

# **Terror War and Pakistan: Limited Options for the Nation**

Monir Ahmed

## ***Abstract***

*Today the whole world is afflicted with insomnia of terror war. It was drummed up in such a way as if it was no less than another world war. The fire of this war was ignited from among the rubbles of the World Trade Tower within a limited boundary in New York. But it spread like a wildfire engulfing others within its periphery. But nobody knows with certainty who had the courage to execute it! On pure assumption the affected Americans came out with war machinery and roared in the mountainous terrains of Afghanistan to punish those whom they considered rogues and behind the carnage. Gradually it encircled Afghan neighbour Pakistan; trapped it and forced it to reiterate it was his own war, though it was not. Ultimately Pakistanis had to bear the brunt. The Pakistani soldiers, on behalf of US, started shedding their blood in the way of killing their own brothers. There was public lament that the mercenaries were buying their blood on so cheap rate! The situation is now so alarming that Pakistan seems in the brink of collapse, and its nuclear power may be robbed any day. Pakistan stands now in a very tight corner. Its option is very limited. Though the government has been cooperating with the mercenaries, there are forces within the country which consider it not feasible to toe the line of the war mongers. They are on the look out for an alternative, a man, not a so-called democrat, who can call a spade a spade.*

## **Introduction**

War is no joke. It is an extreme outcome of amalgamation of impatience and anger. It has the role in making and breaking; breaking and making a nation, a country.. It shapes up the world map in a new

perspective. Since ages it appears and leaves behind traces of devastation throughout the globe. Once emperor Ashoka the Great minutely observed the devastation of the Kalinga War and was completely shattered. It brought a turning point in his life. Rest of his life he followed the life of a Buddhist monk and never went to war. Nobody wants it. Yet it appears becoming unavoidable. The mankind witnessed it on different occasions in history. Below is the chronology of major wars worldwide:

History at a Glance	
c. 1250 BC	Trojan Wars
431 - 404 BC	Peloponnesian War
264 - 241 BC	First Punic War
218 - 201 BC	Second Punic War
149 - 146 BC	Third Punic War
1096 - 1099	First Crusade
1147 - 1149	Second Crusade
1189 - 1192	Third Crusade
1202 - 1204	Fourth Crusade
1337 - 1454	Hundred Years War
1455 - 1485	Wars of the Roses
1562 - 1598	French Wars of Religion
1642 - 1648	English Civil War
1618 - 1648	Thirty Years War
1689 - 1697	War of League of Augsburg
1700	Great Northern War
1701 - 1713	War of Spanish Succession
1730 - 1738	War of Polish Succession
1740 - 1748	War of Austrian Succession
1756 - 1763	Seven Years War
1775 - 1783	American Revolutionary War
1793 - 1815	Napoleonic Wars
1821 - 1829	Greek War of Independence

1846 - 1848	Mexican-American War
1854 - 1856	Crimean War
1859	War for Italian Independence
1861 - 1865	American Civil War
1866	Austro-Prussian
1870	Franco-Prussian War
1894 - 1895	Chinese-Japanese War
1899 - 1902	Boer War
1904 - 1905	Russo-Japanese War
1914 - 1918	World War I
1918 - 1921	Russian Civil War
1931 - 1933	Chinese-Japanese War
1936 -1939	Spanish Civil War
1939 - 1945	World War II
1950 - 1953	Korean War
1967	Six Day War
1964 - 1973	Vietnam War
1980 - 1988	Iran-Iraq War
1982	Falklands War
1991	Gulf War
2003	Iraq War (Occupation of Iraq)
Continuing	War on Terror

**Source:** Chronology of War: [www.guardroom.co.uk/chrono.htm](http://www.guardroom.co.uk/chrono.htm)

War is neither fought any more on a ground, nor fought between two war lords only. It now involves the whole population. So, the devastation can be easily gauged. It is huge. Though, sometimes, war is termed as the way out of any impasse, it brings in no proper peace. It is a time consuming mechanism in the name of peace. It is manufactured in the factory of the winners and then slapped on the defeated weak. After the Second World War the world saw only the bloody peace in which Japan and Germany had to bear the brunt. Germany was bifurcated and Japan brought under tight armament

control. It was barred to maintain army (vital state organ) so on and so forth. And on their ruins US flapped. It showed its fangs to others. Its involvement in Vietnam War that continued from September 26, 1959 to April 30, 1975 is a good example of it.

So, those who survived the onslaught of the World War II with an anticipated hope for a better future following drastic change in every sphere of life throughout the world, gradually felt insecure at the instance of the mighty Americans. Even the USSR which was part of allied forces, soon became a rival player in the cold war. Even Pakistan that throughout embraced the Americans with open arms could not be spared. Through intimidation or bucks Pakistan was trapped, misused of its prowess in the war called terror war, amid talks of friendship echoing almost daily from abroad.

### **Terror war, a new addition to war terminology**

The war that is ornamented as terror war or war on terror is a new addition to the war terminology. Possibly it germinated in the womb of declaration of New World Order which is termed as emergence of bureaucratic collectivist one-world government. Soviet forces were petted on the sands of Afghanistan and there was none to challenge the prowess of the winner. The latter did not want to miss the train. It tried to impose its will over others the world over. That's what came up in the name of the Order. Its use was not even handed. Most affected under its thrust were those who had long been in struggle for their rights of freedom. So, soon appeared on the horizon nameless players with small opposition. Until the sudden strike in the heartland of the New World Order, nobody knew about them; no one cared about them. Later they were known as Al-Qaeda, an organization of hardcore religious people. Over a period of time since the three-pronged attack on the World Trade Tower, this organization developed a fighting technique for their campaign, that was termed as terrorism by the US.

The terminology needs a citation to find out its differences with the traditional battle or war. The major difference lies in the nature of operation to assert one's will. While the traditional war is fought directly against the opponents, the terror war mostly applies guerrilla warfare

techniques. It was applied by the Viet Congs in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Indo-China war; it was used by the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka. The reason is where the fight is between two un-equals, the 'weak' do not find the frontal war feasible for them. But question remains why the guerrilla warfare adopted by the communists was not called terror war despite the fact that the aspect of severe violence was very much inherent in it. And why the present war is termed as terror war! It may be so termed because for the first time US was terrorized in such a non-traditional way.

It is no denying a fact that no war can be peaceful. Peaceful means adopted by Nelson Mandela proved ineffective. So, finally he had to adopt violence as a mode of his struggle against racial government in South Africa. Violence is the mode of execution of the war. All types of war must carry this aspect one way or the other. In the traditional war, firework is used, in which the peaceful people too are terrorized. They become the target also. The drone attacks by US that have perished many innocent persons are a living example of it. Similarly the campaign of the so-called 'terrorists' aims at destabilizing the order which their enemies want to maintain. And in the process many innocent lives are lost. And as they are less equipped with modern armament, they bait their lives for the cause. The incidents of suicide bombing are instances of it. The ultimate aim of both of them is to defeat the opponent. Only the difference is the mode of operation. One interesting aspect is that a suicide bomber is very dear to his cause. He does not even hesitate to shed his own blood. He can kiss the death with ease whereas his contemporary from opposite camp can never think of it.

Therefore, it is very tricky to blame one or the other when the two opposite groups struggle for supremacy. For this supremacy, US dropped atom bombs in Japan, and for the same reason, the Al-Qaeda, the Taliban or the Tamil Tigers adopted violent path. This very fact is crystal clear. So, proving it otherwise has so far failed. American attempt to prove the militants' mode of operation illegal as well as immoral could not bear fruit.

The question came before the world body to find a suitable definition for the terror war and give justification to oppose it tooth

and nail. There were debates and discussions but no definite result was in sight. The question of struggle for human rights and independence came in the way. The question of Palestinians' struggle, the Kashmiris' fight etc stroke hard the mind of the UN discussion. The line of differentiation between the freedom struggle and the terror fight looked very thin. So, the American attempt ultimately fizzled out.

### **Terror War and public debate**

- i) World Sindhi Congress & Baloch Voice (Sindhi Baloch Forum) organized a seminar on Dec 2, 2001 in London namely Positioning Pakistan in War against Terrorism in which speaker Mr. Anwar of MQM presented his view point. According to him, in this war Pakistan had no choice of positioning herself. The people's will was not respected here, rather the will from above was imposed. What was needed was a single telephonic conversation between the senior members of the US administration and the President of Pakistan. And the outcome was followed by Pakistan.

Pakistan believed Taliban were the US guys, Osama enjoyed US protection. Thousands of Pakistanis were perished. But it was not a game for the Pakistanis. They wanted America either cooperate with Pakistan or faced the wrath. That was the tone of Pakistan Government with regards the war against terrorism.

President Pervez Musharraf considered Taliban were a reality in Afghanistan. What they did was jihad and jihad was not terrorism. The jihad that started from within the sands of Afghanistan was transported to Kashmir. Muslims all over the world supported their struggle for self-determination.

But the situation took a u-turn under threat from the US. The jihadis were termed as terrorists overnight and Pakistan had to withdraw its support from the Taliban. "Musharraf did not have any other choice: 'Either you are with us or you are against us.'" This mentality of the Bush Administration left no choice for Musharraf but to cooperate. Later situation was made so tricky that it had to use its political clout and military power in the name of its

own survival. Pakistani Taliban who posed threat to the writ of the government, became the target.

The speaker, however, lent support to the US move and wanted to eradicate the 'menace.' For formation of a nation religion has no proper base, he believed.

- ii) Another speaker Balach Marri who talked on Role of Liberation Movement and Progressive Forces within Pakistan to Safeguard Global Interests, said that the Sindhi Baloch nationalists did not believe in Taliban ideology. The reasons he put forward were that 1) Taliban were creation of ISI and American CIA; 2) they were fundamentalist in views and way of governance, and 3) they are violators of human rights. In the same stretch he also disapproved gruesome killings and abuses of human rights of the Afghan people and the POWs in Qalai Janghi and other places by the West and its allies. Rejecting the western viewpoint he said the war on terror was not a conventional war. It was more a war of prevention of terrorism than a war of curing it.. Bombing had the adverse effect. It did not kill terrorism rather breeds it. He said one is cornered to such a state where justice is denied, one gets depression and that depression leads one to retaliate. One who does so is called a terrorist. But it should be understood that a weaker person is branded as terrorist. 'Terrorism is his weapon, but ironically this weapon is used by the strong.' So, it was his considered view that the international community must find a peaceful means to solve the problem of terrorism. He suggested the US to look at the nationalist forces in Pakistan and follow what they believe, US should curtail its hunger for power, which may lead them having slightly smaller share of the booty but it will help them win the war against terrorism.
- iii) Another seminar arranged by PINA was held in Lahore. Its title was Armed forces role in war against terror acknowledged. Lt. Gen. (R) Khalid Lateef Mughal presided over it while Brig. (R) Yasoob Ali Dogar, Brig. (R) Farooq Hameed Khan, Mr. Altaf

Hasan Qureshee, Brig. (R) Yousaf, Mr. Qayyum Nizami, Hafiz Muhammad Idrees, Mrs. Naheed Tahir and Mr. Ahmad Fareed spoke on the occasion. The seminar surveyed the analysis of American scholar William R. Polk on "Violent Politics" which drew lessons from the history of insurgency, terrorism and guerrilla war from the American Revolution of 1776 to Iraq War of 1991 and recommended that Pakistan should be facilitated to tackle the situation independently without any foreign interference. Further America should start negotiations with the Taliban etc. One of the keynote speaker mentioned about three components of guerilla warfare i.e., Public Support, Effective Administration and the military power. The latter plays its role up to 5 per cent, he said. Referring the Pak guerrilla operation in Azad Kashmir, he talked of three elements that play the role of guerilla war, such as Target, Sponsor and the Public. When Pakistan abdicated sponsorship in Kashmir, the guerilla operation there came to end, leaving India successful in its plans. Terming that Pak army's success in Waziristan limited, he suggested that success could be achieved through politically vibrant process. Another speaker spoke about US hegemony in the world and suggested for countering it. He said US was working to divide states into further smaller countries and Pakistan should identify the elements bent upon dividing the country. US system was based on lies, said another speaker while the other was opposed to take dictation from others.

- iv) Karachi University Teachers Society in collaboration of People's Resistance held a seminar about military operation in Bajaur, Waziristan, Kurram Agency and Swat. Main speakers were TV journalist Kak Kahil and Wali Haider who just came back from a tour to Bajaur region. Both speakers criticized Taliban's activities on the one hand and on the other took the Pakistan Army to task for playing second fiddle to the NATO and US agenda which are leading towards collapse of the sovereignty of Pakistan. They termed it a proxy war between two super powers. Both India and Russia pushed the Taliban inside Pakistan and huge money was



poured into it. One of them suggested that Pakistan should safeguard its own interest by shunning the policy of dancing on the imported tune. Another pointed out that the attacks on Afghanistan and war in Pakistan were part of US hegemonic designs and gaining control over natural resources of the region. He was of the view that both US and the Taliban had the same interest and both of them were on attempt to destabilize the region.

- v) In yet another discussion in the platform of Shura Hamdard Karachi Chapter, continuation of military operation against militancy was urged. The topic of the discussion was 'Prevailing situation of the country and our responsibilities.' The meeting was presided over by former Chief Justice, Federal Shariat Court, Haziqul Khairi. One of the speakers made it a point that military action in Swat and Malakand division became essential and opposed any deal with the militants. But a lady speaker placed just the opposite view. The door for negotiation with the Taliban should remain open, she opined.

### **US roar of war against Taliban/Al-Qaeda**

There are at least two hot spots within the globe where sabre-rattling of war is being heard. They are Middle East and Afghanistan. Though Mideast problem has long been pestering, Afghanistan, the new hottest place, the world attention is focused on. It is said to be the hotbed of Muslim militants. Practically the whole world is locked at present into what's called anti-terror war in which Al-Qaeda and its ally Taliban on the one side whereas the US and allies on the other are the major stakeholders. The former has thrown a gigantic challenge and the mighty has started an all-out war against them.

This Al-Qaeda factor might have never been in forefront had the cold war not been buried under the rubbles of Berlin Wall and the Soviet mercenaries did not put on vermilion of defeat in Afghanistan's mountainous terrains. Interestingly, though the cold war ended with a positive tilt towards the capitalist block, in its womb cropped up the

Al-Qaeda and its ally Taliban as anti-thesis in the Marxian terminology.

It was not that the think-tank of the capitalist block was not aware of the consequences of nurturing the poisonous serpentine in its own womb. But it was due to exigencies it had to swallow the bitter and poisonous pill for a quick result. The capitalist block did it and took the result only to prove their negative supremacy rather than using it to make the world congenial for the people as a whole. But they might have forgotten or posed to forget that in this negative fertile soil the seeds of dissents that had been sowed during anti-Soviet onslaught in the past might turn into saplings any day, any moment. So, the rise of the militancy is not abrupt, rather the logical consequences of the action the 'First World' took against the 'Second World' through the misuse of religious sentiment of a greater segment of the human society. This segment is none but the Mujahideen, loosely aligned Afghan opposition groups, who were allegedly trained by American CIA during Carter and Reagan administrations. With the support from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, China and several western European countries they fought with the Soviet invaded army in Afghanistan in the 70s and after. In fact, they were the hard core Muslims. They took their fight as jihad against the people they considered infidels. The western power used the clout of their religious belief, but left them unattended after the Soviet forces accepted defeat. This amounts to misuse of their service to a cause.

But how can one overlook the point of crime of misusing others' religious sentiments for nefarious designs, no matter who's who is in the helm of affair? So, why will not the demand for punishment on that count be justified?

It is against nature to keep on perpetuating any wrong doing for a longer period. One day the follies of subjugation by the mighty come up. Exactly that's what happened. The above mentioned greater segment demanded its share in the booty that the mentors of the militants as is claimed, tried to eat it alone after the mighty Soviet's ouster from Afghanistan. The crux of the problem lies here.

**New World Order Vs real war heroes**

Denying the share in the booty was amounted to injustice in the eyes of the Muslim war heroes. But who cared! The claimants of the anti-Soviet war made the winning jubilation in the name of New World Order meaning thereby they were supreme in all spheres. In the same vein they started to distort the image of those who through their blood really made Afghanistan hell for the Soviet forces. Ironically they were stamped as terrorists. They are said to be enemies of the United States. They were portrayed as the real threat to the existence of mankind throughout the globe. This was the US strategy that was on constant shift on new exigencies daily. And it was part of that strategy to buy people either through threat or through bucks to ensure a shield for the mighty against the onslaught of the militants.

This way another war spread its wings in the horizon of the whole world.. The flame that was once ignited from the rubbles of the Trade Tower in the US, spread like a wildfire. Following 9/11 incident, US, UK and NATO forces roared into Afghan soil. They made a campaign in the name of Operation Enduring Freedom, International Security Assistance Force. A large number of countries contributed to it. This way the whole mankind was brought under its devastated influence. There appeared two fronts—one entailed the vast might and the other stood with conviction to oppose the former's hegemony. In other words, it was a war between two un-equals.

War means armed conflict at least between two groups. It is the last option. Physical war breaks out when all options to settle a dispute are exhausted. On that count, emphasis is on examination of exhaustion of options. Further, it is incumbent on every country to save its own territory, sky and water from outside onslaught. So, the next stress is on query as to how a superpower can be so vulnerable to the attack of the non-state actors, if it is at all done by the latter. And if it is really unable to withstand such a thrust, then how will it justify spending of huge public money on its security?

Therefore, the onus is on the US to prove that all the options for avoiding an armed conflict were exhausted before it roared into the battle field. In this context the reference of Iraq under Saddam Hussain

as the dumping ground of weapons of mass destruction which was later proved a hoax, can be reiterated. But for the bluff, the US under Bush Jr. was not brought to book whereas in the post World War II, the war mongering countries were punished. Why?

Secondly, proof must be put forward that without instigation the non-state actors launched the sudden attack. On this count, the onus again is on US to prove that it had not crossed its own boundary for its hegemony abroad. It is on record they had done so and is still doing it. Many people were of the view that US secret service used clout to kill Nkrumah of Ghana, Ben Bella of Algeria, Bhutto of Pakistan, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. And still the head of CIA is shuttling between Washington and Islamabad. Is it for what? Is CIA not involved in thrusting its influence over Pakistan? In fact, on many occasions CIA highups stepped in Pakistani soil. Against this background, if the Al-Qaeda or else launched any attack on US soil, how far unjust it is in the name of justice, needs to be judged.

However, it is no denying a hard fact that the US had undergone the violent thrust known as 9/11 on its soil assumed to be inflicted by Al-Qaeda militants. Reportedly nearly three thousand souls were perished in the carnage. And on that pure assumption, without any ground proof, American Government hastened to move to punish the militants. There was opposition too from within and abroad against the move. But nothing deterred the war monger Bush Jr. to change his mind.

He behaved like Hitler forgetting the latter's downfall was linked with his command to march his forces through the biting cold to reach the communist mainland. He denied learning any lesson from Hitler's blunders. Defiantly he ordered and his forces had to impede vast landscape and tumultuous water to reach the typical terrains of Afghanistan. They started a full-fledged war against the existing Taliban Government there and finally ousted it. A puppet government was installed instead so on and so forth. This was not the end. To avenge the deaths of nearly three thousand souls it rang the last bell of thousands of innocent souls. Yet its intoxication for more blood could not be contained. Despite change of hands in power still its campaign is on with more velocity and possibly with ulterior motive.

Possibly the question of ethics is not raised in this connection. That's why it looks odd to discuss the issue of revenge by the big brother. How can US justify sending thousands of lives at the altar of only three thousand deaths? Being a super power it was its ethical obligation to prove its Super power greatness of forgiveness and forgetfulness. But the way it reacted was a proof that it wanted to show its super power prowess that 'I am supreme?'

In the context of such a supremacy, how can the mankind erase the trace of guilt the US committed by killing 1,40,000 and 80,000 people respectively in seconds by dropping Little Boy and Fat Man on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan; and by ensuring her illegal presence for two and a half decades on foreign soil to kill 6 million Viet Congs and their communist allies? (3 to 4m death toll in north and south Vietnam, and 1.5 to 2m in Laos and Cambodia)

Now the question is: being a super power did US ever ask how was there the security lapse when the doomsday descended on the people? And when there was such a lapse, how will US prove its skyrocketed prowess that utterly failed to deter the onslaught of the weak?

This aspect is a testimony that the power of lethal weapons is not the last answer. Beyond that exists the sense of calculated strategy, that gives an upper hand of the 'weak' over the 'mighty'. Further, it is the conviction that proves supreme and it is that thing which provides the weak the might to fight the powerful opponents. Viet Cong's stiff resistance against the vast war machinery is the best instance of it. And again, it gives one the courage to sacrifice one's life for a cause--genuine of course. That's why it becomes evident the 'pahari peanut' is growing strength to strength in the face of the 'paper tigers' with every passing day. High ranking US military officer Adm Mike Mullen admitted that US was losing the war against Taliban and said, insurgency was surging and there would be a tough fight in which huge deaths might take place.

On the other, the latter on weak ethical ground looks desperate in face of the fierce opposition from the forces they never ever expected to survive long. Otherwise, why did the mighty make a surge in its forces in Afghanistan despite the vast forces numbering 70,000

made up of allies throughout the world in hand already present there. Did it mean they were anticipating the militants who cordoned off the technologically superb forces from all sides, would march through the heart of the country? Or was it a strategy to play another game for which it had collected consent throughout the world on one pretext or the other? Through intimidation or bucks.

The coalition forces were brought in Afghanistan on the promise to counter the Taliban. They vastly outnumber the opponents who are estimated at 10,000 (full time insurgents not more than 3000). Yet they concentrate on a small landscape giving the Taliban a freehand elsewhere in the country. Is it a proof they think they are mercenaries and cannot face the opponents? Or is it part of a long drawn strategy to show the world wrongly the prowess of the Taliban as was shown in the case of Saddam's Iraq?

In the words of US special envoy Richard Holbrooke, 'Afghanistan is like no other problem we have confronted, and in my view it's going to be tougher than Vietnam, and in US military official Adm Mike Mullen's words 'Taliban insurgency has gotten better, more sophisticated.' These words are a testimony that US intentionally want to paint the Taliban as a massive power to justify execution of their new strategy.

The coalition forces could have at least contained the Taliban forces where they are today, if they really lack power to completely eliminate them. But it is due to 'strategic innovation' by them, they seemed to have gone against the tide. They made secondary their long drawn strategy to destabilise terrorism and made the Pak N-arsenal their prime target. They (US) believed that it could in some way get its hands on Pakistan's "red" nuclear buttons, by exploiting unrest for which it is partly responsible. That's why Pakistani authorities in Islamabad had to come forward to clarify 'The nuclear installations are so safe that even the US satellite cannot monitor them.'

However, on ground, the US, genuinely or otherwise, showed anticipated fear of Taliban prowess. A statement from none but President Obama may be quoted here. He said, "Multiple intelligence estimates have warned that al Qaeda is actively planning attacks on the

U.S. homeland from its safe-haven in Pakistan... Al-Qaeda and its extremist allies have moved across the border to the remote areas of the Pakistani frontier. This almost certainly includes al-Qaeda's leadership: Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri. They have used this mountainous terrain as a safe-haven to hide, train terrorists, communicate with followers, plot attacks, and send fighters to support the insurgency in Afghanistan."

Thus they forced Pakistan to come to their terms. They argued without Pakistan's active participation the war against terror could not be won.

### **Pakistan bows before US insistence**

Though initially Pakistan had shown hesitation in many respects, it bowed at last before the American insistence and strategy. The US strategists told the Pakistani leadership to ward off the boundaries the Taliban sneak through to fight the coalition forces in Afghanistan meaning thereby the Taliban had the safe havens in Pakistani terrain. This point was kept on alive to hammer the Pak strategists' mind and force Pakistan to allow its soil to target the prey. Finally they were successful in buying blood of the Pakistanis on very cheap rate. Pakistan obeyed the dictate. Once it is done, their secret service people's inroad became evident and drone attacks made a start. In the repeated drone attacks since June 18, 2004 many people including high valued militant Nek Mohammed Wazir and Al-Qaeda No. 3 Hamza Rabia lost their lives.

The whole gamut makes one thing clear. Everything was done by fraud. Modus operandi was devoid of justice. A trap was made and Pakistan was pushed into it. Now question is: when US intelligence agency was allowed inside Pakistan, will US reciprocate by allowing Pak ISI to operate on her soil on even stronger ground?

It is on record, when Pakistan was in trouble in 1971 US Six Fleet never turned up to its help. In similar fashion it showed Pakistan volte face during the Pak Kargil campaign. The interest of Pakistan was compromised against its own interest. Interest of corporate profits led America to snub the then Pakistani PM Nawaz Sharif. It was said

to Nawaz Sharif point blank that India was a favoured country of US and Pakistan must recede from the heights.

However, secretly shifting the drones and killing the innocents in Pakistan through their use, the US operation went on. It was not the last strategy. Soon appeared on the scene of Pakistani soil a force in the name of Pakistani Taliban with which outside link is traced. Huge quantity of arms that were recovered from the Taliban was of US origin. Again, there were traces of India's hobnobbing with those Taliban in the latter's fight with the Pakistan army. This Pakistani Taliban are so-called. They have no link with the Taliban in Afghanistan. This is evident from the fact that the resurgent and emboldened Taliban group in Afghanistan refused to lend support to local Taliban fighters engaged in fierce fighting with security forces of Pakistan. Its target is Pakistan's sovereignty, not the coalition mercenaries in Afghanistan. Appearance of this new force talks of new things and the whole anti-Taliban strategy took a new twist. Its birth seems to kill two birds with one stone.

The US attempt was to crush Taliban in Afghanistan in which it expected Pakistan's cooperation. But as Pakistan was reluctant to involve directly its armed forces in the quagmire, raising the Pakistani Taliban was a better option for US. Finally the Pak army had to come into action against the newly evolved forces. This was a foreign strategy to weaken Pakistan from within. This would hasten destablity in the country on the one hand and ensure brighter chance of falling the key of the nuclear arsenal in the hand of US.

Whatever is the point of view of US and its backeres in Pakistan, the strategy was successfully implemented. Pak Taliban was provided necessary support along with the task of challenging the writ of the government of the soil. It is not that Pakistan was not aware of it. Pak Spy body chief General Pasha surely knew about it. So he became critical of CIA's failure to provide concrete actionable information to Pakistan in containing flow of aid to terror networks operating from Afghanistan to destabilize Pakistan.

However, US mounted pressure on the Pakistan Government to use the local forces to contain the so-called Taliban onslaught.



Alongwith it, apprehension of falling of Pak N-nuke in wrong hand was echoed from afar. On that bogey, war experts, political heavy weight and economic pundits enhanced frequency in their visit to Pakistan. Purpose was to mould Pakistani leaders on the given lines. Finally the army was used. Internal war ensued. Brothers were petted against brothers under one sky. And still it continues amid pinching note-- more is needed from Pakistan. British PM Brown, US Gen David Petraeus and President Obama echoed it.

But what the word 'more' implies. Is there any limit to this demand? Where the mercenaries against the Liliputians in Vietnam and against the pahari peanut in Afghan mountains failed, miracles are expected from the Pakistani forces as if the latter are the world leaders in uniform!

There was another bogey that Bin Laden was in Pakistan which the latter forcefully denied. Yet the point is echoing from one corner to the other. Is this not part of the sinister campaign to make ground to directly invade Pakistan? And the apprehension could be supplemented by the fact that the American and NATO forces were surged along the porous border of Pakistan. Maybe such an invasion is not imminent. The situation may linger. Invasion may be kept in hold unless internal battle weakens the army and the economic graph nose-dives and people's moral is completely shattered. The target is to keep unholy hand on the nuclear key.

### **US campaign vis-a-vis moral justification**

The modus operandi of the US campaign lacks moral justification because there is a trace of fraud in it. It is a violation of Pak sovereignty. It is a sign of cartelization of war. US is the mastermind of this cartelization. If cartelization of trade is a delinquency, that of war is the biggest crime. The two world wars showed such a cartelization and due to that the war with one pulled the others who were woven into a string. Thus the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War blasted into the whole world threatening the very existence of mankind. That's why in the post-war scenario there appeared an attempt to make peace cartelization instead of war's.

An analysis of the bigger US strategy shows no sign of genuineness. It proves to be injustice of the highest order to the innocent people of Pakistan. The terror war is not a war of Pakistan by any definition. It is America's. So, why will Pakistan take part in it? Will American fight for Pakistan in Kashmir? Sorry, all along it remained a silent spectator while innocent Kashmiris bled in Jammu's lanes and by-lanes. It distanced itself by stressing mere need for dialogues between Pakistan and India.

But how is it justified by the US authorities to ignore the former President John F. Kennedy's resolve to solve the Kashmir problem? He requested the President of Ireland to sponsor a resolution on Kashmir in the UNSC in 1962. But persons like Obama and Hillari Clinton were not ready to mediate on the problem, rather they simply stressed on dialogue between Pakistan and India. If they really believe in the power of dialogue as an effective mechanism, then why do they not initiate a dialogue with the Taliban?

However, involving the innocents in the bloody battle is a crime for which the perpetrators should be held responsible, though there lacks criteria of punishing them under the existing so-called international laws.

In fact, laws have been made a mockery. US is behind it. It seems law is a ploy to suffocate the dissent voice of the week, and on the other the powerful mercilessly violate its sanctity. In the face of such a disrespect to law and whether there is law or no law, jungle law or else, it is no denying that Pakistan's existence is at stake. Blasts occur almost daily. Blackwater squads roam here and there, in the sensitive areas unhindered. Country's economy is under full dictation of the IMF, ADB and World Bank.

### **True state of Pak-America relations**

Officially Pak-American ties are shown as excellent. On various occasions US high-ups made it clear that Pakistan was its vital ally in the war on terror. They eulogized the bravery of the Pakistani soldiers for their successful push in a number of areas against the 'Talilban.' The other day a US Senate delegation led by Senator John McCain,

said despite having some disagreements on certain issues, both Pakistan and US have been working closely and in agreement on many other issues. They said the relations of United States with present democratically elected government in Pakistan are very close and based on shared values of democracy, rule of law and both the countries are real partners for the welfare and safety of the people.

And their Pakistani counterparts too are boastful of their relations with US. Pakistan Ambassador to the US Husain Haqqani, once said that his country's relationship with Washington was no longer transactional, and added that they were now long-term and strategic in nature. Addressing a gathering of intellectuals, think-tank members and academia at the Nixon Centre he said that the new US Administration and the democratic Government in Pakistan had common stance on how the two countries should cooperate not only in the fight against terrorism but also in the fields of education, health, trade and infrastructure building.

The Pakistani officials were all praise as to how the US is extending its helping hand to save Pakistan from economic dips. They want to show the countrymen how generous the Americans were to immediately okay share of drone technology by Pakistan on the latter's request. On the question of Pak energy crisis, American experts like the true friends showed eagerness to lend helping hand to solve the problem. In short, the American leaders assured the Pakistani counterparts that it is their resolve not to see Pakistan dipping down the ocean of crisis. They will provide them 'lifeboat' to ferry them to safety.

At least one big thing the US leaders did was that they showed the dictator the path of no return and instead showered petals on the politicians in the name of democracy. Naturally the politicians had no proper words to praise the US leadership in the right earnest. They considered that they were indebted to them. So, it seems to be reciprocity on the part of Pakistani politicians even to swallow the bitter pills on the advice of their 'friends' in Washington!

Though there were various ups and downs in their relations, it is no denying that military ruler Ziaul Haq drew proper US support

when the 'non-believers' were posing threats from the doorsteps of Pakistan. No matter what followed next! Even President Musharraf took benefits from US when there was massive destruction following the thrust of the killer quake. The US government lifted the sanctions imposed against Pakistan following the bloodless military coup led by General Musharraf in October 1999. Pakistan's status was elevated to that of a major non-NATO ally despite India's serious reservations. So, when need arose, the US wanted to 'destroy what they once built' and Musharraf had to say yes, he was ready to disown the Taliban at least to save the integrity of Pakistan, no matter how threatening was the tone of his counterparts when they talked to Musharraf after 9/11!! Chief of the army Staff Gen Kayani too termed the war against terror as Pakistan's war, and armed forces involvement was to maintain integrity of the country. In this context, it is worth mentioning that Musharraf earlier considered the Taliban as genuine force in Afghanistan.

In the later stages, on one count or the other Pakistan had to oblige repeatedly the big brother USA. Its private security Blackwater had to be allowed to make covert operation inside Pakistan. Its pilotless missiles had to be lent pad secretly for operation. On its dictates Pak army had to go on operation in the tribal areas. On its pleasure, many Pakistanis, innocent or otherwise, had to be handed over to US authorities on one pretext or the other. On its sweet will, delegations of politicians, khakis, blackcoats and the like had to be dispatched to the US territory. Visiting dignitaries of USA had to be accorded warm welcome in Pakistan. Yet the demand for 'more from Pakistan' was echoed all along.

The reality is that despite exchange of warm pleasantries between the two governments, the ties between were some time warm, some time not. It was based on suspicion. In his dispatch Hamid Mir wrote: "Top level. Pakistani security officials suspect the Americans are playing a double game to destabilize the only Muslim state with nuclear weapons in the world. They think that violence in Balochistan province was escalated only after the arrival of the US troops in

Afghanistan .They have complained to American officials many times that India is allegedly helping the Baloch separatists.”

According to Pak intelligence officials, the ratio of successful drone attack is only 10 percent. The rest hits the wrong targets killing innocent people, confirmed Shoab Shuttle, DG of Pakistan’s Intelligence Bureau. When there was a hullabaloo over the issue throughout the country, Pakistani Prime Minister tried to pacify the US counterparts by saying that lenient view would be aired against the drone operation in future.

Pakistani officials tried to convince Holbrooke and Michael Mullen that the main trouble spot in the country is the tribal area, which is just three per cent of Pakistan. US drone attacks in these areas are providing justification to the tribal militants to organise attacks in big cities like Lahore and Karachi. But how far it had positive impact on the visitors is a big question.

Similarly, Americans too have complained many times that the ISI is secretly helping the Taliban in Afghanistan . ” A US senior journalist and Asia Society member Mary Anne Weaver openly claimed that she had heard the tape provided by the Obama administration officials in which General Kayani had a talk with Al-Qaeda leader Jalaluddin Haqqani. Private persons in US consider the Pakistanis as terrorists. They have no trust in Pakistan civilian government.

The fact is that the Pakistan Army, the FC and the police lost more than 2,100 lives in the tribal areas and the NWFP. Over 50 officials of the ISI were also killed and 74 injured by the militants but even then the Army and the ISI are not trusted by the US government.

The issue of screening the Pakistani visitors at the US airport had a bad impact. The guidelines are so irritating that even President Zardari had to raise the issue with the US Special Envoy Richard Holbrooke. It went against the true spirit of the Pakistanis to join anti-terror war. Senator Raza Rabbani, Senate’s Deputy Chairman Jan Mohammed Jamali echoed similar view at a seminar in Islamabad. Prime Minister Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani underscored the imperative of bridging existing trust deficit gap between Pakistan and the United

States, by sincere and concerted efforts in the interest of long term strategic partnership between the two countries. He stressed that removal of Pakistan from the list of countries whose nationals have been designated for special screening at the US Airports and repatriation of Dr. Aafia Siddiqui to Pakistan on immediate basis, could help improve the US image in Pakistan.

With every day passing American agenda in this part of the world was becoming clear. Its interference went beyond the arenas of politics as well as economics. Education field was another target. In the name of USAID it tried to intrude into Pakistan's internal dynamics. Luckily it was detected. Many were amazed that it attempted to bypass Ministries and normal producers in order to implement US agenda as fast as possible. It sought access to the electronic media for running education programmes for children who were not attending schools in Balochi, Pushtpo and Urdu languages. In short what the Americans were going to do would jeopardise Pakistan's interest.

A deep look at various probables regarding Pak-US ties, confirms that their relations are deeply strained. While Pakistan lacks guts to say a spade a spade, US is swinging the cradle of Pakistani leaders with the pretext that it would provide them comfort, but its ultimate aim is something else. By now Pakistani leadership too might have grasped it. That may be the reason Pakistan is avoiding 1) foreign direct investment (FDI) of \$3.5 billion by scrapping a long-negotiated deal with two major international mining firms to build a copper and gold mine under Reko Diq project in Chaghai district. 2) LG or port officials fail to set aside required land for the "container security" program, SFI, though the delays would cost Pak exporters millions of dollars. 3) Pakistan is lapsing this year the US-funded Secure Freight Initiative (SFI) at Port Qasim because of the former's failure to approve long-pending visas for a "handful of American inspectors", who would have come here to train the PQA employees.

Such a stand of Pakistan irks the Americans. So, US Ambassador Anne Patterson became critical while outlining the US' political, economic and security agenda towards Pakistan for 2010.

**Conclusion**

The government may be friendly with the US for one reason or the other. The small number of people in the government may fly any moment to seek asylum in America, if unfavourable condition forces them to take such a decision. But what about the general masses? They have no alternative. They have to live and die in Pakistan. So, it is they who will decide the future course of action.

**Limited option**

The option before them is very limited. Their position is like a trapped tiger. As the latter cannot sit idle in such a position, the nation must chalk out a strategy to free themselves. But for that a farsighted, benevolent and strong leader like Quaid-e-Azam, Kamal Ataturk, Khomeini, Ho Chi Min or the like must be chosen. The move of the government will be offensive, no matter how much effective was former president Musharraf's defensive posture in the face of US Dy Secy of State Richard Armitage's threat that US would bomb Pakistan if he did not lend support to US war on terror, and how much genuine was PM Gilani's belief that Pakistan was weak to counter mighty Americans.

If the Liliputians could drive the mighty Americans out of Vietnam, Bolsheviks overrun the powerful Tzar forces, Chiang Kai-shek forces could be gheraoed into a cage like island, the Iranians can stand against the tumultuous multi-national waves and the Muslims of this subcontinent curb a land for themselves fighting the English and the vast Hindu majority in India, nothing is impossible, though difficult of course. Despite all the valour and bravery that the Pak defence forces can show, conventional war should be shunned as much as possible. Instead, there is a need to raise popular army in which the whole nation will participate. Everybody will fight according to his own capacity, big or small in every front, no matter it is battle field, economic field or the political one. The existing evolutionary ideas must be replaced with revolutionary flames. And the fight will go on amid move for cartelization of peace over that of the war.

## References

- ◆ Kalinga War, Wikipedia. Retrieved on Jan 20, 2010
- ◆ Dividing Germany after 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, The Guardian, Sept 10, 2009
- ◆ Japanese history: post-war (since 1945) [www.japan-guide.com/e/e2124.html](http://www.japan-guide.com/e/e2124.html)
- ◆ Britain, France, Germany and Japan ceased to be great powers. US and USSR replaced them. Encyclopedia World War II. [www.history.com/encyclopedia.do?articleId=226140](http://www.history.com/encyclopedia.do?articleId=226140)
- ◆ Vietnam War, Wikipedia.. Retrieved on Jan 21, 2010.
- ◆ New World Order (conspiracy theory), Wikipedia. Retrieved on Jan 22, 2010
- ◆ It indicates the warring group which has high fighting spirit but is not equipped with sophisticated armaments.
- ◆ African National Congress, Wikipedia. Retrieved on Jan 22, 2010
- ◆ The CIA's silent war in Pakistan, Time, June 1, 2006
- ◆ Definition of Terrorism, Wikipedia. Retrieved on Jan 22, 2010
- ◆ Speech by Anwar in seminar on Positioning Pakistan in war against terror, London, Dec 2, 2001
- ◆ Zahid Hussain, *Front Line Pakistan*, Columbia University Press. Jan 26, 2007.
- ◆ Speech by Anwar in seminar on positioning Pakistan in war against terror, London, Dec 2, 2001
- ◆ Speech by Balach Marri on Role of Liberation Movement and Progressive Forces within Pakistan to safeguard global interests, London, Dec 2, 2001
- ◆ Seminar on Counter insurgency national strategy, Pakistan Observer Newspaper online edition, Jan 13, 2010.
- ◆ Karachi University seminar about the military operation in Bajaur, Oct 27, 2008
- ◆ Shura Hamdard for continuation of mly operation against militancy, Business Recorder, Karachi. June 14, 2009
- ◆ Berlin wall was breached on Nov 9, 1989
- ◆ Mujahideen in Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mujahideen>. Retreived on Dec 5, 2009
- ◆ Rep. Ron Paul, Under Writing the Taliban. *Counter Punch*, Nov 6, 2001
- ◆ *War in Afghanistan (2001-Present)*. Retrieved on Dec 9, 2009.
- ◆ See War, Wikipedia. For elaborate knowledge read Bobel Laureate Richaard E. Smalley's view on war. Retrieved on Dec 8, 2009.
- ◆ CIA chief visited Islamabad unannounced on Nov 9, 2009. Report. *The News Site*, Dec 9, 2009. [www.thenews.com.pk](http://www.thenews.com.pk)



- ◆ In the WTC carnage 2776 persons plus 19 hijackers died. *CBS News*, Sept 22, 2006.
- ◆ War in Afghanistan (2001-Present), *Wikipedia* The Free encyclopedia. Retrieved on Dec 9, 2009.
- ◆ *Frequently Asked Questions*. Radiation Effect Research Foundation. Retrieved on 18.9.2007; *Vietnamwar.com.archive.org record*
- ◆ Report. *Daily News, Karachi*, Dec. 09, 2009. P.1.
- ◆ Report *Daily News, Karachi*. Dec 8, 2009.
- ◆ Greg Bruno, Eben Kaplan, *The Taliban in Afghanistan*. Aug 3, 2009.
- ◆ S Iftikhar Murshed, An Afghanistan Perspective. *The News International*. March 9, 2009. Quoted by CNN's Joy Sterling in feature Analysis: Why are the US allies still in Afghanistan? *CNN.com/asia*. Aug 9, 2009.
- ◆ This terminology indicates US wants to snatch N-power from Pakistan.
- ◆ Syed Saleem Shahzad, US eyes on Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal. *Asia Times*. Nov 15, 2007.
- ◆ Obama said US success in Afghanistan is linked to Pakistan. Report: *Daily News*. Dec, 2, 2002.
- ◆ A new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. April 1, 2009. <http://afghancitizen.blogspot.com/2009/04/new-strategy-for-afghanistan-and.html>
- ◆ Jonthon Harley, Pakistan allows US troops on soil. Islamabad, Oct 11, 2001. <http://www.abc.net.au/pm/stories/s388608.htm>
- ◆ Drone attack in Pakistan. *Wikipedia*. Retrieved on Dec 10, 2009
- ◆ *Indiadaily.com*. Oct 28, 2007.
- ◆ Zahirul Hassan, RAW's Sponsored Taliban Suicidal Blasts. *Pakistan Defence Forum*, June 30, 2009; India interfering: PM Gilani. *The Nation*, Dec 11, 2009.
- ◆ Pakistan safe heaven for Al-Qaeda. *State Times, Jammu*. Nov 12, 09; Amir Latif, Afghan Taliban stay out of Pakistan conflict, Nov 12, 2009. *IslamicOnline.net*.
- ◆ *The Nation, Karachi*, Dec 11, 2009.
- ◆ *The News International*, Karachi, Dec 11, 2009; *The Nation Karachi*, Dec 11, 2009; Maqbool Malik, *The Nation Karachi* Dec 10, 2009.
- ◆ *The News International*, Dec 9, 2009.
- ◆ Two instances are given here. (1) Chairman of US Joint Chiefs of Staff Mullen held talks with Pak army chief in Pakistan, *AP World Stream*, March 4, 2008. (2) US CIA chief spymaster Leon Panetta, was in Pakistan as a follow-up of the US Secretary of State Clinton. *The Nation*, Dec 10, 2009

- ♦ *The News International*, Karachi, Nov 29, 2009; *Daily News*, Karachi, Dec 10, 2009; *Daily News*, Karachi, Dec 12, 2009.
- ♦ PM Gilani rejected report Osama in Pakistan while he was on board a plane to fly to Berlin. Report: *The News International*. Dec 1, 2009.
- ♦ Top US mly commander Admiral Mike Mullen and NATO Secretary General confirmed the plan. Report: *Daily News*, Karachi, Dec 8, 2009
- ♦ Ahmed, Quraishi, Land of Conspiracy. Published in *The News Blog*. [www.thenews.com.pk/blog/blog\\_details](http://www.thenews.com.pk/blog/blog_details)
- ♦ Obama's Kashmir comment. <http://blogs.reuters.com/pakistan/2008/11/03> ; Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's comment, *The News Blog*, Dec 7, 2009; *Thaindian News*, July 20, 2009.
- ♦ America continues to mock Pakistani laws. *The Nation*, Karachi, Dec 13, 2009.
- ♦ Fasi Zaki, Anne Pattersons' Blackwater-gate, *The News International*, Dec 9, 2009. Former ISI chief Gen Durrani confirmed it. Blackwater spokesman too admitted it finally. *The Nation*, Karachi , Dec 13, 2009.
- ♦ Report: *Daily News*, Karachi, Dec 8, 2009.
- ♦ US enjoying close relations with Pakistan, *Associated Press of Pakistan*, January 8, 2010
- ♦ Pak-US relations no longer transactional, *Thaindian News*, Jan 19, 2009
- ♦ US envoy chides Pakistan on economy and visa issue, *Aaj TV Online*, Karachi, Jan 7, 2010
- ♦ Ibid
- ♦ Pak-US relations no longer transactional, *Thaindian News*, Jan 19, 2009
- ♦ Pakistan earthquake 2005, *Google*, Nov 4, 2008
- ♦ Non-NATO US ally status for Pakistan, *India News Online*, March 22, 2004
- ♦ Five basics turned the tide, *The News*, Karachi, Feb 2, 2010
- ♦ Pak-US ties at lowest ebb, *The News*, Karachi, Apr 9, 2009
- ♦ Ibid
- ♦ Screening issue can sever Pak-US ties, *the News*, Jan 20, 2010
- ♦ Bridging existing Pak-US trust deficit gap, *APP*, Jan 29, 2010
- ♦ USAIS designs halted by conscientious Babu, *The Nation*, Jan 31, 2010
- ♦ US envoy chides Pakistan on economy, visa issue, *Aaj TG Online*, Jan 7, 2010
- ♦ *BBC* Sept 22, 2006 ; Ahmed Quraishi, Land of Conspiracies. Published in *The News Blog*. [www.thenews.com.pk/blog/blog\\_details](http://www.thenews.com.pk/blog/blog_details)
- ♦ Sindh Assembly's Public Accounts Committee chief Sardar Jam Tamasi Unnar opined that situation has come to such a pass that people are awaiting a bloody revolution. Report: *The News*, Karachi, Dec 6, 2009. P. 13.