



## **Pakistan: The Odd Man Out in Its Own Region**

Author

Rakisits, Claude

Published

2013

Journal Title

Griffith Asia Quarterly

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/340300>

Link to published version

<http://pandora.nla.gov.au/tep/141524>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

## Pakistan: The Odd Man Out in Its Own Region<sup>1</sup>

Claude Rakisits\*  
*Deakin University*

**Abstract:** One can identify three clusters of factors which have constrained Pakistan's capacity to integrate with South and Southwest Asia: the violent partition of the sub-continent and the unresolved issue of Pakistan's identity and the role of Islam in the administration of the country; the multi-ethnic and odd geographic nature of the country; and Pakistan's alliance with the United States. This article argues that Pakistan has sought to compensate for this isolation by building ties with countries outside its own region, notably China and the Middle East. This has not only further isolated Pakistan from its immediate region but also fuelled subsequent domestic instability.

From its creation in 1947, Pakistan has had a difficult relationship with its immediate neighbourhood, making it difficult for it to integrate with its 'natural' region. And it is this lack of integration with the region that explains much of the instability that has wracked South Asia for more than half a century. One can identify three clusters of factors which have constrained Pakistan's integration in South and Southwest Asia: the violent Partition of the sub-continent and the unresolved issue of Pakistan's identity and the role of Islam in the administration of the country; the multi-ethnic and odd geographic nature of the country for the first 25 years of its existence - the east and west wings of the country separated from one another by over 1500 kilometres; and Pakistan's alliance with the United States since the 1950s. I will argue that Pakistan has sought to compensate for this isolation by building ties with

---

\* Claude Rakisits is Associate Professor of Strategic Studies at Deakin University. Dr Rakisits has published extensively on South Asian security and strategic issues in academic journals such as *Australian Journal of International Affairs* and *Security Challenges* and newspapers including, *Asian Wall Street Journal*, the *Australian Financial Review* and *The Australian*.

countries outside its own region, notably China and the Middle East. This has in turn not only further isolated Pakistan from its immediate region but it has fuelled the subsequent domestic instability. As a corollary, this lack of integration has contributed to the general instability in South Asia.

The first part of this paper will discuss the original constraining factors (Partition and the lack of consensus on the role of Islam in Pakistan; geography and the multi-ethnic nature of Pakistan; and the US alliance) identified above. The second part will examine the long-term geo-political implications of this lack of integration with the region. It will also discuss the implication of the successive Pakistani governments' decisions to compensate for this isolation by turning to countries outside the region. The concluding section will briefly outline what Islamabad's policy-makers would need to do to break that isolation so that the country can break out of the odd-man out mould and be better integrated with its own region.

## **The Original Constraining Factors**

### *The 'Two-Nation Theory' and the role of Islam*

The process by which Pakistan was created, which came about as a result of the violent partitioning of British India in 1947, laid the groundwork for the country's lack of integration with its immediate region. About seven million Muslims migrated from India-to-be to the two separate wings of Pakistan, with the overwhelming number going to West Pakistan. However, compounding the physical break-up of the sub-continent was the psychological division of the peoples of British India into broadly two groups: the Muslims and the non-Muslims. According to Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the leader of the All-India Muslim league, the Muslims and Hindus were two distinct 'nations' which would not be able to live together peacefully in one country. Hence, Jinnah formulated the 'Two-Nation Theory' which argued that Muslims of British India needed to have a homeland of their own in which they would feel safe and secure, separate from an overwhelming Hindu majority.<sup>2</sup> Importantly, Jinnah, who was deeply influenced by liberal

thinking and believed in a broad interpretation of the religious tenets, never stipulated which version of Islam should be followed in Pakistan-to-be. And this should come as no surprise because he did not believe it was the role of the state to determine religious matters.<sup>3</sup>

One could be forgiven for assuming that all Indian Muslims were wholeheartedly in favour of the creation of Pakistan. However, this was certainly not the case, because opposing the Muslim Nationalists, essentially represented by the Muslim League, were two other important Muslim groups: the Nationalist Muslims and the Islamic Nationalists. Although the two groups that opposed the Muslim League eventually lost out in the debate, the fact that a large number of these non-Muslim Nationalists decided to migrate to Pakistan inevitably created serious clashes over the role Islam should have in the administration of the country.<sup>4</sup>

Briefly, the Nationalist Muslims, led by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, believed that all Indians were made up of one *Qawn* (national community) that was itself composed of several *Millats* (religious communities). In practical terms this meant that, 'a group could be co-national with another group in one sense, and separate from it in another'.<sup>5</sup> However, one of the Nationalist Muslims' major concerns with the creation of an independent Muslim homeland would be the burden that would be placed upon those Muslims left behind in the Hindu-dominated portion of India.<sup>6</sup>

On the other hand, the Islamic Muslims, led by Maulana Abu'l A'la Mawdudi, believed that, whilst all those who accepted Islam constituted one nation, territorial nationalism would destroy the very foundation of Islamic nationalism because it would create national exclusiveness and therefore hamper the creation of a 'greater' Islamic nation.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, he considered that the Muslims' real duty was the establishment of the Islamic way of life and not the setting up of a Muslim national state.<sup>8</sup> As far as the Islamic Muslims were concerned in an Islamic state there could be no flexibility with regard to the application of the *Sharia*.<sup>9</sup> According to Mawdudi, if it were based on anything else it would merely be a Muslim state, meaning it could eventually secularize itself with its Muslim population adhering to the tenets of Islam as it saw fit.<sup>10</sup>

And, as far as Mawdudi was concerned, 'Muslim nationalism is as reprehensible in the *Sharia* of God as Indian nationalism'.<sup>11</sup>

Unfortunately, Jinnah added to the ideological confusion and weakened the fundamental basis of his 'Two-Nation Theory' in the eyes of the Islamic Muslims when he stated in an address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on 11 August 1947, that:

...in the course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, because that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the State.<sup>12</sup>

Most analysts certainly do not believe that Jinnah had suddenly ceased to believe in his political framework only four days before independence but rather that, having already seen how much carnage had already taken place even before Partition, he probably wanted to reassure the future citizens of Pakistan that there would be internal cohesion and stability in the new state.<sup>13</sup>

As a result of these deep philosophical and political cleavages regarding the creation of a homeland for the Muslims of British India, when Pakistan became a reality the Muslim Nationalists migrated to Pakistan and the Nationalist Muslims remained in India. The Islamic Nationalists, on the other hand, faced a dilemma, since they had criticized both groups with equal hostility. They eventually decided to opt for Pakistan, hoping to mould Pakistan into a truly Islamic state based on the *Sharia*. It was the inevitable clash between the various groups of Muslim Nationalists and the Islamic Nationalists that was going to create the ideological problems present in the Pakistan polity since 1947.

In order to try to resolve these deep-seated differences between the religious groups, the Constituent Assembly passed the 1949 Objectives Resolution. This compromise document was acceptable to all schools of thought because of its lack of specificity and inherent vagueness. The ulama were satisfied with its general direction because it 'created the impression that Pakistan would move in the direction of an orthodox Islamic state'.<sup>14</sup> Although there was no mention of the *Sharia* anywhere

in the text, or for the establishment of an Islamic state for that matter, the fact that it started off by stipulating that sovereignty over the entire universe, which would presumably include Pakistan, belonged to Allah was sufficient assurance that the government had come around to accepting the Islamic Nationalists' point of view. The Muslim League members, on the other hand, saw no contradiction between Islam and the Western model of popular representation, as indicated in the resolution. Actually, the document was rife with contradictions, such as, giving sovereignty rights at the same time to Allah, the people, parliament and the State. As to who or what would have precedence was anyone's guess and, as such, open to all kinds of interpretations.

In any case, the 1949 Objectives Resolution was eventually put in the preamble of the 1956 Constitution and thus was not justiciable and was only meant to provide general guidance to successive governments. So all in all, this resolution failed to resolve the heated and polarizing religious debate. This adversely affected the population's perception of Islam as a unifying force, and as Ziring observed, 'the *raison d'être* for Pakistan as an Islamic state ceased to have much significance ...'.<sup>15</sup> As a consequence, this major development had the effect, especially in East Pakistan, of reinforcing the appeal of political forces demanding provincial autonomy.

Further re-enforcing the view of those who opposed Partition that Pakistan was an aberration was the fact that even the name of the new country had to be made up. The name 'Pakistan' is actually an acronym that was conceptualised by an Indian Muslim studying at Cambridge University in the 1930s.<sup>16</sup> India's position that Pakistan was indeed illegitimate was given further ballast by the manner in which the international community welcomed these two newly-independent countries. While India's diplomatic credentials were automatically accepted at the United Nations and in foreign capitals even before it was granted independence, Pakistan, on the other hand, had to apply for membership to the U.N. as a 'new' country, and wait until after 15 August 1947 to have its ambassadors accredited to foreign countries. This diplomatic differentiation between Pakistan and India confirmed that the world viewed India as the natural successor to British India and Pakistan as a country that had 'seceded' from the former British



possession. Pakistan's western neighbour, Afghanistan, even voted against its UN membership application – the only country to do so.

### *Ethnicity and an odd and divided geography*

Pakistan's odd geographic composition – the two wings separated by over 1500 kilometres of Indian territory - not only complicated its internal integration but made it difficult for Pakistan to integrate with its two immediate neighbourhoods: Southwest Asia and the Middle East, on the one hand, and Southeast Asia, on the other. Moreover, as we noted above, the violence and deaths of one million people which accompanied Partition, meant that Pakistan would not be able to integrate with its 'natural' home – India, and would need to create integrative links elsewhere. However, this would not be easy to achieve.

Given that East Pakistan was surrounded on three sides by India meant that it was unable, or certainly heavily inhibited, to build ties with its external environment other than India, that is, South-east Asia. Turning to the other wing, West Pakistan also had difficulties integrating with its immediate neighbourhood to the west, Afghanistan. The main point of contention between the two countries concerned the validity of the 2500 kilometre-long Durand Line, the official border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, established in 1893.<sup>17</sup> Afghanistan had always questioned the legitimacy of the Durand Line, arguing that it had been forced into the border agreement under British duress in the nineteenth century. To complicate matters, Afghanistan was also promoting the idea of an independent Pakhtunistan that would comprise Pakistan's former Northwest Frontier Province (now called Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) and parts of Baluchistan but not the Pakhtuns of Afghanistan.<sup>18</sup> Afghanistan has yet to officially recognise the Durand Line as the international border. Even the Taliban, who had been nurtured by Pakistan from the very beginning, refused to recognise the Durand Line while they were in power in Kabul in 1996-2001.

While the odd geography of the country located in an unfriendly environment already made it inherently difficult to manage the new state, it was the overwhelming political dominance of the country, including East Pakistan which represented 60 per cent of the total national population, by Punjabis and to a lesser extent the *Muhajirs*

(Muslim migrants from India) which compounded an already difficult integrative process. According to the Muslim League's 1940 Lahore Resolution, the founding document of Pakistan, this should not have been the case. Although the Lahore Resolution, later called the Pakistan Resolution, was open to several interpretations on a number of fronts, it was nevertheless clear, at least in spirit if not in letter, that the constituent provinces of Pakistan would have wide range autonomy. In an attempt to correct the problems of interpretation, the Muslim League passed a resolution at the 1946 All-India Muslim League Legislators' Convention, with the modifications superseding the previous text. The adjective 'autonomous' was not included in the 1946 resolution.<sup>19</sup>

Notwithstanding the confusion over the issue of provincial autonomy, and despite widespread opposition from the provinces, political power was very quickly centralised in the capital. Jinnah set the tone early with the sacking of the chief ministers of NWFP and Sind in 1947 and 1948, respectively. In Baluchistan, Jinnah used high-handed tactics to have the Khan of Kalat accede to Pakistan in March 1948.<sup>20</sup> East Pakistan was put under Governor's Rule following the break down of law and order in 1954 and put under the direct control of the Minister for Defence, Major-General Iskander Mirza, a *Muhajir* from East Punjab. However, two more decisions at the centre would further exacerbate centre-province relations, and affect East Pakistan in particular.

On 21 March 1948, during his only trip to Bengal, Jinnah stated that, 'the state language of Pakistan is going to be Urdu and no other language'.<sup>21</sup> Although Jinnah's aim was to avoid 'the curse of provincialism'<sup>22</sup> at the federal level, the Bengalis resented the imposition of a 'national' language which only a very small minority in East Bengal spoke; and, though Urdu was recognized as the language of the Muslims of India, it failed to acknowledge that Bengali was spoken by the majority of Pakistanis, albeit only in the eastern wing.

Following the Muslim League's electoral defeat in East Pakistan in 1954 and fearing that the Bengalis' demand for greater autonomy may spread to the smaller provinces of West Pakistan, the central government, using once again heavy-handed tactics, managed to have the Constituent Assembly agree to the One Unit Plan, the unification of the four western provinces into a single entity. As part of the One Unit



Plan both wings had equal representation in the Constituent Assembly, even though East Pakistan had 60 per cent of the total population. Needless to say, this was bitterly resented by the smaller provinces, and by the Bengalis, in particular. It was another step away from the original guarantee of full autonomy for the provinces.

Unfortunately, the promulgation of the 1956 Constitution did not resolve centre-province relations. On the contrary, it formalised the centralization of the political system. Although the recognition of Bengali as one of the state languages – a reversal of the decision to only have Urdu - could be viewed as a major victory for the East Pakistanis, the fact that the constitution only provided for one chamber based on territorial representation was a major set-back for the Bengalis. It not only failed to recognize that the majority of the population lived in the eastern wing; but, by being unicameral, it de jure gave the country a unitary structure, a political form which contradicted the federal features of the Lahore Resolution. Moreover, given that Bengali representation in the bureaucracy and the armed forces was minimal, the East Pakistanis' ability to counter Punjabi and *Muhajir* power of centralization, including their control over East Pakistan's administration, would remain very low.<sup>23</sup> Ultimately, it was the conflict between Punjabi power versus Bengali majority which led to the break-up of the country.

### *Western Alliances*

Feeling threatened by India and Afghanistan, and recognising the security problems of a geographically divided and internally weak country, Pakistan turned to the United States and the United Kingdom for support. Accordingly, Pakistan became favourably inclined to accept membership in a number of Western-run regional security organizations, and to participate in Washington's 'containment' strategy. This alliance with the US, in particular, and the West, in general, would have far-reaching and long-term geo-political consequences for Pakistan and the region.

In May 1954 Pakistan signed the Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement under which the US agreed to train and equip the Pakistan armed forces. This was followed in September 1954 with Pakistan's

decision to join the Manila Pact (later known as the South-East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO). In February 1955 Pakistan also joined the Baghdad Pact, later to be called the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Membership of CENTO appealed to the Pakistani leaders for they felt that this organization fulfilled their earlier objectives of having close relations with other Muslim countries. Finally, President Ayub Khan signed in 1959 the Bilateral Agreement of Co-operation with the United States, an agreement that basically stated that the US would protect Pakistan against any aggression.

Although Pakistan received substantial amount of American military aid between 1954 and 1956, from 1957 onwards, however, the 'ratio of US aid to India and Pakistan was greatly altered to the advantage of India'.<sup>24</sup> This stark reality brought home to the Pakistani leaders several important points: first, that membership in Western alliances did not favour Pakistan over India as they expected it would; instead, it demonstrated to the Pakistani leadership that Western links had actually been counter-productive in their drive to improve their sense of security vis-à-vis India. Second, their hopes for Western support in their diplomatic battle to have the Kashmir issue settled in their favour had not materialized; while, on the other hand, the Soviet Union had openly declared that Kashmir rightfully belonged to India. Finally, by joining CENTO, which Pakistan's leaders believed would strengthen the country's ties with the Muslim world, Pakistan ended up isolating itself from mainstream Muslim thinking; for under the leadership of Egyptian President Nasser the main concern of Islamic countries was not the crusade against Communism but rather the struggle against colonialism. This fact alone endeared India in the eyes of the Arab League and destroyed Pakistan's credibility as a reliable Muslim country. Last, it is important to remember that the Non-Aligned Movement had recently been established in Bandung, with India and Afghanistan as two of the co-founders. Accordingly, Pakistan's decision to join Western security organisations meant that it went against the trend of developing countries of turning away from the West, thus further isolating it from its neighbourhood. And this too would have far-reaching consequences for the region.

## The Geopolitical Implications of Pakistan's Isolation

### *Three wars with India*

The most important consequence of Pakistan's isolation from its own region was, and still is, the distrust and clashes that it has engendered with its largest neighbour, India. And the persistent issue of contention over which both countries would argue over - and still do - would be Kashmir. Accordingly, it did not take long for Pakistan and India to clash over the status of that Muslim-majority state in north-western India. The first military confrontation between the two countries first took place in 1947 between militant Pakhtun tribesmen from neighbouring North West Frontier Province (NWFP), now called Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and the Indian army and later in May 1948 between the two armies. With the hope of containing the conflict two U.N. Security Council resolutions were passed on 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, with the second one calling for the holding of a referendum. The two U.N. resolutions produced irreconcilable interpretations regarding the holding of the plebiscite. Moreover, India felt secure enough to be able to renege on its previous promises of holding a referendum without fearing adverse consequences from the international community. It argued that since Kashmir had acceded to India, there was no longer a need for a referendum.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, occupying two-thirds of Kashmir and having Soviet support in the UN Security Council, India was under no pressure to hold a plebiscite to the Kashmiris.

The next attempt to resolve the Kashmir issue militarily took place in 1965. By the middle of that year President Ayub Khan felt that the continued popular unrest in Kashmir coupled with the perception of an ineffective Indian Army would make it easier for Pakistan to once and for all gain the upper hand on Kashmir. India's defeat in the 1962 Sino-Indian war and the Pakistan Army's relatively good performance in the brief Indo-Pakistani clash in the Rann of Kutch in Spring 1965 had given him the impression that his army would be able to stand up to India's military forces.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, Ayub Khan believed the confrontation could be limited to the Kashmir theatre without the international border being violated, and if India did cross it, then the Americans would be

obliged to come to Pakistan's assistance as stipulated in the 1959 bilateral agreement.<sup>27</sup> However, as subsequent events were to demonstrate, Ayub was wrong on virtually every one of these assessments.

The events that took place in Kashmir were not only confusing, but by their very nature made it difficult to determine who was the aggressor. What has been proven beyond any doubt, however, is that a force of 20,000 Azad (free) Kashmiri armed men, which had infiltrated into Indian-held Kashmir on 5 August 1965, were directly trained and armed by the Pakistan Army.<sup>28</sup> This resulted in Indian Army troops launching a major offensive into Azad Kashmir on 30 August 1965.<sup>29</sup> President Ayub Khan, believing that India would never expand the conflict along the international border, decided to send the Pakistan Army across the 1949 Cease-fire Line on 1 September 1965.<sup>30</sup> Within five days India retaliated by crossing the Punjab border and launching a three-pronged attack against Lahore. On 23 September, seventeen days after the beginning of the latest hostilities, the two countries agreed to a United-Nations cease-fire.<sup>31</sup>

The Chinese were the most supportive of the Pakistani position, threatening to take military action against the Indians.<sup>32</sup> The US, on the other hand, terminated all military aid to both Pakistan and India. It justified its failure to support Pakistan by stating that the 'US view is that the situation is somewhat confused and belligerence is not justified on either side'.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, the USSR did not stop the shipment of weapons to India during or after the 1965 war. Needless to say that the Americans' failure to support Pakistan caused great public outcry in Pakistan. One can trace today's 'trust deficit' between the two countries to that American decision in 1965.

The third Indo-Pakistan war in November-December 1971 was the result of an amalgamation of domestic Indian and Pakistani issues as well as foreign policy factors. India's military intervention on 21 November 1971 enabled it to kill two birds with one stone: dismember Pakistan and resolve its West Bengali insurgency problem. India's leaders were increasingly worried that the East Pakistani refugees who had fled to India to escape the Pakistani army's repression would fuel India's China-supported West Bengali insurgency movement.<sup>34</sup> As

indicated by Subrahmanyam, director of the influential Indian Institute for Defence Studies that generally reflects government thinking, 'the break-up of Pakistan is in our interest and we have an opportunity the like of which will never come again'.<sup>35</sup>

India's invasion of East Pakistan, which New Delhi justified as an act of 'self-defence',<sup>36</sup> was severely criticized by the US and China. But the great power equation on the sub-continent had radically changed since the previous Indo-Pakistani war, and with the recently signed Indo-Soviet treaty of friendship, China could no longer assume that the USSR would remain neutral. However, when the war spread to West Pakistan and Kashmir on 3 December, and the Pakistan Army was incurring heavy losses,<sup>37</sup> then China's attitude changed. It denounced India's aggression against Pakistan and pledged 'resolute support' for Pakistan.<sup>38</sup> Fearing that Beijing would not allow India to hit the Pakistan heartland, Washington pressed Moscow to pressure the Indians to cease the hostilities on the western front.<sup>39</sup> Accordingly, India offered a cease-fire in the west on 17 December, one day after Pakistani General Niazi and his 90,000 men had surrendered in Dacca.<sup>40</sup>

### *The Middle East Attraction*

With the loss of East Pakistan and the humiliating defeat, the leaders of truncated Pakistan were confronted with the task of re-defining the country's foreign policy according to the new geo-political reality of South Asia. There was general agreement that Pakistan's close ties with the West had isolated Pakistan from the Third World, in general, and the Muslim World, in particular. Determined to end this isolation, the new leader of Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, adroitly turned an apparently weakened national stature into a source of strength; for now with the loss of its eastern wing Pakistan was not only more easily defensible as a result of its more compact geography,<sup>41</sup> but its essentially homogeneous religious composition facilitated the implementation of a new foreign policy approach: the close identification of Pakistan with the Muslim World.<sup>42</sup> However, this rapprochement with the Middle East would ultimately facilitate the penetration of Islamic extremism into the Pakistan polity and strengthen the hand of the Islamic Muslims,



a consequence with far-reaching consequences for the long-term stability of Pakistan and the region.

If the normalization of relations with India was already difficult enough given New Delhi's critical role in the break-up of Pakistan, India's 'peaceful' nuclear explosion in May 1974 certainly did little to improve bilateral relations. Simply put, it reinforced Pakistan's deep-seated mistrust of Indian designs. India's introduction of the nuclear factor to the sub-continent not only brought a qualitative change to Indo-Pakistani relations, but it also decisively altered the power equation in favour of India. However, instead of forcing Pakistan into a state of psychological and military submission, this intensified Bhutto's resolve to oppose Indian domination. It also reinforced Pakistan's 'non-integration' in South Asia. Ironically, the timing of India's detonation of its nuclear device came at an opportune time for Pakistan.

The Muslim World was united, at least in rhetoric; it had emerged as a significant force in the sphere of international finance and it generally supported Pakistan's new Muslim foreign policy. Bhutto realized that this was the ideal time for him to exploit all these elements in order to obtain support for the construction of Pakistan's own nuclear bomb. Therefore, with the aim of mustering financial support for his scheme, Bhutto appealed to the religious feelings of the Muslim community, by placing his nuclear idea within the larger context of Islamic politics. By doing so, Bhutto managed to don it with a certain aura of 'legitimacy', since it could then be viewed as a weapon to counter Israeli and Indian nuclear capability. Moreover, it would strengthen Pakistan's drive to become a major and credible leader of the Muslim World.<sup>43</sup>

As of 1974, economic ties between Pakistan and the countries of the Arabian Peninsula, especially Saudi Arabia, grew quickly. Not only did trade ties grow very quickly but the number of Pakistanis working in the Middle-East, mainly on the Arabian Peninsula, quickly grew from approximately 170,000 in 1976 to an estimated 750,000 to 1.25 million in 1979.<sup>44</sup> These Pakistani expatriates sent back home more than \$2 billion in annual remittances.<sup>45</sup> Importantly, Saudi Arabia contributed massively to Pakistan's development needs. In 1976 alone Islamabad was Saudi Arabia's single largest recipient of foreign aid.<sup>46</sup> Saudi



Arabia's deepening economic relationship with Pakistan would facilitate Riyadh's eventual involvement in the anti-Soviet coalition which would be centred in Pakistan.

### *The Afghanistan connection*

The Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 was a major turning point for Pakistan because it would not only affect its relationship with its neighbourhood but would have a deeply negative and long-term impact on the home front as well. And whilst US-Pakistan relations were at their nadir at the time of the Soviet invasion because of Islamabad's on-going nuclear program, Pakistan would nevertheless become the frontline state vis-à-vis Soviet-occupied Afghanistan and form, with Saudi Arabia, the southwest pillar of Washington's strategic framework for the region.<sup>47</sup> Accordingly, Pakistan became the channel to financially and militarily support the *mujahedeen* (Freedom fighters) fighting the Soviet and Afghan forces. By the mid-1980s the US and Saudi Arabia were funnelling about one billion dollars a year to the resistance.<sup>48</sup> In return for hosting the resistance groups in Pakistan's tribal areas as well as hosting some four million Afghan refugees, Washington offered Pakistan a very generous economic and military assistance package, totalling \$3.2 billion over six years.<sup>49</sup> The decade-long military activities of the Pakistan-based resistance were instrumental in breaking the will of the USSR and to force it to leave in 1989.<sup>50</sup> However, Pakistan's support of these *mujahedeen* also reinforced its isolation from its neighbours; the Indian government had supported the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan.<sup>51</sup> However, while the resistance had been successful in expelling the Soviets, there was also a long-term domestic impact in having had these *mujahedeen* groups embedded in the tribal areas of Pakistan and at the same time nurturing such a close relationship with Saudi Arabia in the process.

Many of these resistance fighters were ideologically driven and most had been given financial support from Saudi Arabia that in turn was promoting Wahabism, its fundamentalist version of Islam quite foreign to Pakistan.<sup>52</sup> Saudi Arabia spent millions of dollars into the building of thousands of new *madrassas*, Islamic schools, in Pakistan.<sup>53</sup>

Many of the students who graduated from these *madrassas* were heavily indoctrinated in *jihadist* thinking and in the more traditionalist Deobandi School of thought favoured by Maulana Mawdudi; a number of the Afghan Taliban leaders are graduates of some of those *madrassas*.<sup>54</sup> Not surprisingly, these Saudi-financed *madrassas* went hand-in-hand with General Zia-ul-Haq's Islamization program that he had been implementing since his 1977 *coup d'état* which toppled Bhutto. Compounding the situation, the thousands of *mujahedeen* fighters not only brought their radical version of Islam, but they also brought with them their thousands of guns which infiltrated into Pakistani society easily and quickly. Thus was born the 'Kalashnikov' culture that progressively led to the brutalisation of Pakistani society.<sup>55</sup> Today we see the extreme versions of this in the daily killings in Karachi.

Given the above developments in the 1980s, it was easy for the Afghan Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters to embed themselves in the tribal areas along the border with Afghanistan following their ouster from Kabul in October 2001. These new arrivals simply build upon the terrorist networks previously established. Moreover, the physical remoteness, the lack of infrastructure and the ruggedness of this 'no-man's land' further facilitated their ability to establish safe havens in that area.<sup>56</sup> Finally, the Pakhtun honour code, *Pakhtuwali*, also meant that a Pakhtun had to offer hospitality to these 'guests'. From their secure bases in the Pakistani tribal areas, the various Afghan militant groups, particularly the Taliban, Gulbuddin Hekmatyar's Hezb-e Islami and the Haqqani Network, have been able to launch attacks against NATO-led forces in Afghanistan. Accordingly, their presence over the border has complicated the Western-led Coalition and the Afghan government's efforts to defeat the decade-long insurgency. And although Pakistan officially joined the 'War on Terror' and has lost more soldiers fighting the insurgents than the Coalition forces based in Afghanistan,<sup>57</sup> Pakistan's inability to expel or defeat the Afghan insurgents has further isolated the country from its region, particularly from Afghanistan and India. This has been reinforced with the generally held view in Afghanistan that Pakistan wants to see a return of the Taliban to power in Kabul after the Coalition forces leave Afghanistan in 2014. But more critical to the future stability of Pakistan,

and therefore the region, is that the presence of the thousands of *mujahedeen* fighters on Pakistani soil in the 1980s and then the Taliban and al-Qaeda post-2001 unwittingly spawned a whole suite of *jihadists* with different agendas.

*A toxic mix of criminals, terrorists and religious extremists*

It is important to remember that thousands of Pakistani *jihadists* who had joined the various *mujahedeen* groups fighting the Soviets returned to Pakistan in 1989 after the USSR had left Afghanistan. The Pakistani military decided to use these battle-hardened fighters as a proxy force to fight the Indians in the Indian-held region of Jammu and Kashmir where an indigenous insurrection had started. One of the most important groups to fulfil that role was the Laskar-e-Tayyaba (LeT), a militant group which had recently been formed by Hafiz Muhammad Saeed, a Lahore-based Islamic preacher. Saeed was particularly keen to direct his *jihadist* attention to the anti-Indian struggle in Kashmir given that he had lost many members of his family during Partition.<sup>58</sup> The LeT and other militant groups were again used during the Kargil clash in May 1999. However, under heavy external pressure, particularly from Washington, many of these groups were sent away from the Kashmir region to the tribal areas post-Kargil to join an already toxic political environment.

Following the capture of Kabul by the Pakistan-backed Taliban in 1996, many Pakistanis who had participated alongside the Taliban in fighting in the Afghan civil war (1992-96) had come back to Pakistan's tribal area keen to establish a *Sharia*-run state in Pakistan. Various militant groups were eventually formed with that objective in mind. By late 2007 the groundwork had been set for the formation of the Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), an umbrella organisation bringing together those different militant groups, nominally led by Hakimullah Mehsud but significantly divided by tribal affiliation, leadership ambitions and opposing views over who should be the principal enemy – the Pakistani state, the Coalition forces in Afghanistan or minority groups.<sup>59</sup> Not surprisingly, given the TTP's ideological bend, Maulana Mawdudi's Jamaat-i-Islami (JI), one of Pakistan's main religious parties, is sympathetic to the TTP. It was particularly so when the JI was in the provincial government coalition of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa until 2007.

There are now many groups included in, or associated with, the TTP.<sup>60</sup> The LeT and other militants originally formed to prosecute the war in Indian-controlled Kashmir have now affiliated themselves with the TTP and some have now turned against their original 'controllers' - the Pakistani state.<sup>61</sup> It is estimated that some 40,000 people have been the victim of these terrorists' acts over the last ten years.<sup>62</sup> Further complicating this picture is that a number of these Pakistani militant groups have had a very close working relationship with the Afghan Taliban groups, including participating in attacks against Coalition forces in Afghanistan.

And to further muddy the waters, many of these militant groups get funds through a thriving black market in the trafficking of smuggled goods, heroin and other drugs, hijacking of cars, kidnapping of high targets individuals and illegal transit fees.<sup>63</sup> It is no wonder that this toxic mix of groups has not only tied down some 150,000 Pakistani troops but that there is absolutely no appetite by the army to launch a new operation to try to dislodge some of the Afghan Taliban groups, notably the Haqqani network, which have found refuge in the tribal areas.<sup>64</sup> The army's biggest fear is that such an operation could lead to the opening of a new domestic front that could potentially have far-reaching consequences. Since the election of Nawaz Sharif in May 2013 it is even less likely that such an operation will be launched, as he is keen to talk to the TTP and find a negotiated solution to the scourge of terrorism. Chief of Army Staff General Pervaiz Kayani has indicated in no uncertain terms that the TTP would need to put down their arms first before talks could begin.<sup>65</sup> In either case, the TTP has shown little interest in talking until the army withdraws all its troops from the tribal areas and releases all TTP prisoners.

Meanwhile un-manned US drones have been flying over the tribal areas since 2004 successfully eliminating Afghan and Pakistani Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters. However, there have been significant civilian casualties in the process; some say that it could be as high as 20 per cent. It is generally acknowledged among analysts that these drone strikes are the single most important factor contributing to the rampant anti-Americanism in Pakistan. Successive Pakistani governments have demanded that Washington stop these drones, claiming these strikes are

a violation of their sovereignty. While it is unlikely that Washington is going to oblige, it would appear that the Obama administration has decided to significantly reduce the number of strikes. This is probably because there are fewer high-value targets to eliminate but also because these strikes weaken the government in Islamabad. And the last thing Washington needs as it prepares to leave Afghanistan is a weak Pakistan. And there are two reasons for that.

First, at a practical level, the US still has about 100,000 containers of hardware which it needs to transport out of Afghanistan by road through Pakistan. It will be critical that this route be safe. However, this is less likely to be the case if relations between the US and Pakistan are tense due to the drone strikes. So the sooner this issue can be resolved the less likely the TTP can exploit this, including by attacking the truck convoys as they roll through Pakistan.

Second, at the diplomatic level, the US administration has repeatedly stated that Pakistan has an important role to play in convincing the Afghan Taliban to participate constructively in the US-supported Afghan peace talks. It would be in Pakistan's vital national interests to ensure that when the US-led forces leave Afghanistan in some 15 months that there is some orderly transition to an agreed political settlement between all the major domestic players. Unless this happens, there may well be a repeat of the vicious civil war that wracked utter destruction upon the country in 1992-1996. Such an outcome would be bad news for Pakistan because there would inevitably be a spill-over effect into Pakistan, further weakening an already very fragile state. And a weak Pakistan would not be in a position to try to integrate in its neighbourhood. Unfortunately, such integration has become more difficult with Afghanistan's deepening relationship with India.

### *The perpetual Indo-Pakistan rivalry*

Islamabad has felt increasingly uncomfortable with Kabul's growing relationship with New Delhi. These deepening ties include the signing of an Afghan-Indian strategic treaty in 2012, two billion dollars of Indian investment, a very heavy diplomatic presence and the construction of roads.<sup>66</sup> And even though General Kayani has stated on a number of



occasions that domestic terrorism is now Pakistan's major threat, not India,<sup>67</sup> this sense of now being surrounded on both its flanks by India has meant that Pakistan has not been able to drop its guards on the eastern front. Accordingly, Pakistan not only maintains some 100,000 troops along the international border with India and has approximately 90 to 120 nuclear warheads,<sup>68</sup> but it has also developed tactical nuclear weapons to compensate for its numerical disadvantage with India. Pakistan's fear is the execution of India's 'Cold Start' doctrine – a quick, unexpected, limited strike by the Indian army into the Punjab in case of another terrorist attack, for example.<sup>69</sup> It is important to remember that, as opposed to India, Pakistan does not have a 'no first use nuclear weapons doctrine'. Accordingly, Pakistan has been able to keep India guessing as to whether it would indeed use its nuclear weapons in case of an Indian thrust across the international border.

Despite this continued military preparedness, there have nevertheless been some slight improvements in the bilateral relationship. This includes Pakistan being close to granting Most Favoured Nation status to India and the Indian Prime Minister promising to visit Pakistan, where he was born prior to Partition. However, the most important sticking point in really making substantive progress on the bilateral front is Pakistan's refusal to hand over Hafiz Saeed, the leader of the LeT which committed the terrorist attack in Mumbai in 2008, killing 166 civilians.<sup>70</sup> Unfortunately, and despite Nawaz Sharif's genuine desire to improve bilateral relations, it is almost certain that Saeed will not be surrendered to the Indians; that is a bridge that would simply be too far to cross for the Pakistanis. In the meantime, bilateral relations will remain stunted, thus effectively keeping Pakistan out of its South Asian neighbourhood. But Islamabad has been able to deal with this isolation from its region thanks to its 50-year old relationship with Beijing.

### *The China-Pakistan partnership*

Just as it turned to the US in the 1950s, Pakistan turned to China in the 1960s for assistance after its disappointment over Washington's lukewarm support for its clash with India in 1965 and its support for New Delhi in the brief 1962 Sino-Indian war. Since then the bilateral



relationship has developed significantly. As we noted above, the relationship has been particularly helpful not only in the diplomatic sphere, but also in the military field, especially in Beijing's assistance in building up Pakistan's nuclear arsenal and its missile and aircraft capability. That relationship has become so substantial that Pakistan is now China's most important market for its arms export. In 2000-2010 Pakistan was the recipient of 48 per cent of China's total arms exports. And in 2010 alone, Pakistan was the destination for 60 per cent of China's total arms sales.<sup>71</sup>

Importantly, China has also been assisting Pakistan with its civil nuclear program, helping it build nuclear plants to assist it with its very substantial energy shortfall which prevents it from meeting its full economic potential. As part of assisting Pakistan with its economic development, China has had a significant involvement in the development of the port of Gwadar in Baluchistan. And recently China won the contract to manage the port. The plans are for the Chinese investors to develop Gwadar and its hinterland and make it a hub for economic activity for that under-developed but mineral-rich part of Pakistan. The development of Gwadar would link up with the much bigger project of developing a 'Pak-China Economic Corridor' which would originate in Gwadar and go all the way to Kashgar in western China. This corridor would include railway, gas and oil pipelines and electricity power lines.<sup>72</sup> This mega-economic project is part of the two countries' desire to continue to increase their growing bilateral trade that is coming close to \$15 billion annually.

All in all, the bilateral Pakistan-China relationship has now become quite substantial and this is because both countries have benefited from it. For Pakistan, China helps counterweight India and it also reduces its dependence on the US. And for China, Pakistan is a good ally to help keep India focussed on South Asia; it forces India to divert resources towards countering Pakistan and away from China. However, while the Pakistan-China relationship is sound and long-standing, Beijing is also cautious and pragmatic in its management of that relationship. China is keeping an eye on its growing trade relationship with India - now about 75 billion dollars annually. And a proof of that is that China has no intention of signing off on a formal

defence treaty with Pakistan. All in all, China has no long-term interests in creating tension with India, the gatekeeper to the Indian Ocean - the critical maritime highway for transporting vital primary resources to China.

### **Conclusion**

More than sixty-five years since Pakistan gained its independence, Pakistan is still an outsider in its own region. In this paper, I have argued that Pakistan has never fully integrated into its own sub-continental region for a number of reasons: the violent Partition of the sub-continent and the unresolved issue of Pakistan's identity which flowed from Jinnah's 'Two-Nation Theory'; the initial odd-geographic nature of the country which was compounded with the dominance of the Punjab at the centre; and the long-standing alliance with the US. This isolation from its 'natural' home was compounded with Pakistan's decision to build ties with countries outside its immediate region, notably China and Saudi Arabia, in an attempt to compensate for this isolation. Instead, this further estranged Pakistan from its immediate neighbours, India and Afghanistan.

Put differently, it has been the lack of consensus over the role Islam should play in the administration of the country which has created – and still causes - uncertainty as to the national identity of Pakistan.<sup>73</sup> And the TTP's present terrorist campaign is the violent manifestation of this unresolved issue. According to the TTP's version of Islam, there is no place for Muslims who do not follow the traditionalist Deobandi School of thought, and certainly other non-Muslim minorities have no place in their Pakistan. Unfortunately, the TTP and their followers have linked up with the Punjab-based LeT and like-minded terrorist organisation to 'liberate' Kashmir from Indian control. Similarly, the TTP has a close working relationship with the Afghan Taliban, including assisting it undermine the government in Kabul. Accordingly, future developments in Pakistan will have an impact on Afghanistan and vice versa.

As a result of Pakistan's lack of integration with its own region, billions of dollars' worth of trade and economic potential between Pakistan and India remain locked up. Fortunately, there is a real

opportunity to improve Indo-Pakistan relations with the recent election of Nawaz Sharif who is keen to find lasting peace with India. However, for real progress to be achieved on this front will require both countries to take some difficult decisions, including the Pakistani military banning the LeT and the Indians reducing their diplomatic and security footprints in Afghanistan. Were bilateral relations to improve between India and Pakistan, Afghanistan would no longer need to be the battleground for a proxy confrontation between Islamabad and New Delhi. And this would have a positive impact throughout the region and beyond. But before this can happen Pakistan has to first resolve its national identity issue, which includes its relationship with its neighbours. Once consensus is reached on this critical national matter, Pakistan will no longer be the odd man out in its own region.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank the anonymous reviewer for the constructive criticism of an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> *Foundations of Pakistan: All-India Muslim League Documents*, Vol. II, 1924-1947, Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (ed.), (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), pp. 338-339.

<sup>3</sup> Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, *Speeches as Governor-General of Pakistan 1947-1948*, (Islamabad: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, n.d.), p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Not all Muslims in British India were in favour of the creation of Pakistan. For a discussion of this debate, see: Farzana Shaikh, *Making Sense of Pakistan*, (London: C. Hurst & Co., 2009), pp. 28-45.

<sup>5</sup> Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan: 1857-1964*, (Karachi, Oxford University press, 1967), p. 192.

<sup>6</sup> Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development*, (Folkestone: W. Dawson & Sons, 1980), p. 23.

<sup>7</sup> Douglas Ashford, *National Development and local Reform: Political Participation in Morocco, Tunisia and Pakistan*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 317.

---

<sup>8</sup> Kalim Bahadur, *The Jama'at-i-Islam of Pakistan*, (Lahore: Progressive Books, 1983), p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> K.B. Sayeed, 'The Jama'at-i-Islami Movement in Pakistan', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. XXX, No.1, March 1959, p. 67.

<sup>10</sup> Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism*, p. 264.

<sup>11</sup> Maulana Abu'l A'la Mawdudi, *Musulman aur Mawjuda Siyasi Kashmakash*, (Pathankot, 1942, Vol. 3 ), p. 76, cited in Bahadur, *The Jama'at-i-Islam of Pakistan*, p. 39.

<sup>12</sup> Jinnah, *Speeches as Governor-General of Pakistan*, p. 9.

<sup>13</sup> Stephen Philip Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan*, (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), p. 44.

<sup>14</sup> K.B. Sayeed, 'Religion and Nation-Building in Pakistan', *Middle East Journal*, 17 (3) (Summer 1963), p. 283.

<sup>15</sup> Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development*, (Folkestone: Dawson & Sons, 1980), p. 75.

<sup>16</sup> There are a number of different explanations as to what the acronym of Pakistan stands for but the most common one is the following: Pnjab, Afghania (the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), Kashmir, Sindh and Baluchistan. It also means the land of the pure in Urdu. The 'I' was later included for ease of pronunciation. Choudhary Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation*, (Lahore: Mustafa Waheed, 1946), p. 225.

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion about the origins of the Durand Line, see: Alastair Lamb, *Asian Frontiers: Studies in a Continuing Problem*, (Melbourne: F.N. Cheschire, 1968), pp. 86-93.

<sup>18</sup> Nader Entessar, 'Baluchi Nationalism', *Asian Affairs*, 7 (2) (Nov/Dec. 1979), pp. 95-104.

<sup>19</sup> Whether this was a deliberate omission or due to an imprecise wording of the resolution is difficult to ascertain. Nevertheless, the importance of this word, or rather the omission of it, was to have in the future was not obvious in those days, but in subsequent years the right to provincial autonomy was to become an issue of paramount importance in the political life of the country. Although in legal terms the 1946 resolution superseded the Lahore Resolution as the founding document of

---

Pakistan, in psychological terms the Lahore Resolution has remained the cornerstone document of the country. *Foundations of Pakistan: All-India Muslim League Documents, Vol. II, 1924-1947*, Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada (ed.), (Karachi: National Publishing House, 1970), pp. 513ff.

<sup>20</sup> For an account of these events, see the Khan of Kalat's political autobiography: Mir Ahmed Yar Khan Baluch, *Inside Baluchistan*, (Karachi: Royal Book Co. 1975), pp. 152ff.

<sup>21</sup> Jinnah, *Speeches as Governor-General of Pakistan*, p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> At the time of Partition, the Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP), was completely dominated by Urdu and non-Urdu-speaking *Muhajirs*, i.e. Punjabis. And even after a quota system was implanted in 1949, the ethnic imbalance remained skewed in favour of the Punjabis and *Muhajirs*. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, 1973), p. 362. A similar ethnic imbalance was present in the Pakistani army at the time of Partition and has remained heavily skewed in favour of the Punjabis and Pakhtun up to the present. Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan*, p. 98.

<sup>24</sup> S. M. Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, (London, Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 257.

<sup>25</sup> W. Norman Brown, *The United States and India, Pakistan, Bangladesh*, (Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 196.

<sup>26</sup> For a discussion of the Rann of Kutch clash, see: H. Feldman, *From Crisis to Crisis, Pakistan, 1962 - 1969*, (London, Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 133-137.

<sup>27</sup> Ayub differentiated between the Kashmir 'line of Demarcation' and the 'International Boundary' between West Pakistan and India, the crossing of which he considered aggression. W.H. Wriggins, 'The Balancing Process in Pakistan's Foreign Policy', in L. Ziring et al. (eds.), *Pakistan: The long View*, (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1977), p. 325.

<sup>28</sup> Feldman, *From Crisis to Crisis*, p. 141.

<sup>29</sup> Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, p. 329.

---

<sup>30</sup> G.W. Choudhury, *The last Days of United Pakistan*, (London: C. Hurst, 1974), pp. 20-21.

<sup>31</sup> For a detailed account of the 1965 war by the then Commander-in-Chief of the Army, General Musa Khan, see: *My Version: India-Pakistan War 1965*, (Lahore: Wajidalis, 1983). Also see: Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947 -2000: Disenchanted Allies*, (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 158 - 165.

<sup>32</sup> Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, pp. 353-355.

<sup>33</sup> G. W. Choudhury, *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the Major Powers*, (NY: The Free Press, 1975), p. 120.

<sup>34</sup> Leo E. Rose, 1982, op. cit., p. 322.

<sup>35</sup> *Dawn*, 9 April 1971, cited in Hasan Askari Rizvi, *The Military and Politics in Pakistan*, (Lahore, Progressive Publishers, 1976), p. 248.

<sup>36</sup> Choudhury, *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the Major Powers*, p. 209.

<sup>37</sup> Hasan Askari Rizvi, 1976, op. cit., p. 250.

<sup>38</sup> *The Pakistan Observer*, 5 December 1971.

<sup>39</sup> K.B. Sayeed, 'The Historical Origins of Some of Pakistan's Persistent Political Problems', in A.J. Wilson and D. Dalton (eds.), *The States of South Asia: Problems of National Integration*, (New Delhi: Vikas, 1982), p. 40. For a detailed account of the US attitude to this war see: Gary Glass, *The Blood Telegram: Nixon, Kissinger and a Forgotten Genocide*, (New York, Knopf, 2013).

<sup>40</sup> For an excellent account of the 1971 events see, Choudhury, *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the Major Powers*.

<sup>41</sup> Mohammad Ayoob, 'India, Pakistan and Super-Power Rivalry', *The World Today*, 38 (5) (May 1982), pp. 194ff.

<sup>42</sup> About 8 per cent of the population of East Pakistan was Hindu. *Census of East Pakistan*, (Karachi, Ministry of Home and Kashmir Affairs, 1961), p. II- 98.

<sup>43</sup> Sheikh R. Ali, 'Pakistan's Islamic Bomb', *Asia Pacific Community*, 16 (Spring 1982), p. 77.



---

<sup>44</sup> Robert LaPorte Jr., 'The Ability of South and East Asia to Meet the Labor Demands of the Middle East and North Africa', *The Middle East Journal*, 38 (4) (Autumn 1984), p. 702.

<sup>45</sup> Shirin Tahir-Kheli, 'In Search of an Identity: Islam and Pakistan's Foreign Policy', in Adeed Dawisha (ed.), *Islam in Foreign Policy*, (Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 74.

<sup>46</sup> Shirin Tahir-Kheli and William O. Staudenmaier, 'The Saudi-Pakistani Military Relationship: Implications for US Policy', *Orbis*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Spring 1982, p. 158.

<sup>47</sup> *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 11 December 1984, p. 13.

<sup>48</sup> Thomas Barfield, *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), p. 236.

<sup>49</sup> *The New York Times*, 19 November 1981.

<sup>50</sup> For a good discussion of the *mujahedeen* activities in Afghanistan, see: Stephen Tanner, *Afghanistan*, (Philadelphia: Perseus Books Group, 2003), pp. 243-270.

<sup>51</sup> Dieter Braun, 'The Afghanistan Conflict as a Regional Problem', *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, 5 (4) (Summer 1983), p. 35.

<sup>52</sup> For an examination of the various insurgent groups, see: N.P. Newell and R.S. Newell, *The Struggle for Afghanistan*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), pp. 91-106.

<sup>53</sup> For a discussion of the external influences on these madrassas, see: *Pakistan: Madrasas, Extremism and the Military*, International Crisis Group, Asia Report No. 36, 29 July 2002, pp. 9-13.

<sup>54</sup> Peter Chalk, 'Case Study: The Pakistani-Afghan border Region', in Angela Rabasa et al., (eds.), *Ungoverned Territories – Understanding and Reducing Terrorism Risks*, (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2007), p. 69.

<sup>55</sup> Chalk, 'Case Study: The Pakistani-Afghan border Region', p. 57.

<sup>56</sup> For a good discussion about Pakistan's tribal area, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 57-70.

<sup>57</sup> 'More than 9000 terrorism-linked deaths in KP, FATA since 2008', *The Dawn*, 27 March 2013.

---

<sup>58</sup> Raza Rahman Khan Qazi, *Extremism-Terrorism in the Name of Islam: Causes and Counter Strategy*, (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Peshawar, 2013.), pp. 138-139.

<sup>59</sup> The TTP was originally led by Baitullah Mehsud but he was killed in a drone strike in August 2009.

<sup>60</sup> For a good discussion of the militant groups based in the tribal areas, see: Brian Fishman, 'The Battle for Pakistan', *New America Foundation*, April 2010.

<sup>61</sup> In addition to the LeT, there is also Jaish-e-Muhammad, Harakat-ul-Mujahidin and Hizbul Mujahidin. Chalk, 'Case Study: The Pakistani-Afghan border Region', p. 55.

<sup>62</sup> 'India-Pakistan arms race 'massive waste', says Nawaz', *The Dawn*, 28 September 2013.

<sup>63</sup> Chalk, 'Case Study: The Pakistani-Afghan border Region', p. 65.

<sup>64</sup> Author's interview with Corps Commander in Peshawar, July 2012.

<sup>65</sup> Baqir Sajjad Syed, 'Talks with Taliban not to affect operations in tribal areas', *The Dawn*, 5 September 2013.

<sup>66</sup> Jack Healy and Alissa J. Rubin, 'Afghanistan curries favour with India and denigrates Pakistan', *The New York Times*, 4 October 2011.

<sup>67</sup> 'Militants overtake India on fear list', *The Australian*, 18 August 2010.

<sup>68</sup> Tom Hundley, 'Race to the End', *Foreign Policy*, 5 September 2012.

<sup>69</sup> 'A Rivalry that threatens the world', *The Economist*, 21 May 2011.

<sup>70</sup> Alex Rodriguez and Mark Magnier, 'Nawaz Sharif may give Pakistan-India relations a boost', *The Nation*, 27 May 2013.

<sup>71</sup> Claude Rakisits, 'Pakistan-China Bilateral Relations 2001-2011: A Deepening but Cautious Partnership', *Security Challenges*, 8 (3) (Spring 2012), pp. 93-96.

<sup>72</sup> 'China to invest in Gwadar projects', *The Dawn*, 30 August 2013.

<sup>73</sup> Shaikh, *Making Sense of Pakistan*, pp. 9-13.