

Pakistan-US Relation (1947-1962): A New Perspective

Muzaffar Khan Zafar*

Abstract

Theory of offensive realism constitutes the framework of analysis of this research paper. It predicts that great powers are extremely sensitive to the balance of power system. They are always looking for opportunities to increase their share of world power and, at the same time, deny the same to the rival powers. In post-WWII scenario, the emerging world order based on 'ideological bipolarity' replaced the old one. The resultant Cold War unfolded an era of intense competition between the US and the USSR, for world dominance. The US feared the concept of 'historic inevitability of communism.' The two great powers were locked up into an eternal ideological conflict for world dominance. The US created 'formidable structures' in the three strategically located important regions of the world i.e. Europe, Northeast Asia, and Persian Gulf to ensure her dominance. America was acting as an offshore balancer in Asia. The efforts for gaining dominance over the world resulted into two bloody wars in Asia i.e., Korean War and Vietnam War. America constructed worldwide ring of military alliances, supported by its nuclear superiority, to ensure her dominance. During early years of the Cold War, America ignored Pakistan's genuine concerns to win over India into

* Ph.D. Scholar, School of Politics and International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

her fold. For the US, South Asia presented a good opportunity for Soviet penetration. The US must deny that opportunity to USSR. For the US, abandonment of Pakistan was a reasonable cost argues offensive realism.

Introduction

The main argument presented here is that the US policy towards Pakistan in general and South Asia in particular during the Cold War could not be explained properly under the traditional cover of policy of containment. Since the beginning of the Cold War between the super powers in 1945, it has been argued by American politicians and scholars alike that the policy of containment, global in its operational reach, essentially was a 'defensive policy'. This claim is questionable on the basis of empirical evidence and historical facts. The case is other way around. The expression 'Policy of Containment' coined by George F. Kennan, a famous American diplomat was, in reality, a euphemism for US global offensive policy based on the assumptions that theory of offensive realism aimed at gaining, among other things, US global hegemony and the status of maintaining offshore balance in South Asia. It constituted a classic case study of great power conduct in world politics.

Framework of Analysis: Offensive Realist Model

The great powers shape the world political system under an environment of mutual fear and distrust. There has been continuous competition for power among them. The ultimate objective of a great power has been to attain the position of a hegemon in the international political system.¹ Great powers compete for power maximization in the system. They always cherish revisionist intentions. They use force to alter the contemporary balance of power in their favour, if practically possible, at a payable price. In other words, 'great powers are primed for offense'. They perform two functions.

1 John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001), 256.

They exploit opportunities to increase their own share of world power. As offshore balancers, they also check their rival powers to gain the same advantage.

Fates of all petty states, irrespective of their power fundamentally depend upon actions of great powers. In this nuclear age, a great power must be armed with nuclear weapons.² It has been a distinctive character of great powers that they miscalculate, time and again, and their decisions are based on imperfect information and wrong judgments. They do not like peer competitors and at the same time, acting as offshore balancers, prevent potential hegemon in the other regions of the globe. Great powers can go to great length to safeguard current configuration of power in other regions of the world.

Theory of offensive realism consists of five assumptions. Firstly, international political system is based on anarchy. The units of international political system are sovereign states having no supra-state authority to control. Secondly, some inherent offensive military capability has always been wedded in great powers. They can hurt each other and, if possible, destroy each other. Thirdly, states can never trust on other states intentions.

The most important thing about intentions is their uncertainty. Fourthly, survival is the top most priority of great powers. Fifthly, major powers, with no exception, are rational actors. They rationally think about the outcomes of their actions and their rival's actions. Taken together, these five assumptions create a formidable external environment of great powers wedded with great incentives to think and act offensively in relation to each other. Under such conditions, international political environment is characterized by fear, self-help and power maximization. In the self-help system, great powers understand that their survival could be guaranteed only after gaining hegemony in the system. Consequently, they pursue hegemony in the system.

2 Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 5.

Great powers cherish aggressive intentions. John Mearsheimer, the offensive realist theorist, is of the opinion that only a 'misguided great power' would lose opportunities to become hegemon within the system. They do not behave as *status quo* powers unless they become predominant power in the system. In this process they even lie, cheat, and use force, if necessary, to gain the advantage in their favour. For them, their 'best defense lay in good offense.' The assumptions of offensive realism are equally true for all great powers.

America is a liberal state. However, US leaders think and act according to realist principles. American foreign policy usually followed realist logic. There has been a discernible gap between leadership rhetoric and real policy. The United States speaks in liberal language but act according to realist dictates. Intelligent observers throughout the globe understand this tendency in US foreign policy.³

International Context of the Cold War: America on the Offensive

It was in the year 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, the US and Russia were fated to become rival powers in future. They emerged as great powers in the backdrop of WW-II. The post-WW-II international political system was characterized by bi-polarity.⁴ In the context of the Cold War, Dean Acheson, in his memoirs titled *Present at the Creation* wrote that the people perceived US as a world leader. There was a deep rot between the two superpowers based on ideological conflict.⁵ The revisionist historians of the origins of the Cold War were of the opinion that the US was pursuing an empire. For these historians, the US, in the

3 Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 26.

4 Charles Jr. Kegley and Eugene W. Wittkopf, *American Foreign Policy*, 5th ed., (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), 54.

5 Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1987), 38.

post-WW-II era was pursuing neo-imperialist foreign policy⁶. For a deeper understanding of the Cold War we need to keep this context in mind. How did the US follow her agenda of world dominance?

The UN was not created as a powerful body to ensure peace in the world. It was just after the creation of UN, the US dropped two nuclear bombs on Japan. Some critics believed that the use of nuclear weapons against Japan was, in fact, a move to demonstrate US military might to threaten the USSR.⁷ There arose a controversy between Washington and Moscow in 1946 over the Baruch plan. It was an American proposal for the UN control of nuclear weapons. Moscow rejected this proposal. It was intended to get rejection from Moscow.⁸ In October 1949, communist forces won the Chinese civil war. Despite communist victory in this civil war, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), under US influence, allowed Chiang Kai-Shek's Nationalist government of Taiwan to continue the occupation of China's permanent seat in the UNSC. It was manoeuvred by the US.⁹

The US developed two basic doctrines in the early days of the Cold War. They constituted the core of US foreign policy during the Cold War. The first was doctrine of nuclear deterrence. The central theme of the doctrine was the prevention of attack from the USSR by imposing unacceptable cost through the fear of retaliation. The use of single nuclear bomb against Hiroshima had killed about 130,000 individuals; while 70,000 died later on due to

6 Melvyn P. Leffler, *Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

7 Martin J. Sherwin, "The Atomic Bomb and the Origins of the Cold War: US Atomic Energy Policy and Diplomacy," *American Historical Review* 78, no. 4 (October 1973): 945-68.

8 Martin J. Sherwin, "Baruch, Bernard Mannes", in *Encyclopaedia of U.S. Foreign Relations*, Bruce W. Jentleson and Thomas G. Paterson, eds., (USA: Oxford University Press, 1997), 135-36.

9 B. W. Jentleson, *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century* (London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007), 96.

harmful effects of radiation and poisoning. The US must deter any nuclear attack against its territory before it began.¹⁰ By 1953, the US deployed 427,000 US troops in Europe. In another aggressive move, in accordance with the assumptions of offensive realism, the US also deployed seven thousand atomic weapons in Europe during 1950s and early 1960s.¹¹ This movement of American troops to Europe followed its traditional pattern of offshore balancing in Europe. During the World Wars America intervened in Europe to check German dominance of the continent. It was a classic case of America acting as an offshore balancer.¹²

Doctrine of containment was the other basic concept developed in the early years of Cold War. In 1946, George F. Kennan gave the concept. He recommended the US government to adopt, “patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies... the USSR was not in hurry to achieve the desired goal of historic inevitability of world communist revolution.”¹³

It was interesting to note, argued revisionist historians, USSR lacked a ‘large military fleet’ and ‘inter-continental air power’ and as such did not present any threat to the US. Moreover, the US had monopoly over nuclear power. Soviet Union was not a serious threat to the US security.¹⁴ In March 1947, President Truman announced the US policy during cold war which was came to be known as ‘Truman Doctrine’.

It is to be noted that American military might was greater in post-WW-II period than before the war.¹⁵ For economic dominance of the world, even during the WW-II in 1944, the US created new international economic structure based on Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, America. The system

10 Jentleson, *American Foreign Policy*, 93.

11 Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 256.

12 Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 252-56.

13 George F. Kennan, “Sources of Soviet Conduct”, *Foreign Affairs*, 25, no.4 (July 1947) 572-82.

14 Steven W. Hook and John Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II*, 11th eds. (Washington, D.C. CQ Press, 2000), 47-48.

15 Hook and Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II*, 54.

formalized three international economic institutions including International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and General Agreement on Trade Tariff (GATT). These three institutions were created for the global economic dominance of the US.¹⁶

President Truman, supported by Congress, created the National Security Act of 1947. The act established three institutions, the Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and National Security Council. NSC was to help the President on the matters of foreign policy.¹⁷ The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created in April, 1949 as the first US peacetime military alliance since its independence. NATO perhaps was the biggest military alliance. The US also extended nuclear umbrella to her NATO allies. The founding members of NATO included Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States. Greece and Turkey joined the alliance in 1952. West Germany became member in 1955.¹⁸ The Federal Republic of Germany was created through US efforts in May 1949 as a bulwark against USSR. The creation of NATO, American nuclear monopoly, and inclusion of West Germany into NATO were the three major developments which increased US share of world power in accordance with the assumptions of offensive realism. It represented great power behaviour in international political system in a classic way. Only the theory of offensive realism in retrospective, in a proper way, explained US foreign policy during these years.

In the year 1949, there occurred two important developments which, once again, initiated a reassessment in US policy. One was the Soviet nuclear explosion of July,

16 Robert L. Pollard, *Economic Security and the Origins of the Cold War, 1945-1950* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

17 Hook and Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II*, 56-57.

18 William R. Keylor, *The Twentieth Century World: An International History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 284-85.

1949 and other was communist revolution of China the same year. A reassessment of US policy was initiated, and a secret document titled as NSC-68 was produced. The document declared that the containment policy adopted in 1947 was no longer sufficient. The secret paper recommended to the US government a 'global offensive against the communist bloc'. The paper argued "It is necessary to have the military power to deter, if possible, Soviet expansion, and to defeat, if necessary, aggressive Soviet actions ..."¹⁹

NSC-68 asked for three major changes in US strategy-globalization of containment policy, militarization of containment, and the development of the 'hydrogen bomb'. It is to be noted that NSC-68 dismissed the chances, if any, of serious talks between the superpowers to control arms race.²⁰

Paul Nitze, the primary author of NSC-68 report, wrote that our civilization was at stake. The basic objective of this report was to get approval of Congress for a big increase in US defense budget.²¹ In 1950, during these circumstances, North Korea, the Soviet puppet invaded South Korea, a part of global American sphere of influence. It is to be noted that South Korea was not a formal US ally. On June 25, 1950, North Korea attacked South Korea. Joseph Stalin had already endorsed this attack in March 1949.²² It is to be noted that South Korea was not part of the American Pacific defense system. Dean Acheson, the then US foreign secretary, recognized this before Congress. The American Pacific defense perimeter, argued Acheson, "ran from the

19 U.S. Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States: 1950*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), 237-39.

20 Jentleson, *American Foreign Policy*, 103-105.

21 Quoted from the reporting Ernest R. May, ed., *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC-68*. (New York: Bedford, 1993), 26.

22 Kathryn Weathersby, "The Soviet Role in the Early Phase of the Korean War: New Documentary Evidence," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* (Winter 1993): 425-58.

Aleutian Islands off the Alaskan coast to Japan, through the Ryukyu Islands to the Philippines.”²³

On September 15, 1950 General Douglas Mac Arthur, the US supreme commander in the Pacific, after getting UNSC approval, landed its military forces at the port of Inchen in South Korea. The General, swiftly moved and trapped major portion of the invading army. By September 30, the UN forces captured 38th parallel, the border line between North and South Korea. It is to be remembered, the UN forces had the mandate to free South Korea of North Korean forces only and not to enter in the territory of North Korea. Then the Truman administration over-stepped its UNSC mandate and sought to unify Korea by force. The result came in the form of Chinese military intervention, culminating into stalemate.²⁴ It was a well calculated move on the part of Truman administration to change the balance of power in US favour in Korean Peninsula, if possible, at a reasonable cost. But the cost exceeded the reasonable limits. The cost was thirty three thousand US soldiers dead. The Truman administration’s move to unify Korea by force could not properly be explained without applying the theory of offensive realism. When asked, the US military intervention in favour of a non-US ally at thousands of miles away from America was a defensive move? Akram Zaki, a former foreign secretary of Pakistan, declared the US move an offensive one.²⁵ Abdul Sattar another former foreign secretary of Pakistan shared the same answer.²⁶

President Eisenhower came to power in 1953 with the new military policy known as ‘massive retaliation’. The US would not fight any more local wars. In case of future of Korea, America would massively retaliate against Moscow

23 Hook and Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II*, 73.

24 *General Douglas Mac Arthur Controversy and the Korean War* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1959), 222.

25 Interview with Akram Zaki by the Author, February 11, 2017.

26 Interview with Abdul Sattar by the Author, February 15, 2017.

and Beijing, presumably with nuclear weapons.²⁷ By using nuclear deterrence the US could avoid future Korean conflicts²⁸. It was in August 1958, the mainland China, resumed shelling of the off-shore Islands of Taiwan. America threatened to defend Taiwan, if necessary, with nuclear weapons. Mao Ze Dong stopped shelling. The policy mainly remained rhetoric. Consequently, the US policy of containment extended to include China as well. It took the form of an anti-communist crusade worldwide. Nuclear weapons occupied centre stage in this US offensive against global communism.²⁹

By mid 1950s, the US erected a global ring of military alliances against communism. They included Rio Treaty of 1947 (21-countries), NATO of 1949 (15-members), Baghdad Pact of 1955 (5 members), SEATO of 1954 (8 members), and ANZUS of 1951 (3 members). No part of the world was left unattended. In addition to these formal alliances the US concluded about twenty three bilateral/ mutual defense treaties with different countries such as South Korea and Taiwan etc.³⁰

Middle East was another hot spot. In the year 1953, CIA and MI-6 led a covert action in Iran to remove Mossadegh from the power. Under the cover of Eisenhower doctrine, American marines were sent to Lebanon to save the regime from revolution. Similarly, Britain saved Jordan from revolution. The 'Eisenhower Doctrine' committed American military support to any state in the Middle East against international communism.³¹

27 Lawrence Freedman, *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), 83-88.

28 William R. Keylor, *The Twentieth Century World: An International History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 296-97.

29 Joseph S. Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History* (New York: Longman, 2000), 136-38.

30 Hook and Spanier, *American Foreign Policy*, 85-87.

31 Seyom Brown, *The Faces of Power: Constancy and Change in United States Foreign Policy from Truman to Reagan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 124.

France established its imperial control on Indochina (Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea) during 1860s. Due to its interest in the region, France was not ready to relinquish its control over the region in post-WW-II period.³² Ho Chi Minh came to Paris Peace Conference in 1919. He came to know that the application of Wilsonian Principle of Self-determination was restricted to Europe only. He came back frustrated and changed man and turned to communist ideology. During Second World War, Ho Chi Minh tried to achieve independence but in vain.³³

In 1946, France installed Emperor Bao Dai as its puppet in Vietnam. The Truman administration did not appeal Ho Chi Minh for help. A civil war started in Vietnam between the two opposing parties, Bao Dai and Ho Chi Minh in 1946. American interference in the Vietnam crisis started in 1950, when it provided France with economic and military aid. By 1954, the US was paying about 75% of the cost in the conflict. There were also 300 American military advisers on the scene. In May 1954, French military forces were severely crushed in the hands of Vietcong at the fortress of Dien Bien Phu. President Eisenhower was the believer of Domino Theory. The theory was advanced to justify American military intervention in Vietnam.³⁴ By 1961, the number of US advisers in South Vietnam had increased to 900, by 1962 it was 11,000, by 1963 to 16,500, and by the end of 1967 number had increased to 542,000. America replaced France in Indochina as an imperial power. The intervention was designed to keep Indochina in American sphere of influence. US lost the war with serious consequences.³⁵

32 America had misperceptions about Vietnam. The detailed discussion could be seen in Jeffrey Record, *The Wrong War: Why We Lost in Vietnam* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1998).

33 Stanley Karnow, *Vietnam: A History* (New York: Penguin, 1983).

34 Secretary of State Dean Acheson, cited in Thomas G. Paterson, J. Gary Clifford, and Kenneth J. Hagan, *American Foreign Relations: A History since 1895* (Lexington: Mass Heath, 1995), 369.

35 Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 180.

The US failed to establish global hegemony in accordance with the assumptions of offensive realism. Such a drive to achieve global dominance was fated to create conflict among great powers, argued the theory. That was exactly what happened in Vietnam. In an interview Akram Zaki talked about US involvement in Indochina and declared that involvement as an imperial and offensive move.³⁶

America's Nuclear Policy during Early period of the Cold War

The growth of US in 19th century was a function of realist logic.³⁷ American people learnt that the interstate relationship “depend not upon sentiment or principle, but upon selfish interests.”³⁸ The powerful America will ensure its security in the anarchic world. In the words of President Franklin Pierce in March, 1853, “It is not to be disguised that our attitude as a nation and our position on the globe render the acquisition of certain possession not within our jurisdiction eminently important for our protection.”³⁹

It was the period of US nuclear monopoly. The USSR detonated her first nuclear device in August, 1949. By 1950, US believed in nuclear retaliation on Soviet Union.⁴⁰ After the USSR made its nuke in 1950, the new US nuclear policy was based on first-strike capability. Though the US nuclear policy during 1950s was based on what was known as policy of ‘massive retaliation’. It was a misnomer.⁴¹ In reality, the

36 Interview with Akram Zaki by the Author, February 11, 2017.

37 Robert W. Tucker and David C. Hendrickson, *Empire of Liberty: The Statecraft of Thomas Jefferson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 234-36.

38 Letter from Richard Olney to Thomas F/ Bayard, in *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1895, Pt.1. (Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1896), 558-59.

39 *Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States* (Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), 105.

40 David Alan Rosenberg, “The Origins of Overkill: Nuclear Weapons and American Strategy, 1945-1960,” *International Security* 7, no. 4, (Spring 1983): 11-22.

41 Rosenberg, “The Origins of Overkill, 1-69.

US nuclear policy during the decade of 1950s was based on 'massive pre-emption' and not 'massive retaliation'.

Overview of the US-Pakistan Policy from 1947 to 1962: A Regional Context

Jawaharlal Nehru while talking on the Indo-Pak relations in the post-Independence era said, "...if India and Pakistan follow a contrary policy and are opposed to each other, this conflict and wasteful effort will wipe us out from the face of the earth."⁴² On the issue of the creation of Pakistan, Quaid-i-Azam reasoned that the movement for the creation of Pakistan started on "the moment the first non-Muslim was converted to Islam..." he further said that the two communities "throughout the ages.... had not merged their entities, that was the basis for Pakistan."⁴³ On the nature of the two religions, Islam and Hinduism Nehru's remarks were self-explanatory. He said that nothing was more "antithetical to each other than these two religions."⁴⁴

Coupland in his report on the constitutional problem of India cited Sir Syed Ahmad Khan who said in the Imperial Council in 1883, that unlike England, "India was a heterogeneous continent, where Hindus being a larger community in the Indian sub-continent would "totally override the interests of the smaller community."⁴⁵

On June 3, 1947 Jawaharlal Nehru in his broadcast declared that partition of the subcontinent was temporary phenomenon. Sooner or later it will be undone.⁴⁶ Even M. K. Gandhi said in his prayer meeting in September 1947, if Pakistan's leadership would not review its error of the

42 Jawaharlal Nehru, *Speeches*, 11, (Govt. of India, 1963), 446.

43 Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, 1, (Lahore: Mohammad Ashraf, 1960), 64.

44 Jawaharlal Nehru, *Discovery of India* (London: Meridian Books, 1960), 63.

45 R. Coupland, *The Indian Problem, Report on the Constitutional Problem of India, Part 1* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), 155-56.

46 H.V. Hodson, *The Great Divide* (London: Hutchinson, 1969), 315.

creation of Pakistan “the Indian government would have to go to war against it.”⁴⁷

In the initial years, they tried their best to strangle Pakistan in its infancy. Congress in connection with Mountbatten administration created serious problems for Pakistan. They included premature closure of Supreme Commander’s Headquarters, issue of evacuee property, issue of the Indus Waters, issue of cash balances, slaughter of Muslims especially in East Punjab, and origin of Kashmir dispute etc. There was a heavy concentration of Indian troops on Pakistani borders especially in the Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir for successive two years in 1950 and 1951. Pakistan’s leadership started entertaining the idea of a powerful ally who could help Pakistan against India.⁴⁸ Pakistan was seriously thinking to make a request to the US to supply weapons.⁴⁹

American leadership had a negative view of the creation of Pakistan.⁵⁰ At the same time, America wanted to court the Indian support in its struggle against the USSR. America invited Nehru for an official visit to Washington. Nehru refused to become a bulwark against communism.⁵¹ A US State Department official commented that America had a ‘sentimental image of Nehru and India’ and it was not right.⁵² Liaquat Ali Khan visited the US in May, 1950. The Prime Minister made it clear that there was no commonality between Islam and communism and they did not make a fertile ground for cooperation.⁵³

47 Alan Campbell Johnson, *Mission with Mountbatten* (London: Robert Hale, 1951), 206.

48 F.M. Khan, *Story of the Pakistan Army* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 40.

49 Khan, *Story of the Pakistan Army*, 154.

50 Winston S. Churchill, *Second World War* (New York: Bantam Books, 1962), 190.

51 *New York Times*, October 16, 1949.

52 Selig S. Harrison, “Case History of a Mistake,” *New Republic*, August 10 1959.

53 *New York Times*, May 5, 1950.

Pakistan was a “bulwark in the subcontinent and the Middle East against communism...”⁵⁴ American leadership was not yet hopeless about India. On June 25, 1950, North Korea attacked South Korea. Under the UN banner, Pakistan was ready to send its troops to Korean War.⁵⁵ Similarly, during Japanese Peace Treaty in 1951 in San Francisco, America, Pakistan not only signed the treaty but also gave strong support to the US on this occasion.⁵⁶

The US was looking forward to Pakistan for joining Middle East countries into a defense agreement.⁵⁷ Pakistan suffered a serious famine in 1953 and asked the US for help, which America granted. In October 1953, General Ayub Khan visited America. He was followed by Governor-General Ghulam Muhammad and Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan. Resultantly, Pakistan received military assistance from Washington.⁵⁸

In 1953, after his visit, Richard Nixon, the US Vice-President, recommended military aid to Pakistan.⁵⁹ Next step was the conclusion of a Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement of 1953 between Washington and Karachi. US were to provide Pakistan with military equipment and training to its armed forces.⁶⁰

Meanwhile the struggle for global dominance between the two superpowers had been going on. Since 1947, to ensure its world dominance, America had been creating worldwide military alliances. SEATO covering South-East Asia region was created in September, 1954. Pakistan became its founding member along with Thailand, the Philippines, USA, UK, France, Australia, and New Zealand.

54 *Dawn*, May 25, 1950.

55 M.A.H. Ispahani, “Foreign Policy of Pakistan: 1947-1964,” *Pakistan Horizon*, 3rd Quarter (1964): 237.

56 *New York Times*, September 15, 1951.

57 *Dawn*, April 7, 1953.

58 *Newsweek*, November 30, 1953.

59 Ralph de Toledano, *Nixon* (New York: Henry Holt, 1956), 163.

60 *Dawn*, May 20, 1954.

No major power who was the member of SEATO was located in the operational area of the pact. The US opposed to set up a joint military command.⁶¹ The joining motive of Pakistan was to get military weapons from the US. There was also a sharp increase in US economic aid to Pakistan since 1954.

In September 1955, Pakistan joined Baghdad Pact. The pact was designed to thwart Russian expansion towards warm waters. The other factor was the oil in the Middle East. Other members of the pact included Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Britain. Like SEATO, Baghdad Pact did not establish joint military command. The US was not its formal member. The US and Britain had undertaken to defend Baghdad Pact region against a communist attack only.⁶²

In September 1962, an open war between India and China started in which Indian military forces were routed. The war lasted till 21 November. It was an open secret that America preferred India over Pakistan. For US, India was the only counterweight to communist China. America tolerated many things to win over India. India remained the main center of US attention in South Asia. Since 1958, prior to this war, India had become the largest recipient of US financial assistance. This Indo-China war seriously affected Pakistan's relations with Washington. America got a unique opportunity. India requested Washington for the supply of weapons during the war. America conceded Indian request and started heavy shipments of weapons to India. It greatly strengthened India's military capability.⁶³ American supply of weapons to India during the Indo-China war was a part of US global offensive against USSR.⁶⁴

There was a financial crisis in India in 1957-58. America stepped up financial assistance to India. Roughly, from 1958

61 George Modelski, *SEATO* (Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire, 1964), 289.

62 S.M. Burke and Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, 2nd eds., (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1994), 169-71.

63 Burke and Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, 238-41.

64 Interview with Akram Zaki by the Author, February 11, 2017.

to 1962 the volume of US assistance to India was about 2875 million dollars. For the same period Pakistan, despite being a US ally, received approximately 1275 million dollars. Ironically, for Pakistan, America did not use this leverage to force India to come to terms with Pakistan on Kashmir. America placed India in a special category. As a consequence of 1962 war, India also received heavy shipments of weapons from the West. America wilfully ignored Kashmir dispute. Consequently, Pakistan became disillusioned with Washington. It led to the reappraisal of Pakistan's foreign policy.⁶⁵

Pakistan's Role in America Sponsored Military Alliances

During Colombo Conference in April 1954, Pakistan took pro-US stance. The conference of South Asian countries – India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, and Sri Lanka was to deliberate on the Indo-China crisis. In the conference, direct negotiations among the parties concerned were stressed. Again in the Bandung conference in December 1954, Pakistan took the pro-US position by objecting an invitation to China in this Afro-Asian conference. It was attended by 29 countries. America entertained a fear. The conference might take an anti-US stance. Similarly, Nehru's desire to play the role of an Asian leader was eclipsed.⁶⁶

Once again, during Suez Canal crisis of 1956, Pakistan took pro-US position. There was a tripartite invasion of Egypt in 1956—UK, France, and Israel. Egypt nationalized Suez Canal. America had promised Egypt earlier to provide money for the construction of Aswan Dam. President Eisenhower cancelled the loan to finance the dam prompting Nasser to nationalize the canal. This in turn prompted Britain and France to use force against Egypt. President Eisenhower forced the invaders to stop their invasion. About future management of the canal, a conference of 22 users of canal was convened in London in August 1956. Pakistan supported American sponsored proposal which was adopted

65 Burke and Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, 240-60.

66 *Hindu Weekly*, October 8, 1965.

by the conference as its declaration. However, Britain and France invaded the canal in November 1956.⁶⁷ It was the first occasion when, Pakistan supported the US against a Muslim country.⁶⁸

In 1956, there was a crisis in Hungary. After the death of Joseph Stalin, the crisis in Hungary was the result of de-Stalinization, it meant greater freedom for the people. As a result Hungary rose in revolt. The Soviet military forces killed about twenty thousand people in Budapest. Having Kashmir dispute in mind, Pakistan actively followed US suit in condemning the Soviet action.⁶⁹

Similarly, things became worst in the Middle East with every passing day. Nasser emerged as a hero in the Arab world during 1956 Suez crisis. Since then, Arab world was smouldering in revolt. Iraq was under great pressure because Iraq was the only country in the Arab world who was an American military ally. Ultimately, a military coup took over Baghdad in July 1958. Under the influence of Eisenhower Doctrine, America rescued pro-US governments in Jordan and Lebanon. Pakistan welcomed Eisenhower Doctrine. In return US supplied weapons to which Pakistan direly needed for its defense against India.⁷⁰

In May 1960, a US intelligence plane U-2 was shot down in Russia. The pilot was caught alive. Soviet authorities accused that the plane was on an espionage mission and flew from Peshawar. Khrushchev, the Soviet President, threatened Pakistan of dire consequences. Pakistan admitted that in 1959 the US had a leased communication base near Peshawar. The U-2 took off from Peshawar.⁷¹ Despite this spy plane incident, the US communications

67 Sir Anthony Eden, *Full Circle* (London: Cassell, 1960), 527.

68 *Dawn*, September 14, 1956.

69 William R. Keylor, *The Twentieth Century World: An International History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 306-308.

70 Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy, Speeches, September 1946 – April 1961*, (Government of India), 475.

71 Harrison, "America, India and Pakistan: A Chance for a Fresh Start," *Harpers Magazine*, (July 1966).

base was allowed to continue.⁷² Ayub Khan responded immediately, "We are not afraid of such threats."⁷³

After joining SEATO and CENTO, Pakistan sided with the US on the issue of Tibet. Pakistan also took pro-US line during Laotian crisis in 1960.⁷⁴ Communists won the civil war in China. Pakistan supported US position on the issue of representation of China in the UN. Pakistan voted seven times for deferment resolution. It also abstained twice from voting.⁷⁵ Communist China always regarded Formosa, an island, its integral part. After communist takeover of China in 1949, the nationalist government of Chiang Kai-Shek fled to Formosa. The US extended recognition and protection to Chiang's government at Formosa. After joining US sponsored military pacts, Pakistan supported US position on 'two Chinas'.⁷⁶

Conclusion

Both, the US and Pakistan started from different perspectives. Pakistan was a newly independent and weak state, desperately looking for protection against the ill designs of much bigger, hostile, and powerful neighbour, India. The US started from a 'great power' status. The justification of US global policy during the Cold War could not be found solely on the basis of defensive reasons. The US policy of containment during Cold War era essentially was a defensive policy. It truly could not explain aggressive US policy during these years. The explanation could be found in the theory of offensive realism. According to this model, America acted as an offshore balancer in South Asia.

According to the theory, the US would do three things. One, the US would maintain regional hegemony in the Western hemisphere. Second, the US would deny the USSR

72 *New York Times*, May 10, 1960.

73 *Dawn*, May 11, 1960.

74 *Dawn*, December 15, 1960.

75 Burke and Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, 199.

76 Burke and Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy*, 199.

to exploit any opportunity in the international political system to increase her share of world power. Third, America would not allow the USSR to become regional hegemon in any region of the world. The USSR, being a mother state of Marxism actually represented a great danger to the existence of capitalist countries.

From the perspective of offensive realist model, the US, as a great power was power maximizer and looked for opportunities in the system to increase US share of world power. The US being a great power was on the offensive. Great powers always have some offensive military capability, argued the theorist. Accordingly, the ultimate aim of the US was to achieve dominance in the system. The year 1962 provided such an opportunity to the US to increase its share of world power by denying India into the lapse of USSR. It had been against the logic of offensive realism if America would have wasted the opportunity. America acted as an offshore balancer in South Asia.

South Asia carried great strategic importance in US global power calculations. For the US, the cost was reasonable, i.e., Pakistan. It was exactly in accordance with the assumptions of offensive realist model. Though Pakistan was a loyal US ally yet it was unfit vis-à-vis India in US global power calculations and operational model. In 1962, the US exploited the opportunity in the system which came in the form of India-China war. The US ignored Pakistan's repeated requests to link heavy shipments of weapons to India with the reasonable solution to the Kashmir problem. America responded negatively. Rather the US put great pressure on Pakistan not to gain any advantage of India's temporary military weakness and vulnerability.

For the US, India was the largest non-communist democratic country in the world. It was an opportunity to court India's support in US global struggle for dominance in the system. According to the assumptions

of offensive realism the opportunity could not be wasted when the cost was reasonable. In retrospective, America successfully achieved its aim of being offshore balancer by increasing its share of world power, and at the same time, denying the same role to USSR in South Asia. It was a classic case of great power conduct in world political system in accordance with the assumptions of offensive realism.