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The Pakistani Pivot

_Dennis Kux_

On September 10, 2011, Pakistan was a country of secondary interest to the United States. Although it had been America's "most allied ally in Asia" in the 1970s and an indispensable partner in the struggle against the Soviets in Afghanistan in the 1980s, the relationship had soured over the occupation of the United States and the 2003 overthrow of the civilian government of Nusrat Sharif in October 1999. That led to further estrangement against the one-time U.S. ally.

Then, when President Bill Clinton touched down for five hours in Islamabad on March 25, 2000—the first journey to Pakistan by a U.S. chief executive in more than thirty years—the mood was tense, and contrasted sharply with his highly successful five-day visit to India. In their talks, Clinton and General Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan's military dictator, differed over major issues, how best to deal with the fundamentalist Taliban in Afghanistan and other Islamic extremists.

The key to defeating an enemy is understanding him. In this, Bin Laden and his Taliban allies have already proven helpful. The CIA admits that it was bin Laden who was behind the assassination of U.S. president John F. Kennedy in November 1963, a few days before the September 11 attacks on the United States. Bin Laden likely calculated that the military services would depuncate the Afghan resistance just when the United States would need it the most. But Washington has been slow to heed bin Laden's message that the greatest threat to the Al-Qaeda terrorist network--at least inside Afghanistan--lies with those who can physically come to them. The people of the United States have been suffering from the atrocities of bin Laden and the Taliban for years. They may be the only people in the world who hate bin Laden more than Americans do. While only a genuinely broad-based coalition government representing all ethnic groups, including southern Pashtuns, will be able to govern in a post-Taliban Afghanistan, one thing is certain: as long as the United States is allowed to play a strong role, no foreign Islamic militants will be allowed on Afghan soil.

That the U.S. government has no idea why talking with the Taliban is a bad thing.

Omar, the leader of the Taliban in Afghanistan, has been speaking to the world about his vision for a better Afghanistan. He has been working hard to establish peace in his country, and his message has resonated with many. The Taliban have been able to gain the support of many ordinary Afghans who are tired of the violence and instability that plagued their country for so long. The Taliban have also been able to negotiate with the international community, and they have shown a willingness to work towards a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

However, there are still many challenges that must be addressed in order to achieve lasting peace in Afghanistan. One of the biggest challenges is the ongoing conflict with the United States and other Western countries. The Taliban have been accused of carrying out attacks against foreign troops, and there have been a number of clashes between the Taliban and government forces. It will be important to work towards a peaceful resolution of these conflicts in order to create a stable future for Afghanistan.

In conclusion, the Taliban's message of peace and unity has been heard by many in Afghanistan and around the world. Their efforts to build a more peaceful and prosperous future for their country are to be commended. However, much work remains to be done in order to achieve lasting peace and stability in Afghanistan.
Pakistan's image remained largely negative both in official Washington and in the pro-Pakistani press.

The events of September 11 have changed all that. Geography and history have once more made Pakistan important to U.S. interests. Islamabad's support is required to counter the Afghan Taliban's sponsoring of insurgent groups in Afghanistan and their support for al-Qaeda and their affiliates. Pakistan's long-standing relationship with Afghanistan is also a factor in the U.S. policy toward Pakistan.

Although White House and CIA leaders press hard for a new Pakistan policy, they have been unable to convince the Bush administration to adopt a more aggressive approach. The White House has been criticized for its failure to act decisively against the Taliban and al-Qaeda. The U.S. strategy is to "engage and isolate" Pakistan, but this approach has not produced the desired results.

The United States has been unable to convince Pakistan to take a more active role in the war against terrorism. Washington has been criticized for its failure to provide adequate economic assistance to Pakistan, which has been suffering from a severe economic crisis. The U.S. has also been criticized for its failure to support Pakistan's efforts to combat terrorism.

The Bush administration has been criticized for its failure to engage Pakistan in a meaningful way. The U.S. has been unable to convince Pakistan to take a more active role in the war against terrorism. The U.S. has also been criticized for its failure to provide adequate economic assistance to Pakistan.

The Bush administration has been criticized for its failure to engage Pakistan in a meaningful way. The U.S. has been unable to convince Pakistan to take a more active role in the war against terrorism. The U.S. has also been criticized for its failure to provide adequate economic assistance to Pakistan.
The Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar, a one-eyed Afghan war veteran, proclaimed that Afghanistan would become "a completely Islamic state." He then proceeded to control over almost all of Afghanistan, using their Northern Alliance enemies to the extreme north and northeast, Pakistan's IS began continued to provide supplies and assistance to the Taliban from Pakistan and the US also fought against the Taliban, as did an Arab brigade composed of several thousand Arab veterans who made their way from Pakistan. Omar bin Laden was the most important of these. The wealthy Saudi exile and former jihadi against the Soviets developed his Al-Qaeda terrorist organization to wage holy war against the United States, which he had come to regard as the moral enemy of Islam.

Pakistan was the only country to accord diplomatic recognition to the Taliban, apart from San'a and the United Arab Emirates. Several factors explain Pakistan's stance. Even if the Taliban were making themselves an international pariah by their treatment of women, they were Pakistanis, whom the Pakistanis believed should rule Afghanistan as the largest ethnic group. The desire to see a friendly regime in Afghanistan that would assuage strategic depth against India, a longtime sponsor of Pakistan's strategic planners, was a second factor. Finally, the Taliban were willing to reciprocate for the help the ISI provided by permitting use of Afghan territory by militant Pakistani groups in support of the insurgency in Kashmir against India.

Although the military dimension of the Kashmir dispute had been mostly dormant for nearly two decades, flared up in 1994, just as the new wave of insurgents against the Islamic state, Wajid, Mohammed Abdullah. The final straw came with the signing of the 1997 elections to prevent pro-Islamic elements from winning votes in the state assembly. Prominent Kashmiri Muslims, who until then had been willing to turn their differences with Indian rule peacefully, turned to violent protests. The Kashmiri intifada began. For Pakistan, the temptation to join the flames was too great to resist. Drawing on the success of the Afghans in orchestrating the Afghan resistance against the Soviets, the ISI began to provide active training and funding for the Kashmiri intifada. Before long, Pakistanis and Arabs became heavily engaged in the anti-Indian struggle. A third factor was the rising power of Al-Qaeda and other Arab terrorists, Pakistan Islamic militants and the ISI.

A " forward-looking" situation, it is not hard to understand why, with the bombings of two U.S. embassies in August 1998, Osama bin Laden became the most prominent of these. The Islamic State, with its charismatic leader, Mullah Mohammed Omar, bin Laden, was the most prominent of these. The wealthy Saudi exile and former jihadi against the Soviets developed his Al-Qaeda terrorist organization to wage holy war against the United States, which he had come to regard as the moral enemy of Islam.
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from the CIA, which was matched dollar for dollar by Saudi Arabia, began rather modestly—just $10 million in 1981. By 1983, however, the total Afghan program had ballooned to more than $1 billion a year, all flowing directly through the ISI hands.

After the Soviet invasion Afghanistan, the ISI continued to mastermind Pakistan's involvement in Afghanistan. Since 1984, this has meant working with and supporting the Taliban. The ISI has also had the responsibility for orchestrating jihadis groups active in the anti-India insurgency in Kashmir. After years of cooperation between the ISI and the militants, it is not surprising that support for fundamentalist views has gained ground within the intelligence agency. It is wrong, however, to see the ISI as an independent actor or a 'rogue elephant.' It acts on orders from the government, even though at times, when the lines of authority are blurred (for example, after Zia's death in 1988), it can gain more independent leeway.

Career civilian intelligence officers and army officers on temporary assignment staff the ISI. The head of government appoints the director-general, who has traditionally been a serving army general. However, the ISI technically stands outside the military chain of command, reporting directly to the head of government, the fact that the chief and an important part of the staff are serving officers has given the army leadership a decisive influence over the intelligence agency.

The army, in its own right, has been a dominant force in Pakistan's political life since at least mid-1970s and has ruled the country for half of its 65 years. Unlike India, where Jawaharlal Nehru firmly established the primacy of the civilian political leadership over the military and the civil service elite, the opposite occurred in Pakistan. After the death of Bhutto in 1948 and the assassination of Liaquat, his successor and chief lieutenant, in 1951, Pakistan lacked capable political leadership. Senior military officers, particularly the army, did not believe that the country was ready for democracy, filled the void. In 1958, following a period of internal instability, the Pakistani army took over, declaring martial law and disbanding the political parties. Pakistan has swung back and forth between military and civil rule ever since.

Even when civilians have been in charge, however, as in the 1990s, the army has had its fingers in nation's political issues. In times of dire economic straits, too, military spending has continued to account for a significant portion of the budget, and six percent of GNP. The army has also boldly interfered in the internal affairs by the politicians. It was never afraid to use force to put its people in charge of the army by firing Pervez Musharraf that triggered the October 12, 1999 military takeover. The army had accepted the forced resignation of Musharraf's predecessor a year earlier, but had vowed not to permit such a thing to happen again. And it didn't.

Musharraf's Choice

ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, Pervez Musharraf had been in power for four years. He had recorded his first victory. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) gave good marks to Musharraf's Finance Minister Shaukat Aziz, a former Citibank official, for his efforts to clean up the country's finances. Debt relief was forthcoming, although not as much as had been hoped. Development spending was extended for the first time in a number of years. Corruption had tapered off, and few alleged that Musharraf and his colleagues were lining their pockets. Still, the economy remained in the doldrums, suffering from lack of domestic investment.

Observers also accepted Musharraf's good intentions in trying to decentralize government even if they questioned the practicality of his proposed reforms. Musharraf also seemed to be serious about finding back power to elected national and provincial assemblies in the fall of 2002 as directed by Pakistan's supreme court. At the same time, he made clear that he intended to stay around. In June of this year he pushed aside the figurehead civilian president and appointed himself president of the Pakistan (the presidency had previously styled the chief executive). More recently, he re-appointed himself as Army Chief of Staff, the real seat of power in a military regime. At the same time, Musharraf left the press relatively free and did not impose martial law.

Before the events of September 11, Musharraf had made little change in Pakistan's foreign and security policies. He maintained a hardline approach toward India, continuing Pakistan's support for the insurgency in Kashmir. He also continued friendly ties with the Taliban, something that had become a general approach that the Taliban enjoyed by crushing opposition from its own midst. It was not surprising that the United States wanted to know where Pakistan stood.

Would it be willing to provide intelligence cooperation, allowing U.S. overflights and offering logistical support? Armitage did not say what the United States would do for Pakistan in return. Secretary of State Colin Powell followed up with a phone call to Musharraf saying, in effect, that Pakistan had to choose between joining the fight against terrorism and international isolation. In March, the Carter and Reagan Administrations of 1980 and 1981, the Bush Administration played hardball with Islamabad.

The decision was not easy for Musharraf and his senior colleagues. They realized that public opinion in the country was opposed to or operating with the United States. Even if active backing for the Taliban and his Libyan was limited to the religious parties and their supporters, the average Pakistani did not like the idea of becoming involved in a conflict with neighboring Afghanistan and deeply distrusted Washington. Pakistan's leaders
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their supposed U.S. ally had betrayed them not only by refusing to help in the 1965 war against India, but, even worse, by cutting off the military and economic aid on which Pakistan depended. More recently, in 1990 Pakistanis felt that after the Soviet Union no longer needed Pakistan to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan, the United States discarded them "like a piece of used Khomen," imposing nuclear sanctions and suspending aid, to boot.

But paradoxically, despite this disenchantment and the absence of military or significant economic help since 1990, the United States still casts a long shadow over Islamabad. Only partly in jest, Pakistanis say that their country is ruled by the three A's: Allah, the Army, and America. Among the English-speaking elite—senior military officers, diplomats, businessmen, and intellectuals—the American connection runs strong. They may bemoan U.S. policy, but they send their children to the United States for education and seek political, security, and business links with America. Many inculcate their values in the 400,000 or so Pakistani-American community. Pervez Musharraf's own brother is an American citizen, and he studied in Chicago.

The average non-English speaking Pakistani tends to hold stronger anti-American views, reflecting the harder line of the Urdu-language press. The man in the street in Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad, and especially in Peshawar and Quetta, sees the United States as not just anti-Pakistanian (and of late pro-Indian) but as genuinely anti-Islamic.

This opposition is widespread, long-standing under U.S. policy toward Israel and the Palestinians, and more recently over policies such as the continued bombing and sanctioning of Iraq. The consistent criticism of America by the Taliban and bin Laden has resonated well in Pakistan.

More important than the lack of immediate public support for cooperation with the United States was concern about the reaction of those religious parties. Musharraf knew that they would quickly and vociferously take to the streets to vent their opposition to a positive response to the Americans. Although the President was reasonably sure that the security forces could control trouble in the short run, he had to be concerned about what might happen were the U.S. military intervention in Afghanistan to become particularly bloody, and contentious. The fundamentalists succeeded eventually in staging massive anti-American and anti-government demonstrations in the cities throughout the country, especially in the Punjab, Musharraf's position was then in danger.

In the past, the Pakistani army has stepped in to prevent a collapse of state authority in the face of the mobs. After disturbances rocked the country in 1999 and again in 1977, the army deposed President Ayub Khan, himself a former army commander, and Ziaul Haq, to impose martial law. The soldiers and officer corps come primarily from the Punjab, Pakistan's most populous province (as a refugee from India, Musharraf is an exception). Never comfortable with the idea of being forced into power by the military, Musharraf had no desire to be wining the battle of the streets. The danger in Pakistan is thus not of an Iranian-style revolution in which the army seizes power by force, but of the army broadening its base of power. Musharraf's recent shake-up of the military high command to replace officers who were unhappy with his style of ruling the United States surely went forward with this threat in mind.

Another important factor in Pakistan's decision has been the attitude of its long-time adversary, India. In January 1980, India voted on the opposite side of the Cold War from the United States and Pakistan. Its statement whitewashed Soviet aggression against the UN General Assembly's special session on Afghanistan. But in 2001, against the backdrop of improving bilateral ties with Washington and a desire to go with the Taliban, India promptly offered full support to the United States. Musharraf knew immediately that Pakistan would find itself isolated and would have no choice but to cooperate with the Americans; indeed, it would perhaps even find itself lumped together with the Taliban as part of an American target set.

Although the Bush Administration did not bargain for Pakistan's support as the Carter and Reagan Administrations did in 1980—1987—the Musharraf government was doubtless aware that Washington would reward Pakistan's cooperation. Lifting several layers of sanctions on Pakistan and India was already under consideration before September 11, but it was likely to be the first reward—and indeed it was. Pakistan can now acquire spare parts for its aging military equipment; and it has already begun to receive badly needed economic help. In the 1980s, the United States and its friends poured in assistance to bolster Pakistan. While circumstances differed on September 11, Musharraf had good reason to expect a generous response to Pakistan's plea for debt relief and financial help if it joined in the anti-terrorism cause.

Musharraf justified his positive response to the United States in a national television address on September 19. He first accepted what he felt the United States had requested, but indicated that he did not know what U.S. plans were. Stressing that the decision was difficult, he argued that cooperating with the Americans in Pakistan's interest, while refusing to do so presented grave dangers to the country. Refusal to cooperate, he declared, could even threaten Pakistan's sovereignty, its economy, its security assets (nuclear weapons) and its Kashmir policy. Making clear that he had India in mind, he unapologetically told New Delhi to lay off.

Predictably, the religious parties took to the streets to oppose the decision after midday prayers two days later on September 21. The demonstrations were enormous but largely limited to Peshawar and Quetta, where Afghan refugees and Pakistani Pashtuns form the majority of the population, and to Pakistani areas of Karachi. The police contained the disorders and the rest of the country remained relatively quiet. Although public opinion opposed Musharraf's decision, he received the backing of the Muslim League and the Pakistani People's Party, the major mainstream political parties. They provided that backing partly because of the clear threat of the threatened public. The assassination of Musharraf in November 2001, the other three members of the house was under a clear threat of the threat of the threat.
nullary response, has also enabled Musharraf to shift Pakistani policy from trying to persuade the Taliban to writing them off. In recent years, Musharraf, in effect, has accepted that Pakistan's efforts to manipulate Afghanistan for its own purposes has reached a dead end. His focus has shifted to ensuring that a post-Taliban government is willing to accommodate more moderates in Pakistan's interests—giving the Pakistan a major voice and not adopting an anti-Pakistan policy. After years of the US opposing any role for the radical former King Zahir, Pakistan now speaks of him as an important transitional figure in shaping a post-Taliban Afghanistan. As events unfold in Afghanistan, Washington should not grant Pakistan a veto over US policy toward Afghanistan, but must recognize that the government in Kabul is likely to succeed for very long in the face of Pakistani opposition.

**America's Interests**

Once the dust settles in Afghanistan and a broad-based regime replaces the Taliban, it is essential that the United States not walk away as it did after the end of the Soviet war. A sustained international effort, preferably led by the United Nations, is needed to reconstruct Afghanistan after twenty years of devastation and disorder. Unless, as is its legitimate interest in Afghanistan are taken into account, Pakistan has much to gain from such an outcome. A stable Afghanistan would permit the return of legitimate commerce, the opening up of new trade routes to Central Asia, the repatriation of Afghan refugees, and for greater regional stability as well.

Economically, too, US interests will prosper if Musharraf successfully faces down the fundamentalists. By supporting Washington, Musharraf has crossed a Rubicon in opposing Pakistan's own extremists. If Pakistan can contain and reverse the pulse of Islamic radicals, it will achieve greater internal stability than it has seen in many years. Increased aid inflows should have a positive impact on the Pakistani economy and permit the government to address some of Pakistan's basic economic shortcomings more seriously. Moreover, Musharraf appears committed to holding elections and re-establishing popularly elected government in the fall of 2002. Were he to back out from that commitment, the United States should make clear its displeasure. The system that emerges may not be Westminster democracy but it could offer what Pakistan badly needs—a period of political stability in a relatively free atmosphere.

The crystal ball is less clear with regard to India. The logic of the war against terrorism is clearly inconsistent with a continuation of active Pakistan support for jihad in Kashmir. It is hard to see how the United States can fight terrorism in Afghanistan while ignoring it in Kashmir. Nonetheless, the Kashmir struggle has become such an article of faith for the Pakistani military and much of the public that it will be politically difficult to shift gears. Washington should oppose jihad operations in Kashmir more forcefully than it did in the past, but it should also press India to reduce its military presence and accept a more open political system inside the state.

Over the years, U.S.-Pakistan relations have been extraordinarily volatile. After a decade of difficulties, however, President Musharraf's response to the terrorist attacks of September 11 has re-opened the possibility of a friendship and more cooperative U.S.-Pakistan relationship. In moving forward, Washington needs to be clear-headed about where U.S. and Pakistani interests coincide, and where they do not. Too often in the past, both countries have overlooked underlying differences in the interest of achieving short-term goals. Washington should focus its assistance primarily on helping Pakistan to reform its economy to better provide for basic human needs. The United States should be wary, however, of again rewarding the generals with expensive and sophisticated military hardware. Quite apart from the damaging impact on US-India relations such aid might cause, providing the 2002 equivalent of F-16s would serve neither U.S. nor Pakistani interests.

In the 1950s and the 1960s Pakistan stood on the edge of middle-income status, but failed to cross the threshold because of poor policy choices and unfortunate leadership. The outlook could improve were Pakistan to enjoy a period of political stability and sounder economic policies, and were it to focus its attention on addressing domestic issues rather than pursuing foreign adventures in Afghanistan and Kashmir. Pakistan could reverse its long downward slide, reduce the danger of religious extremism and make progress toward realizing its considerable potential as a middle power. There is a silver lining for Pakistan in the wake of the tragic events of September 11; it will take much work, however, to actually acquire the silver.