

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330369168>

# SECURITY GAME: SEATO and CENTO as Instrument of Economic and Military Assistance to Encircle Pakistan

Article · January 2011

CITATIONS

5

READS

636

2 authors, including:



**Mussarat Jabeen**

University of Lahore

23 PUBLICATIONS 26 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



US Policy towards Taliban in Afghanistan [View project](#)



Political Empowerment of Women [View project](#)

## **SECURITY GAME: SEATO and CENTO as Instrument of Economic and Military Assistance to Encircle Pakistan**

MUSSARAT JABEEN and MUHAMMAD SALEEM MAZHAR\*

**Abstract.** Nations having common interests and objectives are impelled to enter into regional pacts to secure themselves from internal and external threats. A state seeks ways and means of self-defense but, in case of common threats, a state tries to make a common cause to align other states against it. Common ideology is also important factor, sometimes persuades nations to enter into pacts to secure their interests. Common racial, cultural, and economic backgrounds are normally helpful in inducing states to build regional arrangements. In 1950s, SEATO and CENTO were formulated by the US to secure the Asian region from the threat of communism. Pakistan aligned itself with the US and favoured American policies designed to frustrate the objectives of the Soviet Union. Pakistan was primarily interested in settling the Kashmir issue and preserving its security in the face of Indian aggression. Both economic and military aid tempted Pakistan to join these military alliances since India was better off militarily and financially. The paper has explored cost and benefits of these alliances and role of Pakistani leadership under the American sphere of influence. American policy towards the region is also discussed.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Every state has its own way of dealing the world and defining its particular role. The foreign policy of a state is formulated according to its regional environment, national interest, capabilities, and ideologies. As “no nation can have a sure guide as to what it must do and what it need not do in foreign policy without accepting the national interests as that guide” (Morgenthau, 1951). America has its own ways and policies influenced by its geographical

---

\*The authors are, respectively, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Sargodha, Sargodha (Pakistan), and Director, Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore-54590 (Pakistan).

location, historic experiences and political values and Pakistan's external relations especially in the early years were founded on the geo-strategic realities and compulsions of the South Asian region. The basic contour of Pakistan's policy was shaped by the Indian factor. Foreign policy was crafted with the aim of acquiring a bulwark against this giant neighbor. India remained the 'arch-enemy.' The situation remained same despite passing of six decades.

After the World War II, the US confronted with the formidable threat of Soviet communism and designed a global strategy to deter its expansion. During this period, Soviet communism was the dominant factor in formulation of American policy towards other states. This brought additional tension between the Soviet Union and the US. Both countries felt a higher degree of insecurity and both regarded one another as potential adversaries threatening territorial integrity and political independence. A bipolarization of the world led to a lengthy Cold War.

#### **American Policy towards the Subcontinent in Early Years**

During the early years, US policy towards the subcontinent was designed not only to contain the advance of Soviet communism but also to promote the exploration of energy resources. A strategic report confirmed the existence of great oil resources in the region that greatly enhanced the importance of the area (Husain, 1987:2). In pursuit of these twin objectives, the US took a keen interest in affairs of the subcontinent and tried to maintain cordial relations with each country. In previous times, the American view of Asia was limited to China, Japan and the Pacific. The British played an important role in focusing American attention on the subcontinent. Since Britain attached great importance to India, its policy toward newly independent Pakistan was unsympathetic. American policy makers also preferred India due to its size (which together with Pakistan was equal to the size of Europe). The US viewed India as a significant contribution to its bloc against the Soviet Union (Rao, 1985:2).

But India adhered to the policy of non-alignment and avoided the rivalry of the superpowers. India followed this policy in the name of world peace but non-alignment became source of many ups and downs in Indo-US relationship. In January 1947, John Foster Dulles, the American Secretary of State, commented during his visit to India that "Soviet communism had strong influence through the interim government of India." Although President Truman said he did not believe it (New York Herald Tribune, 1947, January 18). Later American Ambassador Grady commented after his meeting with Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that India wanted

friendly ties with the US but at the same time it had some fears about US economic penetration. India was desirous of US exports particularly capital goods (Rao, 1985:4; Foreign Relations, 1973:582).

Despite a desire for friendly relations, India was not ready to be part of the American policy of Soviet containment. After failing to get support from India, the US offered Pakistan for alliance partnership and Pakistan gladly accepted it. From the very beginning, the American attitude was based on defeating the communist expansion. India was even more alive to Stalin-inspired threats for its security than was Pakistan (Rao, 1985:4). But India, nonetheless, avoided any alliance. As Nehru commented, “if there is a cold war today, certainly we are neutral, it does not matter who is right or wrong we will not join in this exhibition of mutual abuse” (Nehru, 1952). India tried to maintain friendly relations with both superpowers.

### **Pak-US Relations in Early Years**

The atmosphere of bipolarity produced a constant competition in global politics as both superpowers strived to further enhance their power. Defense analysts in the US were busy in defining US interests and recognized the geographic value of Pakistan. Meanwhile, newly independent Pakistan was wrestling with overwhelming political and economic problems. It was also trying to set up the administrative structure of its federal government and organization of its armed forces. In American eyes, geographical location was very important. (Sattar, 2007:25). George Marshall, secretary of state, wrote to President Truman on 17 July 1947, “Pakistan with a population of seventy million persons will be the largest Muslim country in the world and will occupy one of the most strategic areas in the world.” Marshall also knew about the old Soviet-German agreement and confirmed that “the area in south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf is recognized as the centre of the aspirations of the Soviet Union” (Husain, 1987:3).

President Truman sent a message to Muhammad Ali Jinnah, first governor general of Pakistan, on the eve of its independence, “I wish to assure you that the new dominion embarks on its course with the firm friendship and goodwill of the United States of America” (Venkatramani, 1984). Jinnah, a visionary leader responded positively as he foresaw the urgent need of military equipment for the armed forces and economic aid for the country in general. In 1947, defense assets were divided between India and Pakistan but the agreed share to Pakistan was blocked by India intentionally as India wanted to weaken the young state. It also planned to inflict on newly-born state in as early as October 1947. The Maharaja of

Kashmir had signed an instrument of accession and included his state into the Indian Union. Accepting this accession, Lord Mountbatten stated that as soon as law and order had been restored in Kashmir and its soil cleared of 'invaders,' the question of state accession would be settled by reference to the people (*Ibid*). Through measures such as these, India was trying to smother Pakistan in its infancy. On the northern border, Stalin had undermined the very concept of Pakistan and tried to instigate Afghan leaders in 1946 by contesting the legality of Durand Line, which was drawn by British India and Afghanistan in 1893 to delineate the boundary between the two countries. Jinnah was sensitive about this historic threat. Since the time of its demarcation, the Durand Line was reaffirmed by successive Afghan regimes: 1919, 1921 and 1930 (Husain, 1987:1).

Although Pakistan was little known to America yet the US was one of the first countries to recognize it as a new nation. This was announced by the American press during the visit of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan in 1950 (Sina, 1957:17). M. A. H. Ispahani was the first ambassador of Pakistan to Washington. Presenting his credentials on October 8, 1947, he told President Truman that the Pakistanis were decedents of great Muslim rulers from Central Asia and the Caucasian Mountains. Since the later was original home of the American, both nations shared common ancestry. Truman responded positively saying, "We stand ready to assist Pakistan in all appropriate ways which might naturally benefit our two countries and the world and we have profound hope for continuing peaceful and constructive collaboration between Pakistan, her sister dominion and other countries" (*New York Times*, 1947, October 9; Department of State Bulletin, November 27, 1947:886).

A few months later, US Joint Chiefs of Staff highlighted the geo-strategic importance of Pakistan. They viewed Karachi and Lahore as vital bases to launch air operation against the Soviet Union. It was also a strategic area for defense of oil resources in the Middle East. The US considered Pakistan's army as the best force of the region (Sattar 2007:41; Arif, 1984:15). During those years, Pakistani leaders were trying to promote the country's strategic importance. Ghulam Mohammad, then the minister of finance and later third Governor General of Pakistan, needed economic aid to alleviate the fiscal problems of the country. He contacted American Charge d' affaires Charles W. Lewis in Karachi but Lewis was not in the position to offer any assurance. He suggested that government of Pakistan should prepare a document estimating required assistance, which could then be sent to Washington. He also proposed that request be submitted through Pakistani ambassador in Washington. Lewis also alerted the Secretary of State as to Pakistan's request for military aid. Ghulam Mohammad obtained Jinnah's

approval and Jinnah in turn appointed Mir Laik Ali to serve as his special emissary to negotiate with officials in Washington. Laik Ali and Ambassador Ispahani contacted various officials of different levels in Washington regarding a loan of \$ 2 billion. Although Laik Ali emphasized threat of the Soviet Union on Pakistan's Northern border yet State Department gave no positive response. However, it was suggested to submit Pakistan submit a more specific request for aid. A subsequent petition listed \$ 700 million for industry, \$ 700 million for agriculture and \$ 510 million for equipment and infrastructure of defense. An amount of \$ 2 billion was approved for 5 years. The State Department officials were not ready to become a regular source of funding for expanding needs of Pakistan (Arif, 1984; Venkatramani, 1984). Looking back, it is noted that it was Ghulam Mohammad who originated the concept of massive dependence on the US aid.

### **Visit of Liaquat Ali Khan to the United States**

Washington's invitation to Indian Prime Minister Nehru in 1949 not only generated tension in Pakistan but also evoked a counter move from Moscow. The Soviet Union sent no congratulatory message to Pakistan in the early days of its independence. It was believed that the prime minister of Pakistan had a poor opinion about communism. Liaquat Ali shared such views with an American diplomat in Pakistan pointing failure of American-sponsored Chiang Kai Shek in China. He expressed his fear that the next victim might be India. And in that case Pakistan would be the last bulwark between the Middle East and the Soviet Union. Liaquat Ali suggested that Western assistance was essential to Muslim countries in the same way as was to Turkey and Greece (Venkatramani, 1984). After failing in getting any American response, Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan announced on June 8, 1949, of his acceptance of an invitation from Moscow to a conference in Tehran saying, "Pakistan cannot afford to wait, she must take her friends where she finds them" (Burke, 1975). In response, Washington invited the prime minister to meet President Truman at some mutually convenient date. The US also informed the British ambassador on June 3, 1949, about the transfer of 200,000 rounds of 75 mm ammunition to Pakistan, a day after getting the news of Moscow's invitation (Venkatramani, 1984). Liaquat Ali cancelled his visit with the Soviets after getting American invitation.

Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan's visit to the US impressed the Truman administration. The significance of security relations in South Asia paved the way for Pakistan to express its desire for American goodwill, cordial relations and cooperation between free and peaceful nation. Liaquat Ali told the US Congress that "No material peril or ideological allurements could

deflect Pakistan from its chosen path of free democracy.” An American journalist, Water Lipperman noted that even “Though Pakistan and America are far apart in space, though they are very different in their ways of life, each has the great responsibilities for the peace and welfare of the mankind, which it cannot to meet fully with out the help and advice of the other” (Christian Science Monitor, 1950, May).

Liaquat Ali demonstrated Pakistan’s importance for stability of Asia due to its geo-strategic location. Pakistan also voted in favour of the United Nations resolution for aid and troops in support of South Korea (Khan, 1951:82; Rao, 1985:7). Although Liaquat’s visit created a better understanding of Pakistan, its policy and problems, yet he was unable to gain military assistance and private capital and investment. As far as economic aid was concerned, it was part of package under the Point Four Programme, which also benefitted India (Burke, 1975).

### **Defense Alliances and South Asian Region**

In early fifties, regional changes forced the US to shift its military calculation and secure Asia from Soviet influence. In 1949, defeat of US-backed Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai Shek in China was a blow to American prestige and a clear sign of communist expansion. In March 1951, rise of nationalist Primer Mohammed Mossadegh in Iran and nationalization of the Anglo-American oil company heightened US concerns. To prevent Soviet political penetration and military advancement towards Persian Gulf and Near East Asia, the CIA overthrew Mossadegh in 1953 and restored young Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi to power (Bagby, 1999:207). The US was concerned about the security of the Persian Gulf and the world’s richest oil reserves. Economic aid enabled the Soviet Union to extend its influence in Afghanistan (Keylor, 2003).

In Europe, the problem of Soviet expansion had been resolved through collective security arrangements under military alliance of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). But such arrangements were not possible in the Middle East or Southeast Asia. People living in these countries were not worried about communist threat and were reluctant to involve in superpowers rivalry. In olden times, many Central Asian and South Asian countries were governed by the same regime and shared many cultural similarities. The US was however determined to bring this region under its influence in order to protect the interests of Western powers.

In February 1951, to promote the strategic interests of the free world in South Asia, American policymakers recognized that an effective military

defense would require strong flanks in Turkey, Iran and Pakistan. A build-up of the Pakistani forces was therefore of utmost importance. A meeting of US ambassadors held in Colombo (Sri Lanka) in February 1951, advocated Pakistan's participation in the defense of Middle East (Kux, 2001:45). Ambassador George McGhee was particularly impressed by the willingness of Pakistani leadership to back US efforts to prevent communist encroachments in South Asia. Accordingly he recommended limited American military aid to Pakistan (McMahon, 1994:60-76). In April 1951, British and American officials agreed that Pakistan's contribution would probably be the decisive factor in ensuring the defense of the area (*Ibid*, 132). But the British noted that it would antagonize India. In May 1952, Paul Nitze, director of the State Department, wrote a paper deploring western fragility in Middle East and recommended American involvement in the region since the British were not capable of regional security (*Ibid*, 145).

India initially wanted economic aid from the US but Indo-American relations deteriorated when India criticized the US for non-recognition of China along its involvement of the Korean War (Rao, 1985:5). Despite this set back, Washington provided aid to India during its severe food crisis in 1950-51. The granting and withholding of economic aid was an important instrument in US policy (Bowles, 1954:230-31). Its policy thus varied from one country to another. India for example refused to sign Japanese Peace Treaty in 1951 at a political conference in San Francisco and thereby lost respect in Washington whereas Pakistan signed the treaty and gained respect in Washington (Choudhry, 1975).

### **Eisenhower Doctrine and Mutual Security**

After the Korean War, US policy was set forth as the Eisenhower doctrine. It was designed to assist all nations that were resisting communism. The Eisenhower administration negotiated a series of security or mutual defense treaties as well as aid agreements. The main objective was to deter communist aggression. These alliances were integral part of American national security policy. Mutual defense assistance was designed to assist a nation to defend itself as ally in the free world (Stebbins, 1956:101). The emphasis was on voluntary and mutual cooperation. The Eisenhower doctrine symbolized the determination of the US to go to war, if necessary, to prevent the Soviet Union from gaining control of oil-rich area of West Asia (Rao, 1985:51).

This system of regional defense alliances was known as the 'New Look' of the Republican administration (*Ibid*, 51). It was based not only on military aid but also on economic assistance and political involvement. Eisenhower



maintained that the US would not be an aggressor despite having a massive nuclear capability. Dulles expounded upon this policy and it was followed by series of events that led him to use the phrase 'massive retaliation' (Curl, 1955:7-10).

### **Path to Defense Alliances for Economic and Military Assistance**

The advance of communist ideology in South-East Asia and the establishment of Socialist China made the US eager to follow a policy of containment. The American government undertook numerous measures to counter communist threat over the one third of the global population. These included the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Four Point Programme and NATO alliance. Under concept of collective security, American aim was to coordinate the strength of friendly nations and organize their contributions according to their capabilities. This also represented a standing invitation to the uncommitted nations of Asia and the Middle East to become allies. Regional alliances were designed to deter communism. They committed the US to provide military, economic and technical assistance to friendly nations. This was also a way to contain communist aggression without engaging American troops. The US defined its new position by giving indication of its involvement in the world affairs.

The post- Korean War perception in Washington centered on its search for new allies. By the end of 1952, the Truman administration endorsed the idea of a Middle East Defense Organization (MEDO) that was previously advocated by Britain to shore up its sagging position in the world. The idea was not only opposed by Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt but also by Nehru in India. In November 1952, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, chief of the US naval staff arrived in Pakistan to confer with Governor General Ghulam Mohammad and General Ayub Khan, commander in chief. These discussions led to subsequent military pacts between the two countries (Burke, 1975).

John Foster Dulles set out on a long visit to Asian countries on 9 May 1953. India, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq were included in his tour. He visited Pakistan from 23 to 24 May to explore the feasibility of alliance. Dulles appreciated Pakistan's efforts and wanted to firm up Pakistan's support for a collective security agreement. Prime Minister Mohammad Ali Bogra, Governor General Ghulam Muhammad and Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan stressed their allegiance to the anti-communist pact. They were eager to join the alliance and showed their desire to join the free world defense team (Kux, 2001:55). Ayub Khan argued that the US would fill the vacuum left by the British. Dulles appreciated the support as well as the spirit and appearance of Pakistan's

armed forces. He stated in a cable to Washington, "Communist China borders on northern territories held by Pakistan, and from Pakistan's northern border one can see the Soviet Union. Pakistan flanks Iran and the Middle East and guards the Khyber Pass, historic invasion route from the north into the subcontinent" (Sattar, 2007:43).

In India, Dulles personally met Nehru and talked about Indo-American relations and American assistance to Indian development projects. Dialogue on military grouping in Middle East or Southeast Asia failed as Nehru refused to join any military bloc due to policy of non-alignment. After the meeting Dulles said, "One of my clearest impressions was that of the outstanding and sincere friendship which leaders of Pakistan feel for the United States. I was greatly impressed with their understanding of the world problem and they will resist the menace of communism as their strength permits" (Singh, 1985:29-30).

The positive Pakistani stance towards the US was result of assistance provided before the Dulles visit. The US demonstrated goodwill by expediting Pakistan's request of one million tons of wheat valued of \$ 74 million. It was speedily delivered to the port of Karachi at no charges (Sattar, 2007:43). The first public report of US-Pakistan military alliance appeared in *The New York Times* on November 21, 1952.

The US used economic, political and diplomatic measures to contain communism in Asia. It adopted a policy of massive retaliation to counter the Soviet nuclear threat. And it supported the liberation of Soviet satellites in eastern and central Europe. At the same time, the US supported colonial policies of Western Europe. The US for example played a leading role in keeping Tunisia-Morocco issue out of Security Council at the United Nations. American concerns were limited to communism not to colonialism in North Africa and elsewhere. But its efforts were active in first instance and passive in the second. However, it tried to work without being labeled as a supporter of colonialism (*The New York Times*, April 30, 1952).

The Cold War brought foreign military bases to both Asia and Africa. Many nations paid heavy price in return for military and economic assistance. This situation was not congenial for promotion of international peace and security. India avoided close ties with both superpowers. India saw the US an overdeveloped and materialistic power following in the steps of the British Empire. India suspected that its dominance was undercut more by the US than the Soviet Union. Nehru showed this opinion even in 1927: "Russia could never become a threat to India in the foreseeable future and is not a colonial power and has not a colonial past" (Rao, 1985:31). Indian

policy makers were critical to the US policy of containment. They ridiculed America's fear of the Soviet Union and regarded Soviet military preparation as merely defensive (*Ibid*). India and Pakistan held divergent opinions on almost all issues. Indo-US relations remained strained. Indian policies were not identical to American plans and the former was not ready to extend unconditional support to the later. Contrary to this, Pakistan's policies were generally pro-American and were pushing it towards the military alliances designed to contain Soviet communism. Consequently Pakistan was singled out as a friend of America in South Asia (*New York Times*, September 15, 1953).

### **Regional Alliances and Pakistan**

Pakistan was militarily important in terms of its location. Other thing was navel bases in Indian Ocean that were desirable for the US. Pakistan had considerable influence not only in the South Asia but also among Middle Eastern countries and the Afro-Asian bloc. The US recognized that Pakistan was in the position to advocate western policies and to moderate extreme nationalistic and anti-western feelings generally. Pakistan's internal situation was worse than India's. But its relationship with the US was better. A northern tier concept of collective security was promoted by Western powers as an extension of NATO. The American-Pakistan-Turkish arrangement formed a part of the Northern Tier Plan (*Economist*, March 17, 1956). Dulles included Turkey Pakistan Iran and Iraq when he spoke of northern tier countries. In July 1953, the idea was approved by American National Security Council and a security alliance was decided in principle. The bilateral agreements signed by Pakistan with Turkey and the US were taken as steps leading to defense arrangement of the 'northern tier.' Ayub Khan visited Washington in 1953 and tried to convince President Eisenhower for collective security links of mutual interests. Ayub assured him that "Pakistan will stand by you if you stand by Pakistan." Ghulam Mohammad also went to the US in November 1953 but both leaders failed in getting any aid since the administration was reluctant due to offend India. It was only after the visit of Vice President Richard Nixon in December 1953 when President Eisenhower finally agreed to give military aid to Pakistan. Before declaring this decision, Eisenhower suggested to contact India and offer a similar pact to India but India refused to become part of any alliance (Sattar, 2007:44-45). US interests in the Middle East however, were instrumental in incorporating Pakistan into the Northern defense tier (Singh, 1985:13).

During this period, the US adopted different forms of aid including overt military aid, covert grants, military sales, commercial credits and training in

foreign institutions. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara remarked, "It is beyond price to make friends of such men." During the period of 1954 to 1965, the US provided military grants valued at \$ 650 million, military support valued at \$ 619 million and cash and commercial credits at valued \$ 55 million. The arm sales were at peak during the period 1954 to 1961 (Husain, 1997:4).

The original intent of the military aid was to bolster Pakistani defense on the periphery of the Soviet Union and China. The US military aid was intended to promote peace in the world whereas US economic aid was intended to raise standards of living. Fifty-seven countries were recipients of aid whose structure of society differed widely (Objectives of the.. 1955, March 2; Rao, 1985:62). Military assistance to Pakistan was intended to provide internal security as well as defense of the area. First public report about US-Pak alliance appeared in *The New York Times* on November 2, 1953, which disclosed Pakistan was willing to consider an exchange of air bases for military equipment. India reacted to this gesture and President Eisenhower declared in a press conference that the US would be cautious about doing anything in Pakistan that might create unrest or hysteria in India (*New York Times*, November 15, 1953).

All this indicated that the US never wanted to annoy India. India, nevertheless, made it an excuse for holding a plebiscite in Kashmir. The Indian President specifically told his Parliament that any American aid to Pakistan would affect negotiations on the question of Kashmir. The US tried to assure India that Pak-US agreement was in no way a hurdle to friendship between the US and India (Rao, 1985:57). In fact, the US had its interests in India as well Pakistan. It was involved in a balancing act between the two (Srivastva, January-March 1976).

### **Formation of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO)**

The idea to secure Southeast Asia from the threat of communism came after the French defeat in Indochina in 1954. The Eisenhower administration undertook several measures to strengthen the nations of the region politically, economically and militarily besides its aims to deter communist threat. Collective security was envisioned in context of global policy with respect to alliances. In September 1954, the representatives of eight governments met at Manila (Philippines) and formed an alliance for peace in South East Asia. Since East Pakistan was located in this region, Pakistan signed the South East Asia defense treaty in Manila on 8 September 1954. The treaty was designed to maintain peace in the region and to facilitate regional economic cooperation (Singh, 1985:15). Pakistan joined the pact

since it was against aggression in general. But the US limited its commitment to act only against communist aggression. During Manila Conference, Pakistan's Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan strongly opposed it on the plea that the treaty was not applicable only to communist aggression (*Washington Post*, September 7, 1956). Pakistan threatened to leave the treaty if the US refused to apply it to conflict between India and Pakistan. Prime Minister Muhammad Ali also indicated that Pakistan had joined SEATO in order to resolve its disputes with India. India viewed Pakistan's inclusion to the pact irrelevant since East Pakistan was never in danger from international communism or from Chinese communist. Washington rejected Pakistan's plea because it was not interested to support Pakistan in case of war with India (Pasha, 1985:221). America's commitment to Pakistan was unlike to its obligation to NATO allies and it did not regard attack on Pakistan as an attack on the US. Pakistan's plea was brushed aside (Rao, 1985:60). Pakistan wanted defense against all types of aggression irrespective of the communist label but the US had importance for label. Washington also tried to pacify India and President Eisenhower wrote a letter to remove Indian misgiving regarding American objectives. However, American press criticized Nehru for opposing aid to Pakistan while others regarded it a mistake.

Before finalization of SEATO, Chester Bowles, the American ambassador to India, wrote a letter to Dulles in December 1953 saying that "arm supply to Pakistan could be used against India and would lead to great instability in the Middle East and Asia." He also stressed the importance of maintaining friendly relations with India but Washington rejected his protest (Rao, 1985:78). Dulles flatly declared that the negotiations were already underway to provide military assistance to Pakistan. Collaboration with the US was seen in Pakistan beneficial to its defense and economy (Singh, 1985:31).

In the later years, American deference to India waned as many in Congress viewed Indian fears as exaggerated. India nevertheless continued to complain that arms aid to Pakistan would promote an arms race between Pakistan and India instead of building a common defense against the Soviet Union. In Pakistan, some communist and other extremist political elements opposed American aid as well (*New York Times*, April 10, 1957). But most of the Pakistanis blamed Nehru for pushing Pakistan into the western orbit over the dispute in Kashmir (Rao, 1985:73).

Pakistan's Prime Minister Mohammad Ali commented that Pakistan had no intention to use weapons but to safeguard its security interests against any

aggressive action (Spontaneous welcome, *The Dawn*, February 25, 1954). Pakistan wanted insurance for its security against India. But it was not granted by America as India was still important to Washington despite its different approach to world affairs.

### **Baghdad Pact or Central Treaty Organization**

The US was willing to assist any nation or group of nations in the Middle East having the history of Russian drives in the region. The Baghdad Pact was designed to strengthen the nations in the region and to fill the power vacuum left in the wake of the crisis over the Suez Canal and the resultant animosity toward Western European countries (Department of State Bulletin, May 1957:728). Turkey and Iraq laid the foundation of the Baghdad pact for mutual defense that was signed on 26 February 1955. They invited Pakistan to join but Pakistan was reluctant to do so without the inclusion of the United States and its military might. But mounting pressure from Britain and the US was sufficient impetus for Pakistan to sign the agreement on 23 September 1955 along with Britain and Iran. The Baghdad Pact provided a framework upon which a programme could be built around military and economic assistance. American ambassador James Richard visited the Middle East and Pakistan in 1957. He made it clear that American policy in the Middle East was not intended to establish any sphere of influence. However, situation in the region demanded that the power vacuum be filled.

Secretary Dulles stated in both Senate and House committees that “the US tried to preserve peace through diplomacy not by brutal force” (Rao, 1985:96). Pakistan requested America to join the Baghdad pact since Pakistan was one of those nations of that time that have influence on the US to conclude the Middle Eastern doctrine. But the US was reluctant due to the implications of treaty in the event of a war involving Israel and the Arab states (Rao, 1985:92; Sattar, 2007:49). Although the US worked for treaty yet the US did not sign it thus maintaining its status as unofficial observer. However, the US actively participated in the business conducted by the various organs of the alliance. The lack of official US participation weakened the chances of attracting other nations. After the Iraqi revolution in 1958, the name of the pact was changed to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) with a minor addition referring to the Eisenhower Doctrine.

### **Bilateral Defense Agreement of 1959**

After the Iraqi revolution, Secretary Dulles promised that the US would enter into new arrangements to strengthen the members of CENTO. In April 1959,

the US signed a bilateral defense agreement with Pakistan. That agreement provided that the US would take such appropriate acts as might be mutually agreed upon in the event of aggression against any of the country. This agreement was regarded by the US as vital to its national interest. For Pakistan the preservation of its independence and integrity was crucial. President Ayub said, "We had to look for allies to secure our position" (Khan, 1969:154).<sup>1</sup> America appreciated Pakistan as a faithful ally, which provided facilities important to US interests in the region. Making further cooperation, the US went beyond Article 1 of the treaty that "regards as vital to its national interests and to world peace the preservation of independence and territorial integrity of Pakistan." The US promised to take appropriate action including the use of force as indicated in the Joint Resolution to Promote Peace and Stability in Middle East. In Article 2, the US pledged to assist the government of Pakistan in the preservation of its national independence, integrity and effective promotion of economic development. The US commitment to assist Pakistan in the event of aggression was more specific than any previous pacts including SEATO and CENTO. But when Pakistan attempted to invoke the provisions of the agreement in 1965 and 1971, the US did not honor its obligation (Sattar, 2007:48).

### **Output of Alliances and Cultivation of American Friendship**

Pakistan strove hard for four years to secure US aid prior to 1953. But it did not succeed. The US was more interested in providing aid to India due to its strategic position *vis-à-vis* communist China. Pakistan miscalculated at diplomatic level. It never obtained US support against India on issues such as Jammu and Kashmir, Indus water and economic assets of Pakistan, which were taken by India at the time of partition. No issue was resolved through military alliances.

**Kashmir Dispute:** It was during this period that Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah, was replaced by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed. India refused to appoint a plebiscite administrator in spite of promises it made during a conference at Karachi in early fifties. That conference was held to find solutions to bilateral problems and was followed by a meeting in New Delhi. But nothing changed. Alliance partnership did

---

<sup>1</sup>President Eisenhower accepted Pakistan's significance. In 1952, General Ayub briefed him that Soviet Union would use India as a cat's paw for establishing a major presence in South Asia, a prophecy that came true in 1971. At the end of visit, Nixon gave a message to radio Pakistan that "A strong independent Pakistan is an asset to the free world" (Khan, Muhammad Ayub, 1969, *Friends not Masters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press).

not give any upper hand to Pakistan in respect of its disputes with India particularly Kashmir. Pakistan alleged India since there was no resolution of the dispute over Kashmir (Rao, 1985:138). Correspondence during that period revealed deep rooted suspicions on either side. Bakshi Ghulam Muhammad stated that a plebiscite administrator would never be appointed giving the reason that accession to India was ratified by the constituent assembly of Jammu and Kashmir. Pakistan strongly condemned this decision. India claimed that the accession of Jammu and Kashmir was legal and was compacted in October 1947 (Choudhury, 1968:125). CENTO council emphasized the need for an early settlement of Kashmir and Palestine disputes. But India resented the calls of regional pacts for the settlement of Kashmir and pleaded that Kashmir dispute had no concern with professionally organized anti-communist military groups. America joined the military committee of pact but did not support Pakistan on this issue. Pakistan brought Kashmir dispute to the pact but got no favour in resolving the issue through multilateral military pacts (Pasha, 1985:222).

**Indian Opposition to Treaties:** Pakistan attempted to settle its disputes with India in at the annual SEATO conference in 1958. But India protested that the Kashmir dispute was beyond the scope of SEATO. And the Soviet Union supported India's position while the US remained on the sidelines. So it was agreed that the issue should be settled at position in the UN or through bilateral negotiations (Callard, 1959:26).

India viewed Pakistan as a serious threat after 1954. A small country well-equipped with modern arms could accomplish much against a large neighbor as demonstrated when Israel attacked Egypt in 1956. Pakistan was not hostile towards communism and Chou En Lie confirmed it in 1963. Pakistan's objective was to strengthen its position *vis-à-vis* India. India wanted the US to exert its influence through economic assistance. But the US attempted to promote stability by persuading both countries to resolve their inter-regional disputes (*The Dawn*, April 10, 1963; Pasha, 1985:228). Nehru commented about these pacts that they disturbed the peace of area and brought the Cold War to the subcontinent and upset the balance between India and Pakistan. Nehru shared his concerns with Prime Minister of Pakistan at Common Wealth meeting in London. In return, Pakistan proposed joint defense policy but Nehru rejected it on the excuse of divergent foreign policies. He implied that joint defense might lead to military pacts, which is against the spirit of non-alignment, basic policy of India (Rao, 1985:127).



The Indians worried that Pakistan's military officers after exposure to American training "begin to see themselves as invincible superior beings. They held the Indian military forces in derisive contempt." The US however, made it clear that Pakistan would not use force or even the threat of force to settle the dispute over Kashmir. Pakistan received general abuse by being labeled as camp-follower and a stooge of an imperial and colonial power (Qureshi, 1980:471).

India developed a new method to oppose military support for Pakistan when the Congress Party organized mass demonstrations. And Indian diplomats throughout the world were instructed to lobby against aid for Pakistan. Indian officials in the US and at the UN issued warnings that military support to Pakistan could push India out of the UN and into Soviet bloc. Pakistan was earlier warned that it was in danger of losing all of the ground it had gained so far in Kashmir including canal water and evacuee property (Rao, 1985:130-34; Nehru, nd:32-40).

The Indian press promoted the idea that American military assistance created tension and an atmosphere of fear among the non-aligned nations. The Indian government claimed that US military aid jeopardized the imminent resolution of the Kashmir problem through bilateral negotiation. India firmly opposed American policy not only in Pakistan but also in Korea and China (Singh, 1985:15). The US military aid jeopardized the solution of the Kashmir dispute that was almost in sight as a result of bilateral discussions.

**U-2 Incident:** In 1952, Pakistan provided bases to America in Peshawar for intelligence and surveillance purpose. The consequences of which resulted in 'U-2 incident', which brought Pakistan in direct confrontation with the Soviet Union. The spy plane was shot down by Russian and its pilot Francis Gary was arrested. The spy plane took photographs of Soviet atomic installations using Peshawar airfield. The Soviet Premier Khrushchev warned Pakistan of dire consequences (Pasha, 1985:221). A diplomatic row erupted between the two countries. The US called this base as "communication centre" and did not disclose its purpose and even no Pakistani person was admitted to the base. In later years, it was come to be known that this facility was also used against China (Sattar, 2007:50). The base was closed in 1968 after Pakistan refused to extend the contract for another decade. In spite of providing the base for US operations, Pakistan got no American support on the issue of Kashmir. None of the allies gave substantial support while Pakistan had to pay heavily for taking these risks.

**Indo-Pak Wars of 1965 and 1971:** During the Indo-Pak War of 1965, the US concluded that its involvement was not in American national interest. It was simply a regional crisis. President L. B. Johnson suspended aid to both countries and relinquished responsibility for management of the conflict to the Soviet Union. Johnson and his Secretary of the State Dean Rusk saw little risk in allowing the Soviet Union to make peace in the region. South Asia was not vital to US interests compared to Europe, Northeast Asia, or the oil-rich Middle East. President Johnson refused to get directly involved in the Indo-Pak war of 1965 and instead backed UN peace-keeping efforts. Johnson supported the Tashkent agreement which was brokered by the Soviet Union. The Indo-Pak War of 1965 ended US military assistance to Pakistan much to the satisfaction of India.

During the Indo-Pak war of 1971, President Nixon urged Pakistan to accommodate dissidents in East Pakistan. He also offered aid to India in dealing with the refugee crisis. Nixon wanted to preserve Pakistan's integrity. So he sent the nuclear aircraft carrier 'Enterprise' to the Bay of Bengal. According to Henry Kissinger that 'Enterprise' was to deter India from attacking Pakistan on the Western border. But it was also intended to show China that the Americans supported their ally in the region. The 'Enterprise' continued to "sail" in Indian journals and books for more than two decades, epitomizing American hostility toward India's rising power. In 1972, the Simla Agreement was concluded as a regional framework for conflict resolution. Indeed.

During most of the Cold War and the decade following it, India viewed the US as hostile to it for becoming a dominant power at either the regional or global level. Indian strategic community saw Washington untrustworthy and sometimes hostile state while Moscow often sided with India. The USSR terminated its aid programme to Pakistan in late 1960s responding to Indian pressure. American aid was suspended to Pakistan during the wars of 1965 and 1971. The most substantial US military aid to Pakistan was given from 1954 to 1968. Pakistan received a \$ 630 million grant for weapon and \$619 million for defense assistance in addition to \$ 35 million of equipment that was purchased for cash (Husain, 1987:4).

**Pushing Pakistan in other Directions for Aid:** Influential lobbies in the US were hostile to Pakistan and superpowers' globalism, they began to criticize Pak-US security relations around 1959-60. The first cut in military assistance to Pakistan came in this period. An effort was made to down grade importance of the base in Peshawar by reducing its rent. The victory of the

Democrats in 1960 was a watershed in Pak-US security relations as J. F. Kennedy made every effort to win over non-aligned India.

In 1962, India and China went to war over a border issue. The US rushed to support India which forced Pakistan to mend fences with China. Pakistan demarcated its common border of 300 miles. Then it established an air link with China. In the 1965 war, the Pakistani air force achieved superiority and its ground forces succeeded in halting the Indian attacks. That resulted in an arm embargo as the US blocked support for Pakistan and the Soviet Union blocked support for India. But the Soviet Union raised its embargo within weeks whereas the United States continued its embargo until 1967 when it was partially lifted for the sale of spare parts. During the interim, Pakistan was forced to turn to China. Pakistan also obtained jets and submarines from France. In 1968, Soviet Union offered Pakistan \$ 30 million worth of guns as well as military vehicles and helicopters. It even offered to develop the seaport at Gwader (*Ibid*).

By 1969, a friendship treaty was signed between the Soviet Union and India. Although the Soviets stopped all military aid to Pakistan, they nonetheless offered to set up a steel mill at Karachi. Earlier, both the US and West Germany had rejected the mill project after conducting feasibility studies. In 1969, after President Nixon's visit, the US offered to make a one-time exception and sell 300 armored personnel carriers to Pakistan for \$ 50 million to counter Soviet influence. But the sale did not materialize for another six years. President Ford finally authorized it in March 1975 on cash and carry basis. In April 1971, a full embargo was re-imposed on Pakistan. It lasted until April 1972 when some sales of non-lethal items and spare parts were allowed. Meanwhile, India implemented three consecutive five-year defense development plans which gave India the third largest army, fifth largest air force, and eighth largest navy in the world by 1977 (*ibid*, 5).

Since 1975, India lobbied the State Department and Congress as well as the Arms control and Disarmament Agency. The Symington-Glenn Amendment cut off economic and military aid to Pakistan in July of 1977 for its pursuit of the nuclear option. But military aid resumed in 1981 with a package that included forty F-16s aircraft. That did not however tilt the military balance in favour of Pakistan since it received only \$ 6 billion from 1953 to 1979. In the year of 1979, Soviet military advisers moved into Afghanistan and took control of the regime in Kabul.

**World Opinion about Membership of Pakistan in Defense Treaties:** Pakistan's adherence to pact was disliked by non-committed Afro-Asian countries and the Arabs who were against the alignment with the West.

These alliances were an attempt to extend the Cold War to other areas. Since the formation of these pacts, the Soviet Union had been using its veto power against any effective action on Kashmir in the UN Security Council (Rao, 1985:92). Soviet ambassador in Pakistan stated that his country could not remain indifferent towards the reports of Pakistan's participation in American plan to set up military bloc in the region. Replying to it, Pakistan asserted that it had more concern for its security against India than over fear of international communism (Pasha, 1985:217).

### **Positive Aspects of Alliances**

Despite all this, the agreement strengthened Pakistan on several issues vis-à-vis India, as there was no intermediate threat to Pakistan from any communist quarter. The participation of Pakistan was to encircle India and thereby threatened its security. India criticized the treaty and informed the US that extension of Eisenhower doctrine to Pakistan had increased the tension between the two countries instead of promoting solution to the problems through peaceful means.

The US aid was principal instrument of American strategy in South Asia. The substantial amount of modern planes and equipment made Pakistan Air Force comparable to Indian Air Force in its effectiveness and strength. A large number of planes were supplied after President Ayub's visit to Washington in 1961. Several scores of Pakistani airmen who were trained in the US helped to establish training centers and programmes in Pakistan. America also assisted in construction of airfield and other installations. Pakistan received \$ 1.5 billion worth of defense aid from the US till 1959 (Pasha, 1985:234). President Kennedy asked Pakistan to contribute troops in Laotian issue but Pakistan refused. One reason of this refusal was President's liberal attitude towards India and tough policies towards Pakistan.

### **Soviet Invasion and Bilateral Agreement of 1959**

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was a problem for the Carter administration. On the day of invasion, Carter spoke to Pakistan's President Zia-ul-Haq. Carter assured him of his support and declared that the US would honour the commitment of 1959 and work within its framework rather than to initiate a new treaty. But the track record of the US was not good. The US failed to live up to its obligations when Pakistan tried to invoke the agreement during the Indo-Pak War of 1971 (Wriggins, 1987). Many Americans nonetheless linked India's attack to the Kremlin's invasion of Hungary in 1956. Indira Gandhi of course denounced Carter's cultivation of friendship with Pakistan responding in much the same manner as her father

who used a double standard when measuring the sins of the Soviet Union. Instead of rebuking the Kremlin, she criticized US aid to Pakistan and refused to join international community in denouncing the Russians as aggressors in Afghanistan (Brands, 1990:167; Kux, 1992). President Carter offered an aid package of \$ 400 million to Pakistan but F-16s were not included in accordance with his policy of non-proliferation. President Zia rejected the limited offer calling it a peanut (Tahir Kheli, 1997). Carter then sweetened the deal and once again offered to revive the treaty of 1959. But Zia refused to be bought off so lightly saying he would wait for next US election (Kux, 2001). Reagan won the Presidency in 1980 and announced aid package for Pakistan of \$ 3.2 billion over a five-year period. Its centerpiece consisted of forty F-16 aircrafts with an early delivery in spite of protests from the Pentagon. Zia characterized the deal as a new partnership (Rizvi, 2004:49). But he also said that Pakistan would no longer provide military bases on a *quid pro quo* basis. Zia valued his newly adopted non-aligned status and no longer wished to enter into Cold War alliances (Sathasivam, 2005:133).

### **End of Alliances**

The decade of 1960s witnessed the abatement of brinkmanship policies that characterized the Cold War. What followed was a period of transition during which relations changed among the nations along with their strategic calculations. The system of alliances began to collapse. America's support for Pakistan was intended to counter the threat from communist countries not India. CENTO began to collapse after numerous blows including the withdrawal of Iraq. The neighboring Arab states of Egypt and Syria strengthened their ties to the Soviet Union and were unwilling to participate in CENTO. Arab-Israeli War, the Indo-Pakistani War, and Turkey's invasion of Cyprus finally led the UK to withdraw from the alliance (Raghu, 2005). And, after Indian military intervention in 1971, Pakistan left SEATO in November 1972. The half hearted commitment of Great Britain and the US weakened the system of alliances and left few options to war besides diplomacy.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Cold War was a fight for hegemony in the world and the alliance system was an instrument in it. Pakistan allied itself with the US in order to insure its independence and territorial integrity. Its enhanced military and economic position enabled it to negotiate with India on a better footing. The political and bureaucratic leadership of Pakistan tilted toward America but the US did

not fully reciprocated. Although Pakistan took grave risks on America's behalf, it received comparatively little in return. Its cooperation with the US took Pakistan from qualified neutrality to unqualified alliance. Due to U-2 event, Pakistan faced the danger of retaliation in terms of a rocket attack. In spite of that, the US failed to support Pakistan on the Kashmir dispute. New Delhi viewed Pak-US military relations as a move against India not as a move against communism. The repercussions of Pakistan's alliance with America adversely affected Pakistan's relations with other countries in the world making it harder to build bridges of friendship in Asia and Africa. Pakistan nonetheless continued to exert its influence in the Middle East and in the Muslim countries of Northern Africa advocating less nationalistic and more moderate policies. American foreign policy was designed with anti-communist objectives in mind. India, because of its non-aligned status, refused to be a part of any American sponsored alliance. And yet it received more loans and grants from the US than Pakistan. US aid and advice adversely impacted the constitutional process in Pakistan and resulted in sectarian and regional imbalances throughout the country. The American connection distorted Pakistan's internal political balance as the army became the dominant political force. Economic aid strengthened the military but undermined democratic institutions. These alliances did not serve collective security arrangement in wars of 1965 and 1971. Pakistan was allied with the United States but the US refused to offer any assistance to ward off Indian aggression. America pursued its own interests particularly after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The US increased its aid to Pakistan as a frontline state in the war against communism. But aid was cut off after the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s on nuclear issue. It demonstrated that the US never shared Pakistan's concerns or interest but preferred its goals. History repeated itself after the terrorist attacks of September 2001. The US relaxed four sets of sanctions against Pakistan when it joined US-led coalition forces in the war against terrorism. The US never once considered Pakistan's interests after its own interest were achieved. It is, therefore, important that Pakistan now review its foreign policy to promote its own national interest and prestige.

## REFERENCES

- Arif, K. (ed.) (1984), *America-Pakistan relations-documents*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Bowles, Chester (1954), *Ambassador Report*. New York: Harper.
- Brands, William (1972), *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Great Powers*. New York: Counsel of Foreign Relation.
- Burke, S. M. (1975), *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Historical Analysis*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Callard, Kerth B. (1959), *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Choudhry, S. G. (1975), *India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and the Major Powers*. New York.
- Choudhry, W. G. (1968), *Pakistan's Relations with India*. London: Pall Mall.
- Curl, Peter V. (ed.) (1955), *Documents on American Relations*. New York: Harper.
- Department of State Bulletin (1947, November 2), Volume 18.
- Department of State Bulletin (1957, May), Volume 36(6), Washington: USGPO.
- "Foreign Relations of the United State 1947" (1973), Volume 3, Washington: Department of State.
- Howard W. Wriggins (1987), Pakistan's foreign policy after Afghanistan. In Cohen, Stephen P. (ed.), *The Security of South Asia: American and Asian Perspectives*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Husain, Noor A. (1987), Pakistan-US security relations: Arms sales, bases, and nuclear issue. In Leo E. Rose and Noor A. Husain, *Unites States-Pakistan Forum: Relations with the Major Powers*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- Keylor, William R. (2003), *A World of Nations: The International Order since 1945*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, Liaquat Ali (1951), *Pakistan: The Heart of Asia*. Cambridge: Mass, 1951.
- Khan, Muhammad Ayub (1969), *Friends not Masters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kux, Dennis (1992), *India and the US: Estranged Democracies, 1941-1991*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press.
- Kux, Dennis (2001), *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*. Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

- McMahon, Robert J. (1994), *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India and Pakistan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. (1951), *In Defense of the National Interests*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Nehru, J. (1952, June 12), *Indian Lok Sabha Debates*. Lok Sabha Secretariat, Volume 11, No. 1, Column 1662.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal (1966), *Indian Foreign Policy: 1946-64*. New Delhi: Publication Division.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal (nd), *Indian Foreign Policy 1946-56*. New Delhi: Publication Division.
- “Objectives of the US aid.” (1955, March 2). *Statesman*.
- Pasha, Ahmad Shuja (1995), *Pakistan: A Political Study*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 1995.
- Qureshi, H. (1980), Foreign policy in black. In Thompson (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World of Change*. New Delhi.
- Raghu (2005, April-September), Indo-US defense agreement: Partnership or entrapment. *The Marxist*, Volume 21, No. 2&3. Available at [http://cpim.org/marxist/200502\\_indo-us.doc](http://cpim.org/marxist/200502_indo-us.doc), Accessed 29/12/2008.
- Rao, Kilaru Ram (1985), *India, United States and Pakistan: A Triangular Relationship*. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Rizvi, Hasan Askari (2004), Pakistan, the United States and South Asia. In *Major Powers and South Asia* compiled by Institute of Regional Studies, Islamabad. Islamabad: Institute of Regional Studies.
- Sathasivam, Kanishkan (2005), *Uneasy Neighbors: India, Pakistan and US Foreign Policy*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Sattar, Abdul (2007), *Pakistan's Foreign Policy 1947-2005: A Concise History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Sina, J. (1957), *Pakistan and Indo-US Relations: 1947-1958*. Patna.
- Singh, Rajvir (1985). *US, Pakistan and India: Strategic Relations*. Allahbad: India.
- “Spontaneous welcome all over the country.” *The Dawn*, February 25, 1954.
- Srivastva, B. K. (1976, January-March), US military assistant to Pakistan: Reappraisal. *Indian Quarterly Journal*.
- Stebbins, Richard B. (1956), *The United States in World Affairs: 1954*. New York: Harper.
- Tahir Kheli and R. Shirin (1997), *India, Pakistan and the United States: Breaking with the Past*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.



Venkatramani, M. S. (1984), *The American Role in Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard Books Ltd.

Wriggins, Howard W. (1987), Pakistan's foreign policy after Afghanistan. In Stephen P. Cohen (ed.), *The Security of South Asia: American and Asian Perspective*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.