Scenario 111

BREAKING PAKISTAN PLAN

Why the Chief of the Pak-Army Gen Raheel Sharif took the bold decision [in 2013 when he took his assignment] to face the menace of terrorism in Pakistan. Successive terrorist activities since a decade at least, in which his two forerunners [Gen Pervez Musharraf & Gen Kayani AND not the army as a whole] were named as innocent partners, had not only devastated Pakistan economically but was *nearly declared a 'failed state'* by the world's defence - media commentators.

To understand the phenomenon in true spirits, one may like to peep into the vicious plans designed by our 'friends' in recent past.

'US's BREAKING PAKISTAN' PLAN:

Dissident voices went on rising in Balochistan since about a decade. Tribal belt stayed disturbed as such since 2001 due to drone attacks from the US and power play by Pakistani and Afghan Taliban factions. Gilgit valley kept on bleeding in lawlessness triggered by sectarian game players. Karachi has been burning since 1990s and still the killing sprees were on, till the recent past at least, amidst a controlled atmosphere of 'bhatta' [forceful extortion], 'bori-band' bodies' culture, 'Qabza' mafias and acute administrative lethargy on the part of state.

Pakistan was being pushed towards a dead end due to short sightedness of their political leaderships in succession. Did the country deserve so; read the following paragraphs based on open American Announcement of December 2009 [*Published at pakspectators.com on 10th March 2012*].

Quoting a few lines from an article titled 'Obama Declares War on Pakistan' written by Webster G. Tarpley on 11th December 2009 available on internet media:

'Obama's West Point speech of December 1 (2009) represents far more than the obvious brutal escalation in Afghanistan - <u>it is nothing less than a declaration of all-out war by the United States against Pakistan</u>. This is a brand-new war, a much wider war now targeting Pakistan, a country of 160 million people armed with nuclear weapons. In the process, **Afghanistan is [also] scheduled to be broken up**.

This is no longer the Bush - Cheney Afghan war we have known in the past. This is something immensely bigger: the attempt to destroy the Pakistani central government in Islamabad and to sink that country into a chaos of civil war, Balkanization, subdivision and general mayhem.

The chosen strategy is to massively export the Afghan civil war into Pakistan and beyond, fracturing Pakistan along ethnic lines. It is an oblique war and the United States and its associates in aggression are far too weak to attack directly. In this war, the Taliban are employed as US proxies. This aggression against Pakistan is Obama's attempt to wage the Great Game against the hub of Central Asia and Eurasia.'

[Referring to Obama's speech at West Point Academy New York on $1^{\rm st}$ December 2009 at the Cadet's passing out occasion of US army]

For a moment; leaving the mockery of 9/11 and Osama's killing in Abbotabad aside, let us contemplate that what were the real aims of dominating Pakistan from all the four corners. The war actually started long before when the Americans had planned to take over Iraq for oil and Pakistan because of having nuclear technology. On Iraq the US forces attacked in the garb of 'Mass Weapons' but for Pakistan they developed an idea of splitting the country through civil war.

The architect of this Pakistani civil war was Gen Stanley McChrystal of US Special Forces , who had organized the infamous network of US torture chambers in Iraq by successfully patronizing the Iraqi civil war of Sunnis versus Shiites, by creating 'al Qaeda in Iraq' under the pseudo command of a double agent Zarkawi.

Tarpley had rightly pointed out then that 'McChrystal's senior, Gen Petraeus, wants to be the new US Field Marshal' through CIA or otherwise and possibly the next US president. Both had gone home but left the bleak fu-

ture for the south western Asia as 2012-13 were the election years in Afghanistan and Pakistan both.

If the US scenario through 2010-11 is analysed, the things had started taking shape. See the map of the prevalent ethnic groups of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, and India; these maps show only political borders which date back to the time of British imperialism. The main sects like Pashtun, Balochi, Kashmiri, Punjabi and Sindhi were purposefully divided in the above countries and then a new phenomenon on religious sectarian basis like *Sunnis, Shias, Deobandis, Ahl e hadiths* and many more was infused in them while settled in all areas.

From where the said groups get finances to live up lavishly and generously; the American government and especially the **Jewish lobby injected huge funds to feed the imams of all sects equally** and leaders through different ways but keeping themselves behind the curtain.

In the same essay, Webster Tarpley mentioned: Chris Matthews of MSNBC, a devoted associate of Obama, had pointed out that the US strategy as announced at West Point on 1st December 2009, 'very much resembles a Rube Goldberg mechanism. [He had described "al Qaeda" as the CIA's own terrorist squad.]' Even then, knowingly false and fabricated, it was then planned that:

'There are only few Al Qaeda fighters left in Afghanistan then why to concentrate US forces there rather than in Pakistan where Al Qaeda are present now, so our next target should be Pakistan and not Afghanistan.'

The innocent Pakistani people should have been able to grasp from the above that to conquer their country the US had first developed Al Qaeda ideology, trained certain people as their own brigades, equipped them with Indian / American arsenal, planted them in Afghanistan, then ordered to move into Pakistan to make out a case for the world that Pakistan harboured Al Qaeda so was being attacked. Pakistani leadership could not understand it hoping to brew more billions of dollars on one pretext or the other. Their ultimate fate was visibly bannered on the wall.

A Democratic Senator Russ Feingold of Wisconsin once asked (Ref: ABC TV) the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, and (late) Mr Holbrooke that: 'if there is a risk that we build up troops in Afghanistan, that will push more extremists into Pakistan?' They couldn't deny it and next week the then PM Gilani had to reflect their concerns over the same. The Senator said in the television interview that:

'Pakistan, in the border region near Afghanistan, is perhaps the epicentre [of global terrorism] although al Qaeda is operating all over the world, in Yemen, in Somalia, in northern Africa, affiliates in Southeast Asia. Why would we build up 100,000 or more troops in parts of Afghanistan, (pointing out towards) in Helmand Province? – [of course, to teach a lesson to Pakistan].'

There was no answer; obviously to control and try occupying Pakistan which had started happening then bit by bit; by and by.

In the above scenario, Pakistan should have pondered to formulate a national policy on the related issues. *After the event of Osama's killing there were three more drone attacks in the FATA area within the same week*. Even then Pakistanis were not in a mood to demonstrate a consensus as a nation.

Most of the population considered Osama as a foreign national, an illegal immigrant, as Pakistan's equal enemy due to whom 42000 civilians and 5000 army troops were sacrificed besides thousands of homes devastated but still there were some who had shown street power for him [Osama BL], taken out processions, offered *Namaz e Janaza* in absentia and enchanted slogans. Moreover, they felt pride in doing so. By what standards Osama was Pakistan's national hero leaving aside the Gen Hamid Gul's innocent wishes of *Islamization* of Afghanistan at the cost of Pakistani nationalism.

{What good Osama had done for Pakistan except giving a gift of £50million to Nawaz Sharif in 1986 to establish Mujahideen Training Camps in Punjab but, instead, were allegedly invested by him in buying properties in London on which multi-billion estate business of Hasan Nawaz was later established.}

What contribution Osama made for betterment of Pakistan beyond leaving behind two mixed generations of Uzbeks, Chechans and Afghani *Jehadis* in its tribal areas.

The real issue was of solidarity of Pakistan. No body thought for it as a nationalist. Pakistan should have confined to think that America had attacked it and was also looking for more such chances to ruin it. Pakistani leaders continued sleeping or unable to see across the wall though were overtly warned by President Obama on 1st December 2009 as cited in the first paragraph. Pakistan was gradually trapped and dragged into war unconsciously; later pushed towards the end scenes.

The US plans were not secret; they were banging South West Asian doors since long. Pakistan's brief - case political rulers should have kept their eyes open to read the banners on their walls around.

WHY US WANTED PAKISTAN'S BREAK:

Why was the United States so obsessed with the break-up of Pakistan?

First and the foremost reason; that Pakistan has been traditionally a strategic ally and economic partner of China. With the development of Gwadar port in Balochistan, Pakistan opted to function as an energy corridor linking the oil fields of Iran with the Chinese market. This provided China a guaranteed land - based oil supply not subject to Anglo - American naval superiority, while also cutting out the 12,000 mile tanker route around India and adjacent countries of Asia. Beijing had already done a deal with Tehran for China's pipeline project through Pakistan and Islamabad always welcomed China's participation.

The proposed pipeline from Gwadar to Chinese border in Pakistan's north was expected to bring \$200 million to \$500 million annually for Islamabad in transit fees alone. Blue print of the project was successfully worked out. Pakistan offered to China the shortest possible route to import oil from the Gulf countries, too; so China had agreed to finance the said pipeline project. Referring to the **ASIA TIMES** dated **27th May 2009**:

'The Chinese have also proposed a refinery at Gwadar. Imports using the pipeline would allow Beijing to reduce the portion of its 80% oil shipped through the narrow Strait of Malacca. Islamabad had once announced the plans to extend its railway track from Gwadar to China.

Gwadar port had already been declared feasible as likely terminus of proposed multibillion - dollar gas pipelines reaching from the South Pars fields in Iran or from Qatar, and from the Daulatabad fields in Turkmenistan for export to world markets.'

The Anglo - American forces were hell-bent on stopping this normal and peaceful economic progress amongst the neighbouring states. They were successful in at least stopping the whole process during PPP's regime of Mr Zardari but one must hail the strategy of PML[N] government installed in

2013 which not only revived the previous plans but also took one step forward to launch adequate road links from Gwadar to Chinese borders.

Gen Raheel Shrif swiftly took the road project in hand and deployed 3200 Pak-Army personnel to start the project in hilly terrains of Northern Areas through Army's Engineering Corp and Frontier Works Org [FWO] on immediate basis.

Oil and natural gas pipelines from Iran across Pakistan and into China could carry energy resources into the Middle - Eastern Kingdoms and also to serve as conveyor belts for Chinese economic influence around. The said planning made Anglo - American dominion increasingly fragile in a part of the world which London and Washington had traditionally sought to control as their colonies. That was why since early 2009, US domestic propaganda started *portraying Pakistan as the home base of terrorism; sometimes as nearly 'failing state'*.

Another analysis of **30**th **December 2009** [available on media pages] had confirmed President Obama's vicious plans in the garb of new world order which he continued to preach amongst his associates.

A former NATO officer claimed that US Special Forces conducted secret raids inside Pakistan's border regions between 2003 and 2008, but only one was ever made public; that was of September 2008 which was condemned as a provocation by the Pak-Army. Most of those raids were done in Balochistan province, AND Baloch dissidents were told to blame the government in Islamabad for allowing these things to happen; thus US used to kill two birds with one stone. The NATO officer pointed out that:

"President Obama's West point speech of December One is a thinly veiled declaration of war against Pakistan in the sense that it announces the intent of the US to promote the dismemberment, the partition of Pakistan along ethnic lines and in order to do that you have to create trouble on the ground.

Ambassador Richard Holbrook, who is the US tsar for the region, was asked 'Do you have troops in Pakistan?' and he said 'The US has intelligence personnel in Pakistan but not troops'. And I would ask — What about the contractors, Mr Ambassador?"

Webster Tarpley's disclosed information published in '*The Nation'* and '*Vanity Fair'* magazines about <u>Blackwater Select</u> and <u>Total Intelligence</u>

<u>Solutions</u> having massive snatch and grab and even assassination operations carried out in Karachi, Pakistan's largest city, under the command of the US Joint Special Operations Command and CIA.

The Taliban refused to take responsibility for some explosions in public places in Pakistan and blamed the CIA for destabilizing the situation in the country through terror. It was held that:

"I guess from some points of view the golden age of Blackwater was perhaps not under Bush / Cheney but it is now under Obama; and they are running wild in ways they trample the sovereignty of Pakistan as a country."

The Pakistani people remember that these Blackwater mercenaries were issued Pakistani visas by the then Interior Minister Rehman Malik and Hussain Haqqani, Pakistan's envoy in Washington, without any security clearance. Some visa applications contained written 'President House Islamabad' as their place of stay in Pakistan. For details see Judges & Generals in Pakistan Vol-IV; Scenario 84 on Raymond Davis.

[Published at pakspectators.com on 10th March 2012]

PAK - ARMY DELEGATION HUMILIATED:

The journey of tense Pak-US relations had taken start soon after Obama's above referred speech of December 2009 but then

On 31st **August 2010,** Pakistan's military delegation was humiliated at Dulles International Airport of the United States, off loaded from plane, checked and rechecked before being cleared to proceed. The delegation had been invited by US military to visit CentCom (US Central Command). The visit was cancelled midway to protest against the alleged misbehaviour and the delegation was called back due to the harsh and humiliating treatment meted out to the Pakistani officers. The army delegation was boarding a flight from the Dulles Airport to attend a US Defence Department meeting at CentCom.

The said checking or search was not in routine nor was it required at all. The delegation maintained that they were interrogated and rudely treated by security officials at Airport. However, the cat came out of the bag [later] that:

'Once inside the United Airlines plane, one of the delegation members remarked that he hoped the flight might be his last flight.....their destiny. However, an attendant who overheard them mistook the officials for terrorists. The airport security staff was alerted, who off-loaded and questioned the Pakistani delegation and misbehaved with them.

The US Defence Department had apologised for the incident, but till then the delegation had decided to return home.'

The nine-member group of high-ranking Pakistani officers boarded United Airlines Flight 727 from Washington to Tampa late night but were pulled off the plane after one of them made above comments to a flight attendant; Mike Trevino, a United Airliner spokesman told. However, the Pakistani officials said the remark came from a General in the delegation who - weary of a long day of travel that began in Islamabad - said, 'I hope this is my last flight'. That was just the routine conversation but the Airline staff took it other way round.

That sparked a call to Dulles law enforcement officials, who detained the delegation for about three hours and refused to allow the officials to contact their embassy or the US military officials who had invited them to visit.

The delegation members were finally released after police at Dulles determined they did not pose a threat. But instead of proceeding to Tampa, the delegation was ordered to return to Pakistan by their military command in Islamabad, in protest of their treatment. [*The US media sources later divulged that the Pakistani officials were 'verbally abused'*.] The group of officers spent the next 48 hours in Washington while waiting for the next available flight home.

The Pakistani officers were originally en route to US Central Command headquarters in Tampa to attend the annual conference of the US - Pakistan Military Consultative Committee, said Maj David Nevers of the US Central Command. Pakistani officials were later offered apologies from Pentagon and CentCom officials both.

One odd comment from the American media:

'Pakistani Military brass were in a civilized country US where every one is equal. Late Ted Kennedy, a well known US senator, was stopped several times at US airports for security checks; he simply followed the process and never complained. Army Generals, Minis-

ters and the politicians never go through security checks in Pakistan but they have a rude awakening when they are abroad where they have to abide by the rules of that country.'

The same media link also wrote: <u>`perhaps the officials [might be] humiliated because they were Muslims and especially from a rigid Islamic state like Pakistan'</u>. Then the following event was quoted:

'In an Israeli cabinet meeting shortly after the 9/11 (False flag) "Terror" attacks, which benefited the State of Israel, Larry Silverstein's bank account and the Globalist agenda of stripping away our Constitutional rights with the absurdly - named 'Patriot' Act; Hebrew radio Kol Yisrael on Oct. 2, 2001, reported Shimon Perez cautioned Ariel Sharon not to upset Americans.

Reportedly, Sharon angrily boasted back to Perez: DON'T WORRY ABOUT AMERICAN PRESSURE ON ISRAEL. WE, THE JEWISH PEOPLE, CONTROL AMERICA, AND THE AMERICANS KNOW IT.'

Ruptured Pak-US relationship goes more tense

Washington and Islamabad had barely been on speaking terms since US forces killed Osama bin Laden on $2^{\rm nd}$ May 2011. But with American and NATO troops set to leave neighbouring Afghanistan soon after, nuclear-armed Pakistan had shown little motivation to improve relations; hatred of the US was growing in Pakistan.

Sheikh Rashid, 61, a veteran of Pakistani politic, six times MNA, served in several cabinet posts under PML(N) and Gen Musharraf from 2001 to 2008; lately founded his own party, the "Awami Muslim League Pakistan," had once formally declared *jihad* on America. For weeks, Sh Rashid had been going around the country with a travelling cavalcade of religious leadership, whipping up the masses into anger against United States.

The cavalcade consisted of the leaders of 44 religious groups who joined forces some years earlier to form the **'Pakistan Defence Council'**; Sh Rashid was amongst the moderate forces; unlike Hafiz Saeed, the old timer *aalim* [religious scholar]. The US government, for obvious reasons, had then announced a bounty of \$10 million for Hafiz Saeed's capture but he was just leading a normal life in Pakistan with no danger of arrest or capture from any side, neither from the public nor the state machinery. That bounty announcement appeared so amused for Saeed, who had promptly

called a press conference in Rawalpindi, where he openly joked about the bounty and said:

"I am here, and I am visible. America should give that reward money to me. I will be in Lahore tomorrow. America can contact me whenever it wants to. In my homeland I'm a hero, not a villain."

Pakistan was thrown into turmoil by the war in Afghanistan. Militant religious leaders had assumed cultural hegemony and went frenzied over the arrogance of the US superpower, its drone attacks in the border regions and the killing of Osama bin Laden in May 2011 — the general populace could not forget American's intrusion. Washington had not given the Pakistani government or military any advance notice, so as not to jeopardize the mission. The US humiliated its ally by showing its deep mistrust of Pakistan. The operations, known as 'Neptune's Spear' & 'Geranimo' created a rupture in relations between the US and Pakistan — still one can feel the cold wave.

The US armed forces and the Pak-Army always pretended to be working together, with diplomats and senior military officials of both countries travelling up and back; but for months, there had been a lack of communication between Gen James Mattis, Head of the US Central Command and in charge of the war in Afghanistan, and Gen Ashfaq Kayani, the Chief of the Pakistan Army. The Pakistani parliament, under President Zardari's instructions, once had named a committee to discuss new parameters for its new relationship with US but the matter could not gain importance.

The relationship went more sour when Pakistan refused to allow its territory to be used to transit NATO troops and ammunition in Afghanistan after November 2011's 'Salala Event', when NATO helicopters had [surely not] accidentally fired on two Pakistani border posts, killing 24 soldiers. Immediately after, NATO was forced to use a route through Central Asia, an extremely costly detour.

Later, when agreed to re-open the routs, Pakistan demanded a fee of \$1,500 for each container of food, fuel or military equipment that arrived at Karachi for onward transportation by truck to Kabul or Kandahar. NATO's only choice was to either accept the new price until its 2014 withdrawal or continue to use the Central Asian supply routes. The US had to accept the new price but got an exemption on tolls. *The US had not suffered much loss because nearly the same amount used to go in the pockets of corrupt Pakistani customs and police officials on duty en-route.*

In December 2011, an article in the well respected US magazine *The Atlantic* created a furore in both the countries. An essay titled "<u>The Ally from Hell</u>" started as:

'Pakistan lies. It is home to both radical jihadists and a large and growing nuclear arsenal. With a friend like this, who needs enemies?'

The twin authors described in detail how great the military's fear was that it could be deprived of its nuclear weapons and noted: 'the Pakistani generals' fears are not directed at al-Qaida, as one might assume, but the United States'. According to The Atlantic, Pakistan's security apparatus saw the attack on Bin Laden as an indication 'that the US has developed the technical means to stage simultaneous raids on Pakistan's nuclear facilities.'

The security measures Pakistan used to adopt to protect its arsenal were also noted. Most of the information given in the article was based on secret discussions between top brass of the two countries. Pakistan felt that the US Generals had deliberately leaked that classified information to some rogue US media-men.

The US machinery started pinching more; saying that:

'Pakistan is a nuclear power, but it's also a poor country that does little to alleviate poverty and illiteracy. About half of its 190 million people cannot read or write. Pakistan; if is a democracy, at least according to its constitution, it is terribly meaningful.

In reality, feudalism forms the basis of society, and old families like the Bhutto clan still control the country, as they always have. President Asif Ali Zardari has been given a reprieve.

He [Mr Zardari] is an accidental president, the widower of Benazir Bhutto, one of the most hated politicians in the country. His nickname from earlier days is "Mr. Ten Percent," because he was an investment minister in his wife's cabinet. He was convicted of corruption in 1999 and spent five years in prison.'

Pakistan was also cursed for its *Absurd Justice;* for decades, the justices were nothing more than the vicarious agents of the military, giving every coup a constitutional blessing - but they never got investigated President Zardari, and his old companions. Sometimes they tried to review the cases

that had come under the amnesty, involving millions of dollars that Zardari had allegedly laundered and deposited into Swiss bank accounts.

The judges could not harm Mr Zardari but turned to Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani instead, ultimately sentenced the defendant Gilani to a prison term lasting only some minutes, because it was [symbolically] deemed served [what inheritance the judiciary wanted to leave behind].

In fact the relationship between Pakistan and US suffered from mutual suspicion from the start, as far back as 2003, which had only increased over the years. US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had repeated her reprimand of the Pak-Army to go after the *Haqqani* network because, in NATO's assessment, that *Pashtun* clan of the Haqqanis, based in North Waziristan, was posing a serious threat to the US troops in Afghanistan.

The NATO held that seven simultaneous attacks in Kabul [killing 40 people] in mid-April 2012; suicide bombing killing 11 people shortly after Obama's unannounced visit to Afghanistan, 3 bombings in Pakistan's FATA killing 25 tribal elders, were all done allegedly by *Haqqani* Group.

From the perspective of the Pakistani Army, the US had planned to withdraw from Afghanistan by the end of 2014, thus Pakistan needed to keep all Afghan groups at all levels as 'equally important', including the Haqqani clan. Contrarily, the US, for its part, also wanted to retain its influence in the region after 2014 - but Pakistan was not affirming to become base for its operations any more; *hats off to Gen Raheel Sharif's stand*.

This was the upshot of a symbolic democratic conflict because in Pakistan, the civilian governments are either swept away in coups or forced to resign because of corruption.

GEN MUSHARRAF WAS LOUD ENOUGH:

Let us travel into the near past of US-Pak relations.

It was on official record and on media as well that the US government had given 10.65 billion dollars to Pakistan in the name of 'war on terror' [WOT] after 9/11 attacks on Trade Towers in 2001. (Gen Musharraf had, however, admitted nine billion dollar's aid during this period: referring to his interview to French daily 'Le Figaro' on 12th January 2008) Most of that aid was spent on agencies and their covert operations against

Taliban or Al-Qaeda. No audit or expenditure statement had been placed before the concerned 'audit party' (not talking of media or general public) of the Pakistan's Parliament; thus presumed by the people that Pakistan's 'agencies' were run by the Americans while seeking priorities from US control rooms and serving the US chains of command.

Till about a decade earlier, India had been claiming that the intelligence agencies of Pakistan remained associated with the CIA and Pentagon and worked as their B teams to fulfil the operational requirements of United States in the Asian region. [That is another fact that since the last decade that role has successfully been taken over by the Indian RAW and perhaps more vigorously.]

See a 'tiny' news clip from Pakistan's press; the leaders of FATA Grand Alliance (jirga), in a press conference held at Peshawar Press Club **on 12**th **January 2008**, had directly warned the US government that they should refrain from interference in the border belt adjoining tribal areas of Pakistan. In open words the jirga had retaliated and vowed that:

'If the US forces are seen at our tribal borders, they would be taught such lesson that they will forget their defeat in Vietnam. They should remember that Pakistan's safety and solidarity is our priority'.

The above news item was viewed with much concern in an arena of some statements then floated by the US. The picture became more blurred when the American's unrest was excavated amidst their sayings that 'we are unable to get any reasonable accountability on this front (sending aid to Gen Musharraf on account of 'War on Terror') thus they are not satisfied'. There was much hue and cry in US Senate and Congress and the then President Bush was asked to call the expenditure statement from Pakistan and the next instalment would only be issued after analysis and scrutiny of the aid previously supplied.

Before general elections of 2008 in America, most of the presidential candidates, particularly Obama and Hilary Clinton, had been launching their election campaigns on the basis of slogans carrying derogatory remarks against Pakistan. All Pakistanis were feeling embarrassed and depressed. The American candidates were openly saying that they would be sending US forces directly in the tribal areas of Pakistan to locate Osama and crush Taliban without permission of Pakistani government. Our Foreign Office seldom bothered to retaliate on the issue.

During January 2008, Gen Musharraf while releasing an interview to Daily 'Streets Times' of Singapore, first time opened his mind and mouth with sufficiently loud message that:

'If the NATO forces or the American troops entered Pakistani territory from Afghanistan, it will be treated an aggression by all means. If the American troops entered our tribal area on the pretext of searching Osama, it will be considered an open invasion. If the American forces did so without our permission, it will be taken as an act against our sovereignty.

If America understands that our forces or our intelligence are inactive there and the American troops would do a better job, it is false impression. I challenge them to come to our tribal mountains and they will definitely repent on their move'.

Gen Musharraf once more retaliated and tried to pay in the same coin while giving an interview to '*Le Figaro*' of France and saying that:

'Do you think Pakistan would die if it didn't receive this money (US aid)? Our economy is doing well. Over the last 6 years, we have received a total of around 9 billion dollars. More than half for fighting terrorism ... If the Americans do not want to pay any more, they should ask other people to help them. But the fight against terrorism would suffer.'

On the allegations of 'not doing more', Gen Musharraf had said:

'How can one say that we are not doing enough? We are the only country to have arrested or eliminated from 600 to 700 members of Al-Qaida.' (Referring to an interview to **Le-Figaro** dated **12**th **January 08**)

Would the US try to find out some other ally to cope with this situation, a question aroused amidst the above scenario of statements? Iran was already at their enemy list [then] and Mr Karzai in Afghanistan was not in a better position to help Americans at the borders where Karzai's forces themselves had no hold.

US never opted to launch a search for another ally; instead, they planned to pick it from our existing files and ranks. This time it was from within and was not a shrewd politician like Ms Benazir Bhutto to further the American cause, who would like to stand by them. No senior General had the capabil-

ity, sharpness and shrewdness to avail this chance, so they chose Mr Zardari to accomplish their theme.

In February 2008, the regime changed; history also changed its horses on the chess thus their tones also changed altogether - see what happened during those five years since then.