

# Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror

Pages: 272

Publisher: Routledge; 1 edition (March 26, 2015)

Format: pdf, epub

Language: English

---

[ [DOWNLOAD FULL EBOOK PDF](#) ]

---

**Additional Comments on *Pakistan's Drift to Extremism*** Hassan Abbas has written a book that will be required reading for anyone hoping to understand the dense thicket of Pakistan's jihadist organizations and the social and political milieu in which they have flourished. Abbas draws on his wide experience as a senior Pakistani police officer and government official, allied to his experience as an academic, to write a book that is nuanced, authoritative, and well written. Any student of Pakistan will find Abbas's work richly rewarding.

**PETER BERGEN**, Terrorism Analyst, CNN, and Author of *THE HOLY WAR INC.: INSIDE THE SECRET WORLD OF OSAMA BIN LADEN*; After a long but mixed history as a sometime-ally of the United States, Pakistan itself might evolve into Washington's worst foreign policy nightmare: a nuclear-armed state, rife with Islamic terrorists, and in direct conflict with its neighbors. No one is better prepared to explain how Pakistan arrived at this point than Hassan Abbas, who knows the country and especially its Islamic radicals from the inside. This book not only traces Pakistan's trajectory over the last forty years, but it provides valuable insights into the workings of its establishment and should be required reading for anyone interested in a deep understanding of this troubled state.

**STEPHEN PHILIP COHEN**, Brookings Institution; Hassan Abbas is a brilliant geopolitical psychoanalyst who has put schizophrenic Pakistan on his couch and discovered the roots of the country's permanent state of denial as it slipped into the clutches of religious extremists and condescending spooks. The remedy lies in a new America that finally learns how to conjugate soft and hard power.

**ARNAUD DE BORCHGRAVE**, Editor-at-Large of *THE WASHINGTON TIMES* and *UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL*; Abbas warns of a frightening future; one in which extremists gain more military support and more military might, and tensions between India and Pakistan continue to rise, partly as a result of domestic pressures on both sides. But he also offers us hope by suggesting a way out of this frightening morass, detailing a role for the United States and the international community. It is to be fervently hoped that his message will be heard worldwide, especially in Washington.

from the Foreword by **JESSICA STERN**, Harvard University

**Pakistan's Drift into Extremism Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror** Foreword by Jessica Stern Hassan Abbas First published 2005 by M.E. Sharpe Published 2015 by Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017 *Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business* Copyright © 2005 Taylor & Francis. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers. Notices No responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use of operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the



do terrorists choose Pakistan as their refuge? And why was Dr. A.Q. Khan, the father of Pakistan's nuclear weapon and a self-described Islamic fundamentalist, allowed to go free after confessing to unprecedented nuclear crimes? Twin devils plague Pakistan, Abbas explains: fundamentalist extremism and corruption. Abbas attributes much of Pakistan's woes to the Pakistani military's historical practice of courting the "mullah," a figure he describes as a barely educated religious leader largely ignorant of true Islamic principles, likely to be corrupt, and likely to have a great deal of pull with various political factions. Abbas also describes the history of this practice and traces its development through the alternating civilian and military regimes that have ruled Pakistan since its birth as a nation in 1947. To look different from previous military rulers, Abbas explains, Musharraf suspended only parts of the constitution and did not impose martial law. He also made fighting the corruption that has dragged down Pakistan's economy the centerpiece of his early tenure. His decision to establish the National Accountability Bureau (NAB), and to appoint as its leader a general widely admired for his integrity, generated excitement among all those interested in seeing Pakistan thrive. But who in Pakistan could be relied on to force the people with political power—mullahs, industrialists, politicians, and military personnel—to comply with laws they had long grown used to ignoring? The Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) was known to have monitored civilian government, known for its corruption, and the NAB assumed that the ISI had acquired sufficient data to prosecute. But, much to the dismay of the new anticorruption officers, of which Mr. Abbas was one, the data were sketchy. In the end, Musharraf chose to compromise with those willing to play along with his regime. He sidelined the liberals, and cozied up to the religious parties, facilitating their unprecedented victory in the October 2002 parliamentary elections. Abbas explains Musharraf's difficulty: the masses wanted Musharraf to stamp out corruption and political patronage, while the political and military elite wanted the status quo to continue. Musharraf began swinging in between. This swinging applies not only to the anticorruption campaign, but also to Musharraf's relationship with the jihadis. Pakistan's intelligence agency, the ISI, has long supported numerous jihadi groups, which it used as "volunteer fighters" in the conflict with India over Kashmir. Pakistan looked the other way as the groups began to harbor ambitions that reached beyond their original mission. They established close links with Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other international jihadi organizations that emerged from the earlier Afghan war against the Soviets. After 9/11, Musharraf officially banned a number of these jihadi groups, renounced the Taliban, and arrested hundreds of Al-Qaeda suspects, turning them over to the U.S. government. But even as Pakistani officials were arresting some terrorists, factions within the Pakistani military continued to support those same terrorist groups. Pakistani jihadi groups fought beside Al-Qaeda and the Taliban against the United States and its allies. They are leading suspects in a number of terrorist strikes since September 11. Sunni sectarian terrorists, also assisted by the military since their inception, have grown increasingly brazen, gunning down large numbers of Shia civilians in broad daylight. Shia terrorists have responded in kind. But the jihadi groups seem to have crossed a line when they attempted—apparently with assistance from members of the military—to assassinate Musharraf himself in December 2003. Musharraf's swinging in regard to the jihadis may have ended for good, but it may eventually spell the end of his regime. It is not clear that Musharraf can completely control the military he ostensibly commands. The power of the army to control the mullahs is increasingly a facade, Abbas argues. Mr. Abbas is uniquely qualified to teach us about these issues. A former senior police officer, Mr. Abbas has earned several master's degrees, and recently completed a fellowship at Harvard Law School, where he studied Islamic law pertaining to jihad. He also served in the administrations of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and President Musharraf. The fate of Pakistan will affect the entire world. Will Pakistan's military continue to use the mullahs to achieve its short-term political and military goals? Will the sectarian killers created by the ISI get involved in sectarian crimes in other countries, for example in Iraq, further destabilizing that country? Will terrorists continue to see Pakistan as a hospitable place of refuge? If Pakistan is to be saved from a Taliban-like future, and the rest of the world saved from future Dr.

Khans, it will have to make accommodations with India over Kashmir, and stop flirting with the mullahs. It will have to spend less of its national income on defense, and more on educating its youth. It will require that a true democracy take hold. But none of this will happen, Abbas warns, without assistance from the United States. After all, the U.S. government helped to design and fund the strategy of employing violent Islamist cadres to serve as "volunteer" fighters in a war that seemed critically important at the time, but left those cadres to their own devices once they were no longer important for achieving U.S. strategic goals. The idea of international jihad; which was promoted by the United States and Pakistan when it was expedient, took hold and spread, ultimately resulting in deadly terrorist crimes throughout Asia as well as the September 11 strikes. U.S. assistance to Pakistan helped to create the problem we now face; and U.S. assistance will be required to undo it. But that assistance cannot be exclusively military. The enemy is not just a military target, but a bad idea. Fighting that idea will require providing alternatives to the youth who are currently educated at extremist schools, who find solace in hate. Targeted development assistance, especially in regard to education, is the most important aspect of the war on terrorism, as Mr. Abbas makes clear. Mr. Abbas warns of a frightening future; one in which extremists gain more military support and more military might; and tensions between India and Pakistan continue to rise, partly as a result of domestic pressures on both sides. But he also offers us hope by suggesting a way out of this frightening morass, detailing a role for the United States and the international community. It is to be fervently hoped that his message will be heard worldwide, especially in Washington.

Jessica Stern  
Harvard University  
April 2004

**Preface** This is a story of Pakistan. The three main characters of this story are the Pakistan Army, the jihadi actors, and the United States of America. It is an inside account of how these players have shaped the development of Pakistan in its fifty-six years of history; for better or for worse. It is my candid and straightforward analysis of what went wrong with Pakistan. But it is more than just that. It is also my jihad against the injustices inflicted upon the people of Pakistan. It is my hope that this book helps explain how Pakistan came to be what it is today because it is only through understanding its journey that we can hope to help the nation overcome its troubles and build a brighter future. The information I collected for this book is from various sources, including the major works published on the related issues in Pakistan and the West in different languages, declassified American documents, and interviews with dozens of Pakistani politicians, military officials, journalists, and many American political analysts and diplomats. The last few chapters that cover General Pervez Musharraf, the Kargil episode, and the profiles of jihadi groups and their linkages with Al-Qaeda and the Inter-Services Intelligence "ISI"; are largely based on interviews with militants of the jihadi groups and officials of the ISI. Due to sensitivities involved with these issues, all the sources are not identified by name in this book. But I have confirmed the information with many credible sources for accuracy. My access to these avenues was possible due to my being a former government official in Pakistan, having served in Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's administration in 1994-1996 as a staff officer and in General Pervez Musharraf's Chief Executive Secretariat "National Accountability Bureau"; during 1999-2000 as a deputy director. My service as an assistant superintendent of police in the North-West Frontier Province in 1996-1998 also provided me an opportunity to witness the ground realities vis-à-vis the *Madrasa* network in the region and the Pakistan-Taliban-al-Qaeda linkages. All together, the writing of this book is a work of six years of investigation and research. The effort to translate and analyze this information in a book form, however, started a couple of years ago and was made possible through a research fellowship at the Islamic Legal Studies Program at the Harvard Law School "2002-2003"; I am indebted to Professor Frank Vogel and Peri Bearman for this support. Professor Emeritus Roger Fisher at the Harvard Law School, managing the Harvard Negotiation Project, was also very kind to provide me access to the Harvard library and research facilities during the final phase of my work as a research fellow. Studying at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University "2001-2002"; was another valuable experience in this context. I greatly benefited from the classes that I took with Professors Andrew Hess, Alan Henrikson, and Richard Shultz at the Fletcher School and Dr. Jessica

Stern at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. From these professors I learned how to scrutinize and evaluate events and data from a political analyst's perspective. Jessica Stern especially had been a source of guidance for me while working on this book project. Many friends and colleagues read various chapters of the book and provided immense help in improving the text with their valuable comments and encouragement. I am very thankful to Ahmed Rashid, Marvin Weinbaum, Khalid Hasan, Peter Bergen, Samiullah Ibrahim, Sohail Iqbal, Mahnaz Ispahani, Professor Robert Wirsing, Professor Saeed Shafqat, Professor Christopher Candland, Arnaud de Borchgrave, and Barry Bearak in this regard. I am deeply grateful to Silbi Stainton, my dear friend who read almost the entire manuscript and gave excellent suggestions. Many thanks are due to my Pakistani-American friends Shahid Ahmed Khan and Javed Sultan, who supported my research endeavors. My gratitude is also due to Salman Haider and Jaspal Singh, who helped me comprehend issues from an Indian perspective. I gained considerably from my discussions with Usman Rahim Khan, Yasin Malik, Farooq Khatwari, Moeed Pirzada, and Ghulam Nabi Fai about the plight, dreams, and opinions of Kashmiris. I also greatly benefited from my interaction with Stephen Cohen, Ambassadors Teresita Shaffer and Steven Monblatt, and most of all Professor Ayesha Jalal, whose seminal work on Jinnah many years ago had motivated me to turn to academia besides giving the realization that the history textbook I was taught in Pakistan had many distortions embedded in it. Barry Hoffman, Pakistan's honorary consul general in Boston, was always patient listening to my conspiracy theories about the American role in Pakistan over the years. He facilitated my understanding of the issues from an American perspective, though in the process I found a Pakistani patriot in him. He also kindly provided most of the pictures of Pakistani and American heads of state printed in the book, from his private collections. I am thankful to my editor at M.E. Sharpe, Patricia Loo, for her encouragement and support. Managing editor Angela Piliouras and editorial assistant Amy Albeit earned my gratitude for their cooperation and help in the publication process. Finally, for loving support and patience, I wish to give my warmest thanks of all to my wife Benish. The book could not have been written without the support of a mentor, who despite my insistence wants to remain anonymous. Besides providing useful information, he was of enormous help in making the book readable. In this sense the book is a collaboration; his as much as mine. Any errors of fact, interpretation, or judgment expressed in this book are of course entirely my own and should not be attributed to the institutions I remained associated with or the individuals mentioned above.

**Pakistan's Drift into Extremism** — [Chapter 1](#) — [Introduction](#) In A.D. 712, Mohammad bin Qasim, an Arab general at the age of seventeen, conquered a part of the Sindh region of India, and thus Islam touched the Indian subcontinent. Here the predominant religion was Hinduism, which had evolved in India after the Aryans came from the north many thousands of years earlier. India then, as now, had much diversity. The great traditions of Hinduism were nurtured by a conglomeration of sects, each sect having different religious texts and believing in various gods and goddesses. The religion itself possessed little in the way of a formal central structure. But Brahmans, the clergy, undermined this religion by instituting a stratification of Hindu society into four watertight castes. At the bottom of the scale, the *shudra* the untouchable has eked out his subhuman existence more or less unchanged for many generations. The caste system thus was largely intolerant of social mobility within Indian society. By the same token it was expected to be equally intolerant of the outsider. And the Islam that met Hinduism then, being sternly monotheistic, was prejudiced against all pluralistic worship. Thus, when these two faiths met, it was to be expected that the resultant collision could lead to a catastrophe. But this is not quite what happened. The reason for this was that the Islam that came to India had yet to be subverted by its own brand of Brahmanism; that is, the power of the clergy. Mohammad bin Qasim won the hearts of his new subjects, but his stay was so short that soon he and the religion he professed were a distant memory. The next to come to India were the Muslim conquerors from the north who consisted of Central Asians, Afghans, and Persians. Many of them were more prone to plunder and pillage for achieving military glory rather than pursuing any Islamic ideals. But in their train came the Sufis mystic saints; and with them Islam came to stay. They presented the softest and most tolerant

face of Islam, and it was this Sufi tolerance that cushioned the meeting of Islam and Hinduism. They gained thousands of Hindu disciples, many of whom converted to Islam. Also, many who did not convert remained disciples because association with the saints was not made conditional on one's religious identity. Their core message was love for humanity and its creator. Thus, such was the Allah to which India was first introduced. Even in today's India the annual feasts in honor of these saints are celebrated and massively attended.<sup>5</sup> And even, at times, surpassing the Muslim disciples in number and enthusiasm are those of Hindu and Sikh faith; the great-grandchildren of the original disciples.<sup>6</sup> Historically, most Sufis were rebels against the degeneration of the despotic rulers in the Arab and other predominantly Muslim regions. When the Sufi threat to despotism increased, it was thought expedient to discourage Sufism. Consequently the mullah class—clergy that originally had no place in Islam was built up. Mullah, distinct from an *alim*—learned religious scholar—, stands for a narrow-minded and semiliterate person who is the product of the decadent *Madrasa* system and oftentimes leads prayers in mosques and poses as a religious authority claiming the discretion to interpret religious texts for all Muslims. The term mullah is also used throughout the book to portray the general mentality of the majority of Pakistani religious parties' leadership. And as the mullah influence increased, with the passage of time the population of the Indian subcontinent began to see the not-very-alluring face of Islam. Today's Pakistan is seeing the flowering of this phenomenon that started so far back. Starting with Mahmud of Ghazni in the eleventh century, many Muslim conquerors ruled the Indian subcontinent for a better part of the millennium. Each one established a kingdom, settled down, and became effete, only to be supplanted by a new and more vigorous successor. By the time the British trader had sufficiently organized himself to unveil the bayonet, the sun of Islamic power in India had set. By the early nineteenth century, the Mughal king in Delhi reigned but did not rule. Nevertheless, when British ambitions in India started to take tangible shape in the form of conquered territories, Muslim princes were still ruling a large part of the subcontinent. To remedy this situation the British pursued a policy of divide-and-defeat the country. The British had a natural ally in the Hindu population of the Indian subcontinent for two reasons. The first was the nascent sense of Hindu patriotism that regarded the Muslim ruler as a usurper. It can be argued that this perception encouraged the Hindu to align with any power holding the promise of sending the usurper packing. Second, the education of the average British officer was just barely adequate to have kept the memory of the Crusades alive, which cast the Muslim in an adversarial role. Thus, slowly but surely, a handful of British officers, administrators, and traders got India where they wanted it—as a colony divided between the fiction of self-ruling Indian states and the fact of the rest of the country being ruled from London through its governor-generals and later the viceroys. Because the Hindu was the ally of the British in this new dispensation, his lot stood to improve at the cost of the Muslim subjects of the Crown. At a time like this, the Muslims needed a voice of sanity and vision. What they got instead was the mullah, who was enlightened enough to block the only avenue of advancement open to them. He promptly proscribed British schools and the learning of the English language. Against the prospective violators of these prohibitions he pronounced many oaths, invoked many curses, and listed many areas of a fall from grace. Among the latter was a promise that, in the eyes of Allah, the marriage vows of the transgressors shall stand annulled. And the subject of marriage being a matter of grave concern among the believers, many a good Muslim decided to save his wedlock at the cost of a modern education! And when Sir Syed Ahmed Khan—1817–98—decided to reclaim his coreligionists from the morass of ignorance unrelieved by any hint of the bliss that is supposed to go with it, he was promptly dubbed 'infidel' by the outraged majesty of the mullah. This situation has improved sufficiently in the Pakistan of today so that each school of thought has managed to put the other well outside the pale of Islam. Conversely, the Hindus, not being overly concerned with the fragility of their vows of matrimony, enrolled happily in the network of schools opened by the British. Unfortunately, however, education sowed the seeds of a different type of problem in the Hindu psyche. As he came to study his history book, he found that among other things, this was a history of an unbroken series of conquerors issuing from the north, debouching onto the

plains of India, defeating the Indian forces, and settling down to rule without let or hindrance. But the historical singularity that was most galling to Indian pride was that very few of these adventurers had ever been defeated and turned back. And it did not augur well for the future of Hindu-Muslim amity to be reminded that for the previous eight hundred years or so almost all the conquerors were Muslims. These calculated moves infected the Hindu mind with a collective inferiority complex, a condition normally associated with individuals. The Muslims of India did not by any chance escape this complex, but instead executed a neat little sidestep. They have conveniently chosen to forget that they are the children of Hindu converts and have equally conveniently chosen instead to range themselves with the Muslim conquerors of India; the position least likely to enamor them with the Hindus. Many roads and places of note in Pakistan are named after Arabs, Moors, and Turks with whom they share little history. As the deck eventually came to be stacked, Pakistan would always have an army anyway, and the army would probably have the toe of its haloed boot in uncomfortable proximity to the anterior of the politician. But if there was a chance to the contrary, brothers Kaiser and Adolf scotched it. The world wars that they unleashed created the requirement of gun fodder from India. And the Muslims of India, having been left behind in terms of education due to the assiduous efforts of their clergy, now wanted nevertheless to advance. And because the semi-or the uneducated had few better routes to advancement than service in the army during those times, they enlisted in disproportionate numbers, compared with their representation in other fields. Hence, Pakistan was destined to inherit a well-trained army. In terms of political development, Muslims were far behind Hindus for the aforementioned reasons. In 1885 the Indian National Congress, primarily a Hindu-dominated party, was formed. Originating as a platform of the British loyalists comprising the cosmopolitan rich, the leisurely, and the powerful imbued with a zeal for social service and political recognition, it acquired by the early twentieth century a fervent nationalist character, and with Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's entry in 1915, it transformed into a bulwark against British imperialism. They decided that India had had enough of 'civilized' governance from Britain. It took the Muslims of India two more decades to wake up to all this, though some Muslims were part of the Hindu-dominated Congress Party. They eventually formed their party, the Muslim League, in 1906 with almost similar motives as that of the early days; Congress, and later joined the chorus for independence but were not too clear about what they really wanted. The Muslim League was organized as an immediate reaction to political developments in Bengal Province; British authorities had divided this large province into two, resulting in the creation of a Muslim-dominant province in 1905. The Hindu Mahasabha, a militant group, violently opposed the Bengal partition through a campaign of terror that enflamed communal passions. Muslim League leadership at this juncture got convinced that they must speak for the rights and interests of Muslims as Congress had done very little to thwart or condemn the role of Hindu militants in this episode. They needed therefore a leader who could define the primary needs of the Muslims of India and voice it effectively. They found such a leader in Mohammad Ali Jinnah, who joined the Muslim League in 1913, though without abandoning his membership in the Congress. A lawyer who had spent his formative years in Britain, Jinnah was a Muslim primarily by birth and loyalty, and in all other ways was more British than the British. He was not overly keen on independence, but he was only too aware that the Muslims of India were far too backward compared with the Hindu majority, and thus the withdrawal of the British authority would lay the Muslims open to the possibility of exploitation by this majority. His first priority therefore was to obtain guarantees to obviate this eventuality, or at least make such exploitation less probable. The demand for Pakistan as a separate homeland for the Muslims of India was seriously considered by Jinnah much later, and then too as a bargaining chip for obtaining these self-same guarantees. Up to the second decade of the twentieth century he was a member of both the Congress Party and the Muslim League and was called the greatest ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. And so he would have remained had the march of events not decided differently. In 1916, in what came to be known as the Lucknow Pact between Congress and the Muslim League, Jinnah sought and received from Congress such constitutional guarantees, which in his estimate were an adequate constitutional insurance for the minority

Muslims against the might of the Hindu majority.<sup>7</sup> But the deal was wrecked by the Nehru Report<sup>8</sup> in 1928. Jinnah tried his best to save the spirit of the Lucknow Pact, but without success. This was a severe rebuke to Jinnah's faith in Indian nationalism.<sup>9</sup> Soon, he left the Congress Party. In such a political atmosphere, Dr. Mohammad Iqbal, a respected Muslim philosopher and poet, came up with the idea of an independent Muslim state in the subcontinent. He presented this proposal at the 1930 annual meeting of the Muslim League and questioned Jinnah's insistence on the unity of India. Jinnah, though increasingly disillusioned with Congress, saw the issue of a separate Muslim homeland as a nonstarter. Earlier, after Gandhi had joined the Khilafat Movement,<sup>10</sup> Jinnah refused to be associated with it by saying that "it was a crime to mix up politics and religion the way he had done."<sup>11</sup> At that time he had little doubt left that the soul of the Congress was in fact communal, but the sabotage of the Lucknow Pact was the one act that more than any other issue led to the "parting of the ways"<sup>12</sup> between Muslims and Hindus and to the eventual partition of British India. It stunned Jinnah, broke his faith in the word of the Hindu leadership, and he henceforth regarded all assurances and commitments issuing from that quarter as mere expedients. He thereafter believed that the secularist slogan of the Congress was a mere hoax meant to calm the fears of the Muslims and gain credit with the secular democracies of the West. As Jinnah progressively came to represent the Muslim opinion in India, a number of the better organized Muslim religious parties, most of these anti-Pakistan, lost little time in branding him an infidel<sup>13</sup>; a time-honored label for all such who did not conform. The battle lines between the moderate, westernized Muslims and the potentially militant groups were beginning to be drawn way back then. The Muslim religious groups had devoted their energies and time to the cause of freeing the Muslims from colonial rule and had concluded that the British were the chief enemy of Islam. For them British control of India was the reason behind the decline of Islamic civilization in the region. And they saw Jinnah as a lackey of the British. Because of the general backwardness of the Muslims, the organizational structure of the Muslim League was much weaker than that of the Congress. And when the Congress started agitational politics against British rule during the Second World War and most of its top leadership was clapped into prison, the very challenge posed by this situation further honed and strengthened the second-tier leadership of this party. But Jinnah supported the British effort in the war. He was only too keenly aware of the weakness of the Muslims and was in dire need of a strong ally, which he saw in the British. And he could not hope to obtain their support by withholding his support from them at an hour so crucial for the Western democracies. Thus the already weak leadership of the league was further denied the opportunity to learn in the hard school of agitational politics. With the exception of Jinnah, Pakistan was destined to inherit a generally lightweight political leadership, a hash of comparatively well-organized religious parties, and a much stronger and better-organized army. This power equation was to play a very important role in the emerging Pakistan. As India lumbered and lurched its way toward independence, Jinnah nevertheless hoped for a compromise that would keep India's unity intact while at the same time he was trying to obtain the minimal security guarantees on behalf of his Muslim followers. As such, he played the consummate lawyer. He built up the case for Pakistan but steadfastly refrained from defining it to any degree of exactitude,<sup>13</sup> using it as a card to achieve his main aim and keeping the gratitude of the British "earned through active cooperation in their war effort"; as a resource of last resort should the formation of an independent Pakistan become necessary. Unfortunately for him, except for Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, none in the top leadership of the Congress was ready to make the sort of compromise Jinnah was hoping for, and he had a visceral dislike for Azad. Worse than this, the Congress Party gave enough cause to confirm Jinnah in his opinion of the basic hypocrisy of that party.<sup>14</sup> The elections of 1937 were one such event that did little to rehabilitate his faith in the honesty of his chief adversary. Having a firm understanding with the Muslim League to form coalition governments in all provinces irrespective of the election results, the Congress, after returning with large majorities in nearly all the provinces, promptly reneged on its commitment. It not only dumped the Muslim League, but soon stood accused of serious instances of abuse of power by the Muslims in a number of provinces. This further destroyed Muslim trust in the Congress and was considered the second major demonstration of

bad faith by it. As time ran out for the British in India, they resorted to their last major effort to leave India a united country in which the Muslims could hope for advancement in an atmosphere of security. In 1946, through the Cabinet Mission Plan, a proposal was made to group the Muslim majority provinces in both the east and the west of British India. These two groups were to have considerable autonomy under a weak center handling a few subjects. Ten years later there was to be a referendum in these two groups to stay within the union or to opt out. Both Jinnah and Jawaharlal Nehru agreed to the plan. When Gandhi was apprised of the details of the agreement, he immediately advised Nehru to make his acceptance conditional and thus torpedo the last effort of keeping India united. This brought down the curtain on Jinnah's hopes, compelled him to solicit the support of as many of the religious parties as possible, and led to the bloodshed and tragedy that accompanied the emergence of a moth-eaten Pakistan in 1947. The dream of a united India was dashed by the Congress in search of a strong center, though it artfully blamed the partition on the intransigence of Jinnah. And if there was any chance left for the economic uplift for either peoples, Nehru decided to annex Kashmir, a state contiguous with Pakistan with an overwhelming Muslim majority. This effectively robbed the peoples of both countries of the promise of their days in the sun. From then on these two poor countries were to spend their scarce resources feeding their mutual animus and building up their armed forces. Because of its large economy, the effect of such sterile expenditure, though vexatious, was at least bearable for India. For Pakistan it was a disaster. Over the years it meant enhancing the power of the army at the expense of all the other institutions of the country. For the people of Pakistan it meant progressive and gathering poverty, with any expectation of reclamation through mass education going out the window. As soon as India was partitioned, the region saw another divide in the foreign policy orientation of the two newborn countries. The Cold War had set in, and the socialist leaning of the Indian leadership helped it gravitate toward the USSR and become firmly aligned with it while the anticommunist bias of Pakistani leadership coupled with the country's security needs ensured its alignment with the United States. And for all of America's commitment to the noble cause of democracy, its first commitment was to anti-communism. Thus it looked for strong anticommunist allies. In many such countries of the Third World the governments came in the form of dictators, civil or military, which was all very well with their sponsors. The army's influence in Pakistan was increasing as politicians were failing and the limited revenues of the country were insufficient to support a huge army, which Pakistan needed to defend itself from India. The Kashmir crisis was also a potent factor behind the army's demand for more funds. This made the army even stronger in Pakistan and a competitive contender for U.S. funds. Thus the army became the major recipient of U.S. financial aid. The rabidly anticommunist religious parties also got their share of support from the United States, which kept them financially alive at a crucial phase of their lives. In its long association with Pakistan, America lost the forest for the trees. It saw only its army, but behind it, it lost sight of Pakistan itself. The continued advancement of the army meant the concomitant impoverishment of the country and the emasculation of the nascent political process. Each dollar spent on the steel helmet meant a dollar taken away from education, health, and industrial infrastructure. As the army grew in strength, it frequently took over the task of governance, diluted its own fiber, and weakened all the other institutions, including the judiciary and the political parties. In all of this, the growth of religious parties' influence seemed arrested. Their poor showing at the ballot was held up as proof of this and was celebrated by the many who wanted to see in this a settled fact that they had no political future in Pakistan. But religious elements, due to politicians' failure, were making enough progress to take on the government from time to time with increasing vigor, irrespective of the result of the previous engagement. And there was just the right amount of education among the ruling elite not to be able to take the long-term view of history. And, most important, few seemed conscious of the fact that as poverty and insecurity increase, humans are driven to seek the embrace of religion. And it was the mullah whose influence would grow in such circumstances. As Pakistan progressed in its regression, as the army became stronger and stronger, and particularly as the army subdued and outlasted the few genuine political leaders of the old guard around whom a political process and governing consensus could be built, a political vacuum was

created within the first decade of Pakistan's birth. In this vacuum the army became an acceptable alternative. From then on the army never gave up the privilege of imposing martial law whenever it wished or whenever the incompetent Pakistani politicians provided them even the slightest opportunity. In 1971 the Indian subcontinent witnessed yet another partition when Pakistan broke into two and Bangladesh emerged; a direct result of Ayub Khan's policies, West Pakistani chauvinism, and insensitivity to its Bengali brethren. With this, the country was given the taste of its first popular civilian leader in the shape of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who rode to victory on his socialist slogan. He started on the road to break feudal power and to emancipate the oppressed of the land, but could not deliver what he promised. He gave the country a legitimate democratic constitution and successfully initiated the work on acquiring nuclear technology, but on the other hand he handed over to the mullah his first significant victory when, under pressure from the religious parties of Pakistan, he amended the constitution of the country to declare the Ahmedis<sup>15</sup> as non-Muslim. This was the community whose active help was solicited and received by Pakistan's founding father Jinnah at the creation of the country.<sup>16</sup> In 1936, Jinnah had successfully resisted an effort by a religious group, Ahrars, to make it incumbent upon Muslim League candidates for legislatures to take an oath vowing to expel the Ahmedis from the Muslim community.<sup>17</sup> In the words of leading scholar of South Asian studies Ayesha Jalal, Jinnah had done so because he "saw no reason to strip the Ahmedis of their Muslim identity simply on account of a doctrinal dispute."<sup>18</sup> Thus, declaring them non-Muslim after the creation of Pakistan was considered a breach of contract by the Ahmedis. The next ruler the people of Pakistan had to bear was a general; Zia ul-Haq. He was basically a politician in uniform and a very scheming one at that. His ready smile covered a vast range of malice. Under him, lip service to Islam became the official creed, and hypocrisy became the lubricant of easy passage to positions of pelf and power. And the officialdom of Pakistan, already hovering around the outer limits of politeness, did not find it too difficult to make a transition into the brave new world of obsequiousness. And just when bets began to be taken as to when Zia was likely to bow out, the Soviets marched into Afghanistan, Zia became indispensable to the West, and Pakistan became the most allied ally of America. No one could have guessed it then, but the onset of the Afghan war was the most fateful dagger driven into the heart of Pakistan. America could never forget its Vietnam experience. It would do anything to reverse a Vietnam on the Soviet Union. When Brezhnev walked into Kabul, the United States had the USSR right where it wanted. A long-forgotten Pakistan was the only country that could help America avenge itself. A U.S. ally since its inception and in very poor economic health, it decided to play the role of an ally to the hilt. The Afghan war indeed reversed Vietnam on the USSR and in such a manner that it not only withdrew its forces from Afghanistan but broke up into pieces. As soon as the Soviets left Afghanistan, the Americans left Pakistan. Pakistan had helped America sow the wind in Afghanistan, but when the time came to reap the whirlwind, it had to do it alone. The abandonment of Pakistan by America left it more than 3 million Afghan refugees to care for; thousands of *Madrasas*; religious seminaries; funded by Saudi money to militarize the youth and convert them to the intolerant brand of Wahhabi Islam; a Kalashnikov culture such that one could rent an automatic gun in Karachi at less than two dollars an hour; and last but not least; the drug trade. The people who actually did the fighting and gave their lives were not just Afghans themselves but Muslims drawn from all over the world, including thousands of Pakistanis, most of whom were the students of *Madrasas*. They were motivated to fight a jihad; religious war; against an infidel communist aggressor and take martyrdom in the process. Their religious fervor was not only due to the motivation provided by the *Madrasa* or the mullah; it was also fully backed by the Pakistani Inter Services Intelligence; ISI; and financed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency; CIA;. Not just the Pakistanis but the United States well knew of, and welcomed, Saudi funding of the *Madrasas* that produced the holy warrior who was now fighting a war not only for the freedom of Afghanistan, but also a vicarious one for the United States. As far as this was being achieved, the United States quite welcomed this Muslim holy warrior brought alive from the Middle Ages. General Zia ul-Haq and his shortsighted generals, who did not have a clue about Afghan history,

were pursuing their own agenda. They had it as their aim to impose upon the new postwar Afghanistan a regime of their own choice in order to have strategic depth against India. Toward this end the ISI devoted a disproportionate amount of U.S. aid to Gulbadin Hikmatyar for the good reason that he was expected to play their game. Furthermore, some Pakistani generals started charity from home in strict compliance with the moral precept of such distribution, and enriched themselves. Thus the most tangible result of this policy was their own fat fortunes, which continue to smile on their children and shall continue to do so on their grandchildren as well. However, they could not seat their chosen king on the throne in Kabul because Hikmatyar, who had few followers, lost out. And the real warriors like Ahmad Shah Masud, who had the following but little aid, turned against Pakistan. So the end result was unity among the many warring groups of Afghanistan, that is, in their contempt for Pakistan, the country that had risked the most in standing up against the USSR for the cause of Afghan freedom! After the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, and particularly after it settled down into an ordered anarchy imposed by the Taliban, Pakistan was awash with unemployed mujahideen &#x0028;holy warriors&#x0029; who were no longer needed there. These heroes of yore, the likes of the bin Ladens and Mullah Omars, whom it was possible to switch on, could not as easily be switched off. These battle-hardened fundamentalists trained, supported, and motivated both by Pakistan and the United States were now without a cause to fight for. By this time, Zia ul-Haq had died in a mysterious plane crash in 1988, and Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif were taking turns at the helm of Pakistan. The problem of the mushrooming militants did not occupy the politicians, as it meant direct confrontation with the ISI, which had opened up enough avenues for the jihadis to remain busy. Sectarian violence also reached its peak during the 1990s, but the political leadership failed to gather the courage to counter the growing strength of the jihadis. By the time General Pervez Musharraf, a moderate and progressive Muslim, came to the scene, the very scale of religious extremism had reached its climax. When he halfheartedly tried to halt this trend before the tragedy on 9/11, the army found that it was faced with a potential adversary that it was not willing or able to bring to heel. Many of these groups had developed independent channels of financing, giving them increased maneuverability. This was the beginning of a shift in the power equation away from the army and toward the jihadi groups, the latter being supported by the mullah parties acting as their political wings. No one realized this shift. In part this had to do with the sloth and inertia inherent in any bureaucracy, civil or military, which is generally disposed not to disturb the prevailing status quo. Also, the ISI, the organ responsible for drawing up analyses and presenting them to the government, failed to awaken the government to the emerging exigency. They were not aware perhaps that their tools were fast becoming Frankenstein monsters. Apart from the religious parties, it was the ISI that had grown most in size, in influence, and in resources during the Afghan war. In the aftermath of the Afghan war, Pakistan not only inherited thousands of mujahideen, but also their handlers in the shape of a vastly expanded and powerful ISI. The ISI, having its natural sympathies with the mujahideen, which it had helped motivate and train, could not obviously see in them a potential menace. And those few who did were too few in number to swim against the tide of inertia and settled opinion. And last, the very scale of the problem gave it immunity from redress. It was therefore a predicament more conveniently ignored than faced. It was in this atmosphere of self-imposed ignorance and enforced bliss that the problem continued to expand and found three directions in which to focus its attention and unleash its pent-up energies, that is, within Pakistan itself in terms of sectarian violence; against the West &#x0028;primarily U.S. interests&#x0029;; and against the oppression of the Indian forces in Jammu and Kashmir. At first the diversion of the mujahideen effort to Kashmir was spontaneous. Kashmir was contiguous with Pakistan, and the cause of the Kashmiri fight for freedom had much in common with that of the Afghans, and the Indian atrocities in Kashmir were such that very little was required in the way of motivation for the veterans of the Afghan war to change direction toward Kashmir. With the passage of time, ISI increasingly got involved with directing and diverting the effort of the erstwhile mujahideen into Kashmir. This suited the ISI both because it was the logical extension of Pakistan&#x2019;s policy on Kashmir and, equally important, it suited the ISI to divert elsewhere a problem that Pakistan was in no position to address. India, on the other hand, took advantage of this situation. It refused

to accept its own complicity and responsibility in the creation of the Kashmir imbroglio and brazenly went a step further by denying totally that there was in fact any problem in Kashmir, except at the instigation of Pakistan. It has cynically used Pakistani involvement in Kashmir to cover up the atrocities of its own forces of occupation in that unhappy land. These forces have thus far sent many thousands of Kashmiris to their deaths, maimed and crippled thousands more, raped countless women, and put to the torch entire villages. The largest democracy in the world, in having pledged and then having consistently broken this pledge of providing the right of self-determination to a small part of its population, is directly responsible for lighting the fires of a freedom struggle in Kashmir. And though Pakistan has contributed both through a policy of commission and acts of omission, it is India that initiated the Kashmir conflict. This dispute is primarily responsible for providing to the militant factories of Pakistan an endless stream of willing recruits. Unless a just solution of the Kashmir issue is achieved and *Madrasas* are reformed, the prospect of a Pakistan going down the extremism path must not be discounted. A peace process is taking shape lately, but more needs to be done. It is time India heeds the voice of sanity and, in a leadership role that is natural to its size and position, leads the region out of the impending catastrophe. Only then can the Pakistan Army be 'convinced' to take up the challenge of tackling religious militancy with full force. The Pakistan Army, because of its institutional and corporate interests, will never allow Musharraf or for that matter any other general to completely clamp down on militants before achieving something on the Kashmir front. It is not inferred that Kashmir has to come into Pakistan's lap; it is the promise of self-determination for Kashmiris that must be fulfilled. An increasing number of Kashmiris, after helplessly witnessing the sectarian and politically motivated killings orchestrated by Pakistani-sponsored militant groups in Indian-held Jammu and Kashmir, have lost their dream of joining Pakistan. The Pakistan Army and the jihadi forces must understand that the Kashmiris alone have the right to decide about their future. A jointly controlled Kashmir Valley with an autonomous political setup in this scenario may turn out to be the only viable option. But India is not likely to focus on the reality and significance of this issue unless the West, especially the United States, recognizes its seriousness. In the post-September 11 scenario, the U.S. military campaign in Afghanistan and the ostensible destruction of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda forces was hailed as the first victory of this war. But as the dust begins to settle, so has the euphoria of many who had hastened to call this a victory. In its after-math there have been elections in Pakistan, and the mullahs have been re-turned to the national and provincial houses of the legislature in unprecedented numbers. This has been a vote against both the United States and Musharraf for his pro-American policies. It has also been a vote that has announced a paradigm shift in the traditional equation of power in Pakistan. For the first time, a large number of Pakistanis have considered the mullahs fit to rule over them. Potentially, this betokens the handing over of the baton by the army to the religious forces, as one of the most powerful forces in the politics of Pakistan. The U.S. military campaign in Iraq and its aftermath have made this power shift complete. And close behind the mullahs are the forces of militant extremism. Thus, where the United States has cut off one head of the hydra in Afghanistan, many more heads are now growing in Pakistan. Arguably, the way Musharraf has mishandled the domestic political situation and the way the U.S. campaign in Afghanistan and Iraq is progressing, the barely surviving Muslim moderate in Pakistan will soon be heading toward extinction, further reinforcing the already abundant reserves of extremists in the Muslim world.

---

This book examines the rise of religious extremism in Pakistan, particularly since 1947, and analyzes its connections to the Pakistani army's corporate interests and U.S.-Pakistan relations. It includes profiles of leading Pakistani militant groups with details of their origins, development, and capabilities. The author begins with an historical overview of the introduction of Islam to the Indian sub-continent in 712 AD,

and brings the story up to the present by describing President Musharraf's handling of the war on terror. He provides a detailed account of the political developments in Pakistan since 1947 with a focus on the influence of religious and military forces. He also discusses regional politics, Pakistan's attempt to gain nuclear power status, and U.S.-Pakistan relations, and offers predictions for Pakistan's domestic and regional prospects.

---

Threat of Extremism & Terrorist Syndicate beyond FATA by - Noah Feldman article on books on relationship between Islam and the West AT THE HEART OF TERROR Islam, Jihadists, and America's War on Terrorism. PAKISTAN'S DRIFT INTO EXTREMISM Allah, the Army, and HRHW - LoveReading Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's - American war against Al-Qaeda, and Taliban in Afghanistan,. Pakistan took Bin Laden and the existence of terrorist camps in Taliban-controlled territory.... 4 Khaled Ahmed, Pakistan the State in Crisis, (Lahore: Vanguard Books Ptv. 2002), p. 30 15 Hassan Abbas, Pakistan's Drift into Extremism Allah, the Army and. (PDF) Strategic Decision Making: Pakistan's Support to the US - Canadian Centre Pakistan's Drift Into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's - Dr. Abbas has been based in Boston, Massachusetts, since early 2001 and "Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and America's War on Terror." The book has been on bestseller lists in India and Pakistan and Archived Content Information archiv e dans le Web - BIBLIOGRAPHY. 1. Abbas, Hassan, Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and. America's War on Terror, (Pentagon Press, Washington, 2005) Chowdhury, Srinjoy, Despatches From Kargil, (Penguin Books India,. New Delhi, 2000). Pakistan's Drift Into Extremism - Google Books - His latest book, Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and America's War on Terror (M.E. Sharpe) has been on bestseller lists in India Pakistan's Drift Into Extremism: Allah, The Army, And - Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror, is authored by Hassan Abbas, a Research Fellow at the Harvard Pakistan's drift into extremism - National Library of Australia - Jump to Skip to main content - Instability in Pakistan's federally administered tribal areas and North-West frontier of its policies and goals in the border region, the book is a substantial contribution to is the author of Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and America's War on Terror (M.E. Sharpe, 2004). Pakistan's Drift into Extremism : Allah, the - Books Kinokuniya - Dr. Abbas has been based in Boston, Massachusetts, since early 2001 and "Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army and America's War on Terror." The book has been on bestseller lists in India and Pakistan and Buy Pakistan's Drift Into Extremism Allah, The Army, And - Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror

## Relevant Books

---

[ [DOWNLOAD](#) ] - The Mill on the Floss (Unabridged Content) (Famous Classic Author's Work) (ANNOTATED)

---

[ [DOWNLOAD](#) ] - Read Frozen Vegetables in Poland: Market Sector Revenues

---

[ [DOWNLOAD](#) ] - Coin Management Equipment in Brazil: Market Sales pdf

---

[ [DOWNLOAD](#) ] - Download book Sack Time: a Romantic Comedy

---

[ [DOWNLOAD](#) ] - Download book Suicide Squad (2016-2019) #43 free epub, pdf online

---