

To: Assistant Secretary of South and Central Asia
From: David Chorney
Subject: U.S policy towards Pakistan
Date: 02/22/08

Executive Summary

- The United States needs a consistent foreign policy towards Pakistan to increase trust between the two nations, stop the terrorists gaining a strong hold in the tribal areas, help stop terrorist recruiting, and to promote a growing democracy.
- Policy One: Is a combination of democracy and allying itself with Pakistan's military. No Sanctions. Create an equal relationship with the civilian government and the military.
- Cost Benefit of Policy One: Major costs are money and time. Promoting democracy may result in an election of a leader that is part of an Islamic movement or anti-American.
- Benefits: Look at the past and the al Qaeda leaders captured with good relations with Pakistan. Greater Stability in Pakistan. Liberal theory says democracies are more peaceful and work better together.
- Policy Two: Build up infrastructure. Reform Pakistan's educational system to decrease the number of students going to radical Madrassahs. Proven evidence from NGOs this will work. Also look at how stabilization helped China's economy.
- Cost of Policy Two: Make sure aid is used for the educational reform. Do not need another Abdul Qadeer Kahn. The problem arising from empowering a mass of people. Building up infrastructure could create more competition.
- Benefits: A lot of potential. Diminish the amount of recruits terrorist groups can choose from. Direct correlation between uneducated people and terrorism. Education will help stabilize country and modernize economy. Look at India's young educated skilled workers.
- Policy recommendation three: Give aid to military. Develop tribal areas. Restore political legitimacy in Pakistan. Short term answer.
- Costs of policy three: Money and the reaction of the army to a civilian government. Cost of Musharraf not accepting a civilian government or power sharing agreement.
- Benefits of policy three: In tribal areas ends reliance on terrorist groups. Legitimizes government and political system and gives power to choose back in the people. Helps develop economy. Promotes good working relationship between U.S army and Pakistani army. Short term solution to problem put increase troops on border of Pakistan in Afghanistan.
- Recommended policy: Combination of Policies two and three. Educational reforms coupled with the economic development of the tribal regions. Also military aid and political reform to restore legitimization.

Over the past 35-40 years Pakistan has become an increasingly important ally to the United States. The early 1970s were major years in the development in US Pakistani relations. In 1970 Pakistan used good offices to initiate talks between the United States and China. Pakistan became very important in US strategy to keep the Soviet Union in check with the help of one of its main adversaries China. This helped the United States policy of containment because China kept the Soviet Union in check and it allowed the United States distance itself from the Soviet Union in the region. Right now Pakistan and especially Pervez Musharraf are friendly allies in the war on terror. After the recent elections there is a good chance that these relations could become strained. The election of the opposition party could test Pakistani US relations.

Currently Pakistan poses security dilemmas to the United State. Al Qaeda has been discovered on the border of Pakistan. Other than Al Qaeda, Pakistan is home to United States bases used for military operations in the Middle East. These bases are very important because they keep US soldiers close to trouble areas where they may need to be deployed. Over the past few months Pakistan has been becoming more destabilized. Musharraf has started emergency rule and there has been the assassination of Benazir Bhutto.

Currently the United States is selling a lot of arms to Pakistan. “The United States has rewarded Pakistan yet again for its support of the U.S war on terror with increased access to U.S. weapons and technology even though the father of Pakistan’s nuclear program, Abdul Qadeer Khan, admitted supplying nuclear technology to Iran, North Korea, and Libya.”¹ This is a big problem for the United States. Abdul Khan’s network opens the possibility of United States military technology falling into the hands

¹ Schroeder, Matt and Stohl, Rachel

of their enemies. This could directly increase the amount of American and allied deaths in the war on terror.

This policy sends the wrong message to the states in the region and all allies in the war on terror. “The decision to proceed with the MNNA (most important non NATO ally) designation despite these developments speaks to a disturbing trend in the post- 9/11 U.S. policy: Regardless of past (or even current) behavior, if a country is on the right side of the war on terror, sins will be forgiven.”² This is not the type of behavior that the United States wants its allies or even other states to think they can get away with. This policy actually goes against the rhetoric that has been coming out of Washington in the post-9/11 era. George Bush has said numerous times that he will go after terrorists where ever and with whatever it takes. He has also said that it is unacceptable for states to harbor or aid terrorists. Contradicting policies and statements is never a good idea.

Another major security threat when combining the destabilization of Pakistan and Al Qaeda on the border is nuclear weapons. Pakistan is a nuclear power and the greater the influence of the tribal leaders and Al Qaeda, the greater the security threat there is towards Pakistan’s nuclear weapons. If the new leaders of Pakistan strike a deal with the tribal leaders that have given refuge to Al Qaeda, this could lessen the government’s leverage over them. This would give the tribal leaders more power and influence. It would also give some Al Qaeda leaders safe haven to plan and execute attacks on American military especially in Afghanistan. Pervez Musharraf has already shown that he will make “peace accords” with Islamist extremists. Accords like these threaten the effectiveness of NATO and American troops in the South and Central Asia because it creates a safe haven for the terrorist to regroup, plan, and launch an attack. “While

² Schroeder, Matt and Stohl, Rachel p. 1

Pakistan may be a vital ally and a nuclear power, it is also the incubator of a resurgent Taliban and the base of al Qaeda's senior leadership.”³ Thus poses a major threat to US security.

Pakistan is also a good ally to have and keep for the future. Currently the United States needs to start moving some of its overseas bases closer to trouble areas and the United States do not have a lot of friends in the Middle East. Pakistan is in a perfect position geographically to house a base or two more in the “War on Terror”. Also Osama Bin Laden has yet to be captured and Pakistan could play a vital role in helping the current administration find him and allow this administration to leave on a high note.

“Officials say there is clear, if unstated, pressure to make a last effort to capture or kill [Osama bin Laden](#) before Mr. Bush leaves office.”⁴ In a recent development the United States is developing a stronger presence in Pakistan. The plan is to put in command centers on the Afghan border in the tribal areas to promote stabilization and to get more on the ground intelligence. This will also serve as a center for all coordinated intelligence. This way Pakistani, Afghani, and American intelligence can come together and share intelligence and ideas. This will hopefully enable American forces to learn of the location of terrorist leaders and it will also hopefully lessen the amount of terrorist attacks in the area and surrounding areas.⁵

Like in the past the United States wants a peaceful Middle East especially for economic reasons. A lot of oil comes out of the Middle East and the more conflict the

³ Twining, Daniel, “Our Pakistan Challenge”, *The Weekly Standard*, Nov. 19, 2007, http://0-newfirstsearch.oclc.org.library.muhlenberg.edu/WebZ/FSPage?pagetype=return_frameset:sessionid=fsapp14-51943-fd290rjx-t3cmmma:entitypagenum=4:0:entityframedurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.gmfus.org%2Fpublications%2Farticle.cfm%3Fid%3D357%26parent_type%3DP:entityframedtitle=PAISInternational:entityframedtimeout=30:entityopenTitle=:entityopenAuthor=:entityopenNumber=: Access on (February 23, 2008)

⁴ Schmidt, Eric and Sanger E. David,

⁵ Stockman, Farah

greater chance of higher oil prices. Without access to enough oil the US economy will be in big trouble and so will the businesses in America. Also the United States is also considered at sometimes the world's policeman. A lot of countries could lose a lot if the Middle East blew up in conflict and the United States has a responsibility to try and keep the area stable. If it is not a responsibility it is in the United States vital interest to try and keep the Middle East fairly stable at least until there is a new source of renewable energy.

The United States needs to research and create an effective and decisive foreign policy towards Pakistan. This foreign policy should not rely on Pervez Musharraf and the army but on the Pakistani citizens. Daniel Twining says that combining a policy that includes both military leaders and the middle class to help enforce a democratic resolution in Pakistan is the best idea. This will end the chaos Pervez Musharraf has started with trying to get rid of his opposition. It will give new life to the people that think like us and want a democratic country like the United States. It will help the middle majority get together and coordinate a solution to the terrorist situation and they will become a very loyal and powerful ally of the United States in the "War on Terror".⁶ Even though the United States currently has a policy toward Pakistan it needs to evolve with the current situation and the ever changing conditions. The United States is heavily invested in the area and an effective and decisive foreign policy towards Pakistan can only strengthen the United States current operation in the Middle East. The United States should alter its current policy of backing Pervez Musharraf. There have been new elections and the people are not in favor of him and his future in Pakistan maybe limited. The new policy should start to ally with the people who are supporting new ruling elites

⁶ Twining, Daniel

not the ruling elite in place. If the United States fails to ally with the majority it could severely limit what they will be able to do.

The history between the United States and Pakistan started during the cold war. Pakistan was a major player in the United States foreign policy of containment. Pakistan was a member of two different treaties that were used in containing the Soviet Union. These treaties were the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization CENTO and SEATO. These organizations were made up of states that allied to each other to enclose the Soviet Union. Pakistan was also the base for American reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union. “During the Cold War years, Pakistan was considered one of Washington’s closest allies”.⁷

In 1971 Pakistan tried to alleviate its dependence on the United States because the new president Zulfikar Ali Bhutto decided that the United States did not do enough to deter India from interfering in the civil war in Pakistan. This directly led to Pakistan’s withdrawal from SEATO and starting to lessen its policy ties with the United States. Bhutto also declared “bilateralism” which meant that they were a neutral country in the cold war and they would treat both superpowers the same. This along with their withdrawal from SEATO only helped to complicate America’s foreign policy of containment. As a result of this the United States limited the amount of aid to the minimum required by the Symington Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The relationship between the United States and Pakistan was brought back to life in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. This resulted in billions of dollars of aid programs for Pakistan. These continued on the condition that Pakistan did not have a nuclear weapon. When the cold war ended there was less of a need to give a lot of

⁷ Library of Congress Country Studies

aid to Pakistan. The United States also started taking a tougher stance on nuclear weapons and thus the aid given to Pakistan stopped. As of 1994 the relationship between Pakistan and the United States rested on the Mutual Defense Agreement which was brought about in 1954. This has been considered very outdated.⁸

The United States has used Pakistan only when it has served their interests. When Pakistan was not needed or considered crucial the United States did not do anything this can be seen in Pakistan's civil war and war with India. But Pakistan became very important when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan and the United States did a lot to regain Pakistan's trust. This all ended again with the fall of the Soviet Union because the United States did not receive any direct benefit from being a good friend and ally with Pakistan. The aid ceased and now again Pakistan is back at the forefront of countries the United States needs to have a good healthy relationship with for the war on terror. In looking at the history between these two states it become very apparent why some leaders in Pakistan and in their military do not trust the United States. To regain this trust the United States needs to create a policy that wins over the people of Pakistan and changes the minds of its leaders.

Policy Alternatives

A policy action the United States could take towards Pakistan is one of a combination of democracy and allying itself with Pakistan's military. The United States

⁸ Library of Congress Country Studies

can not get an effective policy if it sees the only way to work with Pakistan is either through the military or through a rapid democratization of Pakistan. Many of the reasons for this will be discussed in the cost benefit analysis of this policy recommendation later in the paper. One reason the United States may be keen on trying to work with civilians and promote a rapid democracy in Pakistan comes from liberal theory. The thinking is that democracies work better together than other forms of government. This means that if Pakistan and the United States had an ideological base they would be more likely to support and serve each others interests. The United States has a lot of interests in the region.

A rapid democratization of Pakistan would not work. The military has always had significant power in Pakistan. It would be very unlikely for it to rapidly give up power and it would be nearly impossible to take this power from the military in Pakistan. The main reason for this is because whoever becomes the new leader in Pakistan is going to have to rely on the military to control some major national security matters. A big one is limiting the extremist's power especially in the tribal areas and keeping terrorists from crossing the boarder into Pakistan.

The United States needs to partially work with moderate civilians because right now they are not allied with the United States. They believe that the United States is all to concerned and interested in working with Pakistan's army than to find other solutions to the problem through the people.

The United States can not only work with the Pakistani army for two reasons. The first is that they will alienate the Pakistani people. The second is the belief by some Pakistani military that the United States is only interested in using the army until their

interests have been served and at that point they will leave and forget about Pakistan. This fear stems from previous times when the United States has abandoned Pakistan during the cold war once its interests had been served. If the United States continues to only focus on the Pakistani army and does nothing to ally with the people and help stabilize the country through infrastructure it will look like the United States is going to leave after its interests are served.

Using some sort of sanctions or refusing aid to get Pakistan to comply and to democratize or to influence the army is also a bad idea. This will alienate the Pakistani people and the military. If the United States wants the Pakistani military to be capable of helping American troops in the War on Terror then it is best for the United States to train Pakistan's military. Also United States training of Pakistani military personnel will fuel trust between the two sides.⁹ This course of action of refusing aid will also only help to fuel fears of the Pakistani military. "Pakistan's military establishment who believe Washington will abandon Pakistan once its tactical utility is gone."¹⁰ This policy alternative calls for increasing democratic ties with the civilian government while maintaining a positive healthy relationship with Pakistan's army.

The second policy recommendation is to build up the infrastructure of Pakistan. This means to improve education and literacy rates. It also means helping to modernize their military and economy. The most important part of building up Pakistan's infrastructure is building it up in a way to make Pakistan a very stable State. One can look at China as precedent to see how important stability is to national security concerns. If Pakistan becomes a stable country its economy will modernize and prosper. This will

⁹ Markey, Daniel p. 4

¹⁰ Markey, Daniel p. 4

give Pakistan a much greater influence in the region and therefore they will be better off to help serve America's interests.

One of China's main foreign policy initiatives was to stabilize its borders and the other countries in the region. This has worked well with China and its economy is one of the fastest growing economies in the world. If the United States works to stabilize Pakistan and increase its links to India there will be two strong countries in the region to keep the region in order. "The strength of Pakistan's infrastructure and public health, education, law enforcement, and just sectors will determine its ability to sustain the fight against extremism over the long term. A weak Pakistani state and a faltering economy prop open the door to discontent, alienation, and radicalization"¹¹.

One major area the United States should look at is strengthening the educational system in Pakistan. Education is crucial for civil involvement and aid in the defeat of radicalization. It also will make citizens more informed and open minded thus creating a stronger base for democracy in the country. Pervez Musharraf has said he will reform the countries educational system. But throughout his entire rule he has not. "His five-year old plan to reform Pakistan's Madrassas is "in shambles", according to a report last week by the International Crisis Group, a research and policy outfit."¹² Since he is unable to do anything that is working the United States should pledge aid to help Pakistan's educational system.

Another blow to the educational system could come if Pervez Musharraf is removed from power in a coup. The little reforms that he has initiated could be reversed. This would leave Pakistan's educational system in a worse state then when it was before.

¹¹ Markey, Daniel p. 6

¹² The Economist

This is just another reason the United States should seriously consider an aid package that directly affects the educational system in Pakistan.

Strengthening Pakistan's public health is also needed. Disease can really decrease a country's stability. If there is a pandemic of some sort and the country's infrastructure is not strong enough to deal with it then it will spread more rampantly than in other states. The state will be affected by the disease in regards to its government and economy. The disease can create a lot of unrest and the government could fall. Also increasing the law enforcement in Pakistan could help a lot. It should provide for a lot more internal stability.

A policy to bolster Pakistan's infrastructure could help deal with some of the flaws and weaknesses in the government. It would require a longer commitment to the region but with all the problems and destabilizing factors stemming from the area it might not be a bad idea. Also a stronger infrastructure is a good way to fight terrorism without actually having to place a large number of troops anywhere.

The third policy recommendation has two parts. The first is aimed at increasing political legitimacy in Pakistan. The second part addresses the problems that are raised by violent extremists. These are the two biggest security threats to America in Pakistan and in the region. The extremists pose the biggest threat to U.S troops and the war on terror. These extremists have been able to use Pakistan's border areas as a safety zone and then cross the borders to attack American troops.

The problem with Pakistan's military does not pertain to its recent failures. "The recent setbacks that the military has suffered, might you imagine, have stiffened the resolve of the Pakistan military.... This should have a positive effect in getting them, as I

say, to take more aggressive positions.”¹³ This increased resolve and the appointment of General Kayani are two very positive things for the Pakistani army. The problem with their army is that it is not trained adequately and it does not have the right equipment. This policy calls for consistent and constant aid to Pakistan and training the army with America’s military.

Aid can come in monetary and training forms. People in the United States military should help train the Pakistani army. This way they will be empowered to fight the extremists and stop the violence between Pakistanis. Also in this training there needs to be a greater emphasis on the fact that the jihadists are not good. “Conflict comes from a belief system after years of having been told that the jihadists represent a force for good. And now they are being told to fight them, some of them are not able to make that transition as quickly as General Musharraf.”¹⁴

This aid should be used for two things one is the military and the other is Pakistan’s economy. The most pressing problem lies with the military. Without a strong military the United States is going to have to increase the number of troops on the border of Afghanistan to help control the flow across the border to and from Pakistan into Afghanistan. This seems to be the best viable option the United States has for a short term solution.

The second part of this policy deals with political legitimatization. This is a very big issue especially right now when extremists are pushing for an Islamic Revolution. The threats a revolution would pose to the United States in the region are infinite. One of the problems facing this legitimatization is the fact that political parties in Pakistan seem

¹³ Dr. Marvin Weinbaum, Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

¹⁴ Curtis, Lisa Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

to be becoming increasingly controlled by families. This means that the political future is held in the power of the political elite and not in the people. The United States should encourage a civilian government in Pakistan. “It is important to bear in mind that this identity of the United States with military rule should now end, and if assistance has to be provided to Pakistan, assistance should continue under civilian rule as much as there has been under military rule”¹⁵ This being done by the United States will promote more trust between the two states.

The aid given to this new government has to be given out carefully. The United States has to make sure the aid given does not fall into the hands of another Abdul Qadeer Khan. This political aid can be used for stability especially in the tribal regions. Currently the United States has pledged 750 million dollars over the next five years to help economically develop the tribal areas. This aid should continue and it needs to be carefully distributed. This aid should accomplish two goals. The First is to develop the area and the other is to change people’s minds about the jihadists. Once people realize support for the jihadists is inherently bad for themselves and Pakistan, a grass roots movement to weed out terrorists will be able to be sustained. This should directly result in fewer deserters and fewer capitulations to the extremists in the Pakistani army. It will also decrease the amount of pressure the U.S army in having to control the Afghanistan Pakistan border.

Costs and Benefit analysis

¹⁵ Haqqani, Husain Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

There are multiple different costs and benefits to choosing the first policy recommendation. The first major cost is money. This policy of building up a coalition with the people and the army will cost money. Training Pakistan's military and enabling their security defense systems all costs money and time. This cost is worth the benefits though. Even though it costs money and takes time to train Pakistan's military it means that they will think the way we think. Also Pakistanis will have more interaction with the United States and that could foster more trust and cooperation. These are two major factors that a United States foreign policy towards Pakistan needs to address.

Another cost associated with this foreign policy initiative is the costs incurred when dealing with Pervez Musharraf. Pervez Musharraf is seen "as a master of doing the least necessary in order to satisfy competing tactical requirements, prioritizing U.S interests only when the costs of doing otherwise become unacceptably high, as was the case immediately after 9/11".¹⁶ Whether this cost of dealing with Musharraf is real or perceived does not matter. This perception by the United States will continue to hinder what it can or can not do in regards to Pakistan. This of course will only be a cost of this policy if the United States took an uncompromising stance.

Pervez Musharraf leads into another cost associated with this policy. As discussed before there is distrust among the United States and Pakistan. Not all Americans and foreign policy makers trust Musharraf and Pakistan in general. They are worried that with increasing democracy an Islamic extremist regime will rise up and the United States will lose an essential foothold in the region. This is much more of a perceived threat than a real threat. One can look at the recent elections in Pakistan to see

¹⁶ Markey, Daniel

that the Islamist extremists are not gaining power. In fact because of the new conflicts and terrorist activities they have supported in Pakistan their popularity has decreased.

A cost that can be associated with democratization in Pakistan is the fact that the people choose the leader. Whoever the people choose is who the United States has to work with. This can be good and bad. There is the possibility that through democratic election the people will choose someone worse than Musharraf. A Pakistani president could be elected that disagrees with the United State's policies and will not work with the United States in trying to help serve their interests.

The next cost could be incurred because of Pakistanis beliefs in the United States. Some Pakistanis believe that the United States does not really care about Pakistan and is only now trying to be an ally because it serves their interests. But as soon as the interest is served the United States will go back to ignoring Pakistan. They are also worried that if Pakistan really needs the United States help America may not come to their aid. Looking into past history this is a very realistic fear for Pakistan. If this policy is not initiated correctly then the United States may find it harder to influence Pakistan to align their policies with the United States.

This Policy has to be initiated in a certain way to gain Pakistan's trust and to dissuade the costs mentioned above. Firstly the United States should not try to sanction Pakistan because it will only anger Pakistan and foster more distrust. Instead the United States should pledge to help build up their infrastructure and continue to strengthen the ties between India and Pakistan. Also the United States should continue to help build up Pakistan's security defense. By doing this it could create more interdependence between Pakistan and the United States. If America sells military equipment to Pakistan then

Pakistan will most likely look to the United States to buy replacement parts and to repair this equipment. This will help America's economy and will foster more trust between the two countries. Also by training Pakistan's military they will be much more enabled to fight along side with out being a burden to American forces.

The biggest benefit from working efficiently with Pakistan is the fact that in the past it has been very effective in serving the United States interests. "Washington's post 9/11 engagement with Islamabad has achieved notable successes. A number of al Qaeda leaders have been killed or captured in Pakistan, including Abu Zubaydah (2002), Ramzi bin al-Shibh (2002), Khalid Sheik Mohammad (2003), and Abu Faraj al-Libbi (2005). Such achievements would not have been possible without extensive cooperation between Pakistan and the U.S."¹⁷ It is foreseeable that continued cooperation between the two states can only continue to create more achievements in the war on terror.

Another major benefit from this policy would be that an outcome could be greater stability in Pakistan. This is a major benefit because a stable Pakistan would be able to wield a lot more influence in the region. Pakistan could also become the model for other countries seeking stability in the region. It could essentially help to solve the problem of instability in Iraq and the question of what will happen when the United States leaves Iraq if Pakistan is strong and stable enough to assert enough power and influence over the region.

Another benefit comes from the gradual democratization of Pakistan. This can also be a cost but theoretically it can be a major benefit. Liberal theory says that democracies work better together. Through democratization Pakistan will gradually become a democracy and in theory democracies do not fight each other because it would

¹⁷ Markey, Daniel p.2

be inherently bad for all democratic states involved. This means that there will be more peace in the region and Pakistan's interests and policies will become more in sync with the United States.

There are a lot of potential benefits and fewer costs in the second policy recommendation. The one of the biggest infrastructural flaws in Pakistan is its educational system. Over fifty percent of its population is illiterate. Another problem is that some of the Madrassahs or religious schools in Pakistan have become very close to radical groups. These few schools are a major player in helping sustain a global terrorist network.¹⁸ So while some may consider education to be an internal problem in Pakistan it is a problem that is directly affecting the United States. According to international law and abatement theory the United States has the grounds to step in and force Pakistan to reform its educational system. These schools are directly aiding terrorism and the United States has been a direct target of terrorist activities. This gives them the right to interfere in another countries internal problems if it has a direct effect on them.

The major cost of this policy would be money and making sure the aid goes to the educational system does not get taken away by corrupt government officials. One way to circumvent this issue is to give the aid to Pakistan not in monetary forms but in material form. Send the actual things needed to run a school. Send textbooks and computers for example. Another promising policy is to send food. It has been proven in some private schools in the north that free lunches or meals will attract a greater number of students. "A number of NGOs run schools for the poor in Northern Pakistan, and local observers note that their enrollments had a drastic increase when meals were introduced. Many parents would prefer less radical schools, if only these schools provided the lure of a free

¹⁸ Singer, P.W.

meal.”¹⁹ The cost of sending enough food for aid to give kids free lunch is not nearly as much as sending money with the probability of corruption to reform Pakistan’s whole educational system. All the United States has to do is to ensure that Pakistan’s non-religious and non-radical schools do not keep closing. This will give parents enough alternative options instead of being forced to send their kids to a radical Madrassah.

There are two other possible costs of this policy. The first is the problem of empowerment. If the United States were to empower Pakistan’s masses coupled with the lack of stability in the state right now there could be some kind of a coup. Worst case scenario a fundamentalist is put into power. Even if an anti American was put into power it could create problems for the United States policies in the region. A coup would create problems on its own regardless of who is put into power. The United States would have to use some of its power and influence in the region to regain stability in Pakistan. This would take away from what the United States is trying to do in other areas on the war on terror and they might have to sacrifice some of its resources.

Another cost of this policy is that the United States is potentially creating another competitor. This could potentially happen when America helps modernize Pakistan’s economy and helps create more links with India. This could create more internal complaints in America about outsourcing jobs. This policy does not create a lot of spin off in the United States.

The benefits of this policy have the potential to be numerous. Firstly it could help stop terrorism at its roots. One of the problems with the war on terror right now is that it is not addressing the real problem. All the United States is doing is killing different terrorists and going after the leaders of the terrorist networks. These leaders and

¹⁹ Singer, P.W p. 7

terrorists that the United States is able to kill are just replaced with younger and brasher people that are recruited from these schools. “These schools have become the new breeding ground for radical Islamic militants, where the next generation is trained and groomed. Their graduating classes form an integral recruiting pool for transnational terrorist and conflict networks.”²⁰ Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Kashmiri terrorist groups have all recruited students that have graduated from these schools. A major problem with these new graduated students is that they were taken at a young age from their parents and have had no influence outside of the radical teachings of their school. They have been taught from very early on that martyrdom via suicide is celebrated. This means that they are not afraid of dieing for their cause and this makes it hard for the United States to change their mind through a cost benefit analysis. If the worst that can happen to them is death which in their minds is not bad the United States is actually helping them.

Secondly aiding Pakistan’s educational system correlates to having less troops on the ground in danger. If the United States can find a feasible way to attack terrorism at its roots instead of attacking from the top an educational policy is it. Sending aid and empowering great numbers of people is cheaper then sending the United States military into battle. This policy will not completely eliminate the need for America’s military in the area to help fight terrorism but over time it could significantly ease the burden. With out these radical religious school terrorist networks like the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Kashmiri will have to look harder and elsewhere for recruits.

Thirdly by helping reform Pakistan’s educational system the United States will be helping to bring stability to the region. There is evidence that the more stable a region is

²⁰ Singer, P.W p. 3

the less conflict there will be. Also the Madrassah schools are a destabilizing factor in Pakistan. “Despite going to school for eight years, the graduates of most Madrassahs have no acquaintance with needed subjects like economics, science, or computing.”²¹ This directly affects the stability of the nation. Graduates come out only being educated in Islam. This means that it is very hard for them to get a job that has nothing to do with Islam. This produces an unskilled labor force that creates a feedback loop for less stability. If Pakistan has an unskilled labor force then it is less likely that they will receive foreign investment because there are not a lot of investment opportunities. Also the graduates of these schools will likely become unemployed and the only jobs they can get are as teachers in the Madrassahs which mean more Madrassahs are opened throughout the country. If they do not become teachers they often join radical religious groups.

By investing in the reform of Pakistan’s educational system the United States will help stabilize the country. Much like in India whose educational system focuses on graduating skilled workers that are competent in a number of different areas and subjects. As Pakistan grows and educates its masses these two countries could become partners in trade and investment. These two countries could act as a stabilizing force in the region. As by fully educating Pakistan’s masses the United States will be helping Pakistan to rid itself of its debt. An increase in education correlates to a stronger economy and a growing economy will help Pakistan alleviate its debt burden. Aiding education is a much better and safer way to give aid to Pakistan because if the United States sent money to Pakistan in the form of aid for debt relief there is a good chance that it would end up in a private bank account due to corruption in the government.

²¹ Singer, P.W p. 5

There are significant costs associated with the third policy recommendation. The third policy tries to get at a short term solution in Pakistan and Afghanistan. A major cost of this policy is that while the United States is training the Pakistani army they will have to pick up the slack. To stop the attacks and suicide bombers coming out of Pakistan and into Afghanistan the United States will have to increase the number of troops it has located on the border. “Our only option here is to fortify ourselves to redeploy larger number of troops into the frontier area on the Afghanistan side.”²² This will increase the monetary cost of the war on terror and as with any increase in troops there is the chance of an increase in casualties.

Another cost arising from training the Pakistani army could come in the differences of the two societies and military traditions. The Pakistani army is very proud and has historically held a lot of power in the country. “They’ve got their own education system, a lot of economic facilities.”²³ The Pakistan army has pretty much separated itself from the rest of society and created its own norms and essentially its own world. This could be very difficult for the United States military trainers to combine with America’s ways of education and training. This means that training could potentially be very confusing and could take a lot of time.

Another cost that is associated with the backing of a civilian government comes in how the army will react to this. The Pakistani army has always held a lot of power and the leader of Pakistan usually comes out of the army. It is essential to lessen the costs of this that the United States supports both and promotes a good working relationship. Worst case scenario could arise if the civilian government calls upon the army to do

²² Dr. Marvin Weinbaum, Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

²³ Haqqani, Husain Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

something and the army does not react because they are angered by the new policies.

This would create immense amounts of stability in the state and increase the likelihood of another revolution. One that is much less likely to be sympathetic to U.S. interests.

A cost of supporting civilian governance is the possibility of someone becoming elected that disagrees with the United States policies in the region. The United States would have to create new policies and it might force the U.S to have to take a few steps back in the war on terror before it can go forward again. After the recent elections this does not seem to be as big of an issue as it was before. In the election the Islamic movement was slowed down. This election may have potentially provided a check for what these extremists can do in Pakistan. They may be able to have bases in Pakistan but if they act up with a lot of terrorist activities and kill a lot of Pakistan's their movement will run out of civilian support. Civilian support is crucial to their movement because these networks act as a family and it is also their recruiting base.

Another cost is associated with Pervez Musharraf. There could be problems if he decides that he will not share power. This will create a lot of conflict in Pakistan because he does not have a high popularity rating in Pakistan. Also it could fuel the Islamic movement if they are the only ones that can get him to listen. Another thing that could fuel the Islamic movement would be if Pervez Musharraf said he was going to stay as the absolute ruler of Pakistan and the United States continued to support this decision. This would decrease the United States already fragile popularity ratings in the region.

If Pervez Musharraf agrees to a power sharing deal this could be a major benefit. It would work directly in line with what this policy is trying to accomplish. It would help the United States efforts to support a civilian government while at the same time

continuing ties with the army. This would also solve the problem of his unpopularity. Since the people won the election they would be able to have their say and Musharraf would not have the final say and everything. At the same time he could still use his influence and ties in the Army to help promote U.S interests.

Though there are some short term costs the long term benefits of this policy could be very big. It will help break the bonds between the extremists and the people living in the tribal areas. Right now some of these tribes in the tribal areas survival depend on al Qaeda and the Taliban. Al Qaeda and the Taliban provide economic ties, money for safety and support, and food. If the 750 million dollars is spent correctly to increase development in the area these tribes will not be dependent on the al Qaeda or the Taliban for survival. These tribal areas will no longer be able to provide terrorist and extremists with a safe haven to plan attacks. This would ultimately lessen the load on America's military and it would also ease tensions between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

There are major benefits with aiding Pakistan' army. Like in the benefits of the other policies training Pakistani troops allows for a more unified action in the area. Pakistan and American militaries will know how to work with each other and they will be able to successfully utilize each other strengths to fight the war on terror. The biggest benefit of this policy is that it helps erase the distrust of the past between Pakistan and the United States. "U.S.-Pakistani relations have usually been cyclical in nature. They have started with great hopes and they have ended with great disappointments."²⁴ Pakistan is going to be a very important ally to the United States because as we have seen in the post-9/11 era this fight against terrorism is not going to be short or easy to win. It is very

²⁴ Haggani, Husain Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee

important to create a policy that will foster trust between the two nations and to not let this policy end in great disappointment in the future.

Selected Policy

I do not think that any of these three possible policies will solve everything that is wrong with the United States and Pakistani relations. I do think that the second and third policy recommendations are the best. I would personally advocate not choosing either of them but instead offer up the idea of choosing different parts of each policy. I do not think the second policy does anything substantial to help Pakistan's military problems. This is definitely a strength in the third policy. The problem with the third policy is that it does not fully address what to develop and how it should be done and this is definitely the major advantage to the second policy. I think that a combination between policy recommendations two and three will work out the best in a cost benefit analysis.

The main thing that needs to be taken from policy two is how to address Pakistan's educational system. This is a very big problem because it allows major terrorist groups to recruit from pools of uneducated masses. Also the benefits of reforming the educational system are already proven. NGO's have started some private schools with free meals and they have attracted a lot of new students that may have otherwise ended up in Madrassahs. Also students that graduate from these schools will be much better equipped to help modernize the Pakistani economy and open up new trading avenues for Pakistan. With increases in education it will cut down on the base of these terrorist groups which will directly decrease the number of attacks and different

activities they will be able to do. Also increases in education will help solve one of the problems that policy three addresses. This problem is that a lot of people in Pakistan especially those living in the tribal areas do not understand that the jihadists are inherently bad for them.

Policy two's education reforms coupled with the development plans of the tribal regions will effectively cut down on al Qaeda and the Taliban's influence in the area. These tribal areas will no longer have to resort on the Taliban or al Qaeda for survival. This is also a good example as to why political legitimacy needs to be restored to Pakistan. There is a problem when the citizens of a state can no longer depend on their government to aid in their survival and have to look into other avenues for survival. This is what makes the tribal areas so attractive to terrorist groups because they can provide these people with things the government can not and in return they get recruits and safe passage.

Policy recommendation three deals with political legitimacy and for the reasons stated above needs to be restored in order to stabilize Pakistan. Political legitimacy will bring a lot to Pakistan. It will put the power back into civilian's hands and in looking at the past election there does not have to be too much worry about an Islamic uprising if the United States supports the change to a civilian and military power sharing agreement. Policy three addresses not only political reforms but military reforms that need to be addressed. Right now Pakistan's army is in disarray. They are surrendering to extremists with little fight and there are deserters. They are not trained in a way to fight guerilla warfare and to involve themselves in counterterrorism activities. This is why policy three

states the benefits of training and equipping the Pakistani military. Training will allow Pakistanis and U.S troops to fight side by side effectively and efficiently.

The one major problem policy three addresses that needs to be done is a short term solution. The U.S does not have the time to allow what is happening to its troops in Afghanistan because Pakistan is currently unable to deal with it. Unfortunately it will take an increase in troops in Afghanistan on the Pakistani border. This is the only way to reduce the flow of people crossing the border and to make sure suicide bombers are not getting through. An increase in troops on the border will also help in the training and adaptation of Pakistan's army to counterterrorism and helping them control their borders. It will also help create a better working relationship between Afghanistan and Pakistan. This is very important because if this region is going to be stable in the future these two states must be able to put aside their distrust and work together. For these reasons I believe this combination of both policies is the best option for the United States.

Works Cited

1. Twining, Daniel, "Our Pakistan Challenge", *The Weekly Standard*, Nov. 19, 2007, http://0-newfirstsearch.oclc.org.library.muhlenberg.edu/WebZ/FSPage?pagetype=return_frameset:sessionid=fsapp14-51943-fd290rjx-t3cmmma:entitypagenum=4:0:entityframedurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.gmfus.org%2Fpublications%2Farticle.cfm%3Fid%3D357%26parent_type%3DP:entityframedtitle=PAISInternational:entityframedtimeout=30:entityopenTitle=:entityopenAuthor=:entityopenNumber=: Access on (February 23, 2008)
2. Schroeder, Matt and Stohl, Rachel, "Pakistan Sends Dangerous Signal" *Center For Defense Information*, March 2004, Cio, Access on (April 9, 2008)
3. Library of Congress Studies, "Pakistan The United States and the West", April 1994, Access on March 4th, 2008
4. Markey, Daniel, "A False Choice in Pakistan" *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 86, Number 4, July/August 2007, Access on April 8th 2008
5. Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, Capital Hill Hearing, October 10th, 2007, Copyright 2007, Federal News Service inc. Access on March 15th, 2008.
6. Stockman, Farah, "US Moves to Expand its role in Pakistan", *The Boston Globe*, February 28, 2008
7. Singer, P.W. "Pakistan's Madrassahs: Enduring a system of Education not Jihad", Brookings Institute, November 2001, Access on April 8th, 2008.
8. The Economist, "Teacher Don't Leave Them Kids Alone", April 7th, 2007, vol. 383 Issue 8523 p. 42, Access on April 8th, 2008.
9. Schmidt, Eric and Sanger E. David, "Pakistan Shift Could Curtail Drone Strikes", *New York Times*, February 22, 2008.