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ABSTRACT

“From the Indian Ocean to the Persian Gulf” assesses Pakistan’s connections to two of the Persian Gulf’s principal actors, Iran and Saudi Arabia from 1971 to 1977. In the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War, Islamabad began orienting its foreign policy toward the Gulf politically, economically, militarily, and religiously. These relationships in the 1970s established the foundation for Pakistan’s relations with the Gulf in the 1980s and subsequent decades. Utilizing Pakistani news media, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s speeches and statements, memoirs from Pakistani diplomats, and American archival material, I argue that understanding the ways in which Pakistan, Iran, and Saudi Arabia interacted with each other in this period helps to explain the cooperation seen during the Soviet war in Afghanistan and the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s. Furthermore, this project sheds light on the importance of regional constructions to foreign policy interests. Islamabad, Tehran, and Riyadh all consciously placed themselves in one interconnected region, aligning the interests of the Persian Gulf with that of the Indian Ocean. The United States was also heavily involved in promoting this regional construction to suit its own foreign policy interests. While the U.S. angle is examined in some detail, this project is largely concerned with the ways in which states in the global south interacted with each other and the implications of these relations.
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INTRODUCTION

Sitting in a prison cell awaiting his execution, former prime minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto reflected on his time in office and the man who deposed him, General Zia ul Haq. While imprisoned, Bhutto kept a diary which was eventually copied and published. “I am not going to ask for something by way of alms; I am not going to sit up with fore-paws raised,” Bhutto wrote.¹ He was sure that his “countrymen will not sit silent; they will not let General Zia go scot-free.” Despite his dire situation, Bhutto declared, “I am not afraid of death.”² These sentiments illustrated Bhutto’s own resolve and personality while also capturing the way in which he characterized himself and his place in Pakistan’s history. These statements also exemplify the way in which Bhutto governed his nation in the aftermath of a disastrous war.

Bhutto was born into a wealthy landowning family in Sindh before the Partition of India. He was educated in the United States at USC (University of Southern California) and Berkeley, eventually moving on to Oxford before returning to Karachi.³ Upon returning to Pakistan, Bhutto entered politics under the Ayub Khan regime, joining the cabinet in 1958 and becoming foreign minister five years later. He became disillusioned with the government after the Tashkent Agreement which ended the 1965 war. Bhutto left Ayub Khan’s government and formed the Pakistan’s People’s Party (PPP) in 1967.⁴ Three years later, Bhutto’s involvement in the 1970 election crisis inadvertently contributed to the secession of East Pakistan and created a path for him to become President. However, as will be demonstrated in the following pages, many of the

¹ B. L. Kak, Z. A. Bhutto: Notes from the Death Cell (New Delhi: Radha Krishna Publisher, 1979), 64.
² Kak, Z. A. Bhutto: Notes from the Death Cell, 65.
same internal and external dynamics that contributed to Bhutto’s rise also led to his imprisonment and execution.

The 1971 Indo-Pak War and the secession of East Pakistan can arguably be traced back to President Yayha Khan’s fateful decision to hold national elections in December 1970.

Yahya Khan came to power in Pakistan in 1968, after Ayub Khan abdicated. He acquiesced to popular demands for free and fair elections, largely from East Pakistan but also from elements in West Pakistan. He still envisioned maintaining some form of control in Pakistan. As the election results were reported on national television, Yahya Khan was shocked by the results. The PPP, founded by Bhutto who also ran as the primary candidate for the party, won a majority 81 out of 138 seats in West Pakistan. More alarming was the news that Sheikh Mujib Rahman’s Awami League won an overwhelming majority of seats in East Pakistan, 160 of 162. This gave the Awami League the majority needed in the National Assembly to form a government with Mujib at its head. Yahya Khan had underestimated the support of both the PPP and the Awami League. On the advice of military generals such as Gul Hassan, Yahya Khan threw his support behind the PPP. He supported Bhutto for strategic reasons. The PPP had won a major number of seats in the Punjab province where most of the military was recruited. Furthermore, Bhutto himself had cordial connections with various members of the military. However, with the 160 seats won by the Awami League, Yahya Khan faced a major problem.

Before the 1970 elections, the Awami League had advocated for greater regional autonomy for East Pakistan, which had felt economically exploited and militarily/politically

---

5 After the Partition of India, Pakistan was established as two halves of one whole. West Pakistan constituted what today makes up modern Pakistan. One thousand miles away, in what today constitutes modern Bangladesh, was East Pakistan.

oppressed by West Pakistan for years.\textsuperscript{7} While the evidence about whether Mujib had called for the independence of East Pakistan before the 1970 elections is disputed, Yahya Khan and other West Pakistani authorities feared that the Awami League planned to break away from West Pakistan. Upon winning the election, the party began drafting a new constitution based on the Six Point Plan. The Six Points called for greater regional autonomy in East Pakistan and envisioned a new federation, in which West Pakistan and East Pakistan would govern independently of each other, paving the way for the eventual independence of East Pakistan. More specifically, the Six Points advocated for a federal parliamentary system based on universal adult franchise, direct elections, legislative representation of federating units on the basis of population, limiting the federal government’s authority on defense and foreign affairs (with foreign trade and aid negotiated and managed by the two governments), and rescinding the federal government’s authority on taxation and foreign exchange resources.\textsuperscript{8}

The Six Points were unacceptable to both Yahya Khan and Bhutto and thus both parties negotiated with Mujib on a settlement. As the negotiations made little progress, Yahya Khan threatened to postpone the convening of the National Assembly, delaying the transfer of power to the Awami League. On March 1, 1971, on the advice of Bhutto, Yahya Khan did just that.\textsuperscript{9} Immediately after the news broke, East Pakistan erupted in protests. Government offices were closed, including key railways and Pakistan International Airlines. Students, government workers, educators, etc., amounting to hundreds of thousands of East Pakistanis, boycotted and protested. On one of the first days of the strikes, unarmed young men were fired upon at Farm Gate, Dacca, with two killed.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{7} Wolpert, \textit{Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan}, 135.
\textsuperscript{9} Raghavan, \textit{1971}, 42.
\textsuperscript{10} Wolpert, \textit{Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan}, 148.
Yahya Khan, with his military advisors, had in fact planned for this contingency well before the elections. On February 20, 1971, the military began preparing for operations in East Pakistan. By the end of March 1971, the West Pakistani Army had taken control of Dacca, but failed to disarm the East Bengali Regiment and the East Pakistan Rifles. The Bengali soldiers had mutinied and fighting quickly broke out between both sides. The military’s crackdown in East Pakistan was brutal, with significant evidence to label it as a genocide. Anthony Mascarenhas, a Pakistani reporter of Goan Christian descent, was taken to East Pakistan by Yahya Khan’s regime to witness firsthand what was taking place. Yahya Khan hoped to convince reporters to support his efforts to restore order. However, what Mascarenhas witnessed influenced him to report on the situation in East Pakistan as genocide, making him one of the first observers to utilize this label.

The example of the University of Dacca supports these claims. In a show of force the military attacked the students and faculty at the university with American supplied tanks, killing everyone residing on campus.

Since the start of the hostilities, the Bengali rebels looked to India for support in their struggle. While initially India was hesitant in sending troops to aid the Bengalis, the government supported the rebel forces with diplomatic support in the United Nations (UN) and provided them with sanctuaries in India. In early October 1971, India supported Bengali fighters in their attacks against the Pakistani military with artillery support and small numbers of Indian troops. By the second week of October the Indian army was ordered to defend the border alongside launching offensive operations ten miles inside of East Pakistan. By mid-November, the army conducted larger offensives in East Pakistan, engaging the Pakistani military. In response, on

---

11 Raghavan, 1971, 42, 52.
12 Raghavan, 1971, 131.
13 Wolpert, Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan, 155.
14 Raghavan, 1971, 213-234.
December 4, 1971, Yahya Khan decided on a preemptive strike utilizing the Pakistani Air Force. However, directly engaging India proved disastrous. The Indian army was much larger than Pakistan’s and Soviet weapons played a major role in India’s quick victory.15 13 days after Islamabad’s preemptive strike, on December 17, 1971, the Pakistani army in East Pakistan surrendered to the Indian Army in Dacca. Pakistan had been soundly defeated and the independent state of Bangladesh was formed.16

It is in the context of this humiliating defeat that Bhutto assumed power in December 1971. The war left the Pakistani economy in shambles and its international reputation sullied. During the conflict, Pakistan’s traditional allies, especially the United States, did little to assist Pakistan during the war. Although Bhutto did not abandon relations with Washington, he often blamed the United States for Islamabad’s defeat. From 1971 to 1977, Bhutto attributed more importance to bilateral relationships with states among the Persian Gulf, mainly Saudi Arabia and Iran. Through an examination of public speeches and statements, personal memoirs, newspaper interviews, and government documents it is evident that Tehran and Riyadh became significantly important to Islamabad. This relationship helped alleviate Pakistan’s economic troubles while also restoring Islamabad’s standing in the international community. Thus, Pakistan was able to stabilize its integrity and security of during a time of insecurity. Bhutto took concrete steps to align Pakistan with the interests of the Gulf states. Therefore, he often constituted Pakistan and the Persian Gulf as one interconnected region, feelings that were reciprocated by Mohammad Reza Pahlavi Shah and King Faisal. The connections established in

---

15 For the Soviets, supporting India militarily served Soviet interests in several ways. By this time Sino-Soviet relations were strained and supporting India was a way to challenge China. In addition, supporting India gave the Soviets military bases along the Indian coastline and was a way for the Soviets to assert their own power in the global south.
16 Raghavan, 1971, 262.
the 1970s became highly significant, especially with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq War in 1980. Although the shah was deposed in 1979, Pakistan maintained its relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran, with some evidence to suggest that Islamabad supported Tehran during its struggle with Baghdad.

Therefore, in examining these interrelated contexts, I argue that the 1970s established the foundation of Pakistan’s relations with the Persian Gulf. Pakistan’s economic troubles necessitated new economic relationships, which led to the creation of the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD), and resulted in multimillion dollar loans from both Iran and Saudi Arabia. Moreover, Tehran and Riyadh’s own insecurities (Baluchistan, Iraq, Yemen) influenced coordination with Islamabad on security matters. Pakistan’s strategic position in the region offered the Gulf states a unique opportunity to not only project influence but to also better secure their borders with an Islamic and Third World ally (as opposed to solely relying on the West which was seen in postcolonial discourse as supporting imperialism).

This project benefits greatly from recent scholarship that has emphasized the 1970s as a transformative period. Their emphasis on global connections to understand regional dynamics and events inspired this project. Paul Thomas Chamberlain and Abdel Razzaq Takriti emphasize the role of non-state actors while Daniel Sargent focuses on a superpower’s strategy and economics in the 1970s. The connection among these scholars is their emphasis on the influence of global contexts which emerge out of the 1970s.

---

Scholarship on Pakistan’s foreign relations addresses this period but only to an extent. Dennis Kux and Husain Haqqani devote one or two chapters to Bhutto’s relationship with the United States. Their arguments emphasize the 1970s as a tumultuous period in U.S.-Pakistan relations, largely because of Pakistan’s pursuit of a nuclear program which Washington attempted to dismantle. U.S.-Pakistan relations significantly improved after Bhutto’s removal from power, where Washington coordinated with Zia ul Haq to support mujahidin forces in Afghanistan. Most of the scholarship, however, focuses its attention on the Zia period and the War on Terror.

Works on Pakistan and Saudi Arabia by Marvin Weinbaum, Zulfikar Khalid, and Abdullah Khurram also emphasize Pakistan’s coordination with Saudi Arabia in the context of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the War on Terror. With the exception of Lawrence Ziring perhaps, many scholars highlight Riyadh’s support of Pakistan (economic, religious, and military) as a product of mutual support for mujahidin forces and defense against regional threats (Iran, Afghanistan, Iraq).

There is little scholarship that completely explores Pakistan’s relations with Iran in the 1970s. Usually, this relationship is featured in small subsections of larger articles and books. Stanley Wolpert, who has written one of the more definitive accounts of the Bhutto period, mentions the shah’s relationship with Bhutto but only in passing. Surenda Chopra and Kusum Lata Chadda, two Indian scholars, devote some time to discussing Pakistan’s economic

---

relationship with Iran through the RCD, but the larger purpose of their more problematic arguments attempt to explain the rise of fundamentalism in Pakistan resulting from Islamabad’s connections to the “Muslim World.”\textsuperscript{21} Shirin Tahir-Kheli and Selig Harrison take note of some peaks in Pakistan relations with Iran in the 1970s (such as with economic cooperation and Baluchistan).\textsuperscript{22} However, far more scholarship is devoted to highlighting the Zia period (during the time of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Iran-Iraq War) and Pakistani and Iranian coordination on post 9/11 Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{23}

The three chapters of this thesis explore this multifaceted relationship. The first section examines Pakistan’s economy and politics in the aftermath of the 1971 War. Examining Bhutto’s economic and political reforms, his battles with the domestic opposition, and his relationship with the military provides important context to understand why Bhutto continually oriented Pakistan towards the Gulf. The second chapter discusses Bhutto’s relationship with the United States. Although Bhutto sought weapons and economic aid from Washington, he mostly received the latter. American hesitation in supplying Pakistan with weapons alongside American efforts to stop Pakistan’s nuclear program further alienated Bhutto from the United States. As a result, Pakistani foreign policy shifted further in the direction of the Gulf. Chapter 3 explores the economic and military relationship between Islamabad and Tehran as well as Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Mohammad Reza Pahlavi and Faisal ibn Abdulaziz Al Saud’s relationship with Islamabad took off in the 1970s, with hundreds of millions of dollars flowing into Pakistan from

\textsuperscript{21} Kusum Lata Chadda and Surendra Chopra, \textit{Islamic Fundamentalism, Pakistan and the Muslim World} (New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers, 2009).
both states. The shah collaborated with Bhutto on various security measures and the Pakistani military not only trained Saudi military personnel but also stationed troops within the Kingdom’s borders.

Overall, these relationships are important because they emphasize interactions among states of the developing world, moving away from previous trends in historical scholarship that emphasize the role of great powers. Exploring these relationships offers interesting insights into regionalism, Third World/Islamic solidarity, and the evolution of developing states during a rise in global inflation which altered the post-war order. Moreover, this project emphasizes the role of small/weak states in the international system. There is some merit to Ian Lustick’s argument about weak states, that their status was due in part to “their late arrival in an international system” dominated by established large powers. This holds true for Pakistan, which gained its independence in 1947 and whose development was very much tied to foreign (mainly American) economic and military aid. However, there is something to say about the agency of small states like Pakistan. For example, Egypt under Gamal Abdel Nasser attempted to play the two superpowers against each other for its own benefit. At the same time, Nasser positioned Egypt and himself as a leader of the non-aligned movement, and at the center of the Arab World, Africa, and the broader “Third World.”

Bhutto took a different approach. A student of international politics, Bhutto relied on bilateralism which meant dealing with each state independently of others on a case by case basis. In doing this, Bhutto rejected the overarching influence of Cold War paradigms and rivalries and was able to assert Pakistan’s own interests (even in dealings with great powers like the United States and the Soviet Union). Yet, Bhutto often overstated his country’s own importance while

---

also overemphasizing his place in the Third World. He never became a prominent leader in the Third World, but was able to connect Pakistan to the global south in significant ways that served Islamabad’s interests, whether that was supplying troops and/or advisors to the Persian Gulf or coordinating with regional hegemons like Iran to bolster regional security.
Chapter One - Bread, Clothing, and Shelter: Pakistan’s Political-Economic Situation in the Aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War

We are facing the worst crisis in our country’s life, a deadly crisis. We have to pick up the pieces, very small pieces, but we will make a new Pakistan, a prosperous and progressive Pakistan.¹ – Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

The 1971 Indo-Pak war left the Pakistani economy crippled, its reputation in the international arena decimated. Bhutto officially came to power in December 1971, inheriting a Pakistan with few friends and little support. Yet, Bhutto was ambitious and for the next six years attempted to “pick up the pieces” and restore Pakistan’s economy and standing in the world. While Bhutto pursued an ambitious reform program at home, he frequently made trips to the Middle East, especially to Iran and Saudi Arabia, in an effort to cultivate much needed support for Pakistan’s ailing economy and defeated military. This context was important, I argue, in persuading Bhutto to cultivate relations with Iran and Saudi Arabia. Economic hardship, domestic political disputes, and the reorganization of the military all contributed to this relationship. Utilizing Bhutto’s own speeches and statements as well as Pakistani news sources and memoirs, I explore Pakistan’s economy and politics under Bhutto in an effort to illustrate why Bhutto felt Pakistan needed to orient itself toward the Persian Gulf.

In addressing Pakistan’s domestic political situation in the 1970s, most scholars do not emphasize Islamabad’s relationship with Iran and Saudi Arabia. Scholars such as Anwar Syed and Stanley Wolpert note the influence of India and Afghanistan on Bhutto’s political and economic decisions, but do not emphasize how Pakistan’s political-economic situation in the

aftermath of 1971 led to an orientation towards both Iran and Saudi Arabia. Often, this relationship is rarely explored in detail. ²

Other scholarship has extensively commented on Bhutto’s relationship with the Army, but often does not frame Bhutto’s military buildup as a product of improved relations with Saudi Arabia and especially Iran. Bhutto’s relationship with the Army is usually framed as a competition for power and in the context of Pakistan’s struggle to achieve democracy. Hasan Askari Rizvi traces Bhutto’s complex relationship with the Army, framing Bhutto’s military reforms as a tool used by the civilian leadership to keep the Army out of politics, yet noting how the military increasingly became involved in the politics of the nation often at the behest of Bhutto. Aqil Shah also examines Bhutto’s power struggle with Army, noting how throughout Bhutto’s rule the military frequently tried to assert its independence from the civilian administration. Shah assesses how the increasing buildup of the military in the 1970s, along with other factors, contributed to the military coup that deposed Bhutto in 1977, thus ending any prospect of democracy in Pakistan for several years to come. Bennett Jones views the Army as an impediment to democracy in Pakistan but only briefly mentions foreign influence and investment in Pakistan’s military, particularly by Iran. Shuja Nawaz highlights the internal and external factors which contributed to Bhutto’s complicated relationship with the Army, especially in the case of uprisings within Baluchistan, but Nawaz does not explore these connections in detail.³

---

While acknowledging the validity of these perspectives, I argue that they do not completely explain this period. Drawing on recent trends in the history of the global Cold War, such as those of Paul Thomas Chamberlin and Abdel Razzaq Takriti, in this chapter I aim to provide an overview of Pakistan’s domestic political situation from 1971 to 1977, establishing important context for Pakistan’s orientation toward Iran and Saudi Arabia. Rather than emphasizing the role of great powers, I explore how Pakistan’s domestic situation in the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War influenced its connections in the global south.

The three sections of this chapter detail Pakistan’s domestic political-economic situation. First, I examine Bhutto and the PPP’s attempts to introduce economic and political reforms to rectify the country’s difficult situation in the aftermath of 1971. In addition, I discuss unrest amongst the frontier provinces in the country and how the Bhutto government responded. While PPP reforms did steadily improve the country’s dire situation, they ultimately failed in subduing unrest and curbing inflation. The second section explores Bhutto’s relationship with his domestic political opposition, which frequently challenged Bhutto’s reforms and thus his legitimacy as a democratically elected ruler. Finally, I detail Bhutto’s complex relationship with the Army.

**Bhutto, the Pakistan People’s Party, and Economic/Political Reforms**

On December 1971, President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was left to pick up the pieces after the former general-president Yahya Khan abdicated power. For the first time in over a decade, a civilian government gained control over the country. Yet, the disastrous war in East Pakistan left

---

the country’s economy shattered.\textsuperscript{5} Thus, from 1971 to 1977, Bhutto initiated his socialist economic and political reforms in an attempt not only to rectify Pakistan’s dire economic situation but to restore its prestige and confidence. Bhutto and the PPP enacted a number of reforms, such as land reform, labor reform, nationalization, and the establishment of a new constitution in 1973. However, Bhutto’s reforms could not solve all of Pakistan’s troubles. Tensions frequently arose in provinces such as Sindh and Baluchistan. Despite the economic reform program, inflation rose on key commodities, heavily influenced not just by the emergence of globalization in the 1970s but also from the 1973 Arab Oil embargo, which negatively impacted economies in the global south. The combination of rising inflation and changing oil prices led to major price increases for wheat and other key commodities, initiating a food crisis in Pakistan.

This section examines Bhutto and the PPP’s response to Pakistan’s economic and political crisis in the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War. In addition, it analyzes the Bhutto government’s response to some of the major crises during the 1970s. I argue that Bhutto’s reforms were largely ineffective in rectifying the country’s major issues post 1971. Pakistan’s economy did slowly recover while Bhutto remained in office, but that was not through the government’s reforms alone. Massive economic assistance came from countries such as Iran and Saudi Arabia which kept Pakistan’s economy afloat.

In the 1970 elections, Bhutto ran as the candidate for the PPP. The PPP Election Manifesto maintained the party’s four-fold motto of “Islam is our faith, Democracy is our polity, Socialism is our economy, All Power to the People.”\textsuperscript{6} Its more popular motto became 	extit{roti, kapra,}

\textsuperscript{5} East Pakistan transformed into the independent state of Bangladesh in the aftermath of the 1971 war. Bangladesh was not recognized by the Pakistani government until 1974 and thus much of the source material before 1974 refers to Bangladesh as East Pakistan.

\textsuperscript{6} Pakistan People’s Party, \textit{Election Manifesto of the Pakistan People’s Party} (Lahore: Classic, 1970), 3.
*aur makh*n (bread, clothing, and shelter). The PPP perceived of itself as the “party of the poor and unprivileged” which aimed at disrupting feudal rule and breaking the power of capitalism. It advocated for the poor and laboring classes through the nationalization of key industries and through land reform, which aimed to redistribute land to peasants with little to no land holdings. After more than a decade of military dictatorship, the party advocated for the restoration of democracy in the country alongside civil liberties such as the respect of various “cultures and languages” in Pakistan, safeguarding “the autonomy of the provinces,” and reaffirming “the freedom of the press.”

In an address to Pakistan on December 20, 1971, Bhutto affirmed his party’s commitment to democracy. Bhutto stated, “I can assure solemnly, this is my pledge to you, that I will restore democracy. I would not like to see Martial Law remain one day longer than necessary, one minute more than necessary, one second more than necessary.” The issue of martial law, which remained in effect in the immediate aftermath of the 1971 war, was one critique which the opposition leveled against Bhutto, challenging his commitment to democracy. However, Bhutto’s relationship with democracy was far more complicated. Despite maintaining martial law in 1971 and for most of 1972, Bhutto withdrew the ban on the National Awami Party (NAP). In 1972, Bhutto set out to implement the major reforms he promised in his election campaign. On January 2, Bhutto announced the nationalization of ten major industries which included: the iron and steel industries, basic metal industries, heavy engineering and electrical

---

9 Bhutto, “Address to the Nation on December 20, 1971,” in *Speeches and Statements*, 3.
industries, assembly and manufacture of motor vehicles, tractor plants, heavy and basic chemicals, the petro-chemical industry, the cement industry, and public utilities such as electricity, gas, and oil refineries.\textsuperscript{11} Nationalization aimed to alleviate Pakistan’s economic woes, but it led to a flight of capital which significantly lowered Pakistan’s international credit rating in London and New York. This in turn influenced Pakistan to seek investment from the Gulf States, China, and Libya.\textsuperscript{12}

Nationalization was followed by labor and land reforms. Labor reforms aimed at providing workers with “participation in the management of industry,” alongside providing workers with a share of annual profits and greater bargaining power. In addition, one child of each worker was provided with free education up to the high school level and workers were provided with better compensation for work related injuries.\textsuperscript{13} Land reforms intended to significantly reduce the major landholdings of the wealthy and redistribute the land to the poor and lower classes. The ceiling on individual holdings was reduced from 500 irrigated acres to 150 and from 1000 unirrigated acres to 300.\textsuperscript{14} Land reforms tried to diminish the power and influence of the Sardars and Nawabs (feudal landlords), but the landlords continued to dominate the countryside because the reforms only applied to individuals and not family units. Thus, wealthy landowners divided their land among relatives.\textsuperscript{15}

Although Pakistan’s exports increased from 1973 onward, inflation also rose, especially with the prices of key commodities such as wheat, resulting in a small wheat crisis in the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} Wolpert, \textit{Zulfi Bhutto Pakistan}, 176.
\textsuperscript{13} Bhutto, “Address to the Nation announcing the New Labour Policy on February 10, 1972,” in \textit{Speeches and Statements}, 75-78.
\textsuperscript{14} Bhutto, “Address to the Nation announcing Land Reforms in Pakistan on March 1, 1972,” in \textit{Speeches and Statements}, 99.
\end{flushleft}
country.\textsuperscript{16} Furthermore, the increase in oil prices resulting from the 1973-1974 Arab oil embargo hurt Pakistan’s export income.\textsuperscript{17}

Bhutto’s critics often argue that his economic reforms, such as nationalization and land reform, largely failed to alleviate Pakistan’s troubled economy. To some extent these arguments have merit, but they neglect factors that affected the Pakistani economy outside of Bhutto’s control. Natural disasters devastated Pakistan during Bhutto’s time in office. Floods in 1973 inundated about two million acres of land, destroyed about 800,000 homes, and disrupted the lives of up to 10 million people.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, the Tarbela Dam incident further crippled the Pakistani economy. The Tarbela Dam was conceived in 1960, with construction beginning in 1967, to separate the waters of the Indus Basin region between Pakistan and India.\textsuperscript{19} The disaster at the dam resulted in a 300-million-dollar loss in foodgrains and led to a loss of production in wheat.\textsuperscript{20} Globalization also influenced the government’s economic reforms and led Bhutto to “admit there are economic difficulties” impacting Pakistan. He acknowledged that, “The value of the rupee was so over rated in the international market that massive devaluation had to be undertaken.”\textsuperscript{21} Moreover, the increasing price of oil on the international market, from $3 a barrel to $11.5 a barrel, on top of a 100 percent increase in the price of wheat, further contributed to Pakistan’s economic woes.\textsuperscript{22}

Furthermore, the Bhutto government nationalized the cotton industry with the creation of the Cotton Export Corporation. Although this angered the Pakistani cotton industry to an extent, the government justified the nationalization to control and thus protect the price of cotton in

Pakistan after Southeast Asian states stopped buying Pakistani cotton.23 These processes negatively impacted the Pakistani economy but in turn they further cemented Pakistan’s economic relationship with Saudi Arabia and Iran.24

In terms of political reform, Bhutto removed a large number of civil servants who worked for the previous two regimes. In a speech detailing the decision, Bhutto stated that these civil servants “were sucking the people’s blood. They were parasites.”25

The major political reform of this period was the passing of the 1973 Constitution. As the career foreign service officer Iqbal Akhund noted, “The crowning achievement of Bhutto’s rule was the unanimous adoption in 1973 of a new Constitution, a Constitution that more than twenty years later remains the sheer anchor of democracy in the country.”26 Despite his quarrels with the opposition, Bhutto understood that Pakistan required a constitution that all political parties approved of, even in areas such as the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Baluchistan, where the PPP did not hold a majority in the local assembly. The 1973 Constitution was passed by an overwhelming majority and it officially replaced the presidency with a parliamentary system. In the constitution, Bhutto conceded to some of the opposition’s demands, such as establishing Islam as the state religion and creating oaths of office for the president and prime minister. The opposition in turn accepted greater federal jurisdiction than that of the 1956 constitution, accepted for the next 15 years that only a two thirds majority vote in the National Assembly was required for a no confidence vote against the prime minister, and accepted a senate

with virtually no powers of its own.\textsuperscript{27} In a speech to 28th session of the UN General Assembly, Bhutto ecstatically claimed that:

\begin{quote}
we firmly established civilian supremacy and hammered out with the unanimous agreement of the people's elected representatives, a Federal Parliamentary Constitution, settling once and for all the problem of provincial autonomy. This Constitution has come into force and it was an honour for me, thereupon, to step down from the office of President to that of Prime Minister responsible to the Parliament.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

Yet, the problem of provincial authority was not settled. Even before the official signing and passing of the 1973 Constitution, unrest rocked the province of Sindh. Emboldened by requests of greater provincial autonomy in areas such as Baluchistan and East Pakistan, and with the head of the country being a Sindhi, on July 7, 1972 the Sindh National Assembly advanced and passed a bill that established Sindhi as the official provincial language. The bill stipulated that all provincial government officials were required to learn Sindhi.\textsuperscript{29} Its passage sparked violent riots between the Urdu speaking Muhajirs, who made up 30 percent of the population in the province (with 90 percent of that population residing in Karachi), and native Sindhis.\textsuperscript{30}

Initially, Bhutto left the resolution of the matter to “the elected representatives of the people in the National Assembly.”\textsuperscript{31}

However, violence continued to plague Karachi and Hyderabad despite Bhutto’s calls for a peaceful settlement. As the conflict refused to subside, Bhutto restricted the activities of the Jiye Sind Front. The Jiye Sind Movement was a nationalist Sindhi movement that advocated for greater expressions of Sindhi culture in public and eventually called for a separate state of Sindh.
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G.M. Syed, born to a traditional Wadera family (feudal) family, led the movement but was ultimately arrested by the government. In an effort to subdue unrest, Bhutto removed his cousin Mumtaz Ali Bhutto from the office of Chief Minister of Sindh, affirmed Urdu as the national language of Pakistan, and enacted a “Peace Formula” on July 15, 1972, which specified that for 12 years no person who was qualified for an appointment to the civil service could be discriminated against based on their knowledge of Sindhi or Urdu.

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) assessments of Pakistan’s economy illustrate the economic hardships in the aftermath of 1971 while also emphasizing the importance of Pakistan’s connections to the Gulf. The agency concluded that Bhutto handled various natural disasters quite well. PPP economic reforms led to modest growth in 1974. However, the inflation rate rose to 25 percent and unemployment also rose. The oil price increases of 1973 and 1974 largely contributed to this. Yet, the CIA was optimistic about the prospects for Pakistan’s economy, largely because of “the massive aid that has begun to arrive from Iran and the Arab States.”

The early economic challenges that Bhutto faced threatened his legitimacy as a ruler. Thus, Bhutto sought out assistance from outside of Pakistan. As will be demonstrated in Chapter 3, Bhutto’s cultivation of ties with the Middle East, particularly Iran and Saudi Arabia, through global networks such as the Islamic Conference of 1974, provided Bhutto with much needed political legitimacy and economic assistance.
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Bhutto and the domestic opposition

Throughout his years in office, Bhutto dealt with the opposition’s challenges to his government. The persistence of the opposition alongside Bhutto’s suppression of its members further cemented Pakistan’s ties to Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the Middle East more generally.

But Bhutto faced challenges from within his own party as well. The PPP was filled with strife and factionalism due to ideological differences, property and class differentiations, and caste distinctions. According to CIA assessments, the PPP was divided among two primary factions, one moderate and one leftist. The factions within the moderate group included Sindhi/Punjabi landlords and the Ramay group, led by Haneef Ramay. The Ramay group strongly believed in Islamic Socialism, a key tenant of the PPP platform at its founding. Other internal factions, such as the Jiye Sind Student’s Front, the National Liberation Front, and the Pakistan Liberation Movement belonged under the leftist umbrella.35

These differences culminated in several disputes. One involved a public meeting held at Qaddafi Stadium in Lahore where a faction of the PPP disrupted the meeting to discredit the Ramay group, which had been in charge of the arrangements. Another factional fight occurred at a “tea party” at Shalimar Gardens in Lahore, where the newly appointed Chief Minister of Punjab, Malik Meraj Khalid (of the Punjab Centrists in the moderate group), was being honored.36 Furthermore, a bitter rivalry emerged between two prominent PPP members, Sheikh Rashid (President of Punjab who belonged to Punjabi leftwing group) and Ghulam Mustafa Khar (a Punjabi landlord who represented the pro-landlord elements within the PPP). From 1972 to 1973, pro Rashid elements of the PPP were harassed and removed from the party hierarchy at the

behest of Khar. \textsuperscript{37} Despite Bhutto’s personal friendship with Khar, Bhutto eventually dismissed Khar from his post of Governor of Punjab in July of 1975. He perceived Khar as an arrogant and semiautonomous ruler, making it difficult for him to control the actions of the Secretary General. Rather than succumb to Bhutto, Khar ran again for office but outside of the PPP. He defected to the Muslim League and denounced Bhutto, cementing his membership among the opposition. \textsuperscript{38} By 1976, Bhutto favored the conservatives within the PPP, which relied on the nawabs and landed aristocrats to govern and control the provincial governments. The Nawab of Bahawalpur came out of retirement to govern the Punjab and Dilawar Khanji, son of the former Nawab of Junagadh, became the governor of Sindh. Other feudal landlords took positions of chief ministers in the provinces. These developments fueled dissent within the PPP and also influenced the opposition’s critiques of the regime. \textsuperscript{39}

From the period of 1971 to 1977, the opposition drew together a diverse set of political parties within Pakistan. The parties shared few similarities but were united in their opposition to Bhutto’s government. In its early period, this conglomeration was sometimes referred to as the United Democratic Front (UDF), however within Pakistan it was more often referred to as simply the opposition. Formed in 1972, it was made up of the Jama’at-i-Islami (JUI), the Jama’at-ul-Ulema-Islami, the Muslim League, the Pakistan Democratic Party, and the National Awami Party. \textsuperscript{40} Of all these parties, the JUI and the NAP provided some of the most rigorous opposition to Bhutto’s government. The JUI represented one of several religious parties in Pakistan. It advocated for the presence of Islam and Islamic law in the governing structure of Pakistan. The party opposed Bhutto’s policies of nationalization and land reform, which meant
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the JUI allied itself to the landed gentry, rural politicians, shopkeepers, and merchants who also opposed Bhutto’s policies. In addition, the JUI also challenged Bhutto on what it perceived as a pro-Sindhi policy, the government’s commitment to socialism over Islam, and on Bhutto’s secret dealings with Bangladesh and India.\textsuperscript{41} The NAP was left leaning and secular, often advocating for greater regional autonomy for the provinces. It was led by Khan Abdul Wali Khan and based in Baluchistan and the NWFP, thus the party drew support primarily from the Pathans and Baluch of those regions.\textsuperscript{42} Bhutto removed the ban on the NAP on December 20, 1971, yet both parties frequently clashed throughout Bhutto’s seven years in office on the issue of provincial autonomy.\textsuperscript{43}

This issue provided a major point of contention between Bhutto and his opposition, further pushing Bhutto towards establishing important links with Iran. It became especially complicated when Bhutto assumed office in 1971. Many of the provinces were emboldened by East Pakistan’s successful bid of independence and utilized this climate to advocate for further provincial autonomy. Moreover, Bhutto conceded that the PPP did not hold a majority in provinces such as the NWFP and Baluchistan. Rather, the NAP and JUI made up the majority parties in these assemblies. Thus, Bhutto allowed both parties to “form the Governments in these two provinces.”\textsuperscript{44}

The Pathans of the NWFP, where the NAP held the majority and governed, were encouraged by the Bengali split and requested the Bhutto government for greater autonomy,
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resulting in clashes between the Pathans and the PPP.\textsuperscript{45} Pathani nationalism asserted itself in the province and informed the Bhutto government that if its demands were not met war would break out. Wali Khan denied charges that the party was advocating for a separate state in the NWFP. He argued that the NAP was pushing for greater self-government in the province, not secession. These sentiments were echoed by the President of the Peshawar City Committee Saeed Mohammad Ayub, who demanded that the PPP government lift martial law and restore democracy, allow Pathans self-government, recognize the new state of Bangladesh, and pursue friendly relations with India.\textsuperscript{46} These events only reinforced in Bhutto’s own mind the dangers of opposition parties to the government.

The major provincial challenge to Bhutto arose from Baluchistan, where the NAP and JUI were allowed to form a coalition government. However, requests for greater autonomy in the region, coupled with Bhutto’s own aspirations to strengthen the PPP majority in the province, led to hostilities. The provincial government threw out Punjabi officials from service, of which 2,600 were policemen. To replace this deficit in law enforcement, the provincial government raised the Rural Guards, which acted as the province’s new police force, a police force loyal to the NAP-JUI government. Bhutto tried to curb the power of the local Sardars and remove the \textit{Shishak} tax. This feudal tax was levied by the Sardars for decades, and although Bhutto outlawed its implementation, the NAP-JUI government did not comply and continued to levy the \textit{Shishak} tax.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Also referred to as Pashtuns. They are of Afghan and Iranian origin who primarily live along the border areas between Afghanistan and Pakistan.


The matter was further complicated when a large cache of arms was discovered in the Iraqi Embassy in Pakistan. Among the weapons found were 300 submachine guns, 921 magazines for carbines, 26,000 rounds of 7.62 mm ammunition, 10,000 rounds of 303 ammunition, and 40 incendiary hand grenades.\(^\text{48}\) The implications of such a find were numerous. While it is unclear how these weapons arrived at the Iraqi Embassy and which country supplied them, it was clear to Bhutto that these weapons were sent in aid of dissidents within the provinces.\(^\text{49}\) The Pakistani government, alongside the Iranian government, feared that Afghanistan was supporting rebels in Pakistani Baluchistan. The exposure of such a large foreign weapons shipment in the country only exacerbated these fears. In communications between the Pakistani and Iraqi governments, the Islamabad expressed its shock “at the existence of this veritable arsenal and surprised that the government of a Muslim country, with whose people Pakistan has always had fraternal relations, should have become a party in a conspiracy with elements within and outside the country, which seek to subvert the security and tranquility of Pakistan.”\(^\text{50}\) In addition, the Pakistani government called on the removal of Iraqi Embassy personnel involved with the shipment and recalled its own ambassador from Iraq.\(^\text{51}\)

In this context, the Bhutto government felt justified in disbanding the NAP-JUI provincial government and replacing it with PPP loyalists. The Pakistani military was deployed to the region to quell the resulting unrest. The opposition charged that Bhutto stoked conflict in the province, such as at Las Belas, in an effort to take control of a region where his party was not in the majority.\(^\text{52}\) The PPP disputed this claim. According to a formal statement issued by the
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central government on the situation in Baluchistan, it was the provincial government which made the request for military assistance. Also, the federal government blamed unrest in the region on its “feudal and primitive conditions.” While both sides debated who was to blame for unrest in Baluchistan, the situation in the province quickly escalated into an insurgency. The insurgency in Baluchistan, along with other factors such as the Tarbela Dam incident and general unrest throughout Pakistan, convinced Bhutto to request the National Assembly for an extension of the state of emergency in August 1974. The JUI and NAP opposed the decision and thus began a boycott of the National Assembly.

Extending the state of emergency did not subdue the insurgency in Baluchistan. Instead, it peaked during 1974. The rebels seized major roads connecting Baluchistan with the neighboring provinces of Sindh and the Punjab. Oil survey teams in the region were also attacked by the rebels. Then, in September 1974, the Pakistani Army initiated Operation Chamalang, a massive operation which aimed to break the back of the insurgency. The operation led to a pitched battle between the Pakistani Army and rebel forces. It was then that the Army unveiled its thirty Huey Cobra helicopter gunships, gifted from Iran with some Iranians piloting the gunships themselves. The Pakistani Air Force also proceeded to bomb key areas in the region. These military operations were successful in forcing the rebels to withdraw to the hills, where they were eventually flushed out and forced to surrender, while some escaped across the Afghanistan border. Iran’s military involvement in subduing the insurgency illustrated the ways in which Islamabad and Tehran coordinated in security matters. Much of Iran’s military and
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economic aid aimed at subduing unrest in Pakistani Baluchistan, emphasizing Iran’s fear that nationalism in Pakistani Baluchistan could spread to Iranian Baluchistan.

On October 15, 1974, Bhutto happily declared that “organized resistance to legal authority in Baluchistan, which more precisely meant insurgency against the state, has come to an end.” Yet, unrest continued within the province and beyond. Just when “a turning point had been reached in Baluchistan and the nation is being released from its anxiety on this score, bomb blasts have occurred in a number of places.” Here Bhutto referred to an incident at Peshawar, where a bomb explosion killed Bhutto’s closest Frontier PPP lieutenant, Senior Minister Hayat Mohammad. Bhutto pinned the blame on the NAP and specifically Wali Khan. Wali Khan was subsequently arrested and the NAP was dissolved. The insurgency in Baluchistan, which did not truly end until after Bhutto’s time in office, and the subsequent crackdown on the NAP, further fueled the opposition’s dissent.

Bhutto’s autocratic tendencies further pushed the opposition to call for his removal. One of Bhutto’s major opponents, Asghar Khan, relates some of the abuses he and his party (the Tehrik-i-Istiqlal) suffered. He was once the commander of Pakistan’s Air Force and entered politics during the Ayub Khan regime. His party, the Tehrik-i-Istiqlal, was founded in 1970. He often criticized Bhutto and his autocratic tendencies, becoming a major spokesperson for the opposition. In his memoirs, Asghar Khan details many incidents where Bhutto’s heavy handed tactics disrupted the Tehrik-i-Istiqlal’s political events. In a 1972 incident in Lahore, Asghar Khan recounts that:

The local branch of Tehrik-i-Istiqlal had arranged a reception for me at a local hotel … a few minutes before my arrival the place was raided by people armed with
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revolvers, stenguns and iron bars led by MPAs of the People’s Party. These persons … beat up the guests and the organisers of the function. A large number of people were injured, the meeting broken up but fortunately no one was killed.\(^{60}\)

In another incident at Multan City where Asghar Khan was addressing a press conference, the area:

was surrounded by some 200 armed hooligans and PPP workers led by the Provincial Law Minister. Soon, they started firing and one bullet hit the wall behind me not far from where I was sitting. The press correspondents were eventually allowed to leave but my colleagues and I were besieged for about eight hours during which the house remained under intermittent rifle fire.\(^{61}\)

Asghar Khan remained one of the principle figures of the opposition until his arrest on March 17. He was arrested for criticizing the election process of 1977 and demanding new elections.\(^{62}\)

Bhutto’s crackdown on unrest within Pakistan also led to a growth in opposition against his regime. When student groups protested, Bhutto utilized a massive show of force which jailed many of the groups’ leaders. Many newspapers and periodicals were shut down and their editors arrested, leading Bhutto to state “you should also see what they write. It is absolutely unbelievable.”\(^{63}\) In addition, the Bhutto government frequently utilized violence. As Anwar Syed notes, “In a petition filed at the Lahore High Court, Ghulam Jilani alleged that he had been lodged in a filthy cell in the Lahore Fort, kept awake and interrogated for 36 hours, and denied medicine for his angina pains because he would not agree to testify that the arms seized in the Iraqi embassy in February 1973 were intended for the Pakhtun Zalme.”\(^{64}\)

According to the Pakistan Constitution of 1973, new elections were scheduled for some time in 1978. However, Bhutto remained optimistic about the PPP’s popularity and thus decided
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to hold elections one year earlier in 1977. In a speech marking the fourth anniversary of the PPP
government, Bhutto exclaimed that “general elections are no more than one and a half years
away. We have firmly chosen the democratic path and we know how to pursue it. I see a glorious
future for our country, I see reconciliation ahead and not division, adjustment not conflict,
dialogue not venom, cooperation not futile confrontation, responsible opposition not incitements
to violence.”65 Having cultivated orthodox Islamic support with the Second Islamic Conference
of 1974 (which also strengthened Islamabad’s relations with Iran and Saudi Arabia), signing the
1972 Simla Agreement, all while continuing the pursuit of a nuclear program in the face of U.S.
pressure, Bhutto felt confident about his chances at winning elections held in 1977.66 In a letter
from Bhutto to the Pakistani president dated January 9, 1977, Bhutto ordered the dissolution of
the National Assembly, officially marking the initiation of new parliamentary elections.

Upon hearing the news of early elections, the opposition transformed from the UDF to
the Pakistan National Alliance (PNA), ready to contest the election if any evidence of an unfair
electoral process surfaced. The PNA incorporated many of the same parties which formed the
UDF, however the PNA was far larger. Formed on January 11, 1977, the party brought together
about 90 political parties with fairly divergent views. Despite the differences between Islamic
conservatives, secular nationalists, and provincial autonomists within the PNA, the various
political parties agreed that Bhutto and the PPP could not be reelected.67

In the lead up to the elections, PNA party members were hassled and delayed by the PPP
government, with some unable to file their nomination papers in some cases.68 When the PPP
won a landslide victory in the elections, immediately charges of election fraud surfaced,
especially from the PNA. Not only did the PPP win the vast majority of seats in the National Assembly, but many PPP chief ministers were elected unopposed. The PNA took to the streets in protest of the election, resulting in major unrest in Karachi. Iqbal Akhund noted that the area “around Emoress Market in Karachi, an area within a half mile radius looked like a battlefield—rubble, rocks, broken bottles, and shards from broken windows of looted shops and smashed liquor stores lay everywhere.”69 Unrest erupted not only in Karachi but in cities such as Hyderabad, where on election day eight people were killed and 130 more injured along with 13 policemen. In response to this unrest, the federal government announced that “in order to ensure maintenance of law and order, Section 144 has been in effect throughout the country from 6 p.m. today. It will be relaxed only during the polling hours on 10 March 1977 [sic], to enable the people to cast their votes in the Provincial Assembly elections. During the enforcement of Section 144, all public meetings, processions, etc., by all political parties are banned.”70

Martial law did little to subdue the unrest that plagued the country. Bhutto, as well as the PNA, realized that a settlement was needed. A series of letters exchanged between Bhutto and the president of the PNA, Maulana Mufti Mahmud, detail some of the negotiation process. The PNA demanded that Bhutto acknowledge the election rigging, stated that is why the PNA has boycotted the election, and demanded new elections for the National Assembly to take place. Bhutto rejected the accusations of election rigging and claimed that the PPP won the majority of votes fairly. He also denounced the PNA for inciting violence. Responding to the government crackdown on unrest, Bhutto claimed that “the persons who have been arrested are not those who, as you suggest, are ‘peaceful citizens demanding nothing more than the restoration of their
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constitutional rights’. They are the ones who have flagrantly violated the law, incited people to violence, burnt and looted properties and killed innocent people.”

As the negotiations stalled, Bhutto turned to the Islamic parties for newfound support by banning gambling, drinking, and nightclubs. However, this move did not quell unrest or halt the PNA from contesting the elections. In this context, Bhutto turned to the Saudis, who mediated the dispute between Bhutto and the PNA. He believed that the Kingdom’s Islamic credentials could subdue much of the unrest. Pakistan’s Islamic parties would listen to such an authority and Bhutto hoped to save face by appealing to the nation’s Islamic sentiments. Despite foreign mediation, progress towards a settlement reached a standstill. It is in this context which precipitated General Zia ul Haq’s coup in July 1977.

Bhutto and the Army

On December 17, 1971, the West Pakistani military surrendered in Dacca, officially placing Bhutto in power. Thus, during the next seven years, a complex relationship developed between Bhutto and the Army, one of competition but also of collaboration. Bhutto, ever cognizant of the Army’s role in Pakistani politics, attempted to keep a close eye on the Army and its generals while also curbing the military’s ability to influence politics, which often included promoting generals loyal to Bhutto. Overall, I argue that Bhutto’s increasing reliance on the military, which influenced massive defense expenditures, to enforce his rule further cemented Bhutto’s relationship to Saudi Arabia and especially Iran.

After Pakistan surrendered to the Indian military in Dacca, Pakistani public opinion turned on the army and its generals, a rather new development in the country’s politics.
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military’s failure to achieve victory in the conflict, leading to the dismemberment of Pakistan, led to a decline in the public’s confidence in the army. In addition, an April 1972 Supreme Court ruling decided that Yahya Khan’s assumption of power on March 25, 1969, was illegal and unconstitutional, further tarnishing the Army’s image and strengthening the position of the civilian government. Thus, with popular support behind him, Bhutto dismissed and/or retired over 30 high ranking officers in the armed forces, most of whom served under the Yahya Khan regime.

But Bhutto also brought the military establishment closer in line with the civilian government. In a public speech, he claimed that the “People and the armed forces are one. The trouble has arisen because efforts were made to divide the people and the armed forces. The armed forces come from the people.” The significant purge of the military required that Bhutto appoint new generals to take control of the army, preferably ones with no political inclinations or ambitions. For these reasons, Bhutto appointed Lt. General Gul Hassan Khan as Commander in Chief of the Army and Air Marshal Rahim Khan as Commander-in-Chief of the Air Force. Bhutto believed both men had no political ambitions. In fact, he owed a bit to both men who “acted as the spokesmen of the armed forces in installing Bhutto as the President and Chief Martial Law Administrator.” In a public speech, Bhutto announced the appointment:

I have asked General Gul Hassan to be the Acting Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army and he will take this position immediately … I do not think he has dabbled in politics and I think he has respect and support of the armed forces … but he will retain the rank of Lt. General … We are not going to unnecessarily fatten people.
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Despite Gul Hassan’s new role, Bhutto further subordinated the army’s influence. Gul Hassan often clashed with Bhutto. From the outset Gul Hassan told Bhutto that “if I took over the Army, I wanted no interference from anyone, himself or any of his ministers.” As Aqil Shah argues, although the military was in a weak position, it tried asserting its independence from civilian authority, something which Gul Hassan adamantly represents in his memoirs. Gul Hassan tried exonerating the military for its role in the 1971 war, claiming “the politicians had played a major part in the debacle,” referencing the role of politicians such as Bhutto during the 1971 Bangladesh War.

The tension between Bhutto and Gul Hassan/Rahim Khan continued after their appointments. Upon receiving a report from Kohat that Rahim’s Khan’s soldiers were mutinous (Rahim Khan argued there were only a few rowdy soldiers), Bhutto and Rahim Khan engaged in a heated argument. Tensions between Bhutto and Gul Hassan were exacerbated when “he [Bhutto] asked whether he could attend the meeting of the Army Selection Board. I was surprised when he said this. I told him I was the Chairman of the Board and his attendance as a spectator would not be with his station.” In addition, Bhutto’s attempts at implementing “a plan whereby all Army officers would be screened by the police or intelligence, and those with political leanings or connections would be kept under surveillance, so as to ensure that they did not indulge in anti-State activities,” was directly opposed by Gul Hassan. In his memoirs, Gul Hassan asserts that “my interest had been, and still was, centered around the well-being of the Army. I was not one to permit the troops confront our public unless it was the supreme interest
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of Pakistan.” Giraju Hassan harbored reservations for military involvement in Pakistani politics.

In the face of a police strike that resulted in major civil unrest in Peshawar, Bhutto ordered the army to suppress the strike, an order which Gul Hassan rejected, claiming that Bhutto and the PPP organized the strike in order to force military involvement, an attempt to “defame” the army “beyond redemption.”

The event later influenced Bhutto “to raise a force specifically to deal with such problems. He had already decided on its name—Federal Security Force [FSF].”

As Gul Hassan notes, the FSF was established with the intention of assisting the civilian government in the administration and maintenance of law and order but was really utilized by the Bhutto government to subdue any major unrest and/or political opposition. In addition, Bhutto created the Federal Investigation Agency (FIA), a new intelligence outfit outside of military jurisdiction.

Historically, the military has been an important force in Pakistani politics since its independence in 1947. Pakistani society relied on the military to not only protect the state from external threats, such as India or Afghanistan, but to maintain law and order throughout the new nation, which struggled for many years in establishing a viable constitution. Early on, the military became synonymous with state survival and state building. The military itself was mostly drawn from the Punjab and more tribal areas such as the NWFP. The traditional solidarity of the Punjabi-Pakhtun composition of the Army also contributed to the military’s efficacy in politics. Thus, the military enjoyed a form of patronage in Pakistani society that culminated into
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military rule from 1958 to 1971. Senior generals such as Gul Hassan felt the need to assert their independence and authority.\(^{87}\)

After the police strike debacle, Bhutto invited both Gul Hassan and Rahim Khan to lunch at the President’s House, where he challenged the authority of both generals. While both generals were distracted in conversation with Ghulam Mustafa Khar (Governor of Punjab) and Mumtaz Bhutto (Bhutto’s cousin and minister in the federal cabinet) Bhutto informed General Tikka Khan over the phone that he would be placed in charge of the Army.\(^{88}\) According to Gul Hassan, Bhutto “opened a briefcase and produced two file covers, handing one to Rahim Khan and the other to me. Inside them were our resignations, already typed out.” Bhutto later announced the resignations in a public speech as well as new military reforms:

> By now you must have heard that Lt. General Gul Hassan, who resigned this afternoon, has been replaced by Lt. General Tikka Khan and that Air-Marshal Rahim Khan has been replaced by Air-Marshal Zafar Chaudhury. From today we will no longer have the anachronistic and obsolete posts of Commanders-in-Chief. Every wing of the Armed Forces, that is Army, Navy and Air Force, will be headed by a Chief of Staff.\(^{89}\)

It is clear that Bhutto’s reorganization of the military came out of his experiences with Lt. Gen. Gul Hassan Khan and Air Marshal Rahim Khan. These experiences further influenced Bhutto “to wipe out the Bonapartic influences from the Armed Forces.” The new Chiefs of Staff were given fixed tenures which could not be extended for any reason.\(^{90}\) Furthermore, on the advice of his new Chief of Staff General Tikka Khan and Military Secretary Imtiaz Ahmad, Bhutto retained control of the position of defense minister, which gave him the power to promote military
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officers with high ranks. Often, those that received promotions were either loyal to Bhutto or did not question orders.\textsuperscript{91}

The 1973 constitution further defined the new role of the military. In an attempt to rid the Army of its “Bonapartic” influences, the constitution forced members of the military to swear an oath of allegiance to the elected government. In addition, the constitution relegated the military’s role in Pakistani society to the defense against external threats.\textsuperscript{92} Other major reforms included the creation of the Defense Committee of the Cabinet which served as the country’s highest policymaking body in matters related to national defense, the creation of a separate Ministry of Defense Production to control the arms industry within Pakistan, and the creation of a Joint Staff. Overall, the Prime Minister was made the principal authority on defense.\textsuperscript{93}

In return for this subordination, and in the context of an Indian nuclear weapons test in 1974, the military received a huge expansion. Throughout the mid-1970s Pakistan’s military expenditures rose over 200 percent. From 1973 to 1974, Pakistan began spending 6.6 percent of its GNP on the military, a 1.6 percent increase from the period of 1968-1971. Moreover, the military raised two additional army divisions, increased military salaries and benefits, revitalized the arms manufacturing industry, and shielded Pakistani prisoners of war from prosecution of war crimes related to the 1971 war.\textsuperscript{94} These expenditures were in part funded by economic aid from Iran and were unsustainable.

Bhutto quickly filled this expanded military command structure with loyalists. This newfound trust in the military led to military interference in internal affairs. Despite the constitution’s stance on military involvement in internal politics, loopholes existed which
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allowed Bhutto to utilize the Army in subduing various internal conflicts throughout the 1970s.\textsuperscript{95} From July 1972 to July 1977, the military was involved in the language riots in Sindh, periodic counterinsurgency operations in Baluchistan, patrolling the streets during the Anti-Ahmadi riots, subduing conflicts between the NWFP tribesman and the civil administration, and suppressing the anti-Bhutto movement.\textsuperscript{96}

As Aqil Shah, Hasan Askari Rizvi, and Shuja Nawaz argue, military involvement in these internal conflicts reoriented the army’s historical role in Pakistani politics. The army’s victory in Baluchistan particularly provided the military command structure with confidence, proving that once again the military could effectively govern and maintain law and order. The removal of Baluchistan’s regional governor and the disbandment of the NAP-JUI coalition government in the province contributed to the insurgency within Baluchistan, and the military was charged with restoring order.

The Bhutto government claimed it sent the Frontier Corps of the Army to Baluchistan on December 2, 1972 to “check the marauding tribesman.”\textsuperscript{97} Its stated goals for operations in Baluchistan included: “to assist the civil administration in restoring law and order in the affected areas; to apprehend hostile elements and recover unauthorized arms and other war-like stores; maintain the security of the lines of communications in the affected areas and undertake whether action was necessary against the hostile elements; to assist the civil administration in various development and uplift projects in the Marri and Mengal areas.”\textsuperscript{98} The federal government claimed the development of Baluchistan was paramount, and thus Army operations in Baluchistan included “major development projects such as the installation of tubewells and
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electric generators, the construction of roads, and opening of schools and dispensaries.”

Military operations in the province were partly successful in mitigating the insurgency.

With General Tikka Khan’s term coming to a close in 1976, Bhutto appointed Muhammad Zia ul Haq as the new head of the army, bypassing several more senior ranking generals. Zia was part of the Pakistani mission that advised the Jordanian military during its civil war in 1970. After directly disobeying orders and participating in combat action, Zia was removed from his post in Jordan and returned to service in Pakistan. He surfaced on Bhutto’s radar after his handling of the 1973 Attock Conspiracy, in which a group of middle ranking officers planned a coup to remove Bhutto and the military command structure involved in the 1971 war. The officers were upset with Bhutto’s autocratic rule and believed that Pakistan was heading for another disaster. Pakistani intelligence quickly penetrated the conspirators and successfully disrupted the plot. Zia was put in charge of the trials, which gave him important access to Bhutto and contributed to his appointment as head of the Armed Forces.

The rigging of the 1977 elections contributed to growing unrest throughout Pakistan’s major cities. The federal government declared martial law on April 22, 1977 in response to the growing unrest and violence. Although the FSF was charged with subduing such unrest, the military was called in to maintain law and order. As negotiations between Bhutto and the PNA splintered, Zia took advantage of the situation to initiate a successful coup.

What is often left out of narratives that describe Bhutto’s relationship with the Army is the economic situation of Pakistan and its relationship to foreign economic and military aid. The Pakistani economy could not afford the massive spikes in military expenditures on its own.
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Although Bhutto’s implanted a number of economic reforms, the Pakistani economy still suffered from rising inflation and a lack of economic capital. Despite the reorganization of the military, the economic situation did not allow for the rearmament of Pakistan’s military. The question that then arises is how the state afforded the increase in military spending. Where was Pakistan getting its arms to suppress nationalism in Baluchistan after a bitter defeat by India in 1971? As will be illustrated in Chapter 3, foreign economic and military aid from Iran and Saudi Arabia helps to answer this question.

**Conclusion**

Although Bhutto attempted to enact a reform program to address the ailments of Pakistan post 1971, his autocratic tendencies, along with the effects of globalization and inflation, led to his eventual ouster as president in 1977. Bhutto’s crowning achievement was his successful passage of the 1973 constitution, which made it through the National Assembly with an overwhelming majority, and established the framework of which the current Pakistani Constitution is based off. However, Bhutto’s power grabs in the provinces, his crackdown on the opposition, and his reliance on the military to support his rule, dampened the positive effects of his reforms.

Yet, this chapter illustrated glimpses of Bhutto’s connections to the Iran and Saudi Arabia. Pakistan’s domestic politics were often influenced by these connections. During Bhutto’s attempts to suppress Baluch nationalism, Iran stepped in and provided Pakistan with the military hardware to suppress the uprising. In 1977, the Saudis mediated the 1977 election dispute between Bhutto and the PNA. The 1971 Bangladesh War convinced many foreign powers, such

---

as the U.S., to withdraw economic and military aid to Pakistan. After the war Bhutto cultivated
relations with Iran and Saudi Arabia and both states provided Pakistan with much needed
economic, military, and diplomatic support.
Chapter Two - Old Alliances, New Dynamics: U.S-Pakistan Relations during the Bhutto Period

A developing nation’s bulwark against the pressures of the great powers is its unwavering adherence to principles and its capacity to articulate them in a given contingency. The notion is demonstrably false that a great power, qua a great power, remains beyond conversion to a principle which it might not itself have espoused.\(^1\) – Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

The President of the United States says that the integrity of Pakistan is a cornerstone of the United States’ foreign policy.\(^2\) – Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

In the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War, President Richard Nixon discussed the status of Pakistan with Secretary of State William Rogers and Assistant for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger in an afternoon meeting in Washington. Nixon stated “Bhutto basically has been—he hasn’t changed. My last report is one of my basic [unclear] in ‘67 when I was there, is that the son-of-a-bitch is a total demagogue. And therefore Ayub Khan gave me a rundown on him, and he’s a pretty good judge of men, and he said this fellow is just bad news.”\(^3\)

Despite Nixon’s own personal feelings, he understood that Pakistan had served U.S. interests in the past. Pakistan was a key member of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), maintaining U.S. containment policy on the periphery. According to Harold Saunders, a career foreign service officer with the National Security Council (NSC), Pakistan “was also viewed as an important country because of its proximity to the Soviet Union.”\(^4\) Before becoming president, Nixon had visited Pakistan five times, twice as vice president and three times after leaving office.\(^5\) Thus, Nixon was considered an old friend to Pakistan. President Nixon’s policy on

---

Pakistan in some ways was similar to that of President Johnson, but he adopted a warmer tone toward Islamabad. This warmer tone was largely influenced by one of Nixon’s major foreign policy goals, opening up diplomatic relations with China. To do this Nixon relied on Islamabad to act as an intermediary in facilitating conversations between the U.S. and China. In his oral history, Saunders noted that “Kissinger, in fact, saw the Indians as Soviet surrogates trying to dismember an American ally. As I have suggested, in light of his efforts to establish relationships with the Chinese, he could not let such an event go unnoticed and thought that some efforts on behalf of Pakistan were in order.”6 Therefore, Pakistan became an important player for the Nixon administration’s foreign policy goals.7

Even after Nixon’s dramatic 1972 trip to Beijing, Pakistan was still an important intermediary between the Chinese and the Americans. In addition, Pakistan, and not India, resisted Soviet influence and joined Washington’s battle against global communism. A Muslim majority country, Pakistan also maintained the ability to form close ties with states in the Persian Gulf region. While initially Nixon harbored ill feelings toward Bhutto, throughout his presidency he gave Pakistan the political, economic, and (some) military aid it so desperately needed and desired.

In this chapter, I assess U.S.-Pakistan relations in the 1970s by drawing on American archival documents published in the Foreign Relations of the United States series as well as memoirs of Pakistani diplomats and oral history interviews of American diplomats. I argue that Washington, both directly and indirectly, influenced Pakistan to further cement its ties to the Persian Gulf, mainly Iran and Saudi Arabia. American policy makers often encouraged Pakistan
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to establish economic/military relationships with Tehran and Riyadh. This was partly because the U.S. alone could not meet Pakistan’s needs, especially in the case of military aid. The larger reason behind this was that American foreign policy planners, from the end of 1971 to 1977, envisioned Pakistan as another layer of defense for the security of the Persian Gulf region. Moreover, Washington’s attempts to establish cordial relations with India irked Pakistan and further pushed Bhutto to secure military and economic aid from the Gulf. While Bhutto still requested American assistance, he received far more aid from Iran and Saudi Arabia.

There is an extensive literature on U.S.-Pakistan relations, with two definitive accounts belonging to Dennis Kux and Husain Haqqani. Their books examine U.S.-Pakistan relations in a historical perspective, emphasizing a relationship of misunderstanding and divergent foreign policy goals. They do examine areas of cooperation and geopolitical contexts, but the Iranian and Saudi connection are only mentioned in passing. A collection of essays put together by Usama Butt and Julian Schofield do an excellent job of placing U.S.-Pakistan relations in a broader geopolitical perspective, but the essays that are featured largely focus on the 1990s and the post September 11, 2001 Global War on Terror.

This chapter outlines Pakistan’s relations primarily with the Nixon and Ford administrations, as soon after Carter assumed office Bhutto was removed from power through a coup. The first section examines the Nixon administration’s relations with Bhutto in the immediate aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War. While Nixon claimed he wanted to lift the 1965 arms embargo on Pakistan, he stated he could not do so due to extreme opposition among

---


Congress. Thus, Washington allocated large amounts of economic aid under the PL-480 program to address Pakistan’s economic woes. The Ford administration did much of the same. It even lifted the arms embargo on Pakistan and India, but the 1974 Indian nuclear test, and the subsequent establishment of Pakistan’s own nuclear program, led to tensions between Washington and Islamabad. These tensions were then exacerbated under the Carter administration, which applied even more pressure on Islamabad to give up its nuclear ambitions. This pressure convinced Bhutto that the U.S. was working against him, and he accused Washington of funding his opposition during the 1977 election crisis.

**Bhutto and Nixon: The Tilt?**

Writing in the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak war Secretary of State William Rogers acknowledged that “the United States continues to have no vital security interests in South Asia,” assessing that “no country in the area including India has or is likely to have the ability for many years to come to affect American security directly even if backed by the Soviet Union.” However, Rogers did understand that “developments in South Asia could affect our great interest in stability and impinge on other areas where our vital interests are engaged, i.e., the Middle East, Iran and Turkey and potentially in South East Asia as well. They also impinge upon our interests in the Indian Ocean area generally.”

Rogers and other American policymakers realized the potential for an interconnected South Asia and Middle East and were convinced of this by the rhetoric of regional actors. Tehran and Riyadh expressed their concerns to U.S. officials over the instability in South Asia as a result of the 1971 war. Thus, discussions in the White House centered on the possibility “for both India
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and Pakistan to resolve their differences and for Pakistan to become more self-consciously a part of the Middle Eastern system.”\textsuperscript{11} For this to occur, Washington needed to further cement relations with Iran and other Middle Eastern states which were worried about Soviet gains in South Asia. Furthermore, Rogers discussed orienting Pakistan towards the Middle East (mainly Iran and Turkey) and away from acting as a counterbalance to India. This involved the continuation of military aid to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{12}

The Soviet Union was as involved in South Asia as the United States. Despite Islamabad’s alliance with Washington and its participation in CENTO, Yahya Khan still maintained a dialogue with Moscow. However, the Soviets maintained very little influence over Pakistan. When the Pakistani military began its crackdown in East Pakistan, Soviet efforts to caution Pakistan did little.\textsuperscript{13} Yet, Pakistan never abandoned its relations with the Soviet Union. Although Moscow supported India during the 1971 war and was one of the first states to recognize Bangladesh, Bhutto did not sever diplomatic ties, as he did with several other nations. In a March 1972 visit to the Soviet Union, Bhutto concluded agreements in technical cooperation and restored trade relations disrupted as a result of the war.\textsuperscript{14}

The relationship between India and the Soviet Union was influenced by geostrategic considerations. Moscow felt threatened by Islamabad’s close relationship with Beijing and this fear was exacerbated when Washington took advantage of it to restore its relations with China. India was also wary of Pakistan’s relations with China, but New Delhi’s insecurity significantly increased with Nixon’s election in 1969. Indira Gandhi, the prime minister of India, realized that
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Nixon’s elections would result in a “tilt” towards Pakistan. Furthermore, India believed that Washington was propping up Tehran and Islamabad as strategic counterweights to New Delhi. In this context, India and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation on August 9, 1971. The treaty cemented Soviet military aid to India and also expanded economic cooperation between both nations. India was never a Soviet client state and it still strongly adhered to its nonaligned status. But in response to Nixon’s “tilt” and the American and Chinese reconciliation, Moscow became an important player in Indian security.

As much as the Nixon administration wanted to continue its military relationship with Pakistan, American public opinion turned against Islamabad for its brutal suppression of Bangladesh. Sultan Mohammed Khan (SMK), who served as Pakistani Ambassador to the U.S. from 1972 to 1974, noted the opposition to any continuation of military aid to Islamabad. In his memoirs he details how:

The news media, Congress, and U.S. public opinion by and large were hostile to Pakistan after military action was launched in East Pakistan, and Nixon simply could not bypass these obstacles and come to Pakistan’s help. Even the supply of military spare parts became a hot issue and under pressure from the media and Congress, the programme came to an end in November … Any move to strengthen the Pakistan armed forces was then seen with abhorrence because of the tales of repression and bloodshed in East Pakistan which has caused deep revulsion in American public opinion.

Upon reaching Washington for his assignment, SMK “found that the few friends we had had become reluctant to identify with Pakistan. Even the American ladies who were members of the Friends of Pakistan Association had resigned. Most congressman and senators made excuses, when I requested appointments. Editors and columnists would respond to invitations, but their
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attitude was cold and unresponsive.”18 The situation was so desperate that SMK found himself “knocking at every door” but “Pakistan’s fortunes had sunk … from the fact that several persons who had been sounded out by the White House to go to Pakistan as ambassador had declined the offer.” SMK reflected how Bhutto felt “slighted by the absence of a US ambassador in Islamabad, and in his frequent calls, this was one of the issues on which he often expressed his disappointment.”19

American officials were also concerned about Bhutto coming to power in Pakistan. According to SMK, Bhutto’s attitude and tendencies were a “factor which played a considerable part in America’s hesitation … it was not sure about Bhutto’s future attitude. He had baited the U.S. persistently as Foreign Minister, and they were not certain if he had suddenly shed that personality and could be trusted. They also wanted to see how far he would be able to provide a stable leadership and overcome the problems left in the aftermath of the loss of East Pakistan.”20

Iqbal Akhund, who served as the Pakistani representative to United Nations in the 1970s, also noted how “there remained among American officials a residue of wariness with regard to his [Bhutto’s] leftist leanings, his pat anti-American rhetoric, and generally about Bhutto’s personality.”21

Upon assuming the presidency in December 1971, Bhutto understood the many challenges facing Pakistan. Despite his critical attitude toward the U.S. in the past, and the belief that Washington did not do enough to support Pakistan during the war, Bhutto acknowledged the need to maintain a close relationship with the Nixon administration. On December 18, 1971, only two days after the Pakistani surrender, Bhutto met with Nixon in Washington. He stressed

the need for Islamabad and Washington to continue the relationship both states enjoyed in the past. Nixon agreed, but he informed Bhutto that U.S. assistance would be primarily economic and humanitarian. It was impossible to lift the arms embargo due to opposition from the American public and congress.\textsuperscript{22} Yet, Bhutto did not give up on trying to convince Nixon that military aid to Pakistan was in America’s interest. He frequently reminded Washington that the Soviet Union supplied India with weapons during the 1971 war. With American aid, he argued that Pakistan could act as a counterweight to Soviet inspired Indian aggression. In addition, despite his past rhetoric, Bhutto was quick to praise Nixon and his administration’s assistance of Pakistan during the 1971 war.\textsuperscript{23} As discussed in chapter 1, in the aftermath of the 1971 war Pakistan suffered from a number of economic issues and thus Bhutto needed U.S. aid to alleviate the ailing economy.

Over the next year, deliberations in the American government centered on the issue of military and economic aid. While Nixon and Kissinger could not continue sending weapons to Pakistan, they were able to meet some of Pakistan’s economic aid requests. In an analytical summary prepared by the NSC for Kissinger, the NSC advised Kissinger to continue implementation of a new PL-480 agreement which allowed for about $25 million in wheat and $10 million in edible oil to be sent to Pakistan. However, the NSC also advised Kissinger on the arms issue. It recommended to maintain the present arms embargo but restore the April 1967 policy of selling non-lethal items and spare parts for equipment Pakistan currently possessed. Also, it offered the possibility of reinstating major military items on a grant or sales basis, but this recommendation was denied by the Defense Department, which advised postponing the arms pipeline to South Asia. However, the NSC defended its reasoning, arguing that, “Looking on a
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broader area, one could think of Pakistan strengthening its relations with Iran, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Turkey … Such a combination would begin to look like a new lineup similar to CENTO against the Soviet thrust into the Indian Ocean.” 24 Like Secretary of State Rogers, the NSC believed Washington could encourage Islamabad to cement its security ties with the Middle East, thus acting as a bulwark against the Soviet Union and securing the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf. The NSC also linked American security interests in the Indian Ocean with that of the Persian Gulf.

The State Department supported economic aid packages to Pakistan. In recommendations to Kissinger, it advised the administration to conclude current negotiations on the PL-480 agreement, which now included 300,000 tons of wheat and 25,000 tons of edible oil valued at $27 million. 25 Massive flooding and rising inflation contributed to food shortages in Pakistan, which the American government helped to alleviate. Furthermore, the United States felt comfortable with the direction Bhutto was taking Pakistan in, especially when he signed the Simla Agreement of 1972, which became the peace agreement between India and Pakistan after the 1971 war. The agreement declared Jammu and Kashmir the Line of Control and exchanged 36,000 Bengali prisoners in Pakistan with 90,000 Pakistani POWs in India. This illustrated to Washington that Bhutto was serious in easing tensions with India and that Bhutto was interested in maintaining regional stability. 26

While American officials were contemplating the merits of Pakistan’s importance to security in the Gulf, Bhutto encouraged U.S. officials to think of Pakistan as a strategic asset to
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U.S. interests. In February and March of 1972, Bhutto inquired as to whether the Nixon administration would be interested in acquiring military bases along Pakistan’s Arabian Coast. Bhutto understood that the United States often responded to Cold War paradigms and thus framed these new military bases as a strategic counterweight to the presence of Soviet funded military bases along the Indian coastline.

The Nixon White House deliberated whether such a request was in the nation’s best interest. Rogers noted that, “The GOP [Government of Pakistan] is thinking of ‘access to facilities as needed’ and not of large numbers of American personnel.” He also expressed Pakistan’s intention of welcoming “collaboration in strategic military planning.” What Bhutto really wanted was American funding for a new port, but understood that funding from Washington necessitated some strategic benefit. On the surface it seemed the Nixon administration would accept such an arrangement. In the context of neglecting arms sales to Pakistan, this agreement would do much to appease Pakistan’s military and security needs and improve relations between Washington and Islamabad. In addition, a strategic port along the Arabian coast could provide further security for the Persian Gulf.

Bhutto’s hopes for a closer military relationship with Washington did not materialize. The Nixon administration was not interested in maintaining a military base in Pakistan for a number of reasons. It was clear to the administration that “given the major change in the South Asia equation after the December War, … we could not and should not seek to build up Pakistan as any kind of strategic counter-weight to India.” In other words, because India had won the
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1971 war, it became more important to U.S. interests. Throughout this period, while Nixon was working to improve relations with Pakistan, he also sent Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan to improve America’s relationship with India and court it away from Soviet influence. In addition, the influence of the Nixon Doctrine most likely turned the administration away from maintaining U.S. military personnel in a possible future conflict zone. The Nixon Doctrine was first articulated in a press conference in Guam on July 25, 1969, and was heavily influenced by U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It stipulated that Washington could promise economic and military aid to allies in the developing world threatened by communism, but that these states had to utilize their own manpower to confront security threats. In other words, America was now reluctant to station U.S. forces in the developing world. Furthermore, the approval of this base would only inflame tensions with Afghanistan, India, and the Soviet Union in an era of Détente. This refusal marked the beginning of a trend in U.S.-Pakistani relations, where Pakistan made a request of the U.S. (usually a military one) and was promptly denied, pushing Pakistan to seek military aid from China and countries in the Middle East.

In context of this rejection, Nixon sent Bhutto a letter on March 22, 1972. Nixon addressed U.S. aid to Pakistan and reaffirmed his administration’s stance that it could not supply Pakistan with weapons but would do everything it could to alleviate Pakistan’s economic situation. In his letter Nixon wrote that “we are prepared to do all that we reasonably can to help you with your economic problems. We will participate in an interim debt settlement within the Consortium in support of your economic reform program and are urging the other donor countries to do the same.” He also stated that “we are ready to discuss with you what steps we

can take to resume our previous substantial support for Pakistan’s development efforts, including new lending and additional food support.”

U.S. economic aid alleviated some of Pakistan’s economic issues, especially in the context of natural disasters and global inflation. However, Islamabad continued to pursue American weapons. In March 1972, Pakistani Ambassador to the U.S. N.A.M. Raza made a formal request for American armament. Raza called for the resumption of spares and end items already contracted for including 300 Armored Personnel Carriers, an agreement for the release of lethal sophisticated equipment such as artillery, anti-aircraft guns, ground-to-ground and ground-to-air missiles, 100 M-47/48 tanks, 4 submarines, 12 B-57s, 25 F-5 aircraft, and 1000 M-601 trucks. In a meeting between Bhutto and Sidney Sober, who headed the American embassy in Islamabad, Sober questioned Pakistan’s need for such armament in light of the multitude of challenges the country faced. Bhutto explained that the request was at behest of senior military leaders. Despite Pakistan’s economic situation, Bhutto and the military elite believed the state still required armament to counteract Indian aggression. From the Pakistani perspective, the 1971 war began due to Indian aggression and it was the failure of Pakistan’s allies (especially the U.S.) to support the war effort which resulted in the bitter defeat. Islamabad could not afford such a defeat ever again. Thus, Bhutto continued to ask for American arms, and when the request fell flat, the Pakistanis turned to China and France for arms, funded in large part by Iran and Saudi Arabia.
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Tensions escalated between Islamabad and Washington when the U.S. had to delay its PL-480 wheat shipment to Pakistan.\textsuperscript{36} In response Bhutto announced his decision for the diplomatic recognition of North Vietnam and North Korea.\textsuperscript{37} While this resulted in some tension between Islamabad and Washington, the arms issue remained the primary grievance for Pakistan. This was reflected in conversations between Kissinger and SMK. In a record of an October 1972 conversation, Kissinger explained that while the U.S. government could release the $1.7 million of military aid to Pakistan that was held up in American ports, the administration would also have to release frozen items to India.\textsuperscript{38} While the Pakistani ambassador was happy to hear that some military aid was to be released, he was concerned about the release of aid to India. Kissinger explained that the American bureaucracy had a pro-Indian stance, but Kissinger did not say that India was becoming more important to the administration’s interests as well.\textsuperscript{39}

Harold Saunders reflected on the importance of India to U.S. interests. While he recommended the release of the frozen military aid to Pakistan, he also advised Kissinger to release aid to India, as the arms embargo hurt U.S. businesses. The embargo resulted in a $2.9 million loss for aid designated to Pakistan, while military aid sent to India (mostly radar systems) accounted for $16 million.\textsuperscript{40}

Although India was becoming more important to American interests, the Nixon administration still valued Pakistan, especially since India continued receiving arms from the Soviet Union. When reports surfaced that Pakistan was going to leave CENTO, Nixon once

again reaffirmed his commitment to Pakistan, expressing his wish that the administration “could have done more for Pakistan in the previous struggle.” He also affirmed that “we will do whatever we can to support Pakistan's independence and strength … To the extent the U.S. reestablishes a dialogue with India, our influence will be to restrain India.”

Pakistan still mattered to the Nixon administration. Bhutto’s tour of the Middle East, which aimed at cultivating political and material support for Pakistan, further illustrated that Islamabad could become an important player for the stability and security of the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, Pakistan’s involvement with the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD) with Iran and Turkey was an attractive prospect to Washington.

In September 1973, Bhutto traveled to Washington on an official state visit. A few months before, the Nixon administration discussed lifting the embargo on spares and non-lethal military equipment. Henry Byroade, who served as the American ambassador to Pakistan from 1973 to 1977, initially took on the position to end the arms embargo. According to Byroade, the arms embargo was “very unfair to Pakistan, because India turned to the Soviet Union for their armament needs … Pakistan was left with sort of Korean-vintage US equipment which was worn out. They needed help, but under the embargo we couldn’t do it.”

Due in part to Saunders’ efforts, Nixon later informed Rogers that, “When President Bhutto's special representative comes to the U.S. in March, we believe we should inform him that we have lifted export restrictions on the million dollars worth [sic] of spares and non-lethal military items belonging to Pakistan
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which have not been shipped because of our arms embargo.” In another March meeting, Kissinger discussed the ways in which the U.S. could supply arms to Pakistan. In speaking to Nixon, Kissinger remarked that, “If we were not going to supply equipment directly, one theoretical possibility has been to encourage friendly third countries like Iran or Turkey to supply equipment to Pakistan or money to buy equipment.” American policy makers continued encouraging a military relationship between Iran and Pakistan, especially since Iran was already assisting Pakistan with an insurgency in Pakistani Baluchistan.

U.S.-China relations factored in to the Pakistani arms issue. In a telephone conversation between Nixon and Kissinger, Kissinger explained the importance of states like Iran that could supply Pakistan with weapons. However, Kissinger also noted that “if we won’t give any arms at all, Mr. President, the Chinese will despise us.” Nixon replied that “I know why we’re doing it but I want to be sure the Chinese play the game too.” While the Nixon administration saw the importance of Islamabad’s military connections to Tehran, the Chinese angle cannot be discounted.

Moynihan and other members of the administration opposed the decision to remove the arms embargo on Pakistan. They feared the decision would ruin Washington’s relations with India. Therefore, they urged the Nixon administration to “promise Pakistan anything but arms.” As Daniel Sargent notes, Nixon desired to control foreign policy decision making by removing the State Department and Congress from the policymaking progress. However, in the context

of the American withdrawal from Vietnam, the 1973 Arab-Israeli Peace Process, Détente, and other foreign policy priorities, Nixon and Kissinger were unwilling to spend a large amount of political capital on Pakistan. Pakistan was only a secondary foreign policy concern.

Before visiting Nixon in the United States, Bhutto visited Iran and observed the weapons the shah acquired through Washington. While Bhutto was grateful for the military and economic support he received from the shah, he also did not want a Pakistan subservient to Iran. Bhutto wanted Pakistan to supplant Iran as the closest U.S. ally in the Persian Gulf, believing that Islamabad could serve as a much better ally to Washington. Before he reached the United States, Bhutto instructed SMK to “to ask the U.S. for one million tons of wheat because of shortages caused by serious floods in Pakistan. The U.S. had already given us half a million tons of wheat and regretted that because of an acute supply situation our additional requirements could not be met.” In addition, he tasked his ambassador to lift the arms embargo. However, “in the public mind Pakistan had not yet emerged from the shadows of military action against East Pakistan. Moreover, the general public mood in America at the time—one might call it almost a re-discovered conviction—was in favour of disengaging from excessive involvement in the affairs of other countries.”

Bhutto met Nixon in September 1973. Nixon had been reelected and Kissinger now assumed the role of Secretary of State. The U.S. had just pulled out of the Vietnam War and the 1973 Arab-Israeli war was looming. Moreover, the Watergate proceedings escalated. With these contexts in mind, Bhutto understood the importance of connecting Pakistan to U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf. He stated that, “The Middle East problem is interconnected with the South
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Asian one. Pakistan cannot be unaware of that, and every day we find new emphasis being put on the importance of the Persian Gulf.” He also argued that, “Another element one must assess is geographic position. Pakistan is situated at the mouth of the Persian Gulf. Any state that has access to the Karachi coast can dominate the Gulf. That is why the Soviet Union is so interested in that coast.”\textsuperscript{52} Nixon replied that “it is important that Pakistan, to the extent it can, play a leavening role with the new states like the Gulf states.”\textsuperscript{53}

On the second day of the visit, Bhutto further argued for Pakistan’s importance to Gulf security. He explained that “in the Emirates in the Gulf, we have a solid presence; we have our police and our military advisers there.”\textsuperscript{54} In spite of these arguments, the White House did not lift the embargo, but Nixon did announce his decision to release spare parts and nonlethal military equipment that was originally slated for Pakistan. In an address to Congress, Nixon expressed the administration’s commitment to Pakistan. He acknowledged that since January 1972 the U.S. had “provided over 300 million dollars” to assist Pakistan’s economic recovery. Of the $300 million, $120 million facilitated agricultural and industrial growth while an additional $14 million, provided by the UN, went towards emergency relief in the aftermath of the 1971 war. More importantly, $124 million addressed food shortages in Pakistan as a result of “inadequate rainfall and the dislocations of the war.”\textsuperscript{55} In terms of military aid, Nixon announced his decision to “fulfil outstanding contractual obligations to Pakistan and India for limited quantities of military equipment whose delivery had been suspended in 1971,” but reassured Congress that

America was not participating in an arms race in the subcontinent.\textsuperscript{56} Nixon understood the opposition to such a policy, hence why he released equipment to both Pakistan and India. He hoped that doing so would appease the pro-Indian members of Congress.

While Bhutto’s visit did not achieve its primary aim, Islamabad did receive assurances from the White House that “Pakistan is a cornerstone of the United States’ foreign policy.”\textsuperscript{57} Bhutto further convinced the Nixon administration that Pakistan was an integral part to U.S. interests in the Gulf. In commenting on the meeting, Saunders noted that:

> The President had deliberately chosen the word “cornerstone” for use in his welcoming remarks—that Pakistan is a cornerstone of US policy. This is not just a matter of friendship. It is a matter of the interest which the US has in a peaceful world. It is a US interest that a nation not be fragmented. US and Pakistani interests vis-à-vis the USSR and PRC are similar, and both have common interests in the Persian Gulf and Arab World. US interests are served by a strong and independent Pakistan.\textsuperscript{58}

He also agreed with Bhutto that “the Middle East problem is interconnected with the South Asian problem” and noted how Islamabad argued that Pakistan helped maintain the “importance of the Persian Gulf.”\textsuperscript{59}

The Watergate scandal resulted in Nixon’s resignation. However, since Kissinger remained in charge of U.S. foreign policy under President Gerald Ford, the administration’s outlook on Pakistan did not alter. However, a monumental event in 1974 changed a great deal.
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Bhutto and Ford: The Nuclear Question

On March 18, 1974, India tested a nuclear device underground at the Pokharan test site in the Rajasthani desert.\(^{60}\) Almost instantly, the primary U.S. objective of nonproliferation was threatened. India never signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and yet was given substantial nuclear assistance from not only the U.S. but other Western states. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, claimed the test was undertaken for peaceful purposes only, yet American officials seriously doubted this claim.\(^{61}\) Pakistan was stunned.

In a conversation at the White House, Pakistani Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Aziz Ahmed expressed Pakistan’s concern. He stated Pakistan was “not surprised, but shocked. There is a tendency to play it down in some quarters, and Mrs. Gandhi says it’s ‘peaceful.’ We think the Soviet Union will enable them to build nuclear weapons. This detonation we think is just a first step in the development of nuclear weapons and a delivery system.”\(^{62}\) In light of India’s nuclear test, Ahmed also stated that “we need defensive weapons — SAMs and anti-tank missiles. It is only for defense against India — and Afghanistan, which might not stand aside in another war.”\(^{63}\)

While Washington was reluctant to continue its military aid to Pakistan in the past, the Indian nuclear explosion prompted serious conversations to reassess U.S. relations with South Asia. In a conversation at the White House, Kissinger asked, “Are the arrangements going forward with the Iranians on the tank modernization?” Sober replied that, “Talks were supposed to take place between the Pakistani Vice Chief of General Staff and the Iranians.” Ahmed stated,

“Yes, we understand it will take a year to make the kits. Then they can refit 20 a day.”

Henry Byroade took deliberations a step further. In his correspondence with Washington, Byroade noted how Islamabad’s feelings of insecurity were genuine and that there was a serious threat Pakistan could go nuclear in response to the Indian tests. Therefore, he recommended that the U.S. end its arms embargo on Pakistan in an attempt to dissuade Islamabad from establishing its own nuclear program.

While the Ford administration deliberated the prospects of ending the arms embargo, Bhutto announced to the world that Pakistan would develop a nuclear program in response to India’s nuclear program. Pakistani officials calculated that with “its smaller size [Pakistan] can never hope to deter a bigger neighbor by building up its purely conventional military capability. A nuclear capability alone represents the only possible equalizer for Pakistan in this context.”

The Indian nuclear test gave Bhutto excellent timing in announcing the decision, but Pakistan’s desire to establish a nuclear weapons program predated the Indian nuclear test.

Akhund attests in his memoirs that, “In 1966, in his last days as Foreign Minister, he [Bhutto] directed the Foreign Office to convene a meeting of all concerned, in order to consider the nuclear question and put up recommendations for action to the government.”

Pakistan maintained small scale nuclear energy programs which were overseen by the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) and funded by Canada. Canadian aid and expertise established the nuclear plant in Karachi (KANUPP) which had to abide by international safeguards since the plant produced plutonium. Then, Bhutto held a secret meeting on January 20, 1972 with top
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scientists in Multan, Pakistan to assess Pakistan’s nuclear capabilities.\textsuperscript{69} However, the scientific conference, which was held at the home of Nawab Sadiq Hussain Qureshi (the chief minister of Punjab at the time), was not as secretive as some sources claim. According to Feroz Hassan Khan, a retired Brigadier General of the Pakistani Army who was involved in formulating Pakistan’s security policies on its nuclear armament, in attendance were foreigners and journalists alongside Pakistan’s best scientists.\textsuperscript{70} Bhutto affirmed his support for Pakistan’s nuclear program, saying that, “We are fighting a thousand year war with India, and we will make an atomic bomb even if we have to eat grass.”\textsuperscript{71} For Pakistan, there existed a psychology of defeat, exacerbated by Pakistan’s surrender to India in the 1971 war. This resulted in a “never again” mentality in Pakistan which prompted the state to achieve a degree of self-reliance related to its defense. Finally, the U.S. arms embargo severely affected the ability of the Pakistani military to act as an effective fighting force.\textsuperscript{72} 1972 marked the beginning of Pakistan’s quest to build its own nuclear weapon.\textsuperscript{73}

The Ford administration would not allow Pakistan to develop a nuclear program and convinced the Canadians to withdraw their support of the KANUPP plant.\textsuperscript{74} In the mid-1970s, Bhutto and the PAEC periodically met with the French Government to enlist French support in the construction of a nuclear plant. However, due to pressure from Washington, France eventually dropped its support.\textsuperscript{75}
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Islamabad’s nuclear ambitions led to tension with Washington, but Bhutto continued trying to convince Ford that Pakistan was crucial to U.S. interests, flaunting “ties with Iran, China, and the Gulf” which Bhutto claimed “can be useful.” While American officials understood that Islamabad often inflated its own importance, they also recognized that there was some truth to Pakistan’s claims. In an assessment of Islamabad’s relations with the Gulf, the Department of State concluded that Iranian economic aid was crucial for Pakistan and that Tehran assisted Islamabad in quelling the Baluchistan insurgency. In return, Pakistan remained committed to CENTO by participating in joint naval exercises. In addition, Pakistani pilots were stationed throughout the Middle East training and advising Arab pilots, which brought Islamabad major economic support from Saudi Arabia in the form of loans and grants, amounting to more than a $100 million.

On February 4, 1975, Bhutto made his first visit to the U.S. under Ford. Similarly to his first meeting with Nixon, Bhutto wanted to lift the arms embargo, secure further economic aid to assist Pakistan’s food shortage as a result of the Tarbela Dam incident, and get Ford to ease his stance on Pakistan’s nuclear program. In their meetings, Ford told Bhutto that “I decided Saturday on the PL 480 allotments. You know we promised you 100,000 tons; my decision allows us to provide you 300,000 more tons. We have not yet announced it, but we can do that any time.”

In regards to Pakistan’s nuclear program, Ford urged Bhutto to discontinue the nuclear program. Bhutto responded that Pakistan was abiding by all international safeguards and only
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intended to utilize its nuclear program for peaceful purposes.\textsuperscript{81} Bhutto was ready to concede on his nuclear ambitions, but only if India would do the same. Speaking about the NPT, Bhutto stated, “I will be asked about the non-proliferation treaty. Our objections to that are on a moral basis. India has not signed. Of course we will sign if India signs.”\textsuperscript{82} Islamabad knew India would never abandon its nuclear program, and thus Pakistan repeatedly tied the fate of its own nuclear program to that of India, often citing the inconsistent way in which Washington dealt with Pakistan as opposed to India. From the American perspective however, a Pakistani nuclear program was more dangerous than an Indian one. Because of Libyan and Saudi support of Pakistan’s nuclear program, there were fears among American policy makers that Pakistan would ship nuclear weapons to both states. While there is some evidence to suggest that Pakistan sent its nuclear scientists to train Libyan scientists, there is no clear evidence that Pakistan intended to send Muammar Mohammed Abu Minyar Qaddafi or King Faisal bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{83}

To convince Pakistan to abandon its nuclear program, the Ford administration decided to lift the arms embargo on India and Pakistan. The decision was publicly announced on February 24, 1975 and established strict guidelines for the sale of lethal weapons to both states. The guidelines stipulated that:

Sales of US military equipment to Pakistan and India will be on a cash basis only, all sales of military equipment will be reviewed on a case by case basis, all sales will be consistent with the overall US policy in South Asia to encourage the process of normalization and reconciliation between Pakistan and India [and] at least in the initial stages, the emphasis should be on weapons and equipment which clearly enhance defensive capabilities.\textsuperscript{84}
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Lifting the arms embargo was supposed to deter Pakistan from further developing its nuclear capabilities and it appeared as if the Ford administration was successful in this effort. Then, in September 1975, tensions arose along the Kashmir border, influencing Islamabad to request 110 A-7 fighter-bomber aircraft. However, Pakistan did not abandon its nuclear program. It continued to pursue nuclear weapons through France and West Germany. The Pakistanis protested the American decision to provide India with nuclear fuel, especially after the Indian nuclear test. Yet, in a letter to Bhutto, Ford warned him “that there is considerable apprehension in this country and elsewhere over the spread on a national basis of the nuclear technology associated with the development of nuclear explosives — specifically, uranium enrichment, heavy water production and chemical reprocessing … Pakistan's acquisition of these sensitive facilities would … arouse considerable criticism and could erode this support.”

The nuclear question contributed to much of the tension between Islamabad and Washington. Pakistan did not appreciate the double standard in Washington’s nuclear policy and continued lodging complaints about the Indian nuclear program. Attempts to entice Pakistan with a multilateral nuclear processing facility that was to be housed in Tehran failed. Furthermore, members of the Ford administration reflected a more pro-Indian stance. In a March 19 conversation at the White House, Kissinger stated that “I must say I have some sympathy for Bhutto in this. We are doing nothing to help him on conventional arms, we are going ahead and selling nuclear fuel to India even after they exploded a bomb and then for this little project we are coming down on him like a ton of bricks.” Another administration official replied, “The difference between the Indian and Pakistani cases is that Bhutto came in second.”
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Yet, Kissinger’s sympathies for Pakistan only went so far. If Pakistan gave up the nuclear reprocessing plant it requested from France, then Kissinger would “use that to sell them the A7’s.” Overall, it was American pressure, spearheaded by Kissinger, which resulted in France’s decision to annul a contract in which Paris would supply Islamabad with a nuclear reprocessing plant.

Bhutto responded to these sentiments by once again criticizing the United States. In an interview he exclaimed that “if the United States wants to cut down its contribution in some areas and increase it in others, then its vital interests will suffer accordingly.” In addition, he argued that with the U.S. “diminishing its role in Asia, Pakistan relative to its past has more friends, we have friends in the Middle East, we are friendly with China … If American leaders want to threaten Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, which form an important axis, right from the West and South of the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, they should pause and ask themselves what is it they are threatening us with.”

Conclusion

When President Jimmy Carter took office in 1977, relations with Pakistan were heavily strained. American public opinion turned even further against Pakistan, in large part due to Pakistan’s nuclear program but also due to Bhutto’s autocratic tendencies. A New York Times article noted that U.S. public opinion was not at all in favor of the Pakistani nuclear program, even with the double standards that were applied to Islamabad on the nuclear issue. The 1977

Pakistani elections were also at the heart of tensions between Washington and Islamabad. Bhutto and his supporters alleged that the U.S. government was funding the PNA, attempting to remove Bhutto from power. The cancellation of the 110 A-7 planes also influenced Bhutto to reach these conclusions. He believed the U.S. never forgave him for failing to support the American war effort in Vietnam and for Bhutto’s support for the Arab cause against Israel.

In the opinion of Iqbal Akhund, “There was not much doubt about where American sympathies lay in the Bhutto-PNA tussle. Washington had studiedly abstained from sending Bhutto a congratulatory message on his re-election.” There is no clear evidence that the United States was funding the PNA and it is also unclear if American officials wanted to oust Bhutto from power. Even if Bhutto was removed from power, there were no clear indications that a new Pakistani leader would abandon the nuclear program.

Despite the multiple issues between Pakistan and the United States, American officials in the Carter administration attempted to lure Islamabad away from nuclear weapons with promises of military aid. Secretary of State Warren Christopher recommended that Carter offer cash sales of F-5E and A-7 aircraft, air defense radars, general utility helicopters, and food aid under PL-480. Carter rejected the above recommendations. Furthermore, on the grounds of human rights and allegations of election fraud, Carter denied the sale of $68,000 worth of tear gas to Islamabad while also transferring two destroyers from the U.S. Navy to Pakistan. While
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chastising Bhutto, Carter attempted to keep U.S.-Pakistan relations away from their breaking point. However, the 1976 Symington Amendment halted all economic assistance to any non-nuclear weapons state building uranium enrichment or reprocessing plants that did not accept NPT safeguards on its entire nuclear program, an amendment which clearly targeted Pakistan. Bhutto clearly understood which of his allies supported his ambitions. Islamabad received hundreds of millions of dollars in Iranian and Saudi economic aid (China was providing Pakistan with most of its armament). The Saudis acted as mediators in the negotiations between Bhutto and the PNA. While Washington could not (and would not) commit large scale support to Pakistan, the Persian Gulf states did. After Bhutto was removed from power in a military coup, this relationship accelerated, especially in the 1980s with outbreak of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.


I have repeatedly expressed it on many occasions but it goes without saying and it is undeniable that the support and assistance most generous in its terms has been from Saudi Arabia and Iran. - ^1 Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

For us the friendship with Pakistan comes, in a very natural way. We do not have to give any reason for this friendship. It is normal, it is natural, it is in the interest of both countries. - ^2 Mohammad Reza Pahlavi Shah

We have full confidence in the stand of the sister state of Pakistan towards their Arab brethren who are attached with the ties of religion and faith which is the strongest tie. We are sure of Pakistan's full support, as far as it can, in this struggle of destiny. - ^3 King Faisal of Saudi Arabia

Chapter 1 examined Pakistan’s economy and its politics. In chapter 2, Bhutto’s at times contentious relationship with Washington was explored. Both these chapters provided the context to understand Pakistan’s relations with Iran and Saudi Arabia. Throughout Bhutto’s time in office, he pursued bilateral relations with Riyadh and Tehran, but that is not to say other states in the Middle East and the larger Third World were forgotten. Libya played an interesting role in Pakistan’s economy and nuclear program. The smaller Gulf states, such as Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, provided Pakistan with economic support and in return received Pakistani technical and military expertise. Indonesia also collaborated in joint ventures with Islamabad and contributed to the growth of the Pakistani economy. However, it was the Saudi and Iranian monarchies which remained two of Bhutto’s most important and closest allies.

In this chapter, I evaluate the ways in which Tehran and Riyadh supported Islamabad economically, politically, militarily, and religiously. Using the documentation provided in the Pakistan Horizon journal, I argue that Iran and Saudi Arabia were crucial to Pakistan’s recovery
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in the aftermath of the 1971 war while also becoming Pakistan’s two most important allies. While Bhutto would not abandon other sources of support, such as the United States, throughout the 1970s Pakistan increasingly relied on the two most influential Gulf states. Economically, they provided hundreds of millions of dollars to stabilize the economy while also restoring Pakistan’s tarnished world image. Overall, the relationship established in this period became the foundation of Pakistan’s relationship with Iran and Saudi Arabia when examining the 1980s and onward. Furthermore, for Tehran and Riyadh this type of support was nothing new. Iran’s desire to become a regional hegemon in the region led to the support of various regimes, such as the Sultanate of Oman during the Dhofar revolution. The Kingdom had also been projecting its power in similar ways, such as in the 1960s when it supported the royalist faction in the Yemen Civil War. However, I contend that the economic, political, and military support of the Bhutto regime in this period was unprecedented in its scope and scale in the history of Pakistan.

This chapter benefits from previous scholarship which has also discussed the importance of Pakistan’s connections with the Persian Gulf. Lawrence Ziring, who was one of the foremost scholars of modern Pakistan, explores the extent to which Pakistan intertwined its foreign policy with the interests of Iran and Saudi Arabia. Surendra Chopra and Kusum Lata Chadda note the importance of Pakistan’s economic connections with Iran through the growth of the RCD. Shirin Tahir-Kheli examines Pakistani and Iranian cooperation historically, also drawing on the
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importance of global contexts such as the effects of the 1973 oil crisis. Selig Harrison examines the Baluchistan insurgency of the 1970s, drawing specific attention to Iran’s support of Pakistan during the hostilities. Ian Talbot, another prominent historian of modern Pakistan, argues for the importance of institutions such as the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in strengthening Pakistan’s links to the Muslim majority states, while also assessing how these links served Pakistan’s foreign policy goals. Zulfikar Khalid, Marvin Weinbaum, Abdullah Khurram, and Anwar Syed evaluate Pakistan’s strategic position in relation to the Persian Gulf and explore Islamabad’s military ties to region.

Other scholarship, such as that of Ian Lustick and Louise Fawcett, has examined questions of regionalism and cooperation in the Middle East and the larger Third World. Lustick contends that the absence of Middle Eastern great powers can be partly attributed to the influence of extra-regional powers and international norms that have had important consequences on political development in the Third World. This in turn influenced states in the region to pursue regionalism, which according to Fawcett, is a policy-driven process in which states (as well as other actors) pursue common goals in a given region (security, economic, political, etc.). These theories are important in order to make sense of the motivations and decisions of the three principal actors this chapter covers.
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This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section examines Bhutto’s tour of the Middle East and Africa, less than two months after the conclusion of the 1971 war. The next section examines the Second Islamic Summit Conference of 1974, which took place in Lahore, Pakistan. The second half of the paper discusses Pakistan’s connections with Iran and Saudi Arabia respectively, and Islamabad’s attempts to explore military and economic cooperation along the lines of regional coordination and Islamic/Third World solidarity.

**Bhutto’s Whirlwind Tour of the Middle East**

On January 24, 1972, only a little more than a month after the conclusion of the 1971 Indo-Pak War, Bhutto embarked on a tour of the Middle East and Africa. 14 Sultan Mohammed Khan accompanied Bhutto on his first trip to both regions. Iran was the first stop. Mohammad Reza Pahlavi Shah hosted Bhutto and his staff for lunch at Mehrabad Airport in Tehran. The press photographed Bhutto shaking hands with the shah and walking side by side from ceremonies conducted on the airport tarmac. At the conclusion of Bhutto’s brief visit, a joint communique was issued calling on members of the United Nations to formalize a durable ceasefire between Pakistan and India and to encourage the withdrawal of both armed forces to their respective sides of the border in Jammu and Kashmir. 15 Bhutto then made his way to Afghanistan, followed by Morocco and Algeria. In justifying the trip to the Pakistani National Assembly, Bhutto claimed that “the main purpose of this mission was to reassure our friends at the highest level that we were taking a firm hold of our national affairs, to thank them for their past help and to seek their understanding for our grave predicament.” 16
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The timing of the trip emphasized the importance Islamabad attributed to its relationship with Tehran. Bhutto’s tour of the Middle East and Africa continued throughout 1972 and the Pakistani president continued meeting with various Arab and Third World heads of state.

While Saudi Arabia was not the first Gulf state he visited, Bhutto emphasized the Kingdom’s importance to Pakistan. In speeches to the National Assembly, Bhutto noted that the “national crisis” was “of such magnitude” that it could only be rectified by “inter-related domestic and international action.” It was with this frame of reference that Bhutto justified his travels to the region, claiming that he had “the blessing of the people of Pakistan” for the mission.\footnote{17 “Documents,” \textit{Pakistan Horizon} 25, no. 2, 129.} Upon arriving at Saudi Arabia, Bhutto was greeted by King Faisal and various Saudi Ministers at Jeddah Airport on June 2, 1972. The two nations held formal talks on matters of interest, attended a state banquet in honor of Bhutto hosted by the King, and participated in various religious ceremonies and rituals, such as the Tawaf and the kissing of the Black Stone at the Ka’aba in Mecca.\footnote{18 \textit{Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: A Journey of Renaissance}, 102-110.} Similar to the conclusion of Bhutto’s trip to Iran, upon leaving Saudi Arabia a joint communique was issued that expressed: satisfaction for the growth of political, cultural, and technological relations, commitment to the shari’ a as a “path of light and guidance,” support for the continuing struggle of the Arab people to liberate captured territory and the Palestinian people, support for the Islamic Conference, and solidarity with Lebanon as a result of renewed tensions with Israel.\footnote{19 “Documents,” \textit{Pakistan Horizon} 25, no. 3 (1972): 142, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41403851.}

Immediately after his visit to the Kingdom, Bhutto once again returned to Iran for an official state visit. Bhutto arrived in Tehran on June 8, 1972. He remained in the capital until June 10 before flying back to Islamabad. Once again, Bhutto was cordially received by the shah
at Mehrabad airport. During this trip, photographers captured meetings between Bhutto, the shah, and their wives. In addition, the shah held a banquet in honor of Bhutto in Tehran.\textsuperscript{20} Reports that relayed information about the joint communique issued at the conclusion of the trip were fairly cordial, with the language of the reports very much in favor of Pakistan’s continued relationship with Iran. The reports were not very critical, representing a very controlled press. However, they are striking in that they relate discussions of aspects of the Simla Agreement, with Tehran emphasizing support for Pakistan’s proposals. The two states also expressed their support for the Arab cause in Palestine and support for the Islamic Conference. Islamabad expressed its admiration to Iran for its support during the 1971 war.\textsuperscript{21}

Upon returning to Pakistan on June 10, Bhutto stressed the success of his visits to the Gulf. In discussing his personal reflections of the trip, he stated that his return left him “strong and resolute in spirit.” Bhutto further expressed his jubilation that “everywhere we received support for Pakistan’s position” with the people and governments of various states rallying “to our just cause.” Bhutto left the Middle East feeling that he had “vindicated Pakistan’s position” and that he could now negotiate with Delhi on more favorable terms.\textsuperscript{22} Although Bhutto visited several countries on his tour, his visits to Saudi Arabia and Iran stood out. Reflecting on his trip to the Kingdom, the president noted how the trip was “one of the greatest experiences” of his life and how honored he felt “to have been admitted within the portals of the Khana-i-Kaaba.”\textsuperscript{23} The trip to Iran was also a huge success, “as everyone knows in Pakistan the Shahinshah is a sincere friend and well-wisher of Pakistan.” Bhutto also stated that “apart from reviewing the situation in
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the subcontinent, we also discussed the problems of the region and possibilities of still closer cooperation.”

The “whirlwind” tours of the Middle East and Africa were a resounding success for the new president. At a time where Pakistan’s international reputation was tarnished as a result of the 1971 war, the trips helped to restore Pakistan’s prestige and they also accumulated much needed support. Furthermore, they assisted in cementing Bhutto’s hold over the state. If nations were wary or unsure of Bhutto before, this personal touch alleviated some of those concerns (it also helped to strengthen Bhutto’s position among his domestic opposition). While it is clear how these trips strengthened Bhutto’s relationship with the shah and Faisal, they were also important in fulfilling Bhutto’s ambitions of emerging as a leader in the Muslim/Arab World and the larger Third World. Therefore, the tour cemented Bhutto’s new foreign policy based on bilateralism. This new policy did not view national identity, particularly Arab, Iranian, Turkish, and Pakistani, as antithetical to Islamic solidarity. Rather, Bhutto emphasized the connections between them. Keeping to the tenets of bilateralism, Islamabad would now engage with any nation on a one-to-one basis. Pakistan would remain impartial in all inter-Arab disputes and avoid becoming embroiled in conflicts between rival Muslim states while maintaining relations with fraternal Islamic states despite their alliances, political, and ideological differences. The foundation for these relationships, Bhutto believed, relied on the establishment of international and regional institutions. Moreover, by promoting the Arab cause at every opportunity and elevating the Palestinian issue from a regional to a universal one, Bhutto believed he could promote Pakistan as a key leader of both the Muslim and Third Worlds.
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The Second Islamic Summit Conference, 1974

On October 6, 1973, Egypt and Syria launched a surprise attack on Israeli forces in the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights. The early success of the Syrian and Egyptian forces prompted the Israelis to request the U.S. government for a resupply of weapons. The Nixon administration obliged and began an airlift of military supplies into Israel. With American support, the Israeli military was able to drive back the Syrian and Egyptian forces, emerging victorious. The 1973 war, claimed as a great victory and often referred to as the Ramadan War among Muslim states, reverberated throughout Muslim majority states. In response to U.S. support of Israel during the war, the Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Export Companies (OPEC) imposed an oil embargo on the U.S. The embargo initiated a global oil crisis which not only increased the price of oil but also resulted in a massive spike in global inflation. Iran and Iraq did not participate in the embargo and instead took advantage of the price increase by maximizing their oil production.26 It is this context which influenced the convening of the Second Islamic Summit Conference of 1974.

Historically, the Islamic Summit Conference was established as a forum for Muslim majority states to coordinate their resources and unify policy in regards to the Arab-Israeli dispute. The First Islamic Summit Conference was assembled when on August 25, 1969 the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem was burned. In response to this event, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia and King Hasan of Jordan quickly and rather hastily organized to develop a unified response from Muslim majority countries. While the conference preached unity and Islamic solidarity, the Muslim Arab States in 1969 were divided. Out of the 30 states that were invited, only 24 attended in various capacities. Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt did not personally attend the

conference because of his rivalry with Saudi Arabia and instead sent Anwar Sadat in his place.\textsuperscript{27} Iraq and Syria refused to attend. These rivalries were largely influenced by the Arab Cold War.\textsuperscript{28}

The Second Islamic Conference garnered far more attention from Muslim majority states across the world. In addition, as a result of the Ramadan War and the oil crisis of 1973, Arab states were far more unified than in the past. Algeria, Tunisia, Iraq, Morocco, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan all dispatched forces to assist Egypt and Syria during the war. Since 1968, Cairo had improved its relations with Riyadh. Iraq resumed its diplomatic relations with Iran which were broken off in 1970. Syria resumed its relations with Jordan, which were broken off in 1971.\textsuperscript{29}

In preparation for the conference, with the support of King Faisal who had “full confidence in the stand of the sister state of Pakistan towards their Arab brethren,” it was decided that the conference was to be held in Lahore, Pakistan from February 22-24.\textsuperscript{30} By hosting the conference, Bhutto was able to shine the spotlight on Pakistan, especially in bringing together prominent figures in the Arab world such as Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, Colonel Muammar el Qaddafi, and Anwar Sadat on one stage.\textsuperscript{31} The overall goal of the conference was to express Muslim solidarity from around the world with the Arab cause (and especially the plight of the Palestinians).\textsuperscript{32} However,
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Bhutto had ulterior motives for hosting the conference. While he genuinely did believe in promoting the Arab cause and supporting the Palestinian people, he also hoped the conference would boost the morale of a defeated Pakistan after the 1971 War. Furthermore, Bhutto wanted the Pakistani economy to receive a boost from the oil-rich nations in attendance, something which became more crucial as a result of global inflation. In his public comments, however, Bhutto expressed Pakistan’s support for the Arab cause and Islamic solidarity. In a speech to the National Assembly in December, Bhutto explained that the “Islamic Summit Conference is being held in Pakistan to demonstrate Islamic unity and solidarity for the just and honourable cause of the Arab people.”

With the location of the conference set, Lahore was prepared for the arrival of various heads of state and other delegates. The Pakistani military assisted the civil security forces with the security of the delegates. The Medical Corps was made at the ready to assist in any medical emergencies should they arise. As the delegates arrived to the airport in Lahore, crowds cheered as each delegate received a 21-gun salute. The seven-mile trip from the airport to Shahi Fort was also lined with crowds carrying banners in French, Urdu, and Arabic, the three official languages of the summit. Representation for the conference was significantly better than the previous one. Out of 38 states that were invited 24 were represented at the head of state level, 5 at the head of government level, and 7 at the Foreign Minister level. Yasser Arafat was given the Head of State designation for the PLO, a significant break from the past. The summit began the start of good fortunes for the PLO diplomatically.
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In the keynote address for the summit, Bhutto expressed his gratitude for the “honour upon me which in reality is a tribute to Pakistan.” In addition, Bhutto reminded the delegates of Pakistan’s “support for the just causes of the Muslim world” which was “organically related” to Pakistan’s “own national vocation.” While the address expressed notions of Islamic solidarity and Pakistan’s deep attachment to the Middle East (such as its “deep attachment to its dear neighbor Iran”), the address went beyond this theme. Bhutto connected Pakistan’s struggle during the 1971 war to the larger global Pan-Islamic struggle, recounting how Pakistan had been “a victim of international conspiracies” but still advocated for “nothing but justice and concern for Muslim rights.” More importantly perhaps, the Pakistani prime minister connected the struggle of the Muslim World to the larger struggle of the Third World, arguing that “it is inherent in our purpose that we promote, rather than subvert, the solidarity of the Third World.” Moreover, Bhutto linked these struggles to the oil crisis of 1973. He remarked how the crisis created divisions between the oil and non-oil producing nations of the Third World. These differences, Bhutto claimed, created the “dislocation in the balance of payments position of developing countries” which could be utilized to “sow discord and cause disarray in the ranks of Asian and African nations,” resulting in “grave damage to the political causes they are espousing.”

The effects of the 1973 oil crisis were drastic on the economies of many developing nations such as Pakistan, India, and Ethiopia. For Pakistan the price increases raised the import
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bill significantly above national export earnings.\footnote{Christopher Dietrich, \textit{Oil Revolution: Anticolonial Elites, Sovereign Rights, and the Economic Culture of Decolonization} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 296.} Before the price increase, 17 percent of Pakistan’s foreign exchange earnings were used for oil imports. After the price increase, 41 percent of foreign exchange earnings were utilized for oil imports. From 1975 to 1976, 33 percent of the total export earnings paid for oil and fertilizer imports.\footnote{Tahir-Kheli, “Iran and Pakistan,” 478.}

Therefore, while the overall goal of the summit was for Muslim nations to unify in the aftermath of the Ramadan War, significant attention was given to the plight of non-oil producing nations reeling from price increases and inflation. In his keynote address, Bhutto called on the oil producing states to assist the economies of other Third World states. The delegation from Iran offered its own proposals to meet this challenge. Abbas Ali Khalatbari, the Foreign Minister of Iran, declared Iran’s intention “to put in the near future at the disposal of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund a minimum sum of a million dollars, to aid developing countries.”\footnote{Report on Islamic Summit, 1974, 98.} The declaration adopted by the summit touched upon this issue as well. While confirming the importance of Islamic solidarity and its connection to struggles of the larger Third World, several points in the declaration pay specific attention to macroeconomic trends, calling for: the removal of “poverty, disease and ignorance” from Islamic states, an end to the exploitation of the developing countries by the developed (through the reorganization of trade deals), developing countries to maintain full control over their natural resources, and mitigating the effects of price increases on developing countries in part by encouraging mutual economic cooperation among Muslim states.\footnote{Documents,” \textit{Pakistan Horizon} 27, no. 1 (1974): 205-207, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41393207.}
Critics of the OIC claim that it never brought about tangible results for its member states precisely because the organization had very little power to enforce any given rules. In some regards this argument holds true, but for Bhutto the Second Islamic Summit Conference was a resounding success. It further strengthened Islamabad’s ties to Riyadh economically and politically. While the shah did not personally attend the conference (due to the attendance of Qaddafi), Iran still strengthened its connection to Pakistan with the proposal to introduce new funds for development. In addition, Bhutto was able to successfully promote the Palestinian cause by giving the PLO a greater voice in Middle Eastern politics. More importantly, it allowed Bhutto to recognize Bangladesh in a way that would lessen domestic opposition in Pakistan. Inviting President Sheikh Mujib Rahman to the summit and recognizing Bangladesh placated opponents because a majority of the Muslim world was in support of such a move. Overall, Bhutto significantly increased his standing among Muslim majority states, and in particular Saudi Arabia and Iran. Thus, Bhutto demonstrated that he could manage Pakistan’s security without input from Washington.48

Pakistan and Iran: Regional Cooperation

In December 1971, in the immediate aftermath of the war, the shah briefly visited Pakistan. At the Rawalpindi airport, Bhutto and the shah discussed the aftermath of the war and after a few hours the shah returned home.49 The two leaders discussed Iran’s support of Pakistan during the war, with Bhutto expressing his gratitude to the shah.50 Other topics of discussion included former President Yayha Khan, who the shah did not want to see put on trial. In addition,
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the shah was interested in assessing the situation in Pakistan personally, emphasizing the close bonds between Islamabad and Tehran and how they could be strengthened.\textsuperscript{51}

Historically, Pakistan-Iran relations date back to the independence of Pakistan in 1947. The shah was the first world leader to recognize Pakistan and the first to support it on the Kashmir issue. In 1950, the two states signed a treaty of friendship and in 1955 both states signed the Baghdad Pact.\textsuperscript{52} In February 1955 Turkey and Iraq signed a defense treaty, with the Dwight Eisenhower administration strongly supporting the declaration. The U.S. hoped the British inspired Baghdad Pact would establish a defense organization to stop the spread of Soviet influence. However, the pact quickly became controversial amongst Arab states, as Britain joined in April. Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt denounced British inclusion in the pact and convinced other Arab states to reject it also. Pakistan and Iran signed on later that year.\textsuperscript{53} Eventually, the Baghdad Pact was replaced by the American led CENTO.

During the 1971 war, Iran assisted Pakistan in various ways. It sheltered Pakistan’s civil airline fleet, sent supplies to Karachi when it was blockaded, helped to extinguish fires when Karachi’s oil tanks exploded while also maintaining the flow of oil to Pakistan, meeting shortages of ammunition and aircraft, and offering Pakistan the use of a fully equipped military hospital.\textsuperscript{54}

A discussion of the shah’s perspective is warranted here. With the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf in 1971 (announced in 1968), and with American support, an opportunity was presented to Tehran in becoming the dominant power in the region. The shah saw himself as
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the overseer of excluding and/or minimizing Soviet influence in the Persian Gulf. However, India, Egypt, and Afghanistan all represented challenges to Tehran’s hegemonic ambitions. Thus, in order to compete with these rivals, the shah offered economic assistance and collaboration to states like Pakistan, in an attempt to assert Iranian supremacy across the Middle East and South Asia. In an interview with the *New York Times*, the shah personally expressed these sentiments. He wanted to achieve self-reliance and lessen his dependence on outside aid, assuring reporters that Washington supported his ambition by claiming that “Nixon understands that there is no other way for a nation to insure its protection than by itself.” In regards to Pakistan, the shah maintained that the stability of Pakistan was of upmost importance, because “if Pakistan disintegrates another Vietnam situation could develop. We must see to it that Pakistan doesn't fall to pieces. This would produce a terrible mess, an Indochina situation of new and larger dimensions.” Furthermore, Pakistan was an important buffer state, not only in regards to a Soviet or Afghan invasion, but an Indian or Iraqi one as well. If Pakistan fell, any three of these states could claim that territory and therefore more dangerously border Iran.

Bhutto understood the importance of Iran to Pakistan’s foreign policy. Tehran was a key ally that supplied Islamabad with economic aid while also valuing the integrity and security of Pakistan. In a May 1973 visit to Iran, Bhutto asserted as much in an interview with *Kayhan International*. Bhutto noted that both states were already allies and had “a system of cooperation in defence.” Islamabad had lost faith in defense pacts (pacts which did nothing to help Pakistan during the 1971 war) and thus was reorganizing its foreign policy on a bilateral basis, of which

---

Iran was a key part. In Bhutto’s analysis, Iran received a South Asian partner that could contribute to contingency planning in security and military matters. Yet, the partnership extended beyond security. In defending his relationship with Tehran, Bhutto argued that “neither Iran nor Pakistan have territorial ambitions against anyone. Cooperation between Iran and Pakistan will not be limited to the field of defence. We are going to do great deal together in the economic field and on a bilateral basis.” Equally important was transparency, hence why Bhutto “ordered the publication of details on the support Iran gave us in 1965 and 1971.”

During the five-day trip, the shah hosted exquisite dinners and ceremonies for Bhutto and his wife. The shah had them seated in a “horse-drawn coach,” a display usually reserved for royalty. While Tehran was receiving massive economic and military aid from Washington, it still felt isolated in a region surrounded by rivals. The shah did not need Pakistani military assistance, but he relied on his ally to project influence in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. Surrounded by rivals such as Iraq, Iran needed reliable allies. Thus, the shah attributed great importance to his relationship with Bhutto.

Pakistan’s domestic opposition was critical of Bhutto’s courting of Tehran, hence why Bhutto frequently felt the need to justify this relationship. One way in which Bhutto did this was to connect the relationship to postcolonial and anti-imperial solidarity. The prime minister noted how “it is a fact writ large on our history that a relationship of the closest affinity existed between the peoples of Iran and what is now Pakistan over the centuries and that these contacts were sundered only by foreign imperialism. Nothing is more logical than that, with the end of colonialism, the fulness of the former relationship should be restored.” Furthermore, Bhutto
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continually emphasized Iran’s assistance of Pakistan during the 1971 war, where “it was the avowed policy and attitude of Iran which kept Pakistan’s flanks safe during the hostilities with India.”

Islamabad’s economic relationship with Tehran was rather extensive during this period, as evidenced by the two nations’ involvement in the RCD. The RCD was established in 1964 during a joint summit between Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. General Ayub Khan, who ruled Pakistan at the time, called the organization the Alliance for Progress before it was named the RCD. The rationale for such an endeavor involved emphasizing the historical and cultural links between the three states, that all three constituted one region. At the very beginning, the RCD had the audacious goal of creating regional economic cooperation in order to facilitate rapid economic development for the benefit of the people in the region.

Bhutto had high hopes for the RCD. He wished to create a new regional framework that could assist Pakistan in its own regional disputes (which other pacts historically failed to do). In addition, the economic cooperation that would result from the RCD could help to alleviate Pakistan’s economic troubles. In a message to the 16th session of the RCD Ministerial Council held in Islamabad, Bhutto noted that the importance of the RCD’s economic prospects, but stressed that “RCD is, however, not merely an economic arrangement” but also a “symbol of the unity and friendship” of the three nations, “reflecting a common past, a common heritage, a common culture and a common religion. It is an instrument for strengthening further the centuries old bonds of friendship and fraternity among the peoples of the three countries.” At the conclusion of the session, a joint communique was issued, noting how a RCD Aluminum
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Project in Iran was already in full production. Discussions to form a regional bank were also in progress as well as discussions of cooperation in tourism (the elimination of intra-regional barriers).65

During a May 1974 visit, the two heads of state expressed their satisfaction with the RCD. In the joint communique issued at the end of Bhutto’s visit to Tehran, both leaders “decided that there should be regular and frequent exchange of journalists, establishment of close ties between the radio and television organizations of the two countries and exchange of documentary films to be followed by joint Pak-Iranian ventures in the production of such films.”66 In an earlier March 1974 visit, both men expressed their satisfaction for the progress made with the Joint Ministerial Commission for Economic Cooperation, established through the RCD.67

In an examination of RCD, there is an important question one can ask about whether it ever accomplished its ambitious goals. In their public statements, both the shah and Bhutto praised the RCD for helping to improve “means of communication among the three countries.”68 While criticisms of RCD, which characterize the organization has ambitious yet not yielding tangible results in economic cooperation, hold some weight there is evidence that the RCD did facilitate some economic cooperation between Iran and Pakistan. For example, the second session of the Iran-Pakistan Joint Ministerial Commission for Economic Cooperation did facilitate some important economic cooperation. In regards to industrial cooperation, the session established joint textile plants, which built two factories/mills in Uthal and Quetta of Baluchistan province that maintained a capacity of 50,000 spindles. A joint cement plant was planned that

could produce 300,000 tons of cement per year (with Iran agreeing to purchase 30 percent of the plant’s production). In addition, Iran supplied the $48 million loan necessary to begin production.\textsuperscript{69} In the field of agriculture, joint jute cultivation and meat production facilities were established. More importantly, Iran encouraged the construction of the Kerman-Zahedan rail link, which would be an important trade route to get Iranian exports to Pakistan and other South Asian states such as India. The shah even financed an engineering and medical college in Baluchistan province.\textsuperscript{70}

On April 26, 1976, a RCD summit meeting was held in Izmir, Turkey to discuss the progress made by the RCD in coordinating the economies of Islamabad, Istanbul, and Tehran. While Bhutto acknowledged some of the difficulties and shortcomings of the RCD, he argued “that the final objective of the three countries should be to remove all the barriers to intra-regional trade, if meaningful progress is to be made towards the realization of the declared objectives of interdependence, self-reliance and economic growth through regional cooperation.”\textsuperscript{71} In Bhutto’s view, the failure of international development organizations such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) necessitated regional cooperation like the RCD. In his ultimate ambition, Bhutto hoped he could connect the progress made by the RCD to economic cooperation in the Third World. Thus, Bhutto sought the support “of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah Aryamehr of Iran to co-sponsor … a summit conference of the developing countries. The purpose of the proposal is to reinforce the unity and solidarity of the developing countries and to promote mutual economic cooperation among them.”\textsuperscript{72}

Yet, the RCD also represented a hurdle in Iran-Pakistan relations. Tehran’s desire to include India within the RCD to facilitate trade between both nations was received negatively within Pakistan. Bhutto believed his special relationship with Iran entitled Pakistan a status above acting as a roadway for Indo-Iranian trade.\footnote{Telegram, 21 July 1976, American Embassy in Islamabad to Secretary of State in Washington, 2, https://aad.archives.gov/aad/createpdf?rid=151031&dt=2082&dl=1345.} According to the American government, Bhutto discussed the issue privately with the shah in Tehran. Publicly, Bhutto questioned whether the timing was right to include India in the RCD.\footnote{Telegram, 21 July 1976, American Embassy in Islamabad to Secretary of State in Washington, 3.} However, Bhutto would not let this issue impede upon Pakistan’s relationship with Iran. Iranian assistance was too important.

The extent of Bhutto’s collaboration with the shah went well beyond the RCD. On July 17, 1974, under the context of unrest in Pakistani Baluchistan, the shah issued a direct “loan of 580 million US dollars” which “would be given to Pakistan over a period of three years to meet its development and payments needs.”\footnote{“Documents,” Pakistan Horizon 27, no. 3 (1974): 219, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41403861.}

It was no coincidence that many of the RCD’s development programs and other aid targeted Pakistani Baluchistan. In April 1973, as Baluch guerrillas began ambushing army convoys, Bhutto flew to Tehran, and after meeting with the shah, he announced that Iran would provide about $200 million in emergency military and financial aid.\footnote{Harrison, In Afghanistan’s Shadow, 36.} There is also some evidence to suggest that Bhutto removed the provisional governor of Baluchistan at the request of the shah.

In chapter 1, I examined how Pakistan handled the Baluchistan insurgency with military support from Tehran, but it is necessary to discuss the shah’s point of view during the uprisings. Historically, the Iranian government had two primary methods in keeping control over Iranian
Baluchistan, overt military force and bribery. The military was frequently called in to subdue any calls for regional autonomy. Moreover, Baluch tribal chiefs were bribed by the central government (in the form of stipends and resources for development).\textsuperscript{77} When calls for greater regional autonomy were made in Pakistani Baluchistan, the shah worried that Baluch nationalism in Pakistan would grow into a larger and more dangerous Greater Baluchistan national movement that would encompass Iranian Baluchistan. In an effort to combat this nationalism, the shah encouraged and influenced Bhutto’s heavy handed approach with the Baluch state government while also banning the use of the Baluch language in schools (encouraging Persian instead). Overall, the shah attempted to limit education in Baluch areas.\textsuperscript{78} When news broke of the cache of weapons found in the Iraqi Embassy in Pakistan, the shah concluded that Baluch nationalism was financed and supported by the Soviet Union and its client state Iraq.\textsuperscript{79} In reality, Iraq was not a Soviet client state. Yet, after this discovery the shah was convinced that the Soviets were influencing Iraqi policy. Therefore, events in Pakistan became increasingly important for Tehran’s security.

In 1976 Iran met many of Pakistan’s needs, especially with Pakistan’s balance of payments issue but also as an important source of Pakistani exports. The \textit{Asia Observer} in London asked the Pakistani prime minister about foreign investment in Pakistan. Bhutto replied that “foreign investment does not mean capital coming from the British, French or Germans alone. The bulk of it is now expected from our Iranian brothers … who today have vast resources.”\textsuperscript{80} In a separate interview with Iranian journalists, Bhutto further acknowledged the various links between Iran and Pakistan, boldly claiming that “the destinies of Pakistan and Iran
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are interlinked.”81 In terms of exports, table 1, taken from Shirin Tahir-Kheli’s work on the historical cooperation between Iran and Pakistan, adequately reflects how important trade between the two nations became.82

Table 1. Pakistan-Iran Trade taken from Shirin Tahir-Kheli, “Iran and Pakistan: Cooperation in an Area of Conflict,” Asian Survey 17, no. 5 (1977), 480.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports to Iran (thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Imports from Iran (thousands of dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>21,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>13,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>9,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>33,252</td>
<td>22,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>60,025</td>
<td>11,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>9,487</td>
<td>5,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the start of 1976, Bhutto and the shah continued exchanging visits. In a banquet given in honor of the shah, Pakistani president Fazal Elahi Chaudhry emphasized that “the love of our people for you and the brotherly people of Iran is not based on sentiment alone. Your great country under your Imperial Majesty's guidance has always stood by Pakistan in times of adversity.” Chaudhry also heaped praise on the shah for the “success of the White Revolution.”83 The shah replied that he had “cherished the memory of the fact I was the first head of state to visit your country after the declaration of Pakistan's independence” and that both nations “share
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closely similar views of international issues, which stem from our belonging to a great Islamic society on the one hand, and regional and geographic unity, on the other."\textsuperscript{84}

In light of the 1974 Indian nuclear test, Bhutto stressed the necessity of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. In his remarks at the same banquet, Bhutto noted “the imperative necessity of such a zone in the South Asia hinterland” which extended to a “zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.”\textsuperscript{85} In spite of this public call, Islamabad was still pursuing its own nuclear program and was not looking to implement a nuclear free zone in reality. The public call for a nuclear free zone, which Iran supported, was a political move to influence the international community to harden its stance on India’s nuclear program.

Privately, Bhutto did not want to accept a subservience to Iranian military, political, and economic hegemony. He wanted Pakistan to fulfill this role not only in South Asia but among the larger Third World. However, Bhutto had to accept the reality that Pakistan was not in such a position. Thus, Islamabad’s reliance on Iranian political, economic, and military aid grew. Evidence of this was further illustrated when the shah released a $150 million loan to assist Pakistan in acquiring TOW (Tube-launched, Optically tracked, Wire-guided) missiles from the United States.\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{Pakistan and Saudi Arabia: Islamic Solidarity and Security}

While not as extensive as the relationship with Iran during this period, Saudi Arabia’s relationship with Pakistan was still important. Before 1971, in the late 1960s, Pakistan was becoming more important for Saudi Arabia’s security. A 1967 agreement signed by both states

formalized Islamabad’s role in Riyadh’s defense structure. By 1969, some Pakistani military
advisors were flying Saudi fighter jets, repelling South Yemeni incursions into the Kingdom.87
During the 1971 Indo-Pak war, the Saudis gave some material support to Islamabad.

At the conclusion of 1971, Riyadh’s relationship with Islamabad grew. Not only did Pakistan find itself psychologically more directly related to the Gulf region, but the Kingdom also foresaw the benefits of a working relationship. While on the surface it seems as through Islamic solidarity formed the basis of this relationship, the Saudis were far more interested in Pakistan’s military expertise.

At least initially, King Faisal was not pleased with Bhutto’s socialist rhetoric. In addition, Bhutto himself was not a religious Muslim and Faisal suspected Bhutto of having some Shi‘i lineage.88 However, it is not accurate to attribute Saudi decision making entirely to religious concerns. Despite the suspicions, the Saudis understood their own political vulnerabilities and military limitations, and thus sought out states that could strengthen the security of the Kingdom. Furthermore, in an effort to check the shah’s ambitions in the Persian Gulf, part of Saudi strategic thinking involved relying on the Pakistani military and air force. The Kingdom’s massive oil wealth allowed it to bankroll various Islamic states (such as Pakistan) and Third World states to suit its needs.89

After the 1973-1974 oil crisis, in which the Saudis significantly increased their oil wealth, Riyadh and Islamabad’s economic relationship grew significantly. Saudi Arabia became a major market for Pakistani goods. In the past, Saudi Arabia was not a major importer of

---

87 Weinbaum and Khurram, “Pakistan and Saudi Arabia,” 213.
88 Weinbaum and Khurram, “Pakistan and Saudi Arabia,” 213
Pakistani goods. By 1974, the Saudis became one of the leading importers of Pakistani exports.\textsuperscript{90} In May 1974, in a meeting between both nations’ defense ministers, the two sides discussed establishing a joint ministerial commission for economic cooperation, in some ways similar to the RCD.\textsuperscript{91} It is unclear from accounts of the meeting if defense measures were discussed. A meeting between two defense ministers indicates that some security arrangements were discussed.

In multiple interviews with the press, Bhutto often publicized the aid he received from Riyadh and other aspects of economic cooperation. When asked about Pakistan’s foreign aid and debt, Bhutto replied that Pakistan’s debt amounted to well “over four billion dollars.” To meet this deficiency, Iran invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Pakistan, and the Saudis also contributed “about one million dollars.” He also acknowledged the growing number of Pakistanis who were working in the Kingdom, remitting large amounts of money to the Pakistani economy.\textsuperscript{92} Furthermore, petrodollars were funneled into the Pakistani economy. On September 8, 1974, the Saudis signed a 100-million-rupee agreement with Pakistan, which funded the construction of a fertilizer plant, two cements plants, and a polyester plant.\textsuperscript{93}

In 1975, following the assassination of King Faisal, Bhutto visited Saudi Arabia to express his sincere condolences. In his remarks, Bhutto said that King Faisal was “a great and sincere friend and well-wisher of the people of Pakistan who loved and respected him.”\textsuperscript{94} After attending the \textit{Namaz-i-Janaza} (funeral prayer) for King Faisal along with other Muslim heads of state, Bhutto remarked how “King Faisal's abiding solicitude and concern for the land and people
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of Pakistan calls for a tangible expression of love and respect for his memory - who amongst us can forget his decisive support to the holding of the Second Islamic Summit in Pakistan a year ago.”

In a further display of solidarity, Bhutto announced a ten day period of national mourning in Pakistan and continued to express his condolences to King Faisal’s son, the former crown prince King Khalid bin Abdulaziz Al Saud.

Despite the change in leadership, Pakistan’s economic relationship with the Saudis continued in much of the same ways. A statement by Pakistan’s Economic Affairs Division on January 15, 1976, noted that Saudi Arabia, Libya, Iran, and Abu Dhabi provided about $391 million in financial assistance. About $84 million had already been disbursed. In addition, Pakistan had received another $30 million from the Kingdom for the financing of the Mirpur Mathelo Fertilizer Project. The spokesperson also noted the significant increase of Pakistani exports to the Middle East. From 1970 to 1971, exports totaled about $48.80 million (12 percent of total exports). By 1974 to 1975, that number reached the $256.60 million mark, a dramatic increase.

In October of 1976, King Khalid visited Pakistan. Crowds of cheering Pakistanis lined the entire route from Pindi airport to Islamabad, waving Pakistani and Saudi flags and holding pictures of the King Khalid and Bhutto. 20,000 Pakistani students dressed in green and white expressed their warm greetings to King Khalid inside the new National Sports Stadium in Islamabad as Pakistan’s best military band played in the background. At a banquet held in honor of the Saudi monarch in Karachi, Bhutto expressed his appreciation for the “support and
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assistance” which was “most generous in its terms” from “Saudi Arabia and Iran.” During his visit, King Khalid donated $10 million for the establishment of an Islamic center in Islamabad and donated another $20 million for the promotion of social programs. Bhutto wanted King Khalid to increase economic aid to Pakistan, but he also desired Saudi financial assistance in paying for military expenditures. According to American press reports, Bhutto asked Khalid if Saudi Arabia could help Pakistan with its purchase of A-7 fighter bombers from the United States.

Throughout the 1970s, the number of Pakistani military advisors and troops in Saudi Arabia significantly increased. A number of military protocols were signed with various Gulf states, including Saudi Arabia, in which Pakistan provided the opportunity for the Gulf states to send their military personnel to Pakistan for training. The Saudi army, navy, and air force all trained in Pakistan during the 1970s. Not only were Saudi military personnel sent to Pakistan for training, but these agreements also sent more than 10,000 Pakistani soldiers to be stationed in the Kingdom. In return, the Saudis agreed to fund any arms purchases Pakistan made from the West. As in the 1960s, Pakistani pilots continued to fly Saudi fighter planes and detachments of Pakistani troops were not only stationed along the Kingdom’s southern border, but also near the Israeli-Jordanian-Saudi border. Some troops even served as personal guards for the Saudi royal family.

In chapter 2, it was noted how Washington tried to deter Islamabad’s nuclear program by offering it A-7 aircraft. The American press picked up on this development. A Washington Post
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article noted the importance of Saudi Arabia in this deal. It further stated that the total purchase price of the aircraft amounted to $700 million, with Riyadh allegedly agreeing to give Pakistan $1.1 billion (of which $550 million was marked for the modernization of the Pakistani military).106

Islamabad and Riyadh also cooperated in social and cultural exchange. Pakistani universities accepted more Saudi students than ever before. In schools, Bhutto promoted the teaching of Arabic. The King Faisal Mosque was established in Islamabad, and today serves as an important tourist destination.107

During the 1977 Pakistani elections, Bhutto enlisted the Saudis to mediate the election dispute with the PNA. Because of the Kingdom’s financial and religious influence, especially among the PNA’s Islamist parties, Bhutto believed the Saudis could negotiate terms he could accept. In addition, Bhutto was convinced that Washington was involved in funding and supporting the PNA, an attempt to prevent a Pakistani nuclear program and stop Pakistan from becoming a leading voice in the Third World. Thus, he believed that only King Khalid’s intervention could encourage a favorable outcome for the PPP.108 The Saudi Ambassador to Pakistan, Shaikh Riyadh el Khatib, was chosen to act as the mediator in the election dispute.109

According to Iqbal Akhund, who claims to have had special access to the negotiation documents, there was some evidence that the Saudis sympathized with the opposition’s more Islamist parties. King Khalid had previously received emissaries from the PNA and some parties were allegedly receiving Saudi financial support. It suited the Kingdom’s interests, Akhund
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argues, to encourage an Islamist party to take power in Pakistan, a party that was more in line with the Kingdom’s own brand of Islam. However valid these claims might be, through the negotiation effort it was clear that the Saudis did legitimately try to resolve the dispute. American press reports cited the presence of United Arab Emirates officials who were also involved in the negotiations.

In the process of negotiations, El Khatib shuttled back and forth between Bhutto and the opposition, carrying messages back and forth between both parties. The Saudis rejected the view that the Americans supported the PNA and instead blamed the Soviets. While El Khatib was able to convince the PNA leadership to maintain a dialogue with Bhutto, mediation efforts stalled and eventually were no longer needed when General Zia ul Haq took control of the country through a coup. For the Kingdom, Zia’s rise to power was very much in favor of Saudi interests. Zia instituted a new Islamic government based on the shari’a, a government very much in line with the Kingdom’s own brand of Islamic rule.

**Conclusion**

Reviewing its foreign policy in a February 1977 statement, the Pakistani Ministry of Foreign Affairs recounted important milestones attained throughout the 1970s. The Second Islamic Summit Conference (which established the Islamic Solidarity Fund and the Islamic Bank), the RCD, the influx of Pakistani manpower to the Gulf, and vital economic aid from
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Saudi Arabia and Iran all featured in the Foreign Ministry’s address. The Ministry also noted that since 1972, Pakistan had:

concluded protocols for cooperation in the military field with Kuwait, Iraq, Oman, UAE; Libya and Saudi Arabia. Under these arrangements, Pakistan is providing training facilities in Pakistani defence institutions to the military personnel from these countries. It is also sending its defence personnel on deputation to these countries for imparting training and technical advice to their armed forces personnel.\footnote{“Documents,” *Pakistan Horizon* 30, no. 1 (1977): 229, 232, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41394317.}

Economically, Iran and Saudi Arabia provided hundreds of millions of dollars in loans and development aid. In addition, these states became “Pakistan's biggest market absorbing more than one-third of its exports, compared to only 20 per cent in 1970-71.” Exports in the early 1970s amounted to roughly $58 million, but from 1975 to 1976, they totaled $299 million. Imports rose respectively from $35.7 million to $425.2 million.\footnote{“Documents,” *Pakistan Horizon* 30, no. 1 (1977): 233.}

In return, Pakistan not only collaborated to meet the security needs of the Iranians and Saudis, but also extended its own technical assistance in the form of training facilities in medicine and engineering, providing scholarships for foreign students to study in Pakistan, and providing crucial skilled and unskilled manpower.\footnote{“Documents,” *Pakistan Horizon* 30, no. 1, (1977): 234.} The influence of Pakistani manpower was significant both for the economies of the Gulf states and Pakistan. At the end of Bhutto’s time in office, 700,000 Pakistanis worked in the Middle East with 100,000 of those Pakistanis working in the Kingdom alone. By 1978, the amount that was remitted to Pakistan totaled $1.5 billion.\footnote{Syed, *The Discourse and Politics of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto*, 164.}

Furthermore, by 1977 Bhutto had met with the shah an unparalleled 15 times, while meeting with Saudi monarchy four times and receiving King Khalid in Pakistan in 1976. Therefore, from the evidence it is clear how Tehran and Riyadh factored into Bhutto’s foreign
and domestic policies, but it is equally evident how important Pakistan became to the foreign policies of the Gulf states. Often, these relationships relied on Islamic and Third World solidarity but went beyond this too. However, after Bhutto was removed from power, Pakistan’s relationship with Saudi Arabia began to supersede relations with Iran. This was in part due to the events of 1979. Ayatollah Khomeini and the Islamic Revolution in Iran toppled the shah’s regime, and while Iran-Pakistan relations continued into the 1980s, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan significantly strengthened Riyadh and Islamabad’s relations. The extensive cooperation between Islamabad and Riyadh during the 1980s, 1990s, and the 21st century in large part resulted from Bhutto’s relationship with the Kingdom.
On July 5, 1977, General Zia ul Haq usurped power from Bhutto. Labeled Operation Fairplay, the military under Zia quickly took control of the country. Initially Zia expressed his reluctance in deposing Bhutto. In a July 12, 1977 article, The Washington Post reported that it had obtained a secret document dated May 7, 1977 along with two other secret letters. The documents, circulated two weeks after Bhutto imposed martial law in Karachi, Hyderabad, and Lahore, expressed Zia’s reluctance in removing Bhutto from power. Six army corps commanders expressed their distress with Bhutto’s handling of the unrest. They convinced Zia to initiate the coup, arguing that a coup would save the army’s reputation and therefore the country.

Two weeks after the successful coup, Zia affirmed that within 90 days civilian rule would be reestablished following new general elections.

Despite his claims of not harboring any political ambition, alongside with expressing support for the Bhutto government, Zia’s actions illustrated his desire to maintain power. Although Zia released Bhutto and other political prisoners two weeks after the coup, he quickly came to the realization that Bhutto posed a significant threat to the military regime. Upon his release, Bhutto railed against the coup and military controlled martial law. Large crowds of Pakistanis still supported Bhutto and the PPP, as evidenced by rally turnouts in Karachi and Lahore. If new elections were held and Bhutto regained power, which was likely, Zia feared retaliation. Therefore, Zia had Bhutto arrested once again on charges of murder and other high
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1 Stanley Wolpert, Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan: His Life and Times (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 301.
crimes on September 3, 1977.\(^5\) The new regime would postpone elections twice, thereafter stating that military rule could last another ten years.\(^6\)

Yet, Zia still required legitimacy for his rule. He calculated that keeping Bhutto alive was too dangerous. Thus, he utilized the Pakistani court system for his own ends. On November 10, 1977, Chief Justice S. Anwarul Haq decided that because the Bhutto government was involved in rigging elections, it had lost its constitutional validity and therefore Bhutto could be tried.\(^7\) Zia stacked the courts with loyalists and very quickly the legal system brought charges against Bhutto for his involvement in the murder of a political opponent, Ahmad Raza Kasuri.\(^8\)

The trial took place in the Lahore High Court, with Maulvi Mushtaq Hussain presiding as the Chief Justice. Zia appointed Chief Justice Hussain because of his stark feelings toward the Bhutto government (under Bhutto Hussain was superseded for the Chief Justice position twice and therefore harbored a grudge toward Bhutto).\(^9\) On March 18, 1978, Bhutto was sentenced to death.\(^10\) In the early morning hours of April 4, 1979, Bhutto was taken from his death cell to the gallows in Pindi prison, where he was hanged.\(^11\)

American press reports noted the shock amongst the Pakistani population. Sporadic demonstrations in favor of Bhutto arose in Rawalpindi and Kashmir, where three people were killed and seven more injured in clashes between pro-Bhutto demonstrators and police. In another incident, 500 pro-Bhutto supporters defied martial law to protest and shout anti-
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\(^7\) Wolpert, *Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan*, 322.


government slogans. Government employees wept openly while other segments of the population claimed the execution would become the most disgraceful day in Pakistan’s history.\textsuperscript{12} Other protests were far more violent. Rioters in Rawalpindi protested Bhutto’s execution and called for Zia’s regime to be overthrown. About two hundred demonstrators were taken into custody near the jail where Bhutto was hanged. Sindh province also experienced several violent protests. In response, the military government banned Pakistan International Airlines from flying journalists to Karachi and warned diplomats that they could not enter the province without the government’s permission.\textsuperscript{13}

World leaders also protested Zia’s decision. President Carter made last minute appeals for Bhutto’s life and expressed deep regret over Bhutto’s execution.\textsuperscript{14} Pope John Paul II urged the Zia regime for clemency.\textsuperscript{15} British Prime Minister James Callaghan expressed his regret over the execution and Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi did as well, citing how the decision went against international opinion.\textsuperscript{16} The Gulf states, especially Saudi Arabia, advised Zia not to execute Bhutto.

The 1977 coup and the continuation of Pakistan’s nuclear program under Zia resulted in a low point in U.S.-Pakistan relations.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, the end of Indira Gandhi’s authoritarian emergency once again made India the world’s largest democracy, whereas Pakistan embraced autocratic rule once again. In addition, Carter’s emphasis on human rights and democracy made India a more attractive ally than Pakistan.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{14} World Leaders Express Regrets over Execution,” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, April 5, 1979.
\textsuperscript{16} World Leaders Express Regrets over Execution,” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, April 5, 1979.
\textsuperscript{18} Kux, \textit{The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000}, 234-235.
The first major casualty of Pakistan’s nuclear program was the U.S. decision to rescind its offer of A-7 planes, influenced by Islamabad’s refusal to terminate a deal with Paris for the purchase of a nuclear reprocessing plant. Although the CIA concluded that Pakistan’s nuclear program was a national security response to India, the Carter administration rejected any support for a Pakistani nuclear program. When Zia decided to continue on with the nuclear program despite Carter’s protests, the Glenn amendment was enforced, which barred U.S. aid to countries that had not signed the NPT but still purchased nuclear fuel reprocessing technology. This influenced Pakistan to pursue uranium enrichment and frame Pakistan’s nuclear program as a shared asset of the Muslim world, encouraging the influx of petrodollars to replace the loss of American aid.

However, the Iranian Revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 dramatically shifted U.S.-Pakistan relations. Whereas before the Carter administration was highly critical of Zia, Washington now expressed its upmost support of Islamabad. With the loss of listening posts in Iran due to the revolution, the American government approached Zia about collaboration in the collection of communication intelligence. This involved the CIA providing technical assistance and equipment to improve Pakistan’s electronic intercept capabilities.

These events would also contribute to the Carter administration’s attempts to connect the security of the Indian Ocean with the Persian Gulf. This was best represented by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter’s assistant for national security affairs, who began to see the region as an “arc of crisis” as the Iranian Revolution peaked in December of 1978. For Washington, the “arc of crisis” as the Iranian Revolution peaked in December of 1978.
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22 Don A, Schanche, “Geopolitics in the Mideast,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 26, 1979; For more on the history of the arc of crisis see, Taylor W. Fain, “Conceiving the “Arc of Crisis” in the Indian Ocean Region,” *Diplomatic..."
“arc of crisis” label made the Indian Ocean region a distinct theater of the Cold War and significant to U.S. foreign policy interests. In the minds of American policy planners, the stability of the region was jeopardized by domestic political turmoil, Soviet military intervention, and the perception of a growing threat from Islamic fundamentalism. Brzezinski’s “arc of crisis” stretched from the Horn of Africa to South Asia. Thus, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean became one synonymous region, where the U.S. coordinated “its military assets in the Indian Ocean to a new integrated framework of containment in the Persian Gulf region and the area soon to be labeled Southwest Asia.”

The American press picked up on the “arc of crisis.” As Osamah Khalil notes, a Foreign Affairs article picked up on the “arc of crisis” and argued that the shah’s collapse exposed American vulnerabilities in the Persian Gulf. Other press accounts agreed, depicting an interconnected region in turmoil, a region where instability existed since the “dawn of time.” More importantly perhaps, the press picked up on the interconnectedness of various states in the region. A Los Angeles Times article stated that the “the crucial countries of Iran, Turkey and Pakistan retain their importance. Indeed, they are more important to the United States now than in 1947. And these nations are in trouble-trouble which is to our disadvantage and danger.” Echoing the sentiments of the government, the press warned of the dangers to U.S. interests if Washington did not confront the “arc of crisis.”
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23 Fain, “Conceiving the “Arc of Crisis” in the Indian Ocean Region,” 694, 711.
24 Khalil, America’s Dream Palace, 230
25 Fain, Conceiving the “Arc of Crisis” in the Indian Ocean Region, 711.
26 Khalil, America’s Dream Palace, 230
Before direct Soviet involvement in Afghanistan, from July 1979 the CIA worked together with Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate (ISI) to provide covert support to the Afghan resistance movement opposed to the communist government in Kabul. The American aid that was funneled to the resistance movement contained no weapons and ammunition. However, this early period of CIA and ISI joint cooperation formed the basis of American and Pakistani efforts to support mujahedeen forces during the war.\footnote{Kux, \textit{The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000}, 242.} In addition, when the American embassy was attacked in Islamabad by anti-American protestors, the Carter administration did not overtly chastise Zia’s handling of the emergency, reflecting Pakistan’s new importance to U.S. strategic interests.\footnote{Dan Fisher, “In Relying on Pakistan, U.S. has no other Other Card to Play,” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, Jan 16, 1980}  

When the Soviet army went into Afghanistan on Christmas Eve 1979, Pakistan became the frontline state in the battle against communism for U.S. strategic planners. In an address to the nation, Carter emphasized “the strategic importance of Afghanistan to stability and peace. A Soviet-occupied Afghanistan threatens both Iran and Pakistan and is a steppingstone to possible control over much of the world's oil supplies.”\footnote{Jimmy Carter, “Address to the Nation on the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan,” January 4, 1980, The American Presidency Project, accessed May 3, 2019, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-the-nation-the-soviet-invasion-afghanistan.} For Zia, the 1979 invasion provided Pakistan and his regime with the legitimacy he desired.\footnote{Haqqani, \textit{Magnificent Delusions}, 247.} Although there was some debate in Islamabad about the appropriate response to the invasion, eventually Zia decided that Pakistan would shelter Afghani refugees, support the resistance movement clandestinely, and express support for the resistance movement in the public sphere.\footnote{Kux, \textit{The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000}, 246.}
In its support of Islamabad, Washington initially offered $400 million in economic and military aid, which Zia referred to as “peanuts.” Thus, the Carter administration had to reassess its commitment to Pakistan. While Washington still wanted Islamabad to abandon its nuclear program, the administration also understood that supporting the mujahidin in Afghanistan was impossible without Pakistan’s assistance. Moreover, the Pakistani military desperately sought after American military aid. The Pakistani air force and army was alarmingly obsolete and Islamabad reported that the Soviet air force had violated Pakistani airspace about 200 times. Furthermore, the U.S. worked to get Pakistan the support it needed in several other ways. In 1979, the Los Angeles Times reported that the Carter administration would invoke the 1954 agreement it signed with Pakistan, in which Washington would come to the defense of Islamabad if Moscow attacked or directly threatened Pakistan. Congress also supported these efforts. Two Congressmen attempted to draft a special law that would exempt Pakistan from the terms of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, permitting Washington to provide military and economic aid to Islamabad even if Pakistan tested a nuclear device.

In a January 23, 1980 State of the Union address, Carter outlined what would become the Carter Doctrine. It stipulated that “an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region” would be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America. The two watershed events of 1979 heavily influenced this rhetoric which was

deliberately framed like the Truman Doctrine.39 A short time after the declaration, Washington discussed sending U.S. advisors to oversee shipments of economic and military aid sent to Pakistan while also creating and deploying the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF) to the region (this eventually evolved into the U.S. military’s Central Command).40

While Carter and Zia could not agree on the exact number of military and economic aid, towards the end of the Carter administration the U.S. instituted a covert action program that supplied non-lethal aid to the mujahidin forces in Afghanistan. The ISI acted as the intermediary involved in the actual transfer of American aid to the mujahidin.41 By the end of the President Ronald Reagan’s time in office, the CIA spent over $2 billion supplying the Afghan resistance movement through the ISI.42 This amount was matched by the Arab Gulf states, especially by Saudi Arabia.

The events of 1979 further cemented Pakistan’s military and economic relationship with Saudi Arabia. In December of 1980, Crown Prince Fahd visited Pakistan and in a statement openly declared that Saudi security was directly tied to that of Pakistan. During the war, 60,000 Arab fighters gravitated to Pakistan (probably the largest number from Saudi Arabia), where they would make their way to Afghanistan to join the mujahidin forces. Riyadh also requested that larger numbers of Pakistani troops be stationed in Saudi Arabia, not only in the context of the Soviet invasion but also due to the Iranian Revolution and the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s.43 The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), formed in 1981 as a response to the Iran-Iraq War, relied on Pakistani military advisors. Overall, about 40,000 Pakistani troops were stationed in Saudi

43 Weinbaum and Khurram, “Pakistan and Saudi Arabia,” 214.
When the United States began funding mujahidin forces, it requested the Saudis to match American contributions dollar for dollar, a request the Kingdom obliged. The head of Saudi Intelligence, Prince Turki bin Faisal Al Saud, even guided Islamabad in its dealings with Washington.

Economically, the number of Pakistani expatriates working in Saudi Arabia increased dramatically, becoming the largest number of Pakistani expatriates anywhere in the world. The remittances that were sent back to Pakistan totaled well over $2 billion and became a major source of Pakistani foreign exchange. For Zia, the relationship with Saudi Arabia was crucial, not only for economic or military reasons, but also as a source of Islamic and political legitimacy for his regime.

Religiously, the Kingdom attempted to counter Shi’a Iran by patronizing Pakistan’s anti-Shi’a groups. In addition, Riyadh funneled large sums towards the construction of mosques and madrasas that spread the Wahhabi ideology and rooted out any Shi’a influence.

Public narratives are obsessed with sectarianism in Muslim majority states, yet Pakistan’s relations with Iran after the fall of the shah dispute these claims. Zia was concerned that he might have lost one of Pakistan’s closest allies when the shah was removed from power by the Islamic Revolution. However, the relationship established in the mid-1970s continued on into the late 1970s and 1980s. Zia adhered to the Sunni orthodox view of Islam while revolutionary Iran embraced Shi’a Islam. Yet, Zia felt comfortable with Pakistan’s longtime ally connecting Islam with the government, something which he implemented in his own governance. Thus, Iran
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46 Haqqani, *Magnificent Delusions*, 221.
remained an ally of Pakistan despite theological differences. On January 14, 1979, Pakistani officials met with Ayatollah Khomeini while he was still exiled in Paris. Islamabad became one of the first states to recognize the Islamic Republic.49

During the Iran-Iraq War, Zia was pressured by Saudi Arabia to support Iraq in the conflict. However, despite Saudi pressure, Zia would not support Iraq against Iran.50 Zia still viewed Iran as an ally despite theological differences. Furthermore, large numbers of the Pakistani military were Shi’a Muslims which would have objected to any attack on Iran.51 In addition, Zia rejected an American plan to train some Afghan mujahidin in Baluchistan to destabilize Iran.52 There is also some evidence to suggest that Pakistan supplied weapons to Iran during the Iran-Iraq War. According to Methab Ali Shah, Pakistan sold Iran American made weapons, such as shoulder-fired Stinger missiles that were intended for the mujahidin in Afghanistan. Zia made large profits off of selling weapons to Iran during the war and even transferred Chinese weapons to Tehran.53 In 1989, the two states signed a defense agreement in which Islamabad and Tehran coordinated in the joint production of Pakistani supplied Al-Khalid tanks.54

Further research is needed to fully explore Pakistan’s relationship with Saudi Arabia and Iran during the 1980s, especially Pakistan’s weapons sales to Iran and the extent to which Saudi Arabia funded Zia and the ISI. However, it is important to remember that these relationships owe much to Bhutto’s efforts in the 1970s. In comparing Bhutto’s foreign policy to Zia’s, and even to

51 Shah, The Foreign Policy of Pakistan, 30.
52 Alam, “Iran-Pakistan Relations,” 531.
53 Shah, The Foreign Policy of Pakistan, 30.
54 Alam, “Iran-Pakistan Relations,” 539.
Yayha Khan and Ayub Khan, one can see an overall trend of continuity where Pakistan increasingly oriented itself as a member of the Persian Gulf.

The conception of an arc of crisis by the Carter administration (problematic as it may be) illustrates the way in which various actors thought about the region and their place in it. In an examination of U.S. government documents, ideas connecting the security of the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean predated the arc of crisis. According to a number of documents from the *FRUS* volumes, Washington deliberated on the viability of an American military presence in the Indian Ocean as early as the mid-1960s and early 1970s. More importantly, these conceptions of an interconnected region served geopolitical/strategic interests, and various actors were conscious of this.55

One can argue that Iran’s quest to achieve regional hegemony in the 1970s centered on connecting the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. The shah understood that supporting Pakistan in its confrontation with nationalists in Baluchistan served Iranian interests (keeping Iranian Baluchi’s away from nationalist ambitions). Furthermore, he acknowledged the influence of rival states (Afghanistan, India) that could challenge Iran’s supremacy and thus supported Pakistan to keep these rivals in check. Like Washington, Tehran calculated that maintaining some form of a presence in the Indian Ocean was crucial. This in part can explain why Iran maintained its ties with Pakistan even after the shah was deposed.

The Saudis also understood the importance of maintaining influence in the Indian Ocean. Riyadh’s support of Islamabad was predicated in part due to religious concerns, but the Saudis were far more interested in projecting power and assuring their own security. Sending large sums of economic aid to Pakistan in the 1970s and 1980s fulfilled these purposes to a large extent. The

55 For more on the importance of regional constructions see, Khalil, “The Crossroads of the World.”
Kingdom was able to propagate its own theological views, but more importantly it was able to acquire Pakistani military expertise.\(^{56}\) The Saudis maintain this relationship into the present day, where the influx of “Arab dollars” continues to flood into Pakistan.

Lastly, both Bhutto and Zia consciously connected the Indian Ocean to the Persian Gulf. This framing served both foreign policy and domestic goals. Bhutto utilized Gulf military and economic aid to keep Pakistan from falling apart in the aftermath of the 1971 Indo-Pak War. Economic aid from Riyadh and Tehran helped to alleviate Pakistan’s battered economy and Iranian military aid helped Bhutto suppress unrest and maintain the military’s loyalty (but only to an extent). In the international arena, Iranian and Saudi support (through the RCD, Islamic Summit Conference of 1974) assisted in restoring Pakistan’s image abroad, while also providing Bhutto with the support he needed to negotiate the Simla Agreement of 1972 and placating his domestic opposition (if only for a time). Although Gulf support did not deter Bhutto from being deposed in July 1977, Bhutto’s policies established the foundation of Pakistan’s relationships with Saudi Arabia and Iran that would expand over the next four decades.

\(^{56}\) Riyadh relied heavily on Western security forces, but enlisting the Pakistani military to support the Kingdom’s security was an attempt to mitigate criticisms of Saudi’s Arabia dependence on Western military aid.
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President Bhutto arriving at National Assembly Session on April 15, 1972. Reproduced from Pakistan, Department of Films and Publications, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the People’s President: A Pictorial Record, December 1971-July 1972 (Karachi: 1972), 67. Image believed to be in the public domain.
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Glossary


Ayub Khan – Pakistan’s second president who came to power through a coup in 1958. He was forced to resign in 1969 amid popular protests in West and East Pakistan.


East Pakistan – Before the 1971 Indo-Pak War created the modern state of Bangladesh, Pakistan was comprised of two territories. East Pakistan was the territory which is now Bangladesh.

Faisal ibn Abdulaziz Al Saud (King Faisal) – The king of Saudi Arabia from 1964 to 1975. In 1975 he was assassinated.

Gamal Abdel Nasser – The second president of Egypt who came to power through a coup in 1952. He died of a heart attack in 1970.

Gul Hassan Khan – Former Lt. General of the Pakistani Army. He served during the 1971 Indo-Pak war. After the war, Bhutto made him Commander-in-Chief of the Army until he was forced to resign in March 1972.

Ghulam Mustafa Khar – A Punjabi landlord who represented the pro-landlord elements of within the PPP. He was appointed the Governor of Punjab until his falling out with Bhutto. He denounced Bhutto and the PPP, leaving to join the Muslim League.

Harold Saunders – A career American foreign service officer served under the National Security Council.

Jama’at-i-Islami – One of Pakistan’s conservative Islamic parties founded in 1941. It opposed Bhutto’s socialist reforms and advocated for the introduction of Islamic Law in Pakistan.

Jiye Sind Front – A Sindhi nationalist party led by G.M. Syed that advocated for greater expressions of Sindhi culture in Pakistani society. When it called for a separate state in Sindh, Syed was arrested.

Khalid bin Abdulaziz Al Saud – He became king of Saudi Arabia after his father King Faisal was assassinated. He ruled from 1975 to 1982.

Khan Abdul Wali Khan – The leader of the National Awami Party, he also served as the opposition’s parliamentary leader. In 1974, the Bhutto government accused him and his party of orchestrating a bomb blast in the North-West Frontier Province.
Maulana Mufti Mahmud – A representative to Pakistan’s Islamic parties, he served as the president of the Pakistan National Alliance and was directly involved in negotiations with Bhutto during the 1977 election dispute.

Mohammad Asghar Khan – A former commander of the Pakistani Air Force who founded the Tehrik-i-Istiqlal. He was one of several major figures to oppose the Bhutto government.

Mohammad Reza Pahlavi (the shah) – The last shah of Iran who ruled from 1941 until he was deposed in 1979.

Muhajirs – Urdu speaking Pakistani who immigrated to Pakistan after the Partition of India in 1947

Namaz-i-Janaza – This refers to the funeral prayer for Muslims.

N. A. M Raza – He served as a Major General in the Pakistani Army before becoming the Pakistani ambassador to the U.S. from 1971 to 1972.

National Awami Party – A left leaning and secular party which was led by Khan Abdul Wali Khan. The party was banned by Yahya Khan, but it was lifted by Bhutto in 1971.

Nawab/Sardar – The Urdu term for feudal landlord.

Pakistan National Alliance – Made up of a diverse array of political parties, it formed to contest the PPP in the 1977 elections.

Pakistan People’s Party – Formed in 1967 by Bhutto, it was a leftist/socialist party that won the 1970 general elections in West Pakistan.

Ramay Group – A faction of the PPP which strongly advocated for Islamic Socialism, one of the PPP’s founding tenants.

roti, kapra, aur makhan – One of the PPP’s election mottos. It translates to bread, clothing, and shelter.

Sheikh Mujib Rahman – The leader of the Awami League who is referred to as the found father of Bangladesh. After Bangladesh achieved independence, he served as the state’s first president until his assassination in 1975.

Shishak – A feudal tax levied by nawabs and sardars.

Sidney Sober – From May 192 to December 1973, the U.S. had no ambassador to Pakistan. Sober fulfilled this role until Henry Byroade was appointed.

Six Point Plan – The Awami League’s plan for the governing structure of East and West Pakistan. It called for greater regional autonomy (especially in East Pakistan)
Sultan Mohammed Khan – A career Pakistani diplomat who served as Pakistan’s ambassador to the United States from 1972 to 1974.

Tashkent Agreement – This 1965 agreement served as the formal peace treaty which concluded the 1965 war between India and Pakistan.

West Pakistan – Before 1971, Pakistan was split up into West and East Pakistan. West Pakistan was the territory which today constitutes the state of Pakistan.

Yahya Khan – Became President of Pakistan after Ayub Khan abdicated in 1969. He held general elections in 1970 which ultimately resulted in the 1971 Indo-Pak War. He was replaced as president by Bhutto in the aftermath of the war.

Muhammad Zia ul Haq – A Pakistani general who, at the request of Bhutto, superseded a number of more senior generals to become the new head of the army. He deposed Bhutto in a July 1977 coup. He maintained power until his death in 1988.
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