been a great headache for Washington.

India though often blamed the US for the double standard in order to achieve its own interests in the region. As before 9/11 the US kept on rejecting India's plea for freezing the bank accounts of the suspected terrorists of Khalistan and Kashmir freedom movements. The US rejected those allegations on the basis that its law did not permit to freeze the accounts on mere suspicion. They were insisting to provide concrete evidence if the suspension of their accounts deemed necessary. But after 9/11 they had frozen dozens of the suspected bank accounts of Al-Qaeda and its associates without bothering to find any concrete evidence.³⁷ Basically a fair analysis revealed that the WOT was the point where Indo-US policy making and ideology coincided. Their strategic and logistic cooperation in Afghanistan had become a foremost source of the problems for Pakistan. The Afghan president and the administration were playing a role to bring the policy makers of India and the US close to each other.

Karzai Government which was the Indian puppet government had blamed Pakistan for a number of times for failing to root out Taliban and AL-Qaeda havens from the bordering areas of Pakistan. The US Admiral Michael Mullen claimed that the expansion in fighting in Southern Afghanistan in 2006 was the result of the Taliban who were in Pakistani Pushtoon Tribal areas and crossed the border for fighting Jihad after getting military training in the camps run under the cover of ISI.³⁸ According to the US Director of National Security in 2007:“

³⁷ B Raman, “Counter Terrorism cooperation-International Terrorism wMonitor”, *Force*, <<http://www.saag.org/papers>> (retrieved on April 12, 2010).

³⁸ Karl R. De Rouen, Paul Bellainy, *International Security and the US: An encyclopedia*, (London:Green Wood Publishing Group, 2007) 44.

Long term projection for eradicating the Taliban threat appears dim, so long as the sanctuary remains in Pakistan and there are no encouraging signs that Pakistan is eliminating it.”³⁹

Zahid Malik, a renowned Pakistani analyst had rightly pointed out that India and the US wanted Pakistan Army to be indulged into domestic turmoil within the country. They also sought to eliminate the so called rogue elements from ISI. According to him there were confirmed intelligence reports of 2008 that in order to achieve the aims, the CIA had hired the services of at least a dozen of Afghan warlords and provided them arms and financial support in order to support militancy in FATA and Swat. Those militants carried out devastating activities in the country. He called that American policy as the “double Edge Sword” as to get the Army to launch attacks against Taliban and on the other side the CIA used Taliban to fight against the Pakistani forces. The Director General ISI General Shuja Pasha put irrefutable facts before CIA Director Leon E Panetta on November 20, 2009 in Islamabad and that showed the involvement of CIA officials in deadly attacks in Pakistan. According to him, there were intelligence reports that Tehrik-e Taliban leaders were provided phones operated by a Gulf based western company and they had been interviewed freely by BBC and other media organization without any fear of being detected and targeted by any missiles or drones. It meant that they were given full protection by the US authorities⁴⁰.

The US evacuated some of the crucial posts as soon as the Pakistan Army launched operation against the Taliban. It showed that the US forces wanted the safe fleeing of the Taliban to Afghanistan who was destabilizing Pakistan. Some of the terrorists caught there also confirmed that they had strong links with RAW and CIA.⁴¹

In February 2009, CNN had reported that almost 1/3rd of all weapons the US had procured for Afghanistan government was missing. Those were estimated as 87,000 weapons or about 36% of the 242,000 weapons that US procured and shipped to Afghanistan from December 2004 to June 2008. The US

³⁹ *ibid*

⁴⁰ Zahid Malik, “US Objectives”, *Pakistan Observer* (December 16, 2009).

⁴¹ *Ibid*.

military was unable to provide the serial number for 46,000 out of the missing 87,000⁴². All the weapons were supposed to be in the custody of the US forces till they were sent to their destination. So, someone from inside the US force was involved in that missing. No investigation was done even when the reports appeared on the media too.

The military and investigation reports had confirmed that the hundreds of the militants of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) had sophisticated Indian and American weapons which included M249 automatic machine guns, US made Glock pistols, Indians handguns, Indian machine guns Heckler and Koch MP5 A3 9mmx19mm.⁴³ Human loss and miseries suffered by the people of Pakistan were no longer hidden from the world community. Almost 4,000 Pakistani citizens had been disappeared on suspicion of terrorist activities and were transferred to Guantanamo Bay for the last eight years⁴⁴. The American Drones continued to violate Pakistan's sovereignty, killing innocent people and fueled more violence in the country. Out of 60 US Drone attacks, from January 2006 to April 2009, 50 misdirected attacks killed 687 innocent Pakistani civilians⁴⁵.

The US authorities had denied a number of times their involvement in terrorist activities in Pakistan from the Afghan soil. Hillary Clinton, during her visit to Pakistan, refuted such kinds of allegations very strongly and declared that nothing had been done on Afghan soil against the interests of Pakistan. According to a report published by the United Nations, the terrorists all over the world were sponsored by the drug producers. Afghanistan had become a narco-state and was the largest opium producing country in the world. Ahmed Wali Karzai, the youngest brother of Hamid Karzai in Kandahar, had been the key player who was exporting heroin to Europe via Turkmenistan. Indian Embassy in Kabul had been working as a coordinating centre for the drug trade. It had been said by the year 2008, that some

⁴² *CNN News*, (October 21, 2009).

⁴³ Briefing by ISPR, (December 27, 2009), <www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main/asp?=-t=press-released &id=189> (retrieved on April 12, 2010).

⁴⁴ Asian Human Rights Commission, "Pakistan: false statements about missing persons", May 06, 2008.

<<http://www.ahrchk.net/statements/mainfile.php/2008statements/1503/>> (retrived on Feb 13,2010)

8000 metric tons of opium had been exported to the world markets. Afghanistan was contributing 8250 metric tons opium per year which was almost 90 to 92 percent of world opium supply.⁴⁶

The international drug mafia was fully controlled by the Zionists, CIA. It was not possible to export opium in such a huge quantity without the active support of Pentagon and CIA. There had been incredible reports that the US military planes had even filled some coffins with heroin instead of the dead bodies. Former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds remained deadly silence for years during George W Bush regime when NATO planes were used to transfer drugs as well as international terrorists⁴⁷.

Prime Minister Yusaf Raza Gillani had said that the poppy cultivation had been the biggest source of terrorism menace in Pakistan. India had also joined hands with the US to promote terrorism in Pakistan. RAW had made an alliance with RAAM and they were actively backed by CIA, and had established 70 training camps near Pakistan's border in Afghanistan where they provided training to Chechens, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Afghans, Baloch and FATA rebels. The terrorists' Camps in Afghanistan provided huge amount of money to the terrorists and all that money was gathered through the opium supply. The drug money was being used as a geopolitical weapon by the Indo-US nexus to destabilize Pakistan⁴⁸.

2.5 Indo-US Nexus and the Kashmir Issue

Kashmir had a great importance for Pakistan. Not only due to the reason that the people of Jammu and Kashmir had a great affiliation with Pakistan but also due to the reason that the water of the rivers of Pakistan flowed from the occupied Kashmir. Soon after the end of the Cold War, the US managed to sustain equilibrium in its policy regarding Kashmir towards India and Pakistan. India kept on blaming

⁴⁶ Asif Haroon, "Drug Money Used as a geopolitics weapon by CIA-RAW-Mossad", *Asian Tribune*, <<http://www.spiegelndee/international.html>> (retrived on April 22, 2010).

⁴⁷ ibid

⁴⁸ ibid

Pakistan for the cross border terrorism but the US administration kept its lips sealed and never pointed out Pakistan or blamed it for that. It was a time when there was a growing fear in India that the US could favor to conduct plebiscite in Kashmir according to the UN resolutions.⁴⁹

India had never accepted the status of the All Parties Huriyat Conference as a true representative of the Kashmiri people. India was blamed a number of times by the Human Rights agencies and even in American parliament the members were not hesitant to speak against the Indian atrocities. Senator Michael Floranda said that India must be prevented from committing the genocidal activities in Kashmir. It had made the people of Kashmir as its hostage through 7, 00000 soldiers of its army.⁵⁰

The Kashmiri mujahidin along with the moral and political support of Pakistan were fighting against the Indian forces and they kept the issue alive on the international forums by their sacrifices. There was a remarkable shift in the US policy on Kashmir which was obvious as a result of Clinton's visit to India in 1999. Clinton showed great sympathy with India for being the victim of terrorism and blamed Pakistan very openly to stop its activities across the line of control. During the Kargil conflict Pakistan was accused by the US as aggressor. India threatened retaliation but Clinton interfered in the matter and pressurized Pakistan for the mistake it committed and persuaded Pakistan to move its forces back from the line of control.

In the post 9/11 era, India was hoping to realize the world that the true definition of the word Terrorism would be only that defined Pakistan's activities in Kashmir as acts of terrorism. The cold war was followed by the growth of Islamic fundamentalism. The Indians felt that both secular and democracies of the world should work together to defeat that menace of instability. Both the Indians and the Americans felt that the Islamic fundamentalism could be a "security threat to India and potential threat to the US⁵¹" in a way of achieving its ambition to be the global power. For them, Pakistan was the lighthouse of those extremists. Saying in the same context, a senior US official pointed out that Pakistan needed a better governance. It needed to abandon its ties with the extremists. It needed to restrain the activities of terrorists

⁴⁹ Stephen P Cohen, *Emerging Power India*,(New York: The Brookings Institute, 2004) 55.

⁵⁰ *The New York Times*, (February 10, 1996)

⁵¹ Shams-ud-Din, *Perspective on the Emerging World Order*,(New Delhi:Gyan Books, 1995) 122.

in Kashmir. It needed to be open minded and start dialogue process with India. It should shun indulging itself in the adventures like it did at Kargil. It should close all the terrorists' camp inside its territory.⁵²

It had rightly pointed out that the US had chosen to castigate Pakistan for its support to the so called terrorists in Kashmir while it had deliberately ignored the presence of 7, 00000 Indian forces who had been solely responsible for committing the cruelties, including torture, rape and harassment of the Muslims in Kashmir. Till then they had killed thousands of Kashmiris and raped more than that number of women.⁵³ The major power of the world ignored all the atrocities when their interests were out of danger. No law had been framed and implemented ever by the world community to save the lives of the innocent people of Kashmir. When they resisted and started armed struggle they were unjustly called as terrorists.

The American policy makers and the Indian parliamentarians reviewed the Kashmir policy in June 2002. Their sole aim was to pressurize Pakistan to show flexibility on her stance towards Kashmir issue.

2.6 Indo-US Nexus and the Gwadar Port

The Gwadar Port is located in Balochistan at the entrance of the Persian Gulf located on Arabian Sea. Gwadar is located on south western coast of Pakistan which is closed to the important straits of Hormuz. It is located 460 kilometer west of Karachi. The total population of Gwadar is 100,000. It became part of Pakistan in 1958 when Pakistani government bought it from Oman.⁵⁴

The US was worried that China had been rapidly growing its influence in the region and it could monitor the activities of the US Naval Forces in the Persian Gulf. It also had a great trepidation that Gwadar would be the naval base which would be a great threat to Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean. India's concerns on the construction of the Gwadar Port were not very different from that of the US. The Indian Naval Chief Admiral Suresh Metha said in January 2008 that Gwadar port empowered Pakistan as it

⁵² Ashley J. Tellis, Testimony before the House Committee on IR (November 16,2006)1-25 <www.nti.org/e-research/official-does/congress/senate_042806.pdf (accessed on January 17, 2010)

⁵³ Dina Roy, Ganesh Lal, "India, Pakistan and the question of Kashmir" *Socialist Review*, (August, 2002):21

⁵⁴ Om Gupta, *Encyclopedia of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh*, (New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House,2006)875.

would be in a position to control the energy rich sea lanes of the Persian Gulf. So, on a broader level it could be analyzed that geographically India had no choke point in its control in the subcontinent through which international shipping passed.⁵⁵

If India ensured the security of the sea lanes of the Indian Ocean, the US would have a political advantage of having a great influence in the region unless and until its forces remained in Iraq and Afghanistan. 40% of the world oil and commerce passed through the Indian Ocean and India could make it secure from the sea pirates. India could counter weight China's growing influence in the region which would be a military gain for the US⁵⁶.

New Delhi saw the Gwadar Port with a great suspicion because it considered it beneficial not only for Pakistan but also for China. It feared that in the near future Chinese navy would likely to develop nuclear submarines or air craft carriers. In that case India's domination of regional waterways would be ended.

India and the US were busy in limiting the functioning of the Gwadar Port. They had adopted few strategies to refrain the port from smooth working. These included:

- i) advancement of Chabahar Port of Iran
- ii) fanning sectarianism and terrorism in Baluchistan

In order to stop the efficient working of the Gwadar Port, India had started finding the alternative ways to generate hurdles in its working. For India, the advancement of Chabahar Port of Iran was the best to counter balance the Gwadar Port. India was engaged in construction of the road links from Iran to Afghanistan in order to access the landlocked countries of the Central Asia. The US had always considered Iran as one of the prevalent threats to the world security but it did not take the commitments of India with Iran very seriously due to two reasons. First it wanted to contain China and secondly in order to safeguard its interests in the region, India was the best choice for the US. It had given India free hand with the

⁵⁵ Syed Fazl-e-Haider, "Gwadar: An Emerging Centre of the Great Game", *ISPI-Policy Brief*, (Oct, 2009).

⁵⁶ *ibid*

condition of sustaining the US superiority in the region. So, the US had realized that Chabahar Port would be beneficial for India and US interests to contain China.

Two political groups, the leftist Baluchistan Liberation Front and the Centrist Baluchistan Protection Council claimed to be active in Baluchistan. They started fueling Baluchi separatist feelings. Those extremist groups started harassing the journalists who were involved in the media coverage of the activities on the Gwadar Port. In order to turn the local people against the construction of the Port, the Baluchi Nationalists started raising slogans that Pakistan together with China would export the provincial natural gas resources.⁵⁷

In order to stop the operational activities of the Port, the Baluchistan Liberation Army killed three Chinese engineers on 03 May, 2004, who were working on the Gwadar Port. On 21 May, 2004, Gwadar airport was attacked at midnight by rockets. On 09 October, 2004, two Chinese engineers were kidnapped; one of them was killed later on in a rescue operation. In 2007, a bus carrying Chinese engineers came under attack too. The army was deployed to kill Nawab Akbar Bugti in 2005. The operation resulted in a number of casualties on both sides. In that operation military used jet fighters and helicopter gunship to destroy the hide outs of the combatants.⁵⁸

The human rights agencies and the Indo-US media tried to internationalize the Baluchistan matter. Indian intelligence officers stationing at Kandhar and Jalalabad were also involved in fueling insurgency in Baluchistan.⁵⁹ The US and India tried to surpass each other in their efforts to stop and derail the projects and activities at the Gwadar Port.

Majority of the leaders of the Baluchistan Separatist Movement often stayed in India and monitor the destructive activities from there. Few of their sympathizers were also found there in America. Dr. Wahid Baloch, an activist of the Baloch Society who was staying in Washington and won sympathies of the American officials raised slogans that Pakistan Army was committing atrocities in the province. He said

⁵⁷ Muhammad Alamgir, "Gwadar Port", *Pak Tribune*, (April 12, 2010).

⁵⁸ Juo Harpn, "Baluchistan Conflict", *New York Times*, (January 6, 2008).

⁵⁹ Zaid Haider, "Baluchis, Beijing and Pakistan's Gwadar Port", *Politics Diplomacy*, (winter/spring 2005).

that the army had no right to kill the common people. He challenged that there was no need of the army to stay in Balochistan as it was bordering to Arabian Sea and Iran which had no rivalry with Pakistan.⁶⁰

2.7 Indo-US Joint Media Campaign Against the Pakistan's Nukes

Indo-US nexus had utilized a lot of energy to defame Pakistan in order to mount the international pressure on Pakistan. They put certain allegations against Pakistan which had no solid basis. Both the states tried to surpass each other in spreading such information that could spoil the image of Pakistan in the international community. Both the states had used their media as the biggest tool to achieve their desired aspirations. The most spectacular anti-Pakistan media campaign against Pakistan had been launched by the US media since 9/11. The purpose behind that seemed to soften the international opinion for a possible military action against Pakistan. There was no question that the campaign against Pakistan was backed by the US officials sitting there in Pentagon as it was done before the invasion of Iraq.

The US government claimed that Pakistan was trading nuclear weapon technology to North Korea in exchange for ballistic missile technology. In March 2001, Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan was dismissed by the government of Pakistan from his post as Chairman of Kahuta Research Laboratories. In 2002, the Wall Street Journal quoted unnamed Pakistani government official that the dismissal of Khan from his post resulted from the US suspicions that he transferred nuclear weapons technology to North Korea.⁶¹

North Korea had denied the reports that a top Pakistani scientist had sold nuclear weapon technology to the communist state. A statement was released by the Foreign Office spokesman terming the information "A false propaganda spread by the US administration".⁶²

The US administration strongly pressurized Pakistan. The Indian media presented it as the headlines and highlighted the matter to such an extent that it seemed that they were supporting the evidences of the US investigation teams with their media trial. The US officials declared that they had found solid evidence that an unidentified group had offered nuclear weapon technology to Iraq on behalf of

⁶⁰ *The Washington Post*, (November 16, 2009).

⁶¹ *The Wall Street Journal*, (23 October, 2002).

⁶² Glen Segell, *Axis of Evil and Rogue State: Bush Administration, 2000-2004*. (np: Glen Segell, 2005) 335.

Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan in the mid 1990's. The Pakistani government denied the allegations and declared them to be fraudulent.

Again in 2003, news on Indian and US media circulated that Khan had transferred nuclear technology to Iran also. Iran, under the huge international pressure agreed for the inspection of its nuclear assets and the International Atomic Energy Agency reported that Iran had established a large uranium enrichment facility using gas centrifuges based on the stolen URENCO. Again Pakistan was declared as the sole responsible for all that.⁶³ The Indian and the US media demanded that Pakistani nukes should be taken into custody by the international agencies in order to stop nuclear proliferations.

Both India and the US had found the nuclear assets of Pakistan a hurdle in a way of achieving their common aspirations. The slogans were being raised that Pakistan's nuclear program was unsafe and as such was causing the biggest threat to the world peace. The strategy adopted by both the states was to present Pakistan as an incapable and unstable state which could not secure itself against the religious extremists and Pakistan would be succumbed to them within few months. In that case its nuclear assets would be in the control of the extremists. In order to avoid that situation, the nuclear assets of Pakistan should be disabled, detained, or forcibly taken out by the US. The other solution that was brought forward was that the international agency should keep them in their custody for safe keeping. Pakistan had firmly rejected the terrorists' threat and made it clear that the consequences of those kinds of conspiracies to harm Pakistan's nuclear assets would be disastrous for the region. Under the umbrella of the US, India had always been in a struggle to harm Pakistan's interest because she considered the latter as the biggest hurdle in the way to be in the list of the super powers of the world.

On December 13, 2001 an armed group attacked India's parliament in New Delhi. Again Lashkar-e-Tayiba (LT) and Jash-e- Muhammad were blamed by the Indian authorities. Indian government officially requested the US government to pressurize Pakistan's government to take action inside its territory against those culprits who were involved in terrorist activities in India. The US President Bush said in that context:

⁶³ Ikram ul Majeed Sehgal, "Korea, Iran, Libya rejected allegations against Pakistan", *Defence Journal vol 7*, (2004).

“Pakistan’s Northern Areas are a safe haven for the terrorists in the world. We do not want that our forces sacrifice to secure the future of their coming generations and we leave those terrorists of Pakistan as future threat for America and for the world too. I do believe that our reliable ally Pakistan will understand the sensitivity of the matter and will take positive steps to eradicate them from its territory...our forces do not need any permission from any government to chase the terrorists”⁶⁴

2.8 Indo-US nexus and the formulation of Kerry Lugar Bill (KLB)

Indian leadership had raised serious objections to the military and economic assistance of \$ 10.5 billion to Pakistan. That was announced by President Bush for fighting the WOT while in reality it was nothing as compared to the loss that Pakistan had to bear for being an ally of the US in the war on terror. The Indian lobby played a key role in making the language of the KLB insulting for Pakistan and added few harmful clauses in it. Clause 2 of the bill conditions that Pakistan will be given aid by evaluating extent to which the Government of Pakistan has made progress on matters such as

“(A) ceasing support, including by any elements within the Pakistan military or its intelligence agency, to extremist and terrorist groups, particularly to any group that has conducted attacks against the United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, or against the territory or people of neighbouring countries; (B) preventing al-Qaeda, the Taliban and associated terrorist groups, such as Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed, from operating in the territory of Pakistan, including carrying out cross-border attacks into neighbouring countries, closing terrorist camps in the Fata, dismantling terrorist bases of operations in other parts of the country, including Quetta and Muridke, and taking action when provided with intelligence about high-level terrorist targets”⁶⁵.

The Kerry Lugar Bill raised serious political and military implications for Pakistan. Once it was passed, the Indian media tried to prove it as a very good move for Pakistan. They argued that the bill did not infringe upon Pakistan’s sovereignty as asserted by the army. The purpose was to increase the circle of KLB in Pakistan as it was designed according to the wishes of the Indian lobby in the US.

⁶⁴ *The News* (January 10, 2008).

⁶⁵ [http://forum.pakistan.defence.com/index.php?showtopic-85164 & views get newpost](http://forum.pakistan.defence.com/index.php?showtopic-85164&views_get_newpost)

CHAPTER -3

INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA AND ITS MILITARY AND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN

Indo-US nexus in the Post Cold War Era had both direct and indirect military implications for Pakistan and it was an undeviating security threat to Pakistan. The term military absorbs all the areas that include5 all the war heads, equipments required for defense and attack, the operational techniques etc. The chapter covers the different dimensions of their nexus and their multiple impacts on Pakistan’s military and security. These were: Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal, Indo-US military cooperation, Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan, their nexus against the operational activities of the Gwadar port, their joint efforts in the formulation of Kerry Lugar Bill (KLB) and their military and security implications for Pakistan.

Military and Security Implications of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal for Pakistan

In spite of the US claim that the Indo-US nuclear deal would be undisruptive for Pakistan. There were very solid reasons and facts existed on the basis of which no one could deny the military and security implications of the deal for Pakistan.

“The latest estimates by David Albright of the Institute for Science and International Security were that India has 50 to 60 assembled weapons (with enough plutonium for 100) and that Pakistan has 60 weapons. Both countries prolong to amplify their arsenals. Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons tests indicate that the yield of the warheads would be similar to the 15-kiloton explosive yield (equivalent to 15,000 tons of TNT) of the bomb the U.S used on Hiroshima.”⁶⁶

The comparison showed that almost deterrence was retained in the region. So there were less fears of the nuclear war. Deterrence had never been a strategy for war. It is a strategy for peace which was designed to convince the rivals that aggression should not be the preferable option of all the alternatives. In other words, it could be said that it restrained the enemy psychologically rather than physically.

According to the deterrence by punishment, the side that might yearn to start war could not do so being threatened by the unacceptable possible damage in case of retaliation from the opponent side.⁶⁷ Pakistan had attained the nuclear capability in order to maintain deterrence. It’s all due to the nuclear

⁶⁶ Edward Mile, “Deterrence Policy in South Asia”, *Times of London*, (April 10, 2007).

⁶⁷ Ibid

capability that the Indians did not get courage to attack Pakistan because they could foresee the disaster that might be inflicted on them.

When Pakistan and India were on the verge of war, many Western experts depicted two scenarios that could follow the upcoming Indo-Pak war. According to them both states had a total of almost 50-75 fissile weapons with an estimated yield between 5-25 kilotons. They assumed that the Pakistani weapons would be mounted on missiles and the Indian gravity bombs would be deployed as fighter aircraft. The Natural Resources Defense Council in a study had predicted the loss of the lives of 12 million people. The hypothesis put forth was based on few assumptions including if 10 nuclear weapons of 15 kilotons were dropped over five Indian and five Pakistani major cities that would cause death toll of 1,690,702 and 2,021,106 injuries in India and 1,171,879 deaths and 1,361,872 injuries in Pakistan⁶⁸.

The deal surely gave a sense of superiority to India and once it was confirmed that it had a better position it could attack Pakistan first. The devastations of nuclear war were not hidden from the world. The world had already tasted them during the Second World War when the US dropped atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Something was to be urgently done by the world community to prevent the region from disaster because in the last decade (1990-2000) both the states were on the brink of war at least twice and that threat could possibly be averted if deterrence had been maintained.

The US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in 2006 declared India an emerging global power and “pillar of stability in South Asia.”⁶⁹ That made it a natural partner of the US and a nuclear agreement would further consolidate that partnership. Almost same feelings were expressed by Stephen P. Cohen while appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee commenting that the nuclear understanding was said to be an instrument to take up the relationship with the people and government of India to the height of the glory⁷⁰.

⁶⁸ Dr Zulfqar Khan “ India-Pakistan Nuclear Rivalry: Perceptions, Misperceptions and Mutual Deterrence”, *IPRI*, paper 9, (Jan 2005)

⁶⁹ *CNN News*, (22 Dec, 2006). 10.00 p.m

⁷⁰ Rahul Bhonsle, *US Strategic Engagement of India – The Underlying Theme of Indo-US Nuclear Deal*, (New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007) 92.

That deal would surely have adverse effects on Pakistan and it could make India a pillar of instability in South Asia. Firstly, one could see that the reactors geared to arms requirements and those meant for civil purposes were very skinny. Any Indian government intended to develop its nuclear program could turn the programs of civilian amenities to armed ones according to its own scheduled time. India had always been pretending to have a leading role of making the South Asia as a nuke free zone and that deal had revealed the true picture of its policies. It would surely be a great dampener for the benign energy such as solar energy, wind power which would surely be not an environmental friendly act. It would surely lead towards the acceleration of the nuclear arms race in South Asia and the dreams of a peaceful nuke free South Asia would be undermined. It would surely encourage Pakistan to go and search for the nuclear weapons in order to maintain the equilibrium of power in the region.

Although few of the Indian critics evaluated the nuclear deal in different manner and claimed that the deal had a negative impact on India's strategic interests. They were of the opinion that the deal bounded India to rely on the US more than it was required. That dependency could be a source of pressurizing India to sign CTBT or NPT.⁷¹ But the close up of the deal confirmed that India was not bound to use the fissile material for civilian purpose. The US Senator Hyde commented before Senate:

*"The US remained committed to achieving Indian curtailment of fissile material production we have strongly encouraged a move in this directionbut we will not insist on it for purpose of these civil nuclear initiatives."*⁷²

The Indian government on the other hand had assured that the deal did not compel India to cease production of the fissile material. These were the clear indications that India was interested in enhancing its nuclear capabilities for the military purposes. Ashlay Tellis's statement before the International Relations Committee also confirmed that India was not bound to stop its nuclear up gradation. He said that Congress should not support any such amendment that compelled India to limit its capacity to produce fissile material for the nuclear weapon purpose⁷³.

⁷¹ Kumar Gurmant, *The Asian Giant*, (New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007) 26.

⁷² *The Washington Post*, (February 16,2006).

⁷³ Tellis, op.cit 14

Indo-US Nuclear Deal was very much against the letter and spirit of the previous US non proliferation regulations. Pakistan that had already been against the nuclear proliferation and the deal would compel it to find something equivalent to that in order to counter balance the deal. That deal was violation of Non-Proliferation Treaty as Pakistan had always been against the proliferation of the nuclear weapons but the recent deal between the two states led Pakistan to think further options to counter balance the deal. The flow of military aid stopped in 1990's and Pakistan was blamed by the US administration that she was expanding her nuclear program rapidly which was against the international laws and Pakistan was much pressurized to sign CTBT and NPT. That was the time period that halted the discrimination of US with Pakistan. Pakistan faced military sanctions thrice in the post Cold War Era and that was really a great setback to Pakistan's defense. Pakistan even paid for 28 F16 in advance costing \$658 million and their deliverance was stopped. It was the supreme example of the US favour for India.

The US had done a great discrimination to Pakistan as was evident from the nuclear deal which the former concluded with India. Pakistan's ambassadors to US General (ret'd) Jahangir Karamat said in Washington that Pakistan should have been given same access to the US civilian nuclear technology that was offered to India and pointed to the tilting of the balance towards India. According to him Pakistan could be compelled "to start taking extraordinary measures to ensure a capability for deterrence and defense." The editor of the IPRI fact file did not ignore the answer given by the American authorities that said that India was different from Pakistan as it had never indulged itself in the smuggling of lethal nuclear parts as Pakistani scientist did.⁷⁴

By analyzing the fact it could be realized that it was a lame justification put forth to keep Pakistan away from such kind of deal even in the near future. It was a perfect illustration of their nexus. But if once Pakistan succeeded in getting nuclear fuel from China or any other country, it would be a never ending contest of nuclear arms between the two neighboring states. The indications of that were also given by Pakistan's ex-President Pervaiz Musharraf that Pakistan had adopted the strategy of credible deterrence in both conventional and unconventional fields in regard to the threats that it might perceive. According to him:

⁷⁴ Noor ul Haq,(ed) "India-US Nuclear Deal" *IPRI Fact File*. (May, 2006).

*“Pakistan has quantified the strategy of minimum defensive deterrence and is refining the deterrence level of force....whenever an imbalance is created in the region Pakistan has to balance it out in accordance with its strategy of minimum deterrence.”*⁷⁵

The assurances of the US authorities that Indo-US partnership had nothing to do with Pakistan and it should not be apprehensive about its security because together India and the US were endeavoring to maintain peace and security in the world. But the true picture presented something else. The balance of power had tilted in South Asia due to the Indo-US nuclear deal. India appeared as a power that had started bullying Pakistan. Their changing tone was not only obvious through the statements of the Indian politicians and military persons but the intellectuals and men of letters also were not left behind.

Few of their writers presented a very arrogant scenario of the region. They portrayed four scenarios for Pakistan in the light of recent collaboration between US and India and suggested measures for Pakistan that included:

1. By accepting Indian dominance Pakistan should adopt reconciliatory attitude and try to accommodate overall controversial issues if it seeks to improve the relations with the emerging power India
2. By retaining ties with the US, Pakistan could coerce India through Chinese.
3. Pakistan should try to capture the area of Kashmir through military means before India maximizes its power.⁷⁶

It showed that the Indians were aiming that the deal would de-hyphenate India and Pakistan as India would be a way ahead after that deal. The language and gestures of the Indians could escalate the tension at any time in the region and the menace of nuclear war could not be denied. Both the states had controversies over a number of issues between them that included Kashmir issue, water issue as India was constructing dams on the rivers, the water of which was allocated to Pakistan, Siachen Glaciers etc.

3.2-Implications of Indo-US military ties for Pakistan

⁷⁵ “Address to foreign correspondents Association of Phillippines” *The News*, (April 21, 2005).

⁷⁶ Gary K. Bertsch , Seema Gahlant, Anupam Srivastans, *Engaging India: US Strategic Relations with the World’s Largest Democracy*,(London:Routledge, 1999)225.

India exercised strong military disproportion against Pakistan with the army twice the size of its adversary, an air force which is thrice of Pakistan and navy which was four times of that of Pakistan. The US transfer of advanced missile and arms technology had really imbalanced the arms equation in the region.⁷⁷ The Indian columnists tried to create misperception by providing imaginary equations to realize the world that the US cooperation in South Asia was for the betterment and safety of the world. The Times of India published that the US wanted to treat Pakistan and India equally, as on one side, it was promoting India's missile technology, held joint military exercises while on the other side it gave Pakistan F-16's to maintain the balance of power between the two rival states.⁷⁸

Although India blamed the US for playing the double game as it provided arms to Pakistan also and the Indian leadership raised some serious objections when the US provided some low profile equipments to Pakistan to participate actively in the War on Terror.⁷⁹ The fact was that the US had engaged Pakistan with short term programs of either providing few aircrafts to Pakistan or any equipment of low profile but in comparison with that it had always worked on a long term plans with India. It transferred technology of weapons to India much better than the finished items offered to Pakistan. In order to balance the arms equation, Pakistan had to search for any other state like China to counter that imbalance. When the arm equation had imbalanced, the history confirmed that war ought to happen between the rival states. It meant that Pakistan's safety and survival would be to buy more arms from the countries it had better relations in order to shatter the clouds of war that had been hovering over the region.

⁷⁷ Ghulam Abbas, Qadir Baloch, "Indo-US Militant Nexus and our Strategies for Survival", *the Dialogue*, vol 11,(Qurtaba uni, 1998).

⁷⁸ *Times of India*, (June 23, 2008).

⁷⁹ Asif Haroon, "India's Dangerous Designs Against Pakistan", *Asia Tribune by WIAS* vol 9:16(December, 2009):22-23

India, having the superiority complex, had always been blindly struggling to advance its military capabilities in order to be the sole power of the region. It was keen to have a close relationship with a country that had advanced and modern military equipments. The Indo-US military relations was multi-beneficial for India as, on one side, the US itself was providing sophisticated material to India and, on the other side, it cleared prohibited weapons trade between Israel and India. So the Indo-US nexus, in other words, meant strengthening India's ties with the US. There were confirmed reports that Israel would transfer to India among other material, the Phalcon airborne radar system and Arrow missiles which could further imbalance the arms equations between India and Pakistan.⁸⁰

The subcontinent, which had unique physical features including snow capped high peaks, deserts and valleys, was fast turning into a difficult battlefield in case of a war as had proved in the 1965 and 1971 wars. As India was holding joint military exercises with the US it meant that it was gaining the new war techniques. The US Army had variety of war techniques based on scientific methods. Their joint military exercises were to improve the war games of the Indian Army. As the Indian Army Chief of Staff said

“India has got the latest technology from the USA, its naval force, armed force, and air force have enhanced their capabilities much higher than the expectations of our neighbors... as the joint exercises of the super power and the emerging power is a determination to maintain peace and stability in the world.”⁸¹

The contradiction even in his own statement was quite palpable and had conceived double meanings because, on the one side, he was contending the

⁸⁰ K. Alankronsadt , *“India-US Relations”* (New Dehli:Oxford Publication 2008) 145.

⁸¹ Subha Chandar, *Military ties of India with the US*,(Chandigarh: Suran Publication 2008) 14.

world community that India, being a peaceful state, was seeking world security in spite of achieving the high professional capabilities while, on the other hand, he was warning Pakistan that the Indian army had enough skills as compared to the Pakistan Army. Certainly it was evident from his remarks that India had aggressive designs against Pakistan.

The intelligence sharing between the American CIA and Indian RAW had been frequent since America started the WOT. Their counter terrorism group had adverse effects on Pakistan's security as the RAW's focus had always been to harm the interests of Pakistan. Through the Indian agency services India declared the freedom fighters of Kashmir as terrorists. Kashmir was the key for the survival of Pakistan as Pakistan received the water in all its rivers from Kashmir. The Mujahideen had been fighting the war for the interest of Pakistan too and by declaring those terrorists meant to keep Pakistan away from those fighters. In case if that was achieved, that would have been a great blow to Pakistan's strategic interests. By modernizing its intelligence agencies on the American line India was fully involved in creating insurgency in Pakistan through its purchased killers.

The supply of the latest submarines to India meant to make its naval forces strong enough to face all the challenges and threats that it could face in the Indian Ocean. It meant that Indian dominance would be maintained in waters too. Again it was an alarming situation for Pakistan's security and defense. The way the forces of both the states had come closer to each other showed that India was not

only fond of maintaining superiority on lands and water but it was also interested in gaining supremacy over the sky too.

In 2005, the US President Bush and Indian Prime Minister ManMohan Singh signed an agreement on space technology. The two leaders decided that the US would build close ties with India in “space exploration, satellite navigation and launch technology control regime guidelines.” The deal was again revived in 2009. The US agreed to assist India in certain types of satellite technology such as the automated deployment of structures in space, the US space cooperation would provide facilities to India to move ahead towards further achievements.⁸²

It had not been possible to separate India’s space launch program in the incubator from its military program. Obviously if the US would assist India in launching the satellite it would get more revenue in expanding its space programs including rocket development. These rockets could be used against all the countries including Pakistan for tracing their secrets through the rockets used for spy purpose. Satellite technology could also help India to advance multiple nuclear warheads for its ballistic missiles.

3.3 Indo-US nexus against the Gwadar Port: A threat to Pakistan’s Security

The US was much worried about the rapidly growing influence of China in Asia. The Pentagon had a great fear that the activities of the US naval forces could be

⁸² Ruban Chager, *The Height of Relations*, (Banglore: Dawn Publication, 2009)11.

monitored by China in the Persian Gulf and the Gwadar Port could prove to be the Naval headquarter which was likely to develop into nuclear submarines or the air craft carriers home port in the near future. On the other hand, India seemed to be frustrated of the Chinese presence in the Gwadar Port as it would undermine India's dominance of regional water ways and stay of the Chinese naval forces in the Arabian Sea would be beneficial for Pakistan. Their plan to spread discontent in Balochistan province aimed to stop the operational activities of Gwadar Port. The killings of the Chinese engineers engaged in the constructional activities at the Gwadar Port intended to stop China for being involved in the advancement of that port which could also keep Pakistan's navy away from the Persian Gulf.

3.4 Indo-US Activities in Afghanistan: Challenges for Pakistan

When the US attacked Afghanistan, it was necessary for the US forces to win the logistic support from Pakistan. It threatened Pakistan for sending it to the "Stone Age" in case of lack of cooperation with the forces. Pakistan provided the logistic support to the US forces under the huge American pressure. India, from the very first day of the plan to initiate the WOT, was in favor to take action against the Taliban regime.

Moonis Ahmar pointed out that for Pakistan the event of September 11 resulted in multiple challenges. The country again needed to render services as the US ally in the war against terrorism. The economic benefits that Pakistan gained were quite petty as compared to the enormous challenges that it had to face. The situation that emerged after 9/11 compelled Pakistan to participate in the international WOT as there was no viable choice for the state to opt. It withdrew its support for the Taliban regime. The Pakistani

government had to take U- Turn in order to avoid the American predictable reaction.⁸³

The price of the loyalty proved to be very costly for Pakistan because it had to face challenges that included:

1. domestic repercussion resulting from the policy against the Taliban government
2. threat of war with India as a result of the attack on the Indian Parliament

These challenges were surely a great threat to Pakistan's security and defense that were faced soon after the end of the Taliban regime. It seemed that the threat of war with India was the result of Indo-US nexus against Pakistan. The scenario that Moonis Ahmer had depicted in his book was a true reflection of the facts. He said that, on the one hand, Pakistan's government was supporting the US against Al-Qaeda and Taliban in Afghanistan while, on the other hand relations with India turned to be very tense and India deployed half a million of its troops along the borders of Pakistan by charging it for supporting the cross border terrorists' activities.⁸⁴

In reality the US wanted to exert pressure on the Pakistan's government so that it could not deny its support against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The threats of war diverted when Pakistan provided full support to the allies' forces and as a result of that the Indian forces went to their positions where they were usually at the time of peace. When the US, along with its allies, captured Afghanistan then India enhanced its influence in Afghanistan and as a result Pakistan had to face some more problems.

⁸³ Moonis Ahmar,(ed). *The World after September 11: Challenges and Opportunities*, (Karachi: university of Karachi Press, 2003) 77.

⁸⁴ *ibid*

As the US forces did not get the expected frequent successes they blamed that militants from Pakistan were supporting the Taliban and warned Pakistan to stop supporting them if it wanted to avoid the pre-emptive strikes. The US Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice said in this context at Delhi

“We, the biggest democracies of the world have some common responsibilities including maintaining peace in the world and the time has come when we must join hands to take over them....the USA will chase the Al-Qaeda backed terrorists everywhere in the world. Our forces will not hesitate to launch pre-emptive strikes to destroy their safe havens even in Pakistan when the time and need to do so will come and we will be just in doing so.”⁸⁵

Following the language of the US leaders, the Indian leadership started threatening Pakistan in more or less the same words. The Indian Foreign Minister visited Kabul the same year and said in a press conference:

“Our neighbor is our common enemy and is promoting insurgency in the region. We cautioned the world about this problem a few decades ago. They have realized and given their response late but it’s not too late to prevent the states of the region from complete disaster”⁸⁶

The uniformity in the statements of both the leadership clearly indicated that the nexus was just to harm Pakistan in order to achieve their common aspirations. Even after the Mumbai attacks, India was intending to launch pre-emptive attacks against Pakistan but changed its policy when Pakistan announced that the launching of the pre-emptive attacks meant the full fledged war in which all the options would be opened for Pakistan including the use of nuclear weapons.

⁸⁵ *New York Times*(Jan 2003).

⁸⁶ *Reuter*, (15 December 2005).

As a result of their nexus in Afghanistan, Pakistan's eastern and western borders had become insecure. The Eastern border was insecure since the creation of Pakistan. Its rival India had imposed two major wars on Pakistan in the past and even now never hesitated to boast off its power and make Pakistani border insecure by committing its cruelties in the border areas. Twice since 9/11 it brought its enormous military on Pakistan' border to start a full scale war. The Northern Alliance government had been ruling in Afghanistan and it had cordial relations with India. Their hostility with Pakistan had been an open secret. The current leadership off and on questioned the Durand Line. So the Western borders were not secured as that Indian backed government had not lost any chance to create insurgency in the bordering provinces and adjacent areas Another threat imposed by the US forces was their air strikes that they had started since 2005 to destroy the hide outs of the militants. It was a clear violation of the international law and was against the sovereignty of Pakistan.

According to a press report, at least 11 Pakistani FC soldiers were killed on the western Pakistani border as a result of the air attacks of the US forces on a Pakistani security post of the Frontier Corps in Sheikh Baba area in Mohmand Tribal region adjacent to the Afghan Border. The Pentagon Spokesman Geoff Morrell defended the strike by declaring them legitimate because the purpose was self defense.⁸⁷ The famous defense analyst Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema interpreted that the US along with the adversaries of Pakistan was targeting to spread discontentment in the state and as anti-American sentiments would also be aroused and internal instability would have surely negative

⁸⁷ *BBC News(Dec 12, 2009)*.8.30 p.m

impacts on Pakistan's security.⁸⁸ So there was a continuous threat hovering on Eastern and Western borders of Pakistan.

The complete hold of Afghanistan by the US and its allies including India meant complete disconnection of Pakistan with the Central Asian States. Those states were rich in energy resources. Pakistan needed energy not only to fulfill its domestic needs but also to meet the needs of its nuclear capability. If Pakistan somehow managed to get the energy from those states, in that case it needed Afghanistan's cooperation in order to use that route but Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan could not allow Pakistan to use that route freely. While the way India had been expanding its nuclear capabilities, was an alarming situation for Pakistan and the latter needed to do something urgent to run its nuclear program without interruption.

India had always an eye on its long term interests in the region. On the other side, the US entrance in Afghanistan had provided it chances to flourish its designs against Pakistan. The Indians at Farkhor and Ayni bases in Tajikistan gave it a better chance to keep a check on Pakistan. The Indo-US presence and active participation in the reconstruction activities in Afghanistan was a joint tactic to keep their nexus growing in Afghanistan without the interference of any other state of South Asia specially Pakistan and Iran.

India took a full advantage of destabilizing Pakistan by promoting terrorism in different parts of the country. The Indian government had opened consulates in the southern part of Afghanistan near border and almost 2000 Indian commandos were

⁸⁸ Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, "Targetting Strategic Partner?" *The Post*, (June 15,2008).

stationing there who were real threats to Pakistan's security. Pakistan had very openly condemned and protested the opening of the Indian diplomatic missions in Kandhar and Jalalabad. There was a strong belief in Islamabad that Indian secret services RAW's agents supported the rebellion elements in Balochistan and FATA through Afghanistan to destabilize Pakistan. According to news item published in "The News", more than 100 Baloch dissidents had been sent to India by the Indian consulates opened in Kandhar for six months training. They were given payment of 500 to 1000 US Dollars. They were given training in different warfare like sniper, shooting, handling of technical equipments such as wireless set, intelligence gathering techniques. Their handlers trained them for the terrorist activities in Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan. RAW had organized a network of training schools in Afghanistan. These were operating in Kabul, Jalalabad, Khawaja Ghar, Khost, Paktia, Urgun, Kandhar, Spin Boldak and Drang. These training camps washed the brains of the innocent people of FATA, Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and enforced and encouraged them by giving incentives to work against the interests of Pakistan.⁸⁹

In the bordering town of Kandhar, there had been a refugee's camp for the dissidents of Balochistan and the RAW personnel were given free access to them. RAW not only cultivated their minds but also provided them with funds to keep up their anti-Pakistan activities. Spin Boldak was said to be the main hub for the destructive activities against Pakistan. All those activities were being taken in the areas which were claimed to be in full control of the allies' forces. The US forces had numerical majority in the

⁸⁹ *The News* , (July 26, 2008).

coalition forces. If it was so then it meant that all those terrorist activities that took place in Pakistan had a direct link with India and Afghanistan and indirect link with the US.⁹⁰

3.5 Kerry Lugar Bill and Indo-US joint Ventures against Pakistan's Military

Kerry Lugar Bill which was passed by the US government aimed to give annual \$10.5 billion. The language of the bill was too harsh to bear for Pakistan's Army. The government although was facing economic crisis and it found the aid a great blessing and accepted it without any objection. The formulators of the KLB had certain findings on the basis of which they formulated the bill. One of the findings was that despite of the affective action of the Pakistan Army that had killed or captured hundreds of Al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders and operatives such as Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, Abu Faraj al Libi, Ramzi bin al Shibh, few of the places including FATA points of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Quetta in Baluchistan and Muridke in Punjab had been very safe sanctuaries for the terrorists.

On March 27, 2009 the US President Obama noted "multiple intelligence estimates have warned us that al-Qaeda is activating, planning attacks on the US home land from its safe havens in Pakistan."⁹¹ These findings had a very adverse affect on the formulation of the Kerry Lugar Bill. The conditions put forth in the KLB were against the sovereignty of the nation. Few of the clauses clearly indicated the intentions of the US and India against our security forces:

⁹⁰ *BBC News*. (June 17,2007).10p.m

⁹¹*The Washington Post*, (June 24, 2009).

“ceasing support, including by any elements within the Pakistan military or its intelligence agency, to extremist and terrorist groups, particularly to any group that has conducted attacks against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, or against the territory or people of neighboring countries”⁹²

That clause clearly depicted that the US wanted to have a strict check on Pakistan Army in order to make a way clear for the India to become the regional power. For them the Pakistan army was the biggest hurdle. It seemed that the US administration was playing in the hands of the Indian leadership in their policy making process regarding South Asia.

Another clause made Pakistan security forces bound to follow the US directions in order to wipe out the suspected terrorists involved in activities against the US and the neighbouring countries. It said that Pakistan would have to make sure preventing al Qaeda, the Taliban and associated terrorist groups, such as Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed, from operating in the territory of Pakistan, including carrying out cross-border attacks into neighboring countries, closing terrorist camps in the FATA, dismantling terrorist bases of operations in other parts of the country, including Quetta and Muridke, and taking action when provided with intelligence about high-level terrorist targets.⁹³

Obviously if actions were launched in Pakistan by following the directives of the US there would be extreme discontentment in the country and misunderstanding would be created between people and the security forces. Pakistan’s ex-Army Chief Mirza Aslam Baig declared these clauses of the KLB as a direct attack on the state’s

⁹² ibid

⁹³ *The Washigton Post*, (June 24, 2009).

sovereignty. The DGISPR (Director General, Inter Services Public Relations) had categorically denounced the presence of militants' camps anywhere in Pakistan.

Another area of assessment in order to get aid was to evaluate the extent to which the Government of Pakistan exercised effective civilian control of the military, including a description of the extent to which civilian executive leaders and parliament exercised oversight and approval of military budgets, the chain of command, guidance and planning, and military involvement in civil administration.⁹⁴

The hidden purpose behind the KLB was to stop the Pakistan Army from being too independent to direct the strategic interests for the state. If the approval of the military budget and approval of the promotion of the senior military leaders would be in the hands of the civil government, the US could keep an indirect check on Pakistan Army's advancement through the civilian government. James Geoffrey had rightly pointed out that the KLB had been a trap for Pakistan. Once it was caught in that trap it would become much easier for the US to pressurize Pakistan to follow the directions set by the US. If it did so it would be a great threat to its own security because the Indo-US nexus had been strengthened far beyond the expectations of Pakistan's administration and the US demand would surely reflect the Indian ambitions. It would be threat to Pakistan's nukes as the demand for access to the network of A Q Khan was conveyed through the KLB, and efforts were made to control the military indirectly.

⁹⁴ *The Washigton Post*, (June 24, 2009).

CHAPTER-4

INDO-US NEXUS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

AND ITS POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR

PAKISTAN

The term strategic has absorbed politics in itself as the military and security of a state cannot be dissected from the political interests of a state. The nexus between the two states in the fields of culture, economics, and military had deep political affects on the target country (Pakistan). The term politics absorbed national and international politics of a state. It addressed all the state affairs including coherence of the pillars that run the state, harmony among the people of the state that promoted integrity and the foreign relations of the

state that opened new vistas of prosperity for the state. This chapter will comprise of the Indo-US nexus and its political implications for Pakistan. These included.

- a) Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan;
- b) Indo-US Nexus and the Kashmir issue;
- c) Indo-US nexus and Pakistan's nuclear assets;
- d) Indo-US nexus to declare Pakistan – a terrorist state;
- e) Indo-US nexus to exert pressure on Pakistan's government;

4.1 Background of the Political Implications of Indo-US Nexus for Pakistan

Pakistan had been one of the most reliable friends of the US during the Cold War and had rendered unforgettable services at the cost of taking its own security at risk and retained the socialist influence in the region. But afterwards as a result of the Indo-US nexus with India, it suffered irreparable losses. Few of the analysts had an opinion that the US weighed India and Pakistan equally in early 1990's. It was, to some extent, defensible. The major change to be called a turning point was Clinton's visit to India. He stayed for five days in India where as his stay in Pakistan was just for five hours. That could be known as a fair proportion of the US ties with India and Pakistan. Clinton declared in 2000 that it was more than mere a slogan to say that India's success would be the US' success and together India and America could change the world.⁹⁵ After the new beginning of their ties, Pakistan was suspected and declared as the responsible for the worst terrorist activities after the Cold War Era by India and the US. Whether it was attack on the Indian parliament or the 9/11 incident, Pakistan was declared as a culprit either directly or indirectly by the US and India.

It had often been claimed that India and the US were far away from each other in the political issues of the international importance. Stephen P Cohen held the view that the emerging power India had a great difference of opinion with that of the US. He believed that the US wanted to enjoy a sole hegemony

⁹⁵ Muhammad Khalid, "Indo-US Nexus", *Pakistan Observer*, (July3, 2002).

of the world while India wanted that there should be five or six super powers in the world and each should be responsible of maintaining the stability in its own region. They must be abstained from meddling in the affairs of other super powers. The Indians were yearning to have a veto power in the United Nations but their desire seemed to be far from being fulfilled.⁹⁶

But one fact could not be denied that though they had a difference of opinion in the political matters of their mutual interests but their designs against Pakistan were almost identical. On the other hand, some positive remarks for India given by the US leadership could not be ignored which clearly depicted that for the US India was one of the most important allies. Like the US ex- President Bush had called India as a natural partner of the US in the 21st Century.⁹⁷ The successful transformation of the US- India relationship was believed to have a constructive influence on the future of international system as it evolved in the new century.

As the concept of the global village had dominated the contemporary world, so the nations of the world were interdependent on each other for the strengthening of their economies. The previous military contest between the global powers had been replaced with the economic acceleration. The economic integration between the states was the foremost priority even while formulating their political interests. The end of the Cold War set a criterion for the super powers that economic power was the most necessary thing to retain the hegemony. The USSR, inspite of having a huge military power, could not survive just because of shallow economy.

The US started formulating its foreign policy directives on the basis of strong economy as a guarantee to sustain the hegemony. The current US foreign policies towards many regions of the world was focused on mainly, the extent of the opportunities offered by those regions and amongst them economic opportunities were preferred. The notions of the dynamics of the global economy were economic transforming, commerce culture, free market etc. Obviously, in South Asia India was the best choice for it. The 'Global Reach' of the US had made it clear that India could be a very effective center for the economic activities of the US. India had become the 10th largest market for US trade. The political interests of the

⁹⁶ Stephen P Cohen, *Emerging Power India*, (New York: The Brookings Institute, 2004) 48.

⁹⁷ *ibid*

states were strongly integrated with the economic interests in the contemporary world. The US had expected to get no economic gain from Pakistan. It could predict huge economic benefits from India. So, in those conditions it was suitable for the US to favour India in all matters of political interests of the international affairs. Their consensus on the political matters of the region meant that they were conflicting with the political interests of Pakistan. As their nexus exerted more pressure on Pakistan to solve the matters by accepting the dominance of India in the region. Alone India could not achieve those ambitions.

Pakistan and Afghanistan had a strong bond of religious harmony and Pakistan's services during the Cold War for the Afghans had brought it close to the Afghan people and they forgot the past adversaries. The Indo-US interference in Afghanistan was an attempt to break those strong ties that Pakistan and Afghanistan had during the Taliban regime. The establishment of pro-Indo-American government in Afghanistan meant that everything would be planned there to harm Pakistan's interests under Indo-US cover. So Pakistan would be politically cut off from Afghanistan. India wanted to besiege Pakistan and the US led war on terror had provided it a golden opportunity to fulfill its designs. Obviously Afghanistan had also become the biggest hurdle for Pakistan in its way to have links with the Central Asian states. On the one side, India bordered Pakistan and on the other side there was Afghanistan.

In the 21st century media had been the source of revealing the intentions of the policy makers or the think tanks. The careful analysis chalked out the intentions of the policy makers as media had been the mouth piece of them. The Indian Express published a column in which it was written that Pakistan's besieged was the outcome of its own coward policies. It wanted to create internal instability in India; it interfered in the matters of Afghanistan and fully backed pro-Pakistan terrorist government. But the international community had saved Afghanistan from complete disaster whereas India's stance had also been accepted by the world and then Pakistan had to surely pay a lot as it was busy in backing Jandullah to create problems for the Iranian Government. They called Pakistan- a busy terrorist state along all its borders.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Bahar Sanjay, *Times of India*, (22 May, 2009).

Other than that the Indo-US Nuclear Deal had been concluded and India seemed to be no longer interested in IPI Gas Pipeline Project. In case of its withdrawal, there were chances of the complete failure of the project which could again be a great blow for Pak-Iran friendship. In order to achieve political isolation of Pakistan, they had consensus to advance Chabahar Port of Iran. Obviously when ports of two states would be competing with each other political rivalry was bound to happen.

The construction of the Gwadar port had been a great example of Pak-China friendship. China had always been a trustworthy ally of Pakistan. The Karakoram Highway was a supreme example of their friendship. China had already invested a huge amount of money in order to make the Gwadar Port operational. Its phase 1 had been completed in 2007. Indo-US had been making all out efforts to stop the constructional as well as operational activities of the Gwadar Port. Had the nexus succeeded in doing so besides getting other advantages by both of them, it would have caused a tremendous setback to the Pak-China relations. That would result in more isolation for Pakistan in the region.

Pakistan could never be besieged because it had ports for carrying trade activities whereas Afghanistan had to depend on those ports for its trade. And the matters between Pakistan and Iran were always solved peacefully and both the governments were quite optimistic to solve that problem or issue peacefully and Pakistan's relations with China had always proved to be time tested.⁹⁹

The 9/11 incident had compelled the nations of the world to join hands with US against the war on terror. It would not be refutable to say that the world community had sponsored for the first time together to eliminate any problem unanimously in the last few decades. Almost all the political and economic giants of the world were on one side to fight against Al-Qaeda. The US-led war on terror and later the allegations by India and the US on Pakistan to sponsor the havens of the terrorists in its Northern Areas was surely meant to turn the international community against it.

Pakistan's Ex-President Pervez Musharraf was forced to undertake a shift towards the US after 9/11 and he was assigned to play a role of a trustworthy ally but the way Pakistan was treated during Ex-President Bush's era confirmed that the US considered Pakistan headache more than an ally due to the root

⁹⁹ Ahmed Farooq, "Pakistan's neighbouring countries" *The Frontier Post*, (January 14, 2010).

cause of all endangers to the US today. It was nurturing the militant extremism. It had all the features of a failed and a rogue state. So it was hoped that as long as Washington needed the collaboration from the states like Pakistan, there was no basis for the idea that the US had maintained its hegemony.¹⁰⁰ It was an effort to isolate Pakistan from the international community. All the major powers of the world were following the US blindly in formulating their policies regarding the war on terror. They were even providing potential support and were called as the US allies in the WOT. The allegations from India and the US meant that any adverse policy towards Pakistan resulting from the allegations would not only be the Indo-US policy but Pakistan could get its bitter fruits from other US allies' of the world which could lead to further political isolation.

4.2 Indo-US Nexus: A great Setback to Kashmir Issue

Indo-US nexus had greatly harmed Pakistan's political interests including its stance on Kashmir. Indians pretended the world community that they believed in solving all the problems through peaceful means that included the dialogue process too. *The Hindustan Times* published news item which showed Indian prime minister's willingness to thrash out all problems very openly with Pakistan's Ex-President Pervaiz Musharraf including Kashmir issue and that was a real gesture of maturity and confidence. It was considered to be the constructive approach from the Indian side.¹⁰¹ In 2005, it was very difficult for the two leaders to meet and discuss very trivial issues. Both leaders could not postpone their discussion on Kashmir issue as it was the source of other problems in the region which could be security threats to the region.¹⁰²

It seemed that India wanted to win the sympathies of the world by presenting itself as a peaceful state ready to compromise with a state that was intended to harm its integrity but beyond the curtain it seemed that it was a part of its rogue diplomacy. It hid the fact from the world and it never allowed the neutral people like journalists or the members of the human rights commission to visit the valley and meet the people freely. To cheat the world, its leader never hesitated to shake hands with the Pakistani leadership

¹⁰⁰ Edward A. Kolodziej, Roger E. Kanet, *from Super Power to Besieged Global Power: Restoring World Order after the Failure of Bush Doctrine*, (US: University of Georgia Press, 2008) 231.

¹⁰¹ Rajeev Sharma, "Conflicts in South Asia" *The Columbo Monthly*(April , 2005):46-55

¹⁰² *The Indian Express*,(May10, 2005).

to pretend their open- heartedness. It had been a part of their treachery to divert the attention of the world community away from the atrocities its forces were committing in Kashmir.

Showing the same enlightenment, Ex- president Musharraf by following the instructions of the US and Indians showed flexibility and called a public debate on the Kashmir issue which would be other than plebiscite. He was much encouraged by the US to ignore the UN resolution which stressed on holding of the plebiscite in Kashmir giving the right of self-determination to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The opinion put forth by General Musharraf was that the state could be divided into seven regions. He further explained that few regions should be provided autonomy or given under the control of the UN's trusteeship while rest of them could be divided between India and Pakistan. His suggestions did not convince any side. It was rejected by the people of Pakistan, Kashmir and India.¹⁰³

The military aid provided to Pakistan became a source of discontent for the Indians. The US made it clear that it was the reward given to Pakistan as a result of the fight against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban and it would not be used against India. The US Defence Secretary Donald Ramsfield visited New Delhi in 2001 and assured India that the close relations with Pakistan would not be at the cost of India's interests.¹⁰⁴ They succeeded in bringing a little leniency in Pakistan's policy towards Kashmir. As the US State Department Director of Policy Planning Richard Haars declared that President Musharaf was determined to fulfill the American goals of eradicating terrorism across the line of control and removing the terrorists' camps was surely in the interests of India as well.

So both India and America should be happy if America succeeded. Indo-US nexus was focusing to disconnect Pakistan with the Indian occupied Kashmir.¹⁰⁵

The Americans believed that their close relationships with Pakistan were in the interests of India too. It was proved when Pakistan's ex-President Pervaiz Musharraf said in an interview that he was ready to solve all the outstanding issues with India including that of Kashmir. He believed that in the 21st century

¹⁰³ Maleeha Lodhi, "Is Kashmir towards Solution?" *Khaleej Times*.(January 13, 2006).

¹⁰⁴ Howard B Schaffer, *The Limits of influence in America's Role in Kashmir* , (New York:Brookings Institutions Press, 2009) 171.

¹⁰⁵ Muhammad Khalid, "Indo-US nexus on Kashmir", *Pakistan Observer*, (July3, 2002).

the states must be flexible to solve their bilateral issues. India and Pakistan must look forward for the betterment of their people. They must think to make the future of their coming generations bright.¹⁰⁶ The critics thought that it was India's victory because in the same interview he assured that cross border terrorism if it happened would be stopped.

Hurriyat Conference, which was the representative of a large mass of Kashmir released a joint statement on 18 April, 2005 and expressed disappointment that the agreement between the leaders of India and Pakistan had not brought any relief to the Kashmiri people and their discussion or intentions to divide the people of Kashmir would never thrive. In that way mistrust was created between the people of Jammu and Kashmir leadership and Pakistan's government. It was a major blow for the Kashmiris because it was an absolute change of policy rather than strategy and India was given a free hand to indulge itself into destructive activities.

Ex. vice Chief of Army Staff General Yusuf claimed that the backchannel diplomacy spearheaded by General Musharraf's reliable sub-ordinate Tariq Aziz was undertaken without taking army brass into confidence. Retired Lt. General Shukat Aziz had revealed that Musharraf used to take decisions unilaterally.¹⁰⁷ Few of the critics believed that the U- Turn on Kashmir policy was not a decision made by Musharraf alone; they believed that such a great shift was done by Pakistan Army under the pressure of the US. They did not visualize the situation that the loss of Kashmir Card would leave them at the mercy of Indian machinations.¹⁰⁸

Under the American umbrella India kept on trying to find any solution that could push Pakistan away from its actual stance over Kashmir. In order to stop the resistance in Kashmir it blamed Pakistan's Jash-e-Muhammad, Lashkr-e- Tayiba and declared them terrorist organizations that were involved in terrorist activities not only in Kashmir but all over India. India's plan was to exert pressure on Pakistan in order to stop it supporting the Kashmiris morally and politically. It was trying to push Pakistan on the defending position so that it would not be in a position to demand to award Kashmir to it.

¹⁰⁶ *CNN News*, (June 7, 2005). 10:00 p.m

¹⁰⁷ Brig Asif Haroon Raja, "Upcoming Pakistan-US Strategic Dialogue in Washington," *The News* (April 24, 2010)

¹⁰⁸ *ibid*

The US invited India to attend the meeting of the communities of democracies in Warsaw in July, 2000. The invitation indicated that India had been accepted to stand as a “peer among nations who determined the destinies of the lesser states”.¹⁰⁹ Awarding that high status to India surely had a direct political implication for Pakistan. In the contemporary era, the nations were heading to the dialogue process to solve their mutual conflicts. Pakistan had always preferred the dialogue process over any other way for the solution of the problems and conflicts. It was India that had always derailed the dialogue process. Inviting India to such conferences would surely discard the dialogue process between India and Pakistan that was the only option seemed for the solution of the problems. It gave sense of superiority to India as being among the list of the communities of democracies.

4.3 Indo-US Joint Allegations against Pakistan

It could not be accepted as an absolute fact that Pakistan was responsible for providing the nuclear technology to Iran, North Korea and Libya. However, the allegations of assistance could not be ignored. The reality was that all the states having nuclear capability had achieved the nuclear capability by getting the fissile material illegally from other states. On the other hand, by analyzing the facts fairly one could judge that Pakistan was not a signatory to Nuclear Proliferation Treaty whereas the USA, being itself the signatory to the NPT, had shared nuclear weapons to Belgium, Germany, Italy, Canada and Greece.

Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad had criticized them as violation of NPT Article 1 and 11 arguing that the Articles did not permit Nuclear Weapon States to entrust the control of their nuclear weapons directly or indirectly to others. The recent Indo-US Nuclear Deal was also a violation of NPT.¹¹⁰

Cyber warfare had been a multifarious, more piercing and detrimental than the conventional warfare. Cyber warfare was a new battlefield for Pakistan’s government and people and it had an equal

¹⁰⁹ *The Hindustan Times* (February 22, 2001).

¹¹⁰ Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, “NPT in 2000, Challenges Ahead,” *ISSI Journal*, (Spring,2003).

threat of that of the conventional war. The US, Israel and India had joined hands. There were reports that much of the money, technology and talent had been utilized to defame Pakistan and its nukes.¹¹¹

There were reports that confirmed that the “US pressurized Pakistan to take dubious Permissive Action link boxes to put on its nuclear program to prevent ‘unauthorized’ detonation of bombs but Pakistan quite sensibly refused these locks which are said to be impossible to beat”¹¹²

That was a clear evidence of how the enemies were determined to harm Pakistan’s nuclear assets through Cyber warfare. Till April 2009, Pentagon had spent 100 million dollars in six months to fight against Cyber attacks on various systems and money spent on propaganda was apart from that.¹¹³

Like the US, India also played up threat posed by religious extremists in Pakistan and agreed on the theme that Pak nukes were insecure and liable to be stolen by terrorists. In order to indicate interest of terrorists in Pak nukes, a fake interview was given to a private TV channel by Afghan based so-called Al-Qaeda leader Mustafa Abu Al-Yazid on 22 June. He boasted of using Pak nuclear weapons against the US. It was surely an attempt to legitimize the expected act of taking over the Pakistan’s nuke by US marines. The interview was given in Khost (eastern province of Afghanistan), which further strengthened the speculation by western countries and the US officials including Hillary Clinton that Al-Qaeda leadership was based in FATA.¹¹⁴ In actuality, the bomb had already been stolen from Kaiga Atomic Power Plant in Karnataka through an Indian scientist Lokanathan Mahalingham. The matter was very cunningly hushed up even the dead body of the scientist was recovered. He had been murdered either to confiscate all footprints or else “he was about to spill the beans”.¹¹⁵ Ironically, well aware Western media did not utter a word about the incident.

In order to harm the strategic interests of Pakistan, the Indo-US nexus crossed all the limits and kept on giving statements that Pakistan’s nukes could be accessed to the terrorists easily. To create

¹¹¹ Farzana Shah, “India-Israel, Cyber War against Pakistan’s Nuclear Program”, <[www.southasiananalysis.org/%5Cpapers](http://www.southasiananalysis.org/%5Cpapers%5C)>(retrieved on March 5, 2010).

¹¹² Shah, op.cit.96

¹¹³ ibid

¹¹⁴ *The Dawn*, (June 1, 2008).

¹¹⁵ *The Dawn* (June 1, 2008).

sensation the American journalist Rolf Mowatt Larson built his case against the Pakistan's nuke on the basis of following acts of terror which took place in 2007- 2009. According to him in November 2007 an Air Force bus was hit by the terrorists, another bus was hit on the GT Road near Kamra, six people were arrested from Sargodha who were intending to carry suicide blasts there in August 2009, attack on the gate of Ordnance Factory in Wah, attack on GHQ's entrance gate in October 2009, attack on the entrance of the Naval HQ in Islamabad in December 2009.¹¹⁶ He asserted that all those attacks were carried on the nuclear installations. He claimed that there were almost 8000 to 12,000 people working in various nuclear related installations and majority of them had their sympathies with Al-Qaeda and Taliban.¹¹⁷ Almost similar reports appeared in the Indian media and newspapers. For the American media, Pakistan was a "failed" state and for the Indian media it was not only a failed but also a 'rogue' state. The Indian newspapers published a news item that the Taliban were about to take over Islamabad and Kahuta.

They failed to defame Pakistan and its nukes even after spending a lot of money. Their pleasures to create misconceptions shattered when an official statement was released by Pakistani foreign office spokesman:

*"Pakistan's nukes are safe and are kept under full proof arrangements. There are zero chances that these can be stolen and mishandled by the terrorists. These are safe far beyond the imaginations of those raising propaganda against Pakistan's nuclear assets...Pakistan being a nuclear state is fully aware of its responsibilities."*¹¹⁸

Indo-US nexus had attempted to declare Pakistan as a terrorist state. India did not lose opportunity to declare Pakistan a terrorist state since the post- cold war era. India requested the international community to declare Pakistan a terrorist state and accused that Pakistan promoted terrorism in Kashmir and the militants who fought there in Kashmir were trained on the Pakistani soil. In order to fulfill its ambition of declaring Pakistan as a terrorist state, it provided support to the Russian backed Northern Alliance in Afghanistan and it pushed the people of Afghanistan into a civil war but blamed Pakistan that it interfered in Afghanistan's matter. Indian government, in order to get the attention of all the western countries including US, condemned the Taliban's implemented Islamic Law.

¹¹⁶ Rolf Mowatt Larson. "Terrorists are close to Nukes" *Washington Post*, (March 6, 2010).

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ *The News* (March 29, 2010).

The Indo-US nexus strongly appeared against Pakistan after 9/11. Whatsoever was done in Afghanistan, Pakistan was declared as culprit by the US and whatsoever was done in India by the terrorists, Pakistan was declared as guilty by India without even trying to find proof. With the establishment of Taliban regime in Afghanistan, India started propaganda against Pakistani madrassas.

Madrassas were considered to be the institutions that save the life of people from being indulged in sins. They tried to shape the life of the people according to the teachings of Islam. Usually they served as sanctuary for the homeless and displaced people. These imparted education to the people who did not have access to the formal education. Masjid and Madrassa had a focal point for the individual's moral grooming in Pakistan. At madrassa, students learn how to recite, memorize and render the Holy Quran properly. Other branches of higher studies were also imparted to the students in Madrassas. But violence in the name of religion had never originated or considered as their dominant feature. Madrassas, that were a normal part of the life of the people of Pakistan, were quite different from those very few madrassas that promoted international terrorism and sectarianism. The Indo-US authorities blamed madrassas as a source of promoting terrorism in the name of Jihad through their syllabus. Their reputation was greatly harmed in the international community.

India struggled a lot to declare Pakistan a terrorist state since the end of the Cold War. It got a little success when the US properly joined hands and on December 26, 2001 the US Treasury Department Office of Foreign Assets (OFAC) included Lashkar-e-Taiba (LT) in the list of those organizations suspected to be the supporters of terrorists and had assets and the US had a legal access of them to be controlled or frozen. In May 2005, Secretary of State Collin Powell renewed the status of Jash-e-Muhammad and Lashkar-e-Tayiba as foreign terrorist Organizations. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher made an announcement on 23rd December that renewal was made in consultation with Attorney General John Ashcroft and Treasury Secretary John Snow.¹¹⁹ That action gave free hand to the US government to deny visas to the representatives or the leaders of those organizations and charity was banned to them that also included any type of military support to them and their assets were also frozen.

¹¹⁹ Subhash Kapoor, *Pakistan, Madrassa, Extremism and Terrorism*, (Bangalore; Sunder Publication , 2006)23,26

Pakistan's government decided to take action against those organizations under the huge international pressure. These included leaders of Lashkar-e-Tayiba and Jash-e-Muhammad as well as Jammiat-ulema-i- Islam, Muslim parties having ties with Taliban and Kashmiri terrorist groups. Ex-President Musharraf vowed that he would not allow its territories to be used against any country by the terrorists. LT was banned and its assets were frozen by the Pakistan's government in January 2002. Jammat-ud-Dawa which was closely linked with banned militant groups Al-Rashid Trust and LT, was not banned officially but was kept under government's watch list.

All the terrorists' activities that took place in India after 2001, Pakistan was declared as the responsible for them either directly or indirectly. LT was also believed to be involved in the attack in May, 2002 on an Indian Army base in Kaluchak that left 336 dead. That was just the beginning, as LT was accused of some more terrorists' activities including bomb blasts near a Hindu Temple in August 2003, two bombs blasted in Mumbai killing 40 and wounding 120 people, attacks in Bangalore in 2005, in 2006 attacks on multiple Mumbai Commuter trains, bomb blasts in Uther Pardesh, Rajasthan, and Hyderabad in 2007 and 2008.¹²⁰

The pro-Indian government in Afghanistan did not leave behind the campaign of blaming Pakistan as a terrorist State. Afghan investigators believed that the suicide killer who crashed the explosive laden car into Indian embassy in Kabul in July 2008 was a LT operative. Indian intelligence also confirmed that Hamza Shakoor, a resident of Pakistani city Gujranwala district was believed to be the suspected of killing 54 people including four Indian diplomats in Kabul. Again the tentative recognition was that of a LET's worker.¹²¹ India took the matter to Washington to win the American sympathies and a US official flee to Pakistan to handover the reports and proofs given by the Indian government. The US again pressurized Pakistan to cooperate with India in order to avoid that kind of incident again.

A report appeared on the US media confirmed that Al-Qaeda operative Abu Zubaydah, who was declared as the operational chief after the death of the renowned leader Muhammad Atif, was caught in a Lashkar's safe house at Faisalabad Pakistan. Other internationally renowned terrorists including David

¹²⁰ *ibid*

¹²¹ *BBC News* (June 17,2007).

Hicks, Richard Reid and Dhiren Barot had also got training in LET's camp and demanded Pakistan to allow FBI to approach them.¹²²

Al-Qaeda was an international Organization and its network was worldwide spreading not only in Pakistan but it stretched from Arab countries to Africa and from Africa to Europe and America. If any terrorist of Al-Qaeda had been caught in Europe, Africa or in America, it did not mean that those states had been supporting them. It was just because of their nexus that Pakistan was imaged as a terrorist state.

The Mumbai attacks had made the situation even worse for Pakistan. A group of ten terrorists attacked at different places at Mumbai and killed 192 people. As soon the situation reached at its climax, India started declaring Pakistan behind the incident and claimed that the Pakistan's Agency ISI was behind the attack. Indian media started propaganda against Pakistan that the terrorists came from the Pakistani controlled maritime area. It succeeded in winning the sympathies of the international community and, taking advantage of that, took the matter to the United Nations and the US supported India's stance in the UN. The United Nations banned the suspected organizations including Jammāt-ud-Dawa. However, no solid evidence was found on the basis of which Pakistan could be declared as a terrorist state. The members of the UNO declared that non-state actors were involved in that act to push both the nuclear powers into the nuclear war.

"Do more" was the demand often made by the US administration. Pakistan had already paid a lot as a result of the war on terror. It had lost precious lives of not only the security personnel but also of the common people including school going children, shopkeepers, other professionals etc. All the provinces became victim of the terrorists' activities a number of times. The terrorists attacked the Army Headquarters, shopping centers, markets, mosques. Even the educational institutions were not safe from them. All was due to Pakistan's decision to join the US in the war on terror. So what more could Pakistan pay to protect the US' interests in the region. The demand of 'Do More' did not make any sense for the country that had already done a lot by even tossing its own security and integrity at risk.

¹²² Schmidt Susan, Siobhan Gorman, "Lashkar-e-Taiba served as a gateway for Western Converts Turning to Jihad", *Wall Street Journal*, (December 4, 2004)

4.4 Indo-US Joint Efforts to Build Up Internal Pressure on the Elected Government of Pakistan

Indo-US nexus did not lose a single opportunity to build up internal pressure on Pakistan that could lead towards instability. In case of creating internal instability, both the states could achieve some common aspirations including to compel the Pakistani government to take steps that were desirous to both India and the US. The joint moves by both the states had become a source of internal controversy amongst the institutions of the state. On February 17, 2009 there were reports that Taliban's top commander had been arrested as a result of the joint raid by US and Pakistan's intelligence forces.¹²³ The Pakistan's Interior Minister Rehman Malik said in that context:

*"We are verifying all those we have arrested, if there is any big target, I will show the nation"*¹²⁴

The comment came a day after the *New York Times* reported that Afghan's top Taliban commander Mullah Abdul Ghani Badr was arrested in Karachi during a secret operation by Pakistan and American spy. In the context of that news, Pakistan's Interior Minister said:

*"If New York Times or India TV gives information; it is not a divine truth, it can be wrong. We have joint intelligence sharing and no joint investigation, nor joint raids... We are a sovereign state and hence will not allow anybody to come and do any operation. So this (report) is propaganda."*¹²⁵

The purpose behind the report was nothing but to build up pressure of the people of Pakistan on the government. Obviously when people of the state would be against its government, the government would have no other way except to look towards the foreign support to sustain its credibility in the state. If the foreign pressure was applied, the government always had a very limited choice either to resign or to accept the foreign demands. Indo-US nexus adopted that policy successfully during Musharraf's regime. They pressurized him when they knew that the public had turned against him and got the desired results.

¹²³ "Report of Taliban Commander's Arrest, a propaganda: Pakistan," *The Indian Monthly*(February 17,2010).

¹²⁴ *ibid*

¹²⁵ *The Indian Monthly*, (February 17, 2010).

The US again in the present conditions when a democratic government was working there in the state wanted to create political instability by creating misunderstanding between the people and government or between government and army. The US President Barrack Obama's remark could be evident of that in which he showed great concerns over the fate of Pakistan's government because it could not provide services to the people.¹²⁶ Obviously the fact was that they did not like the government because they were not entertained the way Musharraf did in his period. The intentions of the US government were confirmed through Admiral Mullen's writing that he did not remember the details of his first meeting with General Ashfaq Pervaiz Kiyanni, the Pakistan's Chief of Army Staff. But he could remember that he was a man with plans, a leader who knew where he wanted to go. He understood the nature of extremists' threat inside Pakistan and had started working up solutions without waiting for any permission from inside the country.¹²⁷ These kinds of comments surely intended to create misunderstanding among the institutions of the state. The reality was that Pakistan's Army Chief had always consulted the government and fully followed the instructions of the government. In other words, there was complete consensus between the government and the army.

The harsh language of the Kerry-Lugar Bill and observation in it really mounted anger of Pakistan's military services and intelligence agencies. The army had also protested to the US when Commander of International Forces in Afghanistan General McChrystal met Army Chief General Ashfaq Pervaiz Kiyanni at GHQ. The Pakistan's Chief of the Army Staff informed him that the Pakistani people, the military and the intelligence services had reservations over the articles added against Pakistan's security establishment in the KLB.¹²⁸

Kerry Lugar bill imposed restrictions on Pakistan's army not to interfere in country's political and judicial matters. In addition, it conferred the authority to the US to decide about the promotion of Pakistani senior army person. It also tried to limit the working of Pakistani Agency ISI. Again the purpose behind the bill seemed to create misunderstanding between Pakistan's army, government and the people. It was a deception to destabilize the government and the state.

¹²⁶ Ahmed Qureshi, "Obama is lying about Pakistan," *International Analysis network*, (May 5, 2009).

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Kamran Khan, *The News*, (October 12, 2009).

It would not be incorrect to say that the Indo-US nexus was working together to destabilize Pakistan internally and to defame it externally. It was time to demand that Indian operatives move out of Afghanistan and Indian consulates in Afghanistan along the border area with Pakistan be closed. The fact that the Indian aggression had come immediately in the aftermath of the discussions between the Indians and visiting Americans including Defense Secretary Gates, and following on the heels of the visit to Kabul by India's DG MI, showed only too clearly the Indo-US nexus in terms of presenting Pakistan with a possible two-front threat.

The political interests of the contemporary states were strongly integrated with each other in order to get their economic interests. The growing Indo-US economic relations directed the political consensus over the different issues between the two states. The mutual economic interests of both the states had brought them even closer to each other. India had proved herself to be amongst the largest markets for the US as it imported sophisticated machinery, computers, gas turbines, electrical machinery etc. The US had become the second largest investor in India. So, the US and India were close to each other on political forums and economic interests served a bridge between them to attain their political interests.

CHAPTER-5

INDO-US NEXUS AND ITS ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN

Economics had been the major element of strategy which can never be separated from politics and military. While formulating the foreign policies, the states keep their economic interests before them. It has been rightly said that the next hegemony of the world would be the one that has the strong economy. History tells that the USSR had a great military and political power but even then it could not retain its hegemony due to its economic crisis and hence disintegrated. This chapter will deal with the issues that were considered to be the hurdle in Pakistan's economic progress and were resulted from the Indo-US nexus. These were:

- a) Economic sanctions on Pakistan before 9/11;
- b) Economic implications of Indo-US nexus against the Gwadar Port for Pakistan;
- c) IPI Gas Pipeline Project and its expected impacts on Pakistan's economy;
- d) Pakistan's economy and Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan;
- e) Decline in the state's reserves after the War on Terror;

5.1 Economic Sanctions on Pakistan before 9/11

Pakistan faced economic sanctions in 1990's. Pakistan's cotton industry faced countless problems as a result of the unfair sanctions. The quota of Pakistan's fabrics reduced in the international market in the year 1995-96. India's fabrics, in spite of having the low quality were preferred. Pakistan was alleged for the child labor by Indian and American media as a result of the report presented by the United Nations' Committee on October 16, 1995 by the human rights' agency that was working under the UN comprised of four Indians and seven Americans besides other nine members from different countries.¹²⁹ According to a survey 50% of the population of Pakistan had been spending the life below the poverty line. There was just an eldest male to fulfill the economic needs of the entire family. When the eldest boy of the family attained the age of 14 or 15 years, he was assumed to be ready to take up responsibility of the family members by sharing the economic burden. What could be preferred? Either death resulting from poverty or doing labor to avert the gloomy fate. In India, the child labor was very commonly practiced. While ignoring that absolutely, Indian and the US media showed documentaries of the industries of Sialkot where children from the ages 12 to 15 were shown working in the industries making footballs and other sports goods.

In another report which appeared in January, 1996 raised objection that Pakistan had been a poor country and its government did not provide education facilities to the children. At least free primary education should be provided to the children. The report emphasized that a person at the age of even 16 years was considered as a child according to the United Nations Declaration. The report suggested that in the coming Soccer World Cup 1996, sports goods especially football should not be taken from Pakistan.¹³⁰ Their suggestions were accepted and a number of countries boycotted Pakistan's sports goods and the industry suffered a huge loss.

¹²⁹ Farrukh Kamal, "Economic condition of the South Asian Countries" <<http://www.saag.org/papers13/paper1279.html>>

Again, Pakistan suffered huge economic losses as a result of the sanctions imposed when the military took the charge of the government in the year 1999. The US imposed military sanctions and India fully supported them. India was amongst the first countries that favored those sanctions. Their foreign office released the statement in November 1999 that said that the military dictatorship had always been harmful not only for the subject state but also for the neighbors as two major wars in 1965 and 1971 were fought when there was military rule in Pakistan.¹³¹

5.2 Economic Implications of Indo-US Nexus against the Gwadar Port of Pakistan

India and the US showed their great concerns over the construction of the Gwadar Port. They were doing their utmost struggle to stop the construction and productivity of the port. The background of the port, its importance for Pakistan and reasons for Indo-US concerns were:

The Gwadar Port had multidimensional geostrategic significance. The technical and financial feasibilities for the development of the Gwadar Port were started for the first time by Pakistan government in 1993 from the straits of Hormuz through which 13 million bbd of oil passed. Its strategic importance had been enhanced due to three important regions surrounding it that included:¹³²

1. the oil rich Middle East;
2. heavenly populated South Asia; and
3. economically emerging and source rich Central Asian Republics

China showed a great interest in the construction of ambitious maritime access project of Gwadar Port in Balochistan in 2001. Pakistani leadership had already felt the urgency of this project following the 1999 Kargil Crisis. India deployed its destroyers, submarines and frigates quickly just outside the Karachi harbor. 90 % of the Pakistan's trade including oil imports was carried out on that route. Karachi port was also known as a Head Quarters of the Pakistan Navy. The major vulnerability of Pakistan navy was

¹³¹ N..Jayapalan, *Foreign Policy of India*,(New Delhi: Atlantic Publication ,2001)54

¹³² Gupta op.cit. 880.

revealed when the Indian Navy bottled up the Pakistan Navy quickly in 1999. The construction process was initiated during the US invasion of Afghanistan as Beijing felt the presence of the US in Central Asia as alarming for its own interests.¹³³

The first phase of the project that completed in December 2004 had three functioning berths having length of 602 m, 45 km and 100 m service berth. The port had the capacity to handle bulk carriers weighing up to 30,000 tons and container vessels weighing up to 25,000 tons the cost of the first phase was \$ 248 million while the total cost of the project was approx at \$ 1.16 billion. China's contribution was \$ 198 million in that phase and \$ 200 million to the construction of Makran Coastal Highway that linked Gwadar to Karachi.¹³⁴

The second phase of the project was planned to construct nine more berths and terminals that would be able to handle ships in 200,000 ton category. Over there 18,600 hectares of land would be developed which included "400 hectares in phase 1 and 11 for port development; an export processing zone of 74 hectares, a special industrial zone of about 400 hectares and 1,000 hectares oil refinery".¹³⁵

The oil rich Middle East states could be helpful to Pakistan to improve its economy. Pakistan had planned to increase its export with those countries through the port. It could export rice, fruits, wheat cotton, garments and other luxuries of life to those countries. Pakistan could also get oil and fuel at a reasonable rate from those countries. If the Middle East states preferred to use the Gwadar Port, Pakistan would get transit fee from them in return to that service of providing them facility to use the port.

South Asia which had been a thickly populated area and obviously its needs were more than the needs of the people of any other continents. Through the Gwadar Port, the goods could easily be accessed to Pakistan by the Central Asian states that were landlocked.

The Port was strategically located to serve as a key shipping point in the region. The port would be a source to provide access to the landlocked Central Asian States, Afghanistan and the Chinese Xingiang

¹³³ Amardeep Athwal, "China-India Relations: Contemporary Dynamics", (London: Routledge, 2008).

¹³⁴ *ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

province to the Arabian Sea's warm water. The under construction road from Gwadar to Saindak ran parallel to the Pak-Iran border which would be the shortest route between Central Asia and Arabian Sea. Pakistan could earn a huge profit as a transit fee as the port would transfer Central Asia's vast resources to the world market. It was beneficial for China as it secured its crude oil import and provided it an opportunity to extend its presence in the Indian Ocean.¹³⁶

The optimistic side of that port was that once the road links were established, its routes would provide quite quicker and cheaper transportation than the other primary alternatives that included the shipment of goods from South Asia through Suez Canal and then into Mediterranean and then into Black Seaport of Odessa in Ukraine. It would surely enhance the trade potential of CAR's through Gwadar. It would be alternative route for the supply of oil and gas resources to the global market.¹³⁷

The government had decided to declare Gwadar as an industrial zone and being the hub of the economic activities, it would surely open new vistas of economic development in the coastal region. It would attract the tourists, job opportunities would be created as a result of the foreign investment. Gwadar had an airport for the commercial aircrafts. Different export companies had decided to establish their zones in that coastal area. Pakistan had a plan to connect that port with the Karakoram Highway. In that case the port would be very beneficial for China as well as for Pakistan.

The people of Balochistan would surely find opportunities to progress economically. The port would be a source of providing employments to them. The flow of foreign investment in that province would surely attract the local people to invest in all the sectors including education and health sector. The local people would be able to afford to send their children to good schools and automatically a cyclic process of progress would be started. The history of Balochistan tells that three main tribes Bugti, Mengal and Muree had been living in the province for centuries. They had made the local people of the province their sub-ordinates and their interests were to keep the local people of Balochistan away from all those developmental projects. The common residents of that area were already fed up of those false Sardars.

¹³⁶ Ziad Haider, "Baluchistan, Beijing and Pakistan's Gwadar Port, Politics and Diplomacy" ,(winter/spring 2005).

¹³⁷ Jahanzeb, "The trade potential and industrial development in Gwadar". *Journal of Management Science*, vol 1(2007).

They did not pay heed to their perceptions against developmental projects. After failing to win the support of the local people, they turned towards the anti-Pakistan elements and joined hands with India and the US in order to take revenge from Pakistan.

If the Indo-US nexus succeeded in harming the Gwadar Port Project, it would be a great economic loss for Pakistan. The deplorable condition of the people of Balochistan would not be changed. Foreign investment would be stopped if terrorists' activities become hurdle in the way of smooth trade running in that area. The total estimation spent by Pakistan was approx \$ 1.16 billion. Although China had contributed a lot, but whatsoever Pakistan had contributed in its limited resources, it's a huge amount.¹³⁸ The hurdles in Gwadar Port's operational activities could result in loss of that money.

These Indo-US activities were really harmful for the operational activities of the Gwadar Port. Pakistan had spent a lot of money on the construction of the Port. These terrorists' activities could surely limit China's investment in the construction of the port. If China once changed its intention of using any other alternative way for the oil supply and to have an access to the energy rich Central Asian States, it would be a huge economic setback for Pakistan. The local investors would be hesitant to invest their money in that industrial zone. These mistrusts were surely created due to their joint efforts. In order to make the Gwadar Port less important, India was making efforts to advance the Iranian Chabahar Port which could limit the economic efficiency of the Gwadar Port. Obviously when there would be insurgency on Pakistan's port while peace on the Iranian side, the investors and the traders would surely preferred Chabahar Port.

If the operational activities of the Gwadar Port succeeded then there was a threat for the US to retain its hegemony in the world. It had been said that the next super power and hegemony of the world would be the state that would control the Arabian Sea. So in that context keeping the facts in front of them, the US and India had nexus to keep the activities at the Gwadar Port limited.

¹³⁸ *ibid*

5.3 Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) Gas Pipe Line project and its expected impacts for Pakistan's economy

The IPI gas pipe line was first suggested by the Director General India Energy Resources Dr R K Pachauri and Dr A S Ardedani of Iran in 1989. Iran had the world's second largest energy reserves and India wanted to benefit from them.¹³⁹ But the major problem was that Pakistan would be a transit country. The tensions between India and Pakistan hardly reduced in the last few decades so for India that project seemed to be far from reality as Pakistan itself had enough energy resources to meet its needs. The plan took a sudden turn when Pakistan faced a shortfall of the natural gas. That was considered to be the revival of the plan.¹⁴⁰

Pakistan, which was already facing the energy crisis desperately, wanted the conclusion of such kind of an agreement. Its industries were closed only due to lack of the energy resources. Pakistan was supposed to get the transit fee from India in case of the completion of the project. Although Washington tried to derail Pakistan from getting the pipeline from Iran but did not promise any commitment as it had finalized its Nuclear Deal with India. Indians believed that if they were out of the deal, Iran would never go for bilateral agreement with Pakistan. A senior official said in May 2008:

"We are engaged with Washington regarding the fulfillment of our energy requirement and if we quit from IPI, its future would be gloomy even on the bilateral level of the two other party states".¹⁴¹

According to the initial design of the project, 2,700 km long pipeline would cover 1,100 km in Iran, 600 km in India and 1000km in Pakistan. The size of the gas pipeline was estimated to be 56 inches in diameter. The official report prepared by the petroleum ministry and ISGS said that Pakistan would be able to generate 5,000 megawatts power after purchasing the gas. The petroleum ministry said that there would be annual saving of up to \$ 1 billion in furnace oil import if the crude oil prices were at \$ 50 per barrel as a result of the power generation and the consumption of the Iranian imported gas by heavy industries. Under

¹³⁹ Rosh Ganer, *Energy Crisis in South Asia*, (Banglore, New World Publication, 1989)166

¹⁴⁰ Lgia Noronha, "Anaut Sudarhan. India's Energy Politics", *Taylor and Francis*, (2009).89

¹⁴¹ India TV (June 11, 2009). 6p.m

the agreement, in 2010 Iran would provide 750 million cubic feet of gas per day to Pakistan for 25 years. Pakistan would earn an estimated one billion dollar annually as a transit fee.

The IPI Gas Pipe Line Project seemed nearly impossible due to the Indo-US nexus. The Indo-US Nuclear Deal would be mutually beneficial for both the countries but it would have huge negative economic impacts on Pakistan as the IPI Gas Pipe line project was towards its failures. Pakistan would be at a great loss as it had been facing acute shortage of energy and its industrial sector was facing crisis and the failure of IPI Gas Pipeline Project would be a great setback to the hopes of fulfilling energy needs. Pakistan would have to lose transit fee if India withdrew from the deal. Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) was established in the year 1983 and there were three member countries that were Iran, Turkey and Pakistan though, later on, the number of the member countries was extended and CAS also joined it. The aim of the establishment of the organization was to strengthen the economic ties between the member states. The failure of IPI Gas Pipeline could lead the ECO towards failure which had already been towards its lowest ebb.

5.4- Indo-US Nexus in Afghanistan and Pakistan's Economy

The Indo-US in Afghanistan had created a lot of problems for the economic growth of Pakistan. Pakistan suffered directly or indirectly a huge loss of 35 billion dollars since 2004 to 2009 as a result of the war against terror.¹⁴² The main problems that emerged after the US' invasion of Afghanistan included foreign investment in Pakistan. There was a time when the economy of the state was rapidly progressing due to the investment of different states of the world. Pakistan was considered amongst those countries that had an ideal environment for the investment. The investors invested in all the sectors including education, health, construction of roads and motorways, banks, telecoms etc.

The state faced a deficit of 108.527 billion in 2007 which was expected to reach at Rs 114 billion in the year 2008-09 which affected the state's socio-economic development badly. The foreign investment

¹⁴² Khalid Hassan, "War on Terror Costs Pakistan \$ 35 billion", *The News*, (May 19, 2009).

in Pakistan had been reduced to \$ 910.20 million from 1.4 billion in the year 2008. “Net foreign investment had registered a decline of some 324 million dollars during the first seven months (July-January 2009) of fiscal year.” The Indo-US backed terrorism had shaken the confidence of the foreign investors in Pakistan. As a result of that the downfall in the banking sector had been clearly observed. The bank deposits fell from Rs 3.77 trillion to 3.17 trillion on September 2009. Foreign direct investment in Pakistan declined by 54.6 % in the last seven months of the fiscal year 2009-10 as the foreign investment dropped down to only \$ 1.18 billion according to the State Bank.¹⁴³

Pakistan’s foreign exchange reserves fell from 14.43 to \$ 14.23 billion on October 3, 2009. The statement released by the State Bank confirmed that the reserves held by the bank were \$ 10.64 billion a week earlier while the commercial banks were holding \$ 3.59 billion. The statement released by the central bank said that foreign reserves fell steadily from \$ 16.5 billion in October to \$ 6.6 billion in the year 2009 largely because of the active role played in the WOT.¹⁴⁴

According to a report in the year 2003, 140 civilians and 24 security personnel were killed in terrorists’ activities in Pakistan. In the year 2004, the figures fluctuated to the death of 435 civilians and 184 security persons. 430 civilians lost their lives in 2005, while 81 security persons were killed. In the year 2006, 608 civilians and 325 security people died in the terrorists’ activities all over the country. The figures again enhanced in 2007 when it was declared that in the different terrorists’ activities 1523 civilians and 597 security people had lost their lives. While in 2008, 2155 civilians and 654 security people lost their lives. In the year 2009, the death toll was 2307 civilians and 1011 security people in different terrorists’ activities. Majority of the incidents took place in different parts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Rawalpindi, Lahore and Karachi.¹⁴⁵

The major industrial centers that were demolished in terrorists’ activities in Pakistan were Marriot Hotel Islamabad, Moon Market Lahore, Qisa Khawani Bazar Peshawar, industrial zone in Karachi. As a result of that the traders had to bear the loss of billions of dollars. The government had to provide

¹⁴³ *ibid*

¹⁴⁴ *The Nation*, (November 6, 2009).

¹⁴⁵ [http// www.sassu.org.com.loss-of-life-in -Pakistan-paper/2030](http://www.sassu.org.com.loss-of-life-in -Pakistan-paper/2030)(retrieved on January, 2010).

compensation to those who lost their business in those activities. The reimbursement given to them by the government was a great load on the budget while on the other hand it was not enough for the businessmen to restart their business with the same condition that was before the destruction of their properties. The compensation given to the families of the martyred were too huge but even then it was nothing for the families that had five to six members to feed and their sole earners were killed in the terrorism.

An interview of a woman was presented on the television. She told that the bread earner of her family was killed and her eldest son was injured in the Qisa Khawani Bazar Peshawar's incident. She was given Rs 100,000 as compensation. Her eldest son was of 14 years who had been on bed since then. The money given by the government had been consumed on treatment of her son. Rests of all children were below the age of 10. The loss of her husband was the greatest tragedy of her life. She never knew that who would fulfill the responsibilities of her children till they grow up and take the responsibility. For her the life was futile as she could not see her starved children yelling for food.¹⁴⁶

Another interview was presented on media in which it was shown that a widow had five children and the two eldest were abnormal. They could not walk; they could not eat any solid thing. They were just fed on milk. The only bread earner of their family was no more in the world to fulfill the requirements of his lame sons. The money promised for compensation was not given even after six months. The eldest one grew weak because he did not get the required food and died while the second one was in a critical condition.¹⁴⁷

Obviously the government provided money to the victims and at the same time it had to take measures to secure the lives of the people too. The sources of income for the government were limited as there was no foreign investment and expenditures and price for the war on terror were too high. The government requested the international community for aid but nothing practical could have been done. The losses that Pakistan had to bear in the War on Terror were really a huge one. The economy of every individual had suffered a lot. The operations going on in FATA and other areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa started under a pressure of the US. The state had consumed a huge amount of money in buying weapons

¹⁴⁶ *Express News*, (December 22, 2009). 10.pm

¹⁴⁷ *Express News*, (December 20, 2009).7a.m

that were used against the terrorists. So the expenses of the war inside the country were almost far behind the calculations.

Pakistan had to join hands with the US in the WOT under a huge international pressure. The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Chamber of Commerce published a report in which it was mentioned that some 3,500 industrial units were functioning in the province before the start of the war against terror but that number had been reduced to 600 in 2009. According to the analysis of the State Bank of Pakistan, net foreign investment had declined by 13% in the year 2009. All that happened due to the frequent terrorism activities in Pakistan. Pakistan was heavily indebted with foreign debts standing at a \$44.5 billion. IMF released a report that predicted that Pakistan's GDP would decrease to 3.5% in the fiscal year starting in July 2009. It was 5.8% in the year 2007-2008 and approximately 5.4% for 2008-2009.¹⁴⁸

Pakistani rupee had slumped by more than 30% against the US Dollar in 2009 and share prices had been dropped down by 40%. In the year 2002, Karachi Stock Exchange was declared as the best Stock Exchange of the world. On 31st December 2007 KSE closed at the index of 14,127 points with capitalization of Rs 4.57 trillion. But soon after the government's declaration of war within the state, the index dropped to 4,675 points with market capitalization of Rs 1.58 trillion, a loss of over 65% from its capitalization in 2007.¹⁴⁹

Pakistan had to declare action against the so called extremist elements known as Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan. It was done as a result of the Indo-US pressure on Pakistan. Firstly, there was a peace agreement concluded between Pakistan government and the extremists but soon after that NATO and US forces faced more resistance in Afghanistan and a result of their joint pressure Pakistan had to change the policy.

As a result of the Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan, pro-Indian government had been established and other than terrorism Pakistan had to face the scarcity of the food items as those had often been smuggled to

¹⁴⁸ Vilani Peiris, "Pakistan facing bankruptcy as world financial crisis deepens" *Asia Business Watch* (June, 2010) 33.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

Afghanistan. The NATO forces had their check posts in the bordering areas and it was very difficult to smuggle the items without their support and cover. Pakistan was already feeling the scarcity of food and increasing prices of the food items. That did not have any logic as Pakistan had a plenty of wheat and rice crops. In the year 2007, Pakistan consumed 22 million of wheat annually and the last season's yield was 23 million tons. Some officials accused smugglers for supplying wheat to Afghanistan and Central Asia.¹⁵⁰ Everything including flour, rice, pulses, edible oil had been taken across the border illegally to Kyber Pakhtunkhwa and FATA and sold across Afghanistan.

According to Naeem Butt, President of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Flour Association, the considerable increase of the edibles from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa to Afghanistan had widened the demand and supply gap and that was responsible of rising prices. According to the reports, the overall exports to Afghanistan were 1,063.463 million dollars out of which the value of edibles was 397.393 million dollars. According to him the volume of commodity export was 291.699 million dollars but the worth of the smuggled items was much higher than that of the official trade between Pakistan and Afghanistan.¹⁵¹

Officially, the trade between Afghanistan and Pakistan was 2 billion dollars but of the record the clandestine business between the two countries had reached more than ten billion dollars every year. Another contributing factor to poverty was inflation of the country. According to the Economic Survey Report of Pakistan (2009), the inflationary rate in the country had been 22.3% which was 6.9% in 2006-07 and reached at 17.6 in 2008-09.¹⁵² Pakistan had been suspected as a terrorist state by India and the US and that had resulted a great setback to Pakistan's economy. Pakistanis who were running their own business in the US faced a very hard time. They were interrogated by the US security forces and the Indian lobby had joined hands with them.

CONCLUSION

¹⁵⁰ Ashfaq Yusafzai, "Conflict Shortages push food prices up" *IPS Journal*, (September 26,2009).22-23

¹⁵¹ *The New*, October 26,2009

¹⁵² Yusufzai, op.cit. 101

The Indo-US nexus had been a direct threat to Pakistan's military and security, political economical and psychological interests. Both the countries did not have cordial relations in the cold war era. India's sympathies were towards the USSR while Pakistan's close relations with the US also became a source of keeping both India and the US away from each other. With the demise of the USSR, the US became the sole hegemony of the world. India, in order to protect its interests, started showing flexibility towards the US while reformulating its foreign policy. On the other hand, the US priorities and interests were also changed. It started giving preference to India in the region in order to counter China which could be the emerging threat for the US in the future.

In order to minimize the threat of the Chinese emergence in the world, the US started strengthening India. The way it was collaborating with India, it had direct implications and threats for Pakistan. As a result of the Indo-US nuclear deal, not only energy needs of India were fulfilled but India was given a chance to flourish its nuclear program. If it happened, a nuke race would be started in South Asia. Pakistan which had gained the nuclear capability as deterrence would surely try to maintain the balance of power in the region. Although the US administration had announced it occasionally that the relationships between the US and India, the biggest democracies of the world aimed to maintain peace and stability in the world but the reality had been far away from that. Their military nexus had comprised of all the areas including the purchase and sale of weapons, transference of arms technology, joint military exercises, and cooperation in space technology. All that had adverse effects on Pakistan's security. It would tilt the balance of power towards India in South Asia. If Pakistan struggled to retain deterrence in the region, there would be arms race in South Asia. Both the states had been on the verge of war at least twice in the last decade and the war between both of them could be deadly disastrous as both the states had nuclear weapons.

Indo-US joint activities in Afghanistan had also been a source of destabilizing Pakistan. The US blamed Pakistan for the cross border terrorism and in reality, it was itself committing that. The drone attacks launched by the US were surely an example of the cross border terrorism and a source for creating mistrust between Pakistani government, forces and the common people. India was running the terrorists' training camps in Afghanistan. It was providing arms and equipments to the terrorists trained for the

terrorists' activities inside Pakistan. The US could not be kept away from the activities of the terrorists in Pakistan. The area where the terrorists' training camps had been opened was completely under the control of the American forces. A strict check had been kept on even the activities of the citizens of those areas. So, how could those camps remain hidden from the Americans? The international reports confirmed that terrorists were getting a huge amount of money by selling the opium in different parts of the world. Both India and the US helped the opium dealers to approach worldwide. Indo-US nexus in Afghanistan had not only caused threat to Pakistan's security but it also had serious economic and political implications for Pakistan. Politically, Pakistan was blamed for the cross border terrorism in Afghanistan and India. As a result of their nexus in Afghanistan, Pakistan had been disconnected from the energy rich Central Asian States.

Both the states had tried to limit the operational activities of the Gwadar Port. They were fanning the terrorism and sectarianism in Balochistan in order to stop the activities at the Gwadar Port. The purpose behind that was to stop China to be influential in the Indian Ocean. India believed that if China would make its naval base in the Indian Ocean, India's navy could never be in a position to challenge Pakistan Navy which would become stronger due to China's support. While on the other hand, the US was not pleased over the growing influence of China in the region. So it also wanted to limit the activities at the Gwadar Port. If it happened it would not only be a great economic loss to Pakistan but a great setback to Pakistan-China relations. As a result of their nuclear deal, India seemed to be withdrawn from the IPI gas pipeline and it would have negative implications for Pakistan's economy, as its energy needs would not be fulfilled and industrial progress would be stagnant.

Both India and the US wanted to take control of Pakistan's nukes as they considered them the only hurdle in their way to fulfill their designs against Pakistan. They raised allegations that Pakistan's nukes would be taken by the terrorists. Sometimes they started saying that Pakistan had transferred the nuclear technology to North Korea, Iran and Libya. Their media presented documentaries and programs having fake information that showed that Pakistan's nukes were a great threat to the world security.

During the Cold War Era, the US had a very neutral policy towards the Kashmir issue. It never blamed Pakistan for the terrorists' activities in Kashmir. After the 9/11 incident, there was a major turn observed in the US foreign policy towards South Asia. It had been observed that the US preference towards any region revolved around the fulfillment of its interests. The major shift in the US policy had resulted from the fact that the US wanted to limit China's growing influence in the region in order to retain its hegemony in the world.

The Indian lobbies in the US played a key role in the formulation of the Kerry Lugar Bill. KLB restricted Pakistan to be involved in any terrorist activities in the neighbouring countries. It was a plan to keep a strict check on the activities of the Pakistan army and the ISI. As the term strategy absorbed military, political, economic and psychological impacts in itself. The psychological aspect of the Indo-US nexus on Pakistan could not be ignored. The psychological impacts of the Indo-US nexus could have a far reaching effect on Pakistani nation. Their demand to Pakistan's government to "Do More" was an attempt to pressurize Pakistan's government to take more actions against the terrorists. The allegations against Pakistan for the cross border terrorism had been surely an attempt to turn the world opinion against Pakistan. Again the allegations against Pakistan for transferring nuclear technology to other states and that Pakistan's nukes were unsafe had deep psychological. They wanted to create an image of Pakistan as a failed state and this essentially lowered the morale of Pakistani nation.

The states being interdependent on each other had freedom to have good relations with each others. Same had been the case with the Indo-US relations. Following things should be done in order to make the Indo-US relations harmless for Pakistan. Instead of the Indo-US bilateral dialogue, there should be Pak-US bilateral dialogues too, to satisfy Pakistan's security needs including its energy needs. The US must adopt a balanced foreign policy towards South Asia.

Efforts must be made to declare South Asia a nuclear free zone but that could only be done if India signed the CTBT. Options must be explored that help to take confidence building measures in South Asia and efforts must be made to help to solve the Indo-Pak conflicts. Instead of the bilateral dialogues between India and Pakistan, there should be a third party that could decide their controversies fairly. It could be any

party acceptable to both the states either any state, European Union or the United Nations. All the disputes including Kashmir, water issue should be discussed very openly in those dialogues. The possible solution of all those issues should also be given by the representative of both the states and efforts must be made through both media to make the public opinion flexible on the expected outcomes of the dialogue process.

The US, if wanted to retain its hegemony in the region, must have to treat both India and Pakistan equally. In case of getting Pakistan's support over different issues, it could win the support of the Muslim world too. The Indo-US media should be discouraged to show the fake documentaries and intentional propaganda against Pakistan. Instead of giving more importance to India's role in Afghanistan, Pakistan's role must be preferred. The people of Afghanistan had close affiliation with Pakistan and if Pakistan had been assigned a dominant role there, it could be helpful to maintain stability in both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Pakistan, being a peaceful country did not have any aggressive designs against any country including its neighbours. It just wanted to maintain the balance of power in the region in order to prevent India for being too aggressive against Pakistan. If the US kept on providing military, technological and economic assistance to India, it could result in their political consensus. In that case Pakistan should surely tilt towards any other big state to counterbalance that nexus. The best and the most suitable option for Pakistan would be China, as it was also facing the same kind of threat from that nexus. China had been a trustworthy ally of Pakistan in the past too. It supported Pakistan in the wars of 1965 and 1971 against India. It had always supported Pakistan on its policy over Kashmir, nuclear capability. It had always provided military and technical assistance to Pakistan. China's cooperation with Pakistan in different projects could never be ignored or forgotten by the people of Pakistan. It provided technical and economic assistance for the completion of the Gwadar Port. Whether it's the JF Thunder war planes or Al Khalid Tanks, China had assisted Pakistan in all the fields.

In order to cope with the current situation, Pakistan must concentrate on the revival of Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO). Once ECO gets revived, it would be much easier for Pakistan to speed up its economic development. A chain of the Muslim countries could be made that would include: Pakistan,

Iran, Turkey, Afghanistan and all the Central Asian States. These states were quite rich in minerals and by promoting trade relations, these states could share their resources. Pakistan, Turkey and Iran had advanced technology and they could help the other member states to explore their resources through advanced technology. The IPI Gas Pipeline Project must be carried out at any cost even if India withdrew.

The development of the Gwadar Port Project must be carried out efficiently in order to make Gwadar a hub port for the economic activities of that region. A well equipped airport should be constructed in Gwadar and a huge part of the income gained from the Gwadar Port must be consumed for the betterment of the people of Balochistan. Some steps must be taken to attract the foreign investors. All states of the region including Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, China and Iran should make a Joint Counter Terrorism Committee and be committed to share the intelligence sharing honestly in order to stop terrorism in the region.

Bibliography

BOOKS:

Abbas, Hassan. *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 2005

Abbas, Sohail. *Probing the Jihadi Mindset*, Islamabad: National Book Foundation, 2007.

Athwal, Amardeep. *China-India Relations: Contemporary Dynamics*. London: Routledge,

2008.

Andrew, Joseph. *The War Zones in the East*. California : University Press, 2006

Audana, Hanveh. *The New Transit Routes in Asia*, Kuala Lumpur: New Moon Publication, 2005

Bajpai, Kanti, and Amitabh Mattoo. *Engaged Democracies: India-US Relations in the 21st Century*. New Delhi: Har Anand Publications Pvt. Ltd., 2000

Bhonsle, Rahul. *US Strategic Engagement of India in the Underlying Theme of Indo-US Nuclear Agreement*, New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007

- Birla, G.D. *In the Shadow of Mahatma*, Bombay: Chand Publication, 1953
- Chandar, Subha. *Military Ties of India with the US*, Chandigarh: Suran Publication, 2003
- Chager, Ruban. *The Height of Relations*, Bangalore: Dawn Publication, 2009
- Chellaney, Brahma. *Nuclear Proliferation: The US-India Conflict* New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1993
- Cohen Stephen P, *Emerging Power India*, New York: The Brookings Institute, 2004
- C. Raja Mohan, *Afghanistan –A Buffer Zone* New Dehli: Delhi Publications, 2003
- Dennis, Kux. *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies, 1941-1991*, National Defence University Press, Washington DC, 1993.
- De Rouen R. Karl, Bellainy Paul, *International Security and the US: An Encyclopedia*, London: Green Wood Publishing Group, 2007
- Din Shams ud, *Perspectives on the Emerging World Order*, New Dehli; Gyan Books, 1995
- Foilage, Rudy *Nuclear Age*, London; Oxford ,Publication, 2008
- Ganer Rosh. *Energy Crisis in South Asia*, Bangalore; New World Publication, 1989
- Gurmant, Kumar *The Asian Giant*. New Delhi; Atlantic 2007
- Hardinge, Lord, *My Indian Years 1910-1916*, London Publication 1946
- Jayapalan, N *Foreign Policy of India*, New Delhi; Atlantic Publication, 2001
- Johnson, Foleds. *The US Needs New Allies*, NewYork, 2001
- Kapoor,Subash *Pakistan, Madrassa, Extremism and Terrorism*, Bangalore; Sunder Publication, 2006

- Karat, Parakash *Sub-ordinate Ally in the Nuclear Deal and India-US Strategic Relations*, New Delhi; Left Word Books, 2007
- K, Gary Seema Gahlant, Anupam Srivastans. *Engaging India: US Strategic Relations with the World's Largest Democracy*, London;Routledge, 1999
- . Kheli Tahir, R Shirin *India, Pakistan, and the United States: Breaking with the Past*, Lahore:Vanguard Books Pvt. Ltd. 1998. .
- Kolodziej, A Edward, Kanet E Roger, *From Super Power to Besiege Global Power: Restoring World Order after the Failure of Bush Doctrine*, Georgeon: University of Georgeon Press, 2008
- Kutab, Abu al. *US Israel Nexus and the Arab World*, Cairo: Cairo Publication, 1979
- Nixon, Richard. *Seize the Moment*, Los Angeles: SEA Publication, 1998
- Noronha Ligia, Sudarsham , *India's Energy Politics*, India: Banglore Publication, 2009
- Om, Gupta. *Encyclopedia of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh*, New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House, 2006
- Richely, James, *The World and I*, Norway: Norwegian Publication, 1991
- Ruban, Chager. *The Height of Relations*, Banglore; Dawn Publication
- Saksena, Jyotika & Grillot,Suzette. “*The Emergence of Indo-US Defence Cooperation: From Specific to Diffuse Reciprocity*” Chicago: Horizontal publication, 2001
- Segell, Glen. *Axis of Evil and Rogue State: Bush Administration, 2000-2004*.Glen Segell, 2005
- Sharma, Ram Shri. *Indo-US Relations*, New Delh: Discovery Publishing House, 1999

Schaffer, B Howard. *The Limits of influence in America's Role in Kashmir* , New York: Brookings Institutions Press, 2009

Ziring, Lawrence (Ed), "*The Subcontinent in World Politics: India, Its Neighbours and the Great Powers*" New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978

REPORTS:

Alankronstadt , K. CRS Report for Congress, updated on August 12, 2008

Aneja, Urvashi "Pakistan-China Relations: Recent Developments" (Jan-May 2006)', *Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, Special Report No. (26, June 2006)*

Haass N. Richard & Rose, Gideon "A New US Policy Towards India and Pakistan", Report of an Independent Task Force sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 1997.

Schaffer, Teresita C., Rising India and U.S. Policy Options in Asia. *Report of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), South Asia Program*, (January 2002).

CRS Report for Congress "India-US Relations", (August 12, 2008)

Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott, "Address at India International Center", (New Delhi, Jan. 30, 1999).

Report by the Kashmir Study Group, "*Kashmir: A Way Forward*", Livingston, New York, September, 1999

JOURNALS:

- Abbas, Ghulam, Baloch, Qadir, “Indo-US Militant Nexus and our Strategies for Survival”, *the Dialogue*, vol 11, Qurtaba uni, 1998< <http://qurtaba.edu.pk>>
- Aftab, Safiya. “Poverty and Radicalization”, *Research Journal; Pak Institute for Peace Studies*, Islamabad: October 2008, 65.
- Ahmed, Maqbool. “Route to Roots”, *The Herald Annual*, April, 2008, 44-45.
- Ashton, B. Carter. “The Architecture of Government in the Face of Terrorism”, *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Winter, 2001-2002), *The MIT Press*
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3092086>
- Azam, Muhammad. “Radicalization and Media”, *Research Journal; Pak Institute for Peace Studies*, Islamabad: October, 2008, 21.
- Alamgir, Muhammad. “Gwadar Port”. *Pak Tribune*, April 12, 2010
- Burns, R. Nicholas. “America's Strategic Opportunity with India: The New U.S.-India Partnership”, *Foreign Affairs*,. 156 *Pakistan Vision Vol .10 No.2* November/December 2007,
- Bidwai, Praful “For a Creative “Near-West’ Policy”, *Front Line, Chennai, Sep 10, 2005*.
- Chatterji Manas and Jain. “B M Historical and Contemporary Perspective on South Asia,” *Conflict and Peace in South Asia* vol 5, n.d
- Cheema, Iqbal Pervaiz, “Missile Race in South Asia”, *IPRI* ,2006
- Haider Fazl-e,Syed “Gwadar: An Emerging Centre of the Great Game”, *ISPI-Policy Brief, Oct, 2009*
- Haider, Ziad Baluchistan, Beijing and Pakistan’s Gwadar Port, *Politics and Diplomacy,winter/spring, 2005*
- Haroon, Asif. “India’s Dangerous Designs Against Pakistan”, *Asia Tribune* vol 9, no 16, 2009

- Huntington, Samuel. "The Erosion of American National Interests," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 76, no. 5 ,September-October 1997.
- Inderfurth, Karl. "*South Asia: Challenges to US Policy*". Statement before the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, Committee on International Relations, US House of Representatives, Washington, DC, March 3, 1999.
- Jahanzeb, "the trade potential and industrial development in Gwadar". *Journal of Management Science*, vol ix,2002
- Kanwal, Gurmeet " Indo-US Defense Cooperation: Full Stream Ahead," *IPCS*, Sep 25, 2007
- Khan, Zulfqar " India-Pakistan Nuclear Rivalry: Perceptions, Misperceptions and Mutual Deterrence" *The Times of India*, *IPRI* paper 9, Jan 2005
- Kumaraswamy, P.R. "India and Israel: Emerging Partnership," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 4 December 2002.
- Mazari M.Shireen, "The Indo- US Strategic Partnership", *Strategic Studies*, Vol. XXV Autumn, Number 3, Islamabad, 2005.
- Roy, Dina. Lal, Ganesh. David *White House, India, Pakistan and the Question of Kashmir*, international Socialist Review, August, 2002.
- Santosh, G "Importance of Indo-US Nuclear Deal", *Pratiyogata Darpan* vol 2, 21,June,2008
- Sehgal ul Majeed Ikram , "Korea, Iran, Libya rejected allegations against Pakistan", *Defence Journal* vol 7, 2004
- . Sherwani A Latif, "Pakistan, China and America" *Council for Pakistan Studies*, Karachi, 1980.

Wirsing, Robert “Arms Race in South Asia: Implications for the US”, *Asian Survey*,
Vol.25, No.3 March 1995.

“A National Security Strategy for a New Century”. *The Wall Street Journal*, 23 October,
2002

NEWS PAPER ARTICLES:

Ahmed, Hussain. “The US- Pak Ties are Temporary”. *The Dawn*, April 09, 2009

Ali, Cheema. “The Political Economy of Crises” (op-ed), *Friday Times (Lahore)*,
October 24, 2008.

“Aneja, Atul “US objects to sale of Arrow missiles to India,” *The Hindu*, September
8,2003.

Cheema, Pervaiz. Iqbal “Targetting Strategic Partner?” *The Post*, June 15,2008

. Dugger, Celia. “US and India Map Path to Military Cooperation; More Arms Sales Are
Seen.” *New York Times*. November 6, 2001.

Einhorn, Robert. “Should the US Sell Nuclear Technology to India? – Part I”, *Yale
Global Online*, November 2005

Gauhar, Humayun. “America’s Indian bomb”, *The Nation*, March 26, 2000.

Harpn Juo “Baluchistan Conflict”, *New York Times*, 6 January, 2008

Hudson, Geoffry. “US Deal with Asia”, *The Washington Post*, December 9, 2006

Khalid, Muhammad. "Indo-US nexus on Kashmir", *Pakistan Observer*, July 3, 2002

Mahmood, Afzaal. "A strategic defence pact", *Dawn*, Lahore, July 9, 2005.

Malik, Zahid "US Objectives", *Pakistan Observer*, December 16, 2009

Mile, Edward. "Deterrence Policy in South Asia", *Time of London*, April, 2007

Mojumdar, Aunohita. "India to Give all the help to Kabul" *Times News Network*, 24 Dec 2001

Mufti, Marya. "Washington-Delhi nuclear deal", *The Frontier Post*, Peshawar, August 12, 2005.

Nayar, Kuldip. "India-US Treaty or Alliance"?, *Dawn, Lahore*, July 16, 2005.

Patel, Aakar. "Kerry Lugar is good for Pakistan", *The News*, Oct 18, 2009.

Pal, Izzud-Din. "The Challenge of Rising Terrorism", *The Dawn*, Islamabad: October 04, 2008.

Pervez, Hassan. "Whose war is it anyway?", *The Dawn*, Islamabad: October 4, 2008.

Slevin, Peter. "US to Send India Nuclear, Space Technology," *Washington Post*, January 13, 2009.

Tellis, Ashley the US-I "address to foreign correspondents Association of Phillipines", *The News*, April 21, 2005

Yusuf, Moeed. "Washington's Non-Proliferation Focus is Misplaced", *The Friday Times*, October 2004.

The Nation, (December 6, 2009)

Washington Post, (June 24, 2009)

Times of India, (June 28, 2006)

CNN News (Dec 22, 2006) 10p.m

Washington Post, (June 24, 2009)

The Washington Post, (February 16,2006)

Bertsch. *The News* , (July 26, 2008)

New York Times(Jan 17,2003)

Reuter, (15 December 2005).

“Text of the Kerry Lugar Bill” *The News*, (October 19, 2009)

The Washington Post, (November 16, 2009)

CNN News,(October 21, 2009)

Frontline,(April 14, 2000).

“US sponsoring secret initiative on Kashmir”, *The Nation*,(June 7, 2000).

Strobe Talbot in a interview reproduced in daily *Jang*, (November 29, 1998).

“Pakistan may face US curbs on terrorism”, *The Nation*, (June 5, 2000).

Text of Jaswant Singh’s interview reported in *The Hindu*, (July 25th, 1999).

The Telegraph, Calcutta, (May 15, 1998).

Asian Age, New Delhi, (May 22, 1998).

“Budding Israel India relationship bad for Pakistan”, *Daily Times*, (June 16, 2003)

“We need more Business: Sharon,” *Times of India*, (September 11, 2003);

“India, Israel aim to increase Bilateral Trade,” *Associated Press*, (September 9, 2003).

India Today, (April 10, 2004)

The New York Times, February, 1996

News International, (October 10, 2006).

Ahmad, Ghayoor “India’s Defence Ties with US”, *Dawn*, Lahore,(July 7, 2005).

Dawn, Karachi, (April 18, 2002).

Mahmood, Afzaal “A Strategic Defence Pact”, *Dawn*, Karachi, (July 9, 2005).

The News, Islamabad, (July 1, 2005).

The Hindu, Delhi, (June 14, 2005).

WEBSITES:

Haroon, Asif. “Drug Money Used as a geopolitics weapon by CIA-RAW-Mossad” *Asian Tribune* <http://www.spiegelIndee/international>

Kamal, Farrukh, “Economic condition of the South Asian Countries”
<http://www.saag.org/papers13/paper1279.html>

Qidwai ,Minhaj. “US-India Nexus: Implications to China and Pakistan” Raman, B
“Counter Terrorism cooperation-International Terrorism Monitor”, *Force*, (April,
2003) <http://www.saag.org/papers>

Ramana, MV. “the impact of Indo-US Nuclear Deal on the NPT and the Global Climatic
Regime”, *Hein Rich Boll, Stiftung, the Green Political Foundation*, (Dec 8, 2009)
<http://www.greenwood.com>

Sud, Hari "India-US Nuclear Deal- the Benefits", *South Asia Analysis Group*, (March 20, 2006)<http://www.southasiananalysis.org/%5Cpaper>.

Zai Yusaf Rahim Ullah, BBC. <http://www.bbc.urdu.com>)

"US-India Relations: A Vision for the 21st Century, (March 21, 2000")

www.usembassy.state.gov/pakistan1995

WTO, Third Ministerial Conference, "*American Trade Relations with India*", Amd.

Susan Esserman, Deputy US Trade Representative, address to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi, (November 3, 1999), www.nic.in/commin .

Analysis Group. <http://www.saag.org/papers13/paper1279.html>

The bilateral statement on friendship and cooperation signed between India and Israel during Ariel Sharon's visit to India in September 2003, <http://www.idsa-india.org/SAARCHIVES/SA200302/APR-JUN01>;

President Bush during his visit to India on 2nd March 2006 signed an agreement with India in this regards. See: http://news.yahoo.com/fc/US/Bush_Administration

"Al-Jazeera, (July 3, 2005). Available at:

<http://www.aljazeera.info/Opinion/editorials/2005/July/3o/US-India%20Nexus%20Implications.htm>

www.indianembassy.org/inews/2000.inews/september-2000.pd

www.saag.org/papers4/paper303.html

Report 2004, given by the Human Rights' Agency. < <http://www.global.hr/newyork/HH09Df03.html>

<<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/pakistan/pns-gwadar.htm>>

Pakistan: Karachi's Madrasas and Violent Extremism, International Crisis Group, Asia

Report N°130, March 29, 2007. <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1765&l>

Pakistan: Reforming the Education Sector, International Crisis Group, Asia Report N°84,

October 07, 2004. <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1342&l>

“Pakistan: The Mullahs and the Military, International Crisis Group”, *Asia Report* N°49, March 20 March, 2003.<http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1628&l> accessed.

Pakistan's Tribal Areas: Appeasing the Militants, International Crisis Group, Asia Report N°125, December 11, 2006. <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1564&l>

Poverty raises risk of Conflict in Central Asia, International Crisis Group, Asia Report N°112, July 21, 2004). <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1289&l>

“Responding to the evil of terrorism” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3811045.pdf>