MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITY

Cultural Intelligence for Military Operations

Product Number: MCIA-2420-PAK-001-12 November 2011

Pakistan Cultural Intelligence Studies

Pakistan Military Culture

Executive Summary

The Pakistan military is ambivalent toward the United States yet largely dependent on U.S. military aid. The Pakistan military distrusts civilians, and throughout Pakistan's history, the military has repeatedly sought to control the civilian government. Currently, a worsening security and economic situation is taxing the military's resources. However, the military is a hierarchical organization that remains internally stable and professional.

Introduction

The Pakistan military is a complex organization that has significant influence on Pakistan's economy, politics, and society. The military was formed in 1947, when the partition of British India created the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Pakistan's military is composed of three branches: army, navy, and air force. The army is by far the largest and most powerful branch, and the head of the army, the chief of army staff (COAS), is typically the most powerful man in the country,[1] particularly during times of martial law but also during civilian rule.[2]

Pakistan's military has a diverse role in society that extends beyond that of many military organizations in other countries.[3] Its primary mission is to defend the country, which entails border defense activities and threat reduction measures, both internal and external. The Pakistan military believes that the country's primary threat comes from neighboring India, against which it has fought four wars (in 1947, 1965, 1971, and 1999). Ongoing skirmishes over Kashmir and the Siachen Glacier are a constant concern. Internal threats are also a concern for the military; it has put down uprisings in all four provinces and in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and is battling religious extremists groups throughout the country.[4] The military is particularly concerned with the *Tehrik-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan* (Student Movement of Pakistan, commonly known as the Pakistan Taliban, or TTP).

In addition to its standard defense role, Pakistan's military also plays a significant political role. The military has fostered its role in politics and governance because it believes that it is a more efficient, better organized, and less corrupt institution than the civilian political class, which the military considers largely inept.[5] Pakistan's military has directly ruled the country for more than 31 of Pakistan's 64 years of independence. All

military coups have been bloodless, led by the COAS, and generally welcomed by the population.[6] However, the longer the military's rule extends, the less popular it becomes.[7] Because of this, the military repeatedly cedes power voluntarily as its declining popularity threatens its position in the country. This dynamic has created a cycle of civil-military rule in which the military perceives civilian rule as threatening to stability or inviting civil unrest, steps in to gain control, and is then forced, because of declining public support, to hand power back to the civilians, who rule until the military returns to power. However, the military never fully cedes power in areas it determines crucial to its mission, such as foreign affairs and nuclear polices.[8]

The military has a major role in Pakistan's economy, officially to provide resources and welfare to retired soldiers and officers. The military is frequently in charge of construction and transportation projects in the country, and the government has even called in the military to manage the country's utility and electricity companies. The military also has its own business conglomerations that give it a source of income independent from the state. These commercial ventures are the largest businesses in Pakistan.[9] Retired officers run most military businesses, which do not publically disclose the full scale of their activities, leading to accusations of corruption and nepotism. These business ventures, combined with the estimated 20- to 40-percent share of the government's yearly budget for defense spending and millions in yearly foreign military aid, make the military one of the largest economic players in the country.[10]

The military also sees itself as the defender of Pakistan's ideology, which is built around Pakistan's role as a home for South Asia's Muslim population and the constant threat it feels from India.[11] Pakistan's ideology has been important in defining the purpose of the state (because of its short history) and differentiating Pakistan from India despite the many cultural and historical traits the two countries share. Pakistan believes that India has never accepted Pakistan's status as an independent state and that India will exploit any opportunity to challenge Pakistan's existence.

In 1940, Mohammad Ali Jinnah and the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) asked British India for an independent state for South Asia's Muslims because they believed that Muslims would not have equality and opportunity in a Hindu-dominated India. Britain's partition of India created an independent Pakistan composed of the Muslim majority areas of contemporary Pakistan and Bangladesh. Initially after partition, the fact that millions of Muslims remained in India conflicted with Pakistan's vision of itself as a home to South Asian Muslims; the 1971 civil war and creation of an independent Bangladesh also challenged this vision. The military became the primary defender of Pakistan's ideology when it came to political power in 1958. In the 1970s, Gen Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq (1977-88) changed this ideology to focus on Pakistan as an Islamic state rather than a home for Muslims.[12] His military regime undertook campaigns to impose Islamic principles on state institutions, including the military, and eliminate what he considered un-Islamic influences.

Pakistan is struggling to recreate an ideology that promotes its purpose as a country. The military believes that it is the only force in the country able to protect Pakistan's unity and integrity. Segments of the population share this belief and often place more trust in the military than in civilian leaders to direct the country's image and vision.[13] However, this claim remains controversial in Pakistan because it provides the army with a much-expanded potential role in the country's economy, politics, and society.[14]

Views of the military, held by both the public and scholars, are widely divergent. Some consider the military an efficient, professional organization that has had to expand its role in the country because of the ineffectiveness of civilian institutions. Others consider the military a predatory organization that has sought to expand its influence and wealth at the expense of the rest of society. The Pakistan military has made itself an institution separate from wider society. Entrance into the military is difficult and competitive. The military offers excellent pay and benefits, particularly for officers, which encourages enlistment and loyalty to the institution. Members of the military are better educated and better paid than other members of society. They

see themselves as living above the corruption that characterizes most of society.[15] Although at times the wider society shares this view, segments of the broader population often resent the military's dominant role in the economy and politics. This was particularly the case near the end of Gen Pervez Musharraf's rule.[16]

Challenges to Culture

Insecurity and Extremism

The Pakistan military is facing a failing state bureaucracy, a marked increase in violence and insecurity across the country, rising radicalization among the population, a weak economy, and internal challenges to national identity.[17] Some of these issues date back decades, while others have only recently become dominant.[18] Some of the violence stems from the upsurge in extremist activities, but it also originates from more systemic problems such as ethnic and criminal violence in Karachi, ethnic and sectarian violence in the Punjab, and the nationalist conflict in Balochistan. The military is at the forefront of combating these challenges, and the concurrence of these many issues is taxing the military's resources and stamina. Violence and political and economic insecurity, which have increased in nearly every region of the country, are particularly troubling to the military. Blockades and check posts have become common in major cities where residents previously moved freely, which has been difficult for some residents to accept.[19]

Because of the state's failure to build an inclusive Pakistani identity, the military will likely face ethnic and nationalistic issues in the future. Ethnic-based violence occurs in all provinces. Sindhi nationalism is strong in Sindh Province, particularly in rural areas, and conflict between the *mohajir* (migrants from India) community and Sindhi and Pashtun residents has been ongoing in Karachi since the 1990s. Baloch and Pashtun nationalism are strong forces in the western provinces of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan and have led to repeated insurgencies. Banned sectarian outfits in southern Punjab are increasingly involved with violence.[20] A loose network of groups, such as the *Laskhar-i-Jhangvi* (LeJ) and *Sipah-i-Sahaba Pakistan* (SSP), which previously focused on sectarian and Kashmir issues, have coalesced into a network known as the Punjabi Taliban. The government believes that the Punjabi Taliban is involved in bombings and attacks in Punjab.[21] This ethnic and sectarian insecurity will likely continue because the government has made few efforts to solve the larger issues of identity and inclusion in Pakistan.[22]

The drug trade also contributes to instability in Pakistan. Drug addiction and trafficking have increased greatly throughout the country, and some analysts and scholars report that the military has a hand in these activities. The government has arrested and charged high-ranking senior officers with drug smuggling and trafficking. Because the drug trade represents a source of power in the country, the military likely wants to control it.[23] The Anti-Narcotics Force, which the government reformed in 1995, has made some recent strides combating the drug trade.[24]

All these factors have contributed to the general lack of security and stability in the country. Although this insecurity has strained the military, critics argue that the military has used this insecurity to extend its reach in society by arguing that stricter military control over society is necessary to combat these threats.[25]

Pakistan's Self Image

Pakistan is remaking its self image, which it has built around the threat from India and Pakistan's role as a home for South Asia's Muslim population. This vision has been challenged for decades, particularly following the 1971 war and the creation of an independent Bangladesh. In recent decades, additional factors have further challenged Pakistan's conceptualization of its role, purpose, and identity.[26] Pakistan's internal

religious divisions and the escalation of religious-based violence have damaged its self image as a Muslim state. Extremist groups have a strict interpretation of what it means to be a Muslim or an Islamic state and are fighting to remake Pakistan in this image. It is unclear whether these groups, the military, or other elements of society will have the greatest influence on the future of Pakistan's identity and relationship with Islam.[27] However, the Pakistan military, as the most influential force in Pakistan society, is likely to have a large say in what kind of country Pakistan becomes.[28]

Additionally, Pakistan's relationship with India has changed markedly during the past decade. The military has built so much of its purpose and identity around the threat from India that it is difficult for the military to redefine its threats or to re-imagine its relationship with India. In particular, the fact that both nations now possess nuclear weapons has changed the foundation of the relationship between the two countries. However, neither country's military has fully assessed what the possession of nuclear weapons means for the two countries' relationship. Neither country has made substantial changes to its conventional forces or defensive strategies. India's emergence as a leading economic power has also challenged Pakistan. Because of the Pakistan military's large economic footprint, the changing economic relationship between the countries might alter the Pakistan military's perceptions of its interests. Pakistan and India do not have an economic relationship, yet it is questionable whether Pakistan's economy can thrive without interacting with the largest regional economy.[29] Pakistan's economy is contracting, and poverty is rampant;[30] further economic decline could significantly affect the military. However, the military continues to believe that economic contact with India will not be beneficial.[31]

Youth and Technology

Pakistan's population is young; 63 percent of the population is under the age of 25.[32] Technology and education have exposed the younger generations to the world more than any previous generation in Pakistan. This exposure might bring new perspectives and ideas to the military. Younger officers commonly have cell phones and Internet access.[33] These factors, combined with the growth of free media in the country,[34] might challenge the military's ability to formulate and control its image in Pakistan.[35] In the past few years, more than 80 new television channels, numerous independent radio stations, and Internet availability have begun to transform the social and political landscape of Pakistan, giving voice to a wider range of opinions and providing the general population much greater access to information. Some radicals have already used these avenues of communication to challenge the military and government.[36]

Organizational Values

Loyalty, Bravery, Honor

As is the case in many countries' military establishments, the Pakistan military values loyalty, bravery, and honor.[37] These values enable soldiers and officers to remain a unified and mission-driven force in the face of difficult circumstances. The Pakistan military also highly values unity. The military consciously works to keep divisions and factions out of the military, and there is a general belief that the military must stick together to overcome both internal and external threats.[38] The values of honor and loyalty create a sense of camaraderie in the military. They contribute to the notion that no man is left behind, and soldiers and officers will put themselves at great risk to save their fellow fighters. Examples of these values were demonstrated during recent fighting in FATA.[39]

Respect for Authority

Like most military establishments, the Pakistan military is hierarchical.[40] The COAS holds ultimate authority in the army.[41] The nine corps commanders and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) director also hold considerable authority. The army respects rank, and dissent is rare.[42] Relations between senior and junior officers and between officers and enlisted soldiers are hierarchically structured and paternalistic. The top-down nature of the military is evident in Pakistan's military coups. The COAS, with the support of the corps commanders, has led each successful coup. Lower-ranking, dissident officers in the army and air force have attempted to assassinate the military leadership without success.[43] Coup attempts by low-ranking officers, such as the Rawalpindi Conspiracy in 1951 and coup attempts in 1984 and 1995, have failed because Military Intelligence has discovered the attempt or the coup could not muster enough support.[44]

Respect for authority restricts criticism and dissent in the military.[45] Although some internal discussions occur, the military does not accept public criticism. For example, following the 1971 war, then-President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto aired footage on public television of the military's surrender to Indian and Bangladeshi forces. Although the military was demoralized and removed from public politics after the 1971 war, this event helped galvanize the military against Bhutto in retaliation for his attack on the military's public image.[46] Additionally, although freedom of the press has increased in Pakistan, public criticism of the military in the media is frowned upon and is not common. However, following the U.S. operation that killed Usama bin Ladin, the media frequently ran reports critical of the military and openly questioned the military's role in Pakistani society.[47]

Professionalism

The Pakistan military sees itself as a disciplined, well-ordered, and professional force.[48] It considers itself an institution separate from broader Pakistani society,[49] where nepotism and patronage are the norm. The military conducts most of its promotions and entrance exams on a merit basis without the influence of personal and family connections. The military often describes itself as a meritocratic institution that rewards hard work and skill.[50] The military has created a separate ethos that demands loyalty and honesty of its members. In exchange, the military rewards members with good pay, social services, education, and welfare after retirement.[51] Because of these factors and the military's professional image, it is one of the most appealing professions in Pakistan, particularly among the middle and lower classes.[52]

The military strives to protect its image as a professional force. It does not tolerate political intrusion into its operations or promotions. The military believes that if politicians are able to influence promotions, the military could easily become a tool for bickering political groups.[53] The military has also worked hard to rebuild its professional image after extended periods of military rule have damaged it. The military regimes of Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan, Zia ul-Haq, and Pervez Musharraf sullied the military's professional image, and, in each case, the military removed itself from politics to rebuild its image.[54] Despite its desire to be a professional institution, the military still struggles with internal corruption and politics, particularly at the higher ranks.

Nationalism

The Pakistan military has a strong sense of nationalism. Soldiers and officers feel a strong obligation to the country and idea of Pakistan.[55] The military has long held an informal status among the people as the guardian of the nation,[56] and many believe that without a strong military, Pakistan would disintegrate.[57] The intense nationalism in the military contributes to a suspicion of outside forces and influences. Many military members believe that Pakistan faces existential challenges, and they often do not trust outsiders' intentions.[58]

Recent Challenges to Organizational Values

Recently, there have been signs of increasing divisions in the military; internal divisions have created issues during military operations in FATA. Low-ranking military members have supported attacks on military leaders and officers of the ISI, Pakistan's premier intelligence agency, raising questions about the unity and cohesion of the military forces.[59] In recent years, there have been attacks on senior military officers and military establishments. The military believes these attacks required inside support and knowledge.[60] In 2003, 2004, and 2007, there were multiple assassination attempts on Gen Musharraf, and in 2009, there was a large-scale attack on the army's general headquarters in Rawalpindi, the seat of the military with a large and usually unshakeable security infrastructure. On 22 May 2011, six militants invaded the Mehran Naval Base in Karachi, killing 10 servicemen and destroying millions of dollars' worth of property and equipment before officers stopped the raid after a 15-hour operation.[61] Following the attack, media reports claimed that the militant attack was a reprisal carried out by a branch of al Qa'ida in retaliation for the navy's arrest of 10 servicemen suspected of having links to al Qa'ida.[62] The military confirmed that it had arrested suspected militants in its ranks but denied the link to the attack. Although this infiltration troubles the military, most military members believe that although there are a few subversive elements in the ranks, overall the military retains strict unity and chain of command.[63]

Further questions about military unity have been raised in the wake of the United States' Operation NEPTUNE SPEAR, which killed Usama bin Ladin in Abbottabad, Pakistan, on 2 May 2011. The operation embarrassed Pakistan's military leadership, whom the United States did not inform about the operation. The military was also embarrassed that it did not detect or stop the U.S. helicopters that flew into Pakistan for the operation. Mid- and low-ranking officers openly criticized the military's leadership and questioned the organization's capability. Some observers compare the Pakistan military's morale in the wake of Operation NEPTUNE SPEAR with the period following the 1971 war, when the military was demoralized and internal pressures forced the resignation of then-COAS Yahya Khan. Most observers do not believe that this discontent will force Gen Ashfaq Parvez Kayani to leave the position of COAS.[64] However, in the wake of the crisis he has met frequently with his corps commanders to maintain unity and has traveled the country, speaking with servicemen to reassure them that the Pakistan military remains viable, independent, and effective.[65]

Identities and Loyalties

Military

A Pakistani officer's status is typically the most important facet of his identity. Officers share a strong sense of unity and kinship. Their membership in the military establishment affects nearly every aspect of their lives; the welfare system that comes with being an officer encompasses even their family life and retirement. Officers and their families have many more resources available to them than the general population; they often live in quarters separate from the rest of the population, their children attend schools run by the military, and they have access to well-equipped military hospitals.[66] The military invests in training and resources to ensure that new recruits see themselves as belonging to a military family that is separate and distinct from broader society.[67]

Regiment and Service

Unit and regiment loyalty are strong in the army.[68] Family-like regiments, where officers and soldiers begin their military careers, are the foundation of the army.[69] Members of these regiments know their regiment's

history, often dating to the British colonial period, and take great pride in their unit.[70] If an officer has family ties to a particular regiment, he often tries to serve in that regiment.[71] For many officers, commanding the regiment in which they began their military career is the greatest honor. Regiments are important for building social networks in the army, and members of a regiment have strong bonds throughout their careers.[72]

Like the regiment, another important source of identity and loyalty in the military is the service branch. Officers in artillery, armor, and infantry have common bonds. Inter-service rivalries are common, and some officers jokingly deride those in other services.[73] Some services are more prestigious than others; the armored services are considered the most prestigious, and the Baloch Regiment (infantry) carries the second-highest prestige. Military members do not see other services, such as signals, as fighting services, and members of these other services can face difficulty being promoted to the highest ranks.[74]

Loyalties are also strong among those who have served together. Social and personal ties develop between officers who have served together in United Nations peacekeeping missions abroad, trained in the United States, or fought in the current insurgency in FATA or Swat.[75] The relationships that military members develop over the course of serving together are important for further developing social networks in the military.

The divide between the army, navy, and air force is also important for military identity. Each branch has its own procedures, customs, and cultures and has separate operations, training, and welfare arms. Social stratification is apparent between services; those who serve in the army have far greater access to resources and benefits than those serving in the navy and air force.[76] Additionally, the army dominates institutions, such as the ISI, that are supposed to represent all three armed forces but which navy and air force officers have never led.[77]

Ethnicity and Language

Although individual soldiers and officers might strongly identify with their ethnic, geographic, linguistic, or family ties, these are not significant factors of identity in the military.[78] The military has worked hard to keep social, religious, and ethnic ties from being divisive among its members.[79] Units are often composed of soldiers and officers from different ethnic groups and provinces. All officers must speak Urdu and English, the languages of the military and the official languages of Pakistan. It is uncommon to hear officers speaking in their native tongue.[80] Other bonds, such as serving together and regimental ties, supersede ethnic and other social ties in the military. Additionally, ethnic and family connections do not necessarily influence promotions and placement.[81] However, these connections can be more influential at senior ranks.[82] Ayub Khan, Zia ul-Haq, and Pervez Musharraf were all accused of favoring officers from their own ethnic groups.[83]

Despite the overarching common bond of military identity, Pakistani society is diverse and the military reflects this diversity. The military does not keep official statistics on the ethnic, religious, or social makeup of its members. The military bases its recruitment statistics on the provinces from which its soldiers and officers were recruited. Although this can offer some insight into ethnicity, as the four provinces roughly correspond to the four main ethnic groups (Sindhi in Sind, Baloch in Balochistan, Punjabi in Punjab, and Pashtun in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), it can also be misleading because many Pakistanis have migrated to different provinces, and minority groups who do not have a "home" province are not distinguished. Despite efforts to build a representative military, strong ethnic traditions remain, which has led to Pashtun and Punjabis being overrepresented compared with other ethnic groups.[84]

Punjabis are the largest ethnic group in the military, making up an estimated 60 percent.[85] Punjabis are diverse; there are substantial differences between Punjabi groups in northwestern, central, and southern Punjab. Punjabis have also settled in Pakistan's other provinces in large numbers. Punjabis speak different languages including Punjabi, Saraiki, and Hindko.[86] Traditionally, the Punjabis in the army came from the

northern districts of Jhelum, Rawalpindi, and Attock, often called the Salt Ranges or the Potwar (Potohar) Plateau.[87] In recent decades, recruitment has spread out over the Punjab, moving from northern to central areas and from rural to urban areas.[88]

Pashtun make up approximately 20 percent of the military. Like the Punjabis, Pashtun are diverse. Tribal traditions are strong among the Pashtun; there are five main tribal groupings and more than 350 sub-tribes. The Pashtun in the military are predominantly from the Dera Ghazi Khan and Dera Ismail Khan districts in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, which border the districts of heavy recruitment in the Punjab.[89] Most Pashtun speak Pashto and are proud of their strong linguistic and cultural traditions.[90]

Mohajirs (migrants from India) are another significant group in the Pakistan military. It is difficult to estimate the number of *mohajirs* in the military because *mohajirs* do not have a "home" province in official statistics. Many *mohajirs* live in Sindh and Punjab provinces. Because of their roots in colonial India, many *mohajirs* were better educated than their Pakistani counterparts, particularly immediately following partition. Although most generals are Punjabi, the higher ranks of the military have an overrepresentation of *mohajirs*.[91] During Musharraf's tenure as COAS, three to four corps commanders (out of nine) were *mohajirs*.[92] Some observers point to Musharraf's decision to promote Gen Kayani, a Punjabi, to the position of COAS as an effort to dispel the notion that he favored his own ethnic group, *mohajirs*.[93]

The Pakistan military does not have a representative percentage of Baloch and Sindhis.[94] The central government has largely excluded the Baloch, in part because of their isolated location and in part because of their resistance to the central state. They are virtually unrepresented in the military.[95] This has led some Baloch, particularly those active in the ongoing insurgency in Balochistan Province, to claim that the military is an arm of Punjabi and *mohajir* domination.

Sindhi recruitment to the military remains low.[96] In 1980, the military founded the Sindh Regiment, which it intended to be a force comprising primarily Sindhis. Although Punjabis and Pashtun initially dominated the Sindh Regiment, the military reports that the regiment is now 50-percent local recruits from Sindh. However, Sindhi representation in the broader military is still low. Some observers believe this is due to the historical precedent from the British, who believed that Sindhis were not a "martial race" like the Pashtun and Punjabis.[97] Others believe that the contemporary power struggles between Sindhis and the larger and more powerful Pashtun and Punjabi communities contribute to low Sindhi recruitment in the military.[98]

The Pakistan military has begun many initiatives to widen and diversify recruitment. The military has focused many of its recruitment efforts on attracting Baloch and Sindhis.[99] It has lowered the recruitment standards for these groups, creating a quasi-quota system. Some evidence suggests these measures have been successful; the military recently stood up a parade of 4,000 Baloch soldiers. However, it is unclear whether the recruits are actually Baloch or whether they are Punjabis and Pashtun who live in Balochistan Province and therefore fulfill the Balochistan quota.[100]

Religion

Pakistani society is religious and conservative.[101] In recent years, religion has come to play a greater role in public life. Many factors influenced this greater role, including a worldwide rise in religiosity, an increase in poverty in Pakistan, general insecurity, religion's role as a mechanism to cope with a fast-paced changing society,[102] and the government's and military's active promotion of religion as a common bond shared across the country's diverse population.[103] Today, the Pakistan military is more representative of the overall population than it has been in previous eras. As the military has become more middle class, it has become more religiously conservative.[104]

Some observers believe that Gen Zia's policies encouraged religion's greater role in the military. Gen Zia was a religious man who made religion a more central issue in recruitment and promotions and increased the role of *maulvis*, or chaplains, in regiments.[105] After Gen Zia died, the government reversed many of these measures.[106] Although the military instituted these changes in part to combat the fear of growing extremism, the real fear in the army was that religion would create a divisive element among the soldiers and officers. Islam is a diverse religion, and the military's members are representative of this diversity.[107] Sectarian violence began to increase in 2005 and heightened these fears; the military did not want tensions to spread between its Sunni and Shi'a members or members from different religious movements (such as Barelvis and Deobandis).[108]

Some critics equate rising religiosity with rising extremism. Although the military has become more religious, it has not promoted a strict theocracy.[109] The military also has measures to keep those it considers extremists out of the top ranks. It controls the promotion process[110] and has a strong intelligence arm that monitors these concerns. Under Gen Musharraf, the military denied promotions to many religious officers regarded as overzealous.[111]

Organizing Principles

Doctrine/Strategy

Pakistan's hostile regional environment, inability to achieve parity with India, and resource restraints have shaped its military doctrine.[112] These issues have resulted in the formulation of a strategic doctrine that focuses on deterrence and finding unconventional means of challenging India.

From the time of partition, Pakistan's military doctrine has focused on the concept of offensive defense, the idea being that if India attacked East Pakistan (contemporary Bangladesh), West Pakistan would not directly combat the attack but would instead launch a counter attack against India from the west.[113] An attack from the west would force India to either to abandon its operations in the east or fight on both borders, which would deter India from attacking East Pakistan. As East Pakistan was separated from West Pakistan by nearly 1,200 miles, it was difficult, if not impossible, for the Pakistani state to defend East Pakistan with the limited resources of a young state and the vast distance between the two wings.

The 1971 war showed the flaws in this doctrine; Pakistan had not accounted for an internal uprising in East Pakistan.[114] However, the Pakistan military continues to employ a version of the offensive defense doctrine. Today, the Pakistan military positions itself to launch a counterattack against India that would minimally confront a direct Indian attack while focusing substantial forces on taking Indian territory, which it could later exchange for any Pakistani land held by Indian forces.[115] In 2004, India developed a new strategy called the Cold Start Strategy, which aims at swift offensive operations to penetrate, isolate, and destroy Pakistan's vital defenses, such as its nuclear facilities.[116] Pakistan has not publically released a new strategy to counter the Cold Start doctrine, which makes the offensive defense doctrine obsolete.

Since the 1980s, Pakistan's military has focused on the idea of meeting the threat from India at three levels: conventional, unconventional, and nuclear.[117] In addition, the military is formulating a new doctrine that accounts for the threat it faces from insurgent and terrorist groups.[118] Although the threat from India remains paramount, COAS Kayani has said that the internal threat from insurgents was a more pressing, "immediate threat."[119]

Conventional

The Pakistan military believes that it needs a strong, well-trained, and quick-to-mobilize force.[120] Although it does not believe that it can achieve conventional parity with India, the military believes that it needs a large enough conventional force to serve as a deterrent and hold back any Indian advancements.[121] Pakistan positions the bulk of its conventional forces along the border facing India; the military stations six corps in the Punjab.[122] The Pakistan military has sought to balance its conventional deficiencies with support from allies, mainly China and the United States. The military has also supported diversifying Pakistan's allies and increasing its internal military capacities to reduce the military's reliance on a limited number of sources of outside aid.[123] The military has also come to depend on unconventional and nuclear options to balance its conventional limitations.

Unconventional

The use of unconventional forces has been part of Pakistan's strategy since the early years after it gained independence. The military has used tribal and militant groups in Kashmir since 1947. These groups have played a greater role in Pakistan's strategy since the 1980s. Religiously motivated groups proliferated in the 1980s, and Pakistan, the United States, and Saudi Arabia supported these groups against the Soviets in Afghanistan. When the Soviets withdrew, Pakistan's military and the ISI encouraged these groups to focus their energy on Kashmir. Pakistan was motivated to do this in part because it considered these groups successful in Afghanistan and believed they could repeat this success in Kashmir. Pakistan's nuclear capabilities also encouraged the military's support of militant groups in Kashmir; the military believed that a full reprisal from India was unlikely because India would not risk a nuclear confrontation.[124] For many years, Pakistan has been using these groups to fight what amounts to a proxy war against Indian forces in Kashmir.[125] Pakistan is not willing to risk a conventional war in Kashmir, which has the highest troop-to-civilian ratio in the world. Pakistan would face a steep conventional challenge and risk damaging its international credibility in an open confrontation with India.

Extreme religious convictions drive most of the unconventional militant groups that Pakistan has supported. They are inspired to fight a religious war against the Hindu occupiers in Kashmir. Among these groups are the *Lashkar-e-Taiba* and *Jaish-e-Mohammad*. However, since the al Qa'ida attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001, Pakistan's relationship with these groups has become more complex. Because of its decision to join the Global War on Terror, the Pakistan military has fought religious extremist groups that it formerly supported or that are connected to other groups that the military continues to support. It is unlikely that Pakistan will abandon support for the groups operating in Kashmir without an alternative option to challenge India in Kashmir. However, according to Indian sources, cross-border movement of Kashmiri militants has decreased.[126]

Nuclear

Pakistan began to pursue nuclear weapons as a defensive strategy in the 1950s, although Ayub Khan was reluctant to acquire such weapons.[127] Zulfikar Bhutto accelerated Pakistan's nuclear program in 1974-75, following India's detonation of a nuclear device,[128] and Pakistan began enriching uranium in 1976.[129] Although Pakistan's nuclear doctrine is not public,[130] most signs indicate that Pakistan possesses nuclear weapons to deter Indian attacks.[131] However, Pakistan has not signed a no-first-use agreement, in part because it believes that doing so would limit the deterrent role of the weapons. The military is proud of its nuclear program and strongly believes that Pakistan is entitled to nuclear weapons and that the nuclear program can neutralize India's conventional capacity.[132]

Pakistan developed its nuclear program internally with assistance from France and China.[133] Pakistani officials repeatedly denied the program publically. However, Indian nuclear tests on 11 and 13 May 1998 prompted Pakistan to respond with its own nuclear tests. Pakistan detonated two bombs on 28 May 1998 in the Chagai Desert of Balochistan.[134]

Pakistan has three nuclear research and development establishments: Khan Research Labs at Kahutta (recently renamed Kahutta Research Laboratories), Chagai Hills in Balochistan, and the Pakistan Ordnance Factory at Wah, Punjab. It has two power reactors in Kanupp, Karachi, and in Chashma, Punjab. Pakistan's military has a tight command and control system over the nuclear weapons.[135] Experts estimate that Pakistan has more than 200 warheads, which are predominantly missile delivered.[136] Reportedly, Pakistan is developing a plutonium bomb and delivery methods that would give it the long-range capability to strike industrial and defense centers in India.[137] In August 2007, Pakistan tested an air-launch cruise missile (called *Ra'ad*, or "thunder," in Arabic) that could carry nuclear weapons 220 miles.[138] Nuclear weapons are stored at facilities separate from their delivery methods. The government separates the weapons and delivery systems to ensure that the weapons cannot be used haphazardly.[139]

Despite the precautionary measures the Pakistan government has taken to protect its nuclear weapons, many international observers raise concerns regarding the security of the weapons. This concern, in part, springs from the discovery in 2003 that Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan (known as AQ Khan), considered the father of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, had helped Libya, North Korea, and Iran develop their nuclear programs. There remains controversy regarding whether Dr. AQ Khan acted alone or with the support of senior military and intelligence officials. From the perspective of the international community, if he acted alone, concerns about the security of Pakistan's nuclear capabilities and the military's ability to control them become pressing. However, if he had support from senior leaders, concerns about Pakistan's nuclear strategy and approach become pressing.[140]

Counter-insurgency and Counterterrorism

Since 2001, Pakistan's military has faced a growing internal threat from extremist militant groups in Pakistan. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have brought a variety of extremist groups into the country and have motivated recruitment to these groups. Suicide attacks have increased markedly in the country; Pakistan experienced 15 suicide attacks between 2002 and 2005 compared with 200 suicide attacks between 2006 and 2009.[141] These attacks occur throughout the country, including in Pakistan's major cities.

To counter the growing threat of extremist groups in the western regions, the Pakistan military has undertaken operations in FATA and Swat, where many militants are based and have support centers. The operations in 2003-04 and 2006 were particularly divisive for the military and broader Pakistani society. Some soldiers, particularly those in the paramilitary Frontier Corps, found it difficult to participate in the attacks and open fire on fellow Pakistanis. There was an upsurge of anti-government sentiment both in the conflict zones and in wider society. The military pursued tactics that resulted in numerous casualties.[142] The military relied on excessive force and large-scale, multi-unit forces instead of smaller, more flexible units. There was an underuse of local force capacity and knowledge.[143] Additionally, FATA is traditionally autonomous from the central state, increasing local resentment toward the Pakistan military's actions.[144] In particular, the Mehsud tribe in FATA believed the government was unjustly targeting it in operations. DNA found at a significant number of later suicide bombings implicated Mehsud tribesmen as the perpetrators of the attacks.[145]

The 2009 operations in FATA and Swat were more successful.[146] In these operations, the military shifted from clearing operations to population-centric security measures. However, there is debate as to whether the military has changed its strategy from a conventional, low-intensity conflict approach to a counter-insur-

gency approach.[147] Gen Kayani has made an effort to reform the military's doctrine to face the threats from insurgent and terrorist groups more effectively. The military has developed training materials and exercises to address these types of threats.[148] The military has rotated its troops in and out of FATA and Swat so that a maximum number of soldiers and officers will gain experience in irregular warfare.[149] The military is also working to develop a lasting police and law enforcement presence to hold areas following military operations. However, the military continues to see India as its most significant threat and is unwilling to dedicate its force completely to the internal threat it believes will soon be over and risk exposing itself on its eastern border.[150] It faces many problems reforming its fighting methods and strategy. Delays in operations have allowed militants to regroup, requiring additional military offensives.[151]

Personnel

Recruitment

The Pakistan military sees itself as an inclusive and representative organization and is proud of the all-volunteer nature of its force.[152] Factors that motivate Pakistanis to join the military include military traditions in families, the relatively high salaries and services that military members receive, and the influential role the military plays in the country.[153] Entrance into the military is competitive, and recruitment boards turn away thousands of applicants each year. To enter the army, officer candidates must pass education, fitness, and social benchmarks. The examination process is rigorous and includes oral and written tests, medical tests, and a 3-day exam and interview by the Inter-Services Selection Board.[154]

The Pakistan military has become more representative of Pakistani society.[155] Military recruits are increasingly from urban and more diverse regions of the country. The military has made efforts to increase recruitment of traditionally underrepresented groups, such as Baloch and Sindhis.[156] However, it is difficult for the Pakistan military to be truly representative of broader Pakistani society because of the military's high standards for enlistment. Pakistan has low social indicators, and nearly half of the population is illiterate. Literacy rates are even lower in rural areas of Sindh and in Balochistan. However, the military only accepts recruits with a minimum of 12 years of education.[157] Recruitment is also difficult in remote and rural areas because applicants have to travel long distances to military recruiting locations. Recruitment generally increases in areas with cantonments or other military outposts that provide access to applicants.[158]

Officer/Enlisted Relations

As in many militaries, there is a hierarchical and paternalistic relationship between officers and enlisted soldiers in the Pakistan military.[159] Wide social differences reinforce the divisions between officers and enlisted soldiers; those divisions are similar to the broader divisions between classes in Pakistani society and have roots in Pakistan's imperial and feudal society. However, the military has also promoted social advancement with the sons of non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and soldiers moving into the officer ranks. Gen Kayani is the first COAS who is the son of an enlisted soldier.[160] Officers must have a high level of education and receive advanced training, both of which divide them from the less-educated enlisted soldiers.[161] Although enlisted soldiers are better off than most of society, they do not receive the same level of comprehensive benefits as officers.[162] In addition, some observers believe officers treat enlisted soldiers poorly, viewing them as their personal servants. For example, the military assigns enlisted soldiers to serve as officers' domestic servants, known as "batmen" (derived from the French word *bat*, meaning "pack saddle"). They must handle officers' domestic affairs, such as cleaning and cooking. This had led to some resentment among the enlisted, particularly when officers have tried to acquire multiple batmen for their

personal service. The military has recently recruited batmen from civilian agencies instead of assigning these roles to enlisted soldiers.[163]

Promotion

The military has an organized and centralized promotion process. It firmly resists any attempt by the civilian authorities to interfere in its promotion process and believes that such interference would be disastrous for the professional integrity of the military.[164] Review boards at the general headquarters handle promotions through the rank of major general. The military largely bases these promotions on merit.[165] This formalized system also promotes continuity among military officers. The military generally does not promote officers that it believes will not accord well with its principles and beliefs, such as highly ideological officers.[166] Beyond the rank of major general, promotions become more personalized, and the COAS determines advancements and placements.[167] At higher levels, personal and family connections play a larger role.[168] Additionally, military members are critical of the recent term extensions for Gen Kayani and the director general of the ISI, Gen Pasha, believing they run counter to the idea of professionalism in the army.[169]

Physical Organization

Army

The army is the largest and most powerful branch of the Pakistan military. It has the largest fighting force, most equipment, and biggest budget in the military, and its role in the political and economic life of the country is unparalleled. The army has approximately 484,000 serving members[170] and a reserve force of more than 300,000. The COAS heads the army, and six main officers assist him: the chief of general staff, the adjutant general, the quartermaster general, the master general of ordnance,[171] the director general of military intelligence, and the director general of military operations.[172] Additionally, the COAS works closely with the nine corps commanders.[173]

The Pakistan Army can be divided either into functional categories or into corps, divisions, and brigades. The army has two broad functional categories: the fighting arms and the support services. The fighting arms include the infantry, armored units, artillery, and aviation. Today, the army has 66 infantry brigades, 15 armored brigades, 30 artillery brigades, 8 air defense brigades, and 17 aviation squadrons.[174] The support services are signals, administrative personnel, medical staff, ordnance, electrical and mechanical engineers, education, military police, remount units, and veterinary units. The army has nine corps, each of which has two or more divisions, which in turn are composed of three or more brigades. Brigades are composed of regiments, the basic unit of the army. A lieutenant general typically leads a corps, a major general typically commands a division, and a brigadier commands a brigade. During wartime, an infantry division, which is the Pakistan Army's major ground force fighting unit, typically consists of major infantry, artillery, engineers, signals, communication, supply, and other support services required for sustained action.[175]

The army general headquarters is in Rawalpindi in Punjab Province. Each of the nine corps has a geographic region under its influence. The nine corps are: 1 Corps at Mangla (Azad Kashmir), 2 Corps at Multan (Punjab), 4 Corps at Lahore (Punjab), 10 Corps at Rawalpindi (Punjab), 11 Corps at Peshawar (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), 5 Corps at Karachi (Sindh), 12 Corps at Quetta (Balochistan), 30 Corps at Gujranwala (Punjab), and 31 Corps at Bahawalpur (Punjab).[176]

The Special Services Group (SSG) is a Special Forces unit that has become a crucial component of the army's structure. In 1953, the army raised a battalion of Special Forces in the Baloch Regiment. In 1965,

this battalion officially became the SSG, and in 2003, the military raised it to the divisional level. Its 2,000 members are divided into companies specializing in desert, mountain, and maritime warfare; intelligence gathering; and detonation and sabotage. The SSG is an elite force that has a strict training regiment based on specialty. The SSG's bases are in Cherat in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Attock Fort in Punjab. SSG members wear distinct maroon berets.[177]

Navy

The Pakistan Navy has approximately 22,000 serving members, including 1,200 active duty Marines. The navy's duties include defending the coast, protecting offshore resources, maintaining the freedom of shipping lanes, supporting diplomacy, aiding civil authorities, and maintaining strategic deterrence. Pakistan bases its naval requirements on its perception of India's naval polices.[178] Like the other branches of the military, the navy is concerned with deterring Indian aggression, particularly by disrupting Indian trade and obstructing amphibious operations rather than through direct battle.[179] Pakistan relies heavily on a defensive mix of submarines, medium- and light-guided missile ships, and mine warfare ships.[180] The navy actively seeks modernization strategies. However, the navy's equipment is expensive, and the navy does not receive the resources required to develop as it desires.[181]

The chief of naval staff (CNS) heads the navy, and three principal officers, who are in charge of operations, personnel, and materials, assist the CNS. There are four area commanders: commander Pakistan fleet, commander Karachi, commander logistics, and commander north navy. The Pakistan Navy is in charge of defending Pakistan's 850-kilometer (528-mile) coastline. It has only a limited number of ports at Karachi (Sindh), Omara (Balochistan), and Pasni (Balochistan). Karachi and Omara have large naval bases. The government is developing an additional port in Gwadar (Balochistan). Additionally, the Pakistan Navy has developed a naval dockyard, 14 berths, a dry dock, and two repair docks.[182]

Air Force

The Pakistan Air Force has a serving strength of 45,000. The air force has played important support roles for the military during operations against India and in the western provinces. Because of the technical expertise and skill level needed to operate and maintain the aircraft, the air force has extensive training regimens. The chief of air staff leads the air force. The air force has five main divisions, each headed by a principal staff officer: operations, engineers, administration, training, and personnel. Three regional air commands have functional control of the region's bases and units. In addition, a command operation center monitors all air defense matters during peacetime and controls all activity during wartime.[183]

Intelligence Organizations

Pakistan's military has branch-level intelligence organizations and the ISI.[184] The army's intelligence branch, Military Intelligence, handles primarily internal army intelligence matters. It monitors the service for subversive activities and other internal threats to the organization.

The government formed the ISI in 1948 to promote greater inter-service cooperation. The ISI is the most powerful intelligence organization in the country. Although it reports to the prime minister, for all practical purposes the COAS controls the ISI. The ISI has an estimated 10,000 to 25,000 members.[185] It grew in prominence and importance in the 1980s and 1990s, when the military tasked it with managing and directing the militant groups used in missions in Afghanistan and Kashmir. Since the early 1980s, ISI members have trained, supplied, and supported various militant groups.[186] Some ISI members had a difficult time

turning against these groups in 2001, when Musharraf changed Pakistan's policy toward many of these groups and designated them as enemies. Because of concerns about the personal relationships between ISI members and these groups, Musharraf dismissed nearly 80 percent of ISI members whom the military suspected of adhering to extremist views. The ISI is divided into eight branches that have different areas of operations. In 2008, Gen Kayani reportedly dismantled the Joint Intelligence Bureau, which had been responsible for political intelligence.[187]

Although often reported to be an autonomous organization, the ISI firmly reports to the military. A serving military officer has always headed the ISI, and large portions of its cadre are serving military members.[188] The military's choice of the ISI head reflects the direction the military would like the ISI to take.[189] The current head, Gen Ahmad Shuja Pasha, is a close ally of Gen Kayani. The ISI has significant influence on Pakistani society. Its district-level representatives across the country are influential because the population fears them.[190] The ISI also manages many aspects of the military's domestic agenda, and segments of the population have accused the ISI of supporting political parties and groups that the military favors.[191] Both military and civilian regimes have used the ISI for political purposes.[192]

The ISI has come under fire for its alleged role in numerous "disappearances" reported across the country, particularly in Balochistan. Baloch nationalists claim that the ISI has unlawfully taken as many as 3,000 Baloch. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan has verified approximately 80 cases. In 2007, the Supreme Court took up the issue, and the chief justice summoned high-ranking ISI leaders to testify. This led to Gen Musharraf's contentious decision to dismiss the chief justice. Disappearances remain a controversial issue.[193]

Paramilitary Organizations

The military also has a strong relationship with and authority over the various paramilitary groups in Pakistan, which represent a combined force of approximately 247,000. The principal paramilitary organizations include the National Guard, Frontier Corps and Frontier Constabulary, the Pakistan Rangers, the Maritime Security Agency, and a small coast guard.[194]

Frontier Corps and Constabulary

The Frontier Corps and Constabulary number around 85,000[195] and play a large role in the current operations in the western provinces. The government officially tasks the Frontier Corps with border control and counter-smuggling operations.[196] However, the corps has taken a frontline fighting role in the current counter-insurgency operations. There are two Frontier Corps commands: Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, headquartered in Peshawar, and Balochistan, headquartered in Quetta. A major general in the Pakistan Army heads each branch.[197] All Frontier Corps officers are regular army officers who serve a 2- to 3-year rotation in the corps.[198] Wings, which are formations roughly the size of battalions, are the operational units of the Frontier Corps.[199] The Frontier Corps recruits the rest of the forces locally to maintain a greater connection with the local population and knowledge of the local terrain and languages.[200] However, in practice, the force recruits mostly from two districts in FATA, and locals often view its members as outsiders, particularly in Balochistan.[201] The Frontier Constabulary serves primarily as a police force in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, but since 2002, the government has been merging it into the Frontier Corps.[202]

Officially, the Frontier Corps operates separately from the military and reports to the Interior Ministry. However, military officers directly staff all Frontier Corps leadership positions, giving the military a strong influence over the organization. The Pakistan government has historically under-resourced and neglected

the organization. This has changed recently because of the organization's frontline posture. Some believe that the military might eventually incorporate the organization into its official structure, as was done with the Northern Light Infantry following the Kargil crisis in 1999.[203] Previously, regular army officers did not consider the Frontier Corps career enhancing, but since its role in the fighting operations has increased, serving in the Frontier Corps has become desirable for army officers.[204] Morale in the Frontier Corps is often low because soldiers earn much less and receive fewer benefits than their military counterparts do.[205] However, the Pakistan military is working to provide better training, equipment, and pay to the Frontier Corps.[206]

Pakistan Rangers

The Pakistan Rangers number around 25,000 in Sindh and 20,000 in Punjab.[207] They are the first responders in crises where the police have proven ineffective.[208] They can be deployed anywhere in the country and have played a large role in limiting and combating ethnic conflicts in Karachi.[209] The military looks on them more as a police force than as a military organization.[210]

Maritime Security Agency and Coast Guard

The navy operates the coast guard and the Maritime Security Agency, which have about 2,000 members.

Police

The Pakistan military also has influence over the country's police forces, which the provincial governments control. Serving and retired military members sometimes serve on police forces. For example, the government recently stood up a police force in Swat to hold the area after the military cleared militants from the district. This force was composed of retired military members. In addition, the military has recently taken a greater interest in police training, believing that an effective police force is instrumental to military counterinsurgency and counterterrorism strategies.[211] Although the government has enacted some police reforms, the provincial governments have rejected most of the reforms, arguing that they curtailed their control of the police. The Pakistan population has traditionally viewed its police force as corrupt and abusive.[212]

Ministry of Defense

Multiple civilian institutions and organizations are intended to direct the Pakistan military and facilitate civil-military discourse. These bodies also give the impression of civil control and influence over military affairs. Among these bodies is the Defense Committee of the Cabinet (DCC), which approves all defense policies. The Defense Council translates the policies approved by the DCC into military policies and provides the DCC recommendations regarding the role, size, and shape of the military. The Ministry of Defense is composed of a Defense Division, Defense Production Division, Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee (JCSC), and the headquarters of the three military branches.[213] The Defense Division formulates policy, and the Defense Production Division provides the services weapons, arms, and equipment through either production or procurement.[214] The prime minster also has defense responsibilities and allocates defense resources, establishes new defense institutions, and coordinates defense policy with domestic and foreign policies.[215] The prime minster has often simultaneously held the position of defense minister,[216] although increasingly the defense ministers are retired army generals.[217]

Technically, the JCSC is the top-level defense institution in Pakistan, and the chairman of the JCSC, currently Gen Shamim Wynne, has authority over the COAS.[218] The JCSC is responsible for preparing joint strategic and integrated logistics plans; providing for the strategic direction of the military; periodically

reviewing the role, size, and shape of the three services; advising the government on strategic communications and industrial mobilization plans; and formulating and reviewing defense plans. The JCSC consists of a chairman, three service chiefs, and the minister of defense. Chairmanships rotate between the services, and under the chairman is a director general joint staff (DGJS) who is invariably a senior army general. Three director generals who look after plans, logistics, and training assist the DGJS. The army holds the planning post, the air force holds the logistics post, and the navy holds the training post.[219]

In 2004, Gen Musharraf created the National Security Council, which the government later abolished and replaced with the National Command Authority.[220] This body gives the military a permanent role in decision making and governance.[221]

Although these bodies provide a formalized structure to civil-military relations, on a practical level they have little authority. Real power and decision-making capabilities lie with the military itself, particularly the army.[222] Civilian bodies have shown little desire or ability to dictate defense spending or polices. Additionally, retired army officers currently staff many positions in the Ministry of Defense, increasing the army's influence over the ministry.[223]

Training

Training is an important means for the Pakistan military to develop and transmit its values and beliefs to its new soldiers and officers.[224] The Pakistan military has a well-developed and diversified training system. Contemporary training programs have their roots in the Ayub Khan era.[225] Ayub Khan focused heavily on training and the development of procedures, which he considered lacking after partition. The military developed much of its training program after Pakistan gained independence because Pakistanis inherited few training institutions from the British Indian Army.[226]

Each military branch has its own training schools, programs, and protocols. Each service runs a military academy that produces junior officers and staff colleges that train senior officers. The Pakistan Military Academy (PMA) is the army's military academy. It is in Kakul, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and was established in 1948.[227] The PMA trains officers in both academic and military subjects.[228] Of roughly 4,000 applicants, the army selects 350 for every session and begins two sessions a year. In addition, recruitment boards select 200 applicants to attend the Junior Cadet Academy, which leads to eventual entrance into the PMA.[229] The military assigns PMA graduates to serving posts based on class rank and serving preference. The army sends selected majors to the Army Command and Staff College in Quetta. The Staff College was established in 1905[230] and was one of the primary British Indian Army training institutions that Pakistan acquired after partition. The Staff College teaches courses in tactics, administration, staff duties, and command functions and trains officers for the brigade- and division-level ranks.[231] The Staff College has a reputation for producing competent, yet conventional, officers.[232]

Because of the high technical and skill levels needed, the air force has a long training process. Air force officers begin their career in a 2-year flight program at the Pakistan Air Force College in Sargodha, Punjab. Of 1,500 applicants, only 300 are accepted. The air force considers this training preliminary, and the most advanced officers will attend the Pakistan Air Force College at Risalpur, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, immediately following their training in Sargodha. The program at Risalpur lasts for 5½ years. This training is rigorous, and nearly 65 percent do not complete the course and opt to enter other duties and branches of the air force. After officers successfully complete training in Risalpur, the air force posts some officers to Mianwali, Punjab, for advanced tactical training on FT-5s to become fighter pilots. Out of 100 candidates, only 15-20 students successfully complete the training.[233]

Naval training begins at the Pakistan Naval Academy (PNA), which was founded in 1970 and is in Manora, Sindh.[234] After officers finish training at the PNA, the navy appoints them to midshipmen and sends them to sea for 6 months of hands-on training. They then continue training at different centers for the naval branches. After a total of 4 to 4½ years of training, officers assume independent responsibilities.[235]

The military also has joint training centers. There is a Joint Staff College in Rawalpindi, Punjab. The National Defense University (NDU), founded in 1971,[236] is the premier institution for training high-level military officers and high-ranking civilian officials. The NDU offers two courses: a national defense course, which offers training in forming and implementing policy, and a war course, which offers training in military strategy.[237] Most participants in the defense course are at the rank of brigadier, and participants in the war course are typically colonels.[238] Recently, the university has combined the war and national security courses into one 48-week course that accepts students at lieutenant colonel rank or higher.[239] Attending the NDU is necessary for further advancement in the military.[240]

Soldiers and officers attend training throughout their career, and specialization largely determines their training path.[241] Although the institutions described above carry out substantial training, other important training is conducted at the regiment or brigade level.[242] Additionally, the military sends some individuals abroad for more advanced and specialized training and to build relationships with foreign militaries. Recently, the military has increased the number of scholarships available to officers to study abroad in the United States and Australia.[243] However, the army is unwilling to allow foreign trainers to train regular Pakistan soldiers and officers in Pakistan, expect for a limited number of SSG officers.[244]

Economic Role

Pakistan's military has a large economic footprint in the country. Its economic activities extend beyond meeting the welfare needs of its serving and retired members and into moneymaking business ventures.[245] The effect of the military's economic role in Pakistan is debatable. Some people believe that the military uses its influence to increase the personal wealth of its members at the expense of the rest of society.[246] The benefits and services given to servicemen have fostered a culture of entitlement among some officers, particularly in the younger generations. However, the long-term effects of the military's economic role are still unfolding. Some argue that the military is preferred over the more corrupt and inefficient civilians, while others do not believe that the military runs businesses more efficiently than civilians.[247] Others argue that the military's economic investments give it a stake in the national economy that could encourage economic growth.[248]

The military's largest business interests are its welfare foundations, which it uses to provide economic support and employment for retired personnel.[249] Each branch has its own foundations run by senior officers.[250] The two largest business groups run by the army are the Fauji Foundation and the Army Welfare Trust. These groups are the largest business conglomerates in the country.[251] The air force runs the Shaheen Foundation, and the navy runs the Bahria Foundation. Little public information is available regarding these institutions.

The military's economic enterprises include activities in manufacturing, services, and agriculture.[252] The military also plays an influential role in the banking, insurance, transportation, agriculture, arms production and sales, and real estate sectors of the economy.[253] The military is the largest landowner in Pakistan.[254] It owns cantonment land in every province, and local residents have accused the military of seizing private land to give to individual officers. Retired military personnel, primarily senior officers, run many of the military's business operations.[255] The hope of obtaining these positions after retirement has increased competition for advancement among junior officers.

Procurement and Production

The Pakistan military has a well-structured procurement and production plan; the army focuses on high-tech products in mobility, armor, and local air defense, areas that are consistent with its doctrine.[256] However, it routinely has to accept what foreign donors offer rather than follow its procurement plans. Following partition, the Pakistan military faced extreme shortages in equipment and had virtually no production facilities.[257] In the early years after partition, Pakistan developed limited production capabilities but focused primarily on procurement. The United States was its main military equipment supplier. However, the 1965 and 1971 wars solidified the military's belief that it could not rely on external equipment because during both wars international arms and equipment sales to Pakistan ceased. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto developed a Defense Production Division of the Ministry of Defense, intended to achieve self-reliance in defense production, accelerate technological development, maximize industrial potential in production and procurement of defense stores, and attain economies of scale.[258] Since the 1970s, Pakistan has aimed to be self reliant in terms of defense procurement and production.[259]

Pakistan's defense production industry is concentrated in Punjab Province[260] and has grown to a workforce of more than 50,000. The Pakistan Ordnance Factories Complex, which employs more than 30,000 people, is made up of the largest defense factories in Pakistan. The defense production industry is primarily based in Wah (Punjab) but also has factories in other areas of the country. It manufactures weapons such as the G-3 rifle and MG-IA3 machine gun as well as ammunition, mortars, missiles, bombs, and explosives. Other production institutions are the Heavy Industries Taxila, which builds tanks; the Pakistan Aeronautical Complex at Kamra (Punjab); and the Aircraft Manufacturing Factory. Pakistan's defense production industry also includes a number of research and development institutions.[261]

Because of its concern about over-reliance on foreign suppliers, the military often engages in import substitution, in which products are produced domestically instead of imported. This can be inefficient and can greatly increase the cost of many products. Additionally, because many of the retired military personnel running these businesses are not trained in economics or business, these facilities are not as economically effective as they could be.[262]

Despite the development of the Pakistan defense industry, the Pakistan military still relies on procurement from abroad. The Defense Production Division procures products for all three services.[263] The largest suppliers of military equipment to Pakistan are the United States and China. The Pakistan military considers China, its largest defense supplier,[264] to be a much more stable partner than the United States, which cut sales to Pakistan in 1965, 1990, and 1998.[265] Pakistan has multiple joint development projects with the Chinese, including tank and aircraft production projects. The Chinese are able and willing to sell more equipment and arms at lower costs and without many restrictions.[266] Pakistan often looks to China for large quantities of products, but still seeks U.S. products for quality.[267] It also looks to new countries to expand and diversify its procurement; for example, it recently purchased tanks from Ukraine.[268]

Peacekeeping

Pakistan's military has a sizeable presence abroad, serving in both United Nations peacekeeping missions and in foreign militaries. In 2005, Pakistan had 10,063 troops serving in the UN peacekeeping operations, 9,359 troops and 89 military observers serving in foreign countries, and 453 police officers serving abroad.[269] The Pakistan military has sent soldiers to serve in UN peacekeeping missions in the Congo, Indonesia, Kuwait, Somalia, Cambodia, Bosnia, and Slovenia.[270] The military, both as an organization and on an individual level, receives significant financial compensation for these missions.[271] Pakistan's military has an active presence in more than 22 countries. In the 1970s, its presence in the Middle East increased as

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto attempted to strengthen Pakistan's ties to the Middle East. Libya gave Pakistan US$200 million in arms in exchange for allowing Pakistani pilots to serve in the Libya Air Force. Pakistani pilots also have a significant presence in the Kenya, Zimbabwe, and Somalia air forces. Saudi Arabia is the largest recipient of Pakistan military forces serving abroad. In 1986, an entire Pakistani infantry unit, or 23,000 soldiers, was stationed in Saudi Arabia.[272]

Many officers and soldiers in Pakistan want to serve abroad. Serving abroad often comes with substantially higher pay and benefits.[273] Returning servicemen can often buy new houses and cars.[274]

Decision Making

Decision making in the military is hierarchical and centralized.[275] Within all branches, the service chiefs have the most authority. However, consensus building between the COAS and the corps commanders is important in the Pakistan military. Although the COAS has final authority, he relies on support from his corps commanders to effectively rule and govern the army. Some corps commanders, such as the corps commanders of Multan and Mangla, have more authority than other corps commanders.[276] Additionally, the corps commander at Rawalpindi has substantial influence because of his proximity to the general headquarters and important nuclear facilities.[277] Dynamics between the COAS and corps commanders change based on individual personalities and the time served in the position. The longer a COAS is in power, the more likely he is to appoint loyal men to corps commander positions, thereby limiting debate.[278] However, the longer the COAS is in power, the more likely it is that the corps commanders he appoints will be younger and not have strong personal and service-related connections to the chief.[279] The longer a COAS serves, particularly as head of state, the more likely he is to overreach his personal authority. This often causes resentment in the military, particularly when the public's opinion of the army declines.[280] The corps commanders' support for the chief may decline, forcing him to leave the post, which occurred during the Ayub Khan and Musharraf eras.

Considerations for Interaction

Unfavorable Opinions of U.S. Policies

Although the United States is one of the Pakistan military's main foreign suppliers and supporters, there is a lot of hostility toward the United States within the military. This stems from the two countries' historically rocky relationship. Although most Pakistanis are welcoming to U.S. citizens on a personal level, they are not receptive to U.S. policies or what they see as self-serving U.S. interests in the region. Many do not trust the United States to fulfill its promises or continue its relationship with Pakistan if U.S. interests change. The military's values of unity and loyalty contribute to its unhappiness with and resentment of the U.S. support to Pakistan's largest enemy, India. Pakistan's general distrust of the United States has translated into distrust of U.S. military trainers and training programs. If the U.S. government appears to be running a program, the program loses credibility and effectiveness with the Pakistan military.

The Pakistan military believes that its allies, particularly the United States, have repeatedly abandoned it. Many military personnel believe that the United States supports Pakistan only when convenient. Pakistanis point to U.S. actions during the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965 and the cessation of U.S. aid in 1990 as key examples of U.S. abandonment. Most significantly, Pakistanis believe that the United States deserted them during the 1971 war. During the war, many Pakistanis believed that the United States was sending its Seventh Fleet to the region to support Pakistan. The fleet never materialized, and today Pakistanis use the story of the missing Seventh Fleet as a metaphor to describe people who make promises they do not intend to fulfill.[281]

These feelings have led to general animosity against U.S. policies in Pakistan and the region. Many Pakistanis are suspicious of U.S. motivations; some believe that the United States was behind the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks and that the United States has used these attacks to justify its incursion and domination of Muslim countries.[282] Most Pakistanis feel contempt with broader U.S. policies in the Muslim world, particularly toward Palestine and Iraq. They do not support the U.S. war in Afghanistan, believing that it is not in the interest of Pakistan and has made Pakistan less secure.

The Pakistan military does not fully support U.S. efforts because it does not believe that these efforts correspond to Pakistan's interests. The military also believes that the United States will leave Pakistan to deal with the fallout from its actions once U.S. objectives have been met and the United States can leave the region. Some Pakistanis consider the more than US$400 million the United States provides to Pakistan's military every year[283] as further damaging Pakistan's civil, political, and social institutions that receive, in comparison, only limited foreign aid. In the military, a generation of leaders now emerging into top positions has had little contact with the United States during their careers because the United States halted training programs following the cessation of U.S. aid in 1990 and did not resume these programs until after 2001. Previously, many Pakistani officers came to the United States for training; this interaction encouraged cooperation.[284]

The U.S. operation that killed Usama bin Ladin has increased anti-U.S. sentiments in the military. Many officers and soldiers are embarrassed that the United States did not forewarn Pakistan of the operation and believe this demonstrates a lack of trust and respect on behalf of the United States toward Pakistan. They believe that Gen Kayani is too close to the United States and are openly critical of the United States' drone attacks and use of Pakistan's roads, bases, and docks to support U.S. operations in Afghanistan. Although in the wake of the crisis Gen Kayani has continued his relationship with the United States, there are signs his support for U.S. operations is fading.[285] With military morale very low, Gen Kayani may attempt to bolster internal support by taking a tougher stand with the United States.[286]

Belief in the United States' unreliability has encouraged the Pakistan military to turn elsewhere for aid and support, primarily to China. The military sees China as its steady ally who has a shared foe in India.[287]

Lack of Dissent

Pakistan's military has a pronounced hierarchy and top-down authority structures. Junior and lower ranking officers are not encouraged to take significant initiative or challenge decisions that they oppose. This culture of intolerance of dissent limits discussion.

Professionalism

The Pakistan military is proud of its traditions and institutions. Although U.S. instructors may be in the country to offer advice and insight into military matters, a Pakistani officer considers his own military traditions and practices admirable. Some Pakistani officers dislike the fact that although Pakistanis travel to the United States for training, few U.S. troops receive training from the Pakistan military. They believe that a more even exchange would benefit the U.S. military and the relationship between the militaries.[288]

Negative Perceptions of Pakistan's Civilian Government

Pakistan's military believes that history has shown that civilian governments are inept and unable to manage the Pakistani state effectively.[289] The military has accused most civilian governments of large-scale corruption. The military routinely steps in and removes civilians from the government. Long periods of military

rule have also stunted the growth of civilian institutions, resulting in a repeated cycle of civilian ineptitude and military takeover.

Origins of Military Culture

The culture, organizational structure, identity, and loyalties of Pakistan's military are derived from a number of different sources and experiences and have changed and evolved since the military's founding in 1947. Pakistan's history and Islamic faith are important influences on its military culture. The military today looks to these sources to define its narrative and its larger role in society and to unite its ranks. The insecure environment, both within and surrounding the state, is also an important influence on Pakistan's military culture. Internally, Pakistan is a diverse nation that has yet to fully develop and embrace a common identity and purpose. Externally, Pakistan faces potential conflicts on both its eastern and western borders. The most significant influence on the military culture has been the threat Pakistan perceives and faces from its larger neighbor, India, which has shaped the military's organization and outlook since its inception.

Pre-colonial Influences

The Pakistan military looks to ancient history to root its culture in a narrative that predates the arrival of the British in the region. Through its connection to ancient military victories and leaders in the region, the military has developed a culture that precedes British influence and reflects true Pakistani roots. The Pakistan military portrays contemporary Pakistani soldiers and officers as descendants of the forces that brought Islam to the region in A.D. 712 and the men who fought successive invasions of the subcontinent, some dating back to Alexander the Great in 326 B.C.[290] The military still proudly tells stories of the battle of Alexander the Great against Porus, a local leader whose selflessness and integrity after defeat induced Alexander to restore his lands.[291] These historical traditions bestow a rich identity to a military that is little more than 60 years old.

The Pakistan military also points to the Mughal Empire, which ruled much of the subcontinent from the 16th through the 18th centuries, as an important influence on its history. The Mughals encouraged leaders in the areas of present-day northwest Punjab and the neighboring areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province to provide them a regular supply of men for their armies. Strong military traditions developed in these regions, which were the Pakistan military's main areas of recruitment for decades.[292]

Islam

Islam is a key source of the military's values and culture. Islam connects the military to its past, creates a common unifying theme in the military, and differentiates the Pakistan military from Hindu Indian military history and culture.

Islamic principles form the foundation of Pakistan's state and military.[293] The military's ethos and organization incorporate the basic values and tenets of Islam, which serve as a guiding set of principles for the military as an institution. The military at times promotes Islam as a source of unity among Pakistan's ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse population, the vast majority of which is Muslim.[294] Every unit in the military uses religious slogans and mottos, officers use religion to inspire and motivate soldiers, and the military teaches its religious foundations in its training institutions.[295] The military leadership also uses Islam to promote professionalism in the military. The tenets of Islam that prescribe believers to follow certain customs and rituals (such as prayer) transfer well to a military that also prescribes orderly behaviors.[296]

Although Islam provides a source of unity in the country, there is significant diversity in how the population practices and interprets Islam,[297] and religiosity varies considerably among the officers and soldiers.[298] Military leadership has often intervened and attempted to limit religious discourse when it has threatened to become a divisive influence in the military.[299] The military believes that sectarian differences and adherence to different religious movements, such as the Deobandi and Barelvi movements, could be problematic. Scholars believe that the majority of Pakistan's Sunni Muslims follow the Barelvi movement, a moderate religious movement that is also common among Indian Muslims. In recent decades, however, there has been an increase in the number of followers of the Deobandi movement, a more conservative religious movement that preaches stricter interpretations of Islam.

Militant groups such as the *Tehrik-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan* and political groups such as the *Jamait Ulema-e-Islam* follow the Deobandi movement and use Deobandi teachings to argue for a morally and socially stricter interpretation of Shari'a in Pakistan. Society is divided regarding the role of religion in the country, and this has led to increasing violence in recent years. This divide is also present in the military,[300] whose members are increasingly representative of the population from more diverse, urban, and middle-class areas of the country and are generally more religiously conservative than the elite who previously composed the military.[301] However, the increase in pious practices and views in the military does not translate into support for an Islamic theocracy.[302] Nevertheless, the military believes that the influence of Deobandis in the military could become divisive and has worked to eliminate this threat by sidelining those it believes hold radical beliefs.

Opposition to India

Pakistan's relations with India have been instrumental in shaping its military culture. The threat, both real and perceived, that the military sees from India has been the most important influence on how the military is organized and how it perceives its role in the country. Since its founding, the Pakistan military has considered the threat from India to be its reason for existence and has routinely justified its influential role in society by arguing that only the military can protect the country from this threat.[303] The Pakistani public's general acceptance of this idea has strengthened the military's hand.[304]

Pakistan's hostility toward India dates back to the time of partition. In the months leading up to partition, some officers[305] in the British Indian Army (BIA) hoped that the newly created Indian and Pakistani militaries would continue to cooperate after partition.[306] However, the experience of partition and its early aftermath created immense hostility between India and Pakistan, negating the possibility of cooperation. Pakistan believed that India did not accept the creation of an independent Pakistan and would try to undermine the new state. This deep insecurity and the almost immediate war with India over Kashmir in 1947 caused Pakistan to view a strong military as crucial for its survival.[307] In the early years of the Pakistani state, nearly 70 percent of the country's budget went to national defense.[308] The Pakistan military believed this excessive defense spending was necessary because of India's duplicity in the division of military assets. Following partition, India kept most of the BIA's equipment, artillery, stocks, and military records. The Pakistan military built its institutions from scratch, which it is proud of today and points to as a sign of its superiority over both Pakistan civilian institutions and the India military.[309]

The Pakistan military structures itself to face the threat from India. It continues to perceive India as its primary threat, despite a strong internal insurgency, and is unwilling to re-deploy the bulk of its forces in the east to fight militants in the west. Historic animosity between the countries and the fact that India positions more than 9 corps,[310] or roughly 700,000 soldiers, facing the Pakistan border, have shaped Pakistan's perceptions.[311] Additionally, many members of both the military and broader Pakistan society believe that

India is behind other threats, such as the insurgencies in FATA and Balochistan Province.[312] The India threat also endangers what the military considers the country's core, namely Punjab Province, which contains the central economic, political, and social life of the country.[313]

The India threat has also shaped the military's strategy, which seeks to deter Indian aggression and minimize the chance of conventional war. Pakistan's military does not believe that it can achieve parity with the India military.[314] The realization that India will always have a stronger conventional force has led the Pakistan military to invest in unconventional methods, such as supporting militant groups.[315] The Pakistan military has invested heavily in militant groups to fight against India in the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir, which the military sees as the crux of the India threat.[316] The military believes these groups can help achieve its goal or at least tie down Indian forces[317] in Kashmir without a conventional confrontation. The Pakistan military also considers nuclear weapons the beacon of its defense because it believes they are the most effective weapon for neutralizing the threat from India.

British Influence

The Pakistan military retains significant influence from the British. Units retain names dating from the colonial period, showing a continued pride in their British linkage.[318] One lasting tradition is the importance of the regiment in the Pakistan Army. The regiment is a source of loyalty and identity for Pakistani soldiers and officers. Regiments carry a strong sense of tradition for members, who often consider these units to be like families.[319] Another British cultural concept that Pakistan adheres to is the officers' mess. Like its British equivalent, the officers' mess in Pakistan is an important center for conversation, social interaction, and building camaraderie among officers.[320]

Military's View of History

Colonial

The military grew directly out of the BIA and, although it has changed significantly, still considers the colonial era an important phase in its history.[321] The British, in the form of the British East India Company, first came to South Asia in the early 18th century. They entered the Punjab in 1846 and forcibly annexed it in 1849.[322] In many ways, the British Empire considered the region of contemporary Pakistan, particularly west of the Punjab, a backwater with a small population and even less economic activity. The British ruled much of the region indirectly through local tribes and princely rulers who retained autonomy in exchange for loyalty to the British.

The British focused many of their resources on defense, in part to quell any internal uprisings and to defend their western flank against Russian encroachment by way of Afghanistan.[323] The British heavily taxed the native population to support the BIA.[324] Defense spending came at the expense of social, political, and economic development in the region. Educational and economic opportunities were not abundant and often were available only to the wealthy, particularly in the remote areas of contemporary Pakistan. Compared with their Hindu and Sikh counterparts, Muslims were less educated and did not have access to the political and economic opportunities available to the elite. Many Muslims saw the military as a means of social and economic advancement.[325] The British also compensated its native soldiers and officers well, in both pay and services, which made the army a desirable profession.[326]

In the 1930s, and particularly during World War II, the British undertook efforts to bring more natives into the officer corps.[327] Despite these efforts, at the time of partition the BIA still had 13,500 British officers out

of a total officer corps of 22,000.[328] The British also carefully manipulated the forces' religious and ethnic balance. Regiments were composed of a set ratio of Muslims and Hindus, and although there were many Muslim commanders in the army,[329] there were no all-Muslim units.[330]

Partition and the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947

Partition in 1947 and the subsequent war with India over Kashmir had a profound impact on the Pakistan military. The insecurity created from these experiences encouraged a highly militarized society in Pakistan and gave the military wide berth to influence Pakistani society. The events of this time, particularly India's occupation of Kashmir, have long shaped the military's impressions of India's hostility and the belief that Pakistan needs a strong and capable military to survive. Today, the Pakistan military believes that India still does not accept its status as an independent state.[331]

Prior to partition, communal tensions in British India sparked a movement for a two-state solution. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, known in Pakistan as *Quaid-e-Azam* (Great Leader) or *Baba-e-Quam* (Father of the Nation), was the leader of the Muslim League, the leading political group representing British India's Muslim population. Jinnah and many other Muslim Indians did not believe it was possible for Muslims to have adequate political power in a Hindu-dominated India. The Muslim populations that most strongly supported the creation of Pakistan lived mainly in Hindu-dominated areas that did not become part of the new state of Pakistan.[332] In a conference in Lahore on 20-23 March 1940, the Muslim League declared that it sought the creation of an independent Pakistan as a home for South Asian Muslims.[333] Afterward, partition became an increasingly accepted idea as Muslim and Hindu political leaders were unable to formulate workable power-sharing arrangements. The British accepted the idea of partition and on 3 June 1947 proposed a plan that allowed for the partition of India into an independent India and Pakistan (including contemporary Pakistan and Bangladesh). The Indian Independence Act of 1947, passed on 18 July 1947, stipulated that India and Pakistan would become independent on 15 August 1947. Because of the limited timeframe before independence, the British, Indian, and Pakistani leaders did not implement a well-ordered plan and instead carried out divisions haphazardly.[334]

Partition proved to be a difficult process. Although the Muslim majority areas generally became part of Pakistan and Hindu majority areas became part of India, there were large minority communities that remained in both countries. Some members of these communities decided to remain in their homes, while large numbers migrated. An estimated 17 million people moved across the newly demarcated border as Hindus and Sikhs moved east and Muslims moved west.[335] This migration was the largest in contemporary history and uprooted people from family, land, jobs, and long-established social ties. Conflict was rampant during this time, driven by land disputes and ethnic rivalries. The massive migration caused a breakdown in law and order, allowing groups of criminals and ethnic and religious radicals to carry out atrocities. Estimates of the number of fatalities that occurred during partition vary from a few hundred thousand to more than a million. All ethnic and religious groups, including Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs, perpetrated these attacks, which targeted both Pakistani and Indian populations. The Punjab was the main area of migration. Nearly 8 million migrants moved across its border, where violence was particularly intense,[336] and hundreds of thousands of migrants were killed.[337]

The formation of a new military was also a challenge to the fledgling Pakistani state. Muslim soldiers and officers joined the Pakistan military, while Hindu and Sikh forces formed the India military.[338] Because no regiment in the BIA was exclusively Muslim, the new Pakistan military did not inherit a single intact regiment at its inception.[339] Additionally, weeks and months passed before Muslim officers and soldiers were able to relocate their homes from India to Pakistan. At the date of partition, the Pakistan Army received 8

out of 29 BIA regiments. The newly formed Pakistan Army had 2,500 of its required 4,000 officers. Specifically, Pakistan had only 1 major general, 2 brigadiers, and 6 colonels but required 13 major generals, 40 brigadiers, and 53 colonels.[340] To fill the gap, the Pakistan military retained British officers and fast-tracked recruitment and training. After partition, Pakistan appointed two British officers as the first and second commanders in chief of the Pakistan Army: Sir Frank Walker Messervy (1947-48) and Sir Douglas David Gracey (1948-51).[341] The Pakistan military also lacked training institutions, supplies, and a defense industry. Out of 46 training institutions and 16 ammunition factories in British India, the new state of Pakistan had only 7 training institutions and no ammunition factories.[342] India did not deliver the equipment, records, and stores as stipulated under partition guidelines.[343] Today, the Pakistan military prides itself on having built a functioning nuclear-capable military from scratch. However, the military still points to India's actions with bitterness and believes it did not receive the resources India was obligated to provide.[344]

The division of land was also an issue at partition and led to the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947 (also known as the First Kashmir War) over the Kashmir region, which remains the largest source of conflict between India and Pakistan. Pakistan points to perceived Indian duplicity in its refusal to give certain Muslim-dominated regions of India to Pakistan. Most surprising to the Pakistanis was the division of Punjab, which they believed would go fully to Pakistan. Pakistanis believe that India's influence motivated the British decision to split the province between the countries. The accession of this area meant that India had access to the region of Jammu and Kashmir, a strategic valley region in the northwestern Indian subcontinent.[345]

Kashmir was a Muslim-dominated region ruled by a Hindu *maharajah* (prince). According to Indian accounts, Pakistani forces and tribesmen entered the region prior to partition to pressure the prince to join Pakistan. The *maharajah*, feeling threatened, instead opted to join India. Pakistan protested, arguing that the British should hold a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the population as it had done in regions where a Muslim leader ruled a Hindu-majority population who opted to join Pakistan.[346] Instead, Indian forces entered the region to fight back Pakistani forces and tribesmen. Pakistan maintains that Indian forces entered the region first and Pakistani tribesmen entered the area only in response to India's incursion.[347] Regardless, Pakistan sent in untrained troops who were operating without a clear strategy from the military leadership and with little coordination between official troops and tribesmen.[348] Both sides endured heavy losses before India sought mediation from the United Nations. The war ended on 1 January 1949. Under the terms of the peace agreement, Pakistan was to withdrawal its forces from the region and India could maintain a light military presence. The agreement divided Jammu and Kashmir between Pakistan and India; Pakistan occupied Azad Kashmir and the northern areas of Gilgit and Balistan while India occupied Jammu, the Kashmir Valley, and the Ladakh range. The agreement stated that a plebiscite would be held to determine the wishes of the population.

Muhammad Ayub Khan and the India-Pakistan War of 1965

Muhammad Ayub Khan, Pakistan's first native commander in chief of the army and the first military ruler of Pakistan, was an influential and formative figure in Pakistan's military history. He contributed significantly to the development and modernization of the Pakistan Army,[349] set the precedent for military intervention in politics, and influenced how the Pakistan military views and interacts with civilian leaders.

During the initial years after partition, the Pakistan military became increasingly prominent in the social, economic, and political life of the country. The government called in the military to assist in instances of internal unrest in Balochistan Province in 1948 and in Punjab Province in the 1950s.[350] In 1953, the government called the military into Lahore to dispel protestors who were angry about the national debate regarding the status of the Ahmadiyya, a religious sect whose members consider themselves Muslim but that many

Pakistanis, particularly Sunnis, consider heretical. After resolving the situation, the military stayed and developed local services, improving the population's opinion of the military. This was one of many instances in which the population came to see the military as being more effective than civilian leaders and the military came to view the civilian government as implicated in violence and unrest.[351]

While the Pakistan military was building its forces and image, the civilian government was struggling. Pakistan's most prominent civilian leader, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, died shortly after the country gained independence. On 16 October 1951, Saad Akbar Babrak, a Pashtun from Afghanistan, assassinated then-Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan, considered by many to be Jinnah's right-hand man.[352] Lacking strong leaders, the civil administration continued to falter throughout the 1950s with a quick succession of leaders and an increase in political tensions. In 1958, unrest in Balochistan Province and political tensions throughout the country prior to elections promised under the 1956 constitution[353] prompted President Iskandar Mirza, with support from then-Commander-in-Chief Ayub Khan, to declare martial law and remove the government.[354] Three weeks later, Ayub Khan ousted Mirza and enacted direct military rule over the government.[355] Many Pakistanis, both civilian and military, welcomed the military's takeover.[356] Many were tired of the politicians' corruption and ineffectiveness and believed that the military was a more disciplined organization that would not experience the power wrangling that hindered the politicians.[357]

Tensions with India continued to build in the early 1960s. India accused Pakistan of sending fighters into Kashmir and declared that it would not allow a plebiscite on the future of Jammu and Kashmir until Pakistan removed its forces from Azad Kashmir.[358] As tensions increased, a disagreement arose over the Rann-e-Kutch (Rann of Kutch) region between Sindh Province in Pakistan and the Gujarat state in India. Armed struggles broke out in the area, prompting India to claim the entire area as its territory. However, after a brief military confrontation, Pakistan proposed a mediated ceasefire, which India accepted; the UN later vindicated Pakistan's position.[359]

Some believe that the Pakistan victory at Rann-e-Kutch gave Pakistan needed confidence on the eve of the 1965 war, while others state that it led to overconfidence and prompted Pakistan to initiate the war in Kashmir. The war began when Pakistan launched Operation GIBRALTAR, in which Pakistani forces planned to infiltrate India-controlled Jammu and Kashmir to encourage locals to rise up against India.[360] Although Operation GIBRALTAR was initially a success, the mission soon turned against Pakistan. India retaliated by invading Pakistan and attacking the city of Lahore. Its homeland threatened, the Pakistan military decided to sue for peace. The war ended on 23 September with both sides having suffered significant blows to their economies and defense forces.[361] The Pakistani population was shocked and demoralized by the outcome of the war; up until the end, military leaders publically proclaimed Pakistan's success and ultimate victory. The Pakistan military faced major problems during the war, including a lack of training, weak leadership, poor command and control, and inadequate intelligence gathering and procedures. The Pakistani forces also faced Indian forces that were better equipped and were seeking revenge for their defeat at Rann-e-Kutch.[362]

Under Ayub Khan, the military also began its tradition of seeking external military support. Although Pakistan gave defense matters the highest priority, spending nearly 70 percent of its budget between 1947 and 1958 on defense,[363] the military recognized that it could not achieve parity with India because of the latter's larger economic and resource base. To counter the India threat, the military made early appeals to the United States for assistance. After initially rejecting the request, the United States soon recognized Pakistan as a potential ally against Soviet influence in the region and began actively supporting the Pakistan military with aid, training, and equipment. Although the United States provided substantial assistance to Pakistan, Pakistan was not happy with the relationship because the United States showed that it was unwilling to be Pakistan's stalwart ally against India. The 1965 war fostered Pakistan's distrust of the United States, when the United States, seeking to remain neutral in the conflict, cut arms sales to both India and Pakistan.[364] The

Pakistan military believed that the United States should have assisted it during the war. Because of the lack of U.S. support, the Pakistan military began to look to other international partners and started developing stronger relations with China, which continue today.

Ayub Khan's power declined after the 1965 India-Pakistan War. Many Pakistanis believed that he was trying to perpetuate one-man rule in Pakistan, which weakened his support from the military.[365] The population increasingly saw him as corrupt. Significant income inequality characterized the economy; 22 families owned 80 percent of the country's wealth. The failure against India, the declining economy, and rising popular resentment prompted the military to push Ayub Khan to step down. In January 1968, Ayub Khan voluntarily left power and handed control to Gen Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan Qizilbash, who assumed full control on 31 March 1969.[366]

Mohammad Yahya Khan and the India-Pakistan War of 1971

The India-Pakistan War of 1971 and the creation of an independent Bangladesh dominated Yahya Khan's short rule. Observers have accused the Pakistan military of massive brutality against the Bangladeshis, and the military's failure, followed by the loss of East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), was one of the most demoralizing events in Pakistan's history.

A combination of economic, political, and cultural alienation in East Pakistan led to East Pakistanis' resentment of the dominant West Pakistan.[367] West Pakistan did not integrate East Pakistan into the country, and many East Pakistanis felt that western leaders deliberately blocked their efforts to participate in politics and the economy.[368] Although East Pakistan had more than half of the country's population, East Pakistanis were grossly underrepresented in the state bureaucracy and military. Many members of the military considered Bengalis (the dominant ethnic group in East Pakistan) inferior.[369] At partition, there were only 155 Bengali officers in the army, and little effort was made to recruit Bengalis until after the 1965 war.[370] By 1971, there were 13,000 Bengalis in the army. Instead of integrating these soldiers and officers into the broader army, the army formed them into a distinct regiment in East Pakistan.[371]

The precipitating event of the war was the 1970 elections. President Yahya Khan declared that Pakistan would hold its first free and fair elections, but both Yahya Khan and the military underestimated East Pakistan's animosity toward West Pakistan and believed that a western-dominated party would prevail in the elections. They favored Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, leader of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP). However, the dominant political party in East Pakistan, the Awami League, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, won virtually every parliamentary seat in East Pakistan, giving East Pakistan control of the national Pakistani parliament. The Awami League criticized West Pakistan and wanted substantial reforms. West Pakistan's leaders, including President Yahya Khan and Bhutto, were unwilling to cede power.[372]

Tensions increased in East Pakistan after West Pakistan refused to accept the election results. The government deployed the military to East Pakistan, and the conflict erupted into a full-blown civil war, with an estimated 30,000-60,000 West Pakistanis fighting in the east.[373] Many West Pakistan military leaders who had served in the east argued that military intervention would not be successful.[374] However, the military went ahead with a full-scale operation, known as Operation SEARCHLIGHT, led by Gen Tikka Khan. Observers have accused Gen Khan of enacting a campaign of massive military brutality against the Bengalis, earning him the name The Butcher of Bengal.[375] The Indians assisted the East Pakistanis in organizing the Mukti Bahini, a Bengali paramilitary group that fought against Pakistani forces.[376] India's closure of East Pakistan's airspace to Pakistan's planes meant that West Pakistan was unable to bring in reinforcements or supplies.[377] India formally invaded East Pakistan on the side of the Bengalis on 21 November 1971. Unable to reinforce its troops and facing a fiercely motivated opponent, the Pakistan military surrendered on 16 December 1971.

The war was demoralizing for the entire country, which lost half its population and land to the newly independent state of Bangladesh. The military and civilian population considered the military's surrender shameful. More than 2,500 soldiers died in the war, and more than 100,000 POWs remained in India, a further humiliation. The population blamed the Pakistan military, and Yahya Khan in particular, for the loss of East Pakistan.[378] The military came out of the war demoralized and with its prestige and image as national savior shattered.[379] Younger officers were furious with the commanding generals over their handling of the war, and for the first time the army's cohesion was threatened.[380] Yahya Khan was dismissed, the country held new elections, and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who firmly blamed the military for the loss, became the president (and later prime minister) of Pakistan.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and the Balochistan Uprising

Bhutto's rule was an important period for civil-military relations in Pakistan. Bhutto was a charismatic leader who came to power with substantial public support and the promise of democratic and economic reforms. He was concerned with limiting the military's power and enacted the 1973 constitution in part because he believed it would enforce civilian control of the military.[381] He eliminated the post of commander in chief, replacing it with the COAS,[382] and created the position of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff. Although constitutionally the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff has authority over the COAS, in reality the position has never held much power.[383] Bhutto also dismissed more than 40 top-serving officers; his ability to do so was a testament to the demoralized state of the military.[384] Although Bhutto worked to limit the military's authority, he maintained high levels of military spending. Although Pakistan lost half of its territory and population in the war, Bhutto kept military spending at pre-1971 levels. In fact, the military's troop strength and number of weapons rose to unprecedented levels during the Bhutto regime.[385]

The military initially accepted Bhutto's reforms and for years refrained from overt interference in politics. Morale was low and a strong cadre of military leaders capable of pushing back against the reforms did not exist. However, over time the military began to galvanize internally against the changes. New leaders emerged in the military, filling the many vacancies created by Bhutto's dismissal of senior officers. Bhutto also undertook policies and actions that angered the military, including airing a television broadcast of the military's 1971 surrender to India. The military saw this as an attempt by Bhutto to further damage its image in the country and greatly reduced its support for Bhutto.[386]

In 1973, unrest in Balochistan sparked a full-blown insurgency. Bhutto dismissed Balochistan's elected provincial leaders, charging them with conspiring with the Soviets to overthrow the Pakistani state, sparking the insurgency. The Marri and Mengal tribes, two of the most influential Baloch tribes, led the insurgency. Bhutto called in Gen Tikka Khan, the serving general during the 1971 war, to lead more than 30,000 troops deployed to the province.[387] Balochistanis refer to Tikka Khan as The Butcher of Balochistan because of the harsh methods he employed against the Baloch, including the use of napalm and indiscriminate bombing.[388] The fighting killed more than 3,000 soldiers and 5,000 Baloch insurgents.[389] Despite its losses in the insurgency, the military was galvanized by the fighting experience.[390] The Baloch insurgency allowed the army to reform and refocus, and officers regained a sense of authority and autonomy.[391] It also helped reestablish the army's image as the savior of Pakistan's unity.[392]

On 28 February 1976, Bhutto appointed Gen Muhammad Zia al-Haq to the position of COAS.[393] Bhutto considered Zia docile and loyal. However, the military and Zia began to push back against Bhutto. In 1977, new elections were held, and the military and large segments of the population accused Bhutto of vote rigging.[394] National discontent expressed itself in widespread unrest. Bhutto tried to induce a military crackdown on protesters, but three senior army officers in Lahore refused to fire on the protesters.[395] On 5 July 1977, Zia

imposed martial law and removed Bhutto from the office of prime minister, stating that the country was in danger of falling apart and that the Bhutto government had not done enough to enact Islamic reforms.[396]

Muhammad Zia ul-Haq and Afghan War

Gen Zia's coup surprised most Pakistanis.[397] Zia quickly moved to consolidate his authority in the military, where he placed key confidants in positions he felt were valuable, including the top civilian bureaucracy, the secretary general (who controlled promotions), and the head of the ISI.[398] He also quickly established his political authority by trying, and eventually hanging, Bhutto for the alleged murder of a political opponent. The court verdict remains highly controversial.[399]

Zia was a pious man, and he attempted to increase religion's role in the military. Under Zia, the military continued to defend Pakistan's ideology but with a new vision of Pakistan as an Islamic state. Zia gave *maulvis*, or regimental chaplains, a larger role in the military. For the first time, entrance and promotion exams took religious values and practices into account.[400] Some consider current mid-level officers who entered the military during Zia's rule more religiously conservative than their contemporary counterparts.[401] These officers are known in the military as Zia Bharti or "Zia's recruits."[402]

During Zia's rule, the military continued to dominate domestic spending. Zia increased the size of the military from 400,000 to 500,000 troops and improved the quality and quantity of its equipment.[403] He also increased the number of higher ranking positions in the military[404] and strengthened the military's influence over the civilian bureaucracy, mandating that serving or retired military personnel filled 10 percent of civilian positions.[405]

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 allowed for this substantial increase in the military. The United States and Pakistan were both deeply concerned with the Soviet presence in Afghanistan and pursued policies to support Afghan resistance groups (known as *mujahedeen*) against the communists. The United States increased its funding for the Pakistan military, which enabled Pakistan to increase the military's size, capability, and credibility.[406] Although the United States intended for the Pakistan military to spend its aid on the conflict in Afghanistan, much of it went to the Pakistani forces positioned against India.[407] The United States gave more than US$1 billion to the effort against the Soviets, most of which was funneled through the ISI. Zia directed the ISI to lead Pakistan's efforts against the Soviets, manage its relationship with the *mujahedeen,* and direct U.S. funding to appropriate groups. This greatly strengthened the ISI's role in Pakistan,[408] and it became almost a state within a state (though it still firmly followed military directions). The ISI also developed lasting relationships with many militant groups.[409] The extremist groups, which the ISI and United States trained and supported, spread and flourished in the region. To Pakistan, these groups demonstrated the success of combining Islamic radicalism, nationalism, and guerilla warfare.[410]

The Afghan war brought other influences into Pakistan that the country continues to contend with today. More than 3 million Afghan refugees came to Pakistan, and many have remained in the country for decades.[411] These refugees have strained Pakistan's resources and at times caused conflict with local communities over land and other resources. The war also increased the influence of drug traffickers in Pakistan. Pakistan became a primary conduit of drugs from Afghanistan, and in the 1980s Pakistan's opium production surpassed that in Afghanistan.[412] The drug trade created new sources of power and many new addicts on the streets of Pakistan. Some believe that drug barons have become the fourth pillar of power in Pakistan along with the military, bureaucracy, and political leaders.[413]

On 17 August 1988, Zia traveled to Bahawalpur, a large military cantonment in the Punjab, to attend a meeting about acquiring new U.S. tanks. On the return trip to Islamabad, his plane crashed, killing Zia and 31

others on board. Controversy remains over whether the plane crash was intentional or accidental and who might have killed Zia. The military still discusses this controversy today.[414]

Civilian Rulers and the Kargil Crisis

Following Zia's death, the military removed itself from an overt political role. From 1988 until 1999, Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif alternately ruled the country, each serving two terms as prime minister. However, during that period, the military held significant influence behind the scenes, and civilian and military leaders constantly competed for power. The military never ceded control of its internal affairs or matters it deemed necessary for its mission, such as foreign affairs, but allowed the civilians varying levels of control in domestic affairs.[415] The military played a role in every transition of power, twice forming caretaker governments to take over before the country had new elections. Additionally, opposition parties routinely sought the aid of the military to intervene against the party in power.[416] During this period, the military had a series of leaders including Gen Mirza Aslam Beg, Gen Asif Nawaz, Gen Abdul Waheed, and Gen Jehangir Karamat.[417] These men all served their time as COAS and left the position after their term ended or the civilian government dismissed them.

Although Pakistan's relationship with the United States strengthened during Zia's rule, the United States severely curtailed its support of Pakistan under civilian rule. In 1990, the United States sanctioned Pakistan because it believed that Pakistan was developing nuclear weapons. Pakistan felt betrayed by this cut in funds, which coincided with the Soviets' withdrawal from Afghanistan. After the Soviets withdrew, civil war ensued between competing Afghan warlords. Pakistan began supporting the Taliban, a group that emerged from *madrassas* in Kandahar and consolidated its control in the war-torn country.[418] The Taliban enforced a strict interpretation of Islamic law and had little international support beyond Pakistan, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia.

Pakistan held elections on 16 November 1988. The PPP won the elections, and its leader, Benazir Bhutto, the daughter of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, became prime minister. Benazir Bhutto did not have a good relationship with the Pakistan military. The military believed that she interfered in internal military matters, particularly promotions.[419] Pakistan's president, Ghulam Ishaq Khan, dismissed Benazir Bhutto in 1990. The government held new elections, which the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) won. The PML's leader, Nawaz Sharif, became prime minister. Sharif was a Punjabi from a wealthy family in Lahore and had been close to Zia. Sharif's first term lasted until 1993, when the government dismissed him and Benazir Bhutto returned to power. In her second term, she was more cautious in her relationship with the military. However, the government again dismissed her in 1997. Although officially dismissed by the serving president, both Sharif and Benazir Bhutto accused the military of having a hand in their dismissals in retaliation for their interference in military affairs.[420] In 1998, Sharif appointed Pervez Musharraf to the position of COAS, believing Musharraf would be loyal and compliant.[421]

Pakistan was soon shaken by the Kargil crisis in Kashmir, a key turning point in civil-military relations. A small group of high-ranking officers, including COAS Musharraf, planned the operation.[422] They were emboldened by Pakistan's nuclear weapons (which Pakistan had successful tested on 28 May 1998 following similar tests by India), thinking that India would not risk a full-scale nuclear conflict to regain lost territory in Kargil.[423] In the fall of 1998, the Pakistan military began sending a combination of Kashmiri fighters and regular and paramilitary (Northern Light Infantry[424]) Pakistani forces into the Kargil district of Indian Kashmir. Kargil was mountainous and inhospitable, and in winter months Indian troops retreated down the mountains along the border. The Pakistan military believed it could establish a stronghold on the India side of the line of control (demarcating the border between India-controlled and Pakistan-controlled Kashmir)

while the Indians were pulled back from the mountains. India responded with a strong counterassault.[425] The conditions in the mountains were difficult, and Pakistani commanders were worried that their under-supplied troops would mutiny. The conflict turned into a strategic nightmare, and Sharif announced the military's unilateral evacuation, which greatly angered the military.[426] Sharif claimed that the military had not informed him of the operation; at the time the military launched its assault, Sharif was in the process of negotiating the Lahore Declaration, a peace agreement with India.[427]

Relations between Sharif and the military deteriorated following the Kargil crisis. Although many in the army opposed the Kargil operation once they learned of it,[428] the military was unhappy with Sharif's decision to unilaterally withdraw and felt that Sharif surrendered too soon under perceived pressure from the United States.[429] Additionally, Gen Musharraf believed that Sharif was trying to gain authority over the military. On 12 October 1999, Sharif attempted to dismiss Musharraf while he was flying home from Sri Lanka. The military would not accept what it perceived as interference in its internal affairs. This event led Musharraf and the corps commanders to dismiss Sharif and reinstitute military rule.[430]

Pervez Musharraf and the Global War on Terror

The Pakistani population was receptive to Prime Minister Sharif's dismissal and the military's return to power, as many Pakistanis believed that corruption had reached unprecedented levels under Pakistan's civilian governments.[431] Gen Musharraf was in power during an important transition period for Pakistan. After the attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001, the United States pressured Pakistan to abandon its support for the Taliban and the other militant groups and support the Global War on Terror and the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan. On 19 September 2001, Gen Musharraf decided to end Pakistan's support of the Taliban and support the U.S. mission. Although most of the corps commanders supported his decision, some dissented; Musharraf later sidelined these dissenters.[432]

The U.S. military's Operation ENDURING FREEDOM in Afghanistan and Pakistan's decision to combat some militant groups active in Pakistan increased violence and militant attacks throughout the country. In late 2003 and early 2004, two attempts to assassinate Musharraf were made within 2 weeks, both in Rawalpindi, the location of the military's headquarters. There was support from within the military for these attacks, and although those supporting the attacks were not senior officers, it raised questions about the military's unity and cohesion.[433] Military leadership was concerned that there was increasing support for militancy within the military and decided to crack down on it. Musharraf reinforced his support from the military by carefully selecting his corps commanders. He also increased profitable jobs in the civil service for serving and retired military personnel and expanded military benefits, particularly in the form of land grants to officers.[434] To increase popular support, Musharraf also attempted broader political and economic reforms. He enacted plans to reorganize local government, taking power away from provincial governments and granting it to district-level administrations. He attempted to reform the police forces and empower the media and justice system. The civilian government reversed many of these reforms, with the exception of the increased media and judicial freedom, after Musharraf left office.[435]

Internal attacks increased sharply after 2005 and challenged the military's control in the country. Sectarian hatred motivated many of these attacks, many of which targeted Pakistan's Shi'a Muslim minority. A small number of attacks were retaliations by Shi'a groups against Sunni militants; however, most Shi'a militant groups have now largely disappeared. An increase in extremist rhetoric and the formation in 2007 of the *Tehrik-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan* (TTP) also motivated attacks. The TTP is composed of Pakistani militant groups that fought against Pakistan military operations in 2006. Baitullah Mehsud led the TTP until 2009, when a U.S. airstrike killed him.[436]

The Pakistan military is increasingly caught between two separate groups of militants: the Afghan Taliban and its close ally, al Qa'ida, who are fighting the U.S forces in Afghanistan, and the TTP and other militant groups, who are fighting against the Pakistani state. These groups have many overlapping supporters. Some U.S and Pakistani observers believe that despite Pakistan's insistence, the military and government continue to support the Afghan Taliban as Pakistan's only reliable ally in Afghanistan.[437] Some believe that Pakistan willingly gives up some Afghan Taliban and al Qa'ida members, allows the United States to use its air bases and ports, and permits U.S. drone attacks against suspected targets while simultaneously hiding and supporting key members of the Afghan Taliban and al Qa'ida. However, Pakistan is fighting a long campaign against the TTP and other militants who have threatened the Pakistani state. These groups have brought increased insecurity to the Swat district in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province and the neighboring FATA, where they have sought to establish an autonomous religious-based authority.

One of the main locations of the fighting is the South Waziristan Agency of the FATA, where the military has fought four campaigns since 2004. The first of these was under U.S. pressure to combat the Afghan Taliban and its allies in 2003-04.[438] This initial operation was unsuccessful and resulted in local tribes rising up against the military and unrest that spread to neighboring areas. The military used conventional tactics in its operations, and the failure to adopt tactics geared to insurgencies resulted in a continuation of violence, high civilian and soldier casualties, increased resentment of the military and support for the militants,[439] and overall poor battlefield performance.[440]

Additionally, the government's failure to offer protection to those who opposed the militant groups discouraged local leaders from fighting the militants; in South Waziristan alone, the Taliban killed more than 200 tribal leaders who resisted its authority.[441] In 2004, the first operation in South Waziristan ended and the military signed a peace deal with Nek Muhammad Wazir, a local tribal leader and close ally of the Afghan Taliban. Because the military traveled to Nek Muhammad's house, a tradition in Pashtun culture undertaken by the defeated side, Nek Muhammad and his Afghan Taliban allies believed they were the victors and were emboldened by their success.[442] The treaty allowed the militants to establish their version of Islamic rule in the area, and the army released the prisoners it had captured in exchange for a cessation of hostilities. These agreements were ultimately unsuccessful and conflict continued.

Like previous military rulers, Musharraf overstepped his authority and began to lose support from the military and among the population at large. The military was unhappy because its operations in the FATA and Swat tarnished its reputation.[443] The Pakistani population was unhappy with the military's actions against fellow Pakistanis.[444] Soldiers were finding it difficult to find wives, a traditional status symbol in Pakistani society. Additionally, Musharraf began to implement measures to cement his authority over the judiciary. These steps were unpopular among the population. In 2007, lawyers held protests across the country after Musharraf dismissed the chief justice of the Supreme Court, accusing him of corruption.[445] The widespread unrest prompted him to uphold a previous agreement he had made with religious parties in 2003 to resign as COAS.[446] On 2 October 2007, Musharraf resigned as COAS and appointed Gen Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, the former head of the ISI, to the position. Musharraf then scheduled elections, allowing Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif to return from abroad to participate. On 27 December 2007, the TTP assassinated Benazir Bhutto. Elections continued as scheduled, and in March 2008 Benazir Bhutto's husband, Asif Ali Zardari, was elected president. A parliamentary coalition of the PPP and PML-N, Nawaz Sharif's party, led an effort to impeach Musharraf, who preemptively resigned as head of state on 18 August 2008.

Gen Ashfaq Parvez Kayani

Gen Kayani remained the COAS following Musharraf's resignation. On 22 July 2010, the government extended Kayani's term for 3 more years.[447] As in the period of civilian rule in the 1990s, the Pakistan military remains firmly in control behind the scenes. Kayani has faced many challenges during his tenure as COAS, including a major attack on army headquarters in Rawalpindi.[448] Military operations against militants in the FATA and Swat have continued. Under Kayani, the military has performed better than in previous operations. It has launched three major operations since 2008. Although the Pakistan military refers to these operations as low-intensity conflict, it employs the classic counterinsurgency strategy of "clear, hold, build, and transfer."[449] The first operation to employ this approach, Operation SHERDIL (Lion Heart), was in the Bajaur Agency of the FATA. The operation lasted from August 2008 until February 2009 and was an endeavor to dismantle the *Tehreek-e-Nafaz-e-Sharia-e-Mohammadi* (TNSM; Movement for the Enforcement of Islamic Law), a militant group led by Sufi Mohammad. The TNSM seeks to enforce Islamic law in the country and developed a stronghold in Bajaur.

The military reportedly changed tactics from its conventional approach, sought greater support from tribal councils and local militias *(lashkars)*, and used more population-centric approaches. The military considered the operation in Bajaur to be more successful than previous operations against militants.[450] However, during the summer of 2009, the TNSM regrouped and began expanding its influence and gaining territory closer to what was seen as Pakistan's heartland.[451] The population increasingly viewed the TNSM negatively as it burned girls' schools and enforced strict punishments for any violation of its view of Islamic law. In particular, a video capturing the TNSM severely whipping a young girl for a supposed immodest act intensified public rage.[452] The military responded by launching Operation RAH-E-RAST (Path to Righteousness) in 2009 in Swat District and Operation RAH-E-NIJAT (Path to Salvation) in South Waziristan Agency.[453]

Some observers have credited Kayani with transforming military operations in Pakistan's unstable western regions, moving away from the use of conventional battle tactics toward a more effective counter-insurgency campaign.[454] However, the shift in military tactics has resulted in a large number of internally displaced persons and higher military casualties. In the Bajaur and Swat operations, the military cleared the area before entering, displacing more than 3 million people,[455] only 200,000 of whom the government accommodated in camps. The military has undertaken efforts to rebuild in areas of conflict; by the spring of 2010, it had finished 435 development projects, such as building schools and mosques, worth more than 515 million Pakistan rupees.[456]

Gen Kayani has also attempted to remake the military's image by reducing its role in the civil service and bureaucracy. Kayani ordered all serving military officers stationed in the civil service to return to the military, although retired military personnel retained their civilian positions.[457] In the summer of 2010, Pakistan experienced the worst flooding in its history. The military was active in providing aid to the population. Many Pakistanis believe that the military brought aid to flood victims while the civilian government did nothing.[458] This perception, combined with an overall decline in the security and economic situation, has led some in Pakistan to call for the military's return to power.[459] However, the military appears to be comfortable with its current position and is not likely to step in unless it feels that the civilian regime is threatening the integrity of the country or the military.[460]

Following the 2 May 2011 U.S. operation that killed Usama bin Ladin, the Pakistani public and military openly questioned the military and its role in society. Some believe that the military's inability to recognize and thwart the U.S. operation points to its lack of sophistication and expertise and question whether the military should receive as much public expenditure as it does.[461] There have been calls for Gen Kayani's removal.[462] However, in the wake of the crisis, Gen Kayani has worked diligently to rebuild public support for

the military, and the military, as the largest political and economic organization in the country, will likely continue to play a prominent role in Pakistani society.

Sources Cited

[1] Fair, Dr. C. Christine. Interviewed 24 January 2011; Lalwani, Mr. Sameer. Interviewed 4 February 2011.

[2] Abbas, Dr. Hassan. Interviewed 24 March 2011.

[3] Devji, Dr. Faisal. Interviewed 13 April 2010.

[4] Lalwani, Sameer. "The Pakistan Military's Adaptation to Counterinsurgency in 2009." New America Foundation. (January 2010) http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2010/the_pakistan_military_s_adaptation_to_counterinsurgency_in_2009_27918 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[5] Schofield, Ms. Carey. Interviewed 14 April 2010.

[6] Lieven, Anatol. "Understanding Pakistan's Military." Open Democracy. (9 August 2010) http://www.opendemocracy.net/anatol-lieven/understanding-pakistan%E2%80%99s-military (accessed 20 June 2011).

[7] Lieven, Dr. Anatol. Interviewed 25 January 2011.

[8] Synnott, Hilary. *Transforming Pakistan: Ways out of Instability*. The International Institute of Strategic Studies: Routledge. (2009), p. 51.

[9] Siddiqa, Ayesha. *Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*. London: Pluto Press. (2007), p. 2.

[10] Nawaz, Shuja. *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2008), p. 575.

[11] Cohen, Stephen P. *The Pakistan Army*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. (1984), p. 150.

[12] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Nawaz, Mr. Shuja. Interviewed 25 February 2011.

[13] Yusuf, Dr. Moeed. Interviewed 2 February 2011; Aziz, Mahzar. *Military Control on Pakistan: The Parallel State*. New York: Routledge. (2008), p. 9.

[14] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[15] Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced).

[16] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 565.

[17] Cohen, Stephen P. "Coping with a Failing Pakistan." *Norwegian Peacebuilding Center*, no. 1 (February 2011), p. 1.

[18] Abbas, Dr. Hassan. Interviewed 11 February 2011; Abbas, Hassan. "Reforming Pakistan's Police and Law Enforcement Structure." *United States Institute of Peace, Special Report* no. 266 (February 2011), p. 2.

[19] Yusuf, Dr. Moeed. Interviewed 3 February 2011.

[20] Cohen, "Coping with a Failing Pakistan," (previously referenced), p. 3.

[21] Abbas, Hassan. "Defining the Punjabi Taliban Network." *CTC Sentinel* 2, no. 4 (April 2009), pp. 1-2.

[22] International Crisis Group. "Pakistan: The Mullahs and the Military." *International Crisis Group Report*, no. 49 (20 March 2003), p. ii.

[23] Kukreja, Veena. *Contemporary Pakistan: Political Processes, Conflicts, and Crises*. London: SAGE Publications. (2003), p. 207.

[24] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[25] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[26] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Devji interview, (previously referenced).

[27] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[28] Cohen, Dr. Stephen P. Interviewed 8 February 2011.

[29] Lalwani, Mr. Sameer. Interviewed 27 January 2011.

[30] Bari, Faisal. "Macro Economic Performance and Prospects." In Charles H. Kennedy and Cynthia Botteron [eds.].

Pakistan 2005. New York: Oxford University Press. (2006), pp. 13-17.

[31] Cohen, "Coping with a Failing Pakistan," (previously referenced), p. 4.

[32] United Nations Development Programme. "Pakistan." http://undp.org.pk/undp-and-the-youth.html (accessed 24 June 2011).

[33] Dr. Abbas, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[34] Nelson, Dr. Matthew. Interviewed 2 August 2010.

[35] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 584.

[36] Cohen, "Coping with a Failing Pakistan," (previously referenced), p. 3.

[37] Nawaz, Mr. Shuja. Interviewed 11 February 2011.

[38] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[39] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[40] Abbas, Hassan. *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror.* New York: M.E. Sharpe Armork. (2005), p. 70.

[41] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[42] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[43] Cohen, Dr. Stephen P. Interviewed 28 February 2011.

[44] Shafqat, Saeed. *Civil Military Relations in Pakistan from Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Benazir Bhutto*. Boulder: Westview Press. (1997), p. 176.

[45] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 70.

[46] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 71.

[47] "Pakistan Military tries to Rebuild Morale after Bin Laden killing." http://www.stltoday.com/news/national/article_d6dd4cf1-1d0f-50de-b328-2870d4b3218e.html (accessed 21 June 2011).

[48] Pakistan Defense Forum. "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan." Pakistan Defense Forum. (25 January 2008) http://www.defence.pk/forums/strategic-geopolitical-issues/9397-comparative-strategic-culture-case-pakistan.html (1 July 2011).

[49] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within* z, (previously referenced), p. xxxi.

[50] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[51] Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced).

[52] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 206.

[53] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[54] Haqqani, Husain. *Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military.* Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2005), pp. 200, 217.

[55] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[56] Ahmed, Ishtiaq. "The Pakistan Military: Change and Continuity Under General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani." *ISAS Working Paper* no. 90 (18 September 2009), p. 1

[57] Lieven, Anatol. "Preserver and Destroyer, Review of Pakistan Eye of the Storm by Owen Bennett-Jones." London Review of Books, 25 no. 2 (23 January 2003). http://www.lrb.co.uk/v25/n02/anatol-lieven/preserver-and-destroyer (accessed 20 June 2011).

[58] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[59] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[60] Inskeep, Steve. "Is Pakistan's Military Facing an Enemy Within?" (10 June 2011) http://www.npr.org/2011/06/10/137087950/is-pakistans-military-facing-an-enemy-within (accessed 21 June 2011).

[61] Masood, Salman. "Former Pakistani Navy Commando Arrested in Sweep for Attack Suspects." New York Times. (30 May 2011) http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/31/world/asia/31pakistan.html (accessed 21 June 2011).

[62] Shahzad, Syed Saleem. "Al-Qaeda Warned of Pakistan Strike." Asia Times Online. (27 May 2011) http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/ME27Df06.html (accessed 21 June 2011)

[63] Inskeep, (previously referenced).

[64] "General Kayani seeks to Repair Dented Army Pride." International Herald Tribune. (20 June 2011) http://tribune.com.pk/story/192512/general-kayani-seeks-to-repair-dented-army-pride/ (accessed 21 June 2011.

[65] Perlez, Jane. "Pakistan's Chief of Army Fights to keep his Job." New York Times. (15 June 2011) http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/16/world/asia/16pakistan.html?_r=3&pagewanted=1&ref=global-home (accessed 21 June 2011).

[66] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[67] Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced); Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[68] Ms. Schofield interview, (previously referenced); Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[69] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 36.

[70] Ms. Schofield interview, (previously referenced).

[71] Dr. Cohen, 8 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[72] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[73] Ibid.

[74] Oxford Analytical Profile. "Pakistan: New Army Chief will Focus on Morale, Image." Oxford Analytical. (2007) http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/OA%20-%20Kayani%20Profile.pdf (accessed 1 July 2011), p. 2.

[75] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[76] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 61.

[77] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[78] Shafqat, (previously referenced), p. 172.

[79] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced).

[80] Dr. Abbas, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[81] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*,(previously referenced), p. 137.

[82] Cohen, Stephen P. *The Idea of Pakistan*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute Press. (2004), p. 99.

[83] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[84] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 60.

[85] Synnott, (previously referenced), p. 22.

[86] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 119.

[87] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 59.

[88] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 571; Fair, C. Christine and Nawaz, Shuja. "The Changing Pakistan Officer Army Corp." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 1 (2011).

[89] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 119.

[90] Bangash, Mr. Yaqoob. Interviewed 13 April 2010.

[91] Ahmed, Feroz. "Pakistan: Ethnic Fragmentation or National Integration." *The Pakistan Development Review* 35, no. 4 Part II (Winter 1996), p. 640.

[92] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[93] Oxford Analytical Profile, (previously referenced), p. 1.

[94] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 59; Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[95] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 133.

[96] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[97] Pakistan Defense Forum. "The Sindh Regiment."http://www.defence.pk/forums/land-forces/33791-sindh-regiment.html (accessed 20 June 2011).

[98] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[99] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[100] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[101] Lall, Dr. Marie. Interviewed 9 April 2010.

[102] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[103] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 3.

[104] Hussain, Zahid. *Frontline Pakistan: The Struggle with Militant Islam*. New York: Columbia University Press. (2007), p. 20.

[105] Cloughley, Brian. *A History of the Pakistan Army: War and Insurrections*, third edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (2006), p. 246.

[106] Hussain, Zahid, (previously referenced), p. 45.

[107] Dr. Nelson, 2 August 2010 interview, (previously referenced).

[108] Cohen, Stephen Philip. "The Jihadist Threat to Pakistan." *The Washington Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (Summer 2003), p. 16.

[109] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Ms. Schofield interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Lall, 9 April 2010 interview, (previously referenced).

[110] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 364.

[111] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[112] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 24.

[113] Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. *The Armed Forces of Pakistan*. New York: New York University Press. (2001), p. 179.

[114] Ibid., p. 180.

[115] Lalwani, Sameer. "Pakistani Capabilities for a Counter-insurgency Campaign: A Net Assessment." Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative, *New America Foundation* (September 2009), p. 42.

[116] Fair, C. Christine and Jones, Seth G. *Counterinsurgency in Pakistan*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation. (2010), p. 35.

[117] Pakistan Defense Forum, "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan," (previously referenced).

[118] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[119] "Internal Threat Facing Pakistan far Great than External: Kayani." (4 July 2009) http://www.topnews.in/internal-threat-facing-pakistan-far-greater-external-kayani-2185971 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[120] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 24.

[121] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 58.

[122] Lalwani, "Pakistani Capabilities for a Counter-insurgency Campaign," (previously referenced), p. 42.

[123] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 275.

[124] Fair and Jones, (previously referenced), p. 5.

[125] Ahmed, Ali. "Reconciling Doctrines: Prerequisite for Peace in South Asia." *Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses*, *IDSA monograph Series* no. 3 (September 2010), p. 30.

[126] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[127] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[128] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 232; Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 167.

[129] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 168

[130] Trainert, Oliver and Wagner, Christian. "Pakistan as a Nuclear Power: Nuclear Risks, Regional Conflicts, and the Dominant Role of the Military." *SWP Research Paper* (June 2009), p. 9.

[131] Cordesman, Anthony. "The India-Pakistan Military Balance." *Center for Strategic International Studies* (May 2002), p. 4.

[132] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*,(previously referenced), p. 231.

[133] Cordesman, (previously referenced), p. 35.

[134] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 171.

[135] Ibid., p. 173.

[136] Ahmed, (previously referenced), p. 37.

[137] Trainert and Wagner, (previously referenced), pp. 8, 10.

[138] "Pakistan: Instability Raises Nuclear Safety Concerns." *Oxford Analytical* (31 August 2009), p. 1.

[139] Trainert and Wagner, (previously referenced), p. 11.

[140] "Pakistan: Instability Raises Nuclear Safety Concerns," (previously referenced), pp. 1-2.

[141] Abbas, "Reforming Pakistan's Police and Law Enforcement Structure," (previously referenced), p. 2.

[142] Pakistan Defense Forum, "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan," (previously referenced).

[143] Lalwani, "Pakistan Military's Adaptation to Counter-insurgency in 2009," (previously referenced). http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2010/the_pakistan_military_s_adaptation_to_counterinsurgency_in_2009_27918 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[144] Markley, Daniel. *Securing Pakistan's Tribal Belt*. Council on Foreign Relations, Council Special Report No. 36, Centre for Preventative Action (August 2008), p. 11.

[145] Abbas, Dr. Hassan. Interviewed 28 January 2011.

[146] Pakistan Defense Forum, "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan," (previously referenced).

[147] Lalwani, "Pakistan Military's Adaptation to Counter-insurgency in 2009," (previously referenced).

[148] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[149] Nawaz, Shuja. "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency." *Atlantic Council* (February 2011), p. 1.

[150] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[151] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[152] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. xxxv.

[153] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[154] Campbell, Kirk S. *Civil-Military Relations and Political Liberalization: A Comparative Study of the Military's Corporateness and Political Values in Egypt, Syria, Turkey, and Pakistan*. PhD thesis, The George Washington University. (2009), p. 386.

[155] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Fair and Nawaz, (previously referenced).

[156] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 386; Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[157] Fair and Nawaz, (previously referenced).

[158] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[159] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 32.

[160] Oxford Analytical Profile, (previously referenced), p. 1.

[161] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 32.

[162] Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[163] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 576; Mr. Nawaz, 25 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[164] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[165] Mr. Nawaz, 25 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[166] Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan*, (previously referenced), p. 99.

[167] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[168] Cohen, *The Idea of Pakistan*, (previously referenced), p. 99.

[169] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[170] Cordesman, (previously referenced), p. 5; Mr. Nawaz, 25 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[171] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 46-47.

[172] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[173] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 397.

[174] Pakistan Military Consortium. "Pakistan Army and Paramilitary." http://www.pakdef.info/pakmilitary/army/main1.html (accessed 14 March 2011).

[175] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 46-47.

[176] Lalwani, "Pakistani Capabilities for a Counter-insurgency Campaign," (previously referenced), appendix IX.

[177] Saad, S.; Ali, M.; and Shabbir, Usman. "Special Services Group Army." Pakistan Military Consortium. http://www.pakdef.info/pakmilitary/army/regiments/ssg.html (accessed 14 March 2011).

[178] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 88.

[179] Lieven, Dr. Anatol. Interviewed 3 March 2011.

[180] Cordesman, (previously referenced), p. 6.

[181] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 93.

[182] Ibid., p. 98.

[183] Ibid., p. 105.

[184] Ibid., p. 43.

[185] Ahmed, Ishtiaq. "Pakistan Inter-Services Intelligence: A Profile." *ISAS Insights*, no. 36 (15 August 2008), p. 2; Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[186] Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced).

[187] Grare, Frederic. *Reforming the Intelligence Agencies in Pakistan's Transitional Democracy.* Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2009), p. 15.

[188] Hussain, Zahid, (previously referenced), p. 13.

[189] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[190] Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Grare, (previously referenced), p. 16.

[191] Hussain, Zahid, (previously referenced), p. 13.

[192] Grare, (previously referenced), p. 4.

[193] Ibid., pp. 32-34.

[194] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 47-48.

[195] Ashraf, Tariq Mahmud. "The Pakistan Frontier Corps in the War on Terrorism Part One." Terrorism Monitor 6, no. 15 (25 July 2008). http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=5053&tx_ttnews[backPid]=167&no_cache=1 (accessed 24 June 2011).

[196] Markley, (previously referenced), p. 37.

[197] Ashraf, "The Pakistan Frontier Corps in the War on Terrorism Part One," (previously referenced).

[198] Markley, (previously referenced), p. 37.

[199] Fair and Jones, (previously referenced), p. 37.

[200] Lalwani, "Pakistani Capabilities for a Counter-insurgency Campaign," (previously referenced), p. 37.

[201] Ashraf, "The Pakistan Frontier Corps in the War on Terrorism Part One," (previously referenced).

[202] Abbas, Hassan. "Transforming Pakistan's Frontier Corps." Terrorism Monitor 5, no. 6 (30 March 2007) http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=1056&tx_ttnews[backPid]=182&no_cache=1 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[203] Markley, (previously referenced), p. 37; Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[204] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[205] Ashraf, "The Pakistan Frontier Corps in the War on Terrorism Part One," (previously referenced).

[206] Ashraf, Tariq Mahmud. "The Pakistan Army's Frontier Corps and the War on Terrorism, Part Two." Terrorism Monitor 6, no. 16 (August 2008) http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=5113&tx_ttnews[backPid]=167&no_cache=1 (accessed 24 June 2011), p. 1; Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[207] Abbas, "Reforming Pakistan's Police and Law Enforcement Structure," (previously referenced), p. 16.

[208] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[209] Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[210] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[211] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[212] Jamal, Asad. "Police Organizations in Pakistan." Human Rights Commission of Pakistan. (May 2010) http://www.hrcp-web.org/pdf/Police_Organisations_in_Pakistan%5B1%5D.pdf (accessed 8 April 2011), p. 17.

[213] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 41.

[214] Global Security. "Pakistan."http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/pakistan/index.html (accessed 20 June 2011).

[215] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 39.

[216] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 396.

[217] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[218] Ibid.; Pakistan Military Consortium, "Pakistan Army and Paramilitary Forces," (previously referenced).

[219] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 42.

[220] Kennedy, Charles H. "Political Issues in 2004." In Charles H. Kennedy and Cynthia Botteron [eds.]. *Pakistan 2005.* New York: Oxford University Press. (2006), p. 2.

[221] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 107.

[222] Aziz, (previously referenced), p. 3.

[223] Mr. Nawaz, 25 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[224] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 54.

[225] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 23.

[226] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 55.

[227] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 390.

[228] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 81.

[229] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 574.

[230] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 23.

[231] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 81.

[232] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 391.

[233] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 106-107.

[234] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 391.

[235] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 89.

[236] Ibid., p. 82.

[237] Campbell, (previously referenced), p. 392.

[238] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 81.

[239] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 18.

[240] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 82.

[241] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 574.

[242] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 38.

[243] Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[244] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 15.

[245] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. xlii

[246] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[247] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[248] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[249] Ms. Schofield interview, (previously referenced).

[250] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 119.

[251] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 3.

[252] Ibid., p. 112.

[253] Ahmed, "The Pakistan Military: Change and Continuity Under General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani," (previously referenced), p. 2.

[254] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[255] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 7.

[256] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 349-350.

[257] Ibid., p. 4; Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 49.

[258] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 159-160.

[259] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 104.

[260] Pakistan Military Consortium. "Pakistan Arms Industry." http://www.pakdef.info/pakmilitary/army/companies.html (accessed 14 March 2011).

[261] Cheema, (previously referenced), pp. 160-161.

[262] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[263] Cheema, (previously referenced).

[264] Ashraf, Tariq Mahmud. "Sino-Pakistani Defense Relations: The War on Terrorism." Terrorism Monitor 6, no. 8 (17 April 2008). http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=4862&tx_ttnews[backPid]=167&no_cache=1 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[265] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 97.

[266] Ibid., p. 161.

[267] Ashraf, "Sino-Pakistani Defense Relations: The War on Terrorism," (previously referenced).

[268] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[269] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 353.

[270] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 83.

[271] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[272] Rashid, Jamal. "Pakistan and the Central Command." *MERIP Middle East Report*, no. 141 Hidden Wars (July-August 1986), pp. 28-30.

[273] Ibid., p. 31; Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[274] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[275] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[276] Siddiqa, Dr. Ayesha Khan. Interviewed 7 March 2011.

[277] Oxford Analytical Profile, (previously referenced), p. 1.

[278] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. xlii.

[279] Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced).

[280] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[281] Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[282] Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[283] Ahmed, Fasih. "A Military Juggling Act." Newsweek (27 February 2011) http://www.newsweek.com/2011/02/27/a-military-juggling-act.html (accessed 14 March 2011)

[284] Nawaz, (previously referenced), p. 572.

[285] Perlez, (previously referenced).

[286] Khan, Saad. "A Colonel's Coup in Pakistan." Huffington Post (20 June 2011) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/saad-khan/a-colonels-coup-in-pakist_b_879286.html (accessed 21 June 2011).

[287] Mr. Lalwani, 4 February 2011 interview (previously referenced).

[288] Lubold, Gordon. "US, Pakistan Build Military Ties, One Officer at a Time." Christian Science Monitor (11 May 2009) http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Military/2009/0511/p21s01-usmi.html (accessed 24 June 2011).

[289] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 93.

[290] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 8.

[291] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 3.

[292] Ibid., p. 6.

[293] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 34.

[294] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 30.

[295] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. xxxi; Dr. Siddiqa interview, (previously referenced).

[296] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 39.

[297] Dr. Nelson, 2 August 2010 interview, (previously referenced).

[298] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 87.

[299] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[300] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[301] Hussain, Zahid, (previously referenced), pp. 19-20.

[302] Dr. Lall, 9 April 2010 interview, (previously referenced); Ms. Schofield interview, (previously referenced).

[303] Fair and Nawaz, (previously referenced), p. 1.

[304] Aziz, (previously referenced), p. 58.

[305] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[306] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 5.

[307] Lavoy, Peter R. "Pakistan's Strategic Culture." Defense Threat Reduction Agency. (31 October 2006), p. 12.

[308] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), pp. 62-63.

[309] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 33.

[310] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[311] Mr. Lalwani, 27 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Yusuf, 2 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[312] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Dr. Cohen, 8 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[313] Lalwani, "Pakistani Capabilities for a Counter-insurgency Campaign," (previously referenced), p. 42.

[314] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 58; Dr. Devji interview, (previously referenced).

[315] Cordesman, (previously referenced), p. 2.

[316] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 4.

[317] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[318] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[319] Mr. Nawaz, 11 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 36.

[320] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[321] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 48

[322] Dogar, Yasub Ali. "The Talibanisation of Pakistan's Western Region." *Institute of South Asia Studies*, *ISAS Working Paper,* no. 98 (November 2009), p. 10.

[323] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 57.

[324] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[325] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 6.

[326] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within*, (previously referenced), p. 13

[327] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[328] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 1.

[329] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[330] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 18.

[331] Pakistan Defense Forum, "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan," (previously referenced).

[332] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 13.

[333] Hussain, Akmal. "Pakistan: The Crisis of the State." http://www.akmalhussain.net/Publish%20Work/IslamPoliticsAndTheState/TheCrisisofTheState.pdf (accessed 14 March 2011), p. 12.

[334] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 20.

[335] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced); Jalal, Ayesha. "India's Partition and the creation of Pakistan." *The Literary Encyclopedia* (9 February 2006). http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=825 (accessed 28 March 2011).

[336] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 20.

[337] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[338] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 2.

[339] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 18.

[340] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 22.

[341] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 32.

[342] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 49.

[343] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 3; Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 17.

[344] Cohen, *The Pakistan Army*, (previously referenced), p. 33.

[345] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 16.

[346] Ibid.

[347] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[348] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 62.

[349] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[350] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 122.

[351] Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[352] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 29.

[353] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[354] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 132.

[355] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 43.

[356] Kennedy, Charles H. "A User's Guide to Guided Democracy: Musharraf and the Pakistani Military Governance Paradigm." In Charles H. Kennedy and Cynthia Botteron [eds.]. *Pakistan 2005*. New York: Oxford University Press. (2006), pp. 120-122.

[357] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 37.

[358] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 58.

[359] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 67.

[360] Ibid., p. 70.

[361] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 110.

[362] Ibid., p. 112.

[363] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 24.

[364] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 73.

[365] Ibid., p. 138.

[366] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 128.

[367] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 73.

[368] Rose, Leo E. and Sisson, Richard. *War and Secession: Pakistan, India and the Creation of Bangladesh*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. (1990), p. 8.

[369] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 134.

[370] Rose and Sisson, (previously referenced), p. 10.

[371] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 124.

[372] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 74.

[373] Schanberg, Sydney. *Beyond the Killing Fields: War Writings.* Compiled and edited by Robert Miraddi. Washington: Potomac Books Inc. (2010), p. 122.

[374] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 70.

[375] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*,(previously referenced), p. 63.

[376] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 74.

[377] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 160.

[378] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 145.

[379] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 87.

[380] Staniland, Paul. "Back to the Future, Again and Again (and um, again): Military Cohesion, Mass Contention, and Pakistan's Peculiar Regime Instability." Draft vl5 Paper presented at the annual meeting of the APSA (2008), p. 39.

[381] Shafqat, (previously referenced), p. 168.

[382] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 219.

[383] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[384] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 77.

[385] Haqqani, (previously referenced), pp. 97,115.

[386] Shafqat, (previously referenced), p. 167.

[387] Synnott, (previously referenced), p. 123.

[388] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 228.

[389] Synnott, (previously referenced), p. 122.

[390] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 39.

[391] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 228.

[392] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 103.

[393] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 233.

[394] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[395] Ibid.

[396] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 237.

[397] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 145.

[398] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 98.

[399] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[400] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 101.

[401] Dr. Abbas, 28 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[402] Nawaz, *Crossed Swords: Pakistan, its Army, and the Wars Within* z, (previously referenced), p. 572.

[403] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 241.

[404] Shafqat, (previously referenced), p. 203.

[405] Kennedy, "A User's Guide to Guided Democracy," (previously referenced), p. 135.

[406] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 247.

[407] Ibid., p. 254.

[408] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*,(previously referenced), p. 13.

[409] Oakley, Robert with Gaday, Franz Stefan. "Radicalization by Choice: ISI and the Pakistan Army." *Strategic Forum*, no. 247 (October 2009), p. 4.

[410] Pakistan Defense Forum, "Comparative Strategic Culture: The Case of Pakistan," (previously referenced).

[411] Dupree, Nancy Hatch. "Demographic Reporting on Afghan Refugees in Pakistan." *Modern Asian Studies* 22, no. 4 (1998), p. 848.

[412] Felabab-Brown, Vanda. "The Drug Economy in Afghanistan and Pakistan and Military Conflict in the Region." In Ehsan Ahrari, Vanda Felbab-Brown, and Louise I. Shelley [eds.]. With Nazia Hussain. *Narco-Jihad- Drug Traf-*

ficking and Security and Afghanistan and Pakistan. National Bureau of Asian Research, NBR Special Report # 20 (December 2009).

[413] Kukreja, (previously referenced), p. 192.

[414] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[415] Synnott, (previously referenced), p. 51.

[416] Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[417] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 286-305.

[418] Dogar, (previously referenced), p. 13.

[419] Shafqat, (previously referenced), p. 228.

[420] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 91.

[421] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 305.

[422] Joeck, Neil. "The Kargil War and Nuclear Deterrence." In Sumit Ganguly and S. Paul Lapur [eds.] *Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia: Crisis Behavior and the Bomb*. Routledge. (2008), p. 118.

[423] Fair and Jones, (previously referenced), p. 21.

[424] Haqqani, (previously referenced).

[425] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), pp. 172-173.

[426] Haqqani, (previously referenced), p. 254.

[427] Siddiqa, (previously referenced), p. 97.

[428] Dr. Cohen, 28 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[429] Joeck, (previously referenced), p. 118.

[430] Cloughley, (previously referenced), p. 335.

[431] Cheema, (previously referenced), p. 152.

[432] Abbas, *Pakistan's Drift into Extremism: Allah, the Army, and America's War on Terror*, (previously referenced), p. 219.

[433] Hussain, Zahid, (previously referenced), p. 1; Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[434] Synnott, (previously referenced), p. 70.

[435] Mustafa, Dr. Daanish. Interviewed 14 April 2010.

[436] Fair and Jones, (previously referenced), pp. 24-25.

[437] Haqqani, Hussain. "The Role of Islam in Pakistan's Future." *The Washington Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (2004), p. 92.

[438] Dr. Lieven, 3 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[439] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 8.

[440] Lalwani, "Pakistan Military's Adaptation to Counter-insurgency in 2009," (previously referenced).

[441] Johnson, Thomas H. and Mason, M. Chris. "No Sign until the Burst of Fire: Understanding the Pakistan-Afghanistan Frontier." *International Security* 32, no. 4 (Spring 2008).

[442] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 8.

[443] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The Pakistan Army and Post Election Scenarios." (13 February 2008).

[444] Markley, (previously referenced), p. 11.

[445] Masood, Salman. "Furor over Musharraf's Suspension of Pakistan's Chief Justice." New York Times. (15 March 2007) http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/15/world/asia/15iht-pakistan.4922391.html (accessed 20 June 2011).

[446] Kronstadt, K. Alan. "Pakistan's Domestic Political Developments." CRS Report for Congress (19 September 2005) http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32615.pdf (accessed 20 June 2011).

[447] "Another Term for Gen Kayani." Dawn. (26 July 2010) http://archives.dawn.com/archives/55688 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[448] Dr. Abbas, 24 March 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[449] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 1.

[450] Mullick, Haider Ali Hussein. "Lions and Jackals: Pakistan's Emerging Counterinsurgency Strategy." Foreign Affairs (15 July 2009) http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65200/haider-ali-hussein-mullick/lions-and-jackals (accessed 20 June 2011).

[451] Nawaz, Shuja. "Pakistan's Summer of Chaos." *Foreign Policy* (17 June 2009).

[452] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 10.

[453] Lalwani, "Pakistan Military's Adaptation to Counter-insurgency in 2009," (previously referenced).

[454] Nawaz, Shuja. "Kayani and Pakistan's Civil-Military Relations." Atlantic Council (23 July 2010) http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/kayani-and-pakistans-civil-military-relations (accessed 20 June 2011).

[455] Nawaz, "Pakistan's Summer of Chaos," (previously referenced).

[456] Nawaz, "Learning by Doing: The Pakistan Army's Experience with Counterinsurgency," (previously referenced), p. 12.

[457] Dr. Fair interview, (previously referenced); Mr. Lalwani, 4 February 2011 interview, (previously referenced)..

[458] Zaidi, S. Akbar. "Pakistan after the Floods." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (29 September 2010). http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41635 (accessed 20 June 2011).

[459] Lieven, "Understanding Pakistan's Military," (previously referenced).

[460] Dr. Lieven, 25 January 2011 interview, (previously referenced).

[461] "Pakistan Military Chief under Pressure following U.S. Raid." Voice of America. (16 June 2011) http://www.voanews.com/english/news/-Pakistan-Military-Chief-Under-Pressure-Following-US-Raid-124015404.html (accessed 21 June 2011).

[462] "General Kayani seeks to Repair Dented Army Pride," (previously referenced).