



RESEARCH PAPER

Pak-US Collaboration on Afghanistan and USSR War 1979 to 1988

Muhammad Aslam Faiz¹ Muhammad Akbar Malik² Khalil-ur-Rehman³

1. PhD Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.
3. PhD Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO

ABSTRACT

Received:
January 08, 2019
Accepted:
June 24, 2019
Online:
June 30, 2019

Keywords:
Collaboration,
USA, Pakistan,
Afghanistan,
USSR, strategies,
War, CIA, ISI

**Corresponding
Author:**

aslamfaizir786@
gmail.com

Pakistan has always been very vital because of its geographical location and strategic position. On Christmas Eve, the Soviet Union attacked on Afghanistan in 1979. USSR wanted to conquer Afghanistan. Soviet distinction was Pakistan but USSR dream just remained a dream. Pakistan put this violation to USA and joined the USA block. With cooperation of USA, Pakistan fights against the USSR in the favor of Afghanistan. USA supported with weaponry Morley against the USSR invasion in Afghanistan. Pakistani, Afghan arms and freedom fighter defeated the USSR. With the withdrawal of USSR troops from Afghanistan, Pakistan outlived its utility with United State. This article seeks to analysis the impact of the Pak U.S collaboration on Afghanistan war against the Soviet Union. Also seek for analyze the implication of Pak U.S strategy on the current demission and future relations with each other. It argues that the two countries share the main goal of the Afghanistan Pakistan strategies which is to defeat power full Soviet Union in Afghanistan. However, the study additionally argues the two countries are yet realizing truly strategic partnership as their performance of the country to defend the any threat in the region

Introduction

Just a little more than four weeks later, on Christmas Event 1979, the Soviet Army marched into Afghanistan to outset headstrong Hafiz UllahAmin and install the more pliable Babrak Kamal as the country's president. The Soviet action shook the globe. The carter administrations quest for détente abruptly ended, and the chill of the Cold War returned. The US attitude toward Pakistan, as Thornton put it, "overnight, literally...changed dramatically" (Thronton, 1982, p. 969). When the

president telephoned Zia that day, his tone and message differed drastically from those of the conversation the two had a month before. The United States President, Jimmy Carter told his Pakistani counterpart, reaffirmed the 1959 bilateral security agreement against Communist aggression and offered to bolster Pakistan's security. With Soviet soldiers at the Khyber Pass, the traditional gateway for invasions of South Asia, Pakistan had become a "front line" state.

In Washington, the Carter administration reacted strongly to the Soviet action, which the US president, believed was a major and qualitative change in Russian behavior. The United States embargoed wheat sales, boycotted the Olympic games scheduled to be held in Moscow in the summer of 1980, and withdrew the second strategic arms Limitation treaty from consideration by the Senate. The Bolstering Pakistan's security was an important element of the US response. In a January 4, 1980, speech dealing with Afghanistan, President Carter, stated, "We will provide military equipment, food and other assistance to help Pakistan defend its independence and national security against the seriously increased threat from the north" (Smith, 1980). After the presidents' phone call to Zia, the administration moved to flesh out the offer of support. In the State Department, assistant secretary for the near east and south Asia Harold H. Saunders reviewed possible help in a memorandum sent on New Year's Day 1980 to Secretary of State Vance, proposing a budget request to Congress for \$150 million in aid and credits for Pakistan, consideration of debt relief which Islamabad wanted and a waiver of the legislation barring economic and military aid because of the nuclear program.

Even though Saunders commented that the Pakistanis would find this "an inadequate basis for a closer, a more supportive relationship", the assistant secretary argued for "caution" because of the expected negative Indian reaction to US provision to Pakistan of high performance aircraft, such as the potent F-16 fighter bomber, or tanks "which the Pakistanis want and will try to make our response the litmus test of our resolve" (Saunders, 1980).

A part form concern about the Indians, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Jane Coon and Thornton recalled that budgetary restraints deterred administration planner's form proposing higher level of assistance (Coon, 1995). Well aware of his vastly improved bargaining position, President Zia proved reluctant to agree to vague promises and wanted to know specifically what Washington had in mind. Reflecting bruised feelings about his dealings with the Americans, Zia told journalists, "We have had bitter experiences with US aid in the past" (Auerbach, 1980). Pakistan's president rebuffed an initiative to send Warren Christopher to Islamabad and instead proposed that Shaha, who would be attending the UN General Assembly's special session on Afghanistan, visit Washington. In the UN debate, where the soviets found themselves on the defensive, Pakistan took a leading role in organizing Muslim countries and other members of the NAM.

In the end, the General Assembly condemned the Soviet action by an overwhelming 104-18 vote with 14 abstentions. Apart from the Communist bloc, the only major country not to vote against the Soviets was India. Before the Pakistani diplomat arrived in Washington, US Officials accurately recognized Pakistan's key concern: "Whether the credibility and magnitude of US support is sufficient to offset the real danger of soviet intimidation as well as the potential damage of close association with the US to their nonaligned and Islamic credentials". In discussions with Hummel in Islamabad, Shahi had signaled that his country wanted to strengthen US security guarantees by replacing the 1959 executive agreement with a formal treaty, as well as a substantial economic and military aid program (Arif, 2008, p. 235). The US approach, which was spelled out during Shah's two meetings with Vance and a white House session with President Carter, had four principal points:

1. To make "the costs to the Soviet Union of the Afghan operation high enough so that Soviet leaders will be deterred from thoughts of similar adventures in the future".
2. To maintain in place, the 1959 executive agreement which "pro-north" (Although Vance rejected a treaty, he was willing to seek a congressional vote affirming the 1959 agreement).
3. To offer Pakistan \$400 million of military and economic aid over the coming two years (President Carter, however, specifically turned down providing advanced F-16 aircraft, which the Pakistanis had requested); and

To maintain US concerns about Pakistan's nuclear program even though the administration planned to seek authority from Congress to waive sanctions, (Willingness to resume assistance "should not be construed", Vance's brief declared, "to mean any lessening of the importance the US attaches to nuclear nonproliferation"). (Shahi, 1980)

Only on the first point making the soviets pay as a high a price as possible was there a real meeting of the minds. On the question of security guarantees, Shahi accepted that a vote by congress approving the 1959 agreement would mark a step forward, even if it was not as good as a treaty commitment. But he found the US position inadequate with regard to both assistance and the nuclear question. The fact that details of the US aid offer soon appeared in the press, along with the implication that Pakistan would accept, irritated Zia, who was still making up his mind. During a January 13, 1980, press conference, the Pakistani leader insisted that Washington was going to have to "prove its credibility and durability" as an ally before Pakistan accepted US aid (Auerbach, 1980). The next day, on January 14, 1980, the State Department nonetheless released specifics of the assistance package, emphasizing that \$400 million would be the US, share of a broader international effort to bolster Pakistan's security (Oberdorfer, 1980).

US Cooperation on USSR and Afghan War

Things were not entirely negative, however, despite the lack of agreement on military and economic aid, intelligence cooperation on Afghanistan between the CIA (2 January 1980) and the ISI expanded. Just four days after the Soviet intervention, on December 29, 1979, Jimmy Carter approved a broader covert action program that instructed the CIA to provide a military weapons and ammunition in addition to nonlethal supplies and support for the Afghan anticommunist resistance fighters, who soon became widely known as Mujahedeen, or freedom fighters (Gogan, 1993). Brzezinski discussed the idea of a larger covert effort with Zia when he visited Islamabad in February 1980 and then persuaded the Saudis to match the US contribution to the insurgency dollar for dollar (Rasanayagam, 2006). Although still modest in size compared with the program of the later 1980s, covert assistance for Afghanistan “expanded to include all levels of military support for the Mujahedeen” (Arif, 2008, p. 149). The operational ground rules worked out as this time continued during the Reagan presidency. At Pakistan’s insistence, the CIA funneled all aid through the ISI, which in turn handed over supplies to the Afghans.

In order to strengthen its control over the Mujahedeen, the ISI limited the distribution of arms and other aid to “recognized” resistance groups, most of which were headquartered in the Pakistani city of Peshawar, an hour’s drive from the Khyber Pass and the border with Afghanistan. The Pakistanis further insisted that the CIA not deal directly with the Mujahedeen, but only through the ISI. This, the Pakistanis felt, would further improve their control and also prevent the CIA from establishing a large and quasi-independent presence in Pakistan. In order to maintain “plausible deniability” to make it difficult for the Soviets to show tangible evidence of US involvement the CIA supplied only types of weapons and equipment that were also used by the Soviets or their East European satellite countries, or items, such as World War I vintage Lee Enfield rifles, that were commonly available in Afghanistan. No arms or equipment made in the United States or typically associated with the West were provided to the Mujahedeen (Jain, 1996). When commenting publicly about reports of aid to the resistance, the Pakistanis followed a disciplined approach: they flatly denied that they were providing military supplies to the Afghan fighters or serving as a staging area or a channel for other countries to provide equipment. For example, Shahi declared in a March 5, 1980, speech, “Let it be stated categorically that Pakistan is determined not to allow itself to become a conduit for the flow of arms into Afghanistan (Kux, 1993, p. 253). Pakistan maintained that its help was limited to food and shelter for Afghan refugees but did not deny that it politically supported the resistance. If queried about the source of the Mujahedeen’s arms, Pakistani sources and the insurgents themselves claimed that they captured the weapons from the notoriously feckless Afghan army.

After the start of the Soviet military intervention, Afghan nationalist sentiment and the cry of “Islam in danger” provided fertile ground for armed

resistance. Efforts by the Kabul regime to modernize and secularize Afghan society along Communist lines and to reduce the role of traditional Islam had already sparked substantial opposition, especially in deeply religious and conservative rural areas. By the end of January 1980, an estimated four hundred thousand Afghans had fled to Pakistan, and the number of refugees was rapidly increasing: it would eventually reach three million people. Given the high-level of motivation, the Afghan warrior tradition, and the virtually open frontier between Afghanistan and Pakistan, it was relatively easy to recruit fighters for the resistance from the burgeoning refugee camps located close to the border in the Northwest Frontier Province and Baluchistan (Kux, 1993, p. 253). Nevertheless, in 1980, few Americans or Pakistanis thought that the Afghans would be able to mount an insurgency capable of holding Soviet forces at bay.

US Soviet specialists, in particular, believed the Russians would be able to contain the resistance movement. Officials with direct experience in Afghanistan had a higher opinion of the capability of the resistance, however, and felt that it might make life difficult for the Soviets (Arif, 2008). During 1980, Jimmy Carter's final year in office, the Iran hostage crisis consumed the White House, the State Department, and the American public. The embarrassing failure of a hostage rescue mission in April 1980 strengthened the world's impression of declining US Power. As part of the Carter administration's effort to counter this perception, Washington continued to seek a broader security relationship with Pakistan to buttress covert CIA ISI ties. On October 3, 1980, after Zia attended the UN General Assembly in New York, Carter invited him to the White House. Their meeting began with a review of Zia's unsuccessful efforts, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Conference, to end the Iran Iraq War, which had begun in mid-1980. Discussion then turned to other subjects, including Afghanistan (Oberdorfer, 1980). Having concluded by then that Republican challenger Ronald Reagan would win the upcoming presidential election, the Pakistanis decided that they would not take the initiative in bringing up the question of security assistance. If Carter won, they reasoned that any offer that he had previously made would remain on the table. If Reagan were the victor as the Pakistanis expected any proposal made by Carter would be meaningless. In fact, in preparing for the meeting, Carter, overriding the State Department, had decided to reverse his position on the F-16s and to offer the aircraft to Zia.

As the time allotted for the session was about to run out and as Zia had said nothing about security assistance, Carter brought up the subject. When he informed Zia and Arif (who was present, as was Brzezinski), of his willingness to include the high performance F-16s in an arms aid package. (Thronton, 1982, p. 973) Zia casually replied that the matter could wait, since Carter was undoubtedly extremely busy with the presidential campaign (Arif, 2008). As he walked out of the White House, Pakistan's military dictator could feel great satisfaction. Since Moscow's intervention in Afghanistan, Zia was no longer a near pariah because of his human rights record, his nuclear policies, and the execution of Bhutto. Instead,

Zia found himself courted by the Americans, the west Europeans, and the Arabs, not to speak of Pakistanis Chinese friends, as a bulwark against the Soviet threat. Even though Washington and Islamabad had been unable to work out a mutually satisfactory security and economic package, Zia could look forward to brighter days in dealing with the United States after Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter in the November 1980 presidential elections. (Kux, 1993, pp. 254-255) By late 1982, the United States and Pakistan appeared to have evolved a new and, for the time being, happy partnership. Washington was providing Islamabad with \$600 million a year in military and economic aid only Israel, Egypt, and Turkey received more assistance. In return, the United States was able, with Pakistani cooperation and matching funds from Saudi Arabia, to fuel the growing resistance against the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan.

At the same time, the Reagan administration hoped that closer security links would influence Pakistan's leadership to desist from or at least go slow on the nuclear program. In keeping with the 1981 Shaha Haig discussions, the United States refrained from commenting on Zia's handling of Pakistan's domestic political scene (Rasanayagam, 2006). For Pakistan, the renewal of intimate ties with the Americans provided a major security and economic boost. The surge of foreign aid helped revive a lagging economy and initiated a decade of substantial growth. The Pakistani military acquired large amounts of badly needed equipment. For Zia personally, the Afghan war meant a new lease on life politically, enormously strengthening his previously shaky position. Both Western and Muslim countries applauded the president and his country for standing up to the Soviets and for sheltering three million refugees who had fled Afghanistan for the Northwest Frontier Province and Baluchistan. Yet US-Pakistan ties in the 1980s differed from the alliance of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

During the Afghan war, the Americans and the Pakistanis were partners, not allies. Their relationship was a marriage of convenience. Still, in contrast to the ultimately conflicting motivations of the CENTO-SEATO years, the two countries shared a strong common purpose in opposing the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, the Pakistanis had no illusions that the United States would support them against India, and US concerns about the nuclear issue kept simmering just below the surface. Zia's December 1982 state visit to the United States reflected the refurbished bilateral relationship. The Reagan administration went out of its way to welcome Pakistan's president and to applaud the role he was playing in the Afghan conflict. To counter criticism of harsh handling of the political opposition and the lack of a free press, as Howard Schaffer, then the deputy assistant secretary of state for South Asia, recalled, US officials stressed Zia's willingness to provide a home for several million Afghan refugees despite the considerable burden and real danger this posed (Rasanayagam, 2006). Afghan aircraft periodically bombed areas near the border where the Mujahedeen were active. Terrorist bombs exploded frequently in Peshawar and other places where Afghan refugee camps were located in the Northwest frontier province and Baluchistan.

On December 6, Zia met with secretary of state George Shultz, who had succeeded Haig in mid-1982. Shultz's briefing paper commended that he warns Pakistan's president that "the nuclear weapons program could seriously undermine US Pakistan relations" and that he also mentions the US interest in improved human rights in Pakistan (State Department, 1982).

How far the secretary of state followed the brief is unclear, since the report of his one on one meeting with Zia remains classified. After US and Pakistani advisers joined the discussion, the secretary expressed the hope that the United States and Pakistan would build a bilateral relationship that "grows over time and is strong enough to survive disagreements and problems which inevitable occur". Replying more realistically if less diplomatically, Zia said that the two countries were a "union of unequal's" and "incompatible" in terms of culture, geography and national power, even though they had strong common interests. When Shultz raised US concerns about increased production and trafficking of narcotics in Pakistan, Zia was quick to request help in dealing with the drug problem (State Department, 1982). At the white house on December 7, Zia and Reagan met alone for twenty minutes in the Oval office before joining their senior advisers in the cabinet room for another hour of talks. In their private session, Reagan raised US concerns about the Pakistani nuclear program (Memorandum of Conversation, 1982). Later in the day, a White House spokesperson declared, "We accept that the president of Pakistan is telling us the truth" in assuring Reagan that the nuclear program is strictly "for peaceful purposes". (Stevens, 1982) The discussion in the cabinet room focused mainly on Soviet prospects and intentions in Afghanistan and on the recent meetings that Zia, Shultz, and vice president George bush had with the new soviet leaders, Yuri Andropov, at the funerals of Leonid Brezhnev.

When US attorney general William French smith brought up the increase in narcotics trafficking, Zia responded, "Pakistan is determined to solve this problem". Among other topics covered were the Middle East, Iran, and china. When the conversation turned to India, Zia said that he was "downing his best" to improve relations but, given close Indo Soviet ties it would be "impossible to pull India too far from the soviet network" (Memorandum of Conversation, 1982). Skilled at public relations, an ever smiling and amiable Zia handled himself adroitly on Capitol Hill and with the press during his stay. Although Afghanistan was the main focus of questions, Pakistan's president kept his cool in the face of often hostile queries regarding Pakistan's nuclear program and its human rights record. Meeting with members of the Senate foreign relations committee, he repeated "very emphatically", according to Senator Charles Mathias, that Pakistan was not seeking as nuclear weapon. Zia further assured the senators that he was moving toward a more democratic system but gave no timetable. At the National Press club, Pakistan's president stoutly defended his failure to hold elections, before departing for the United States he had once more put them off (Calibrone, 1982). He also rebutted criticism of his human rights record. "We have a constitutional government. It is a civilized government. We are not a bunch of

clown", Zia briskly told journalists (Weinraub, 1982). Shultz's sojourn in Pakistan was far happier than the last visit there by a secretary of state had been: Henry Kissinger's unsuccessful 1976 effort to convince Bhutto to drop the nuclear program. Shultz praised his hosts for providing a home for three million refugees, expressed US willingness to continue a large Afghan aid program, and in a lower key, voiced continuing American worries about the nuclear program.

In turn, the Pakistanis vowed to maintain the struggle to free Afghanistan, thanked the United States for its help, and reiterated that they were not seeking a nuclear weapon (Telegram from USDEL, 1983). Assistant Secretary of State Veliotis described the Pakistan stop as a "love in". In cables to the White House about the visit, Shultz lauded Zia as "a capable and impressive leader" and described Yaqub as "one of the most impressive and articulate foreign ministers now in office." In what would become a ritual for senior US visitors, Shultz traveled to Peshawar to meet with refugees? "Fellow fighters for freedom, we are with you", the secretary of state told a cheering crowd of Afghans, (Taubman, 1983) "George Shultz, who is really a quite emotional persons despite his stone face, got carried away when he visited the Afghan tribe's near Peshawar. I thought he was going to grab a gun and run of into Afghanistan" Valuates commented about the World War II Marine veteran. A few months later, in the fallow of 1983, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger followed in Shultz's footsteps, conferring with Zia and then traveling to Peshawar to hail the refugees. Weinberger told a group of applauding afghan trials, "I want you to know that you are not alone. You will have our support until you regain the freedom that is rightfully, yours" (Halloran, 1983).

The defense secretary lauded Pakistan as a key US ally in opposing the presumed Soviet push toward the Arabian Sea. "Pakistan has a strong military, and we're trying to strengthen it all the more", Weinberger stated. In line with the Reagan administration's hands off approach regarding Pakistan's domestic political scene, Weinberger dodged press questions about Zia's repr5ession of large scale antigovernment unrest in the province of Sind (Hiatt, 1983). In May 1984, Vice President George Bush joined the procession of top level US visitors to Pakistan. "Your visit", his state Department brief read, "will both symbolize and further solidify the strong relationship with Pakistan we have successfully developed over the past three years, a major administration objective and accomplishment". Cheering Afghan tribe's greeted Bush near Peshawar along what the Washington post called a "well-worn VIP path.... Through the harsh hills to the Khyber Pass for a peek across the border into soviet controlled Afghanistan". The vice president responded by praising the Afghans and "their indomitable spirit of freedom" which, he declared, has "earned the admiration of free men everywhere" (Arif, 1984). As Americans, especially members of congress, trooped through Islamabad and Peshawar, they regarded the Pakistanis as good people but their heroes were the Afghans who were holding the vaunted Red army to a draw with little more than basic infantry weapons. The "freedom fighters"

awed the visitors with their grit and determination. Rather like the British in 1940, their message was "Give us the guns and we will do the job".

A CIA station chief recalled that he never heard the tribe's, despite heavy casualties and severe suffering; describe their situation as "hopeless". By mid-1984, it had become evident that a standoff was developing in Afghanistan. According to Valuates, "We began to see a Vietnam pattern starting to establish itself. The Russians would take an area, and then the Mujahedeen would move back in as soon as they left.... Optimism gradually grew as we saw the staying power of the Afghans and saw signs of Russian losses" (Jain, 2006). The CIA chief of station grew increasingly confident that the Soviets could not succeed in Afghanistan. He reached this conclusion not because of the human and material losses the Soviet Military was sustaining, but because "the Afghans were bloodthirsty and cruel fighters who simply refused to give up" (Jain, 2006). The Geneva Accords were signed on 14 April 1988. It's cleared the way for the withdrawal of Soviet forces but failed to end the war or create an environment which would have facilitated the repatriation of nearly five million Afghan refugees in Pakistan, Iran and elsewhere.

Conclusion

In this article our focus was to study how two countries Pakistan and United State collaboration with each other and help the Afghanistan to defeat the super power Soviet Union in Afghanistan. In 1979 USSR Sudden Military attack in the Afghanistan and shook the world. This was the not good step to attack the neighbor country. In the General Assembly condemned the soviet action by an overwhelming 104-18 vote with 14 abstentions. Apart from the Communist bloc, the only major country not to vote against the Soviets was India. United State to offer Pakistan \$400 million of military and economic aid over the coming two years (President Carter, however specifically turned down providing advanced F-16 aircraft, which the Pakistanis had requested. Only on the first point making the soviets pay as a high a price as possible was there a real meeting of the minds. December 29, 1979, Jimmy Carter approved a broader covert action program that instructed the CIA to provide a military weapons and ammunition in addition to nonlethal supplies and support for the Afghan anticommunist resistance fighters, who soon became widely known as Mujahedeen, or freedom fighters. The Pakistanis further insisted that the CIA not deal directly with the Mujahedeen, but only through the ISI. Reagan administration hoped that closer security links would influence Pakistan's leadership to desist from or at least go slow on the nuclear program. In keeping desisting form or at least go slow on the nuclear program. During the Afghan war, the Americans and the Pakistanis were partners, not allies. Their relationship was a marriage of convenience. Still, in contrast to the ultimately conflicting motivations of the CENTO SEATO years, the two countries shared a strong common purpose in opposing the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, the Pakistanis had no illusions that the United States would support them against India, and US concerns about the nuclear issue kept simmering just below the surface. Zia's December 1982 state visit to the United States reflected the

refurbished bilateral relationship. Terrorist bombs exploded frequently in Peshawar and other places where afghan refugee camps were located in the Northwest frontier province and Baluchistan. White House spokesperson declared, "We accept that the president of Pakistan is telling us the truth" in assuring Reagan that the nuclear program is strictly "for peaceful purposes and impossible to pull India too far from the Soviet network. In turn, the Pakistanis vowed to maintain the struggle to free Afghanistan, thanked the United States for its help, and reiterated that they were not seeking a nuclear weapon. The "freedom fighters" awed the visitors with their grit and determination. Rather like the British in 1940, their message was "Give us the guns and we will do the job. The Russians would take an area, and then the Mujahedeen would move back in as soon as they left. Optimism gradually grew as we saw the staying power of the Afghans and saw signs of Russian losses. The Geneva Accords were signed on 14 April 1988. It's cleared the way for the withdrawal of Soviet forces and to end the war.

References

- Arif, K. (2008). *Working with Zia*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- Auerbach, S. (1980). *Pakistan is Reluctant to Accept Limited U.S. Arms Pledge*. Washington Post, January 6.
- Auerbach, S. (1980). *Pakistan Ties Arms Aid to Economic Assistance*. Washington Post, January 14.
- Babar, N. (1998). U.S Support Pakistan. (K.M.Arif, Interviewer)
- Bernard Weinraub, "Zia Sees no quick solution to soviet Role in Afghanistan", *New York Times*, December 9,1982.
- Burt, R. (1980). US aid to Pakistan after evidence of aton arms plan and Pakistan is offered a choice on a arm. *New York Time*, 15.
- Coon, J. (1995, september 15). United State and Pakistan 1947 -2006. (J. Rashami, Interviewer)
- Embassy Islamabad Telegram to White House, May 17, 1984, Quoted in K. M. Arif, *Working with Zia*.
- Gogan, C. G. (1993). partners in times; The CIA and Afghanistan since 1979. *World policy journal*, vol 10 no. 2, 173.
- Halloran, R. (1983). Weinberger Meets Zia and Afghan Refugees.*New York Times*, October 2.
- Harrison, D. C. (1995). *Out of Afghistan*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Herbert, S. W. (1981). *The islamic bomb*. New YORK: Times books.
- Hiatt, F. (1983). Weinberger, in Pakistan, Calls Riots Internal Problem.*Washington Post*, October 1.
- jain, R. (1996, Janvary 10). The United State snd Pakistan 1947 -2006. (S. U. Officer, Interviewer)
- Jain, R. (2006). Interview with Veliotes, *The United State and Pakistan: 1947-2006: A Documentary Study*.
- Kux, D. (1993). *India and united States; Estranged Democracies,1941-91*. Washington D.C;: National defence university press.

- Memorandum of Conversation between Presidents Reagan and Zia and Aides, Washing, D.C.: December 7,1982.
- Memorandum of Conversation between Presidents Reagan and Zia and Aidec, December 7,1982.
- Oberdorfer, D. (1980). *Pakistan Offered \$400 Million Aid*. Washington Post, January 15.
- Oberdorfer, D. (1980). *U.S. Urged to Keep out of Iran Iraq War*.Washington Post, October 4.
- Pakistan, S. (1982). *The Evelution of an Influence Relationship*. New York: Praeger Publisher.
- Rasanayagam, A. (2004). *Gates, From the Shadows, 148*, Quoted in Angelo Rasanayagam, *Afghanistan: A Modern Study*.
- Saunders, H. (1980). *Memorandum form Assistant Secretary*. Secretary of State Gyrus Vance, NSC Discussion of Support for Pakistan.
- Shahi, A. (1980, january 12). State deperment Talking point for secretary . (U. s. vance's, Interviewer)
- Shahi, F. M. (1966, 1 26). *pakistan U.S relations nature*. (M. Arif, Interviewer)
- Smith, T. (1980). *Carter Embargoes Technology for Soviets and Curtails Fishing and Grain*. New York Times, January 5.
- State Department Briefing Memorandum and Talking Notes for Secretary Shultz's Meeting with Zia ulHaq, December 6, 1982.
- State Department memorandum of conversation between President Zia and Secretary Shultz, December 6,1982.
- Taubman, P. (1983). *Afghan Refugees Hear Shultz Vow "We Are with You"*, New York Times, July 4.
- Telegram from USDEL (U.S. delegation) secretary in Islamabad to State Department, July 4,1983.
- Thronton, T. (1982). *Between the stools U.S policy towards Pakistan During the carter Administration*. New York: asian survey.
- welport. (2010). *zulfqarali.lahore: karwan*.
- William Calibrone, "Zia Says U.S. Pakistan Ties Based on Strategic Concerns, " Washington Post, December 3,1982.

William K. Stevens, Zia Sees Pakistan as the Front Line, *New York Times*, December 8, 1982.

Wolpert, S. (1993). *Zulfi Bhutto of Pakistan (his life and times)*. New YORK: Oxford university press.