



---

## **Zia - Musharraf Era And Pak-US Relationship, A Tale Of Ups And Down.**

**Afzaal Amin.** Mphil, Department of Political Science, AWKUM, Mardan, Pakistan.

**Hina Malik,** lecturer department of Political Science AWKUM

**Muhammad Hayat Khan,** Mphil peace and conflict university of Peshawar

**Dr. Manzoor Ahmad** Department of Political Science AWKUM

**Muzamil Shah** Department of Law AWKUM

**Faraz Ali** Head of Department of Political Science University of Sawabi

**Sumayya Feroz** Lecturer Department of Political Science University of Sawabi

**Riaz Ahmad khan** Research Assistant(Legal) Department of Law AWKUM

---

### **Abstract:**

If we looked into the historical background of Pak US relation we can conclude it that it was not a forced marriage for Pakistan but yes it was definitely one sided love from our side. US have always given prior importance to their national interest and whenever they achieved their interest they did not hesitate to turn their back on Pakistan.

Since the independence Pakistan has always been given priority to be in the block of USA. Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO which was a Military alliance in the era of 1950s and 1960s. This thing was purely done to contain USSR Communism. We have already provided the Air bases in Badabera Peshawar from where U-2 Spy plane were used to do surveillance of USSR. The famous incident happened when U-2 spy plane went to capture pictures of USSR territory the plan has been hit by USSR and the pilot of the plan was captured.

Pakistan has always favored the USA policy whether it's Afghan Jihad in 1980s, or the USA policies after 9/11. US always promote the establishment of democracy in the world. But if we looked into Pakistan case our relation remain very friendly with USA especially when there is dictatorship in Pakistan.

This thing was not for free of course Pakistan has been received so many Aids and technological assistance and also the US allowed them to have access to the US market. The net worth of Pakistan trade has reached to 2.5 billion dollars in 1980. This paper will explain the relationship status between USA and two military dictators Zia and Musharraf.

### **INTRODUCTION:**

In 1970's the US-Pakistan relations were not good and friendly. Bhutto's the then PM of Pakistan was an anti- Americanism; he was of the belief only USA can't fulfill the interest of Pakistan. His policies, his nuclear program and human rights violations were entirely enough and sufficient to derail and cause immense amount of irritation and disturbance in the political affairs between these two states. For that purposes Pakistan started its nuclear program with the collaboration and help of the Canada. Pakistan installed its very first nuclear power plant in the city of Karachi

under the supervision of Pak Atomic Energy Commission in the year of 1971. This nuclear power plant was capable of having the capacity of 137 MW initially but over the passage of time this capability of 137 MW reduced to only 85 MW. Later on certain other project with the help of china were launched in the country by PAEC. (Small, 2015).

Later on in the year of 1976 Pakistan established another laboratory with the name of Kahuta Research Laboratory (KRL) .they started to work along with the PAEC. They have been given the responsibility of the Uranium enrichment wholly for the sack of Military purposes. It was the time when India tested their nuclear weapon with the codename of SmilingBuddha in the year of 1974. USA wanted to convince the Pakistani government at any cost to postpone their nuclear program. ZA Bhutto was not ready for this as this was not in national interest of Pakistan. USA put certain economic sanctions to put pressure on Pakistan. (Reiter & Gartner,2013)

Pakistan always wanted to go parallel to the power of India in the subcontinent. When the intelligence Agency informs Pakistan government regarding the Indian intentions of having the nuclear power, Pakistan also wanted to counter attack this approach of India. In mean time due to certain reasons Bhutto was removed by a military dictator. This can be said that all this happened with the approval of USA because it was far easy for USA to have dialogues with one dictator rather than that of a democratic government.

Later Zia's entry and his bad human rights record could not bind the two countries into a friendly bond. In 1979 events took a big turn. The USSR's entry into Afghanistan did not only indicate the dawn of Cold War II, but also led to a change in the US policy towards Pakistan. The geo-strategic location of Pakistan once again proved beneficial for it. It not only improved the US-Pak relationship equation but also pours in arms and economic aid to fight back the Soviet Union.

There are two phases of the US policy towards Pakistan during Zia regime. The phase I (1979) indicates the US-Pakistan relations before the initiation of Cold War II period. Where Phase II (1979-88) we would study the US-Pakistan relations after the inception of Cold War II period.

### **The U.S.-Policy under Zia Phase 1 (1977-79)**

In 1977 when Jimmy Carter assumed office as the US president, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Z.A Bhutto was facing worst opposition from the PNA (Pakistan National Alliance) an alliance of all opposition parties, who were accusing Bhutto of rigging in 1977 elections. At that time the US-Pakistan relations were at its lowest ebb for various reasons:

- Firstly, the US was paying more attention to the final outcome of Vietnam War, Middle East crises and on the impact of oil price hike than Pakistan;
- Secondly, Pakistan was no more important for the US because other détente relationship between the United States and Soviet Union, signing of SALT treaties and negotiations over Indian Ocean power race between

The two super powers.

The Bhutto's ouster on July 5, 1977 by a military coup d'état of Gen. Zia-ul-Haq, did not evoke an immediate American response. The US, by adopting openly this non-responsive attitude towards this change showed its hostility to the civilian government of Bhutto. It was widely believed that Bhutto was deposed by the US for his nuclear program.(Bhutto, Z. 1979). Even Soviet leaders concluded that Bhutto had been over thrown by an American engineered plan because the US was interested in propagating military arrangement in Pakistan.(Anwar, 1997). For this reason, Zia"s takeover did not evoke the needed criticism in the US, though it was worst visible violation of democratic norms, which should have pre-disposed Carter against Zia. (Van, 1980).

Zia's thought that American relief on ouster of Bhutto, who was a great believer in Islamic solidarity and the one, who after prohibition of American aid to the countries like Pakistan (Glenn Amendment) declared in fury the US aid as a slander automatically meant that the US would welcome him proved mistaken because the US-Pakistan relations did not assume any greater degree of warmth because of Zia's continuation of Pakistan's nuclear programed.

American Concern towards Zia's Coup D'etat After coming into power, Zia had promised to hold elections within 90 days but failed to live up to his promise. He soon made the human rights situation very serious by inflicting the charges of "conspiracy to murder" of dissident leader Ahmed Raza Kasuri's father led to public outrage and intra-party hostility as Bhutto was accused of masterminding the crime. Thus he arrested a large number of PPP's supporters including male and female members of Bhutto family on the same charge. Due to the circumstances mentioned above, the Carter administration that laid great emphasis on sanctity of human rights and non-proliferation, the suspension of civil liberties and continuation of nuclear programed were taken into account and Carter declined to visit Pakistan in January 1978, when he decided to visit Asia, though, when he over flew Pakistan he sent a message for the early restoration of democracy to Zia. On the other hand, Zia instead of restoring democracy decided to hang Z.A. Bhutto on the charge of murder, despite several appeals of mercy from all over the world including the US Bhutto's execution once again brought the human rights issue in focus and Carter administration began to call Zia and his collaborators as worst violators' of human rights in Pakistan.(Hyman, & Kaushik,1989).

Zia came under the immense amount of pressure due to his policies and the violation of human rights activity in the country. Finally he decided to take a U Turn in the pursuing of the nuclear power. This thing was never acceptable for the ZA Bhutto but Zia not only did it but also asked for certain amount of concession from India. He made the US authority convinced that he is ready to postponed his nuclear program but for that he wanted USA to favour them and made India to terminate their nuclear program too. It is clear like crystal that Zia was always in the favour to derail and terminated the nuclear program but he couldn't bear the pressure of the country men. By doing this and taking dictation from the US administration he made his life easy to rule in the country. Zia these policies made him comfortable to rule in the country. This program was a major cause of the curtailment of US aid in 1979. In April 1979, in order to pressurize Pakistan, the US applied a provision of Symington Amendment and halted all development aid approved in April 1970 for the year 1979 and for the following year. (Thyagaraj, & Thomas2006).

Though this development aid was actually halted in 1977, but the USA decided to use economic aid as leverage as there was no arms supply to chop off. As a result, Pakistan received none of \$51.6 million of the apportioned aid. As India was not ready to accept any of the offers proposed by Pakistan, Zia could not halt the nuclear programed. On the other hand, Zia's determination to continue Pakistan's nuclear program not only ran counter to basic goals of Carter's foreign policy but to American security interests as well. As the US policy on this issue was not personality specific but issue specific. Thus Carter's administration initially was not ready to welcome Zia unless he stopped the nuclear program in Pakistan, which Pakistan could use against Arab's foe but United States friend, Israel. Pakistan, in order to lessen the U.S. criticism, made it clear that its efforts to achieve nuclear capability did not mean that they will completely postponed it but rather they will get some time to developed their nuclear capabilities and research facilities. They also wanted that their research facilities remained in safe hands. The US tried its best to stop nuclear program in Pakistan. In reaction to this policy Zia, in March 1979 along with Iran, decided to terminate Pakistan's membership in CENTO. In response to this anti-US policy, he stated,

“Pakistan felt better to be non-aligned than allied.”

This attempt of Pakistan ended the US-Pakistan alliance relationship, which had tied them up, at least, for a quarter century. Zia, by this attempt, also cleared Pakistan's way for full membership in the Non Aligned Movement (NAM). (Ahmad,1979).

This clearly depicted the drift in the US-Pak relations over nuclear issue. Later in November 1979, another event occurred which clearly demonstrated anti-U.S. feelings prevalent in Pakistan. A rumour, that the US with Israel was behind the attack in the Holy Mosque in Makkah, was widely spread. (Allison, 2018).

It resulted in anti-US demonstrations in Rawalpindi, Lahore and Karachi and also burning of the American Embassy in Islamabad where some Americans killed. These issues clearly depicted the US-Pakistan relations were unfriendly during the first two years of Zia rule. (Richter & Gustafson, 1980).

### **The US. Policy during Zia Phase II (1979-88)**

The US-Pakistan relations did not assume any greater degree of warmth because of Zia's continuation of Pakistan's nuclear programed. Pakistan and USA relation was not great enough in 1970s. Due to the imposition of Martial law and the other human right violation made the things further worst and difficult for the Pakistani Administration. It was the time when Pakistan get started its nuclear program it made the situation further worsen. During this era Pakistan was not at the very priority list of US administrations. But it was the time when there was constant conflict between the world's two blocks which were communist block and capitalist block. USA wanted to contain communism at any cost. On the other hand the USSR wanted to expand its influence to South Asia and wanted to have the control of hot waters. For this purposes USSR entered into Afghanistan in the year of 1979. (Gibbs, 1987).

It was a great shock for the USA. They were not in position to tolerate this act of USSR. They wanted to make the Afghanistan grave yard for the USSR. This thing is not a piece of cake for the US administration without the help of Pakistan. The world has seen a dramatic change in the Pak US relationship. In the split of second suddenly Pakistan has become the most important country for USA. In the beginning of 1970 the Pak US relation was at the lowest ebb. And in the year of 1979 Pakistan was one of the most important countries in the world for USA. The low profile policies have reached to the highest peak. This US approach made Pakistan to play a major role in the region. In this phase, three important events occurred which changed the US-Pakistan Relationship equation from cold into cordial one. These three events were:

- The Islamic revolution in Iran in February 1979;
- The fall of Afghanistan to USSR in December 1979;
- The Iran-Iraq war in September 1980.

These events brought the US closer to Pakistani perception of threat. Before the fall of Afghanistan to the USSR, the United States was showing apathy and insensitivity over the growing Soviet involvement in Afghanistan's politics. Pakistan tried to awaken the US. But it was all in vain. It was the Soviet Union's physical invasion in Afghanistan, which made President Carter to change the US policy from moralist standpoint to real politics. The US experts considered the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan as a prelude to its Expansionism which could threaten the US interests in this region. Geo-strategic importance of this region for the United States, for uninterrupted oil flow and warm waters, could never be disregarded. Equally important in the new context was Pakistan's location at the mouth of Gulf and its relations with the Gulf States.

The Soviet presence in Afghanistan was not good for both Iran and Pakistan. They are in the very access of the Soviet tactical Air Power which also outflanked both Iran and Pakistan on ground. The USSR wanted to have access and control of both Persian Gulf and also that of the Gawadar/ Arabian Sea. Both these areas were extremely closed to the USA Shipping route in the region. By allowing USSR to have control here mean giving them the control of Strait of Hormuz and Strait of Malacca which was against the national interest of USA. Secondly, Pakistan was also important for the US to maintain Afghanistan's freedom and sovereignty. The US could not move arms in substantial quantity in Afghanistan directly to fight back USSR without Pakistan's help. It was the menace of Soviet's ambition in the whole region due to which Carter expounded his famous doctrine on January 23, 1980. He declared that the US would consider any attempt by an outside power to gain control of the Persian Gulf as an assault on the vital interests of the US and that the US would use any means including military force to repel such an assault.

Zia-ul-Haq clearly demonstrated Pakistan's disappointments by stating publically that Pakistan will not buy greater animosity from the Soviet Union which is much more influential in the region than the United States. (Khan, 2020).

Secondly, Zia was well aware the US \$200 million are nothing in front of USSR confrontation. These US \$200 million are very little amount when the war will begin in the region. (Kux, 2001).

Thirdly, the US made the aid subject to Pakistan's curtailment of nuclear program. In this way, Zia tried to influence the US Policy. He tried to change the U.S. attitude towards Pakistan even by menacing and threatening that if the USA administration does not take Pakistan defence issues seriously it will not hesitate to go to the opposite block of USA. Zia's threats worked out very well.

As Carter himself stated that "our inordinate fear of communism" had driven us "to embrace any dictator who joined us in our fear." (Buckley, 1979).

Carter agreed over supply of F-16 fighter jets to Pakistan but Pakistan was expecting much more. (Osgood, 1981).

Thus, it decided to wait for the final outcome of forthcoming 1981 elections in the United States. These elections were expected to be won by the Republican nominee Ronald Reagan. Pakistan had always felt that they could get fairer deal from Republicans than Democrats. Pakistan decided to wait for Reagan's victory. Reagan promised in his election campaign to check Soviet expansion and also expressed his determination on the issue of Afghanistan, which made it more serious to strengthen the U.S. Pakistan ties. (Simon & Marra, 1991).

### **Afghan War and Changing US-Pakistan Relations**

The US-Pakistan relations saw a dramatic turn with the change in administration in the United States in January 1981. Ronald Reagan, the new president of the US accused President Carter of being too soft on the Soviet Union and made the US vulnerable to communists. Unlike Carter, Reagan made a fresh appraisal of the world strategic environment and decided to make fresh policy in accordance with new strategic realities and challenges. The Reagan administration also saw the need for a stronger and more active US policy towards Pakistan. Reagan, like President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger wanted to give priority to the US interests rather than symbolic moralism. He offered a new aid package of \$3.2 billion to Pakistan over a period of six years, the amount to be equally divided into military and economic assistance. (Ali, 1974).

The aid package also involved a rapid restoration of the supply of advanced equipment's. The aid was made possible by waiving Symington Amendment. The annual appropriation process was devised to bar Pakistan from aid when its nuclear program, human rights issue or narcotics problem became inimical to US interests in the region. Thus, Reagan through this appropriation process adopted the carrot and stick policy. (Kulsrud, 1987).

This time, the military aid given to Pakistan reflects the US interests in the containment of Soviet Union in Asia. Because of the revival of cold war after a détente phase, the US decided to make it a part of their policy to supply military equipment's to Pakistan, as this supply would indirectly enhance their own power vis-à-vis USSR. The similarity one can see in 1950s and 1980s, the threat of expansion of communism and military regimes in Islamabad. The United States in both these periods provided Pakistan with a lot of monetary and material aid and forgot moralist points of its foreign policy i.e. promotion of democracy and human rights enunciated by America's Founding Fathers. The difference one can see in 1950s and 1980s is that the US had much broader agenda in 1980s, it included concerns over nuclear proliferation, stopping of flow of heroin to the US and containment of Soviet Union. Secondly, the Package Deal of 1980s rules out the possibilities that the new arrangements might, in any way, affect any change whatsoever in the fundamental principles of Pakistan's determined objectives. Pakistan decided that it would not change its status from non-allied country to allied one and would remain committed to the principles of Non-Alignment. It also decided not to provide military bases to America. But Reagan administration, in order to placate Pakistan, decided to make it a part of their policy to supply military equipment's to Pakistan. They totally forgot the moralist policy. Though out of human rights, narcotics and nuclear non-proliferation issue, non-proliferation was still a cause of concern, yet it was no longer a stumbling block between the two countries. This showed that unlike Carter, Reagan shifted the emphasis from human rights to communism as 'evil power'.(Carothers, 2003).

Over narcotics issue, the US appeared satisfied because of the steps taken by Pakistan, which led to curtailment of poppy production in Pakistan. It was the question of human rights and restoration of democracy which continued to trouble both nations. Even Zia's holding of Feb.1985 general elections was just to placate American public who always demanded Democracy at least in aid recipient countries(Chandio, 2011).

The human rights issue in Pakistan was, however, the major cause of concern to American public but to satisfy them the American ambassador declared bluntly: (Hasnat, 2014).

“It is no secret that the United States feels more comfortable and has the greatest political affinity with other democracies. The fact that Pakistan has a martial law government has been a source of continuing reservation among important sectors of opinion in the United States... {But} it is not for Americans to advise Pakistan on its internal political structure, but for many Americans one of the basic human rights is the right to participate in the political process.”

The same issue i.e. the restoration of democracy had become the seed of discord between the US and Pakistan in the military regime of General Pervez Musharraf.

## **THE US POLICY TOWARDS MUSHARRAF'S REGIME**

The US Pakistan relationship was developed during the cold war period. During this period both the states had their own security perceptions. The American strategy of hindering the growth of communism and Pakistan's fear of hegemonic designs of India brought the two nations into a friendly bond. The United States, despite the proclaimer of promotion of democracy and human rights had decided to support the military governments of Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan and Zia-ulHaq in Pakistan just to attain its global aim of winning the cold war. After the fall of communism in 1989 the foundation of the US-Pakistan relationship rested on a shaky ground. In the post-USSR years, the principal aim of American foreign policy was to make sure that the world adjusts in a manner that suits American interests and values. The United States has had several identifiable interests in South Asia during the post-cold war period such as:

1. USA wanted to develop a very strong business partnership with India
2. Containing terrorist activity in Pakistan and Afghanistan where possible;

3. Preventing a potential dangerous nuclear arms race in South Asia, and promoting a peace process in Kashmir.

### **Musharraf's Coup D'état in Pakistan and the American Concerns**

The developed world, especially the US is widely heralding the post-cold war period as a remarkable era, opening in human affairs, marked by dedication to human rights, promotion of democracy, and other moral principles with no historical precedent. Thus Pakistan's military regime, which had ousted an elected prime minister by the fourth successful military coup d'état on October 12, 1999, was treated differently by the US administration than military coup d'état of Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan and Zia-ul-Haq. However, this coup d'état had more of an accidental character. It gave the government a constitutional facade and to answer the US concern at the same time was very difficult yet it was absolutely necessary because Pakistan, for a long time, has been dependent on the US and its allies for military and economic aid. Pakistan army tried its best to answer the US concerns by saying that this coup d'état had been planned for quite some time but its carrying out depended on events beyond the control of its executioners. In fact it was a counter-coup. As far as the US is concerned, this coup d'état has been given various interpretations by intellectuals to find the root cause of this change of regime in Pakistan. First, due to the intense crises brought forth by the Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif who was trying to amass more and more powers in his hands. During his second tenure, Nawaz Sharif dismissed Chief of the Army Staff (COAS) General Pervez Musharraf. His unprecedented interference in armed forces was resented immediately and widely in the army and instantly the counter coup was affected. Second, Musharraf is said to be the one who had master minded the Kargil operation to internationalize the Kashmir issue with the help of fundamentalist organizations like Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jamiat-e-Ulma-e-Islam who along with military support infiltrated into Indian occupied Kashmir to intensify the jihad already going on there. (Banerjee & Commuri, 2014).

The main areas of the American concerns in Pakistan before General Musharraf's coup d'état in Pakistan were nuclear non-proliferation and regional stability because of the on-going arms race between India and Pakistan fuelled by their rivalry over Kashmir.

Nuclear proliferation was the main cause behind the deterioration in the US-Pakistan relations after the inception of post-cold war era in October 1990. As the US had considered that good relations with Pakistan were key to the US interests in both South and South West Asia, it kept more flexible relations with Pakistan. In May 1998, after the nuclear explosion by Pakistan, the US showed its fear of nuclear proliferation in Asia, by cutting off US assistance after imposing economic and military sanctions as mandated under Arm Export Control Act against Pakistan. In spite of all these sanctions, the US maintained working relations with Pakistan.

The US wanted a stable, democratic, and economically thriving Pakistan that could serve as a model for the volatile and for the newly independent countries of West and Central Asia. Although ruled by military regimes for most of its existence, Pakistan was then being ruled by democratic governments since 1988 as a result of national elections in 1988, 1990, 1993 and 1997.

As far as the reaction of America towards the continuation of the Musharraf rule is concerned, they accepted it as inevitable because of Musharraf's decision to stand with America in its war against terrorism. The US was not against this move of Musharraf because he vowed to go by Supreme Court's decision of holding national and provincial assemblies elections so as to bring democracy in form, at least, if not in spirit.

## **New Policies of Bush Administration**

### **9/11 and USA policy toward Pakistan;**

11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 was one of the most dangerous day in the history of USA. When planes were hijacked from USA different airports and then they intentionally hit the world trade center and pentagon. In response of this attack it was decided by US government to hunt down each single enemy of USA. In this case their prime enemy was AL-Qaeda. This terrorist organization was head by Osama bin laden. This horrific and violent act killed 2900people(Bush,2009).

Al -Qaeda was settled in Afghanistan which was ruled by Taliban's. The US government asked Taliban to hand over the AL-Qaeda leader. This offer of USA was strongly rejected by Taliban's and declared that they will prefer war but will never surrender their sovereignty to USA. They declared that Bin Laden is their guest and by no means will they give him to USA (Caldwell, 2011).

US Government asked Pakistan clearly that we need your help. You have no grey area either you are with us or against us. Pakistan was one of the few states who had officially recognized the Taliban government. As there was no grey are area left to Pakistan. They have taken immediate U-turn and give there total support to the USA. The then military dictator Musharraf made them assured that they will fully support them (D'Souza, 2012; Dalrymple, 2013)

It was a great U-turn in the Pak policy as many people at home was not happy that USA is not trust worthy as they already left us in 1988 and most importantly they imposed certain sanction on us. The relation between Pakistan and USA was good after 9/11 until on June 28. USA and their NATO attack inside the Pakistan territory and killed Pakistani solider. This attack happened in Gora Prai. (Rondeaux, 2008).

Similarly same kind of attack happened over check post at Salala which killed 28 Pakistani soldiers, this incident was the biggest rift that happened between two countries. (Asia,2011;Saikal,2014).

This of USA was not acceptable and in response the people across the country block the NATO supply

The US concerns over ouster of civilian government evaporated into thin air, because the military government ignored the public passion of lower middle class of Pakistan, decided to wage war against accused terrorists i.e. Osama bin Laden and his organization Al- Qaeda and those who harbor them i.e. Taliban. The U.S. requested Pakistan to allow:

- The use of Pakistan air space;
- Stopping of fuel supplies to Afghanistan;
- Exchange of intelligence regarding Al-Qaeda and Taliban;
- Closing of Pakistan's border with Afghanistan.

Till September 11, 2001, the USA kept a working relationship with Pakistan, though it was far from friendly and was definitely heavily tilted toward India, but after this incident, the US and Pakistan came closer to each other. Despite the Bush team's emphasis on India as a rising power, it was unlikely to announce dramatic policy changes towards Pakistan. The main US effort in the region was to scale down the sanctions imposed on both states, while preserving leverage over their nuclear programs.



## **Agenda on Kashmir**

The United States views this problem as a serious issue, which needs immediate settlement to normalize relations between Pakistan and India. The USA kept on advising Pakistan to settle it on bilateral bases, whereas Pakistan has generally called upon the US to intervene for its settlement because bilateralism has failed to solve it. Kashmir has been the cause of all major wars fought between India and Pakistan so far.(Mangrio, 2012).

President Clinton who had described Kashmir as most dangerous area in the world and nuclear flash point in South Asia, during his visit to South Asia in March 2000, Clinton even informed his national security advisor that made it clear for the Pakistan government that now it is the time that you must forget about the Kashmir and most importantly USA blames Pakistan that it is sponsoring the terrorism in Indian occupied Kashmir. Clinton made it clear for Pakistan that do as we say or get ready to be bankrupt (Palit, 2001).

The American officials were saying that Pakistan did not do enough to control the activities of militant Kashmiri separatists based in Pakistan. Even some of the US officials warned Pakistan that it risked being enlisted as sponsored of terrorism, if it was found to be supporting militant Kashmiri separatists who were shown to be involved in hijacking of Indian Airline Plane in December 1999. (Starr, J. E. 2001).The hijackers were demanding from India the release of a Kashmiri freedom fighter's leader. The US accused one of the separatist groups based in Pakistan as involved in this hijacking. (Roy-Chaudhury, R. 2003).

Pakistan government in answer to these accusations clarified that they had never sponsored terrorism. However, General Musharraf, to ease the tension, unilaterally withdrew his troops from international border with India, but the tension still remained. The famous Agra Summit held in July 2001, initiated the talks between Pakistan and India to normalize the relations between the two states, failed because of Pakistan's firm stand on Kashmir as the core issue. (Baral,2002).

The US relations with India were improving constantly as it is evident from President Bush's invitation to the Prime Minister of India, Atal Behari Vajpai, to visit Washington on November 9, 2001. (Vadlamudi, 2005)

During Vajpai's trip to New York to attend the UN General Assembly session after the September 11 incident and the US promise of rewarding Pakistan for its efforts to curb terrorism in the world the America not only assured Pakistan of financial help to strengthen Pakistan's economy, but the Secretary of States. Colin Powel, in his visit to India and Pakistan on October17, 2001, also stated Kashmir issue as

“A dispute central to the relationship between India and Pakistan.”

In this way, Colin Powel “went a step further than President Bill Clinton who had acknowledged Kashmir as a major issue of discord in the region by underscoring the need for a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the dispute acceptable to the people of Kashmir.”(Powell, 2004).

In this scenario, US applied a tactful agenda for the resolution of Kashmir dispute which was neither to annoy India nor Pakistan. The US administration kept urging both India and Pakistan upon nuclear restraint and a peace process in Kashmir.

## **President Bush Visit to South Asia**

Whether the widely perceived US tilt towards India lacks substance or shows a paradigm shift in American policies is a question of vital importance for the security and stability of Pakistan.

However, it is also true that the South Asian region is at present receiving a higher-level attention in Washington than it did in the past. The visit by US President George W. Bush to India and Pakistan during the first week of March 2006 is rightly viewed as a turning point in US relations towards South Asia for two reasons: first, for formally “de-hyphenating” India and Pakistan in Washington’s worldview, in essence India has emerged a strategic partner and Pakistan a tactical ally; secondly, during this visit of Bush he has given prime importance to India. He has signed a nuclear treaty with India. USA has given a legal status to the India nuclear program. This has also made India a key player in international export of nuclear technology.

March 3, 2006, Indo-US Treaty has enhanced India's stature by its acceptance as a de facto nuclear weapons state. India became entitled to purchase uranium and nuclear reactors from the 44-nation nuclear club. The eight exempted reactors can produce 130 kg of plutonium 239 every year, which is enough to make 40 nuclear weapons a year in addition to its stockpile of approximately 100 bombs. This treaty has thus formally sanctified India's nuclear weapons program and has authorized it to continue manufacturing nuclear weapons. It is in fact a nuclear weapons treaty and not a nuclear energy treaty.

President Bush's visit to South Asia was all one expected it to be, although the level of intimacy he achieved with India went far beyond expectations. In Pakistan, a lot of time was devoted to a visit that in the end produced little of long-term strategic value for the country.

It seemed Bush had forgotten all the promises made towards his Major Non-NATO Allied nation Pakistan, known as front-line nation to pursue War against Terrorism. Whether in terms of nuclear handshake or economical vis-à-vis technical investment, Indian soil has captured all the perks & privileges of his recent visit. In case of Pakistan, one can judiciously depict that history has repeated itself, as in historical perspective US foreign policy towards Pakistan has always been based on topsy-turvy philosophy. No matter how hard Pakistan showed his honesty towards the outside world and especially with the US, reward is always based on peanuts and promises followed by words rather than practical actions.

### **Economic gains and losses for Pakistan:**

The USA government has always claimed that they have always provided enough amount of military and economic aid over the years. They have also claimed that in return of that the government of Pakistan has always played double game with us. Pakistan has been given economic and military assistance over last 16 years. They have not delivered as they should. According to the report of congress Pakistan has already been awarded round about \$ 20Bn in order to support USA forces and to eliminate the Taliban and Al-Qaeda and certain other terrorist organization. (Clarke, 2004).

This blame of US has never been accepted by the Pakistan officials. They denied the fact that Pakistan has never been a safe haven for the Al-Qaeda and Taliban's. They are of the view that we have helped out USA and made hundreds of Al-Qaeda leadership arrested like Khalid Sheikh Muhammad (Gall, 2014).

In recent times Pakistan has already pressed for a case of damages and it has been claimed that Pakistan has suffered round about 118 billion dollars in this war of terror. Pakistan has claimed that this war brought huge amount of damage to Pakistan than profit.

### **Conclusion:**

The countries across the world established the relationship with each other purely on the basis of national interest. In today's modern time there is no permanent friend nor is enemy the only thing that the countries do care for their national interest. There are certain ups and downs in Pak-US relation over the time and it's normal. Whenever US need Pakistan help they kept their differences aside and start to work together. They have proved this over the years. USA used

---

**3648** | Afzaal Amin                      Zia - Musharraf Era And Pak-US Relationship, A Tale Of Ups And Down.

Pakistan to contain communism, they also asked for help in Afghan jihad, and their relation reached to the top of Himalayas after 9/11. Pakistan certainly gained a lot from this partnership this romance was not free of course. Apart from gain we have also seen certain amount of loss in the shape of killing of hundreds and thousands of innocent civilian. Pakistan and USA remained close to each other specially when there was military government in the country.

## REFERENCES:

- Bhutto, Z. (1979). *If I Am Assassinated*. New Delhi: Vikas, 223.
- Chandio, A. A. (2011). Non-Party based General election of 1985: Causes and effect. In *International Conference on Social Science and Humanity IPEDR* (Vol. 5).
- Carothers, T. (2003). Promoting democracy and fighting terror. *Foreign Aff.*, 82, 84.
- Ali, M. (1974). 2. PAKISTAN AND THE UNITED STATES. *Pakistan Horizon*, 27(1), 71-76.
- Kulsrud, P. E. (1987). Nuclear Non-Proliferation for the 80's: Carrot and Stick Policy Reexamined. *Brook. J. Int'l L.*, 13, 25.
- Anwar, R. (1997). *The terrorist prince: The life and death of Murtaza Bhutto*. Verso.
- Van Hollen, C. (1980). Leaning on Pakistan. *Foreign Policy*, (38), 35-50.
- Hyman, A., Ghayur, M., & Kaushik, N. (1989). *Pakistan, Zia and after--*. Abhinav Publications.
- Thyagaraj, M., & Thomas, R. G. (2006). The US-Indian nuclear agreement: Balancing energy needs and nonproliferation goals. *Orbis*, 50(2), 355-369.
- Ahmad, N. (1979). The Non-Aligned Movement and Pakistan. *Pakistan Horizon*, 32(4), 79-91.
- Allison, M. (2018). Militants Seize Mecca: The Effects of the 1979 Siege of Mecca Revisited. *Metamorphosis*.
- Richter, W. L., & Gustafson, W. E. (1980). Pakistan 1979: Back to Square One. *Asian Survey*, 20(2), 188-196.
- Gibbs, D. (1987). Does the USSR Have a 'Grand Strategy'? Reinterpreting the Invasion of Afghanistan. *Journal of Peace Research*, 24(4), 365-379.
- Çetin, M., & GAZI, M. A. (2018). THE EXAMINATION OF THE ANTI-USA PROPAGANDA POSTERS IN THE IRAN REVOLUTION ACCORDING TO CLAUDE LÉVI-STRAUSS' BINARY OPPOSITION. *International Journal of Social Science*, 1(3), 31-51.
- Small, A. (2015). *The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia's New Geopolitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, .
- Rizvi, H. (1993). *Pakistan and the Geostrategic Environment: A Study of Foreign Policy* (Vol. 1). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Palit, P. S. (2001). The Kashmir policy of the United States: A study of the perceptions, conflicts and dilemmas. *Strategic Analysis*, 25(6), 781-803.
- Mangrio, N. (2012). A historical and political perspective of Kashmir issue. *Dialogue*, 7(3), 256.
- Khan, F. (2020). 13. The Grazing Horse in the Meadows. In *Eating Grass* (pp. 252-268). Stanford University Press.
- Kux, D. (2001). The Pakistani Pivot. *The National Interest*, (65), 49-59.
- Buckley Jr, W. F. (1979). Human Rights and Foreign Policy: A Proposal. *Foreign Aff.*, 58, 775.

- Osgood, R. G. (1981). The revitalization of containment. *Foreign Aff.*, 60, 465.
- Simon, D. M., Ostrom, C. W., & Marra, R. F. (1991). The president, referendum voting, and subnational elections in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 85(4), 1177-1192.
- Hasnat, S. F. (2014). Pakistan-US Relations on Slippery Grounds: An Account of Trust and its Deficit. *Pakistan Vision*, 12(1).
- Bush, G. W. (2009). *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*. New York: Morgan James Publishing.
- Caldwell, D. (2011). *Vortex of Conflict: U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Asia, B. (2011). Pakistan outrage after 'Nato attack kills soldiers'. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-15901363>
- D'Souza, S. M. (2012). US-Pakistan Relations and the 'end-game' in Afghanistan. Singapore: Institute of South Asian Studies, National University of Singapore.
- Rondeaux, C. (2008). U.S. Military Releases Video Footage of Airstrike in Pakistan. *Washington Post Foreign Service*. Washington : Washington Post .
- Starr, J. E. (2001). Can the US and India be "steadfast friends"? *Orbis*, 45(1), 111-111.
- Roy-Chaudhury, R. (2003). India's response to terrorism after 13 December 2001. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 3(2), 277-285..
- Baral, J. K. (2002). The Agra Summit. *International Studies*, 39(3), 289-302.
- Vadlamudi, S. (2005). Indo-US Space Cooperation: Poised for Take-Off?. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 12(1), 199-223.
- Powell, C. L. (2004). A strategy of partnerships. *Foreign Affairs*, 22-34.
- Banerjee, S., & Commuri, G. (2014). A Strange and Bittersweet Relationship: Pakistan-United States Relations in the Musharraf Era. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 1(1), 41-61.