

**US AID TO PAKISTAN DURING MUSHARRAF'S REGIME
AND ITS IMPACTS ON THE POLITICS OF KHYBER
PAKHTUNKHWA**



Muhammad Shahab

Area Study Centre for Africa, North and South America

Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad

2023

**US AID TO PAKISTAN DURING MUSHARRAF'S REGIME
AND ITS IMPACTS ON THE POLITICS OF KHYBER
PAKHTUNKHWA**



By

Muhammad Shahab

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment for the award of the degree of Master of
Philosophy in American Studies**

Supervised By

Dr. Sadia Sulaiman

Area Study Centre for Africa, North and South America

Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

2023

Declaration

In submitting this thesis titled, **US Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf's Regime and its Impacts on the Politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa**, I declare that I have read the rules and regulations of Area Study Centre and Quaid-i-Azam University regarding the procedures and formally declare that all research work in this thesis is my research work carried out in consultation with my research supervisor. I further confirm that this work has not been accepted in substance for any other degree, nor is it currently being submitted in candidature for any other degree.

Muhammad Shahab

Acknowledgments

I want to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Sadia Sulaiman, for her invaluable guidance, unwavering support, and insightful feedback throughout this research. Her mentorship has been instrumental in shaping this thesis. I am also hugely indebted to Dr. Usman Khan, whose wisdom, advice, thought-provoking discussions, and friendly suggestions have given me a broader perspective and deeper insights into the subject matter.

A great chunk of gratitude also goes to my family and friends, your unwavering belief in me has been a wellspring of motivation. Your encouragement, patience, and understanding have carried me through both triumphs and challenges, making this accomplishment even more meaningful. Among my friends, Asad Ullah is worth mentioning who supported me through thick and thin and I can surely say that without his suggestions, advice, motivation, and mental support this work would not have been completed. I am also humbled to Syed Ihsan Ali, Syed Ali Bukhari, Hassan Zaib, Muhammad Yasir, Muniba, Umme Farwa, and Javeria Baloch. I am also grateful to my teachers namely Sir. Mairaj-ul-Hamid Nasri, Sir. Sher Hassan, Sir. Sajid Khan, and Sir. Hamid-ul-Haq Khaksar, their dedication to education has ignited my passion for learning and inquiry. Their enthusiasm and commitment to fostering an intellectually stimulating environment have been truly inspiring.

This work is dedicated to the memory of my deceased parents, whose legacy continues to resonate in my journey. Once again, my heartfelt gratitude to all those who have contributed to this endeavor in ways both seen and unseen. Your collective support has been the cornerstone of my academic pursuit, and for that, I am truly thankful.

Abstract

Pakistan since its inception has always remained dependent upon foreign aid and assistance for its economic needs and associated stability. Within this context, the United States is of prime importance because the United States has provided Pakistan with immense amounts of financial aid and assistance throughout history. But if studied deeply one can easily find out that the US aid and assistance to Pakistan is security driven rather than to meet the genuine needs of Pakistan, because in history there were times when Pakistan was in dire need of help, but the US did not extend its helping hands to Pakistan. Hence, US assistance to Pakistan is purely based on its strategic goals and national interests. Resultantly, if looked at from a critical perspective US aid has strengthened the non-elected institutions at the cost of the democratic and elected ones. Similarly, the aid has some positive as well as negative impacts on Pakistan generally and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa specifically. The topic undertaken is an attempt to investigate how a country whose ideals are liberal democracy, human rights, democratic institutions, and civilian supremacy has supported and strengthened the authoritarian and non-elected institutions of Pakistan at the cost of the democratic and the elected ones. The research will mainly focus on the Musharraf era and the area targeted will be the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>x</i>
INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Problem Statement	3
Significance of the Study	3
Objectives of the Study.....	4
Research Questions	4
Proposed Hypothesis.....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Literature Review	5
Research Methodology.....	11
Theoretical Framework.....	12
Organization of the Study.....	13
Chapter I	15
<i>A Short History of US Aid to Pakistan</i>	15
Introduction	15
1947-1953: Initial phase, Pakistan’s tilt towards the west and US Aid	17

US aid to Pakistan in the mid and late 1950s: Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (MDA), SEATO, and CENTO	18
1962-71: Diminishing Ties and US-aid	23
1972-79: Pakistan’s Nuclear Program and US Aid.....	29
1980-90: Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, the Revival of Pak-US Ties and US Aid	30
1990-2000: A Drift in the Ties and its Impacts on the Aid	34
Conclusion.....	36
Chapter II.....	38
<i>Turkey, Indonesia, Israel, Taiwan, and South Korea: Recipients of US Aid But With Different Fates</i>	38
Introduction	38
Pakistan	39
Turkey	42
Indonesia	44
Taiwan	45
Israel	47
South-Korea	49
Conclusion.....	51
Chapter III.....	53
<i>US-Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf’s Regime and its Impacts on the Politics of KP</i>	53

Overview	53
Musharraf’s Coup in 1999	54
9/11 Attacks and Improvement in Pak-US Ties	55
US Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf’s Regime	57
The US Aid and its Impacts on the Politics of KP (2001-2008)	61
US Aid and Militancy in KP: Affecting KP Politics	61
US Aid Affecting the Political Landscape of KP	62
US Aid Impacting Civil-Military Relations.....	63
Radicalization and its Impacts on Democracy in KP.....	64
Loss of Government Writ.....	64
The emergence of Pashtun Tahafuz Movement (PTM)	65
The Sidelineing of ANP and the Rise of PTI	66
US Aid and Local Government	67
The IDPs and their Impacts on Politics.....	68
US Aid and Women Participation in Politics	68
US Aid and Weakened Governance in KP	69
Conclusion	70
<i>Conclusion</i>	71
Findings	72
Policy Recommendations	73
<i>Bibliography</i>	75

List of Tables

TABLE 1 US AID AND ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN DURING THE 1950S (1954-59) IN US\$ MILLIONS	23
TABLE 2 US AID AND ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN FROM 1960-1971 IN US\$ MILLIONS	28
TABLE 3 US AID AND ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN FROM 1972-1979 IN US\$ MILLIONS	30
TABLE 4 US ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS SALES TO PAKISTAN DURING THE AFGHAN WAR (US\$ MILLIONS)	33
TABLE 5 US AID AND ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN FROM 1991-2000 IN US\$ MILLIONS	36
TABLE 6 US ECONOMIC AID, MILITARY AID, AND ARMS SALES TO PAKISTAN DURING MUSHARRAF'S REGIME (2001-2008)	59
TABLE 7 COALITION SUPPORT FUND (CSF) TO PAKISTAN FROM 2002-2008	60

List of Abbreviations

ANP	Awami National Party
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
CSF	Coalition Support Fund
EU	European Union
FATA	Federally Administered Tribal Areas
IDPs	Internally displaced persons
JI	Jamaat-e-Islami
JUI-F	Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (Fazl)
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
MDA	Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement
MMA	Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NWFP	Northwest Frontier Province
PATA	Provincially Administered Tribal Areas
PPP	Pakistan People's Party
PTI	Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf
PTM	Pashtun Tahafuz Movement

SEATO	Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
TTP	Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Since its inception, Pakistan has been an aid-dependent country.¹ From the start till now, she has always tried to find foreign donors to support her economy. In this respect, The United States of America (USA) is one of the biggest aid providers to Pakistan.² But this aid to Pakistan is not solely based on altruism, in fact, the US also has some agendas and national interests i.e., mostly strategic interests behind these financial aids.³ If we investigate the history of Pakistan, in the initial phase the country is provided with US aid and assistance for the containment of communism,⁴ the second flow of aid to Pakistan began with the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan⁵ and the third phase was that of after the 9/11 attacks in which Pakistan became the non-NATO ally of the United States.⁶ Moreover, the US aid to Pakistan during the military regimes is significantly higher than the democratically elected regimes.⁷

The era in which Pakistan received the most aid was when the US attacked Afghanistan after the 9/11 attacks and Pakistan had to support the US in the so-called 'war on terror'. At the time Musharraf was in Power, he was a military dictator but despite that, he and his government were heavily supported by the US via economic as well as military aid. During the

¹ Adeeba Sarwar, Mushtaq Hassan, and Tahir Mehmood, "Foreign Aid and Governance in Pakistan", *Pakistan Economic and Social Review* 53, no. 2 (2015): 149–76, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26153255>.

² Susan Cornwell, "Factbox: U.S. Has Allocated \$20 Billion for Pakistan," Reuters, 2011, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-usa-aid-factbox-idUSTRE73K7F420110421>.

³ Andrew Gordan, "Increasing U.S. Aid to Pakistan Is a Strategic and Moral Imperative," Council on Foreign Relations, 2022, <https://www.cfr.org/blog/increasing-us-aid-pakistan-strategic-and-moral-imperative>.

⁴ Mustafa Ali Khan, "The Impact of American Aid on Pakistan," *Pakistan Horizon*, 4, 12 (1959): 346–56.

⁵ Craig Baxter, "The United States and Pakistan: The Zia Era and the Afghan Connection," *Friendly Tyrants*, 1991, 479–506, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-21676-5_22.

⁶ Hussain Shaheed Soherwordi, "Pakistan-US Policies on the 'War on Terror' and the Taliban: Allies at Loggerheads," *Pakistan Horizon* 63, no. 2 (2010): 51–67.

⁷ Murad Ali, "US Aid to Pakistan and Democracy," *Policy Perspectives* 6, no. 2 (2009): 29–46.

war on terror, Pakistan received a huge amount of US\$33.4 billion from the US.⁸ The aim and objective of the aid was to counter terrorism in the tribal areas as well as in the then NWFP.⁹ As a result, Pakistan launched military operations against terrorist outfits in FATA and former PATA. The insurgency as well as the military operations had various ramifications including the problem of internal displacements, peace situation, rift between civil and military, weak governance, and so forth.

Moreover, due to overdependence upon foreign aid and debts Pakistan has lost the way to development. In this regard, Pakistan is not the only country that has received aid from the US some other countries like Turkey, Indonesia, Taiwan, Israel, and South Korea are also recipients of US Aid as well as share some common features with Pakistan, but their fates are entirely different than that of Pakistan.¹⁰ Today, these countries are politically stable, economically prosperous, and socially vibrant. In all these countries, the intervention of the military in politics has reduced and some of them such as Israel¹¹, Taiwan¹², and South Korea¹³ have become aid providers from aid recipients. Similarly, they are on the track of development, unlike Pakistan.

⁸ Shahbaz Rana, "War on Terror Aid: Pakistan Received \$33.4bn from US," *The Express Tribune*, 2017, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1498815/war-terror-aid-pakistan-received-33-4bn-us>.

⁹ Vanda Felbab Brown, "Why Pakistan Supports Terrorist Groups, and Why the US Finds It so Hard to Induce Change," Brookings, 2018, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-pakistan-supports-terrorist-groups-and-why-the-us-finds-it-so-hard-to-induce-change/>.

¹⁰ Thazha Varkey Paul, *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹¹ Sam Gordon, "How Israel Is Redefining Foreign Aid for the 21st Century," Stroum Center of Jewish Studies University of Washington, 2018, <https://jewishstudies.washington.edu/israel-hebrew/israel-redefining-foreign-aid-21st-century/>.

¹² Alain Guilloux, "Taiwan's Humanitarian Aid/Disaster Relief: Wither or Prosper?," Brookings, 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/taiwans-humanitarian-aiddisaster-relief-wither-or-prosper/>.

¹³ Cameron Hill, "Aiming for the Top Ten: Korea's Aid," reliefweb, 2023, <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/aiming-top-ten-koreas-aid#:~:text=Korea%20is%20also%20an%20important,focus%20on%20infectious%20disease%20response>.

In this study we will argue that US aid has always strengthened the non-democratic institutions of Pakistan as compared to the democratic institutions of Pakistan, thus we will be investigating the role of US aid in the deterioration of democratic and elected institutions in Pakistan. Our major focus will be the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa during the Musharraf era which is right after the 9/11 attacks.

Problem Statement

US aid has always strengthened the undemocratic institutions of Pakistan as compared to the democratically elected institutions like the parliament etc. Which is a big problem and should be investigated. US aid to Pakistan and its impacts is not a new phenomenon but limiting it to the era of Musharraf and the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is understudied.

Significance of the Study

United States foreign aid to Pakistan played an important role in Pakistan and the United States bilateral relationship.¹⁴ Over the past few decades, the ties between Pakistan and the United States have seen many ups and downs but their relationship remained congenial.¹⁵ Their bilateral ties resulted in various forms of economic aid and assistance ranging from economic support to military cooperation, particularly in Musharraf's regime. The economic aid contributes to Pakistan's fragile economy and strengthens non-elected institutions.¹⁶ The United States aid has been notable in the realm of the defense sector which bolsters Pakistan forces' defense capabilities. The study draws the reader's attention to the United States aid

¹⁴ S. Akbar Zaidi, "Who Benefits from US Aid to Pakistan?," *Economic and Political Weekly* 46, no. 32 (2011): 103–9.

¹⁵ Aamina Binte Khurram, "The Highs and Lows of Pak-US Relations: From the Cold War to Now," *Paradigm Shift*, 2022, <https://www.paradigmshift.com.pk/pak-us-relations/>.

¹⁶ Sauleha Kamal, "The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan," *The Express Tribune*, 2016, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1120372/politics-us-aid-pakistan>.

impact on the politics of Pakistan as it determines the cause of the maximum flow of United States aid to Pakistan in the Military regimes as compared to the democratic governments. The study also shed light on the impacts of US aid on the politics of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa province which is the actual contribution of the researcher to the already existing literature on the impacts of US aid on the politics of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa.

Objectives of the Study

This thesis is being carried out to achieve the following objectives.

- To examine the impact of US aid on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in Musharraf's regime
- To find out the reasons why Pakistan achieved higher United States aid in military regimes as compared to the democratic regimes.
- To find out how the United States aid strengthens non-elected institutions in Pakistan and how it can be used to strengthen the democratic institution.
- To compare Pakistan with some other aid recipient countries.

Research Questions

- What are the impacts of US aid on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in the Musharraf era?
- Why US aid to Pakistan is higher in the military regimes as compared to the democratic regimes?
- How does US aid strengthen the non-elected institutions of Pakistan as compared to the elected ones?
- How the aid can be used to strengthen the democratic institutions in Pakistan?

Proposed Hypothesis

The US aid has always deteriorated the democratic institutions of Pakistan and as a result, has strengthened the unelected and undemocratic governments in the country.

Limitations of the Study

Pakistan received United States foreign aid and assistance since its independence. Their relationship goes through many ups and downs, similarly, the aid and assistance also increase and decrease with the United States interests. The study of United States aid to Pakistan during Musharraf's regime and its impacts on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa has two limitations. The first limitation is the specific time frame, the study includes US aid to Pakistan in the Musharaff regime. The second limitation is geographical and limited to the United States' impacts on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa only.

Literature Review

The literature review is carried out to evaluate and summarize the understanding of certain topics related to the dissertation. Various books, journal articles, and Scholarly work were analyzed and summarized related to United States aid and economic assistance and its impacts on the politics of Pakistan particularly the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Shahnaz Akhtar in her article *Dynamics of USA-Pakistan Relations in the Post 9/11 Period: Hurdles and Future Prospects* discussed that before the incident of 9/11, Pakistan was facing strict sanction under the strict Pressler amendment, Glenn and Symington amendments, and emergency declaration of military regime. At the beginning of Musharraf's rule, Pakistan was in a severe economic crisis. The United States blamed the Taliban for the 9/11 attacks and demanded that the Afghan Taliban hand over Bin Ladin to the United States but the Taliban

government refused. The United States planned to deploy its forces against terrorists in Afghanistan. In this regard, the United States needs support from the UN and other NATO countries. In the neighboring countries of Afghanistan, the US needed the support of Islamabad more than other countries as the US needed airspace and logistics support to attack Afghanistan. The United States started negotiations through different channels with Musharaff regimes to get the support of Pakistan in the war against terror. The United States demanded airspace, intelligence sharing, and logistic support. Moreover, President Bush threatened Pakistan in the Congressional session “Are you with us or against us?”. Despite the domestic pressure, the Musharaff government announced to support United States in the war against terrorism. In response, the United States waived all sections under the Brownback II. Furthermore, the United States started economic aid and military assistance on a large scale. The United States not only provided aid to Pakistan but also offered debt relief but providing loans of different categories.¹⁷

Hongsong Liu et al. in their paper *The Strategic Purpose of the Post 9-11 US Foreign Aid to Pakistan and its Impacts* discussed the objective of US aid to Pakistan in the post-9/11 era in their research paper. The key objective of the United States aid to Pakistan and its strategic interest in the region particularly to counter terrorism. Pakistan has been a receiver of United States aid since its independence. Before the 9/11 incident, the United States aid was shrined up to a larger extent due to the nuclear test in 1998. after the 9/11 attacks, aid to Islamabad become increased noticeably. President Bush's administration arranged \$379 million for Islamabad to prevent the state from defaulting. The United States aid to Pakistan can be categorized into three categories which are economic support funds, developmental

¹⁷ Shahnaz Akhtar, “Dynamics of USA-Pakistan Relations in the Post 9/11 Period: Hurdles and Future Prospects ,” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2, no. 11 (June 2012): 205–13, 207-208.

assistance, and food aid. It was discussed that United States aid and economic assistance from 1979 to 2002 were offered to the military regime in Pakistan, Zia, and Musharaff. the United States' aid to Pakistan had a significant impact on the internal politics of Pakistan while supporting militarization in the states. the United States' aid to Pakistan in the Musharaff regime was to maintain Islamabad's support in the US-led war in Afghanistan. It is estimated that the US allocated an amount of \$835 million per year as economic foreign aid to Pakistan.¹⁸

Murad Ali discussed in his book *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* that in the Aftermath of 9/11, the United States asked the states to either with us or against us in the war against terrorism. The event made Pakistan a central point in deciding whether with the United States or not in the War on Terror. After the 9/11 events, Pakistan's support of the United States dramatically changed the United States aid policy toward Pakistan. The United States resumed military and economic aid to Pakistan in the post-9/11. He argued that United States aid to Pakistan is linked with security and geostrategic priorities. Whenever the United States interests are at stake in the region like in the Cold War and the Afghan war, the United States provides more aid to Pakistan. After the 9/11 incident, the United States needs Pakistan's support in the region to take action against terrorism. Pakistan become a key non-NATO ally in the war against terror and regularly engages in providing indirect help and assistance in the military operations in Afghanistan while supporting the US troops against the Afghan Taliban. The United States acknowledged Pakistan's role and the sacrifices made by Pakistani people and forces. With the United State aid to Pakistan, few significant developments have taken place in the Musharaff's regime. The United States allocated substantial aid in different ways but few issues threatened the bilateral

¹⁸ Hongsong Liu et al., "The Strategic Purpose of the Post 9-11 US Foreign Aid to Pakistan and its Impact" *European American Journals*, 7, no. 2 (May 2019): 50–66.

relation between the two states. The most highlighted issue was the US blame for the double game that Pakistan forces reluctance to take action against the terrorists inside Pakistan. It led to mutual distrust between the two states. However, the book examines the delivery of United States aid to Pakistan and the relationship between the government institutions and USAID. It was found that there is a considerable gap between aid recipient Pakistan and aid donor United States what they had committed in Paris 2005. The Pakistani government has taken some measures for comprehensive planning, establishment of governmental arrangements, effective implementation, and working groups on aid effective use. Despite all these arrangements the GoP still lacked commitment and leadership. The government lacked extensive aid policy and an efficient and effective staff, efficacious coordinating organization or agency functioning as a source of information, requirements, and priorities. Conversely, the aid effectiveness structure in the government was observed uncoordinated and loosely interconnected. The government of Pakistan also failed to take concrete steps against curbing corruption and strengthening state institutions as committed in the attainments of the PD. It was reported that lack of institutional capacity, absence of development-oriented political leadership, and the public sector are continuously suffering from bureaucratic corruption and inability. It is hard for a country to utilize aid and developmental resources more efficiently for the people's betterment without strong state ownership.¹⁹

According to the renowned Pakistani economist S Akbar Zaidi, it is not obvious who benefits from US aid in Pakistan. He emphasizes that it is unclear whether US aid to Pakistan bears any fruit or not. Whether it brings any positive change or not according to statistics it is crystal clear that US aid to the elected governments of Pakistan is negligible as compared to

¹⁹ Murad Ali, *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* (Routledge, 2019). 154-176

the military regimes and for the military purpose. The United States has given Pakistan almost \$19 billion in foreign aid since 2002. Only 10% of the total aid was explicitly for development, and up to 75% was for military assistance. The aid provided by Musharaff's regime has been used to support Pakistani military and intelligence operations for collective interest usage. The military aid and assistance given to Islamabad was to achieve the United States military's broader objectives in the region. In FATA, as much as \$5.8 billion of United States aid was spent, of which 96% was directed toward military operations. The share of economic-related aid has risen in recent years but is still less than half. The United States' aid to Pakistan in the war on terror is shrouded in mystery and secrecy, with evidence of duplicity and deception. It was not clear that democratic and non-democratic institutions were on the same page as the United States administration in this war, and there has been an oversight in the aid relationship. The impact of the United States aid on the people of Pakistan has been catastrophic, and it is unclear who benefits from the aid. The military aid has been treated as fungible by the Pakistani military to replenish its wider arsenal, making it difficult to know if it has made the country safer. There has been a shift towards greater resources allocated to "civilian" aid, but this aid may not have been visible on the ground in Pakistan. The Pakistani government's weak control over and fear of the military makes it unclear how these conditions will be enforced. The government of Pakistan may play the "moral hazard" card even when conditions are infringed, and aid will flow despite these conditions.²⁰

Murad Ali stated in his paper *US Aid to Pakistan and Democracy* that the US has given more aid to military dictatorships in Pakistan than democratic governments. During military rule, the US has provided \$382.9 million per year for each year of military rule, while civilian

²⁰ S. Akbar Zaidi, "Who Benefits from US Aid to Pakistan?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 46, no. 32 (2011): 103–9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23017764>.

rule has only provided \$178.9m per year. Over the last 70 years, Pakistan has received \$33,606bn in economic and \$8,932bn in military aid from the US. The US has also given Pakistan \$15.71 per capita per year during military rule and \$6.83 per capita during civilian rule. In terms of annual averages, military regimes have received \$781.02m in economic aid and \$207.69m in military aid, while democratic regimes have been provided \$296.98m.²¹

Pakistan is among the list of top countries that receive a huge amount of US aid. It has obtained 5.3 billion dollars in overt assistance since 2001, of which 3.1 billion has been allocated for humanitarian aid and 6.7 billion in military reimbursement for its support of the war against terror.²² It is noteworthy that in the nineteen nineties when there were democratic setups in the country the US financial assistance hit its lowest mark. Similarly, during 1965 and 1971 the US assistance to Pakistan decreased significantly and its major reason was the wars with India. Moreover, a huge surge in US aid can be observed after the 2001 or 9/11 attacks.²³

One of the reasons behind the notion that US aid has always strengthened the dictatorial regimes of Pakistan and has weakened the democratically elected institutions in the country is that US aid is always security-driven. Whenever the USA helped Pakistan financially there was always a strategic and security-related motive. For example, in the fifties when aid and assistance flowed to Pakistan an international phenomenon called the Cold War was on its rise and the USA was the most important player in that game. Similarly, in the eighties aid and assistance were provided to Pakistan against the USSR in Afghanistan, and once again in 2001

²¹ Murad Ali, "US Aid to Pakistan and Democracy." *Policy Perspectives* 6, no. 2 (2009): 119–32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42909240>.

²² Alan K Kronstadt, "Pakistan-US relations." Library of Congress Washington Dc Congressional Research Service, 2009.

²³ Claire Provost. "Sixty years of US aid to Pakistan: Get the data." *The Guardian* 11 (2011). <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jul/11/us-aid-to-pakistan>

when the USA needed Pakistan to fight the war on terror, they provided Pakistan with a huge amount of aid and financial assistance.²⁴

The saga of US aid to Pakistan indicates that whenever the USA has provided Pakistan with aid and financial assistance, they pinpointed the areas upon which the funds would be spent but not very surprisingly the funds are always used in areas where the sitting government whether military or democratic has wished for. This resulted in the ineffectiveness of the aid to the country and raised questions about its effectiveness.²⁵

As Pak-US relations have seen many ups and downs, the same is the case with the story of the aid provision and suspension by the United States. In the mid and late nineteen seventies, the United States suspended its assistance when Pakistan tried to develop its nuclear program as a response to India when they tested its first nuclear weapon in 1974. Similarly, in 1998 when Pakistan tested their nuclear weapons in Chaghi, Baluchistan they were welcomed by the United States with severe sanctions under the Pressler amendment.²⁶

Research Methodology

Research Methodology is the means through which data is collected and analyzed systematically.²⁷ In this study, the qualitative research method has been used. The data collected and arguments presented within the dissertation originate from both primary and secondary sources. Secondary data includes journal articles, newspaper articles, media reports,

²⁴ Andrew Wilder. "Aid and stability in Pakistan: lessons from the 2005 earthquake response." *Disasters* 34 (2010): S406-S426.

²⁵ Khilji, Nasir M., and Ernest M. Zampelli. "The fungibility of US assistance to developing countries and the impact on recipient expenditures: a case study of Pakistan." *World Development* 19, no. 8 (1991): 1095-1105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(91\)90127-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(91)90127-4)

²⁶ Khan, Mahrukh. "Ten years of US aid to Pakistan and the post-OBL scenario." *Strategic Studies* 32 (2012): 122-137. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48527629>

²⁷ Denise Polit and Bernadette P. Hungler, *Study Guide to Accompany Sixth Edition of Nursing Research: Principles and Methods* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1999), 648.

think-tank publications, government reports, books, etc. while the primary sources include government official documents and video interviews from YouTube. Furthermore, the researcher adopted an analytical approach and comparison in his study of US Aid to Pakistan during Musharraf's regime and its impacts on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The analytical approach is historic that is used to provide a setting stage for the main chapter of the thesis i.e., US Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf's Regime and its Impacts on the Politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Theoretical Framework

In this study, the researcher used two different theories. The first one is 'recipients' needs versus donors' interests' and the second theory is 'Realism'. Whenever a donor country provides aid and assistance to a recipient country, it keeps in view two things i.e., the needs of the recipients including its economic standing, social status, and problems related to its basic human necessities, moreover, the donor country also does the analysis of the utility of the recipient country's geographical location, political situation, and trade potential vis a vis the volume of aid allocated to them.²⁸ In the case of Pakistan and the US, the US only provided aid when they saw a potential interest in doing so, in other words, they only helped Pakistan when they needed it and there is sufficient evidence available in history that can back this fact. Similarly, after deeply analyzing the Pak-US aid relationship, one can easily conclude that the US aid is solely driven by its interest in the region which is a perfect embodiment of the theory of 'Realism' in International Relations.

²⁸ Murad Ali, *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* (Routledge, 2019).

Even though the study is based on the theoretical framework of realism, it specifically focuses on the aspects of ‘interest’ and ‘soft power’ of the theory. According to Hans Morgenthau, in the international system, the behavior of states is primarily motivated by national interest.²⁹ Likewise, according to Joseph Nye, soft power is the capacity to influence states’ preferences through attraction and appeal. It is the capacity to accomplish objectives by the cooperative, optimal application of political principles, cultural influence, aid and assistance, and policies that appeal to other countries.³⁰

Organization of the Study

- The first chapter is the introduction of the study: This dissertation consists of an introduction and four chapters. The introductory chapter includes research questions and research objectives, the significance of the study, the Problem Statement, the limitation of the study, the literature review, the conceptual framework, the research methodology, and finally, the organization of the study.
- The second chapter of this study is a short history of US aid to Pakistan: In this chapter, the US aid to Pakistan is discussed in detail since its independence. The chapter throws a glance at the increase and decrease of the flow of United States aid to Pakistan in different governments. Furthermore, the flow of United States aid to Pakistan in both the democratic governments and military regimes is also discussed in detail.
- The third chapter of the study is Turkey, Indonesia, Israel, Taiwan, and South Korea: Recipients of US aid but with different fates. This chapter includes the comparison of United States aid to Pakistan with different states where the military role has been

²⁹ Hans J. Morgenthau, Kenneth Thompson, and David Clinton, *Politics Among Nations*, 7th ed. (McGraw-Hill Education, 2005).

³⁰ Joseph S. Nye Jr., “Soft Power,” *Foreign Policy*, 1990, 153–71.

observed in government affairs directly or indirectly. It also discussed how US aid impacted the economy and institutions of these recipient states in comparison to Pakistan.

- The fourth chapter of the study is about the US aid to Pakistan during Musharraf's regime and its impacts on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. This chapter has focused on the historical background of Musharraf's coup, the 9/11 incident, and Pakistan's involvement and partnership in the war against terror. Furthermore, it explains the US economic aid and military assistance received specifically in the Musharraf era. In the end, the impacts of the United States aid on the politics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa are discussed in detail.
- The conclusion chapter of the study is based on the research findings and recommendations. This chapter concludes the study and provides more comprehensive findings with recommendations.

Chapter I

A Short History of US Aid to Pakistan

Introduction

Pakistan's dependence on US Aid is not a new phenomenon. Right after independence, Pakistan was seeking an ally in the West who could accommodate their financial as well as security needs.³¹ In this regard, the United States was the only country that could help Pakistan and that was because of their interests in the region of the subcontinent.³² At the time of independence, the cold war started and the United States was in dire need of an ally in the region who could secure their interests and play a role in countering communism. The US' first choice to counter terrorism in the region was India but they had already adopted the policy of non-alignment and were not willing to align themselves with the US.³³ Likewise, India at that time had very warm relations with the USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).³⁴ Consequently, as a last resort, the US opted to go along with Pakistan. In this era, Pakistan cashed its geographic location excessively and they even became part of alliances that were not aimed at the region where Pakistan lies, like SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization).³⁵ In this phase of history, Pakistan signed agreements such as SEATO, but it was just the beginning of a relationship that can be called a patron-client relationship. In the

³¹ Muhrunnisa Hatim Iqbal and Mehrunnisa Iqbal, "Pakistan Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy," *Pakistan Horizon* 25, no. 4 (1972): 54–71.

³² Madhurendra Kumar, "American Strategy in South Asia from Cold War to Post-Cold-war," *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 63, no. 3 (2006): 605–16.

³³ Debidatta Mahapatra, "India's Non-Aligned Moment," *The Times of India*, 2022, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/periscope/indias-non-aligned-moment/>.

³⁴ Ramesh Thakur, "India and the Soviet Union: Conjunctions and Disjunctions of Interests," *Asian Survey*, 1991, 826–46.

³⁵ Mohammed Ayub Khan, "The Pakistan-American Alliance Stresses and Strains," *Foreign Affairs*, 1964, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/1964-01-01/pakistan-american-alliance#:~:text=In%20May%201954%2C%20Pakistan%20signed,Philippines%2C%20Australia%20and%20New%20Zealand.>

relationship, Pakistan was the client while the US was a patron who was providing for the needs of Pakistan.³⁶ Multiple factors compelled Pakistan to become a client among them the most striking ones was the fear of India. Pakistan's foreign policy since its inception has always been India-centric it still is like that.³⁷ India, one of the closest neighbors and archrival of Pakistan has always played a determining role in the foreign policy of Pakistan. Similarly, Afghanistan, another neighbor of Pakistan has also had a huge influence on the foreign policy of Pakistan especially concerning Pakistan's foreign policy and its aid-dependent relations with the US.³⁸

The patron-client relationship between Pakistan and the US has seen many ups and downs in history. In the beginning, the US was not willing to cooperate with Pakistan, but the then-Pakistani leadership compelled the US to think over the geostrategic location of Pakistan and to consider it as a bulwark state in the region to counter communism and the Soviet Union from expansion. Thus, in the 1950s the US signed agreements such as the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (1954), SEATO, and CENTO.³⁹ The primary aim and objective of these agreements was to counter communism in the region. This was the beginning of an unending aid-dependency relationship between Pakistan and the US. The aid-driven relationship at that time of history was warm and friendly. After that, in the nineteen sixties, the relationship between Pakistan and the US diminished and that was due to the 1965 war between India and Pakistan.⁴⁰ During this phase of history, US aid and assistance to Pakistan diminished

³⁶ Ahmed Waqas Waheed, "Pakistan's Dependence and US Patronage," *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs* 4, no. 1 (2017): 69–94.

³⁷ Tabinda Siddiqui and Arif Mehmood, "Perception and Reality of Pakistan's India Centric Foreign Policy," *Quarterly Journal Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad* 40, no. 2 (2020): 1–22.

³⁸ Nazir Ahmad Mir, "Issues and Mistrust in US-Pakistan Relations," Atlantic Council, 2021, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/southasiasource/issues-and-mistrust-in-us-pakistan-relations/>.

³⁹ Sultana Afroz, "The Cold War and United States Military Aid to Pakistan 1947–1960: A Reassessment," *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 17, no. 1 (1994): 57–72, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856409408723198>.

⁴⁰ RSN Singh, "Impact of 1965 War on Pakistan," Indian Defence Review, 2021, <http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/impact-of-1965-war-on-pakistan/>.

significantly. Then came in 1970s when the US-Pakistan relationship was in good spirits and Pakistan was enjoying a significant amount of US assistance. During this era, the US also tried to help Pakistan during the 1971 war between India and Pakistan, but they were unsuccessful in preventing Pakistan from breaking. Right after that when Zulfikar Ali Bhutto came in power and initiated Pakistan's nuclear program covertly, the resentment in the US grew impacting US aid to Pakistan adversely. Subsequently, in the late nineteen seventies i.e., 1979 USSR invaded Afghanistan, and once again to defeat the USSR, the US needed Pakistan direly. During this era, Pakistan helped the US immensely by providing warriors against the USSR in Afghanistan while the US helped Pakistan financially with open hearts and hands.⁴¹ Eventually, when the USSR was defeated in Afghanistan with the help of Pakistan in 1989, the US once again took away their gaze of mercy from Pakistan and started questioning the nuclear program of Pakistan.⁴² In that testing time, Pakistan faced sanctions in the wake of the Pressler amendment by the US and assistance to Pakistan by the US was almost suspended.⁴³

1947-1953: Initial phase, Pakistan's tilt towards the west and US Aid

When Pakistan gained independence, its tilt was towards the West and the US. Pakistan was keen to establish a friendly relationship with the West and fulfill its economic and security needs with the help of the West and the US. The main factor behind this was the colonial legacy of Pakistan. Because the UK was not in a position to fulfill Pakistan's needs its only hope was the US. The formal relations between the US and Pakistan were established in February 1948. Subsequently, in June 1949 the then Premier of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan

⁴¹ Marvin G. Weinbaum, "War and Peace in Afghanistan: The Pakistani Role," *Middle East Journal* 45, no. 1 (1991): 71–85.

⁴² Shubhangi Pandey, "US Sanctions on Pakistan and Their Failure as Strategic Deterrent," Observer Research Foundation, 2018, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/42912-u-s-sanctions-on-pakistan-and-their-failure-as-strategic-deterrent/>.

⁴³ Tehmina Mahmood, "Pressler Amendment and Pakistan's Security Concerns," *Pakistan Horizon* 47, no. 4 (1994): 97–107.

was invited by the USSR for an official visit, but it did not materialize. On the other hand, the Premier of Pakistan visited the US in June 1950. This visit demonstrated Pakistan's tilt towards the US. Moreover, Liaquat Ali Khan during his visit to the US delivered speeches that contained pro-western rhetoric. In other words, in his speeches, he tried to persuade the US to choose Pakistan as a defender of its interests in the South-Asian region and provide them with necessary sustenance.⁴⁴

The aid provided to Pakistan by the US in this era primarily consisted of economic aid rather than military aid. In the year 1948, Pakistan received US\$ 0.76 million. In 1949 and 1950, Pakistan received no economic aid from the US however, in 1950 US sold arms costing US\$36 million to Pakistan. Likewise, in the year 1951, the US provided Pakistan with US\$2.85 million in economic aid. In the years 1952 and 1953, a sharp rise in economic aid was witnessed when Pakistan got US\$73.18 and US\$737.37 million respectively in economic aid from the US.⁴⁵

US aid to Pakistan in the mid and late 1950s: Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (MDA), SEATO, and CENTO

During the 1950s Pakistan became a member and signatory of multiple treaties and organizations i.e., Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement, SEATO, and CENTO.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement was signed in May 1954 between Pakistan and the USA.⁴⁶ This was the first formal agreement between the two countries and the beginning of a

⁴⁴ Hassan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Overview 1947-2004," PILDAT, April 2004, <https://pildat.org/parliamentary-development/pakistans-foreign-policy-an-overview-1947-2004>.

⁴⁵ Murad Ali, *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* (52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York: Routledge, 2019).

⁴⁶ Mohammed Ayub Khan, "The Pakistan-American Alliance Stresses and Strains," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1964, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/1964-01-01/pakistan-american-alliance>.

never-ending journey of ups and downs. The agreement was aimed at providing Pakistan with defense capabilities to play its role in countering communism and the Soviet Union in the region. Under this agreement, the U.S. provided military support to Pakistan in the shape of loans, grants, as well as technical know-how. The goal and objective of the agreement was to help Pakistan in modernizing and building its military infrastructure. The agreement consisted of steps such as providing military equipment to Pakistan, training the Pakistani military, and providing them with advisory services. Under the agreement, the U.S. established military bases in Pakistan to keep an eye on the Soviet Union's activities during the Cold War. Moreover, it also included provisions for joint military exercises and training programs. However, one thing should be noted here in para 2, Article 1 of the agreement Pakistan was made bound not to use its military capabilities provided by the US against any country except the Soviet Union or for the containment of communism.⁴⁷ Thus, the article made it clear that Pakistan could not use the provided military power against its archrival India. Although, if looked at from a critical perspective Pakistan's aim in collaborating with the US was to deter India.⁴⁸ Although, the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement was the first agreement of its kind between the US and Pakistan, later on, in the mid-fifties the two countries also signed other agreements namely, SEATO (South-East Asia Treaty Organization) and CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) formerly known as the Baghdad Pact.

In the year 1954, an organization called SEATO was formed. It consisted of member states such as the USA, Pakistan, the UK, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand. Later, observer status was granted to states like South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

⁴⁷ Khan, Muhammad Zafrulla, and John K. Emmerson. "United States-Pakistan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (May 19, 1954)." *Middle East Journal* 8, no. 3 (1954): 338–40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4322618>.

⁴⁸ Murad Ali, *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* (52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York: Routledge, 2019).

The aim and objective of the organization was not to allow the rise of communism in the Southeast Asian region. Ironically, the organization was only joined by two Southeast Asian countries i.e., Thailand and the Philippines. The member states vowed to protect each other in the case of communist aggression and an attack on one state would be considered as an attack on other states as well. Furthermore, the areas of focus under this agreement included intelligence sharing among the member states, joint military exercises, military cooperation, and the provision of economic and military aid to its member states. The organization took part in conflicts such as the Vietnam War. In the war, they supported South Vietnam against the communist North Vietnam. Eventually, in the 1970s the organization started to lose its relevance because in 1970 the Vietnam War ended, and thus in 1977, the organization was officially dissolved.⁴⁹ The organization provided huge amounts of economic and military aid to the member states including Pakistan.

The last organization in the 1950s which was joined by Pakistan in the 1950s and through which Pakistan got a significant amount of US aid and assistance was the Baghdad Pact later known as CENTO (Central Treaty Organization). Cento was formed in the year 1955. It was the initiative of Great Britain but was supervised by the US. The organization was formed to curtail the expansion of communism in the Middle East region. Originally, the organization consisted of Pakistan, Great Britain, Iraq, Iran, and Turkey. The objectives of the organization included strengthening the defense systems of the member states, peace, and stability of the region i.e., the Middle East, promotion of economic and political cooperation, and most importantly protecting the region against communism. Just like SEATO, this

⁴⁹ Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 1954,” U.S. Department of State, accessed August 22, 2023, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/seato#:~:text=In%20September%20of%201954%2C%20the,Asia%20Treaty%20Organization%2C%20%20SEATO.&text=The%20purpose%20of%20the%20organization,gaining%20ground%20in%20the%20region.>

organization also vowed to protect the sovereignty of each member state. An attack on one state would be considered an attack on other countries. Although the US was not the original member of the organization it started pouring economic and military aid into the organization in 1958. The reason behind the US' involvement was the Cold War dynamics, the US wanted to contain communism and they were willing to do anything for it. Like other organizations and security agreements, CENTO also promoted military, economic, and political cooperation among the member states. Intelligence sharing, joint military exercises, and cooperation were the cardinal principles of the organization. The organization's performance was not up to the mark because of internal conflicts and rivalries. In 1958 a coup took place in Iraq and thus Iraq disbanded the organization which badly hampered the effectiveness of the organization. The final blow to the organization was the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran. Eventually, CENTO was dissolved in the year 1979.⁵⁰ Although, the organization fell apart because of internal conflicts still the member states got huge amounts of aid and assistance from the US.

Under these agreements, the Eisenhower administration in the US started pouring economic and military aid into Pakistan. However, the military aid provided by the US, as stated by Article 1 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (MDA) restricted Pakistan not to show its military prowess against any other country except communism or the Soviet Union.⁵¹ The sole reason behind the economic and military aid to Pakistan by the US was to protect US interests in the region and also contain communism. On the other hand, Pakistan's keenness to join these agreements was to protect its sovereignty against its archrival and

⁵⁰ Mussarat Jabeen and Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, "SECURITY GAME: SEATO and CENTO as Instrument of Economic and Military Assistance to Encircle Pakistan," *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 1, 49 (2011): 109–32, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/41762426>.

⁵¹ Muhammad Zafrulla Khan and John K. Emmerson, "United States-Pakistan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (May 19, 1954)," *Middle East Journal* 8, no. 3 (n.d.).

immediate neighbor India.⁵² Overall, in the Eisenhower administration, Pakistan got US\$7,921 million of economic aid and US\$3,130 million of military aid. Although, aid to Pakistan started in the year 1948, just after one year of independence a sharp rise can be witnessed in the aid after these agreements.⁵³

The details of the aid are as follows: In 1954 Pakistan received an amount of US\$156.95 million in economic aid from the US while the military aid was still zero. However, the amount of aid to Pakistan increased significantly in 1955. In this year Pakistan got US\$733.15 million in total including US\$266 million in military aid. 1955 marked the beginning of US military aid to Pakistan and that was because of the agreements signed by Pakistan (MDA, SEATO, and CENTO). Similarly, in 1956 more increase can be seen in US aid to Pakistan via available data. This year, the US provided Pakistan with US\$1065.67 million in military aid. Later on, in 1957, US aid to Pakistan was US\$1079.65 million in total including US\$437.59 million in military aid. Almost the same kind of trends can be observed in the later years of the nineteen-fifties. In 1958, the aid was US\$968.22 million in total including US\$533.13 million in military aid. Finally, data shows that 1959 was the year in the fifties when Pakistan got an all-time high of US\$1367.93 million in aid in total including US\$366.81 million in military assistance.⁵⁴

⁵² Hussain Haqqani, *Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an Epic History of Misunderstanding* (New York, New York: Public Affairs, 2013).

⁵³ Murad Ali, *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump* (52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York: Routledge, 2019).

⁵⁴ "Sixty Years of US Aid to Pakistan: Get the Data," The guardian, accessed July 12, 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jul/11/us-aid-to-pakistan>.

Table 1 US aid and Assistance to Pakistan during the 1950s (1954-59) in US\$ Millions

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic Assistance, Total</i>	<i>Economic Assistance (Through USAID)</i>	<i>Military Assistance, Total</i>
1954	156.95	152.24	0.00
1955	733.15	477.18	266
1956	1065.67	700.89	1086.5
1957	1079.65	619.9	437.59
1958	968.22	589.59	533.13
1959	1367.93	985.25	366.81

Source: Guardian

1962-71: Diminishing Ties and US-aid

During this period of history, Pak-US relations deteriorated, and it harmed the US' aid allocation to Pakistan. The reasons behind the strained relationship were multiple including the US' role during and after the Sino-India war in 1962, Pakistan's quest to improve its relations with both China and the USSR, and the US' indifferent attitude towards Pakistan during the 1965 war between India and Pakistan. Without signing any agreement with the US India enjoyed the perks and privileges which Pakistan did not despite the fact of signing defense

agreements with the US.⁵⁵ This factor perturbed Pakistan very much and they started to rethink their alignment with the West and the US.

In 1962, war broke out between India and China. During the war the US openly supported India. The US provided India with arms, and technical support, and provided a nuclear umbrella to India also. On the other hand, it upset Pakistan. During the war, Nehru requested the US to send their air force to help the Indian military against China. According to Riedel, the Kennedy administration was willing to do so but fortunately, Chinese forces withdrew from Indian territory. Furthermore, amidst the crisis, on November 19, 1962, Kennedy sent Averell Harriman an icon of American diplomacy, and a team of crisis management experts to India to figure out what kind of help India needed. Likewise, in 1963, the air forces of the USA, Australia, the UK, and Canada carried out exercises in India to show their intent to protect the air space of India against any aggression.⁵⁶ Moreover, the USA also recognized the McMahon Line as a formal border.⁵⁷ Later on after the war, US assistance to India continued which impacted Pak-US ties negatively. Besides, some other factors strained Pak-US relations during the 1960s.

In the 1960s, Pakistan and China came close to each other due to which the USA was upset with Pakistan. In 1963, the foreign minister of Pakistan Zulfikar Ali Bhutto visited China marking the beginning of a new era. In the same year, through peaceful negotiations, a border agreement between the two friendly countries was concluded. Similarly, in 1964, Pakistan International Airlines (PIA) started its operations in China. This development made Pakistan

⁵⁵ Hassan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Overview 1947-2004," Pildat, April 2004, <https://pildat.org/parliamentary-development1/pakistans-foreign-policy-an-overview-1947-2004>.

⁵⁶ Ajai Shukla, "America's Role in 1962," Business Standard, July 13, 2023, https://www.business-standard.com/article/beyond-business/america-s-role-in-1962-115122201076_1.html.

⁵⁷ "Timeline: U.S.-India Relations," Council on Foreign Affairs, accessed July 13, 2023, <https://www.cfr.org/timeline/us-india-relations>.

the first non-communist country airline to fly from Beijing. Moreover, an agreement on cultural cooperation was also signed between the two countries in 1965 which aimed at promoting harmony between the two friendly states.⁵⁸ Finally, when the US imposed embargos on Pakistan after the Pak-India war in 1965, China was the country that supported Pakistan in the shape of providing arms, ammunition, and moral support disturbing the USA.

During the 1960s, relations between Pakistan and the USSR improved. The primary reason behind the improvement in the relations was Pakistan's disappointment with the US' shift in their policy. In 1961, the Soviet Union for the first time in history, offered assistance to Pakistan to explore oil in Pakistan. The then foreign minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and President of Pakistan Ayub Khan also paid a visit to Moscow, further improving the bilateral ties. Several agreements of mutual interests were signed between both countries during these visits. Interestingly, instead of siding with India during the Indo-Pak war of 1965, the Soviet Union remained neutral. After the war, Soviet Premier, Alexi Kosygin, offered Pakistan and India help to resolve the longstanding issues arising from the 1965 war between India and Pakistan. Thus, with the help of the efforts of Alexi Kosygin, both countries came to the table of negotiation and sorted out the standoff in January 1966. An agreement was signed between the countries with the mediation of the Soviet Union known as the Tashkent Declaration of January 1966. This was another reason which infuriated the US and had negative impacts on the bilateral relationship of Pakistan and the US, impacting the allocation of aid by the US to Pakistan.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Zamir Ahmed Awan, "China-Pakistan: A Journey of Friendship (1950-2020)," *Global Times*, May 21, 2020.

⁵⁹ Zubeida Hassan, "Pakistan's Relations with the U.S.S.R. in the 1960s," *The World Today* 25, no. 1 (January 1969): 26–35, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/40394188>.

Finally, in the beginning of the 1970s i.e., 1971, a crisis broke out in East Pakistan which compelled Pakistan to take military action. The military action in East Pakistan was condemned by both the major powers at that time i.e., the US and the Soviet Union. During the war, the Soviet Union openly supported India but US and China remained almost neutral. Pakistan was wary of the US attitude during the war, Pakistan wanted the US to be on its side during the war. In this era, Pakistan facilitated the visit of President Nixon to China and played an important role in bringing the two powers closer to each other. Due to these efforts relations between Pakistan and the US improved significantly.⁶⁰

Now, if we discuss the amount of US assistance to Pakistan during the 1960s, it was appreciable till 1964 but was badly impacted when Pakistan initiated the war with India in September 1964. Till 1964, through USAID Pakistan received economic assistance in the domains of food support, developmental projects, and humanitarian projects. By 1964, the share of US aid in Pakistan's GDP was 5%, fueling industrialization and development. As a result, Pakistan's growth rate at that time was 7%.⁶¹ Later on, in 1965, the US cut off its aid to Pakistan and also imposed sanctions in the wake of the 1965 Indo-Pak war. After one year, the US eased the embargo by providing Pakistan with non-lethal military equipment. Similarly, a one-time exception was made in 1970-71 when the US provided Pakistan with spare parts and other arms, but the embargo was reimposed when war broke out between Pakistan and India in 1971.⁶²

⁶⁰ Asoke Mukerji, "A Diplomatic Narrative of the 1971 War," *The Wire*, December 18, 2021, <https://thewire.in/diplomacy/a-diplomatic-narrative-of-the-1971-war>.

⁶¹ S. Akbar Zaidi, "Who Benefits From U.S. Aid to Pakistan?," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, September 21, 2011, https://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_aid2011.pdf.

⁶² Sangeeta Thapliyal, "Indo-Pak Conflict and the Role of External Powers," *Strategic Analysis* 22, no. 7 (October 1998), https://doi.org/https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/olj/sa/sa_98ths01.html.

Details of US economic and military assistance to Pakistan during this era are as follows. In 1960, total aid was US\$1689.84 million out of which US\$1181.35 was economic and US\$230.39 million was military aid, in 1961, total aid was US\$989.43 million out of which US\$780.04 million was economic and US\$260.47 was military aid. Similarly, total aid in 1962 was US\$2334.65 (US\$1446.28 million economic and US\$549.02 million military). The total aid in 1963 was US\$2066.77 million (US\$1063.68 economic and US\$292.31 million military aid), In 1964 the total amount of aid to Pakistan was US\$2222.66 million (US\$1334.16 million economic and US\$187.55 military aid). Then comes the year 1965, when US assistance especially military assistance dropped significantly due to the 1965 war between India and Pakistan. This year Pakistan got a total of US\$1928.9 million (US\$1041.58 economic and merely US\$77.38 million in military assistance). Subsequently, the amount of aid further declined in 1966 due to US sanctions. This year Pakistan received a total of US\$816.28 million (US\$691.28 in economic and only US\$8.4 million in military assistance). Data shows that the latter years of the 1960s witnessed a sharp decline in US aid to Pakistan. In 1967, the total aid was US\$1213.36 million (US\$719.38 million in economic and US\$26.33 million in military aid). Similarly, in the year 1968, the aid was US\$ 1501.68 million (US\$672.5 million economic and US\$25.98 million military aid). In 1969, the amount was US\$541.76 million (US\$504.31 million in economic and only US\$0.5 million in military aid). In 1970, aid allocation to Pakistan by the US improved a little bit amounting to US\$968.32 million (US\$570.93 million in economic and US\$0.87 million in military aid). Finally, in the year Pakistan got US\$474.25 million (US\$31.21 economic and US\$0.73 million in military assistance).

Table 2 US Aid and Assistance to Pakistan from 1960-1971 in US\$ Millions

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic Assistance, Total</i>	<i>Economic Assistance (Through USAID)</i>	<i>Military Assistance, Total</i>
1960	1689.84	1181.35	230.39
1961	989.53	780.04	260.47
1962	2334.65	1446.28	549.02
1963	2066.77	1063.68	292.31
1964	2222.66	1334.16	187.55
1965	1928.9	1041.58	77.38
1966	816.28	691.28	8.4
1967	1213.36	719.38	26.33
1968	1501.68	672.5	25.98
1969	541.76	504.31	0.5
1970	968.32	570.93	0.87
1971	474.25	31.21	0.73

Source: Guardian

1972-79: Pakistan's Nuclear Program and US Aid

This era in the history of the foreign policy of Pakistan is called 'The era of bilateralism and Nonalignment. The era of the 1970s was mostly dominated by nuclear notions. In 1974, India carried out an underground nuclear test which compelled Pakistan to initiate a nuclear program. The initiative was not well received by the US, and they imposed sanctions on Pakistan.⁶³ In 1976, an agreement between Pakistan and France in which France had to provide Pakistan with a nuclear reprocessing plant. The agreement was staunchly opposed by the Ford administration in the USA. The US tried its best to stop sabotaging the agreement. They took several steps to express their displeasure over the nuclear issue for example, in 1977, they withdrew the offer to provide Pakistan with A-7 aircraft. Similarly, in 1977-78, the US suspended new economic assistance and military sales to Pakistan. Adding insult to injury, in December 1977 and January 1978, when Jimmy Carter was visiting Asia including India, and Iran, Pakistan was ignored. Likewise, in 1978, the US pressure on France also worked and thus France withdrew from the nuclear reprocessing deal. Finally, in 1979, when the US came to know that Pakistan was developing a uranium enrichment facility in Kahuta, they suspended all kinds of military sales and economic assistance hurting Pakistan immensely.⁶⁴ Overall, from 1972 to 1979, Pakistan received a total of US\$3,711.52 million in aid. The economic assistance consisted of US\$1,819.63 million while the military aid in this era was significantly low i.e., US\$5.2 million only.

⁶³ Umbreen Javaid and Imrana Mushtaq, "Historical Perspective of Pakistan USA Relations; Lessons for Pakistan," *Asian Studies* 29, no. 1 (July 2014): 291–304, https://doi.org/http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/csas/PDF/22%20Imrana%20Mushtaq_29_1.pdf.

⁶⁴ M. Raziullah Azmi, "Pakistan-United States Relations: An Appraisal," *Pakistan Horizon* 36, no. 3 (2014): 37–50, <https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/41393672>.

Table 3 US aid and assistance to Pakistan from 1972-1979 in US\$ Millions

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic Assistance, Total</i>	<i>Economic Assistance (through USAID)</i>	<i>Military Assistance, Total</i>
1972	692.87	261.87	0.42
1973	715.35	387.63	1.24
1974	381.97	219.13	0.95
1975	614.34	326.02	0.92
1976	644.1	336.78	1.28
1977	319.16	209.4	0.92
1978	214.92	55.49	1.52
1979	128.81	23.31	1.2

Source: Guardian

1980-90: Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, the Revival of Pak-US Ties and US Aid

In the history of the world generally and Pakistan particularly, the year 1979 has immense significance. This year two very important developments took place on the stage of world politics. Firstly, the Islamic revolution was brought by the followers of Ayatollah

Ruhollah Khomeini in February 1979 in Iran.⁶⁵ As a result of the revolution US' close friend and ally Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi was dethroned. Thus, the US lost one of its closest allies in the region. Furthermore, the newly established Islamic regime in Iran was hostile towards the West generally and the USA specifically. Secondly, in the same year, Pakistan's immediate neighbor Afghanistan was invaded by the Soviet Union.

Both these events increased the geostrategic importance of Pakistan manifold. Interestingly, the US attitude towards Pakistan changed overnight. According to Thornton, the US took a U-turn from the policy it followed in the previous decade.⁶⁶ In the 1970s, US aid and assistance to Pakistan were cut off significantly due to the nuclear program of Pakistan, and sanctions and embargos were being imposed by the US, even though Pakistan had never given up on its nuclear program they received huge amounts of aid and assistance from the US in 1980s. This was because of the national interests of the US. This phenomenon endorses the fact that US aid to Pakistan is not associated with the needs of Pakistan, rather it can be said that the aid and assistance is associated with the US interests in the region. In the era of 1980s, Pakistan became the frontline state against Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and was supported materially by the US.⁶⁷

With the revolution in Iran, the US had no more a trusted and faithful ally in the region who could defend their interests in the region. Moreover, India, one of the first choices of the US was following the policy of non-alignment, thus the US had no option other than Pakistan. On the other hand, Pakistan was willing to assist the US and protect its interests in the region.

⁶⁵ D. Parvaz, "Iran 1979: The Islamic Revolution That Shook the World," Aljazeera, February 14, 2014, <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2014/2/11/iran-1979-the-islamic-revolution-that-shook-the-world>.

⁶⁶ Thomas Perry Thornton, "Between the Stools?: U.S. Policy towards Pakistan during the Carter Administration," *Asian Survey* 22, no. 10 (October 1982): 959–77, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2643754>.

⁶⁷ Muhammad Aslam Faiz, Muhammad Akbar Malik, and Khalil UR Rehman, "Pak-US Collaboration on Afghanistan and USSR War 1979 to 1988," *Pakistan Social Sciences Review* 3, no. 1 (June 2019): 305–17.

In the 1980s, the primary US interest in the region was to defeat the Soviet Union and communism. The Afghanistan phenomenon in the 1980s completely transformed Pakistan's importance to the US.⁶⁸ Ironically, during this era, the US completely ignored the nuclear program of Pakistan and turned a blind eye to it. Furthermore, at that time in Pakistan, the military regime of Zia was in power which was infamous for its grave human rights violations, censorship, and undemocratic actions, but still, the US was providing it with enormous amounts of aid. The Amnesty International report of 1985 succinctly summarized the types of human rights violations that were taking place in Pakistan during the Zia regime. As mentioned by the report, the violations included the detention of prisoners of conscience, the trying of political persons through military courts, and the deaths of criminals in police custody, due to torture.⁶⁹

Now we will discuss the aid allocation by the US during the Afghan war. Right after the beginning of the war in Afghanistan, the US removed all types of sanctions that had been imposed on Pakistan in the previous decade. In 1981, negotiations between the Zia regime and the US government on aid issues were started, the proposed amount was US\$3.2 billion.⁷⁰ By 1985, Pakistan became the fourth largest recipient of US military aid. Pakistan was just behind Israel, Egypt, and Turkey, and in 1987 when US\$4.02 billion was approved it became the 2nd.⁷¹

Overall, Pakistan received US\$5,420.24 million in economic assistance and US\$3,739.87 million in military aid from 1980 to 1990. Besides this, a notable amount of arms

⁶⁸ W. Howard Wriggins, "Pakistan's Search for a Foreign Policy after the Invasion of Afghanistan," *Pacific Affairs* 57, no. 2 (1984): 284–303, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2759129>.

⁶⁹ rep., *Amnesty International Report 1985* (London: Amnesty International, 1985).

⁷⁰ Owen Bennett Jones, *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2002).

⁷¹ Thazha Varkey Paul, "Influence through Arms Transfers: Lessons from the US–Pakistani Relationship," *Asian Survey* 32, no. 12 (1992): 1078–92, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2645039>.

were also purchased by Pakistan from the US during this era (Year-wise details are mentioned in Table 3).

Table 4 US economic and military assistance and arms sales to Pakistan during the Afghan war (US\$ millions)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic aid in US\$ Millions</i>	<i>Military aid in US\$ Millions</i>	<i>Arms sales in US\$ Millions</i>
1980	135.17	0.00	185.00
1981	161.44	0.00	33.00
1982	393.96	1.18	93.00
1983	525.24	491.41	250.00
1984	558.57	546.62	480.00
1985	597.1	573.76	549.00
1986	613.06	536.63	126.00
1987	589.26	525.79	90.00
1988	756.99	423.89	73.00
1989	550.88	361.26	651.00
1990	539.24	278.87	53.00

Sources: USAID (2023) and SIPRI (2023)

1990-2000: A Drift in the Ties and its Impacts on the Aid

The era of the 1990s is called the ‘post-Cold War era’ in international relations. This era has its importance in the history of International Relations because the USSR collapsed in this era and the Cold War came to an end. Concerning Pakistan, this came up with several new challenges and problems including the Afghan refugee crisis, Internal conflicts in Afghanistan, the US abrupt withdrawal of support from Pakistan, and nuclear weapon testing by Pakistan and the US response. When the war in Afghanistan started in 1979, millions of Afghan refugees moved to Pakistan and even when the war ended in 1989, they were still residing in Pakistan. The refugees hurt the already fragile economy of Pakistan. Pakistan was not in a position to bear the burden of such a large number of refugees. Moreover, the US, who was helping Pakistan financially during the Afghan war also changed its attitude after the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan. They were not willing to help Pakistan anymore.⁷² When the US realized that Pakistan’s help was no longer required, the US president did not certify further that Pakistan’s nuclear journey was on its way and thus all kinds of economic and military assistance to Pakistan were halted by the US. Adding insult to injury, the US invoked the Pressler amendment in 1990, imposing sanctions on Pakistan on the eve of its nuclear program.⁷³

Under the Pressler Amendment, the US also stopped the selling of F-16 to Pakistan. Pakistan had already paid for 28 F-16 aircraft, but the US did not hand over them to Pakistan and they time and again assured Pakistan of their delivery.⁷⁴ Due to this incident, the bilateral

⁷² Frédéric Grare and William Maley, “The Afghan Refugees in Pakistan,” June 30, 2011.

⁷³ Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947–2000: Disenchanted Allies. Balti- More* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

⁷⁴ C.C. Fair, “The U.S.-Pakistan F-16 Fiasco,” *Foreign Policy*, February 3, 2011, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/02/03/the-u-s-pakistan-f-16-fiasco/>.

relationship deteriorated to its lowest. The immediate parting of ways between the two countries shows that the US help to Pakistan has always been based on its national interests. According to Riedel, the 63-year relationship between the two countries verifies that the US is an unreliable friend.⁷⁵ The relationship further hit its lowest when Pakistan tested its nuclear weapons in 1998 and when a military dictatorship was installed in Pakistan by Musharraf in 1999.⁷⁶ During this time, US aid to Pakistan was once again reduced significantly which had a very negative impact on the already weakened economy of Pakistan. However, the US indifference was temporary, and very soon the situation turned upside down after the 9/11 attacks.

The total amount of aid bagged by Pakistan during this era was US\$606.62 million in economic assistance including US\$160.5 million through USAID and US\$7.42 million in military assistance.

⁷⁵ Bruce Riedel, *Deadly Embrace: Pakistan, America and the Future of the Global Jihad*. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2012).

⁷⁶ Kamran Khan, "Army Seizes Control in Pakistan," Washington Post, October 13, 1999, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/southasia/stories/pakistan101399.htm>.

Table 5 US aid and assistance to Pakistan from 1991-2000 in US\$ Millions

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic Assistance, Total</i>	<i>Economic Assistance (through USAID)</i>	<i>Military Assistance, Total</i>
1991	149.59	141.78	0.00
1992	27.14	0.57	7.2
1993	74.19	7.98	0.00
1994	68.43	0.00	0.00
1995	23.13	10.1	0.00
1996	22.79	0.00	0.00
1997	57.17	0.00	0.00
1998	36.32	0.00	0.00
1999	102.14	0.22	0.22
2000	45.72	0.00	0.00

Source: Guardian

Conclusion

The history of the Pak-US relationship is very dramatic, full of suspense and thrill. At one time both the countries come so close to each other that they become brothers rather than friends while at other times they become each other's bitter enemies. The aid relationship

between the two countries also depicts the same picture. The US started helping Pakistan financially in 1948 but initially, the amount of aid till 1954 was very minimal. Then, in the 1950s Pakistan signed defense agreements such as MDA, SEATO, and CENTO to contain communism in the region and got appreciable amounts of aid and assistance. On the contrary, when a war took place between India and Pakistan, aid from the US declined. Likewise, in the 1970s due to Pakistan's policy of bilateralism and non-alignment, aid to Pakistan was very low. Later on, due to the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan, Pakistan's geostrategic significance once again increased and thus for its national interest, the US helped Pakistan generously throughout the 1980s. Interestingly, the US once again abandoned Pakistan when Soviet forces were defeated in Afghanistan, and they no longer needed Pakistan. Moreover, they also imposed sanctions on Pakistan in the wake of the Pressler amendment. The sanctions were tightened when in 1998 Pakistan carried out nuclear tests. If looked at from a critical perspective, the US always helped Pakistan when they had an interest in the region and whenever their interest is met they have abandoned Pakistan.

Chapter II

Turkey, Indonesia, Israel, Taiwan, and South Korea: Recipients of US Aid

But With Different Fates

Introduction

Pakistan is not the only country that is helped by the US financially, in fact, there are some other countries too. In this chapter, we will proceed with our discussion with countries like Turkey, Indonesia, Taiwan, Israel, and South Korea. The reasons behind picking up these countries are: these countries share many similarities, they all are geo-strategically important, the US has direct or indirect interests associated with them, the role of militaries in these countries is or was overarching, and finally and most importantly these countries received huge amounts of aids and assistances from the US. However, we are particularly interested and concerned with the question of how US aid and assistance has helped these countries in their development, especially regarding democracy? Interestingly, unlike Pakistan, democracy has flourished in these countries. Regular elections, transition of power, and democratic norms are becoming the chief characteristics of these countries. Furthermore, these countries are on the way to economic development. It would not be wrong if we say that these countries have utilized US aid to strengthen their democratic institutions. Although US aid is not the sole reason behind the development of democratic institutions in these countries, it is one of the most important factors in developing them.

On the contrary, if we cast an eye on the history of Pakistan, US aid was much higher during the military dictatorships than the democratically elected governments. While one can argue that the provision of US aid to Pakistan was higher during the military regimes because of US' needs i.e., its national interest in fact, the US helped the military regimes more often

because during the reign of military dictators, it's easy to take the stakeholders in confidence as compared to elected ones and get the work done without any difficulty and restraints. Consequently, democratic norms and traditions did not develop in Pakistan, hurting its economy, social fabric, and democratic institutions. Even though US aid is not the sole factor responsible for the deterioration of democracy in Pakistan, it has a lion's share in it. In the passages below we will discuss US aid concerning the development of democracy, economy, and overall development of countries like Pakistan, Turkey, Indonesia, Taiwan, Israel, and South Korea.

Pakistan

Pakistan, a country in South Asia got its independence in 1947 from the Great Britain.⁷⁷ By 2021, its population is reported as 231.4 million, the 5th largest country by population in the world.⁷⁸ Similarly, its total area is 796,096 square kilometers making it the world's 36th largest country by area.⁷⁹ Originally, the country consisted of two wings i.e., the West-Pakistan and the East-Pakistan which is now called Bangladesh. Unfortunately, East Pakistan separated from West Pakistan in 1971 and now the country is only called Pakistan.⁸⁰ Pakistan occupies a very important geostrategic position on the world map.⁸¹ Three very important regions of the world i.e., South Asia, Central Asia, and Middle East can easily be accessed through Pakistan.

⁷⁷ William Dalrymple, "The Great Divide," The New Yorker, 2015, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/29/the-great-divide-books-dalrymple>.

⁷⁸ "Pakistan Country in Asia," Data Commons Place Explorer, accessed July 19, 2023, https://datacommons.org/place/country/PAK/?utm_medium=explore&mprop=count&popt=Person&hl=en.

⁷⁹ The World Factbook, 2018, <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/about/cover-gallery/2018-cover/>.

⁸⁰ Anam Zakaria, "Remembering the War of 1971 in East Pakistan," Aljazeera, 2019, <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2019/12/16/remembering-the-war-of-1971-in-east-pakistan>.

⁸¹ Muhammad Mohsin, "Geographical and Geostrategic Importance of Pakistan in Global Perspective," ResearchGate, November 2020, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349105200_Geographical_and_Geostrategic_Importance_of_Pakistan_in_Global_Perspective.

Similarly, Pakistan is an immediate neighbor of two nuclear powers namely India and China which increases its geostrategic significance manyfold.⁸² Furthermore, Pakistan also shares a border of 2,670 kilometers with Afghanistan which has been a theatre of war for most of history.⁸³ Pakistan played the role of a frontline state against communism in the Cold War, in 1979 in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and finally, since 2001 against the war on terror. Due to its geographic location, it not only received billions of dollars from the West and the US but also suffered heavily in the shape of the loss of human lives, terrorism, and violent extremism.⁸⁴ The country is blessed with many natural resources but unfortunately, they have never been exploited to their fullest.⁸⁵ Pakistan is the only Muslim country which possesses nuclear weapons. It also has a large military force which is number 7 largest in the world.⁸⁶ Since its inception, the country has been faced with challenges such as political instability, security threats, terrorism, fragile democracy, high illiteracy rates, and a weak economy and these challenges persist. Not one factor or stakeholder can be blamed for this perennial situation because everyone including politicians, bureaucrats, and the military has a share in it because for almost half of its life, the country has been ruled by military dictators.⁸⁷

⁸² Monish Tourangbam, "The China-India-Pakistan Triangle: Origins, Contemporary Perceptions, and Future," Stimson Center, 2020, <https://www.stimson.org/2020/the-china-india-pakistan-triangle-origins-contemporary-perceptions-and-future/>.

⁸³ Bruce Riedel, "The 3 Wars in Afghanistan," Brookings, 2017, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-3-wars-in-afghanistan/>.

⁸⁴ Husain Haqqani, "The Deep Roots of Pakistan's Terrorism Crisis," Foreign Policy, 2023, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2023/03/03/pakistan-terrorism-crisis-inconsistent-policy-military-economy/>.

⁸⁵ Sarfaraz A. Khan, "Underutilising Country's Resources," *The Express Tribune*, 2022, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2355699/underutilising-countrys-resources>.

⁸⁶ Richard Jackson, Earmon Murphy, and Scott Poynting, *Contemporary State Terrorism Theory and Practice* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

⁸⁷ Zafar Bangash, "Disastrous Consequences of Military Rule in Pakistan," *Crescent International*, 2022.

Currently, the literacy rate in the country is 58.9% meaning that 60 million people are illiterate.⁸⁸ The economic condition of the country is also not satisfactory. The inflation, by June 2023, is 29.4% and Pakistan has to pay a total of US\$126.3 billion in external debts. Besides these, Pakistan's other indicators of development also tell the same story, for example, Pakistan spends 1% of its GDP on public health care,⁸⁹ based on GDP, the country ranked 171 out of 229 world economies,⁹⁰ and very shockingly, almost 60.3% of its population spend their lives upon less than US\$ 2 per day.⁹¹ All of these stats show that Pakistan has not performed well on the world stage and one of its reasons is the derailment of democracy and the over-development of military in the country and US aid and assistance is one of the precursors of its over-development.

In 1949, while referring to the Marshall Plan, US President Truman said that 'one of the objectives of the aid and assistance to Europe is to support democracy'⁹². On the contrary, the US completely ignored its ideals including democracy and even supported countries having authoritarian, dictatorship, or monarchic systems and Pakistan was one of them. The US has always kept its ideals after national interests, foreign policy goals, and geo-strategic orientations.⁹³ In the case of Pakistan, the US attitude is not different at all. In 1958, martial law was imposed in Pakistan by Ayub Khan. In his tenure till 1965, an ample amount of aid was received from Pakistan which was halted after the 1965 India-Pakistan war. Similarly,

⁸⁸ "Pakistan 2023 IFRC Network Country Plan (MAAPK002)," reliefweb, 2022, <https://reliefweb.int/report/pakistan/pakistan-2023-ifrc-network-country-plan-maapk002#:~:text=Up%20to%2064%20per%20cent,stands%20at%2058.9%20per%20cent>.

⁸⁹ "Health Expenditure, Public (Percentage of GDP)," n.d., accessed July 20, 2023.

⁹⁰ "The World Factbook-2016," The world Factbook, accessed July 20, 2023, <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/about/cover-gallery/2016-cover/>.

⁹¹ "Poverty: 60.3% Pakistanis Living on \$2 a Day," *The Express Tribune*, 2015.

⁹² "Start of the Cold War - The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan," Khan Academy, accessed July 20, 2023, <https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/us-history/postwarera/postwar-era/a/start-of-the-cold-war-part-2>.

⁹³ Murad Ali, "US Foreign Aid to Pakistan and Democracy: An Overview," *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 29, no. 2 (2009): 247–58.

Pakistan also received a significant amount of US aid from another military ruler General Yahya Khan. Later on, in the 1970s, when a democratically elected government was installed in Pakistan i.e., Bhutto's regime US aid to Pakistan was negligible. However, in the 1980s, during Zia's regime (a military dictator) US aid once again increased. After, the Zia democratic regimes of Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif came who were once again ignored by the US and did not allocate much US aid during these democratic tenures. Finally, during the first years of Musharraf a military dictator, US aid was meager but after the 9/11 attacks aid flow to Pakistan increased manifold. Overall, Pakistan received a total of US\$33.606 billion in economic and US\$8.932 billion in military assistance out of which military regimes received US\$24.993 billion in economic assistance while US\$6.646 billion in military assistance. On the other hand, the democratically elected regimes bagged US\$8.612 billion in economic aid and US\$2.286 billion in military aid. The aid allocation to dictatorial regimes measurably surpasses the aid to democratic regimes of Pakistan which shows that the US aid allocation is purely based on its national interest, foreign policy goals, and geo-strategic orientations.⁹⁴ US aid is one of the factors among others that has caused political instability, state weakness, and economic stagnation in Pakistan.

Turkey

Turkey is a country having a unique geographic location. The country is located both in Europe and Asia. Just like Pakistan, Turkey is also preoccupied with its national security, geo-strategic significance, and military. Due to its location, it has been a longstanding ally of the US and a member of NATO. They played a significant role in the Cold War against the

⁹⁴ Ibid.

curtailment of communism in its region.⁹⁵ Being a member of NATO and a close ally of the US Turkey also received huge amounts of aid from the US. During the Cold War, they gave military bases to NATO against the USSR. In return, they got US\$4.5 billion in economic and US\$9.6 billion in military assistance. Similarly, in 1990 and 1991 during the Persian Gulf war, Turkey received US\$634.4 million in economic aid⁹⁶ and also purchased arms of US\$1.8 billion from the US.⁹⁷ Furthermore, they also took part in the war against terror in Afghanistan and indeed commanded NATO's ISAF mission in 2002 and 2003.⁹⁸ During this adventure, Turkey once again bagged an ample amount of US aid in the war against terror. Since 2003, the country has received almost US\$31.6 million annually from the US.⁹⁹

Likewise, the military in Turkey has also a very active and engaging role in the politics of the country, it is considered as the guardian of secularism. Many times, when the country was in a political or economic crisis the military has intervened. Between 1960 and 1980 the military staged three coups in Turkey ousting democratically elected governments.¹⁰⁰ On the contrary, a state in Turkey is very strong and it has managed to be on the path of economic development and prosperity, unlike Pakistan. Although US aid and assistance is not the only factor responsible for its strong state and economic development it is indeed one of them.

Just like Pakistan, Turkey is helped by the US when it serves the interests of the US. The aid provided to them has never been aimed at strengthening the democratic institutions,

⁹⁵ Eylem Yilmaz and Pinar Bilgin, "Constructing Turkey's 'Western' Identity during the Cold War: Discourses of the Intellectuals of Statecraft," *International Journal* 61, no. 1 (2005): 39–59, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/40204128>.

⁹⁶ "Foreign Assistance Data," n.d., accessed July 20, 2023.

⁹⁷ "Arms Transfer Data- Base" (Stockholm, n.d.), accessed July 20, 2023.

⁹⁸ Jim Zanotti, rep., *Turkey-U.S. Defense Cooperation: Prospects and Challenges* (Congressional Research Service, 2011).

⁹⁹ Thazha Varkey Paul, *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹⁰⁰ Ahmed El Amraoui and Faisal Edroos, "Why Turkey's Military Is Not What It Used to Be," Aljazeera, 2018, <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2018/6/5/why-turkeys-military-is-not-what-it-used-to-be>.

bringing political stability or economic development to the country. Fortunately, unlike Pakistan Turkey has used US aid and assistance for the betterment of their people, strengthening their democratic institutions and economic development making it a different case than Pakistan. Other factors responsible for its development may include principle-based foreign policy, sagacious and visionary leadership, curtailment of military powers, clear vision, and most importantly, secularism.

Indonesia

Indonesia is a Muslim country in the Southeast Asia and Oceania. It is located between the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The country gained its independence from the colonial power of the Dutch in 1949 after a bloody war of independence. Although the country is considered an Islamic one theoretically, it is indeed a mild secular' state practically and all other religions have been given their rights and freedom.¹⁰¹ After independence, the country was ruled for 50 years by two authoritarian rulers i.e., Sukarno (1945-1967) and Suharto (1967-1998).¹⁰²

Indonesia also shares many similarities with Pakistan. Both countries have huge populations, in the world's population list, Indonesia is in 4th and Pakistan in 5th position. Similarly, it is the largest Muslim country by population. Another similarity is that both countries are located in geographically very important locations. Indonesia is home to many significant shipping lanes. Just like Pakistan, the country also faced many internal conflicts but all of them were dealt with successfully. Moreover, the role of the military in politics till 1998 also portrays the same picture as Pakistan, however, the Indonesian military took part in the

¹⁰¹ K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid, "Indonesia's Mild Secularism," *SAIS Review* 21, no. 2 (2001): 25–28.

¹⁰² R. William Riddle, "Indonesia's Democratic Past and Future," *Comparative Politics* 24, no. 4 (1992): 443–62, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/422154>.

war of independence against the Dutch, unlike the Pakistani military which came into existence after independence. Most importantly, the country received a considerable amount of US aid.

As far as US aid is concerned, during the Cold War, Indonesia was provided with aid assistance of US\$3.8 billion in economic assistance and US\$659 million in military assistance. Likewise, it received US\$3.5 billion in economic aid and US\$117.5 million after the cold war.¹⁰³

Unlike Pakistan, the country has achieved much. In 2005, democracy strengthened its roots in Indonesia which is one of the biggest achievements of Indonesia and in complete contrast with Pakistan. In 2005, direct regional elections were held in Indonesia, and they were successful.¹⁰⁴ The country is also the largest East Asian and 16th largest economy in the world.¹⁰⁵ Since 1999, the country has reduced the poverty rate to half.¹⁰⁶ In 2022, the rate of its GDP growth was 5.1 percent even though its economy was in the recovery phase after Covid-19.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, according to The World Bank Indonesia is one of the most vibrant democracies of East Asia.

Taiwan

Taiwan is a country in the East Asia region that gained its independence in 1950 from the mainland (China). Formerly, it was called Formosa. Although the country is

¹⁰³ “Foreign Aid (DATA),” USAID, accessed July 22, 2023, <https://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/data-resources>.

¹⁰⁴ Edward Aspinall, “Elections and the Normalization of Politics in Indonesia,” *South East Asia Research* 13, no. 2 (2005): 117–56.

¹⁰⁵ “Indonesia Economy,” Asia Fund Managers, accessed July 22, 2023, <https://www.asiafundmanagers.com/gbr/indonesia-economy/>.

¹⁰⁶ Hal Hill, “What’s Happened to Poverty and Inequality in Indonesia over Half a Century?,” *Asian Development Review* 38, no. 1 (2021): 68–97, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1162/adev_a_00158.

¹⁰⁷ “Indonesia Overview: Development News, Research, Data,” The World Bank, 2022, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/indonesia/overview>.

sovereign, the People's Republic of China claims its sovereignty over Taiwan. Due to insistent conflict between China and Taiwan, Taiwan does not have membership in the United Nations Organization (UNO).¹⁰⁸ The population of the country is 23,924,917.¹⁰⁹

Like Pakistan, the country is faced with great external threats i.e., from China. China through its policy of 'One China' asserts that Taiwan is an integral part of China and one day it will be united. Taiwan has been an ally of the United States in the Cold War. It has received great amounts of US aid like Pakistan i.e., the disbursement of USAID to Taiwan for 15 years from 1950 onwards was US\$1.5 billion in economic assistance. Unlike Pakistan, the United States compelled Taiwan to reform its economy and make it a free market.¹¹⁰ Likewise, due to external threats, it has developed a strong military. It also has been a target of great power politics like Pakistan. As Pakistan's foreign policy is always 'Indian Centric', Taiwan's foreign policy has always been 'China's Centric'. Even though both countries share several similarities, their fates are very different. Moreover, initially, Taiwan was under authoritarian rule for a long period but since 1987, the country has transformed into a democratic system and democratic institutions are firmly controlling the system. Even the military is also under the control of the political forces.¹¹¹

Due to the fear of China, Taiwan spends a lot on its defense but to fulfill its defense-related needs it has made its economy-based export making it self-sufficient up to a great

¹⁰⁸ "Taiwan Profile - Full Overview," BBC, 2016, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-16177285>.

¹⁰⁹ "Taiwan Population," Worldometer, 2023, <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/taiwan-population/>.

¹¹⁰ Thazha Varkey Paul, *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹¹¹ Gunter Schubert, "Taiwan's Political Evolution from Authoritarianism to Democracy and the Development of Cross-Strait Relations," *European Perspectives on Taiwan*, 2012, 66–83, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-94303-9_4.

extent.¹¹² Besides the export-led economy, there are multiple other factors that make the country stand out in the world community. The country is a strong advocate of freedom and liberty.¹¹³ The country also stands for democratic principles, accountability, and transparency and is the 8th most vibrant democracy in the world.¹¹⁴ In 2021, based on purchasing power parity the country was 3rd in the whole Asia Pacific. It was one of the most successful countries in tackling the 2019 covid pandemic. The country is also one of the biggest exporters of Semiconductors.¹¹⁵

Israel

Israel is a very small country located in the Middle East and has a very complex history. It is a Jewish country surrounded by Muslim states. It shares its borders with Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt and with Palestinian territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.¹¹⁶ The country is inhabited by Muslim Arabs, Jews, Christians, and Druze. In modern history, the country was established in 1948 when British rule came to an end in Palestine. There is a perennial dispute between Israel and Palestine and continuous clashes occur between the two countries. Due to this conflict, other Muslim states such as Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, etc. have fought wars with Israel. So far, Arabs and Israel have fought five major wars i.e., in 1948, 1956, 1967, 1973, and 1982. The war that was fought in 1948 is called the first Arab-

¹¹² “Taiwan Exports,” Trading Economics, accessed July 23, 2023, <https://tradingeconomics.com/taiwan/exports#:~:text=Taiwan%27s%20economy%20is%20export%2Doriented,during%20the%20past%2040%20years>.

¹¹³ “Taiwan,” RSF Reporters without Borders, accessed July 23, 2023, <https://rsf.org/en/country/taiwan>.

¹¹⁴ Anthony B. Kim, “Taiwan’s Free and Vibrant Economy Is a ‘Democratic Success Story,’” The Heritage Foundation, 2022, <https://www.heritage.org/international-economies/commentary/taiwans-free-and-vibrant-economy-democratic-success-story>.

¹¹⁵ “Key Economic Indicators of Taiwan - Statistics & Facts,” Statista, accessed July 23, 2023, <https://www.statista.com/topics/9094/key-economic-indicators-of-taiwan/#topicOverview>.

¹¹⁶ “Israel and Its Neighbors,” Libraries, accessed July 24, 2023, <https://open.lib.umn.edu/worldgeography/chapter/8-4-israel-and-its-neighbors/>.

Israeli war. The second war that was fought in 1956 is called ‘The Suez War’ in history because it was fought due to a conflict regarding the Suez Canal of Egypt. The third war is called ‘The Six Day War’ fought in 1967. The fourth war is called the ‘Yom Kippur War’ which was fought in 1973. Finally, in 1982 a war was fought between the Arab states and Israel when Israel invaded Lebanon.¹¹⁷ Besides, Israel is a technologically advanced country having a very vibrant economy. The country is considered a world leader in fields such as cyber-security, agriculture, and biotechnology.

Like Pakistan, Israel is obsessed with its security, making it a security state. Conflicts between Israel and Palestine occur frequently. Moreover, the location of Israel has a high significance geo-strategically. It acts as a police state in the Middle East on behalf of the West and America. It secures the interests of the West and America in the Middle East because of its historical friendship and alignment with the West.¹¹⁸ Moreover, it is one of the biggest recipients of US aid. Only from 1976 to 2017, Israel received US\$ 55,084.39 million in economic assistance and US\$ 130,440.17 million in military assistance and it is the second recipient of US aid and assistance.¹¹⁹

Even though Pakistan and Israel are similar in factors like security, geo-strategic importance, strong military, US aid, and conflicts, however, Israel has managed to flourish in education, democracy, technology, economy, etc. Today, Israel is called the land of startups and is termed a ‘Startup Nation’.¹²⁰ The country has initiated startups in fields like

¹¹⁷ “The Arab-Israeli Wars,” Aljazeera, 2003, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2003/12/9/the-arab-israeli-wars>.

¹¹⁸ E.G.H Joffé, “Relations between the Middle East and the West,” *Middle East Journal* 48, no. 2 (1994): 250–67.

¹¹⁹ Murad Ali, “Aid and Human Rights: The Case of Us Aid to Israel,” *Policy Perspectives: The Journal of the Institute of Policy Studies* 15, no. 3 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.13169/polipers.15.3.0029>.

¹²⁰ Adrian Bridgwater, “How Israel Became A Technology Startup Nation,” *Forbes*, 2020, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adrianbridgwater/2020/02/21/how-israel-became-a-technology-startup-nation/?sh=4d42c0ba780e>.

cybersecurity, AI, green energy, and biotechnology. Likewise, Israel has also excelled in the field of education. Four Israeli universities are among the top 100 universities in the world.¹²¹ Additionally, the country has a very effective military force equipped with cutting-edge defense weaponry, technology, and warfare skills. It is also very successful diplomatically because even those Arab states who have been once the archrivals of Israel are now becoming friends and trading partners of Israel.¹²² Economically, Israel is counted in the list of developed countries. Its GDP in 2022 was US\$ 501.4 billion and GDP growth was 6.1 percent. It has also absorbed 1.2 million migrants in a decade, due to which its labor force has increased from 1.65 million in 1990 to 3 million in 2010. By 2003, the country had eliminated all external debts. Likewise, by 2000 the rate of inflation was reduced to zero.¹²³ Finally, its democracy is considered a healthier one as compared to other democracies in the world.¹²⁴

South-Korea

South Korea is officially known as the Republic of Korea which is located in the East-Asia. The country shares its borders with North Korea, Japan, and China. In 1948, the then-united Korea was divided into North Korea and South Korea followed by the Korean War. Till then, there has been a continuous conflict between North Korea and South Korea. The system of government that operates in South Korea is a liberal democracy with the president as head of the state and the prime minister as head of the government. Even though the country has been involved in wars and a perennial conflict with its neighbor i.e., North Korea, it still

¹²¹ ILH Staff, “4 Israeli Universities Make List of World’s 100 Best Academic Institutions,” Israel Hayom, 2022, <https://www.israelhayom.com/2022/04/14/4-israeli-universities-make-list-of-worlds-100-best-academic-institutions/>.

¹²² Dan Ephron, “How Arab Ties With Israel Became the Middle East’s New Normal,” Foreign Policy, 2020, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/12/21/arab-ties-israel-diplomacy-normalization-middle-east/>.

¹²³ “Economy: Achievements,” Consulate General of Israel to the Pacific Northwest San Francisco, accessed July 24, 2023, <https://embassies.gov.il/san-francisco/AboutIsrael/Economy/Pages/ECONOMY-Achievements.aspx>.

¹²⁴ Brett Stephens, “In Israel, Democracy Still Holds,” *The New York Times*, 2023.

managed to achieve remarkable growth and development since its independence. The country is technologically very advanced, economically very prosperous, and politically very stable. It also has been a longstanding US ally that has time and again supported the US economically, materially, and politically.

As far as commonalities are considered with Pakistan, the two countries do share some. At some point in history, South Korea has been ruled by military dictators.¹²⁵ Moreover, both countries are strategically very important. Both countries have their archrivals on their borders i.e., North Korea for South Korea and India for Pakistan. Most importantly, both countries have a history of longstanding alignment with the West and America. Both countries have worked to secure the interests of the West and America during the Cold War. Like Pakistan, South Korea is also a recipient of US aid and military assistance. From 1946 to 1975, the South has received US\$ 69.15 billion in total assistance.¹²⁶ Even though Pakistan and South Korea have many similarities, but their fates are entirely different from each other.

South Korea has made tremendous achievements since its inception. In terms of economy, the country is one of the fastest-growing economies in the world. World's prestigious companies such as Samsung, Hyundai, LG, SK Hynix, Shinhan Financial Group, Kia Motors, and POSCO belong to South Korea which generates enormous revenue and earns South Korea a good reputation throughout the world.¹²⁷ The country is considered a global leader in Information and Communication Technology (ICT). It's also excelling in modern fields such as robotics, artificial intelligence, and renewable energy. The country ranks 4 in ease of doing

¹²⁵ KIM, C. I. EUGENE. "Transition from Military Rule: The Case of South Korea." *Armed Forces & Society* 1, no. 3 (1975): 302–16. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45346429>.

¹²⁶ "U.S. OVERSEAS LOANS AND GRANTS," Usaid.gov, 2009, https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADT555.pdf.

¹²⁷ Rajeshni Naidu Ghelani, "South Korea's 10 Biggest Companies," CNBC, 2012, <https://www.cnbc.com/2012/07/23/South-Koreas-10-Biggest-Companies.html>.

business in the world.¹²⁸ In 2009, South Korea became the first country to join the OECD (The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) which itself was a former recipient of foreign aid.¹²⁹ In the field of education, the country is performing exceptionally well. The literacy rate is 97.97% and is ranked 69 in the world.¹³⁰ South Korea is also home to some of the world's best and topnotch educational institutions such as Seoul National University, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Yonsei University, and Korea University etc. Similarly, its healthcare system is also one of the best in the world. The life expectancy is 83.5 years, making it one of the highest in OECD countries. The number of beds per 1000 people is 12.4 in South Korean hospitals just behind Japan.¹³¹ Last but not least, despite its authoritarian history South Korea has been transformed into a vibrant democracy.¹³² The country is politically stable, economically prosperous, and socially vibrant.

Conclusion

In Pakistan, US aid to the democratically elected regimes is negligible as compared to the authoritarian and military regimes. This in turn has a due share in strengthening the non-democratic powers at the cost of the democratic ones. Similarly, the aid provided has not been used effectively to strengthen sectors such as education, industry, health, agriculture, etc. As a

¹²⁸ Ana Maria Santacreu and Heting Zhou, "How Did South Korea's Economy Develop So Quickly?," Federal Reserve Bank of ST.Louis, 2018, <https://www.stlouisfed.org/en/on-the-economy/2018/march/how-south-korea-economy-develop-quickly>.

¹²⁹ Manuela V. Ferro and Akihiko Nishio, "From Aid Recipient to Donor: Korea's Inspirational Development Path," World Bank Blogs, 2021, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/aid-recipient-donor-korea-inspirational-development-path>.

¹³⁰ "Literacy Rate by Country," Wisevoter, accessed July 26, 2023, <https://wisevoter.com/country-rankings/literacy-rate-by-country/>.

¹³¹ "Health Care in South Korea - Statistics & Facts," Statista, accessed July 26, 2023, <https://www.statista.com/topics/5598/health-care-in-south-korea/#topicOverview>.

¹³² Chien Peng Chung, "Democratization in South Korea and Inter-Korean Relations," *Pacific Affairs* 76, no. 1 (2003): 9–35.

result, Pakistan remains an aid-dependent country. If Pakistan had used aid and assistance for long-term economic goals, the situation would have been different. On the contrary, countries like Turkey, Indonesia, Taiwan, Israel, and South Korea utilized the US aid very effectively and today democracy is flourishing in these countries, political stability is there, and they are on the way to economic growth and development, and most importantly they are no more dependent on the US or any other kind of aid and assistance. Even though US aid is not the sole reason behind the deterioration of democracy and economy in Pakistan, it has a share in it. Similarly, it cannot be said that the aforementioned countries i.e., Turkey, Israel, Indonesia, Taiwan, and South Korea developed because of US aid. There are multiple factors responsible for the underdevelopment of Pakistan and the development of the other mentioned countries.

Chapter III

US Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf's Regime and its Impacts on the Politics of KP

Overview

This chapter explains the US aid to Pakistan during Pervaiz Musharraf's regime (2001-2008) and its impacts on the politics of KP. This chapter unearths that Pakistan received a huge number of aid and funds from the great powers especially the US during the regime. The era of the nineteen nineties was not favorable for the relations of Pakistan and the US. It's already been discussed in chapter 3 that due to the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in 1989 and then the nuclear tests carried out by Pakistan in 1998, the US was indifferent towards Pakistan. Sanctions were being imposed by the US for example 'The Pressler amendment'. Moreover, during the 90s democratic setups were running the country. A thesis has already been made in Chapter 3 that US aid and assistance to the democratic regimes is negligible as compared to the non-democratic and dictatorial regimes. Thus, Pakistan in the nineteen nineties was in dire need of foreign assistance but the US was not willing to help Pakistan, instead, they tried to encircle Pakistan with sanctions to pressure them to give up on their nuclear program. When the Pakistani stakeholders did not comply with the US' wishes and tested their nuclear weapons in 1998, they faced severe consequences from the US economically as well as diplomatically.

The era of the 90s in the history of Pakistan is also characterized by several other factors such as tense civil-military relations, political instability, and economic crisis. Civil-military relations deteriorated during this era due to the Kargil War between Pakistan and India in 1999. Intense differences grew between the then Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and Chief of the Army

Staff General Pervez Musharraf which ultimately led to a coup in 1999 by Musharraf. Similarly, in the late eighties and then in the nineties two governments of PPP's Benazir Bhutto and one government of PMLN's Nawaz Sharif dismissed by the presidents of Pakistan i.e., Ghulam Ishaq Khan and Farooq Laghari respectively, making the political situation of the country unstable, chaotic, and uncertain. Later on, the political instability was cashed by General Musharraf and thus a dictatorial rule was established in Pakistan in 1999. Even though there was a military rule in Pakistan from 1999 till 2001 (after the 2001 situation changed), the US was still not interested in providing Pakistan with economic and military aid which endorses our second thesis that US aid and assistance is always attached to its associated interests rather than the needs and necessities of the recipient countries.

Musharraf's Coup in 1999

On October 12, 1999, a coup was staged by General Pervez Musharraf the then COAS (Chief of the Army Staff) of Pakistan, and a democratically elected government of Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif the then Premier of Pakistan was removed.¹³³ Nawaz Sharaf came into power as a result of the 1997 elections and ruled the country till 1997. The immediate cause of his ouster was the differences that arose because of the Kargil War of 1999. Besides, multiple other factors such as political instability, economic crisis, and corruption in the Sharif government also contributed to his ouster. In 1999, Pakistani forces without the prior permission of the civilian government infiltrated the disputed territory of Kargil. The limited standoff between Indian and Pakistani forces led to a full-blown war when Indian forces put all their strength to push back Pakistani forces. The war resulted in hundreds of casualties and

¹³³ Bidanda M. Chengappa, "Pakistan's Fourth Military Takeover ," *Strategic Analysis* 23, no. 9 (1999).

received strong condemnation from the international community.¹³⁴ Infuriated by the misadventure carried out by Musharraf, Nawaz Sharif decided to remove General Pervez Musharraf from the post of the Army chief. While Pervez Musharraf was on a tour to Sri Lanka the documents of his removal were signed by Premier Nawaz Sharif, but General Musharraf was also swift in his actions and had already taken some of the top officials of Army and intelligence in confidence and as a counter act ousted Nawaz Sharif from power.¹³⁵ Later on, Nawaz Sharif was first imprisoned and then sent to exile, thus General Pervez Musharraf became the chief executive and then the president of Pakistan ruling the country from 1999 till 2008.

9/11 Attacks and Improvement in Pak-US Ties

On September 11, 2001, a very tragic incident occurred which shook the whole world from its foundations. On the morning of September 11, 2001, four US commercial planes were hijacked by 19 terrorists. Two planes hit the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, one plane crashed with the Pentagon building in Washington, and the fourth plane fell in a field in Pennsylvania. The attack is considered one of the deadliest terrorist attacks in history. It claimed the lives of almost 3000 people, and thousands also got injured. The attacks were carried out by Al-Qaeda, an extremist Islamic militant group led by the international terrorist Osama Bin Ladin.¹³⁶ 9/11 attacks had a significant impact on America particularly and on the world generally. The then Bush (Junior) administration started a war against terror and

¹³⁴ Bruce Riedel, "How The 1999 Kargil Conflict Redefined US-India Ties," Brookings, 2019, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-1999-kargil-conflict-redefined-us-india-ties/>.

¹³⁵ Kamran Khan, "Army Stages Coup in Pakistan," *The Washington Post*, 1999.

¹³⁶ Katherine Huiskes, "THE SEPTEMBER 11 TERRORIST ATTACKS," Miller Center, accessed July 29, 2023, <https://millercenter.org/remembering-september-11/september-11-terrorist-attacks>.

thus along with allied forces invaded Afghanistan in October 2001.¹³⁷ Furthermore, intelligence sharing among countries became a new norm, security in airports and public spaces became high alert, and a new sense of urgency was felt in the whole world to counter-terrorism. All the countries including international organizations stood with the US against terrorism.

As a result of the attack on Afghanistan, within a very short period, the Taliban government was overthrown by the US and the allied forces. Although, the Taliban were directly not involved in the 9/11 attacks they provided safe havens to Osama Bin Ladin and al-Qaeda militants, and they were not willing to hand over Osama Bin Ladin to America. Thus, the Taliban also faced severe consequences lost their government in Afghanistan, and became one of the front-line enemies of the US.

As Afghanistan is the immediate neighbor of Pakistan sharing a border of 2,250 km, the US sought Pakistan's help and support in the war on terror. At that time, Musharraf was the de-facto ruler of Pakistan and he agreed to support the US. A new era of relationship between the two countries began. Pakistan became the most allied ally of the US in the war against terror.¹³⁸ The US was given air bases by Pakistan to carry out attacks against terrorists. Furthermore, a mechanism of intelligence sharing was also established. The routes used to support NATO forces materially were provided by Pakistan. As a result, Pak-US relations took a shift, once bitter opponents became close friends. Huge amounts of aid and assistance were poured into Pakistan by the US. Thus, the military regime of General Pervez Musharraf drew

¹³⁷ "Instability in Afghanistan," Council of Foreign Relations, 2023, <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/war-afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%209%2F11%20attacks.>

¹³⁸ Touqir Hussain, rep., *U.S.-Pakistan Engagement: The War on Terrorism and Beyond*, vol. 145 (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2005).

its strengths from the US' support and assistance. One of the factors which prolonged Musharraf's rule was the support of the US. Due to high flows of aid to Pakistan, a breathing space was provided to Pakistan's economy and Musharraf's regime as well. Even though Pakistan received huge amounts of US aid and assistance during the war on terror, but they were at a heavy cost. The war claimed the lives of more than 80,000 Pakistani people, it brought a flux of Afghan Migrants to Pakistan pressuring Pakistan's economy. Moreover, Pakistan was also affected by terrorism, and the peace of the country was compromised costing Pakistan heavily.

US Aid to Pakistan During Musharraf's Regime

Once again to secure its interests in the region the US started helping Pakistan generously during the war on terror. Even though a military dictator was ruling the country which is against the ideals of the US i.e., democracy, it completely ignored this fact and continued providing Pakistan with immense military and economic aid. The military dictator (Musharraf) was given a choice by the US to become either a friend of us and support us in the war on terror or otherwise be ready to face the consequences.¹³⁹ Pakistan provided the US with military bases in Sindh and Baluchistan, the bases were filled by the US with advanced arms and weapons to use in Afghanistan in the war on terror.¹⁴⁰ As wished by the US, Pakistan gravely expressed its condemnation of extremism and terrorism, the Pak-Afghan border was sealed for security purposes, and hundreds of militants belonging to Al-Qaeda and Taliban were captured and handed over to the US government by the Musharraf regime.¹⁴¹ As a result,

¹³⁹ Eamon Murphy and A. Malik, "Pakistan Jihad: The Making of Religious Terrorism.," *IPRI* 9, no. 2 (2009): 17–31.

¹⁴⁰ Abdul Salam Zaeef, *My Life with Taliban* (Melborne: Scribe, 2010).

¹⁴¹ Abbas, Hassan. *Pakistan's Drift into extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's war on terror*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2004.

Pakistan's efforts were acknowledged by the US and the world, According to Grare, Pakistan's efforts to strengthen the hands of the US against terrorism were genuine and sincere.¹⁴²

After the incident of 9/11 and the subsequent action of the US against the Afghan Taliban and Al-Qaeda, the US foreign policy took a major shift regarding Pakistan. US economic aid, military assistance, and arms sales resumed to Pakistan. Sanctions were lifted and an additional category of support i.e., the Coalition Support Fund was also founded to bolster Pakistan's efforts in countering insurgency, terrorism, and militancy within its own country. From 2001 to 2008 (which we are restricted to), Pakistan was given a large amount of US aid. Furthermore, Pakistan was praised initially for its efforts against terrorism and extremism. Pakistan was showcased as a front-line state against terrorism.

US aid to Pakistan during this era increased dramatically. Interestingly, in the 1990s the total allocation of US economic aid to Pakistan was US\$598 million, and that too was mostly in humanitarian assistance and was disbursed through certain NGOs. Similarly, aid provided to the military was only US\$7 million, and arms sale was US\$449 million. On the contrary, from 2001 to 2008, the economic aid bagged by Pakistan from the US was US\$4389.07 million indicating a significant increase in the US aid. Likewise, military assistance from 2001 to 2008 was US\$2091.59 million and arms sale was US\$1120 million. The figures are mentioned in table 1. The fluctuation in the US military aid and arms sales demonstrate that US military aid and arms sales are directly connected with its interests rather

¹⁴² Frédéric Grare, "Rethinking Western Strategies toward Pakistan: An Action Agenda for the United States and Europe," Carnegie Endowment Fund, 2007, https://carnegieendowment.org/files/grare_pakistan_final.pdf.

than the shape of democracy or the level of poverty in a country specifically in the case of Pakistan.

Table 6 US economic aid, military aid, and arms sales to Pakistan during Musharraf's regime (2001-2008)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Economic aid (US\$ millions)</i>	<i>Military aid (US\$ million)</i>	<i>US arms sales (US\$ million)</i>
2001	228.02	0.54	
2002	921.41	347.63	44
2003	371.75	304.18	24
2004	399.32	95.65	74
2005	482.47	341.41	171
2006	681.94	324.72	109
2007	678.8	319.37	395
2008	605.36	358.09	303

Source: USAID (2018) and SIPRI (2022)

In addition to economic aid, military aid, and arms sale the US also provided Pakistan with other kinds of aid i.e., the Coalition Support Fund (CSF). The aim and objective of this type of aid was to compensate Pakistan for the efforts that they were performing within its own country against terrorist networks, militants, extremists, and their hideouts in the border area with Afghanistan. According to a report by the US Department of Defense, it has claimed that the US has given Pakistan US\$5.6 billion to compensate Pakistan for its efforts such as

logistical support, actions against terrorism, and intelligence-based operations (IBOs).¹⁴³ The report has further praised the efforts taken by Pakistan against the militants of Al-Qaeda, and other such groups and networks. It endorsed the sacrifices of the people of Pakistan and its military in the wake of the war on terror. The report says that Pakistani forces lost the lives of 1,400 personnel while fighting with the militants.¹⁴⁴ As per the report, the US has reimbursed Pakistan for its efforts via compensations such as the Coalition Support Fund. The details of the CSF are given in detail in Table 3 below.

Table 7 Coalition Support Fund (CSF) to Pakistan from 2002-2008

<i>Year</i>	<i>Amount (in US\$ millions)</i>
2002	1,169
2003	1,247
2004	705
2005	964
2006	862
2007	731
2008	1,019

Source: the politics Of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid allocation and delivery from Truman to Trump

To sum up, the economic aid, military aid, arms sale, and CSF provided to Pakistan during Musharraf’s regime was because of the factor of the threat of terrorism. This period greatly resembles the period of the Cold War when the US wanted to contain and counter the

¹⁴³ “Fiscal Year 2009 Global War on Terror Bridge Request,” US Department of Defense, 2008, https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/fy2009/Supplemental/FY2009_Global_War_On_Terror_Bridge_Request.pdf.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

threat of communism in the region. The US changed its policy towards Pakistan after the 9/11 attacks and provided them with huge financial support not because they realized the gravity of the economic crisis in Pakistan but because they needed Pakistan as they needed it against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in the 1980s. Interestingly, neither the atrocious Zia nor the dictator Musharraf bothered the US.

The US Aid and its Impacts on the Politics of KP (2001-2008)

Although there is no direct relation between the US Aid and the politics of KP, however, their relationship can easily be established indirectly. In that sense, the US Aid has many impacts on the politics of KP specifically and on the politics of Pakistan generally. The impacts of US aid on the politics of KP are positive as well as negative. As we have already discussed in the above paragraphs US aid especially military aid to Pakistan increased manyfold during the war on terror and the regime of Pervez Musharraf. In the following paragraphs, we are going to provide a detailed analysis of how US aid impacted the overall politics of KP.

US Aid and Militancy in KP: Affecting KP Politics

The primary driver behind US aid to Pakistan during the rule of Musharraf was to counter extremism and militancy in the tribal region of Pakistan. Therefore, there are two contradicting views regarding US Aid and militancy. One group believes that US aid helped Pakistan's security forces counter terrorism and militancy in the tribal region of Pakistan effectively. They argue that the CSF provided to Pakistan bolstered its military apparatus, intelligence gathering, and law enforcement agencies to root out terrorists from the land of the tribal areas and KP.¹⁴⁵ On the contrary, there is a group of scholars specifically the local

¹⁴⁵ Touqir Hussain, rep., *U.S.-Pakistan Engagement: The War on Terrorism and Beyond*, vol. 145 (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2005).

population of the tribal areas who believe that the operations carried out with the economic and military support of the US-instigated militancy, extremism, and terrorism in the tribal region of Pakistan. One of the staunch supporters of this view is the former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan. One of the factors behind his party's success in the 2013 general elections of KP was his opposition to US-backed operations and drone strikes in tribal regions thus directly affecting the political landscape of KP. One of his slogans during the election campaign was the opposition to military operations in the tribal building.¹⁴⁶

US Aid Affecting the Political Landscape of KP

As the point has already been made most of the impacts of US Aid on the politics of KP during Musharraf's rule were indirect. With the help and support of US military aid, economic aid, and arms sales, Pakistan launched various operations in KP and tribal regions such as Operation Enduring Freedom (2001-2002), Operation Al Mizan (2002-2006), Operation Zalzala (2008), Operations Sher Dil, Rah-e-Haq, and Rah-e-Rast (2007-2009), and Operation Rah-e-Nijat, but it was launched in 2009-10.¹⁴⁷ As a result of these operations different viewpoints developed regarding the Tehreek-e-Taliban (TTPP) and other militant groups in the political parties of KP. Some believed that instead of carrying out operations and taking military actions the state of Pakistan must engage the groups in dialogue and solve should resolve their outstanding issues on the negotiating table. On the other hand, some political parties staunchly supported the military operations in KP and argued that the enemies of peace must be dealt with an iron hand. The political parties that supported the former

¹⁴⁶ "PTI against the Military Operation in NW: Imran Khan," *Dawn News*, 2012, <https://www.dawn.com/news/742610/pti-against-the-military-operation-in-nw-imran-khan>.

¹⁴⁷ Zahid Ali Khan. "Military Operations in FATA and PATA: Implications for Pakistan." *Strategic Studies* 31/32 (2011): 129–46. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48527641>.

viewpoint included Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI)¹⁴⁸, Jamaat-e-Islami (JI), Jamiat ulema-e-Pakistan F (JUI-F), Jamiat ulema-e-Islam S (JUI-S) or jointly known as Mutahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA).¹⁴⁹ The political Parties that supported the latter view of handling the militants and terrorist groups with an iron hand included Awami National Party (ANP), Pakistan People's Party (PPP), and MQM all secular parties.¹⁵⁰ In short, the operations carried out due to US Aid created dissenting voices in the politics of KP.

US Aid Impacting Civil-Military Relations

From 2001 to 2008, US aid to Pakistan's military amounted to US\$7.9 billion as compared to US\$3.1 billion in economic and development assistance including food aid.¹⁵¹ The military as a result of operations became stronger and civilian intuitions were undermined during the war on terror (2001-2008). During this period, the civil-military relations concerning military operations in FATA and KP remained disturbed. From 2002-2007 MMA remained in power in Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP) now called KP. The MMA was an alliance of Islamist parties that supported the cause of Islamic law. Likewise, the militant groups and terrorist organizations operating in FATA and KP at that time also wanted a system based on Shariah law. Thus, the ultimate aim and objective of both factions coincided with each other. Bear in mind, that the major difference between the two was that the former wanted to strive for an Islamic state but within the constitutional premises of the state of Pakistan while the

¹⁴⁸ Asad Munir, "Imran Khan's Flawed Logic on the War on Terror," *The Express Tribune*, 2012, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/324147/imran-khans-flawed-logic-on-the-war-on-terror>.

¹⁴⁹ Zeeshan Haidar, "Pakistani Islamists in Disarray before Elections," Reuters, 2007, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-islamists-idUSISL32970020071214>.

¹⁵⁰ M Ilyas Khan, "Pakistan Election: Taliban Threats Hamper Secular Campaign," BBC, 2013, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-22022951>.

¹⁵¹ "U.S. Aid to Pakistan by the Numbers," CAP, 2008, <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/u-s-aid-to-pakistan-by-the-numbers/>.

latter wanted to enforce it via violent struggle and bloodshed.¹⁵² Consequently, the MMA government at that time was against military operations thus causing a rift in civil-military relations.¹⁵³

Radicalization and its Impacts on Democracy in KP

The aim and objective of the US aid to Pakistan was to counter terrorism and extremism in FATA and KP, however, because of drone strikes, landmines, and military operations thousands of unarmed civilians lost their lives.¹⁵⁴ As a result, frustration and resentment grew in the local population who lost their loved ones. They started doubting the policies of government and their belief in democracy shattered. They become radicalized challenging the state institutions and thus badly impacting democracy and elected institutions in FATA and KP.¹⁵⁵

Loss of Government Writ

Before the military operations in Swat and Malakand Division the writ of the state was jeopardized significantly. As the people were indoctrinated with extremist ideology the state of Pakistan was shown as the friend of an enemy i.e., the US. Many of the locals condemned Pakistan's security forces for betrayal and declared them as infidels. They believed that killing a security personnel is equal to killing a member of an enemy's army.¹⁵⁶ The outlawed groups

¹⁵² Abdul Sayed, "The Evolution and Future of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2021, <https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/12/21/evolution-and-future-of-tehrik-e-taliban-pakistan-pub-86051>.

¹⁵³ "Kabul Wants Pakistan to Withdraw Forces," Aljazeera, 2003, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2003/6/24/kabul-wants-pakistan-to-withdraw-forces>.

¹⁵⁴ Abbasi, Nadia Mushtaq. "Impact of Terrorism on Pakistan." *Strategic Studies* 33, no. 2 (2013): 33–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48527612>.

¹⁵⁵ Nadia Mushtaq Abbasi, *Impacts of Terrorism on Pakistan*, accessed August 7, 2023, https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1393573242_59579987.pdf.

¹⁵⁶ Shamil Shams, "The Clash of Narratives Swat Military Operation against the Taliban" (Islamabad: SDPI, 2011).

were in a strong position to challenge the writ of the state. According to a study that was conducted by the British Broadcasting (BBC) in 2009, 24% area of FATA and some other areas of the then NWFP were in the control of the militants. Similarly, music was banned, school-going girls, school buildings, military convoys, barber shops, police stations, and the homes of the artists were the primary targets of the militants and the law enforcement agencies seemed helpless.¹⁵⁷

The emergence of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement (PTM)

Although Pashtun Tahafuz Movement an influential pressure group and a to-be political party emerged in 2014, its roots can be found in the time when military operations in FATA and KP were taking place. Initially, in 2014, when it came into existence the movement was called ‘The Mehsud Tahafuz Movement’.¹⁵⁸ The movement raises its voice against the state’s oppression and suppression of Pashtuns. Similarly, one of their demands is to investigate the extrajudicial killings of Pashtuns and to produce the disappeared persons before the courts of Pakistan. Their ideology is that of non-violence and peaceful agitations.¹⁵⁹ The movement strongly opposes the Pakistan military as well as terrorists and militants. They believe that the Pakistani military as well as the extremists and terrorists are equally responsible for the unrest in Pashtun regions.¹⁶⁰ Initially, the movement was restricted to FATA but after the extra-

¹⁵⁷ “The Cost of Conflict in Pakistan,” Humanitarian Library, accessed August 6, 2023, <https://www.humanitarianlibrary.org/sites/default/files/2014/02/Cost-of-Conflict-in-Pakistan.pdf>

¹⁵⁸ Qamar Jafri, rep., *The Pashtun Protection Movement (PTM) in Pakistan*, vol. 8 (Washington D.C, US: International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, 2021).

¹⁵⁹ Ilam Khan, “The PTM: A Nonviolent Movement for Protection of Pashtun Rights in Pakistan,” ICNC, 2018, https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/blog_post/ptm-nonviolent-movement-protection-pashtun-rights-pakistan/.

¹⁶⁰ Madiha Afzal, “Why Is Pakistan’s Military Repressing a Huge, Nonviolent Pashtun Protest Movement? ,” Brookings, 2020, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-is-pakistans-military-repressing-a-huge-nonviolent-pashtun-protest-movement/>.

judicial murder of an aspiring model in Karachi Naqeeb ullah Mehsud, the movement spread into other parts of the country including KP.¹⁶¹

The movement has great significance in the politics of KP. It is in a position to mold public opinions and draw people out of their homes. Similarly, some scholars argue that it has now become a force that has the potential and ability to put pressure on both the military and the government of Pakistan. Furthermore, some scholars also attribute the merger of FATA with the KP and think that in future policies regarding Pashtuns and the region, the movement will be kept in mind.¹⁶²

The Sidelineing of ANP and the Rise of PTI

As already discussed, during the war on terror different political parties had different approaches towards the militants as well as towards the state-led military actions in the region. Out of these, ANP and PTI are worth discussing. ANP, a Pashtoon nationalist party adopted a very hard approach towards the TTP and other militants in FATA and former PATA. They wanted them to be rooted out and thus they were in full support of the state-led military operations against these terrorist outfits.¹⁶³ As a result, the party was the main target of terrorist attacks. ANP sacrificed hundreds of its workers and leaders at the hands of brutal terrorist attacks.¹⁶⁴ As a continuation of this bitter enmity between the militant groups and ANP, they were not able to wage their election campaign for the general elections of 2013 and thus lost to

¹⁶¹ Ishtiaq Ahmed, "Emergence of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement," *Daily Times*, 2018, <https://dailytimes.com.pk/227740/emergence-of-the-pashtun-tahafuz-movement/>.

¹⁶² Dr. Sudha Ramachandran, Hamsini Hariharan, and Shibani Mehta, "Impact of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement on Pakistan's Political Landscape" (Takshashila Institution, 2018).

¹⁶³ Heba Islam, "ANP and the Taliban: A Violent Relationship," *The Express Tribune*, 2012, <https://tribune.com.pk/story/483311/anp-and-the-taliban---a-violent-relationship>.

¹⁶⁴ "Pakistani Taliban Target ANP Leaders during Election Campaign," *The Guardian*, 2013, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/apr/14/pakistani-taliban-target-anp-leaders>.

PTI.¹⁶⁵ Consequently, during all this time PTI, who had a soft corner for TTP and other terrorist outfits rose to the scene of Politics in KP. They won the provincial elections of 2013 in KP. At that time, they were provided with an open ground to disseminate their manifesto and launch their election with full zeal and zest without any hurdles.¹⁶⁶

US Aid and Local Government

As US aid primarily supports democratic ideals, peace, and government at the grassroots level it encouraged General Pervez Musharraf to bring a local government system in Pakistan including KP. In 2000, a devolution power plan was proposed by General Musharraf. According to the plan, a three-tier government was proposed including the Union Council, then the Tehsil Council, and finally the District Council, and elections were held in 2000-2001 on a non-party basis. As a result, government institutions were made responsible to the District Council, and the gap between the president and the local representatives was reduced through institutions such as the National Reconstruction Bureau and the Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment.¹⁶⁷ The system empowered the local representatives which depicts the true spirit of democracy. According to Musharraf, the plan was to empower the destitute. Moreover, the plan was proposed in 2000 but it was executed during the Musharraf rule i.e., 2000-2008 and even onwards. Thus, it was something positive that was facilitated by US aid and support.

¹⁶⁵ Reza Jan, "Taliban Violence Mars Pakistan's Elections," Critical Threats, 2013, <https://www.criticalthreats.org/analysis/taliban-violence-mars-pakistans-elections>.

¹⁶⁶ Jason Burke, "Imran Khan Reaches out to Young Voters with 'third-Way' in Pakistan's General Election," *The Guardian*, 2013, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/03/imran-khan-pakistan-voters>.

¹⁶⁷ "Devolution in Pakistan: Reform or Regression?," Crisis Group, 2004, <https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/devolution-pakistan-reform-or-regression-0>.

The IDPs and their Impacts on Politics

As a result of the military operations in Provincially Administered Tribal Areas (PATA) and FATA, a huge number of its inhabitants abandoned their homes and moved to other settled areas of KP or other parts of Pakistan. An estimated number of 2.7 million people were internally displaced.¹⁶⁸ These Internally Displaced People lost their homes, businesses, and livelihoods thus affecting the politics, economy, and social fabric of KP particularly and Pakistan generally. Remember, when a large-scale exodus took place Malakand division and Swat they were unable to find shelters, food, and other necessary provisions. Similarly, they felt alienated and humiliated as it is in the Pashtun blood that they do not tolerate humiliation at any cost so resentment against the government and political forces automatically created. The IDPs were wary of the then government and political representatives.¹⁶⁹

US Aid and Women's Participation in Politics

Although females are 49.2% of the total population of Pakistan¹⁷⁰, they are still underrepresented in politics.¹⁷¹ Furthermore, Article 25 of the constitution of Pakistan fully guarantees the equality of every gender before the law.¹⁷² The situation of peace created after the 9/11 attacks and the subsequent provision of US aid and then the militancy and military operations in KP significantly reduced the participation of women in politics. In the general

¹⁶⁸ Saira Bano Orakzai, "The War Against Terror and the Issue of Internally Displaced People in Pakistan in the post 9/11 Period," *Journal of Internal Displacement* 2, no. 1 (2012): 67–78.

¹⁶⁹ Najm U Din, "Internal Displacement in Pakistan: Contemporary Challenges," Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, 2010, <https://www.humanitarianlibrary.org/sites/default/files/2014/02/22.pdf>.

¹⁷⁰ "UN Women Pakistan," UN Women Asia and the Pacific, accessed August 6, 2023, <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/countries/pakistan>.

¹⁷¹ Shazia Mehboob Tanoli, "Gendered Politics Prevail," *TMagazine* (The Express Tribune, 2022), <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2342240/gendered-politics-prevail>.

¹⁷² Niaz a. Shah, "Chapter 5. Gender Equality and the 1973 Constitution," *Women, the Koran and International Human Rights Law*, 2006, 109–26, <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004152373.i-263.42>.

elections of 2008, only 15% of the registered women voters cast their votes.¹⁷³ On the contrary, in the general elections of 2013 according to Free and Fair Election Network (FAFEN), the turnout of women registered voters was 46.10%.¹⁷⁴ The data clearly shows that as compared to 2008, when militancy, terrorism as well as military operations were on the way the turnout of women voters was significantly low as compared to the general elections of 2013 when things were getting better.

US Aid and Weakened Governance in KP

The 9/11 attacks and then Pakistan's alliance with the US against the war on terror, and finally the launching of military operations against Al-Qaeda, TTP, and other militant organizations in FATA and PATA (Provincially Administered Tribal Areas) with the full help and support of the US caused a weakness in the governance of Pakistan's government. The major reason behind the weakening of governance in FATA and PATA was the growing instability and situation of peace in the region. The writ of the government was challenged, its institutions and offices were targeted, and civilian supremacy was jeopardized by the violent actions of the militant organizations in the region.¹⁷⁵ Although governance was improved and restored when the military operations launched by Pakistan ended during the time of militancy it was a huge challenge for the government of Pakistan to make its governance stronger and effective.

¹⁷³ Heba Islam, "Women Voters Can Transform Electoral Politics- If given the Chance," *Dawn*, 2013, <https://www.dawn.com/news/811871/women-voters-can-transform-electoral-politics-if-given-the-chance>.

¹⁷⁴ rep., *FAFEN Observation of General Election 2013: Key Findings and Recommendations*, 1st ed. (Islamabad, ICT: FAFEN, 2013).

¹⁷⁵ Nasreen Akhtar, "Polarized Politics: The Challenges of Democracy in Pakistan," *International Journal on World Peace* 26, no. 2 (2009): 31–63, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752885>.

Conclusion

When Musharraf took over the government and ousted the elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in 1999, his action received due condemnation from the West including the US and was termed as an illegitimate act. But, after two years the incident of 9/11 occurred, and the West including the US staunchly supported Musharraf economically as well as diplomatically. It was because, at that moment the US needed full support of Pakistan. As a compensation, Pakistan was flooded with US aid. The aim and objective of the aid was to counter terrorism in the tribal belt and the then NWFP. The Musharraf regime also proved its loyalty by launching various military operations in FATA and the then PATA. The operations waged with the full help and support of the US had several ramifications including political. One thing should be kept in mind that the consequences that were later faced by the province of KP were not the direct result of US Aid however, the relationship between the consequences of the militancy and military operations in the region can easily be established indirectly i.e., the actions taken by Pakistan's military were the output of the US aid provided to the military regime. Some of the very significant impacts of the US Aid on the politics of KP included weak civilian control, the dominance of the military, the rise of PTM, the rise of PTI, the decline of ANP, Political polarization, deterioration of democracy, impacts on voting behavior and the emergence of a devolution power plan. Bear in mind, that all the political developments that took place at the time of military operations cannot be termed as negative in fact, some key developments shaped the future of the province positively for example, the conquest of Pakistan's army against militants, developmental projects related to health, education, and infrastructure. Overall, the aid affected the politics of the province negatively as well as positively.

Conclusion

The study carried out addressed four important aspects of the US aid to Pakistan. First and foremost, US aid to Pakistan was seen through the prism of history. In the pursuit of this, many important developments closely related to Pak-US relations particularly for aid were analyzed. Many ups and downs regarding the US aid were discussed because there were times in history when Pakistan strived for foreign assistance but was not provided with it, similarly, in the past even Pakistan did not even ask for it but was flooded with aid. The chapter clearly states two very important theses i.e., 1) the US aid to Pakistan is interest-driven rather than need-based 2) the US aid to Pakistan during military regimes is far higher than that of civilian and democratically elected regimes of Pakistan.

Secondly, a comparative approach was also adopted to compare countries that are similar in so many ways to Pakistan, for example concerning geostrategic position, US aid recipients, and military intervention. Countries such as Turkey, Taiwan, Indonesia, Israel, and South Korea were deeply analyzed. It was found that the aforementioned countries were once the recipients of US aid, similarly, all of them are strategically important, and finally, all of them have powerful militaries but still unlike Pakistan they managed to become independent politically as well as economically. Moreover, democracy is also flourishing in these countries. The study showcases that the primary reason behind this huge difference between Pakistan and these countries is that they utilized aid to build their democratic institutions and industries. On the contrary, Pakistan's only focus remained its security.

Finally, the study discusses the US aid to Pakistan during the era of Musharraf and its impacts on the politics of the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The study found that this was the era when Pakistan received the most aid from the US. The aim and objective of the aid in this era was to counter terrorism in the Tribal as well as KP region. Military operations were

initiated in this era with the help and support of the US. Some of the key developments as a result of high US aid to the military of Pakistan and the subsequent military actions against extremists and terrorists were; the dominance of military over civilians, disturbed civil-military relations, internal displacements, rise of PTI and PTM, decline of ANP, and finally the impacts military operations on the women participation in elections during the war on terror and after the restoration of peace in the region.

Findings

Due to the US aid, the institution of the military has been strengthened over the history of Pakistan. If looked at from a critical perspective the US aid has bolstered the military regimes in Pakistan. The regimes have drawn its strength as well as longevity from the US aid. For instance, if there was no US support to Ayub Khan, he would not have ruled the country for 11 long years. Similarly, the military dictatorship of Zia was also prolonged due to an immense amount of aid from the US during the Afghan Jihad. He also ruled the country for 11 years. Finally, General Pervez Musharraf, another military dictatorship ruled Pakistan for approximately 9 years during the war on terror. Once again, his rule was strengthened as well as prolonged due to US aid. In a nutshell, historically, one of the factors behind strong military regimes in Pakistan is the influence of US aid and support.

The US aid to Pakistan has immense impacts on its politics especially on the politics of KP. The impacts are positive as well as negative, in fact, the magnitude of negativity surpasses that of positivity. Over the US aid, military operations have been carried out in areas such as former FATA and PATA, these operations on the one hand have rooted out terrorism but on the other hand created numerous other problems such as the issue of IDPs, extremism, marginalization, loss of capital, and loss of human lives etc. These issues hugely impacted the social, political, as well as economic fabric of KP.

As compared to Pakistan there are other aid recipient countries such as Turkey, Taiwan, Indonesia, Israel, and South Korea; these countries utilized the aid for economic development and today they are on the path of development. Some of the aid recipients such as South Korea, Israel, and Taiwan have now become aid donors. These countries have utilized US aid for the long-term betterment of their economies and have pulled themselves out of the swamps of debts and aid. They mostly invested the funds in sectors such as industries, IT, health, and education which is paying them off in the shape of economic development.

The aid provided to Pakistan by the US is interest-driven rather than the needs of Pakistan, for example during the 1965 and 1971 wars with India, the US did not help Pakistan. Similarly, right after the defeat of the USSR in 1989, the US abandoned Pakistan completely and even imposed sanctions. At that time, the nuclear program of Pakistan was in great danger because Pakistan was a country heavily dependent upon the US, but they were not willing to help Pakistan. Hence proved, the US only helps a state when they have some national interest behind it. Moreover, this also endorses the fact that though the US supports idealism theoretically, but in practice they follow the ideology and theory of realism.

Policy Recommendations

- Instead of providing heavy amounts of military aid, the US should channel the aid towards civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- Funds must be provided to support free and fair elections in Pakistan. Aid should be used for the education of the voter.
- Through aid, internal elections within the political parties must be ensured.
- Funds should be allocated for the promotion of free press and media.
- Training for journalists must be organized with the help and support of US aid.
- Reforms in the judiciary should not only be encouraged but also supported by US aid.

- A portion of US aid should be allocated to the local governments and decentralization of power must be appreciated.
- More investment by the US is needed in fields such as civic education etc.
- Youth should be engaged in initiatives that promote critical thinking and pragmatism.
- Efforts are needed by the US aid to address the menace of corruption. Special units aided by US assistance must be formed to combat corruption.
- Instead of temporary projects the US aid must be channeled towards economic development. Industries should be erected with the help of the US aid and assistance.
- A mechanism for the auditing of US aid must also be established.
- Cyber security and digital literacy must also be focused through US aid.
- Every stakeholder in the state of Pakistan must be taken in confidence while allocating aid to different segments.
- Women's participation in politics should be encouraged as well as supported.
- To improve democracy funds should be allocated for programs that target interfaith harmony.
- Teams should be made through US aid to supervise elections.
- Long-term capacity building of government institutions, political parties, and civil society must be focused upon.
- Pakistan should also learn from other aid recipient countries such as Indonesia, Taiwan, Israel, South Korea, and Turkey that how they utilized the aid to bring economic development as well as economic independence.

Bibliography

Books

Abbas, Hassan. *Pakistan's Drift into extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's war on terror*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2004.

Ali, Murad. *The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan: Aid Allocation and Delivery from Truman to Trump*. Routledge, 2019.

Haqqani, Hussain. *Magnificent delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an epic history of misunderstanding*. New York, New York: Public Affairs, 2013.

Jackson, et al., *Contemporary State Terrorism Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Jones, Owen Bennett. *Pakistan: Eye of the Storm*. Yale University Press, 2002.

Kux, Dennis. *The United States and Pakistan, 1947–2000: Disenchanted allies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Morgenthau, Hans J., Kenneth Thompson, and David Clinton. *Politics Among Nations*. 7th ed. McGraw-Hill Education, 2005.

Paul, Thazha Varkey, *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014). *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World*. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Polit, et al. *Study guide to accompany Sixth edition of nursing research: Principles and methods*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1999.

Zaeef, Abdul Salam. *My life with Taliban*. Melbourne: Scribe, 2010.

Journal Articles

Abbasi, Nadia Mushtaq. "Impact of Terrorism on Pakistan." *Strategic Studies* 33, no. 2 (2013): 33–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48527612>.

Abbasi, Nadia Mushtaq. Impacts of terrorism on Pakistan. Accessed August 7, 2023. https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1393573242_59579987.pdf.

Akhtar, Nasreen. "Polarized Politics: the Challenge of Democracy in Pakistan. *International Journal on World Peace* 26, no. 2 (2009): 31–63. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752885>.

Akhtar, Shahnaz. "Dynamics of USA-Pakistan Relations in the Post 9/11 Period: Hurdles and Future Prospects ." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2, no. 11 (June 2012): 205–13.

Ali, Murad. "US aid to Pakistan and democracy." *Policy Perspectives* (2009): 119-132. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42909240>

Ali, Murad. "US Aid to Pakistan during the Tenures of Democrat and Republican Administrations." *IPRI Journal* 16, no. 2 (2016): 31-48.

Ali, Murad. "US foreign aid to Pakistan and democracy: An overview." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 29, no. 2 (2009): 247-258.

Ali, Murad. "Aid and Human Rights: The Case of US Aid to Israel." *Policy Perspectives: The Journal of the Institute of Policy Studies* 15, no. 3 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.13169/polipers.15.3.0029>.

- Ali, Murad. "US Foreign Aid to Pakistan and Democracy: An Overview." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 29, no. 2 (2009): 247–58.
- Anwar, Mumtaz, and Katharina Michaelowa. "The political economy of US aid to Pakistan." *Review of Development Economics* 10, no. 2 (2006): 195-209.
- Aspinall, Edward. "Elections and the Normalization of Politics in Indonesia." *South East Asia Research* 13, no. 2 (2005): 117–56.
- Azmi, M. Raziullah. "Pakistan-United States Relations: An Appraisal." *Pakistan Horizon* 36, no. 3 (2014): 37–50. <https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/41393672>.
- Bangash, Zafar. "Disastrous Consequences of Military Rule in Pakistan." *Crescent International* 51, no. 6, 2022.
- Baxter, Craig. "The United States and Pakistan: The Zia Era and the Afghan Connection." *Friendly Tyrants*, 1991, 479–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-21676-5_22.
- Chengappa, Bidanda M. "Pakistan's Fourth Military Takeover ." *Strategic Analysis* 23, no. 9 (1999).
- Chung, Chien Peng. "Democratization in South Korea and Inter-Korean Relations." *Pacific Affairs* 76, no. 1 (2003): 9–35.
- Faiz, Muhammad Aslam, Muhammad Akbar Malik, and Khalil UR Rehman. "Pak-US Collaboration on Afghanistan and USSR War 1979 to 1988." *Pakistan Social Sciences Review* 3, no. 1 (June 2019): 305–17.

Hassan, Zubeida. "Pakistan's Relations with the U.S.S.R. in the 1960s." *The World Today* 25, no. 1 (January 1969): 26–35. <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/40394188>.

Hill, Hal. "What's Happened to Poverty and Inequality in Indonesia over Half a Century?" *Asian Development Review* 38, no. 1 (2021): 68–97. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1162/adev_a_00158.

Husain, Syed Adil. "Politics of Alliance and Aid: A Case Study of Pakistan (1954-1966)." *Pakistan Horizon* 32, no. 1/2 (1979): 11-46.

Iqbal, Muhrunnisa Hatim, and Mehrunnisa Iqbal. "PAKISTAN—FOREIGN AID AND FOREIGN POLICY." *Pakistan Horizon* 25, no. 4 (1972): 54–71.

Jabeen, Mussarat, and Muhammad Saleem Mazhar. "SECURITY GAME: SEATO and CENTO as Instrument of Economic and Military Assistance to Encircle Pakistan." *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 1, 49 (2011): 109–32. <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/41762426>.

Javaid, Umbreen, and Imrana Mushtaq. "Historical Perspective of Pakistan USA Relations; Lessons for Pakistan." *Asian Studies* 29, no. 1 (July 2014): 291–304. https://doi.org/http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/csas/PDF/22%20Imrana%20Mushtaq_2_9_1.pdf.

Joffé, E.G.H. "Relations between the Middle East and the West." *Middle East Journal* 48, no. 2 (1994): 250–67.

Jr., Joseph S. Nye. "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy*, 1990, 153–71.

Khan, Muhammad Zafrulla, and John K. Emmerson. "United States-Pakistan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement (May 19, 1954)." *Middle East Journal* 8, no. 3 (1954): 338–40.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4322618>.

Khan, Mustafa Ali. "THE IMPACT OF AMERICAN AID ON PAKISTAN." *Pakistan Horizon*, 4, 12 (1959): 346–56.

Khan, Zahid Ali. "Military Operations in FATA and PATA: Implications for Pakistan." *Strategic Studies* 31/32 (2011): 129–46. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48527641>.

Khilji, Nasir M., and Ernest M. Zampelli. "The fungibility of US assistance to developing countries and the impact on recipient expenditures: a case study of Pakistan." *World Development* 19, no. 8 (1991): 1095-1105.

Kumar, Madhurendra. "AMERICAN STRATEGY IN SOUTH ASIA FROM COLD WAR TO POST-COLDWAR." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 63, no. 3 (2006): 605–16.

Liu, et al. "The-Strategic-Purposes-of-the-Post-9/11-US-Foreign-Aid-to-Pakistan-and-Its-Impacts 7, no. 2 (May 2019): 50–66.

Mahmood, Tehmina. "Pressler Amendment and Pakistan's Security Concerns." *Pakistan Horizon* 47, no. 4 (1994): 97–107.

Mohsin, Muhammad. "Geographical and Geostrategic Importance of Pakistan in Global Perspective." *ResearchGate*, November 2020.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349105200_Geographical_and_Geostrategic_Importance_of_Pakistan_in_Global_Perspective.

Murphy, Eamon, and A. Malik. "Pakistan Jihad: The Making of Religious Terrorism." *IPRI* 9, no. 2 (2009): 17–31.

Orakzai, Saira Bano. "The war against terror and the issue of internally displaced people in Pakistan in the post 9/11 period." *Journal of Internal Displacement* 2, no. 1 (2012): 67–78.

Paul, T.V. "Influence through Arms Transfers: Lessons from the US–Pakistani Relationship." *Asian Survey* 32, no. 12 (1992): 1078–92.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2645039>.

Qazi, Shehzad H. "US-Pakistan Relation: Common and clashing interests." *World Affs.* 175 (2012): 71.

Ramachandran, Dr. Sudha, Hamsini Hariharan, and Shibani Mehta. "Impact of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement on Pakistan's Political Landscape." *Takshashila Institution*, 2018.

Riddle, R. William. "Indonesia's Democratic Past and Future." *Comparative Politics* 24, no. 4 (1992): 443–62. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/422154>.

Riedel, Bruce. *Deadly embrace: Pakistan, America and the future of the global jihad*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2012.

Rizvi, Nusrat Fatima, and Anil Khamis. "Review of DFID and USAID initiatives for the development of teacher education in Pakistan." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 50, no. 8 (2020): 1210-1221.

- Sarwar, Adeeba, Mushtaq Hassan, and Tahir Mehmood. "Foreign Aid and Governance in Pakistan." *Pakistan Economic and Social Review* 53, no. 2 (2015): 149–76.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26153255>.
- Schubert, Gunter. "Taiwan's Political Evolution from Authoritarianism to Democracy and the Development of Cross-Strait Relations." *European Perspectives on Taiwan*, 2012, 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-94303-9_4.
- Shah, Niaz a. "Chapter 5. Gender Equality and the 1973 Constitution." *Women, the Koran and International Human Rights Law*, 2006, 109–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004152373.i-263.42>.
- Shams, Shamil. "The Clash of Narratives Swat Military Operation against the Taliban." Islamabad: SDPI, 2011.
- Siddiqui, Tabinda, and Arif Mehmood. "Perception and Reality of Pakistan's India Centric Foreign Policy." *Quarterly Journal Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad* 40, no. 2 (2020): 1–22.
- Soherwordi, Hussain Shaheed. "Pakistan-US Policies on the 'War on Terror' and the Taliban: Allies at Loggerheads." *Pakistan Horizon* 63, no. 2 (2010): 51–67.
- Thakur, Ramesh. "India and the Soviet Union: Conjunctions and Disjunctions of Interests." *Asian Survey*, 1991, 826–46.
- Thapliyal, Sangeeta. "Indo-Pak Conflict and the Role of External Powers." *Strategic Analysis* 22, no. 7 (October 1998).
https://doi.org/https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/olj/sa/sa_98ths01.html.

Thornton, Thomas Perry. "Between the Stools?: U.S. Policy towards Pakistan during the Carter Administration." *Asian Survey* 22, no. 10 (October 1982): 959–77.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2643754>.

Waheed, Ahmed Waqas. "Pakistan's Dependence and US Patronage." *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs* 4, no. 1 (2017): 69–94.

Wahid, K.H. Abdurrahman. "Indonesia's Mild Secularism." *SAIS Review* 21, no. 2 (2001): 25–28.

Weinbaum, Marvin G. "War and Peace in Afghanistan: The Pakistani Role." *Middle East Journal* 45, no. 1 (1991): 71–85.

Wezeman, Pieter D., Justine Gadon, and Siemon T. Wezeman. Trends in international arms transfers, 2022, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.55163/cpns8443>.

Wilder, Andrew. "Aid and stability in Pakistan: lessons from the 2005 earthquake response." *Disasters* 34 (2010): S406-S426.

Wriggins, W. Howard. "Pakistan's Search for a Foreign Policy after the Invasion of Afghanistan." *Pacific Affairs* 57, no. 2 (1984): 284–303.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2759129>.

ZAIDI, S AKBAR. "Who Benefits from US Aid to Pakistan?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 46, no. 32 (August 2012): 103–9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23017764>.

Newspapers Articles

"Pakistani Taliban Target ANP Leaders during Election Campaign." *The Guardian*. 2013.

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/apr/14/pakistani-taliban-target-anp-leaders>.

“Poverty: 60.3% Pakistanis Living on \$2 a Day.” *The Express Tribune*. 2015.

“PTI against the Military Operation in NW: Imran Khan.” *Dawn News*, 2012.

<https://www.dawn.com/news/742610/pti-against-the-military-operation-in-nw-imran-khan>.

“Sixty Years of US Aid to Pakistan: Get the Data.” *The Guardian*. Accessed July 12, 2023.

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jul/11/us-aid-to-pakistan>.

Ahmed, Ishtiaq. “Emergence of the Pashtun Tahafuz Movement.” *Daily Times*, 2018.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/227740/emergence-of-the-pashtun-tahafuz-movement/>.

Awan, Zamir Ahmed. “China-Pakistan: A Journey of Friendship (1950-2020).” *Global Times*, May 21, 2020.

Dalrymple, William. “The Great Divide.” *The New Yorker*, 2015.

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/29/the-great-divide-books-dalrymple>.

Ephron, Dan. “How Arab Ties With Israel Became the Middle East’s New Normal.” *Foreign Policy*, 2020. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/12/21/arab-ties-israel-diplomacy-normalization-middle-east/>.

Fair, C.C. “The U.S.-Pakistan F-16 Fiasco.” *Foreign Policy*, February 3, 2011.

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/02/03/the-u-s-pakistan-f-16-fiasco/>.

Haqqani, Husain. “The Deep Roots of Pakistan’s Terrorism Crisis.” *Foreign Policy*, 2023.

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2023/03/03/pakistan-terrorism-crisis-inconsistent-policy-military-economy/>.

Islam, Heba. "ANP and the Taliban: A Violent Relationship." *The Express Tribune*. 2012.

<https://tribune.com.pk/story/483311/anp-and-the-taliban—a-violent-relationship>.

Islam, Heba. "Women Voters Can Transform Electoral Politics- If given the Chance." *Dawn* ,

2013. <https://www.dawn.com/news/811871/women-voters-can-transform-electoral-politics-if-given-the-chance>.

Kamal, Sauleha. "The Politics of US Aid to Pakistan." *The Express Tribune*, 2016.

<https://tribune.com.pk/story/1120372/politics-us-aid-pakistan>.

Khan, Kamran. "Army Seizes Control in Pakistan." *Washington Post*, October 13, 1999.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/southasia/stories/pakistan101399.htm>.

Khan, Kamran. "Army Stages Coup in Pakistan." *The Washington Post*. 1999.

Khan, Mahrukh. "Ten years of US aid to Pakistan and the post-OBL scenario." *Strategic Studies* 32 (2012): 122-137.

Khan, Mohammed Ayub. "The Pakistan-American Alliance Stresses and Strains." *Foreign*

Affairs, January 1964. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/1964-01-01/pakistan-american-alliance>.

Khan, Mohammed Ayub. "The Pakistan-American Alliance Stresses and Strains." *Foreign*

Affairs, 1964. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/1964-01-01/pakistan-american-alliance#:~:text=In%20May%201954%2C%20Pakistan%20signed,Philippines%2C%20Australia%20and%20New%20Zealand>.

Khan, Sarfaraz A. “Underutilising Country’s Resources.” *The Express Tribune*, 2022.

<https://tribune.com.pk/story/2355699/underutilising-countrys-resources>.

Mahapatra, Debidatta. “India’s Non-Aligned Moment.” *The Times of India*, 2022.

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/periscope/indias-non-aligned-moment/>.

Munir, Asad. “Imran Khan’s Flawed Logic on the War on Terror.” *The Express Tribune*,

2012. <https://tribune.com.pk/story/324147/imran-khans-flawed-logic-on-the-war-on-terror>.

Rana, Shahbaz. “War on Terror Aid: Pakistan Received \$33.4bn from US.” *The Express*

Tribune, 2017. <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1498815/war-terror-aid-pakistan-received-33-4bn-us>.

Stephens, Brett. “In Israel, Democracy Still Holds.” *The New York Times*. 2023.

Tanoli, Shazia Mehboob. “GENDERED POLITICS PREVAIL.” *TMagazine. The Express*

Tribune, 2022. <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2342240/gendered-politics-prevail>.

Web sources

Afzal, Madiha. “Why Is Pakistan’s Military Repressing a Huge, Nonviolent Pashtun Protest

Movement? .” *Brookings*, 2020. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-is-pakistans-military-repressing-a-huge-nonviolent-pashtun-protest-movement/>.

Amraoui, Ahmed El, and Faisal Edroos. “Why Turkey’s Military Is Not What It Used to Be.”

Aljazeera, 2018. <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2018/6/5/why-turkeys-military-is-not-what-it-used-to-be>.

“Arms Transfer Data- Base.” Stockholm, n.d. Accessed July 20, 2023.

Bridgwater, Adrian. “How Israel Became A Technology Startup Nation.” *Forbes*, 2020.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/adrianbridgwater/2020/02/21/how-israel-became-a-technology-startup-nation/?sh=4d42c0ba780e>.

Brown, Vanda Felbab. “Why Pakistan Supports Terrorist Groups, and Why the US Finds It so Hard to Induce Change.” *Brookings*, 2018. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-pakistan-supports-terrorist-groups-and-why-the-us-finds-it-so-hard-to-induce-change/>.

Cornwell, Susan. “Factbox: U.S. Has Allocated \$20 Billion for Pakistan.” *Reuters*, 2011.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-usa-aid-factbox-idUSTRE73K7F420110421>.

“Devolution in Pakistan: Reform or Regression?” *Crisis Group*, 2004.

<https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/devolution-pakistan-reform-or-regression-0>.

“Economy: Achievements.” Consulate General of Israel to the Pacific Northwest San Francisco. Accessed July 24, 2023. [https://embassies.gov.il/san-](https://embassies.gov.il/san-francisco/AboutIsrael/Economy/Pages/ECONOMY-Achievements.aspx)

[francisco/AboutIsrael/Economy/Pages/ECONOMY-Achievements.aspx](https://embassies.gov.il/san-francisco/AboutIsrael/Economy/Pages/ECONOMY-Achievements.aspx).

“Fiscal Year 2009 Global War on Terror Bridge Request.” US Department of Defense, 2008.

https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/fy2009/Supplemental/FY2009_Global_War_On_Terror_Bridge_Request.pdf.

“FOREIGN AID EXPLORER).” USAID. Accessed August 1, 2023. [https://2012-](https://2012-2017.usaid.gov/data/dataset/54687edc-5876-45c3-84a0-9c0aa509c8fe)

[2017.usaid.gov/data/dataset/54687edc-5876-45c3-84a0-9c0aa509c8fe](https://2012-2017.usaid.gov/data/dataset/54687edc-5876-45c3-84a0-9c0aa509c8fe).

“Foreign Assistance Data,” n.d. Accessed July 20, 2023.

Ghelani, Rajeshni Naidu. “South Korea’s 10 Biggest Companies.” *CNBC*, 2012.

<https://www.cnbc.com/2012/07/23/South-Koreas-10-Biggest-Companies.html>.

Haidar, Zeeshan. “Pakistani Islamists in Disarray before Elections.” *Reuters*, 2007.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-islamists-idUSISL32970020071214>.

“Health Care in South Korea - Statistics & Facts.” *Statista*. Accessed July 26, 2023.

<https://www.statista.com/topics/5598/health-care-in-south-korea/#topicOverview>.

“Health Expenditure, Public (Percentage of GDP),” n.d. Accessed July 20, 2023.

“Indonesia Economy.” *Asia Fund Managers*. Accessed July 22, 2023.

<https://www.asiafundmanagers.com/gbr/indonesia-economy/>.

“Instability in Afghanistan.” *Council of Foreign Relations*, 2023. [https://www.cfr.org/global-](https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/war-afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%209%2F11%20attacks)

[conflict-tracker/conflict/war-](https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/war-afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%209%2F11%20attacks)

[afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%](https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/war-afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%209%2F11%20attacks)

[209%2F11%20attacks](https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/war-afghanistan#:~:text=In%20October%202001%2C%20U.S.%20and,%2DQaeda%27s%209%2F11%20attacks).

“Israel and Its Neighbors.” *Libraries*. Accessed July 24, 2023.

<https://open.lib.umn.edu/worldgeography/chapter/8-4-israel-and-its-neighbors/>.

“Kabul Wants Pakistan to Withdraw Forces.” *Aljazeera*, 2003.

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2003/6/24/kabul-wants-pakistan-to-withdraw-forces>.

“Key Economic Indicators of Taiwan - Statistics & Facts.” *Statista*. Accessed July 23, 2023.

[https://www.statista.com/topics/9094/key-economic-indicators-of-](https://www.statista.com/topics/9094/key-economic-indicators-of-taiwan/#topicOverview)

[taiwan/#topicOverview](https://www.statista.com/topics/9094/key-economic-indicators-of-taiwan/#topicOverview).

Khan, M Ilyas. "Pakistan Election: Taliban Threats Hamper Secular Campaign." *BBC*, 2013.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-22022951>.

"Literacy Rate by Country." *Wisevoter*. Accessed July 26, 2023.

<https://wisevoter.com/country-rankings/literacy-rate-by-country/>.

"Pakistan 2023 IFRC Network Country Plan (MAAPK002)." *reliefweb*, 2022.

<https://reliefweb.int/report/pakistan/pakistan-2023-ifrc-network-country-plan-maapk002#:~:text=Up%20to%2064%20per%20cent,stands%20at%2058.9%20per%20cent.>

"Pakistan Country in Asia." *Data Commons Place Explorer*. Accessed July 19, 2023.

https://datacommons.org/place/country/PAK/?utm_medium=explore&mprop=count&opt=Person&hl=en.

Parvaz, D. "Iran 1979: The Islamic Revolution That Shook the World." *Aljazeera*, February

14, 2014. <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2014/2/11/iran-1979-the-islamic-revolution-that-shook-the-world>.

"Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), 1954." *Department of State United States of America*. Accessed July 11, 2023. [https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/seato#:~:text=In%20September%20of%201954%2C%20the,Asia%20Treaty%20Organization%2C%20or%20SEATO.&text=The%20purpose%20of%20the%20organization,gaining%20ground%20in%20the%20region)

[1960/seato#:~:text=In%20September%20of%201954%2C%20the,Asia%20Treaty%20Organization%2C%20or%20SEATO.&text=The%20purpose%20of%20the%20organization,gaining%20ground%20in%20the%20region](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/seato#:~:text=In%20September%20of%201954%2C%20the,Asia%20Treaty%20Organization%2C%20or%20SEATO.&text=The%20purpose%20of%20the%20organization,gaining%20ground%20in%20the%20region)

"Taiwan Exports." *Trading Economics*. Accessed July 23, 2023.

<https://tradingeconomics.com/taiwan/exports#:~:text=Taiwan%27s%20economy%20is%20export%2Doriented,during%20the%20past%2040%20years.>

- “Taiwan Population.” *Worldometer*, 2023. <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/taiwan-population/>.
- “Taiwan.” RSF Reporters without Borders. Accessed July 23, 2023. <https://rsf.org/en/country/taiwan>.
- “Taiwan Profile - Full Overview.” *BBC*, 2016. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-16177285>.
- “The Arab-Israeli Wars.” *Aljazeera*, 2003. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2003/12/9/the-arab-israeli-wars>.
- “The Cost of Conflict in Pakistan.” *Humanitarian Library*. Accessed August 6, 2023. <https://www.humanitarianlibrary.org/sites/default/files/2014/02/Cost-of-Conflict-in-Pakistan.pdf>.
- “Timeline: U.S.-India Relations.” *Council on Foreign Affairs*. Accessed July 13, 2023. <https://www.cfr.org/timeline/us-india-relations>.
- “UN Women Pakistan.” *UN Women Asia and the Pacific*. Accessed August 6, 2023. <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/countries/pakistan>.
- Curtis, Lisa A. *US aid to Pakistan: Countering extremism through education reform*. Washington DC: Heritage Foundation, 2007.
- “Start of the Cold War - The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.” Khan Academy. Accessed July 20, 2023. <https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/us-history/postwarera/postwar-era/a/start-of-the-cold-war-part-2>.

Ferro, Manuela V., and Akihiko Nishio. “From Aid Recipient to Donor: Korea’s Inspirational Development Path.” *World Bank Blogs*, 2021.

<https://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/aid-recipient-donor-korea-inspirational-development-path>.

Gordan, Andrew. “Increasing U.S. Aid to Pakistan Is a Strategic and Moral Imperative.”

COUNCIL on FOREIGN RELATIONS, 2022. <https://www.cfr.org/blog/increasing-us-aid-pakistan-strategic-and-moral-imperative>.

Gordon, Sam. “How Israel Is Redefining Foreign Aid for the 21st Century.” Stroum Center of Jewish Studies University of Washington, 2018.

<https://jewishstudies.washington.edu/israel-hebrew/israel-redefining-foreign-aid-21st-century/>.

Grare, Frédéric. “Rethinking Western Strategies toward Pakistan: An Action Agenda for the United States and Europe.” Carnegie Endowment Fund, 2007.

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2007/07/10/rethinking-western-strategies-toward-pakistan-action-agenda-for-united-states-and-europe-pub-19422>

Guilloux, Alain. “Taiwan’s Humanitarian Aid/Disaster Relief: Wither or Prosper?”

Brookings, 2016. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/taiwans-humanitarian-aiddisaster-relief-wither-or-prosper/>.

Hill, Cameron. “Aiming for the Top Ten: Korea’s Aid.” *reliefweb*, 2023.

<https://reliefweb.int/report/world/aiming-top-ten-koreas-aid#:~:text=Korea%20is%20also%20an%20important,focus%20on%20infectious%20disease%20response>.

Huiskes, Katherine. "THE SEPTEMBER 11 TERRORIST ATTACKS." Miller Center.

Accessed July 29, 2023. <https://millercenter.org/remembering-september-11/september-11-terrorist-attacks>

ILH Staff. "4 Israeli Universities Make List of World's 100 Best Academic Institutions."

Israel Hayom, 2022. <https://www.israelhayom.com/2022/04/14/4-israeli-universities-make-list-of-worlds-100-best-academic-institutions/>.

Jan, Reza. "Taliban Violence Mars Pakistan's Elections." *Critical Threats*, 2013.

<https://www.criticalthreats.org/analysis/taliban-violence-mars-pakistans-elections>.

Khurram, Aamina Binte. "The Highs and Lows of Pak-US Relations: From the Cold War to

Now." *Paradigm Shift*, 2022. <https://www.paradigmshift.com.pk/pak-us-relations/>.

Kim, Anthony B. "Taiwan's Free and Vibrant Economy Is a 'Democratic Success Story.'"

The Heritage Foundation, 2022. <https://www.heritage.org/international-economies/commentary/taiwans-free-and-vibrant-economy-democratic-success-story>.

Kim, Anthony B. "Taiwan's Free and Vibrant Economy Is a 'Democratic Success Story.'"

The Heritage Foundation, 2022. <https://www.heritage.org/international-economies/commentary/taiwans-free-and-vibrant-economy-democratic-success-story>.

Mir, Nazir Ahmad. "Issues and Mistrust in US-Pakistan Relations." *Atlantic Council*, 2021.

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/southasiasource/issues-and-mistrust-in-us-pakistan-relations/>.

Pandey, Shubhangi. "US Sanctions on Pakistan and Their Failure as Strategic Deterrent."

Observer Research Foundation, 2018. <https://www.orfonline.org/research/42912-u-s-sanctions-on-pakistan-and-their-failure-as-strategic-deterrent/>.

Riedel, Bruce. "How The 1999 Kargil Conflict Redefined US-India Ties." *Brookings*, 2019.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-1999-kargil-conflict-redefined-us-india-ties/>

Riedel, Bruce. "The 3 Wars in Afghanistan." *Brookings*, 2017.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-3-wars-in-afghanistan/>.

Santacreu, Ana Maria, and Heting Zhou. "How Did South Korea's Economy Develop So

Quickly?" Federal Reserve Bank of ST.Louis, 2018. <https://www.stlouisfed.org/en/on-the-economy/2018/march/how-south-korea-economy-develop-quickly>.

Sayed, Abdul. "The Evolution and Future of Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan." Carnegie

Endowment for International Peace , 2021.

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/12/21/evolution-and-future-of-tehrik-e-taliban-pakistan-pub-86051>.

Shukla, Ajai. "America's Role in 1962." *Business Standard*, July 13, 2023.

https://www.business-standard.com/article/beyond-business/america-s-role-in-1962-115122201076_1.html.

Singh, RSN. "Impact of 1965 War on Pakistan." *Indian Defence Review*, 2021.

<http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/impact-of-1965-war-on-pakistan/>.

SIPRI. (2023). SIPRI arms transfers database. Retrieved July 16, 2023, from [http://](http://armstrade.sipri.org/armstrade/page/values.php)

armstrade.sipri.org/armstrade/page/values.php.

Tourangbam, Monish. "The China-India-Pakistan Triangle: Origins, Contemporary

Perceptions, and Future." *Stimson Center*, 2020. <https://www.stimson.org/2020/the-china-india-pakistan-triangle-origins-contemporary-perceptions-and-future/>.

Zaidi, S. Akbar. "Who Benefits From U.S. Aid to Pakistan?" *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, September 21, 2011.

https://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_aid2011.pdf.

Blitzer, Wolf. CNN: U.S. cutting aid to Pakistan. Other. *Youtube*, 2011.

Spitzer, Parker. Khan: Pakistan should reject U.S. aid. Other. *Youtube*. *CNN*, 2011.

Zakaria, Anam. "Remembering the War of 1971 in East Pakistan." *Aljazeera*, 2019.

<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2019/12/16/remembering-the-war-of-1971-in-east-pakistan>.

Reports

Din, Najm U. "Internal Displacement in Pakistan: Contemporary Challenges." *Human Rights Commission of Pakistan*, 2010.

<https://www.humanitarianlibrary.org/sites/default/files/2014/02/22.pdf>.

Grare, Frédéric, and William Maley. "The Afghan Refugees in Pakistan," June 30, 2011.

Hussain, Touqir. Rep. U.S.-Pakistan Engagement: The War on Terrorism and Beyond 145. Vol. 145. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2005.

Jafri, Qamar. Rep. The Pashtun Protection Movement (PTM) in Pakistan 8. Vol. 8. *Washington D.C, US: International Center on Nonviolent Conflict*, 2021.

Rep. Amnesty International Report 1985. London: Amnesty International, 1985.

Rep. FAFEN Observation of General Election 2013: Key Findings and Recommendations. 1st ed. Islamabad, ICT: FAFEN, 2013.

Zanotti, Jim. Rep. Turkey-U.S. Defense Cooperation: Prospects and Challenges.

Congressional Research Service, 2011.

Official Documents

“The World Factbook-2016.” *The world Factbook*. Accessed July 20, 2023.

<https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/about/cover-gallery/2016-cover/>.

“US Overseas Loans and Grants”. *Usaid.gov*, 2009.

https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADT555.pdf.

Fair, C. Christine. "US aid to Pakistan: planning and accountability." Testimony presented before the HoU. Se Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs(2009).

Kronstadt, K. Alan. "Education reform in Pakistan." Library of Congress Washington DC Congressional Research Service, 2004.

Rizvi, Hassan Askari. “Pakistan’s Foreign Policy: An Overview 1947-2004.” PILDAT, April 2004. <https://pildat.org/parliamentary-development1/pakistans-foreign-policy-an-overview-1947-2004>.

The World Factbook, 2018. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/about/cover-gallery/2018-cover/>.

USAID. (2023). Foreign aid explorer: U.S. foreign aid by country. Retrieved July 16, 2023, from <https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/PAK>.