

Rethinking Pakistan–U.S. relations

Najam Rafique*

“...the only means of influencing Pakistan has been through economic incentives and the threat of their withdrawal” – Anatol Lieven.¹

In June 2001, a study by the task force of the Centre for Global Development, a private Washington-based think tank, recommended that the United States should delay much of its \$7.5-billion-dollar aid package for Pakistan approved under the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act 2009, better known as the Kerry Lugar-Bermann Act, so named after U.S. Senators John Kerry and Richard Lugar and Representative Howard Berman, who hoped to fight anti-Americanism in Pakistan by switching the U.S. focus from backing the military to building the economy and civilian institutions.²

According to the recommendations by the Centre for Global Development, U.S. assistance has become “muddled” with a lack of clear goals and leadership and pressure “to do too much, too quickly.” The recommendation came in the wake of deteriorating relations between Pakistan and the United States following the arrest and subsequent release, under intense U.S. pressure, of its secret operative, Raymond Davis who shot two Pakistanis in Lahore in February 2011, and the reported killing of the Al-Qaeda chief, Osama bin Laden on May 2, 2011 in a unilateral, secretive surgical raid by the U.S. Navy Seals in violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty. The raid, according to U.S. officials, was carried out without the knowledge of Pakistani authorities, following intelligence reports gathered by the U.S. agencies that Osama bin Laden was living in a military cantonment in the Pakistani city of Abbottabad.³

More than any other incident, including unilateral drone strikes by the U.S. inside Pakistani tribal areas, these two events served to seriously disrupt Pakistan-U.S. relations, creating rifts that led a U.S. House panel in June 2011 to impose limits on American aid to Pakistan,⁴ and a confirmation by the White House that the direct and indirect aid worth \$800 million to Pakistan Army had been withheld until the Pakistani GHQ

* The writer is Director (Americas & Programme Coordinator), the Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad (ISSI).

complies to a 10-point list which will determine how and when this aid would be resumed.⁵ The withheld military aid includes \$300 million for reimbursement under the Coalition Support Fund (CSF), and \$500 million which America provides under the Pakistan Counter-Insurgency Fund. According to later developments relating to U.S. assistance to Pakistan, any future award of security assistance to Pakistan will now be linked to the latter's progress on a secret scorecard

According to later developments relating to U.S. assistance to Pakistan, any future award of security assistance to Pakistan will now be linked to the latter's progress on a secret scorecard of U.S. objectives.

of U.S. objectives, including cooperation in exploiting the bin Laden compound; cooperation with the war in Afghanistan; cooperation in conducting joint counter terrorism operations; and most importantly taking specific steps to improve the overall tone of bilateral relations.⁶

Following the two devastating incidents in the first half of 2011, U.S. officials have been calling for a “behavioural change” by Pakistan. The White House Chief of Staff, Tom Donilon, claims that while the Obama administration's policy towards Pakistan has not changed, United States' relationship with Pakistan has become “difficult” and “it must be made to work over time. Until we get through these difficulties, we'll hold back some of the money that the American taxpayers have committed to give.”⁷

While the American administration under President Obama may claim that nothing has changed in terms of its overall policy of relations with Pakistan, the stresses and strains have been more than evident ever since ‘Operation Geronimo’. Almost a decade after those attacks to root out the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, Pakistan has increasingly been pressed to “do more” in cooperating with the U.S. and NATO forces in their counter-terrorism operations along the border with Afghanistan, and to take out Taliban and Al-Qaeda sanctuaries that have now found a place inside Pakistan's tribal regions. Consequently, any future U.S. assistance to Pakistan, both civilian and military, is once again being linked to certification by U.S. President and the State Department, that Pakistan is making “measurable” progress towards meeting the principal objectives of America assistance, ranging from more visibility of aid projects to greater cooperation in investigating whether Osama bin Laden had any official support inside the country before he was killed.⁸

In the history of relations between Pakistan and the United States over the last 60 years since 1947, these seem to have hit rock bottom in 2011, with American officials alleging that officers of the one institution it trusted the most in Pakistan, are today aiding and abetting the very elements they are trying to eradicate.

Some of the basic concerns that have emerged both among the Americans and Pakistanis include:

U.S. concerns

1. Double games by Pakistan in its military cooperation in the ‘war on terror’.
2. A politically and economically soluble Pakistan.
3. Growing anti-Americanism.
4. Radicalization of Pakistani society.

Pakistani concerns

1. Another let-down by the U.S. – playing its own double games by working with Pakistan when needed, and putting it under pressure through its military and economic aid.
2. America will exit from Afghanistan, and like its predecessor, will leave behind the proverbial ‘Gordian Knot’ that would become impossible for the regional countries to untie.
3. Will always deal with Pakistan for short-term transitory gains rather than working to build a long-term mutually beneficial relationship.
4. Following the raid in Abbottabad, unilateral military actions by the U.S. in future, both in terms of taking out the so-called militant ‘safe havens’ and, when necessary, Pakistan’s nuclear assets

Are the relations between the two countries really heading for a major revision? With the U.S. concentrated on the exit of most of its military forces from Afghanistan by 2014, will these changes lead to the two countries drifting apart, or coming together to clean up the mess in Afghanistan left by 30 years of constant war? Will Pakistan and the U.S. find it expedient to work together under the shadows of mistrust on both sides, or will the U.S. once again abandon Pakistan in its hurry to withdraw from the trillion dollar war in Afghanistan? This paper will look at some of the challenges and opportunities for both Pakistan and the

United States, as they try to juggle the relationship shaken to its very foundation by the events before and after May 2, 2011.

The rough road of relations*

The history of Pakistan-US relations has been a rough road over the last 60 years. Since the 1950s, the nature of their relations was based on the politics of the Cold War. For the Americans, this meant building up regional alliances against the communist expansion. Consequently, the relationship with Pakistan moved within the scales of confrontation with former USSR. With the end of the Cold War in 1990, America entered what academics have called the uni-polar moment pursuing a “War on Terror” after the most devastating attacks on the U.S. homeland since World War Two in September 2001, in which Pakistan once again found itself to be on the frontline as America attacked the Taliban regime in Afghanistan warning Pakistan, one of the three countries that supported the Taliban government, that it “was with us, or against us.”

Ironically, the foundations of the relations between Pakistan and America were laid down by Pakistan’s defence and security necessities and American interests related to the then newly emerging phenomenon of Cold War with the Communist Bloc and the search for cooperative allies in this war.

Ironically, the foundations of the relations between Pakistan and America were laid down by Pakistan’s defence and security necessities and American interests related to the then newly emerging phenomenon of Cold War with the Communist Bloc and the search for cooperative allies in this war. By 1955, Pakistan had entered into two defence pacts, the SEATO and the CENTO or Baghdad Pact and consequently received \$2 billion from the U.S. from 1953 to 1961. President Dwight D. Eisenhower famously called Pakistan America’s “most allied ally in Asia.” However, Indo-Pak wars of 1965 and 1971 considerably undermined Pak-U.S. relationship, as the US suspended assistance to Pakistan, resulting in a drift in relations. In fact, South Asia became a low priority area in terms of U.S. foreign policy, and relations between the two countries remained in a state of limbo until the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

* See Annex for a relations timeline

The invasion revived Pakistan-U.S. relations and Pakistan was viewed as a frontline ally in the effort to block Soviet expansionism. In 1981, the Reagan Administration pledged for Islamabad a five year, \$3.2-billion aid package along with unspecified amounts of military hardware and training, including the coveted F-16 fighter jets. Pakistan became a key transit country for arms and supplies to the Afghan resistance, as well as home to millions of Afghan refugees, who are still on Pakistani soil 30 years after the Soviets left Afghanistan. Despite the renewal of U.S. aid and close security ties, many in Congress remain troubled by Pakistan's nuclear weapon programme. In 1985, Section 620E(e) popularly known as the Pressler Amendment was imposed on Pakistan requiring the president for an annual certification that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device during the fiscal year for which aid is to be provided.

With the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, Pakistan's nuclear activities again came under intensive U.S. scrutiny and, in 1990, the administration of President G.H.W. Bush again found it expedient to suspend aid to Pakistan. Serious problems arose on the nuclear front with the arrest of a Pakistan-born Canadian citizen named Arshad Pervez in Philadelphia in July 1987. U.S. House and Senate committees' clamoured for cutting off aid to Pakistan, and to pressure the country into rolling back its nuclear programme. Among the notable results of the aid cut-off was the non-delivery of F-16 fighter aircraft purchased by Pakistan in 1989. With the Soviets retreat from Afghanistan, and the Iron Curtain's crumbling, Pakistan-U.S. relations took a downward turn as American foreign policy became concerned with the dramatic events that were fundamentally altering the global balance of power.

The Indian nuclear explosions in 1998 followed by Pakistan's tit-for-tat nuclear tests brought ever more stringent U.S. policies towards Pakistan. In responding to the Indian tests, Pakistan, according to President Clinton, "lost a truly priceless opportunity to strengthen its own security, to improve its political standing in the eyes of the world." The nuclear explosions brought the most extended U.S. engagement in South Asia since the 1960s. These were reinforced by the Kargil war incident between India and Pakistan in May 1999, and heightened tensions between the two South Asian nuclear-armed states. American concern in the region increased once again with the Taliban victories in Afghanistan and reports by the U.S. intelligence community that Osama bin Laden, the mastermind of terrorist bombing of U.S. embassies in Africa, was living in Afghanistan under Taliban protection.

America's relations with Pakistan were transformed in a dramatic fashion by the 9/11 attacks on the United States and the ensuing enlistment of Pakistan as a pivotal ally for counter-terrorism operations in the U.S.-led war on terror. The unstinted support of Pakistan in the U.S. war on terror brought American interest and aid back to Pakistan as U.S. jets bombed Taliban targets in Afghanistan.

America's relations with Pakistan were transformed in a dramatic fashion by the 9/11 attacks on the United States and the ensuing enlistment of Pakistan as a pivotal ally for counter-terrorism operations in the U.S.-led war on terror. The unstinted support of Pakistan in the U.S. war on terror brought American interest and aid back to Pakistan as U.S. jets bombed Taliban targets in Afghanistan.

For Pakistan, the message was loud and clear even as the Bush and later the Obama administrations pursued the Taliban and Osama bin Laden through increased military operations across Pakistan into Afghanistan to route out the Taliban government. Ten years after the war on terror began, the focus of U.S. military operations has now shifted to militant 'safe havens' inside Pakistan. The northwest territories of Pakistan, the 'frontline' of the so-called non-NATO ally, are now actually turning into the main frontline of Obama's war in Afghanistan. As he moves the central front of America's war out of Afghanistan, and into Pakistan, two concerns remain of paramount importance:

1. Bringing down the level of insurgency in Afghanistan and Pakistan.
2. Destroying the militant 'safe havens' in Pakistani areas bordering Afghanistan's eastern provinces.

In 2011, the Obama administration and Congress are showing their disapproval with Pakistani authorities on the subject of peace talks with militants operating within the country. These militants, according to the Americans, must be eliminated even if it means violation of Pakistan's sovereignty. The Americans have made it amply clear that if Pakistan remains reluctant to take action against the militants in its territory, the Americans would have no hesitation in doing that. This has been evident in the increased U.S. drone attacks inside Pakistan's tribal regions. Such tactics by the U.S. have called forth statements by Pakistani political leadership calling for defining clear terms of engagements to avoid operational irritants that are today hampering relations with the U.S.

Understanding America & its priorities in the present world

America, after the end of the Cold War, emerged as the sole Super Power with the mightiest Army and largest economy of the world. America is known to be the strongest democracy of the world following the presidential form of government and inherently believing in secular ideology. It exercises greatest influence over the world economy and politics through its complete dominance over the various international bodies like the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO, and organizations like the United Nations. America has the largest number of nuclear stockpiles (around 30,000), is a permanent member of UN Security Council and technologically the most advanced state of the world.

Nuclear and missile proliferation, drug and human trafficking, human rights issues, including democracy issue, along with the rise of extremism resulting into suicide bombings, other forms of militancy and strengthening of radical religious factions in Asia and the Middle East are the issues which are dominating the U.S. foreign policy.

Though, at the moment America enjoys unparalleled position on the world stage, its leadership is subject to various internal and external threats. And that is where Pakistan figures in American policies. The 9/11 catastrophe singularly exposed the vulnerability of the American Empire to fall and perish. Since then, the American leadership's major concern has been to erect a foolproof mechanism to defend its territory and people from any sort of attack from any corner of the world, especially by Al-Qaeda and other militants.

The Iraq and Afghanistan invasions both are part of this American defence mechanism drive which has been given the name of "War on Terror". Nuclear and missile proliferation, drug and human trafficking, human rights issues, including democracy issue, along with the rise of extremism resulting into suicide bombings, other forms of militancy and strengthening of radical religious factions in Asia and the Middle East are the issues which are dominating the U.S. foreign policy. Other than these, America is concerned about the swift flow of oil to feed the ever-increasing energy demand of its home industry and is intensely looking for alliances in order to:

- a) Secure mineral resources and markets abroad, and

- b) Counter re-emergence of Russia and the rise of China which could, according to experts in the U.S., contends for world leadership in the next twenty-five to thirty years.⁹

Pakistan as a State and its needs under the present circumstances

Pakistan, on the other hand, is at the present the world's eighth most populated, nuclear armed country with a strategic location within South Asia. The country has all the ingredients to grow and prosper, but the idea of modernization is plagued with the incessant change of governments, political strife, rise of extremism, externally-sponsored insurgencies, backwardness in education and health, grave internal and external security threats, a teetering economy, mounting frustration among the masses, the weakening writ of the government, troubled borders with India and Afghanistan and hostile policies of these countries. Pakistan under these circumstances needs a sustainable development strategy, robust economic assistance, peace at its borders, improved security situation in the country, resolution of water and Kashmir disputes with India, improved global image of the country and a threat-free environment for pursuing its healthy policies efficiently and effectively.

Based on the nature of Pakistan-U.S. relations, the present needs of both the countries and global realities, it can be said without doubt that both Pakistan and the U.S. need each other at this critical juncture. As is the drift of many voices in both countries, the two cannot afford to be at war with each other, literally – Pakistan with its weak economy, and the U.S. with its debt problems and the over extension of its military in wars around the globe. Under these circumstances, it would require prudent approach by both the countries to meet the following challenges in order to explore the opportunities presented in meeting them in an atmosphere of cooperation and trust.

Challenges

Unrest in North-West Pakistan and Afghan insurgency

The ongoing insurgency in Afghanistan and the rise of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) are matters of serious concern for both Pakistan and the U.S., and this issue has the potential of disturbing the equation. The American leadership often charges Pakistan government of harboring Al-Qaeda militants and demands Pakistan “to do more” to combat their activities. Despite the fact that Pakistan has deployed about 120,000 troops on its western borders and has carried out a number of military operations

against the militants, the U.S. is clearly not satisfied. America has asked many times that the Pakistan government allow the U.S. to expand its military operations to inside Pakistani territory. It does not realize that direct operations by U.S. or NATO troops in Pakistani territory may take relations between the two countries to a point of no return. As it is, drone attacks in Pakistan's tribal areas and regions have killed some 800 civilians since the summer of 2008, and increased hatred for the U.S. among the Pakistani masses. Direct military operations on Pakistan territory can jeopardize the relationship.

America has asked many times that the Pakistan government allow the U.S. to expand its military operations to inside Pakistani territory. It does not realize that direct operations by U.S. or NATO troops in Pakistani territory may take relations between the two countries to a point of no return.

America needs to understand the limitations of the Pakistan government and avoid such acts which are against the writ of the state. At present, America and Pakistan both need to come up with a well-coordinated strategy based on dialogue and negotiations. Relying on unilateral military actions by the United States will never solve the problem.

Indo-U.S. nuclear deal

The Indo-U.S. nuclear strategic partnership is a serious threat not only to the Pakistan-U.S. ties but also to the regional balance of power and global cause of non-proliferation. It is quite unfortunate that the United States has always dealt with Pakistan in isolation, not considering its regional challenges. Remarks by U.S. leaders that "Pakistan and India are different countries with different needs and different histories"¹⁰ expose American's lack of understanding of the challenges that Pakistan faces today. It is essential for the United States to deal with Pakistan as a regional player facing problems of much greater magnitude than its own capability to solve. The remarkable U.S. shift towards India is a huge dent in Pakistan-U.S. relations. It could inspire Pakistan to distance itself from America and find new reliable alliances in future. Secondly, such irresponsible initiatives by America will start a new and aggressive arms race which ultimately could be hazardous for the region.

US concerns about extremism in Pakistan

Another irritant in Pakistan-U.S. ties is the increasing extremism in the form of what Americans call “Islamic Militancy”. U.S. National Security Estimates since 2007 show that the last Bush Administration was not satisfied with Islamabad’s efforts to tackle with the problem of rise of militancy in the country. Some of President Bush’s top military and intelligence aides reportedly sought authorization for more energetic direct U.S. military action on Pakistani soil. With Leon Penetta, the former chief of CIA as the Secretary of Defense, we cannot expect any major shift in the policies of the Obama government that are bound to be based on intelligence gathered by the CIA. Both countries have to understand that allowing tensions to grow in their bilateral ties would only help Al-Qaeda and other extremist groups by fueling anti-American sentiments. America should understand that the problem on Pakistan’s western border will not be solved by military means alone. Long-term stability in Pakistan depends not only on curtailing extremism and militancy in the country, but also on strengthening Pakistan's economy and democracy and on reducing tensions between Pakistan and its neighbors.

Concerns over Pakistan’s nuclear programme

Another issue which plays a vital role in the ties is the U.S. suspicions about the safety and security of Pakistan’s nuclear programme and nuclear assets. It has been conveyed through different reports and analytical articles by American think tanks that the U.S. faces a grave nuclear threat to homeland from materials originating out of Pakistan. There is also talk of buying Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal or forcing the country into unilateral nuclear disarmament based on the thinking that nuclear weapons are not in safe hands in Pakistan. Any attempt by the U.S. or any third party to take out Pakistan’s nuclear facilities will prove to be fatal for U.S.-Pakistan ties.

It has been conveyed through different reports and analytical articles by American think tanks that the U.S. faces a grave nuclear threat to homeland from materials originating out of Pakistan.

US concerns about democracy in Pakistan

Democracy has been restored in Pakistan after a decade-long dictatorship. Pakistan’s checkered history of democracy has brought it

much embarrassment in the global community of democratic countries. The U.S. government under Obama would like to see Pakistan continue on the path of democracy. The Biden-Lugar Bill passed in 2008, besides a 15-billion non-military aid package for Pakistan over the next five years, also proposed a \$1.5-billion “Democracy Dividend”. Any further disruption of the democratic process in Pakistan may estrange its relations with the United States and result in the imposition of sanctions. The dwindling position of the present political government poses a challenge to Pakistan’s relations with the United States. This can be met only by strengthening the elected government by various means.

Influence of anti-Pakistan lobbies in U.S.

The Israeli and Indian lobbies in U.S. Congress also pose a serious challenge to the bilateral relationship. Both India and Israel have much to fear from Pakistan’s nuclear programme and may prove to work at cross purposes to damage Pakistan-U.S. relations to their own advantage.

U.S. dual policies

Most importantly, the overall U.S. double standards towards the Muslim world is a matter of great concern for Pakistan. Despite all the aid assistance to Pakistan, America does not enjoy a good reputation in Pakistan, and that is primarily due to U.S. dual policies. For sustainable cordial relations with the Muslim world in general and with Pakistan in particular, the United States would have to redraw its policies and bring balance in its dealings with the Muslim countries and the rest of the world.

It would be naïve for Pakistanis to expect too much from the new Obama administration as it moves into the mode for the 2012 presidential elections. However, Pakistan can work to avail the following opportunities.

Opportunities

Monetary aid for development

As mentioned above, at present Pakistan faces a host of multifaceted problems starting from the rise in extremism to drug trafficking. The root of all this mess can be traced to the weak economy. The losses being suffered by Pakistan in the ongoing war on terror, according to Pakistani estimates, have been to the tune of \$68 billion since 2001.¹¹ According to American estimates, since 2001, Congress has approved about \$20 billion

for Pakistan in direct aid and military reimbursements.¹² The figures for the money received vary from \$11 billion to \$18 billion. The Kerry-Lugar-Bermann Bill of 2009 promises \$ 10 billion in next five years on the condition that Pakistan will ensure peace along its western border. This is an opportunity for Pakistan to convince the Obama government that Pakistan's economic stability is essential for pursuing the long war on terror, particularly with Obama having just announced an exit strategy from Afghanistan that seeks to withdraw U.S. and other troops from Afghanistan by 2014.

The losses being suffered by Pakistan in the ongoing war on terror, according to Pakistani estimates, have been to the tune of \$68 billion since 2001.¹ According to American estimates, since 2001, Congress has approved about \$20 billion for Pakistan in direct aid and military reimbursements.

Technology/energy assistance

Pakistan's prime need is to excel in science and technology and the United States can assist the country in this regard enormously. Pakistan should work for inking technology contracts with the U.S., and opening ways for Pakistani students to study at American universities on scholarships. Secondly, Americans can train Pakistan's professionals, both civil and military, so that they could contribute to the betterment of Pakistani society. Pakistan can start a process of redesigning its plaguing education sector into a modern education system with American assistance. At present, when the U.S. understands to some extent the indispensable role of Pakistan in the war on terror, Pakistan should make full use of it and try to bring in American investment in the health sector as well, and by establishing small industrial zones where the unemployed youth of the country can be employed. Moreover, Pakistan should work with the American government for a joint energy strategy to cater to the country's soaring energy needs.

Fighting terrorism & insurgencies

Terrorism in the region has acquired an alarming magnitude and Pakistan is its major victim. It is in the interest of Pakistan to secure its borders, especially along Afghanistan by installing a robust monitoring mechanism. For that, Pakistan needs U.S. assistance. It is time Pakistan engaged the Obama administration in a strategic dialogue that sets

common goals for the two countries, building on the major non-NATO ally status it has already achieved. These goals should include both tactical counterterrorism and longer-term counterinsurgency objectives and should specifically engage Pakistan's security concerns that are often at variance with America's.

Kashmir issue resolution

The Kashmir issue is a grave threat not only to the two nuclear armed states but also to regional peace. It goes without saying that the current belligerency between Pakistan and India is due to the non-resolution of the Kashmir dispute. Pakistan should press on the Obama government to seriously mediate a resolution of the Kashmir issue between India and Pakistan. This process may take many years but the initiation of the resolution process with American assistance will definitely prove to be a deterrent to any Pak-India escalation in future.

Parity with India

Any preferential treatment by Americans of Indians will definitely disturb the balance of power which could take the whole region towards backwardness. Pakistan should make efforts to ensure that the country is dealt with on equal grounds in future. But that remains a big question mark now with the de-hyphenation of America's Pakistan-India policy.

Increased and quota-free trade

America is the biggest trade partner of Pakistan. But still Pakistan needs to expand its export base in America for its goods, especially cotton-based products. It is time Pakistan secured such contracts which allow the country quota-free trade with America.

Pak image in America

After 9/11, Pakistanis are facing serious trouble in America due to the mere fact that the perpetrators of those tragic events were Muslims. Many Pakistanis would be subjected to interrogation by intelligence agencies, and American sentiments against Pakistan are increasing day by day. In this situation, Pakistan needs to start an exchange programme with the American government, and by utilizing the media in the States, it needs to educate the American citizens that Pakistan has nothing to do with terrorism; rather this country is the biggest victim of it and has been playing the most active role in combating the menace.

Building trust and cooperation

Over the last six decades since 1947, nothing has affected the ebb and flow of relations between Pakistan and the United States more than the nature of the latter's economic and military assistance that has flown abundantly in times of the wars that the United States and its allies have been involved in the region after the Second World War. And, on other times, a complete and utter abandonment once the need of Pakistan was no longer required. Pakistanis tend to attribute this to American inconstancy and fickleness. In turn, Americans often assert that the frequent twist and turns stem from Pakistani political and economic

Like all relationships, ties between nation-states too are symbiotic, and as with all relationships, nothing can be taken for granted. In the case of relations between Pakistan and the United States of America however, the former has always chosen to take a lot for granted.

instability, but most particularly its fixation with India. However, neither view explains satisfactorily why the two countries have failed to sustain stable relations after becoming allies in 1954-55. The reason lies in the fact that over the years U.S. and Pakistani interests and related security policies have been at odds almost as often as they have been not. The United States and Pakistan were, broadly, on the same wavelength during the Eisenhower, Nixon, and Reagan presidencies. Today, under the Obama administration, both seem to be reading different lines from the same book.

Like all relationships, ties between nation-states too are symbiotic, and as with all relationships, nothing can be taken for granted. In the case of relations between Pakistan and the United States of America however, the former has always chosen to take a lot for granted. The leadership in Pakistan has always assumed that the United States would back it up with support against India, a traditional 'enemy' in the South Asian region. Such are the expectations, even though it was made clear to the Pakistani leadership ever since the two countries signed SEATO and the Baghdad Pact in the 1950s (later known as CENTO), that these were specifically related to the U.S. fight against the onslaught of communism and the 'evil empire', and were not a guarantee of support in case of conflict between Pakistan and India.

Unfortunately for the 180 million Pakistanis, its leadership since Liaquat Ali Khan, to the one that took the helm of affairs in February 2008, seems involved in a romantic-cum-emotional attachment to the United States of America, trusting it to be the savior who would guide and aid them through all of the issues relating to governance and development. Consequently, little heed has been paid to the delicate art of statecraft and its hard lessons as Pakistan was rolled in and out of one disappointing alliance to another, trusting, ad nauseam, that the Americans would be there at all times to back up their ‘most allied ally’.

One cannot blame the Americans of playing games that nations play, as they have moved from being one of the super powers of the Cold War era, to the sole super power now pursuing a relentless and aggressive War on Terror. And in playing this game, its approach and strategy has been grounded in hard-nosed Machiavellian politics that have been based on the use, and at times misuse, of compliant allies such as Pakistan. In pursuing the aims of its wars during the conflict with the ‘evil empire’, and the ‘axis of evil’ and terrorists, Americans have almost invariably found it expedient to buttress their ‘allies’ with military aid rather than in helping address the more acute need for long-term viable development projects. With a constant Indophobia that has afflicted the Pakistani state and leadership, the country has found it beneficial to pursue a military relationship with the United States, and the Americans have been more than willing to oblige.

Such had been the case when Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO, it gained momentous increase when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan with the American offer of a 3.2 billion aid package and more to the Pakistan, and it broke all records as Americans now claim to have appropriated \$20 billion in aid to Pakistan in the War on Terror since 2001 out of which over \$ 5 billion has already been transferred to Pakistan for counter-terrorism operations along its border with Afghanistan.

Suffice it to say that the Pakistani leadership still continues to hold on to the notion that they are in a ‘Platonic’ relationship with the United States who will somehow see the need to have the same level of ‘long-term strategic

Suffice it to say that the Pakistani leadership still continues to hold on to the notion that they are in a ‘Platonic’ relationship with the United States who will somehow see the need to have the same level of ‘long-term strategic relationship’ with Pakistan as with India.

relationship’ with Pakistan as with India. Perhaps the Pakistani leadership has not yet caught the drift of the nature of relations with the United States, or it is deliberately ignoring it – i.e., for the U.S., Pakistan has been nothing more than a satellite for achieving certain goals in the region. Since the 1950s, the nature of its relationship with Pakistan has been cyclical and issue-based. The fruits of these cycles, while shoring up Pakistan defenses, did little in terms of its economic and political development. The Pakistani leadership, on its part, has been content with such a set as long as it maintained a military balance with India.

At the present juncture, what needs to be taken into account in our relations with the U.S. is a complete understanding that its approach to relations in South Asia stands de-hyphenated, and will be pursued on the merit of each state in the region. For Pakistan, it demands a prudent approach in a very delicate and tricky situation that the country finds itself today vis-a-vis its alliance in the War on Terror. While our past affairs with the U.S. had ended at the cost of our development, the present one seems to be coming at the cost of our sovereignty as American officials, think tanks and media continue to portray Pakistan as the most dangerous and anti-America country in the world.

The future of Afghanistan and its development has now been hyphenated with Pakistan and its ability in checking the growing insecurity inside its tribal regions. For this purpose, the Obama administration will be employing a mixture of military and economic resources that both Pakistan and Afghanistan need to root out terrorists in the region. But while Pakistan has been assured of a conditional \$ 1.5 billion annual non-military aid over the next five years, Obama has been unambiguous in making it clear that his administration will not provide a blank cheque and that Pakistan must demonstrate its commitment to rooting out Al-Qaeda and the violent extremists within its borders. Pakistanis at all levels of policymaking need to take this into serious consideration if relations with the U.S. are to endure beyond the ‘war on terror’. Concrete measures need to be taken by the Pakistan government in making sure that:

1. It focuses U.S. assistance on the tools, training and support that the country needs to root out the terrorists in its tribal regions.
2. Rather than political statements, Pakistan needs to demonstrate its commitment by actions that help root Al-Qaeda and the violent extremists within its borders.

3. Make sure that the bipartisan Kerry-Lugar bill that authorizes \$1.5 in direct support to Pakistani people over the next five years serves as a “down payment” on securing an economically strong future for its masses.
4. Pursue a constructive diplomacy to lessen tensions with its arch rival, India.
5. Work to ensure that the trilateral dialogue among the U.S., Afghanistan and Pakistan continues regularly to enhance intelligence sharing and military cooperation along the border as well as to address issues of common concern like trade, energy and economic development.

It will be farsighted for Pakistan to demonstrate, rather than remonstrate, the nature of its collaboration with the U.S. Such an endeavour would not only help remove mistrust, but also help in building a long-term sustainable, multifaceted relationship based on principles of sovereign equality and trust.

Annex

Pakistan-U.S. Relations Timeline- 1947-2011

1940s:

- Power vacuum left by Britain in the last half of the 1940s filled by the U.S. The Truman Doctrine (March 1947) forms the basis of major U.S. foreign policy concerns.
- No major interests perceived in the subcontinent. The entire South Asian region of secondary importance to the U.S. from a military point of view, although Pakistan is thought to be valuable as a base of operations in the event of a war with the Soviet Union.
- Straddled with enormous problems, Pakistan shows pro-West leanings.

“Pakistan (is) a democracy and communism (does) not flourish in the soil of Islam. It is clear therefore that our interests (lie) more with the two great democratic countries, namely the UK and the U.S.”

Jinnah, Cabinet Meeting, September, 1947

1950s:

- **May 1950.** Liaquat visits the U.S., and makes a positive impression in Washington as a “man we can do business with.”
- U.S. concerned with resolving the Kashmir issue for stability in South Asia. Sir Owen Dixon proposes his plan for Kashmir. The plan fails.
- **June 1950.** Pakistan endorses U.S. decision to invoke UN collective security system against the North Korean invasion. However, Pakistan rejects U.S. requests to send troops to join UN forces because of its security concerns with India, and the unresolved problem of Kashmir.
- U.S. interest in Pakistan grows after the Korean War with concerns about a more aggressive Soviet posture in areas such as the oil-rich Middle East.
- While President Truman sought good relations with both Pakistan and India, the attitude changed after Eisenhower replaced Truman who seeks greater reliance on collective security pacts to contain the Soviets. Ghulam Mohammad, Bogra, Zafarullah Khan and Ayub stress their allegiance to the anticommunist cause.
- **June 1953.** Secretary of State John Foster Dulles “tremendously impressed by the martial and religious qualities of the Pakistanis.” Nehru described as an “utterly impractical statesman.” President

Eisenhower agrees to military aid to Pakistan in terms of its role in the defence of the Middle East, laying the foundation that shaped U.S. relations with Pakistan and India for the next three and a half decades.

- **1954.** Pakistan joins U.S.-sponsored anticommunist alliance SEATO. The SENTO document dealt with communist aggression only, and provided no automatic military commitment from the U.S.
- **May 1954.** Pakistan and the U.S. sign Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement. U.S. boosts economic and military aid to Pakistan.
- **February 1955.** Pakistan joins the Baghdad Pact. U.S. serves as the pact's major element, without ever formally joining the alliance.
- **June 1956.** Prospects of Pakistan as a meaningful ally questioned. Alliance with Pakistan proves to be financially costly. In 1957, Eisenhower criticizes U.S. "tendency to rush out and seek allies." Pakistani leadership remains committed to its pro-West course as the best means of improving the country's security against India.
- **1959.** Pakistan grants permission to the U.S. to establish a secret intelligence facility and operate flights over Soviet Union.
- **March 1959.** Pakistan and the U.S. sign a bilateral security agreement. The agreement called upon the U.S. to "take such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as may be mutually agreed upon." The commitment was, however, tied to instances of communist aggression.
- **December 1959.** President Eisenhower becomes the first U.S. president to visit Pakistan. Official discussions did not, however, seriously address the future of Pakistan-U.S. military cooperation.

With access to U.S. equipment, training, and doctrine, Pakistan was able to develop an impressive military capability, numerically inferior to India, but superior in equipment and training. Improvement of the economy was, however, slower. In spite of an alliance with Pakistan on the surface, Eisenhower was able to achieve good relations with India as well.

1960s:

- **1960.** The U-2 episode brings home to Pakistan that besides military and economic aid, alignment with the U.S. entailed risks and dangers as well.
- **January 1961.** Kennedy becomes president. The new administration is lukewarm about Pakistan and boosts assistance to India to \$1 billion annually, while pledging \$150 million for Pakistan.

- **July 1961.** Ayub visits the U.S. Worried about U.S. assistance to India, he warns that Pakistan was re-examining membership of SEATO and stresses Pakistan's reliability as an ally.
- **1962.** Pakistan's border accord with China infuriates the U.S., setting Pakistan and U.S. policies on a collision course.
- **1964.** President Johnson conveys his distress over Pakistan's attention to China.
- **April 1965.** Johnson imposes de facto freeze on aid to Pakistan and India.
- **September 1965.** U.S. suspends military and economic aid to Pakistan following war with India.
- **1966-67.** Johnson approves \$140 million of commodity aid to Pakistan and allows the sale of spare parts for U.S.-supplied equipment, but refuses to provide financial credit or military assistance. He also accepts a more passive role in competition with the Soviet Union and China for influence in the region.
- **1969.** Nixon becomes the second U.S. president to visit the subcontinent. He conveys his intent "to restore a relationship of friendship based on trust" with Pakistan.

There was a fundamental shift in Pakistan-U.S. relationship by the end of the decade following the failure by the U.S. to limit Pakistan's relationship with China. Pakistan feels betrayed by its 'friend'. When Johnson left office in January 1969, the alliance was over in all but name. Although Washington continued to provide substantial economic assistance, military supply relationship was drastically restricted.

1970s:

- **July 14, 1971.** Kissinger pays a secret visit to China through Pakistan.
- **July 15, 1971.** U.S. suspends aid to Pakistan.
- 1972. Bhutto refrains from anti-U.S. rhetoric.
- **March 1973.** Nixon reinstates the 1967 arms supply policy and release \$24 million worth of military equipment.
- **September 1973.** Bhutto seeks U.S. help to construct a new port at Gwadar, Balochistan. U.S. shows no "great interest", and provides food aid and a \$40-50 million rehabilitation loan.
- **May 1974.** Following India's "peaceful nuclear explosion", Bhutto pledges to press ahead with Pakistan's nuclear programme.
- **February 1975.** President Ford lifts all limitations on arms transfers to Pakistan (and India), ending the embargo imposed by Johnson ten years earlier. He hopes Pakistan would not pursue the development of

nuclear explosives. U.S. Congress adopts amendments to section 669 and 670 of the foreign assistance act proposed by Senator John Glenn and Stuart Symington. Kissinger threatens to make “a horrible example” of Bhutto if he pursues the nuclear programme.

- **September 1977.** President Carter imposes sanctions on Pakistan under the Glenn amendment, barring aid to countries that had not signed the NPT, but imported nuclear reprocessing technology.
- **January 1979.** Pakistan withdraws from CENTO.
- **April 1979.** U.S. again suspends aid to Pakistan under the Symington amendment because of its refusal to give up the nuclear programme.
- **July 1979.** Carter approves a small covert-assistance programme for Afghans opposing the communist government in Kabul.
- **November 1979.** U.S. embassy in Islamabad burned.
- **December 1979.** Soviets invade Afghanistan. Carter reaffirms the 1959 bilateral security agreement against communist aggression. Offers to renew aid to Pakistan, and to expand covert assistance for Afghanistan to include all levels of military support for the mujahideen.

South Asia per se remained of limited importance to the new U.S. administration. Nixon strategy was to “protest” events in East Pakistan but “prevent the destruction of West Pakistan.”

Nixon years saw opening of relations with China, the development of détente with the Soviet Union, the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, and the ensuing oil crisis.

Deterring Pakistan from pursuing the nuclear path became the major bilateral issue.

With Carter as president, Washington turned to a policy of strengthening relationships with “regional influentials” which meant India not Pakistan. In the wake of the burning of the U.S. embassy in 1979, Pak-U.S. relations were once again put on ice.

The Soviet invasion turned the cool Pakistan-US relations dramatically. The U.S. approach had four principal points: to make the costs to the Soviets high enough to deter future adventures; maintain in place the 1959 agreement; offer \$400 million over two years minus the F-16s; and maintain U.S. concerns about Pakistan’s nuclear programme.

1980s:

- **January 1980.** Carter spells out the “Carter Doctrine”: Soviet attack on the Persian Gulf would be regarded as an attack on U.S. vital interests. Zia rejects U.S. proposed aid as “peanuts.”
- **1981.** President Reagan offers \$3.2 billion five-year aid proposal equally divided between economic and military aid, including state-of-art F-16 aircraft.
- **1985.** U.S institutes. the Pressler Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, requiring annual presidential certification to U.S. Congress that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device. Pakistan’s U.S. aid continues flowing, as the administrations of Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush certify Pakistan each year until 1990.

As a frontline state against the Soviet intervention, Pakistan was no longer considered a near-pariah despite its poor human rights record, political instability or its nuclear policies. While Pakistan’s nuclear programme remained a major issue of concern, the Reagan administration was willing to live with it as long as Pakistan did not explode a bomb. The U.S. traded military and economic aid for Pakistan’s cooperation in opposing the Soviet presence in Afghanistan.

1990s:

- **1990:** As the Soviets begin withdrawing from Afghanistan in 1988, Pakistan’s nuclear activities again come under intense U.S. scrutiny. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush suspends aid to Pakistan under the provisions of the Pressler Amendment. Most economic and all military aid is stopped and deliveries of major military equipment are suspended.
- **1998:** India, and then Pakistan, conduct nuclear tests and declare themselves full-fledged nuclear-weapons states. The United States imposes sanctions after the tests, restricting the provision of credits, military sales, economic assistance, and loans to the Pakistani government. Among the notable results of the aid cutoff in the early years is the non-delivery of F-16 fighter aircraft purchased by Pakistan in 1989. In December 1998, the United States agrees to compensate Pakistan with \$325 million in cash and \$140 million in goods, including surplus wheat.

- **1999:** Kargil and Musharraf's coup. In May, the incursion of Pakistan-backed armed forces into Kargil in Indian-held Kashmir leads to another war between India and Pakistan. In July, U.S. President Bill Clinton urges Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to withdraw the Pakistani forces. They sign a joint statement saying "concrete steps" will be taken to restore the cease-fire line in the disputed Himalayan territory. In October, overthrow of the Sharif government by Army General Pervez Musharraf triggers an additional layer of sanctions that includes restrictions on foreign military financing and economic assistance.

2000s:

- **2001:** 9/11 and the War on Terror. After the attacks of September 11, the United States lifts some sanctions placed on Pakistan after the 1998 nuclear tests and the 1999 military coup. President Pervez Musharraf—under strong U.S. diplomatic pressure—offers President George W. Bush "unstinted cooperation in the fight against terrorism." Musharraf agrees to help eliminate the Taliban movement in Afghanistan. Large amounts of aid begin to flow to Pakistan. Direct assistance programmes include aid for health, education, food, democracy promotion, child labour elimination, counternarcotics, border security and law enforcement, as well as trade preference benefits.
- **2002:** New U.S. military sales. Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf wins another five years in office, test fires missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and grants himself sweeping new powers. The Pentagon reports foreign military sales agreements with Pakistan worth \$27 million in fiscal year 2002, and \$167 million in fiscal year 2003. U.S. journalist Daniel Pearl is kidnapped and killed in January 2002. In March, a bomb in a church kills five in Islamabad, including two persons associated with the U.S. embassy. The U.S. State Department publishes a report labelling Pakistan's human rights record as "poor."
- **2003:** Fight Against al-Qaeda. President Bush announces a five-year, \$3 billion package for Pakistan during Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf's visit to the United States. U.S. military commanders complain that members of al-Qaeda and the Taliban attack coalition troops in Afghanistan and then escape across the Pakistani frontier. They urge Islamabad to do more to secure its western border. In mid-2003, tensions between Kabul and Islamabad reach alarming levels, with some top Afghan officials accusing Pakistan of destabilizing

Afghanistan. In an unprecedented show of force, Musharraf moves some twenty-five thousand Pakistani troops into the traditionally semi-autonomous tribal areas.

- **2004:** Crimes of A.Q. Khan. In February 2004, the founder of Pakistan’s nuclear programme, A.Q. Khan, confesses to supplying nuclear-weapons technology to Iran, Libya, and North Korea. The United States presses for Khan's arrest. But having just designated Pakistan as a “major non-NATO ally,” the United States settles for a form of home confinement for the scientist, who is a national hero in Pakistan. Meanwhile, Pakistan escalates army operations in the tribal areas, sparking resentment among locals.
- **2005:** The Kashmir earthquake. Following a tragic earthquake in October 2005, the United States responds immediately to Pakistan’s call for assistance and announces a \$510 million commitment for earthquake relief and reconstruction, including humanitarian assistance and military support for relief operations.
- **2006:** Diplomatic ties strengthened. President George W. Bush visits Pakistan in March 2006. He and President Pervez Musharraf reaffirm their shared commitment to continuing their cooperation on a number of issues including the war on terror, security in the region, strengthening democratic institutions, trade and investment, education, and earthquake relief and reconstruction. President Musharraf visits the United States in September 2006. He holds a bilateral meeting with President Bush and also participates in a trilateral meeting with President Bush and President Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan. The United States concludes the sale of F-16 aircraft to Pakistan in late 2006.
- **March 2007:** Judicial crisis. President Pervez Musharraf fires Pakistan’s Supreme Court Chief Justice Iftikhar Muhammad Chaudhry, sparking a civil society movement demanding his reinstatement. Musharraf’s popularity plummets as a result. Increase in attacks by Islamist extremists, a breakdown of truces made with pro-Taliban militants, and a resurgence of low-intensity warfare in the country’s tribal areas lead to a deteriorating internal security situation. A newly independent-minded judiciary and electoral pressures due to upcoming constitutionally-mandated polls further worsen Musharraf’s position.
- **July 2007:** Musharraf-Bhutto deal. President Pervez Musharraf’s popularity further falls and U.S. support for him increasingly comes

under fire. After prolonged pressure from the country's civil society and judiciary, Musharraf is forced to reinstate Chief Justice Iftikhar Mohammad Chaudhry. Musharraf's decision to order the army inside Islamabad's Red Mosque to quash a student uprising led by a rebel cleric escalates the political crisis. Washington tries to broker a power-sharing arrangement between Musharraf and opposition leader in exile Benazir Bhutto. Washington also plans to provide \$750 million in U.S. aid to Pakistan's tribal areas over the next five years.

- **November 2007:** State of emergency. In October 2007, Gen. Pervez Musharraf gets reelected as president. To prevent the Supreme Court from ruling against his reelection, he imposes a state of emergency in November. He dismisses the chief justice along with some other judges, suspends the constitution, and cracks down on pro-democracy activists and the media. The United States follows a cautious line and urges Musharraf to step down as army chief and lift the emergency. Musharraf complies, also agreeing to hold free and fair parliamentary elections in January 2008.
- **December 2007:** Bhutto killed. Pakistan's opposition leader Benazir Bhutto, who returned to Pakistan in October 2007 under an amnesty deal to participate in 2008 parliamentary elections, is killed in December in a bomb and gun attack. Her assassination is followed by rioting and street violence in many parts of the country where angry mobs protest her death. The government orders paramilitary forces into Bhutto's home province of Sindh.
- **January 2008:** Fighting extremists. Amid concerns that Pakistan is facing a tough fight against militants and al-Qaeda in the tribal areas, the United States says it remains ready, willing, and able to provide military support and conduct joint operations with the Pakistanis. This will require the consent of Pakistan, which remains sensitive to any U.S. military presence. Pakistan's parliamentary elections are postponed, now to be held on February 18. Pakistan subjected to daily terrorist bombings and other attacks by militants. U.S officials label Pakistan a the "most dangerous country in the world." Pakistan is seen as the hub of nuclear proliferation; drug smuggling; military dictatorship; and international terrorism.
- **March 2008:** Road to democracy. Opposition parties win February 18 parliamentary elections. They form a ruling coalition that excludes parties allied with President Pervez Musharraf. The new government

signals it will review its policy of cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts. Pakistan's civilian leaders say they want direct talks with militants, leading to concern in Washington.

- **September 2008:** Pakistan's new president. A month after President Pervez Musharraf resigns, Pakistan's legislators elect Asif Ali Zardari, Benazir Bhutto's widower, as the country's new president. Hours after Zardari's first speech to parliament, a suicide truck bombing at one of the country's most elite establishments, the Marriott Hotel in Islamabad, kills an estimated fifty people. International concerns increase over Pakistan's security conditions.
- **March 2009:** Obama's Af-Pak Strategy. After assuming office in January, U.S. President Barack Obama pledges to shift focus from the Iraq front to the war in Afghanistan. He appoints Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as special representative for Pakistan and Afghanistan and orders an interagency review to decide his administration's new strategy on the region. On March 27, he unveils his Af-Pak strategy, treating militants in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region as part of a single theater. The new strategy aims to "disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its safe havens in Pakistan, and to prevent their return to Pakistan or Afghanistan." It links stability in Afghanistan to effective action against these militant groups in Pakistan.
- **April 2009:** U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton tells a House panel that Pakistan government is abdicating to the Taliban and the extremists. With frequent load shedding of electricity and gas, President Obama expresses concern that the very fragile civilian government in Pakistan did not appear to have the capacity to deliver basic services to the people of Pakistan.
- **October 2009:** U.S. aid package. A new \$7.5 billion U.S. aid package (S3263) for Pakistan triples non-military aid for the next five years and aims to improve the U.S.-Pakistan relationship, yet it triggers controversy. The Pakistani army and political opposition argue some clauses in the package impinge on Pakistan's sovereignty. The bill is signed only after legislators in Congress include an explanatory statement. Experts say the furor over the bill also highlights deteriorating civil-military relations in Pakistan. Pakistan launches a long-awaited military operation in South Waziristan, one of the largest militant strongholds in the tribal areas, and home to Pakistani Taliban leadership. The offensive follows months-long military operations in

Swat Valley in the North West Frontier Province, where the army finally wrests control from the militants.

- **January 2010:** Secretary of Defense Gates pays an unannounced visit to Pakistan with a central wish to “relinquish the grievances of the past ... and instead focus on the promise of the future.” He speaks to Pakistani military officers, stating unequivocally that the United States “does not covet a single inch of Pakistani soil [nor] military bases,” nor does it “desire to control Pakistan’s nuclear weapons.” Secretary Gates and Adm. Mullen are said to have shifted from a critical approach to a gentler, “more-flies-with-honey” method of building trust with Pakistani military leaders who remain wary of U.S. intentions. U.S. officials step up a more intensive diplomacy and assurance that Pakistan will play a major role in the political future of Afghanistan.
- **February 2010:** Pakistan is seen as the hub of nuclear proliferation; drug smuggling; military dictatorship; and international terrorism. Vice President Joseph Biden terms Pakistan as the most worrisome foreign policy issue. He says Pakistan has deployable nuclear weapons, significant radicalized population, and not having a completely functional democracy. In their fight against terror, Pakistani officials estimate financial losses of \$40 billion since 2001, with massive socioeconomic costs in terms of human displacement as a result of Pakistan military operations in tribal areas and the Malakand Division against militants, increased funding for security institutions, reduced foreign investment and capital flight. Pakistan’s troubled economic conditions, fluid political and surety setting are seen as serious challenges by U.S. officials. President Obama says Afghanistan cannot be solved without solving Pakistan.
- **May 2010:** Times Square bombing. A failed car bombing on May 1 in New York's Times Square leads to the arrest of Pakistani-American Faisal Shahzad. Pakistani Taliban claims responsibility for the attack, and U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder says the group was "intimately involved" in the plot. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton warns there will be "severe consequences" for Pakistan if a successful terrorist attack in the United States is traced to that country. Pressure builds on Pakistan to do more to fight militancy, especially in the tribal agency of North Waziristan.

2011

- **February 2011:** US administration suspends high level contacts with Pakistan and contemplates suspension of economic aid after Pakistani authorities arrest Raymond Davis, a former U.S. army soldier, and an alleged private security contractor secretly working for CIA, after he shot dead two Pakistani locals, saying that he was being robbed. Pakistan acts tough on him despite U.S. demands that he be freed immediately because he enjoys diplomatic immunity under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Pakistani officials dispute the claim of immunity from a murder charge, asserting that Davis was involved in clandestine operations, and questioned the scope of his activities in Pakistan.
- **May 2011:** In a secret military operation in violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty, a team of U.S. Navy SEALs reportedly kill Osama bin Laden, the alleged mastermind of the 9/11 attacks in U.S. and the world’s most wanted man, in the north-western Pakistani city of Abbottabad. U.S. forces take custody of the body and bury him at sea. U.S. ambassador to Pakistan Cameron Munter says Pakistan government must explain what Osama was doing in Pakistan. Pakistani media and civil society call for review of relations with the U.S.
- **June 2011:** Pakistan send home 90 of the 135 US service personnel training its paramilitary border forces. Mistrust over Osama bin Laden continues to strain and worsen relations between Pakistan and the US.
- **July 2011:** U.S. denies it has vacated the Shamsi airbase in Balochistan being used by CIA to stage drone strikes against suspected militant hideouts inside Pakistan tribal regions. U.S. officials claim that the base has not been and will not be vacated. They assert that drone strikes inside Pakistan will continue unabated. In a move to pressure Pakistan military to step up cooperation, U.S. suspends \$800 million in military aid to Pakistan.
- **August 2011:** U.S. puts in place a classified system of aid to Pakistan after the raid on a compound in Abbottabad that killed Osama bin Laden. White House starts conditioning billions of dollars in aid to Pakistan based on progress on a secret scorecard of U.S. objectives to combat militancy. The move signals a shift in U.S. toward a pay-for-performance relationship. Senior U.S. official calls the unusual new approach “a hard-knuckled reflection of where we are right now” in

relations with Pakistan. The new approach represents an effort to salvage counter-terrorism cooperation to deliver a deathblow to al Qaeda's remaining leadership in Pakistan, and asks Pakistan to take specific steps to ease the increasingly deteriorating bilateral relations.

Notes & References

- ¹ Anatol Lieven, 2011, *Pakistan: A Hard Country*, Allen Lane, Penguin Books.
- ² 'US urged to delay Pakistan aid', *The News International*, June 3, 2011.
- ³ 'CIA Chief: Pakistan would have jeopardized operation' May 3, 2011, *swampland.time.com*
- ⁴ 'US panel puts bar on US aid for Pakistan', *The News International*, June 15, 2011.
- ⁵ 'America punishes Pakistan Army in major shift ', *The New International*, July 11, 2011.
- ⁶ 'US links Pak aid to progress on secret scorecard', *The News International*, August 16, 2011.
- ⁷ 'America punishes Pakistan ...', Op. Cit.
- ⁸ House Foreign Relations Committee Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2012-2014, H.R.2583.
- ⁹ See Robert Gates, *Foreign Policy journal*, Jan-Feb, 2009.
- ¹⁰ http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/11651039/ns/world_news-south_and_central_asia/t/bush-praises-pakistans-help-terror-fight/
- ¹¹ Economic Survey of Pakistan, Government of Pakistan, 2010-11.
- ¹² Susan Cornwell, 'Factbox: US has allocated \$20 billion for Pakistan', *Reuters*, April 21, 2011.