

**PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS  
UNDER OBAMA ADMINISTRATION 2009-2016 (A  
CRITICAL APPRAISAL)**

**BY**

**Fatima Kausar**



**DEPARTMENT OF PAKISTAN STUDIES  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES**

**ISLAMABAD**

**MAY 2022**

**PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS UNDER OBAMA  
ADMINISTRATION 2009-2016 (A CRITICAL APPRAISAL)**

**By**

**Fatima Kausar**

M.Phil., National University of Modern Languages Islamabad, 2022

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**In Pakistan Studies**

To

DEPARTMENT OF PAKISTAN STUDIES  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

## THESIS/DISSERTATION AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the Defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Social Sciences for acceptance:

**Thesis/ Dissertation Title:** PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS UNDER OBAMA ADMINISTRATION 2009-2016 (A CRITICAL APPRAISAL)

**Submitted By:** Fatima Kausar

**Registration #:** Numl-F19-16720

Master in Philosophy

Degree name in full

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Name of Degree

DR. FAZAL E RABBI

Name of Research Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Research Supervisor

PROF. DR. KHALID SULTAN

Name of Dean (FSS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Dean (FSS)

PROF DR. AAMIR IJAZ

Name of Rector

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Rector

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FORM

I Fatima Kausar

Daughter/ Son of Mir Shah Ali Khan

Registration # Numl-F19-16720

Discipline Pakistan Studies

Candidate of M.Phil. in Pakistan Studies at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis (Title **PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS UNDER OBAMA ADMINISTRATION 2009-2016 (A CRITICAL APPRAISAL**

submitted by me in partial fulfillment of MPhil/ PhD degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

---

Signature of Candidate

---

Name of Candidate

---

Date

## **ABSTRACT**

For almost seventy years, the relationship between the US and Pakistan has been based on short-term goals and no long-term strategy. This has led to the failure of both the governments to forge a long-term relationship. Despite their positive disposition towards each other, their interactions have not always been smooth. They are still close friends, but they have also got into a few rows over certain issues. The divergence of their interests on various policy issues can also affect their relations. The inconsistencies and transnational character of Pakistan-US relations are due to their various factors. These include their national interests and diplomatic differences.

After the previous administration's mishandling of the relationship with Pakistan, US President Barack Obama's team launched a new approach toward the country. The new approach, which was referred to as the "AfPak" strategy, was established to strengthen the relationship between the US and Pakistan. The US President focused on the war in Afghanistan and on improving the relationship between Pakistan and the US. Obama decreased its focus on the Pakistan's military establishment. Instead of choosing political groups as the preferred partners for the dialogue, Obama decided to work with the government of Pakistan through a more consultative approach. He also pushed for the passage of a Kerry-Lugar bill that has increased the aid for non-security sectors. The new approach helped break the political stalemate between the US and Pakistan. It also promoted the country's interests in South Asia. Despite the various issues that the US faced with Pakistan, it was still able to improve its relations with the country.

Although the US-Pakistan relationship is the longest and most intense in the region, it has become unstable due to the various factors that affect it and has undergone various changes during the Obama Administration. Aside from the US' interference in Pakistan's internal affairs, other factors such as the violation of its sovereignty and the unilateral actions taken by the US are also contributing to the complicated relationship between the two countries. There is also a lack of consensus on how the relationship should be built. Despite the various factors that affect the relationship between the US and Pakistan, it is still considered a complex and transnational one. This is due to the varying external and internal factors that affect the relationship.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. NO	TITLES	P. NO
	Thesis/Dissertation and defense Approval Form	
	Candidate Declaration Form	
	Abstract	
1	<b>Chapter 1</b> <b>Introduction</b> 1.1 Statement of the Problem 1.2 Aims and Objectives of the Study 1.3 Research Questions 1.4 Hypothesis 1.5 Theoretical Framework 1.6 Significance of the Study 1.7 Research Methodology 1.8 Review of the Literature 1.9 Scheme of Study	1-13
2	<b>Chapter 2</b> <b>Historical Background of Pakistan-United States Relations 1947-2008</b> 2.1 Era of Alliances 1947-1971 2.2 The Reappraisal 1972-1978 2.3 The Partnership 1979-1989 2.4 The Post Cold and the Decline of Pak-US relations in the 1990's 2.5 Revival of Pak-US relations in the Post 9/11	14-32
3	<b>Chapter 3</b> <b>Pakistan-United States Relations and the Obama Administration 2009-2016</b> 3.1 Obama Administration Policies/Strategies towards Pakistan 3.2 Pak-US bilateral ties and the Obama Administration	33-58
4	<b>Chapter 4</b> <b>Pakistan-United States Relations: Trust-Deficit and Issues of Irritants</b> <b>4.1 Trust-Deficit in Pak-US</b> 4.1.1 Pakistanis' Doubts of American role in the war against terrorism 4.1.2 American doubts of Pakistan role in the war against terrorism <b>4.2 Issues of Irritants in Pak-US relations</b>	59-81
5	<b>CHAPTER-5</b> <b>Finding, Conclusion, Suggestions/ Recommendations</b>	82-89
6	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	90-95

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am highly grateful to **ALLAH Almighty** for His countless blessings throughout my life and helping me achieve my goals and giving me strength in the completion of this project. May Allah give me courage, spirit and opportunities to learn more and more. May Allah guide me to the straight Path (Amin).

Peace and blessings be upon the **Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad Sallalloho Alaihi Wa, Alihi Wasallam** the most perfect among all human beings born the one who guided his followers to seek knowledge from cradle to grave and whose teachings have served as a beacon of light for me in the hours of despair.

I feel pleased to express my gratitude to my supervisor **Dr. Fazal e Rabbi** for his constructive suggestions and unique way of guidance. His supervision, spur and support helped me in completing this research study.

I thank my father and my husband because of their unconditional support and prayers were extremely helpful in completing my thesis

Fatima Kausar

M. Phil. Pakistan Studies

## **CHAPTER: 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The relationship between the Pakistan and the United States of America has been regarded as the most complex foreign relationship between the two countries. Despite the various engagements and estrangements there were continuously mistrust and tensions in their relations, thus the two countries have maintained a relatively high and other time low-profile relations, and there is a visible inconsistency in their relations since the independence of Pakistan in 1947. Despite the convergence and divergence of their national interests on several policy issues and the ups and downs in their relations both countries remains flexible and worked for the peace and prosperity of the world.

During the height of the US-Pakistan partnership during the 1950s and 1960s, the two countries were not able to establish a common vision of their interests. Instead, they were focused on different aspiration for their policy goals. Over the course of history, the need for protection against India has driven Pakistan's desire to forge an alliance with the US. It has relied on the United States for economic and military assistance. Despite the various concerns that the US has about its security, Pakistan has remained hopeful that the US will support its regional goals. However, the US has not shared Pakistan's concerns about Indian rule in South Asia.

The US has pursued a strategy of chasing a mirage by assuming that its aid will eventually instill a sense of security in Pakistan, which then led to a shift in the country's priorities. During the beginning of the US' relationship with Pakistan, it gave the country weapons and money in an attempt to establish a powerful fighting force against communism. Despite numerous promises to provide its full support to contain the spread of communism Pakistan was unable to provide its troops for the wars against communists, and has instead used American weapons against India in various wars. The US has also failed to convince Pakistan to abandon its nuclear program, and also failed to convince Pakistan to stop the use of militant groups as proxy forces in the region.



Some of the US presidents including Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have asked the question: What do we gain by helping Pakistan? Five former presidents have expressed doubts about the country's leaders' ability to fulfill their promises. These include Jimmy Carter, George W. Bush, Bill Clinton, Barack Obama, and John F. Kennedy.

Despite the various difficulties that the US and Pakistan have faced, the two countries have managed to maintain a positive relationship. They have been able to rely on each other's leaders for guidance and advice. Despite the various issues that the two countries have faced, they have managed to develop a positive relationship. Despite the billions of dollars in aid that the US provides to Pakistan, the country's governments have been struggling to find a way to preserve its independence while also maintaining its relations with the US. Both sides have maintained their own core policies and have been able to rely on each other's leaders for guidance. The US has mistakenly believed that Pakistan's growing military and economic capabilities give it control over the country even though it has learned that it can't rely on the US for its security. This is contrary to the facts about the relationship between the two countries, which dates back to 1947 when Pakistan gained independence.

The US has often sought to ally with Pakistan due to its various strategic interests. For instance, during the Cold War, the US wanted to establish an alliance with Pakistan to prevent the Soviets containment. However, in the other cases, the US' motivation for pursuing an alliance differed from that of Pakistan.

During the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s, the US used this opportunity to wage war against the Soviets using the support of militant Islamist groups that were being supported by Pakistan's intelligence agency and sponsored by CIA. On the other hand, Pakistan viewed the military operation as a prelude to an asymmetric war against India.

After the terrorist attacks on the United States on 9/11, Pakistan decision to join the US-led coalition against terrorism has many long-term and short-term consequences for Pakistan. It helped it overcome various international sanctions and gain the status of a non-NATO ally. It also proved to be an effective ally against a terrorist state. It also restored its membership in the Commonwealth after it was suspended following the military coup of 1999. Pakistan is paying a

heavy price for its socio-strategic mistakes. It lost the war on terror and faced various foreign policy issues. It also supported the freedom struggle of Kashmir but it had to change its Afghan policy. Due to its involvement in the fight against terrorism, Pakistan has become a target of international forces and has raised various social problems.<sup>1</sup>

During the Obama administration the bilateral relations between Pakistan-United States relations remained uncertain. Pakistan was cooperating with the US in its led war against terrorism in Afghanistan by providing logistic and intelligence support to the US and conducting military operation insides the country. In return Pakistan was provided military and economic assistance by the US. However, there were many issues of irritant between these two countries which resulted trust-deficit in relations. The US continued drone trikes and unilateral operations inside, and Obama pressure on Pakistan to do more, created uncertainty in the relations of both countries.

### **1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

President Barack Obama's attempt to strengthen the US' relationship with Pakistan was ironic since he came into office promising to transform the relationship between the two countries, from transitional and security centered to more durable, deeper and strategic partnership. Bilateral cooperation in the war against terrorism, Obama pressure on Pakistan of do more policy, blaming intelligence agency of Pakistan for supporting militant groups of Afghanistan and its unilateral military actions inside Pakistan related issues created trust-deficit between the two countries.

### **1.2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To describe the nature of Pak-US relations in historical perspectives
2. To analyze Obama Administration Policies/Strategies towards Pakistan
3. To examine the war on terror in Pak-US bilateral ties in Obama administration

---

<sup>1</sup> Rabbi, F. (2012). War against Terrorism and its Repercussions for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 33(2), 71-90.

4. To discuss the issues of trust-deficit in Pak-US relations

### **1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION**

1. What was the nature of Pak-US relations in historical perspectives?
2. What were the Obama Administration Policies/Strategies towards Pakistan?
3. How Pak-US cooperated in the war on terror in Obama administration?
4. What were the issues of trust-deficit between Pakistan and United States?

### **1.4 HYPOTHESIS**

Pakistan-United States relations in Obama administration remained unpredictable due to the nature of ongoing global war on terror and its challenges for Pakistan's foreign policy in the region. Stability in Afghanistan, conundrum of terrorism, extremism in the region, high voltage drone attacks inside Pakistan's territory and the violation of Pakistan's sovereignty by US forces are issues remained the predominant factors which affected Pak- US relation.

### **1.5 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES**

The relationship between the US and Pakistan started to improve following the tragic events of September 11, 2001, which happened when the World Trade Center in New York was attacked. At that time, Pakistan was regarded as the first ally of the US in its fight against terrorism. However, since the incident occurred again, it has highlighted the country's vital role in the region's anti-state activities.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Muhammad Waqas Sajjad, *Pakistan, the United States and the war in Afghanistan*, *Strategic Studies* Vol. 31, No. 3 (Autumn 2011), pp. 181-189.

Due to the recent developments in the relationship between the US and Pakistan, it has become more important to analyze the factors that affect the development of the relationship between the two countries.<sup>3</sup> One of these factors is the convergence policies of the two states. This has caused more uncertainty in the relationship between the two nations.

The thesis sought to answer the its research questions between Pakistan and the United States during the Obama Administration and explored the factors that influenced these relations, using the theory of Realism to explain these.<sup>4</sup>

It provides a theoretical framework for analyzing the US' foreign policy toward Pakistan. Through this framework, an individual can be able to analyze the various aspects of the policy, such as its origins, goals, and consequences. Foreign policy analysis is a process that involves examining theories and methods that can be used to analyze the policies of other countries.

The two most common theoretical frameworks used to analyze the US' foreign policy are Liberalism and Realism. Liberalism focuses on how the country's interests are influenced by its foreign policy. The main objective of this foreign policy is to ensure that the country's security is maintained.

This discipline also provides a deeper analysis of the US' foreign policy by focusing on the various factors that influence its actions. For instance, the ideas and opinions of individuals can have a significant impact on the country's foreign policy.

The killing of Bin Laden by the US has raised many questions about the relationship between Pakistan and the US. It has also led to speculations about the so-called trust-deficit in the relationship between the two countries. This thesis aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the historical and current state of the relationship between the US and Pakistan. The various debates surrounding the trust-deficit in relations between the US and Pakistan have been presented with an incomprehensible number of questions. These include: Why do countries or nations trust each other? What can be done to build trust?

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 184-185.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 189.

International relations is a discipline that combines theories and schools of thought to understand the complex world governing system. Through these, students can gain a deeper understanding of how the world works. Different theories have their own unique assumptions about the international system. For instance, Realism is a popular concept in international relations. It is one of the most relevant theories in the context of Pakistan-US relations.

Neo-realism and realism generally believe that states act in the interests of their national interests, while the interests of other nations are always at risk. For instance, if a country wants to protect its national interests, it should act in the international system.

The national interests of a country are the factors that influence its foreign policy. This is a tool used by realists such as Hans Morgenthau to analyze foreign affairs. According to theories of realism, a nation's capabilities are the primary indicators of its state behavior. Relations between countries are also influenced by their level of power.

For realists, Pakistan's military expenditures and its nuclear program are considered indicators of its state's capabilities. They see it as a country that is taking advantage of its security in response to India's perceived threat. On the other hand, they believe that the US' actions in Afghanistan are rational due to the country's perception of Al-Qaeda as a threat.

Neo-realist believes that the trust deficit between the US and Pakistan is a reflection of their conflicting national interests. Bilateral strategic relations between the US and Pakistan should be based on the rational behaviors of both sides. This can be achieved through the establishment of trust and cooperation. Neo-realists believe that even though the US might consider Pakistan's strategic behavior paranoid, it should still work to address its concerns by reducing its presence in Afghanistan or providing dual-use military equipment to Pakistan. As for Pakistan, it should also address the US' concerns about trans-national terrorism. This can be done through the establishment of a comprehensive strategy to deal with the issue.<sup>5</sup>

One of the tools used by the US to leverage Pakistan's civil society was the Kerry-Lugar bill. The bill was designed to encourage the country's civil society to play a more active role in

---

<sup>5</sup> Niloufer Siddiqui and Joshua T. White, "Pakistan-US trust deficit", *Dawn* June 18, 2011.

addressing the issues of the country. The bestowing of the honor was also aimed at maintaining a firm commitment on both sides to improve relations.

The dynamics of the relationship between the US and Pakistan since 9/11 have not been taken into account in the theoretical frameworks of realism. Instead, they have been shaped by the various factors that have shaped the relationship, such as the US' view of Afghanistan, drone attacks, and militant groups. This provides policymakers with an opportunity to consider the neo-realists' assumptions.

Both the US and Pakistan have their own security concerns and interests, and they should work together to address them. The US can also promise to maintain a long-term relationship with Pakistan, which could help overcome the notion of betrayal. On the other hand, Pakistan could publicly acknowledge that its relationship with the US has contributed to its goals in the region.

## **1.6 SIGNIFICANT OF THE STUDY**

The research study is significant for both Pakistan and the United States long term relations. It provides an in-depth analysis of the events/issues remained important in the bilateral ties of both Pakistan and the United States. It is an important study for the student of Pakistan studies, international relations and common readers to know about the nature of Pak-US relations during Obama administration. It also provides suggestions for both countries policy makers to have long term durable relations between Pakistan and the United States which is considered important for the peace and prosperity of the region. This study also suggested new themes and areas for researchers to conduct research on the various aspects of Pak-US relations.

## **1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The objective of this study is to analyze the relations between the US and Pakistan in Obama administration. Through a systematic research methodology, the researcher was able to collect data. The data collected were used to formulate a descriptive analysis of the relationship between the two countries.

Both primary and secondary sources books, journals, newspapers, reports, speeches and online sources have been consulted in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of Pak-US relations. Other documents such as speeches and statements those from the Pentagon and the State Department and the foreign office of Pakistan have also been used to gather information.

Conducting a systematic research can be very challenging for a researcher. There are various factors that can affect the quality of the work that the researcher does. For instance, in collecting data, he or she may not have all the necessary information.

The main reason why the data was not collected and analyzed properly was due to various factors such as the policies of the government and no access to primary data at the foreign office of Pakistan. Also, the time constraints and English language skills were some of the factors that prevented the researchers from properly analyzing the data.

## **1.8 LITERATURE REVIEW**

The importance of reviewing literature is acknowledged in systematic research. This process has been carried out in the review of various aspects of Pakistan-US relations following the September 11 attacks and specifically in the Obama administration. There is a wide scope of literature related to the relations between the two countries. However, it is important to note that the last period of the relationship is not as well studied. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the literature on the subject. The objective of this study is to provide an inclusive analysis of Pakistan-US relations under Obama administration. It has been conducted without conducting an in-depth study on the subject.

The first and most important book on Pakistan and United States relations covering the historical realities in the bilateral ties is written by Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*.

Dennis Kux's new book, which is based on his extensive research, provides a wealth of new information about the relationship between the US and Pakistan. He also conducted interviews with over a hundred former defense and diplomatic officials. This is the first comprehensive study of the relationship between the US and Pakistan. It focuses on the various

aspects of the relationship, including the political and diplomatic developments that have occurred between the two countries. It also thoroughly reviews the major issues that have affected the relationship. The relationship between the US and Pakistan has been characterized by significant changes due to the various factors that happened during the Cold War. During the Reagan, Nixon, and Eisenhower years, the relationship became more intimate, but it eventually grew strained after the Johnson, Kennedy, and Carter administrations. During his visit to Pakistan in March 2000, President Bill Clinton delivered a blunt message to General Pervez Musharaf, the country's military ruler. Although the message highlighted the differences between the US and Pakistan, it also highlighted the importance of the relationship between the two countries. The book is a companion volume to Dennis Kux's acclaimed *Estranged Democracies*. It focuses on the various aspects of the relationship between the US and Pakistan.<sup>6</sup>

The Book of Daniel S. Markey, *No Exit from Pakistan, America's Tortured Relationship with Islamabad*.

The relationship between the US and Pakistan has been a deeply troubled one. Its growing nuclear arsenal, along with its growing ties with India and China, threaten the security and stability of the U.S. The book argues that these relationships will continue to exert a significant influence on the country's geostrategic map. This book explores the various trends that will affect Pakistan's future. It also explores the history of US-Pakistan relations from 1947 to 2001. It provides an overview of the policies that Washington implemented following the September 11 attacks against the US. It also examines the rise of China as a regional force and the likely shape of U.S.-Pakistan relations. The book presents three options for the US to pursue in its relations with Pakistan. These include comprehensive cooperation, defensive insulation, and military-first cooperation. It also explains how Washington can avoid making mistakes.<sup>7</sup>

The book of Ijaz Khan, *Pakistan's Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Making: A Study of Pakistan's Post 9/11 Afghan Policy Change*, is one of the comprehensive book on Pak-US relations focusing on Afghan dilemma. This book traces the history and domestic context of

---

<sup>6</sup> Kux, Dennis. *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> Markey, Daniel S. *No exit from Pakistan: America's tortured relationship with Islamabad*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.



Pakistan's post-9/11 Afghan Policy. It explores the various factors that influenced its decision to become an ally of the US in the war against terrorism, and it provides a comprehensive analysis of the country's domestic and international debate over the issue. <sup>8</sup>

Zahid Hussain book *No-Win War: The paradox of US-Pakistan relations in Afghanistan Shadow*,

The relationship between the US and Pakistan following the September 11 attacks has become strained. This book aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the two countries, focusing on their core issues. Although the relationship between the two has become strained, it is not clear what caused the tension. It is rarely discussed how Pakistan's decision to align itself with the US led to a war that it fought itself. The country's ties with the Afghan Taliban also cost it. This book explores the various aspects of the war on terror and the relationship between the US and Pakistan. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the current state of affairs in Afghanistan and the various factors that have affected its development. It also explores the various personalities involved in this game. The book breaks down the various headlines and provides readers with a deeper understanding of the various factors that have affected the conflict.<sup>9</sup>

*The Troubled Triangle: A US-Pakistan relation under the Taliban Shadow* is written by Zafar Iqbal Yousafzai.

This book aims to analyze the history of the Taliban and how it has affected the relationship between Pakistan and the US following the September 11 attacks. It traces the origins of the organization and its rise from 1996 to 2001, and it looks closely at how it has affected the US' efforts to remove Taliban rule from Afghanistan. It also delves into the role that Pakistan has played in the US' efforts to get the Taliban to renounce violence and establish a peace agreement. The book explores the various aspects of the US-Taliban relationship

---

<sup>8</sup> Ijaz Khan, *Pakistan's Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Making: A Study of Pakistan's Post 9/11 Afghan Policy Change* (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2007).

<sup>9</sup> Hussain, Zahid. *No-win War: The Paradox of US-Pakistan Relations in Afghanistan's Shadow*. Oxford University Press, 2021.

following the start of the Global War on Terror (GWOt). It also focuses on Pakistan's role in facilitating the Taliban's participation in the peace talks that took place in February 2020. This book provides an introduction to the concept of a new balance of threat theory, which is applicable to a wide range of studies, including those focused on US foreign policy and international relations. It also explores the case study of the Taliban.<sup>10</sup>

Another important book written by Usama Butt and Julian Schofield *Pakistan: The US, Geopolitics and Grand Strategies*.

The killing of Osama Bin Laden highlighted the tension between the US and Pakistan. This book explores the relationship between the two countries and their place within the global order. It also provides a broad geopolitical perspective. This book aims to provide an in-depth analysis of Pakistan's relations with the US following a decade of war on terror. It also explores the country's regional and international relations. Written by experts both from the West and Pakistan, it will be very useful reading for anyone who is interested in learning more about this troubled nation.<sup>11</sup>

Daniel Seth Markey another report *Reorienting U.S. Pakistan Strategy: From Af-Pak to Asia* is a recent publication. In his report, Markey argues that the US and its allies should take a more balanced approach to China's attempt to control the internet. They should also establish a treaty organization that would coordinate efforts related to cyber security and law enforcement.<sup>12</sup>

Charles B. Kelly and Francis edited book, *Pakistan and U.S. relations*.

This book features the testimony of several prominent individuals, including General Anthony Zinni, Richard A. Boucher, Mark Ward, and Mitchell Shivers, regarding the new US strategy for an enhanced partnership with Pakistan. It also includes excerpts from the book's edited chapters. In this book, K. Alan Kronstadt, a specialist in South Asian affairs at the

---

<sup>10</sup> Yousafzai, Zafar Iqbal. *The Troubled Triangle: US-Pakistan Relations Under the Taliban's Shadow*. Routledge India, 2021.

<sup>11</sup> Butt, Usama, and Julian Schofield, eds. *Pakistan: The US, geopolitics and grand strategies*. Pluto Press, 2012.

<sup>12</sup> Markey, Daniel S. *Reorienting US Pakistan strategy: From af-pak to Asia*. No. 68. Council on Foreign Relations, 2014.

Congressional Research Service, provides an in-depth analysis of the US-Pakistan relationship. He also explores the various aspects of the relationship between the two countries.<sup>13</sup>

*The Battle for Pakistan: The better US friendship and a tough neighbourhood* written by Shuja Nawaz is well written book on Pak-US relations covering the two periods of Obama administration.

The Battle for Pakistan highlights the relationship between the United States and Pakistan, which has been characterized by inconsistent and unpredictable developments since the 1950s. Due to the growing influence of India in Afghanistan, Pakistan does not wish to break its ties with the US. Despite its strategic importance to the US, Pakistan does not want to become a part of the US-China rivalry or the Arab-Iran conflict. Its internal and external challenges also pose significant obstacles to its development. The country's political miscalculations during the Obama years could prove costly. With the Trump administration's unpredictable behavior, can the United States help rebuild its relationship with Pakistan? This book explores the complex relationship between the two countries and provides a clear path forward. The author draws on his extensive knowledge of the region to provide a deeper understanding of how the US can work with Pakistan to improve its standing in the world.<sup>14</sup>

## **1.9 SCHEME OF STUDY**

This thesis is divided into four chapters.

**Chapter no.1 is introduction** includes statement of the problem, aims and objectives of the study, research questions, hypothesis, theoretical framework, research methodology, and literature review.

### **Chapter no. 2 Pakistan-United States in historical perspective 1947-2008**

This chapter covers the historical background of Pak-US relation since 1947 to 2008.

---

<sup>13</sup> Beasley, Francis V., and Charles B. Kelly, eds. *Pakistan & US Relations*. Nova Science, 2009.

<sup>14</sup> Nawaz, Shuja. *The battle for Pakistan: The bitter US friendship and a tough neighbourhood*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2020.

### **Chapter no. 3 Pakistan-United Relations and the Obama Administration 2009-2017**

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part has examines the Obama Administration Policies/Strategies towards Pakistan. The second part of this chapter has analyzed the war against terrorism in Pak-US relations

### **Chapter no. 4 Pakistan-United States Relations: Trust-Deficit and Issues of Irritants**

This chapter analyzes trust-deficit and issues of irritant in Pak-US relations.

Apart from these chapters there are findings, conclusion, and suggestions for the improvement of Pak-US relations. Bibliography and Appendixes are given at the end of the thesis.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS 1947-2008**

This chapter aims to provide an overview of Pakistan-US relations in historical perspectives. It also explores the various aspects of their relationship. The chapter aims to appraise the historical perspective of the relationship between the two countries. The history of Pakistan-US relations from 1947 to 2001 provides a comprehensive analysis of the various factors that affected their relationship. It also explores the political and military motivations that influenced their foreign policies. For Pakistan its relations with the United States remained very important over the course of history. Pakistan not only get economic support from the United States to overcome the economic crisis but also get military aid that strengthened Pakistan military forces and made it a strong nation to compete with its regional rivals India.

However in historical perspective the relationship between Pakistan and the United States never remained consistent. Despite the various difficulties that the relationship between the US and Pakistan has experienced, it has been able to sustain the ups and downs of the relationship. The political, economic, and socio-cultural differences between the two countries have made their relationship inconsistent. Due to various factors that have brought closer both Pakistan and the US, but their perceptions and strategic compulsions have prevented them from becoming closer. This chapter deals the bilateral ties of Pakistan-United States in historical perspective from 1947 to 2008.

Looking for friends and alliances is the beginning of Pak-US bilateral ties. Then, in the following years, there were various phases of dissension and distrust. These included the partnership phase, the Afghan conflict front line alliance, and the imposition of sanctions, and then the war on terror. The first phase covers the bilateral ties of Pak-US relations. After its independence from the British India, Pakistan pursued a strategy of seeking friends to fend off its hostile neighbor. It also wanted to receive economic and military aid. The Cold War politics and the origin of US security relations with Pakistan are discussed. The relationship between Pakistan and the US has been thoroughly examined. There are four security arrangements that

have been established between the two countries. These include the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement, the Bilateral Defense Agreement, the Establishment of a Communication Unit, and the Economic and Military Aid.

The fading alliance is the second phases of Pak-US relations. The relations between the US and Pakistan from 1962 to 1979 have been analyzed in this part. Various factors such as the Sino-Indian border clash, the US arms sales to Pakistan, the Indo-Pak Wars of 1971, and the Kennedy administration's pro-Indian policy have been examined. The relations between the US and China have also been analyzed.

The partnership and Afghan war is the next phase. In this part, the US' relations with Pakistan are discussed, including the invasion of Afghanistan, the growing strategic interests of the US in Pakistan, the nuclear issue, and the effects of the conflict on the country are also discussed.

Estrangement (Imposition of Sanctions and the status of a Pariah State) 1990-2001 is the next phase. Issues related to the relationship between Pakistan and the US has been discussed in this section. Some of these include the sanctions imposed on Pakistan in 1990 and the status of the Pariah State in 2001. The end of the Cold War and the US' policy towards South Asia has also been discussed. This section aims to analyze the various issues related to Pakistan's nuclear and missile programs. Also, the situation of Kashmir and the relationship between Pakistan and the US have been discussed. Next is the war against terrorism and Pak-US relations. In this phase the war against terrorism and Pakistan cooperation with the US under Bush administration have been discussed in this part.

## **2.1 Era of Alliances 1947-1971**

After Pakistan gained independence from Britain in 1947, the international situation changed significantly. Following the Second World War, the Soviet Union and the United States became two of the biggest international powers. Due to their expansionist policies, a serious confrontation between the two countries was started.

The US adopted a strategy known as containment. Its objective was to isolate the Soviet Union and expose its weaknesses. This strategy was carried out to destroy the Soviet Union. Due to the threat posed by the Soviet Union and its communist expansion, the US decided to intervene outside its borders. Tension between the two countries eventually grew. The containment policy was established by President Harry Truman. It was followed by other leaders such as John F. Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and Johnson. They all stated that the US would pay any price to ensure that the world would be free from communism. The US' foreign policy became firmly focused on opposing communism. This became the guiding principle of the country's foreign relations for the next four decades.

Due to its external and internal problems, Pakistan became an ally of the US during the 1950s. Although the Soviet Union and China were not a major factor in the country's foreign policy during that period, they were still viewed as threats by India. As a result, Pakistan joined the Western military pacts. As a result, Pakistan became a vital part of the Western military alliance. It received substantial military and economic assistance from the US. It also provided logistical support to help the US and its allies check communism.

Despite its geo-strategic position, Pakistan has gained a significant amount of respect in the US due to its willingness to participate in democracy and its contempt for communism. The US considered Pakistan as a vital ally in its efforts to contain Russia's growing influence in the region due to its strategic position. It also viewed it as a potential stumbling block for the Russians' expansion plans beyond Afghanistan. According to the US, Pakistan is also positioned to prevent the West from being able to prevent the Russians from establishing a foothold in the country.<sup>15</sup>

Pakistan was open to the idea of signing military pacts with the US. It was also willing to provide the US with communication facilities and listening posts on its territory. The US considers Pakistan as an important ally in the region and sees its strong ties with other Muslim

---

<sup>15</sup> McMahan, Robert J. "United States Cold War Strategy in South Asia: Making a Military Commitment to Pakistan, 1947-1954." *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 3 (1988): 812-840.

countries as beneficial for its diplomacy. This is a significant goal for Pakistan as it relates to its international relations. It also demonstrates the country's commitment to the US' foreign policy goals. Its support for the US' objectives during the Korean War and for the Japanese Peace Treaty was also welcomed. Following the signing of the Cooperation Agreement between Turkey and Pakistan, the US decided to provide Pakistan with military aid and economic assistance. This led to the establishment of an alliances era between the two countries.<sup>16</sup>

In 1954, Pakistan signed various pacts with the US, such as the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement and the Baghdad Pact. It was also the only Asian country that joined the South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO). The US also sponsored the CENTO agreement, which was renamed in 1959. As an ally of the US in Asia, Pakistan was regarded as America's most important ally in the region from 1954 to 1960. The two countries maintained a warm and cordial relationship. The US also supported Pakistan's efforts in fighting against India and in maintaining its territorial integrity.

The security relationship between the US and Pakistan was also heavily influenced by the aid that the US gave to the country. This included the purchase of various military equipment, such as tanks and jet fighters. The amount of military assistance that the US gave to Pakistan during this period was estimated to be around \$400 to \$450 million. Aside from providing Pakistan with military aid, the US also helped in the country's economic development by providing it with various economic activities. From 1954 to 1962, the US provided Pakistan with over \$3.5 billion in economic assistance.<sup>17</sup>

Despite getting substantial military and economic aid from the US, Pakistan had to pay a heavy price for its alliance with the Soviet Union, China, and India. This was a painful cost that the country had to pay. Tension with India also became a major issue that had to be resolved through negotiations. During their visits to India in 1954 and 1955, the USSR leaders stated that

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Hussain, Munawar. "Pak-US relations: An historical overview." *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 37, no. 2 (2016): 61-76.



Kashmir was an integral part of India. This was reiterated through the veto of the USSR in the UN Security Council. The USSR also supported the cause of Pukhtonistan of Afghanistan.

On May 1, 1960, Khrushchev asked the Pakistani Ambassador to inform the Soviet Union about the location of U-2 aircraft in Pakistan. He also stated that if the US allowed the aircraft to use the country as a base of operations, Pakistan would retaliate. This incident highlighted the cost of maintaining an alliance with the US. The relations between the United States and Pakistan were generally good until 1962, when a war between China and India broke out.

The Sino-Indian border clash and the US military support to India was not acceptable to Pakistan that has deteriorated relations between the two countries. The growing Pak-China relations was also not accepted to US. But the most important research that Pakistan quit to be the ally of the US in the cold war was the US no support to Pakistan in its wars of 1965 and 1971 with India.

## **2.2 The Reappraisal 1972-1978**

After the outbreak of the country in 1971, the US once again failed to provide assistance to Pakistan. This led to the formation of a new government led by former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. During this period, Pakistan started looking for new friends in the world due to the deteriorating security situation in the country. During her time, Bhutto tried to reorient Pakistan's foreign policy away from the one pursued by former Prime Minister Ayub Khan. The concept of bilateralism was the reaction to Pakistan's involvement in the Cold War as an ally of the US. The main objective of Pakistan's foreign policy was to expand its role in the Muslim world and join the non-aligned movement.

During this period, Pakistan's foreign policy became more independent from the pressures and dictates of the US. However, its relations with the US were not as good as they were during the previous decades. In 1972, Pakistan left the US-backed organization known as CENTO. Its relations with the Soviet forces in Afghanistan also affected the country's relations with the US. The US wanted to see a rapid improvement in the relationship between India and Pakistan following the outbreak of the war in 1971. It also supported the Simla Agreement of

1972 between the two countries. During the early 1970s, the US started to support the restoration of civilian and war prisoners held by both countries.<sup>18</sup>

Through regular visits and personal contacts, the two countries were able to improve their understanding of each other's foreign policy limitations and perspectives. The first step in this process was the visit of President Nixon and Henry Kissinger to China in 1972. During his three trips to Pakistan in 1971, Kissinger reiterated the US President's commitment to maintaining a positive relationship with the country. However, despite this, the US did not follow through with its promise and labeled India as a powerful regional power.

The US' recognition of India as a dominant country in South Asia shocked Pakistan. In December 1974, US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger stated that India had a special role in global affairs. This statement was criticized by the Pakistani government. The main issues that affected the relationship between the two countries were the arms embargo and nuclear issue.

The imposition of an arms embargo on Pakistan was the most important issue that affected the Pak-US relations during this period. As a vital part of the security relationship between the two countries, the US was able to sell arms to both India and Pakistan. The US' decision to stop providing military equipment to these two countries had affected Pakistan more since it was more dependent on Washington for its security.

As a part of its US policy, Pakistan was required to acquire weapons from the US. This was an important aspect of the country's foreign policy, as it lost a huge amount of military equipment during the 1971 war. The Pakistani government expressed its disappointment with the US' decision to impose an embargo on the country. It noted that this was a discriminatory act that affected the country's participation in various regional security agreements. During a visit to the US in September 1973, Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto made a strong plea for the

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, 61-76.

lifting of the embargo. Although the US promised to provide economic assistance to Pakistan, it did not follow through with its word.<sup>19</sup>

Following the detonation of India's first nuclear device in May that year, Pakistan was worried about its security. During his second visit to the US in 1975, Benazir urged the US to lift its arms embargo on his country. He noted that Pakistan needed defensive weapons to defend itself. Following the meeting, a statement was released by the US government. It stated that the US President, Gerald Ford, reiterated the country's support for Pakistan's territorial integrity and independence. The two leaders also discussed their security concerns. Following the president's visit, the US government lifted its arms embargo on India and Pakistan on February 23. Robert Anderson, a State Department official, explained the decision to end the embargo by noting that India had received over \$1 billion in arms from the Soviet Union during the previous years. The US government stated that it would only provide military equipment to Pakistan on a cash-only basis. This policy would only be applicable to the country's grant assistance program.

During the period 1972 to 78, the relations between Pakistan and the US were not as bad as they were during the previous years. However, due to the nuclear issue, the relationship between the two countries became strained. One of the factors that affected the relationship between the two countries was the US' policy on non-proliferation.

The assassination of former Prime Minister Bhutto in Pakistan on August 14, 1979 deeply affected the country's relations with the US. The government of Pakistan then criticized the US policy. During this period, the US did not pay much attention to South Asia. Not only Pakistan, but also other countries in the region were not considered priorities for the State Department.<sup>20</sup>

The US' interests in South Asia are limited due to the region's security concerns. However, the country still values the economic development of the countries in the region. As a

---

<sup>19</sup> Khan, Rais Ahmad. "Fifty Years of Pak-US Relations." *Pakistan Journal of American Studies* 16, no. 1 (1998): 1.

<sup>20</sup> Zain, Omer Farooq. "Zulfi Bhutto's Foreign Policy: Vocalization for Self-reliance and Vivification of Integrity." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)* 32, no. 2 (2012): 427-435.

part of its efforts to promote regional stability, the US has maintained a long-standing interest in the development of these countries. The relationship between Pakistan and the US remained strained until the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union in 1979. The situation between the two countries improved dramatically following the invasion.

### **2.3 The Partnership 1979-1989**

The Soviet forces' intervention in Afghanistan marked the beginning of a new phase in the US' South Asian policy. From 1972 to 1979, the US did not pay much attention to the region's affairs. However, following the Iran-Iraq war, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the Iranian Revolution, the US' South Asian policy shifted dramatically. The invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviets in 1989 significantly changed the strategic significance of Pakistan in the US' efforts to contain communism. This led to a new phase in relations between the two countries. As a result, the US became more interested in Pakistan and designated it as a frontline state. The US provided Pakistan with military and economic assistance, which allowed it to provide weapons to Afghanistan. In 1979, Pakistan withdrew from the Central Intelligence Agency and joined the non-aligned movement. The policy of detente was also implemented with India. Despite the various difficulties that the two countries faced during the 1990s, their relations remained cordial. However, after the Soviets decided to withdraw from Afghanistan, the flows in the relationship started to materialize.

The events of the past few years, such as the Iranian Revolution and the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, have significantly contributed to the improvement of relations between Pakistan and the US. As a result, it was important for the US to review its policy toward Pakistan. The 1979 Iranian Revolution shocked the US government. It was regarded as a misreading of the country's foreign policy. The Shah of Iran was a supporter of the US' policies in the Gulf-South Asian and Persian Gulf regions. However, after he was overthrown by the Islamic Republic of Iran, other pro-western governments in the Middle East were threatened. The events that occurred during the Iranian Revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in

the 1990s shocked the US. It revealed that the country had lost its influence in the Middle East and Iran. The US policymakers had to consider the country's importance in the region.<sup>21</sup>

In December 1979, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. They killed the country's head of state, Hafizullah, and replaced him with Babrak Karmal. The Soviet Union maintained that its forces entered Afghanistan on the Kabul Government's request. The objective of the invasion was to restore stability in the country. During the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Pakistan was under increasing pressure. On the other hand, the US viewed the invasion as part of its strategy to establish control over the oil reserves in the Persian Gulf. These incidents shocked the US and led to a significant change in its South Asian policy.

According to the policy, the US offered Pakistan \$400 million to strengthen its security, if it would allow the Mujahideen to operate against the Soviets from its bases in Pakistan. However, this offer was rejected by the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. During a press briefing, he said that if the offer was real, then it was disappointing. According to the Washington Post, Pakistan will not spend \$400 million on security. Its Foreign Minister Shah Mehmood Qureshi stated that the assistance should be considered in line with the size of the threat.

After the departure of Carter in 1981, the relationship between the US and Pakistan started to improve. Reagan's administration sought to contain the Soviet Union's expansion into the Gulf and to prevent India from becoming dependent on its nuclear weapons. It also wanted to improve the relationship with Pakistan by developing a common understanding of the country's dependence on the Soviet Union.

The first objective of the Reagan administration was to establish closer ties with Pakistan. He also avoided the country's nuclear and democracy issues. As a result, the former President allowed Agha Shahi, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, to travel to the U.S. to discuss the country's security situation. After holding talks with Reagan, Agha Shahi, Pakistan's ambassador to the US, stated that the previous administration's offer did not go far enough in improving the

---

<sup>21</sup> Ali, Babar. "Pak-US Military Relationship in 1980s." *Economic and Political Weekly* (1987): 588-590.

relationship between the two countries. According to her, the magnitude of the threat that the US was facing was not enough to convince Pakistan to accept the aid.<sup>22</sup>

The US offered Pakistan a more substantial aid package of \$3.2 billion. It was proposed that the amount be spent on various programs such as rural electrification, water management, and energy development. The US also agreed to sell Pakistan various military equipment such as helicopters, artillery, and anti-tank guided missiles. As a part of the deal, Pakistan would also receive 40 F-16 fighter jets. This made the country the third-highest recipient of aid from the US after Egypt and Israel. The aid package, which included the purchase of 40 F-16 aircraft, showed the US' intention to strengthen Pakistan's strategic position in the region. It was regarded as the biggest military assistance to Pakistan in history. The aid package provided a boost to Pakistan's foreign policy. It also initiated various high-level visits between the two countries. In December 1982, former President Benazir visited Washington, while in May 1984, George Bush was the first US President to visit Pakistan. In July 1986, Prime Minister Junjo visited the US. Despite the positive effects of the aid package, several delegations from the US visited Pakistan. They expressed their willingness to invest in various fields.<sup>23</sup>

Pakistan also established training camps for Afghan insurgents. These individuals, who were referred to as Mujahideen, were then sent to Afghanistan to participate in guerilla warfare against Soviet forces. Through these camps, the insurgents were given advanced weapons such as the anti-aircraft weapon known as the blue pipe missile. The weapons were also given to the guerillas in Afghanistan by the US through Pakistan. The US also encouraged Muslim nations, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, to send their volunteers to join the fight against Soviet forces in Afghanistan.

---

<sup>22</sup> Amin, Afzaal, Hina Malik, Muhammad Hayat Khan, Manzoor Ahmad, Muzamil Shah, Faraz Ali, and Sumayya Feroz. "Zia-Musharraf Era And Pak-US Relationship, A Tale Of Ups And Down." *Elementary Education Online* 19, no. 3 (2021): 3639-3639.

<sup>23</sup> Khan, Rais Ahmad. "Fifty Years of Pak-US Relations." *Pakistan Journal of American Studies* 16, no. 1 (1998): 1.

Despite the lack of a formal agreement, intelligence cooperation between the CIA and ISI was still maintained. Through the US government's covert aid program, the CIA was able to purchase weapons for Mujahideen. It also provided them with ammunition and rockets. The weapons were then given to the Mujahideen groups through the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). During the period from 1982 to 1989, over 65,000 weapons were delivered to the agency. Some of these weapons were stored at an Ojri camp. After they were given to the various groups, the weapons were later distributed. Through the CIA, the ISI was able to establish depots and hundreds of rendezvous points for the weapons in Pakistan and Afghanistan. The agency was also able to provide technical assistance to the Pakistani army. The CIA also trained the Pakistani forces on how to use various weapons, such as automatic rifles and handguns.<sup>24</sup>

From 1980 to 1988, over a million Mujahideen were trained by the CIA and ISI. The two organizations also sent thousands of fighters to Afghanistan. Through their intelligence-gathering activities, the CIA was able to provide helpful information about the Soviet forces in the region.

Although the CIA did not directly deal with Afghan insurgents, the agency relied on the services of the ISI to provide them with weapons and logistical support. The agency also operated training camps for Afghan insurgents. Through their intelligence-gathering activities, the CIA was able to provide helpful information about the Soviet forces in the region. The two organizations also coordinated with other Muslim nations, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Libya. Despite the US' indifference toward the situation in Afghanistan and its failure to engage the Iranian government, the UN was still able to conduct peace talks. Eventually, a peace agreement was reached in April 1988.

#### **2.4 The Post Cold and the Decline of Pakistan-United States relations in the 1990's**

After the end of Cold War, President George H.W. Bush decided not to change the US' policy toward South Asia. This was because the uncertainty surrounding the region's international relations at that time prevented him from making a significant change. After the Soviets left Afghanistan in 1989, the Bush administration tried to establish a stronger

---

<sup>24</sup> Ali, Babar. "Pak-US Military Relationship in 1980s." *Economic and Political Weekly* (1987): 588-590.

relationship with Pakistan. This was evidenced by the visit of Benazir Bhutto, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, to the US in June 1989. During this time, the president of the United States also reaffirmed America's commitment to the development of Pakistan. In order to maintain its relationship with Pakistan, the US Congress should continue providing the country with over \$380 million in economic aid and over \$240 million in military aid during the 1990s. The main reason for these aid programs was the Soviet Union's continued presence in Afghanistan. The U.S. had to work closely with Pakistan to eliminate the communist forces from the region.<sup>25</sup>

Despite the progress made in Afghanistan, relations between Pakistan and the U.S. deteriorated after communist forces were removed. In 1990, the U.S. Congress enacted the Pressler Amendment, which imposed sanctions on Pakistan. In September that year, Robert Oakley, the U.S. ambassador in Pakistan, notified the country's president about the sanctions. In 1990, the US suspended about \$700 million in aid to Pakistan. It also stopped the purchase of F-16 fighter jets and other military equipment for the country. An embargo was also placed on Pakistan's military equipment. After these sanctions, the level of military and economic aid from the US to Pakistan reached the lowest point since the 1950s.<sup>26</sup>

The sanctions against Pakistan resulted in a sudden decline in the relationship between the two countries. Despite this, the security relationship between the two was maintained. The US military maintained its military relations with Pakistan due to the country's significant role in US activities in the Persian Gulf region. The U.S. wanted to maintain its influence over the Pakistani army to prevent it from supporting groups that are against India. Thomas Thornton, a former US official, stated that Pakistan is very important for the U.S. as it can help it expand its

---

<sup>25</sup> Ottaway, D. B. (1989, June 7). Bhutto denies Pakistan plans nuclear bomb. The Washington Post. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1989/06/07/bhutto-denies-pakistan-plans-nuclear-bomb/88d0c401-f38e-4909-830c-30297950bc04/?utm\\_term=.69b09e548d14](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1989/06/07/bhutto-denies-pakistan-plans-nuclear-bomb/88d0c401-f38e-4909-830c-30297950bc04/?utm_term=.69b09e548d14)

<sup>26</sup> Sattar, A. (2010). *Pakistan's foreign policy: A concise history, 1947–2009*. Karachi: Oxford University Press



influence in the region. Syed Mushahid Hussain, a journalist, noted that the U.S. viewed Pakistan as a potential watch post for other countries such as China.<sup>27</sup>

This strategy was carried out through the actions of President George HW Bush. He tried to delay the implementation of the embargo in 1990 and the Pressler Amendment in 1991. He also pushed for the establishment of a limit on the power of Congress when it comes to implementing government aid programs. Despite the embargo, various aid programs were still allowed to be carried out to Pakistan. Some of these included the sale of military equipment. Senator John Glenn revealed in 1992 that the U.S. allowed Pakistan to purchase weapons through its trade agreement. James Barker, the secretary of state at that time, confirmed this. Despite the embargo, the government still allowed Pakistan to purchase weapons.<sup>28</sup>

During his time as the president of Pakistan, General Pervez Musharraf noted that the country was in a state of military crisis following the sanctions imposed by the US following the invasion of Afghanistan. He also noted that India was spending on nuclear weapons and that the Americans left the country in the lurch. During this period, the governments of Benazir and Nawaz Sharif implemented liberal policies aimed at improving relations with the US. However, after becoming the prime minister and president of Pakistan, respectively, they changed their stance on supporting Saudi Arabia and Iraq. The US' policy toward Pakistan was beneficial for its interests. As a result, Pakistan supported the US during the 1991 Gulf War.

Despite the change in the relationship, the US and Pakistan still continued to conduct various joint military activities from 1990 to 1994. However, tensions grew during the following year. As a result, various military collaborations and training programs were suspended. Some of the issues that led to the reduction of the military activities between the two countries included anti-American sentiment within the Pakistani forces.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Khan, Hafeez Ullah. "China, the emerging economic power: options and repercussions for Pak–US relations." *International Politics* (2020): 1-26.

<sup>28</sup> Glenn, J. (1992, June 26). On proliferation law, a disgraceful failure. *Herald Tribune*.

<sup>29</sup> Farooq, N. T. (2013). Explaining Pakistan's strategic choices in the 1990s: The role of the

In 1993, US President Bill Clinton tried to improve the relationship with Pakistan following the passage of the Pressler Amendment. William Perry, the US Secretary of Defense, supported closer ties between the two countries. Perry viewed Pakistan as an ally in the Middle East and western Asia.

In January 1995, US President Bill Clinton visited Pakistan. During his talks with Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari, he agreed to revive the U.S.-P.P. Military Cooperation Forum, which had been suspended four years earlier. The following year, the US Congress enacted the Brown Amendment, which significantly reduced the sanctions against Pakistan. Despite this, the US still refused to sell F-16 fighter jets and other military equipment to Pakistan. In 1990, Congress allowed the US to provide Pakistan with military equipment that had been requested before. It also allowed the president to sell aircraft to third countries. The amendment also allowed the US to refund the money that Pakistan had paid to the US.

In July 1997, the US Congress enacted the Harkin-Warner Amendment, which allowed the country to resume its democracybuilding activities. One of the objectives of the amendment was to resume the training activities that were suspended under the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act of Pakistan. Senator Harkin and other sponsors of the amendment also wanted to resume these activities as long as the country's elected government was still in place. Despite the improving relationship between the US and Pakistan during the Clinton administration, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee did not support the extension of the IMET program. This reflected the committee's concerns about the program's potential impact on Pakistan's military.<sup>30</sup>

The Clinton administration had four main reasons for improving the relations between the US and Pakistan. One of these was the sanctions that the US imposed on Pakistan following the nuclear issue in 1990. Unfortunately, these sanctions did not achieve their goals and Washington

---

United States. Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The University of Leicester, England.

<sup>30</sup> Roy, K. (2017). *The Nuclear Shadow over South Asia, 1947 to the Present*. Routledge Publisher.

lost its influence in the country. The rising number of terrorist activities in the Middle East and Balkan region has prompted the US to recognize Pakistan's strategic position as an Islamic nation. It also faced various security threats during the 1990s and the 21st century.

Aside from Afghanistan, Pakistan could have also played a significant role in preventing Iran from gaining political and religious influence in the region. It was inevitable that the US would take Pakistan into account when it comes to its strategic interests in South Asia. Aside from being a vital part of the region's security, South Asia also has a significant influence over China's activities in the region.

Due to the increasing competition between the US and China in the region, the relationship between the two countries could become more important. Having a good relationship with Pakistan could help maintain the US' strategic position in the region. The deteriorating security situation in Pakistan and the country's international relations became worse under Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's government. His privatization program did not produce the desired results. During the 1990s, Pakistan's GDP growth rate decreased to around 3–4 percent. The country's poverty rate increased by 33%, unemployment rose by over 6%, and inflation doubled. External debt also increased to the equivalent of the country's GDP during the previous three decades under the rule of Nawaz Sharif and Benazir Bhutto.

Due to the increasing number of political and military conflicts within the country, the policies of the government became more unpredictable. Some of these included the continuation of the nuclear program, supporting groups that were involved in the conflict in Kashmir, and supporting the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The policies of the previous government did not gain the support of the US. This contributed to the growing tensions between the two countries.

After the second term of President Bill Clinton's term, the US' relations with Pakistan became worse. In 1998, Pakistan conducted its nuclear tests, which led to the suspension of the state visit of the president. In October 1999, a military coup led by General Pervez Musharraf caused further damage to the US-Pakistan relationship. Clinton criticized the actions of the previous government and urged the return of civilian rule in Pakistan. The military coup led to the suspension of international aid to the country, which brought it to the edge of bankruptcy. It

also established a military rule in the country. The coup also raised concerns about the security situation in South Asia.<sup>31</sup>

## **2.5 Revival of Pakistan-United States Relations in the Post 9/11**

Pakistan-United States relations were deteriorated at the time when President George W. Bush became the president of America in 2001. As part of his India first policy, the former president had hoped to establish a stronger relationship with the country. However, the September 11 attacks in 2001 prevented him from carrying out this objective. According to the president, the most significant challenge facing the US now was terrorism.<sup>32</sup>

On September 13, 2001, US Ambassador to Pakistan Wendy Chamberslin met with Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf to discuss the two countries' cooperation in the fight against terrorism. At the same time, Richard Armitage, the Deputy Secretary of State, sent a list of demands to the Pakistan Ambassador and the country's intelligence agency, known as the Inter-Services Intelligence. The Bush administration believed that Pakistan would play a vital role in the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan. This was because of its vital position in the Muslim world and its closeness with the Taliban. It also viewed Pakistan as an important ally in the war on terrorism.

During the meeting, Chamberslin told the Pakistani leader that the US wanted to work with Pakistan in the fight against terrorism. On the same day, Richard Armitage, the Deputy Secretary of State, sent a list of demands to the Pakistan Ambassador and the country's intelligence agency. Some of the demands included the establishment of an inter-agency working group, the use of drones, and the establishment of a training facility for ISI officers. To achieve this, the administration demanded that Pakistan stop supporting Al-Qaeda activities in Afghanistan and removes the terrorist organization's leader, Osama Bin Laden, from its territory. It also demanded that Pakistan provide the United States with intelligence information. The

---

<sup>31</sup> Harsh, V. P. (2012). The Pakistan thorn in China–India-U.S. Relations. *The Washington Quarterly*, 35(1), 83–95.

<sup>32</sup> Cohen, S. P., & Dasgupta, S. (2001). *US–South Asia: Relations under bush*. Brookings. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/us-south-asia-relations-under-bush>.

demands also included allowing the US and its allies to carry out military operations against Al-Qaeda in Pakistan. They also demanded that Pakistan stop providing fuel to the Taliban and other banned groups in Afghanistan.<sup>33</sup>

In his memoirs, former Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf revealed that his government agreed to the US' requests when they were presented. He argued that a coalition between the military and the government was needed to address these issues.<sup>34</sup> Following the September 11 attacks in the U.S., President Pervez Musharraf condemned terrorism and vowed to fight against it. To break from his previous pro-Taliban policy, the government eliminated many of the country's military leaders who had ties with the Taliban. These individuals, who had supported the former military ruler during his military coup, were also removed from their positions. The head of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency, General Ahmed Mehmood, and General Asif Ali, who was close to President Pervez Musharraf, were removed from their positions. A general close to the former president, Mohammad Aziz Khan, was also transferred to a position that had no power.

The decision to allow the holding of the concert was made due to several factors. One of these is the desire to legalize the position of Pakistan, which was not recognized by the international community. Also, it was an opportunity to help Pakistan get back on track and benefit from the outside world. Another factor that led to the decision was the statements made by President Bush regarding terrorism. He stated that all countries would either become the enemy of the United States or follow the U.S. and become involved in the fight against terrorism.

In October 2001, Pakistan accepted the US' requests to improve its relations. As a result, all of the sanctions imposed by Washington on the country were immediately lifted. The US also started to provide various aid programs, such as education, health care, and food assistance. Aside from these, the US also gave Pakistan loans and grants. In November 2001, Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf paid a state visit to the US. During his official visit, the two

---

<sup>33</sup> National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, *The 9/11 Commission Report* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. 2004).

<sup>34</sup> Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the line of fire. A memoir.* Londres: Simon & Schuster.

countries released a joint statement that highlighted the special relationship between them. The military cooperation between Pakistan and the US was also strengthened following the September 2001 agreement. On September 13, Pakistan granted the US unprecedented access to its airspace and military bases. This allowed the US to carry out non-offensive operations in Pakistan.<sup>35</sup>

As part of the agreement, Pakistan also allowed the US to use its ports and routes into Afghanistan. It also agreed to provide actionable intelligence to the US. This information would help the US track down terrorist groups in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. As part of the US' Operation Enduring Freedom, the Pakistani military helped the US in capturing Taliban fighters. After the group was defeated in December 2001, the Pakistani military carried out similar operations against the Taliban. In January 2002, Musharraf stated that he would no longer allow the country to be used as a base for terrorism. He identified various terrorist groups, such as Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Muhammed. These groups were banned from operating in Pakistan. Thousands of extremist Muslims were also arrested. Although these were later released, many of them had been charged with committing various offenses.<sup>36</sup>

In return for its assistance in fighting terrorism, the U.S. gave Pakistan various types of modern weapons, such as missiles and light weapons. In 2004, Bush officially declared that Pakistan was a major non-NATO ally. Through this Act, Pakistan was able to benefit from the various military aid programs and activities that the US provides. These include the establishment of defense weapon arsenals, the provision of disposable weapons, and the development of research and development programs.

However, since 2004, the relationship between the two countries started to break down. During this period, the Taliban became more active and caused the most casualties to the US-led

---

<sup>35</sup> Kronstadt, K. A. (2003). Pakistan-U.S. anti-terrorism cooperation. Washington, D.C.: Congressional

Research Service. Retrieved from <https://file.wikileaks.org/file/crs/RL31624.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> Kronstadt, K. A. (2004). Terrorism in South Asia. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://file.wikileaks.org/file/crs/RL32259.pdf>

coalition forces. In 2007, the U.S. intelligence claimed that the ceasefire talks between Pakistan and the FATA helped Al-Qaeda and Taliban groups expand their networks.

However, in September 2008, it was revealed that certain Pakistani intelligence officials knew that Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden was hiding in the country. They did not inform the US about his location. This incident caused a great deal of damage to the relationship between the two countries. During this period, the US government was cautious about the actions of the previous administration of Pervez Musharraf. At the same time, Pakistan was very angry about the actions of the US. The following year, the situation between the two countries deteriorated due to the conflicts that occurred during the final years of the Bush administration.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ali, T. (2008). *The duel: Pakistan on the flight path of American power*. Londres: Pocket Books

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS AND THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION**

The goal of this chapter is to explore the relationship between the US and Pakistan under the Obama Administration. It will look at the administration's strategy for counterterrorism and how it evolved from 2009 to the present. The chapter also looks at how the relationship with Pakistan changed throughout the president's term. After winning the presidential elections in 2008, Barack Obama became the first African American to become the president of the US. Throughout his campaign, he talked about his vision for the future and his desire to transform the country. However, as he took office, he faced many challenges, including dealing with Pakistan and the war on terror. In this chapter a comprehensive effort has been made to examine Pakistan-United States relations under the Obama Administration.

#### **3.1 Obama Administration Policies/Strategies towards Pakistan**

Barack Hussein Obama became the US president with these words “Change has come to America” - in Chicago to the American people. The promise of change and new beginnings were central motives of Obama's undoubtedly impressive election campaign. Inevitably, the question also arises for Pakistan which strategic reorientation of US policy would be expected, especially when one considers the domestic political development in Pakistan, which has led to a new civilian government of Asif Ali Zardri after General Pervaiz Musharraf military regime. What needs to be clarified is whether there was fundamental change in US policy towards Pakistan under Obama, and which actors and interests play a role in formulating Obama's political strategy for Pakistan. These questions are clarified in this chapter.

The 2008-2009 were key years for the development of Pakistan as it has seen whether the worst case scenario is to correct the situation from bad to catastrophic. The US, as the most influential nation under Obama was instrumental in these developments and has set the political agenda, which has also affected the Alliance partnership against terrorism with Pakistan. These circumstances and the strategic importance of Pakistan in the fight against terrorism, as well as the unresolved Kashmir conflict between Pakistan and India and the New Delhi accusation of involvement of Pakistani citizens in the Mumbai assassinations, which brought India and



Pakistan to the brink of war, underline the need to align themselves with the dimension of to analyze analytically US foreign and security policy towards South Asia in general and Pakistan in particular.<sup>38</sup>

In a large number of speeches and statements, Obama and members of his administration pointed out the outstanding importance of Pakistan region for its foreign policy and the associated challenges. Both US Vice President Joe Biden and Obama's Security Advisor James Jones underscored Pakistan's importance to US foreign policy during the Munich Security Conference. Pakistan's role in US foreign policy essentially results from a pentagonal constellation that is as follows:

1. Pakistan's role as a "front-line state" in the fight against Islamist terror.
2. The regional role of Pakistan in the stabilization efforts in Afghanistan and as the linchpin of NATO logistics.
3. Pakistan's role as a nuclear power (security and nonproliferation).
4. The importance of the potential for escalation of the Indian-Pakistani permanent conflict and the resulting threats to the stability of the entire region of South Asia.
5. The perception of an increasing destabilization of Pakistan by a the increase infuse of Taliban and increase of extremist tendencies.

The US foreign and security policy towards Pakistan has historically been volatile and often focused on short-term geostrategic interests.

Since 9/11 Pakis - tan major is non-NATO ally of the USA and front-line state in the war against terrorism.

Pakistan has tremendous strategic importance for the Obama administration. Since 2007, a fundamental evaluation of the strategic approach for Afghanistan / Pakistan has taken place in the USA. There is a desire for pragmatic multilateralism and a new consensus style of policy

---

<sup>38</sup> Khan, Aateeb. "For One Tooth, the Entire Jaw: Cross-Border Extremism, Coercive Diplomacy, and the India-Pakistan Security Dyad." (2018).

towards the allies, a "regional solution" for Pakistan and Afghanistan, and an institutionalization of relations with Pakistan. In doing so, certain instruments of Bush administration in foreign policy towards Pakistan are to be taken over. In the past, US-Pakistan relations were volatile and inconsistent. Pakistan's role in US foreign policy oscillated between the major non-NATO allies to a nuclear-ranged "rogue state."

Depending on the interests of the US, they sought close cooperation or pursued a punitive sanctions policy. For example, the United States denied Pakistan the support and arms deliveries in the Indian-Pakistani wars and the Kargil conflict of 1999. These experiences shape the political perception of many Pakistani decision-makers to the present day. Particularly devastating perceptions arose in Islamabad when in 1990, at the behest of Washington, the supply of already paid F-16 fighter aircraft failed to materialize. In this context, the sanctions against Pakistan imposed in 1990 under the Pressler Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act in response to the nuclear program. Had the US needed Pakistan as a strategic partner in Afghanistan, it would hardly have come to the sanctioning measures. This was the case after the invasion of the USSR in Afghanistan in 1979, when Pakistan, as a frontline state against the Soviet Union, found extensive financial and strategic support from the US and became a major ally to train and equip the Mujahedeen in the fight against the Soviet Union.<sup>39</sup>

This changeability and unpredictability of the United States has created on the Pakistani side a deep-seated mistrust of the motives of the United States. This mistrust in Pakistan was rooted in Pakistan, and thus Pakistanis are reluctant to cooperate with the US even the Obama administration came to power with its new strategy and policies towards Pakistan. The role of Pakistan in the war against terrorism was also doubted and Obama administration have also express its reservations on Pakistan's role, intelligence agencies CIA have shown that parts of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) are al-Qaeda-affiliated groups and targeted US-NATO forces in Afghanistan.

Though both Pakistan and the United States mistrust each other for decades but still the US needed Pakistan's support in the war against terrorism and thus almost all sanctions were

---

<sup>39</sup> Hussain, Munawar. "Pak-US relations: An historical overview." *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 37, no. 2 (2016): 61-76.

effectively lifted against Islamabad and Pakistan became the major non-NATO ally of the US in the fight against terrorism.

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the US policy towards Pakistan changed fundamentally: Pakistan had now become a "frontline state" in the fight against the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. As a result, virtually all sanctions were effectively lifted and Pakistan became the major non-NATO ally in the fight against terrorism. The country opened its airspace to American military aircraft, providing two airfields and land routes to supply NATO forces in Afghanistan. In return for its cooperation with the US in the war against terrorism Pakistan had received economic and military assistance from the US. From 2001 to the end of 2008, Pakistan received over US \$ 12 billion in US financial assistance.

By far the largest share is taken from funds from the Coalition Support Fund (CSF), which is intended to compensate non-NATO Allies for their efforts in the fight against terror. In the years 2001 to 2007, 6.23 billion US dollars were transferred to Pakistan under the CSF. In addition, the country received another \$ 1.6 billion in security assistance from 2001 to 2007. For the financial year 2009, without a planned increase in the Obama administration to be taken into account, a further US \$ 799 million in military aid is planned by Congress. On the other hand, according to generous calculations, 1.15 billion US dollars of development aid totaling US \$ 164 million per year from 2001 to 2007 appear relatively small. For educational programs, USAID has \$ 150 million a year from 2007-2012.

**Direct Overt U.S. Aid Appropriations and Military Reimbursements to Pakistan, FY2009-  
FY2016**

(Rounded to the nearest millions of dollars)

<b>Program or Account</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>	<b>FY2012</b>	<b>FY2013</b>	<b>FY2014</b>	<b>FY2015</b>	<b>FY2016</b>
1206	114	—	-	-	-	-	-	-
CN	47	43	39	1	8	18	23	12
FC	25	—				-	-	-
FMF	300	294	295	296	280	280	265	255
IMET	2	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
INCLE	88	170	114	75	57	57	40	40
NADR	13	24	25	20	11	11	10	10
PCF/PC CF	400	700	800	452	-	-	-	-
CSF	685	1,499	1118	688	1438	1198	700	550
<b>Total Security- Related</b>	<b>1,674</b>	<b>2,735</b>	<b>2395</b>	<b>1537</b>	<b>1799</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1043</b>	<b>805</b>
<b>Total Security Related Aid/Assistance: 13557 (13.5 billion dollars)</b>								
CSH/GH CS	34	30	28	-	-	-	-	23
DA	—	—	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESF	1,114	1,292	919	905	724	477	468	200
FoodAid	55	124	51	96	81	30	-	23
HRDF	—	—	-	-	-	-	-	-
IDA	103	232	145	54	20	101	93	85
MRA	61	49				-	-	-
<b>Total Economic -Related</b>	<b>1,367</b>	<b>1,727</b>	<b>1186</b>	<b>1067</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>Total Economic Related Aid/Assistance: 7681 (7.6 billion dollars)</b>								
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,041</b>	<b>4,462</b>	<b>3581</b>	<b>2604</b>	<b>2633</b>	<b>2177</b>	<b>1604</b>	<b>1203</b>
<b>Total Grand aid/Assistance under Obama Administration: 21238 (21.3 Billion US dollars)</b>								

1206: “Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY2006 (P.L. 109-163, global train and equip)

CN: Counternarcotics Funds (Pentagon budget)

CSF: Coalition Support Funds (Pentagon budget)

CSH: Child Survival and Health (Global Health and Child Survival, or GHCS, from FY2010)

DA: Development Assistance

ESF: Economic Support Funds

FC: Section 1206 of the NDAA for FY2008 (P.L. 110-181, Pakistan Frontier Corp train and equip)

FMF: Foreign Military Financing

HRDF: Human Rights and Democracy Funds

IDA: International Disaster Assistance (Pakistani earthquake, flood, and internally displaced persons relief)

IMET: International Military Education and Training

INCLE: International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (includes border security)

MRA: Migration and Refugee Assistance (also includes Emergency Migration and Refugee Assistance or ERMA)

NADR: Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related (the majority allocated for Pakistan is for anti-terrorism assistance)

PCF/PCCF: Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund/Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCF overseen by the Pentagon, PCCF overseen by State)”

---

Source: Data have been calculated from the various reports of Congressional Research Service, Washington DC, [Online] available at <http://fpc.state.gov/>

If development assistance is significantly lower than military support, the US still pays the largest amount of development aid to Pakistan compared to the other industrialized nations. Finally, it can be noted that the financial support of the Pakistani military seems to be an essential pillar of US Pakistan policy. That the benefits of counterinsurgency armor acquired

from the Coalition Support Fund (CSF) are often not immediately apparent, and the purchase of 24 new F - 16 fighter jets with nuclear weapon launchers is difficult to combat on the ground.

In 2008, the US Congress also noted that terrorist networks can be explained. The fears of some analysts that the Pakistani military purchases mainly commodities that can also be used in a conflict with India are therefore not unreasonable. A report from the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued in May 2008 therefore called for much greater monitoring and control of CSF resource allocation and use in Pakistan.

Regardless of control over the use of funds, the purpose of the allocation was to help the Pakistani army in Afghanistan to be able to actively fight terrorists and insurgents. Especially in the FATA (Federally Administered Tribal Area), the Northwest Province (NWFP) and the border areas to Afghanistan have formed retreats for militants, al-Qaida fighters and Taliban from Afghanistan. The US Intelligence Agency's National Intelligence Estimate, published in July 2007, identifies the formation of "safe havens" in Pakistan as an area of refuge for insurgents in the border regions of Afghanistan, as one of the biggest threats to US security in general, and in particular the NATO troops stationed in Afghanistan. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report to the United States Congress, issued in June 2008, has come to the same conclusion and implicitly calls for a more proactive approach by the Pakistani army in the border areas and a review of US strategy in the fight against insurgents in Pakistan FATA.<sup>40</sup>

So it cannot be denied that in initial years of Obama administration, the rebellious Taliban and al-Qaeda-related groups in the respective regions have been strengthened. Daily fighting and attacks were the order of the day. The situation in the Swat Valley was also continues to be tense. The Pakistani government's negotiations with the resident radical Islamic Taliban were interpreted by the US government as a sign of weakness and de-facto a capitulation to the extremists. Thus, the concessions (permission for the Sharia in the Swat Valley by the

---

<sup>40</sup> *Combating Terrorism: U.S. Efforts to Address the Terrorist Threat in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas Require a Comprehensive Plan and Continued Oversight* (20-MAY-08, GAO-08-820T). <https://www.govinfo.gov/>

extremists) offer only a very limited guarantee for lasting stability. Rather, this policy could lead to the consolidation and strengthening of extremists just 160 kilometers from the capital, Islamabad. In this context, another major change in US policy towards Pakistan in 2007 is to be seen: the Bush administration's approval of attacks with unmanned Predator drones and Special Forces on targets located on Pakistani territory.

- **Obama administration Interests and Challenges**

The Obama administration assumed Pakistan as one of the most unstable states with nuclear weapons. Another important US interest is undoubtedly the security of the Pakistani nuclear arsenal and nuclear facilities. According to Western estimates, Pakistan has up to 50 operational nuclear weapons. There is a double US security interest here. For one thing, they are keenly interested in ensuring the safety and security of Pakistan nuclear assets and second to stop the possible nuclear material proliferation or is passed on to extremist groups or other states, as in the past by the so-called A.Q. Khan network happened.

- **Pakistan change of Musharraf government and its relations with the US**

On the Pakistani side, there were new players who need to be involved in a strategic reorientation of US policy. Looking at the Pakistani actors' constellation, a fundamental change took place here in 2008: the era of the military government Pervez Musharraf, who was President and Chief of Army Staff (CoAS), was ended, and a new civilian government was chaired President Asif Zardari and Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gillani has ruled Pakistan since 9 September 2008. The leadership of the executive and the leadership of the army now represent two different actors: Asif Ali Zardari as president and General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani as chief of army staff and de-facto most influential military in Pakistan. On the Pakistani side, there are new players joining strategic reorientation of US policy. If the proposed draft of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act is in favor of strengthening civilian and democratic forces in Pakistan, while this undoubtedly represents a departure from Bush's policy of supporting the military government, it is also a real political one answer to the new constellation in Pakistan.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Lokanathan, Venkat. "US Strategy towards Pakistan and implications for India in the 21st century." *Volume VII Issue No. 1-2 March-August September-February* (2012): 21.

- **Obama Administration policy towards Pakistan: Change and Continuity**

Turning attention to the actors who has shape US foreign and security policy in the Obama administration, it is more a picture of continuity with the Bush administration's policy in 2008 than of radical change. With Robert Gates as Secretary of Defense, James Jones as Security Advisor, Bruce Riedel in charge of drawing up a new Strategic Approach for Afghanistan and Pakistan, James Holbrooke as Special Envoy, Mike Mullen as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, David Petraeus as Commander-in-Chief of CENTCOM, Joe Biden as Vice President and Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State cannot expect a complete "U Turn" in US foreign policy towards Pakistan. It is striking that Obama, despite all the emphasis on "change" in foreign policy, relies on personalities who have not stood out in those years through innovative approaches.

While the era of neo-conservatives, such as Charles Krauthammer, who advocated foreign policy at all times with the use of military force and widespread unilateral US action, is finally over. But this tendency was already evident in the personnel policy of the last two years of the Bush administration. Robert Gates, James Jones, David Petraeus, and Mike Mullen co-wrote US foreign policy in 2008, and Joe Biden (as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) and Hillary Clinton played influential roles in the Senate. Bruce Riedel was previously acted as an advisor to Congress, and his strategy papers on Pakistan are characterized by a conservative spirit rather than creative new beginnings.<sup>42</sup>

Looking at the level of actors on the US side, the following can be said: Since mid-2008, an era of "pragmatic realists" seems to have begun. While American interests and security continue to be seen as the guiding principles of action, there is also a call for pragmatic multilateralism and the deliberate use of a combination of American soft power and hard power. Since mid-2008, an era of "pragmatic realists" seems to have begun.

Hillary Clinton's cited smart power approach paraphrases precisely this, the combination of diplomatic initiatives wherever appropriate, and military deployments where needed. When

---

<sup>42</sup> Aslam, M. W. "Understanding the 'Pak'in 'AfPak': the Obama administration's security policy for Pakistan at the mid-term." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 7, no. 1 (2012): 2-21.



Obama and members of his government call for stronger economic support and expansion of development assistance for Pakistan, as envisaged by the Enhanced Partnership with the Pakistan Act, this should be seen as an instrument of soft power.

The conditions for allocating funds to Pakistan are much stricter in the Enhanced Partnership with the Pakistan Act than in the Implementing the Recommendations of the 9-11 Commission Act of 2007, in particular the conditions for military support payments. Section 6 of the draft lists strict conditions and restrictions. Obama himself said in an interview with FOX in September 2008 that the support provided by the Bush administration to Pakistan was not adequately controlled and conditions were not sufficiently rigorous.

The condition of Enhanced Partnership with the Pakistan Act was generally debated in Pakistan and was reflected as compromise of sovereignty of Pakistan. However, from the US perspective this confirms the assumption that the Obama administration expects greater efforts from the Pakistani government and army to combat militants and extremists in the NWFP and FATA. The eroding situation in Afghanistan and the effort to get it under control are key motives of the Obama administration. The destruction of retreat areas on Pakistani territory was crucial for the success of a surge strategy of Obama policy towards Pakistan.

The deployment of another 17,000 US troops to Afghanistan and statements by CENTCOM commander Gen. David Petraeus and US Army Commander in Afghanistan, General David McKiernan, have suggested that the US military action would try to control the situation in Afghanistan with the active support and do more policy towards Pakistan. It has also be linked to further demands on the NATO allies and thus also on Pakistan to become more involved in Afghanistan. Do more policy of Obama administration, also pressurized Pakistan for more active cooperation.<sup>43</sup>

Obama's statement that Afghanistan and Pakistan are "a battleground" illustrates the strategic relationship between the two states and the expectations of the American president. In return the Obama administration promise development policy for Pakistan was seen in its Kerry-

---

<sup>43</sup> Aslam, M. W. "Understanding the 'Pak' in 'AfPak': the Obama administration's security policy for Pakistan at the mid-term." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 7, no. 1 (2012): 2-21.

Lugar Bill, the significant expansion of non-military aid to up to \$ 1.5 billion a year as envisaged in the Enhanced Partnership with the Pakistan Act <sup>44</sup>and the focus of these payments on projects in FATA and the Northwest Province are building blocks of this strategy. Other measures were especially in the areas of education and infrastructure, the extremists, al-Qaeda and the Taliban to elude the ground for further recruitment and sympathy. However this developmental policy orientation of Obama administration also bring some drastic challenges of cutting aid to Pakistan if did not cooperate with the US to fulfill its objectives.

- **The Bilateral Junction**

In the last year of its administration, the Bush began implementing some of the changes in its policy towards Pakistan, on the basis of recommendations with the Implementing the Recommendations of the 9-11 Commission Act of 2007. All these approaches and measures were not new inventions of the Obama administration. Anyone who followed the discussions and committee deliberations in Congress in 2007 and 2008, and closely watched the strategic recommendations and analysis of influential think tanks in the US, noticed that concepts such as the smart power approach, the expansion of development aid in Pakistan and their own Better evaluation and coordination has been demanded by almost all institutions - from conservative to liberal think tanks.. Those changes were evident in the strategic approach of the Obama administration is thus also the result of an ongoing evaluation of US foreign and security policy since 2007.

The results of the evaluation process have already been incorporated into the still-to-be US National Defense Strategy of mid-2008. The fact that Obama wants and has expanded both the Predator drone missions on Pakistani territory and the practice of not submitting Taliban and al-Qaida fighters who were trapped in Afghanistan to the Geneva Convention suggests that the new American president is essential Elements of the strategy of the Bush administration in the fight against terror intends to maintain. The "regional approach" advertised by the Obama administration, which includes India, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, China, and Russia, was born more out of strategic necessity than the result of a complete change of heart. So it makes the desolate constitution of the American economy as well as the overloading of military resources

---

<sup>44</sup> U.S. Government, ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP WITH PAKISTAN ACT OF 2009, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-111publ73/html/PLAW-111publ73.htm>

needed to look for new solutions. Interesting here is the fact that the United Nations is not mentioned. It seems that the new US administration is also looking for a strategy without a strong involvement of the UN in a solution. As a result numerous EU countries (Germany, Great Britain, France and Sweden) have also taken up the issue and appointed Special Envoys for Afghanistan and Pakistan.

However, there were far-reaching changes in the organization and structuring of the authorities and ministries, Obama and his government officials announced in order to better coordinate the division of competences of the various authorities and ministries involved in the foreign policy process and regional responsibilities .16 In particular, the responsibilities for Afghanistan and Pakistan should be reorganized. Numerous EU states (Germany, Great Britain, France and Sweden) have also taken up the issue and appointed Special Envoys for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The rhetoric and habitus of US foreign policy was also fundamentally changed. Thus, it was expected that the Obama administration would cultivate a much more consensual communication style. Obviously, Obama, like Bush, as President of the United States, has primarily represented American interests. Nevertheless, the new style of politics can be an improvement of transatlantic relations. The fear of a nuclear weapon in the hands of extremists or terrorists is the worst threat scenario for the US government.

On the other hand, no change can be expected in US policy towards India and nonproliferation policy towards Pakistan. The US efforts since 2006 in the interests of a strategic rapprochement with India was continue under Obama. The close strategic cooperation, which was sealed in 2006 with the signing of a joint document, and cooperation in the civil nuclear sector was intensified rather than reduced.<sup>45</sup>

US re-rapprochement with India and enhanced cooperation in the civil nuclear field was indeed a burden on its relations with Pakistan. Nor does this circumstance suggest that the US would position itself in resolving the Kashmir conflict in favor of one side if one does not want to lose either Pakistan or India as a partner. The irritations over the lifting of the house arrest of

---

<sup>45</sup> Kfir, Isaac. "Us Policy toward Pakistan and Afghanistan under the Obama Administration." *MERIA Journal* 13, no. 4 (2009).

A.Q. Khan showed that the Obama administration also rates the proliferation of nuclear material and technology as a very serious topic.<sup>46</sup>

In his programmatic landmark article, "Renewing American Leadership" in *Foreign Affairs* July / August 2007, Obama identified the threat of proliferation of nuclear materials and / or technology to build the bomb as the greatest threat to US security. The fear of a nuclear weapon in the hands of extremists or terrorists is the worst threat scenario of the US government. As such, it was expected that the new administration's efforts with regard to the security of nuclear weapons in Pakistan are likely to intensify. Demands for more commitment from the Pakistani security forces in the fight against the Taliban and al-Qaeda and the expansion of development aid in the border areas are also understood by the new US government as a measure to stabilize the Pakistani state.

Already, the foreign and security policy approach of the new US president to Pakistan reveals some changes and changes compared to the Bush administration's policy. It is also becoming apparent that the Obama administration has continued to use some of the foreign and security policy instruments of the previous government. In the perception of Obama administration; Pakistan as a frontline state in the fight against terror, partner of the international stabilization efforts in Afghanistan and hub of NATO logistics, crisis-ridden nuclear power, arch rival of India and also as the heartland of Islamist extremism having-safe haven; appears a strategic partner as well challenge to the Obama administration. In this regard, Obama administration foreign and security policy towards Pakistan can be divided into several planning levels:

- **The Regional Level Of Conflict Solution**

The Obama administration appointment of Richard Holbrooke as Special Envoy for the two countries underscores the US search for a regional approach.

It was new in US foreign and security policy, to intensified search for a regional solution to the problematic situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The characterization of Afghanistan and Pakistan as "one coherent area of operations" and the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as

---

<sup>46</sup> Rabbi, F., 2018. The War Against Terrorism and George W. Bush's Policy On Kashmir. *Pakistan Journal of American Studies*, 36(2), pp.84-105.

Special Envoy for the two countries underline this. The Obama administration has apparently taken the view that the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan can only be solved with a comprehensive regional strategy.

Obama administration also tried to include Russia, China, India and Iran in its regional approach policy. After seven years, the involvement of neighboring states for the solution of the problem of counter terrorism was considered a positive sign. However, it should not be forgotten that there were great divergences of interests of regional actors and the mere expression of interest in such an approach was not enough. Rather, the success of such approach was depended on the diplomatic skill of the Obama administration, and it has also been linked to the thorny issue of how to deal with problem states like Iran in the future.<sup>47</sup>

#### ○ **The Institutional Level Of Multilateralism**

It was also likely that the policy style of US foreign policy under Obama has change fundamentally. It was expected that the use of pragmatic multilateralism would replace the Bush administration's partly unilateral policy. The result could be stronger political dialogue and an attempt to reach consensus. However, this may not mean that the Obama administration was lowering the expectations of its allies, but also that the Obama administration would press for greater involvement by the allies in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Despite Washington's less unilateral outreach, it can be said that the United Nations does not appear to have a prominent role to play in developing a regional approach, and although it has been in Afghanistan since then. A Special Envoy of the Secretary-General of the United Nations within the framework of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) was established in March 2002, based on Security Council Resolution 1401.

#### ○ **The National Level of US Engagement**

It was also seen to what extent the severe financial crisis in the US would have limited the president's ability to take action in foreign policy. Thus, Obama primarily have to deal with major economic problems that could severely curtail foreign policy freedom of action. It was

---

<sup>47</sup> Khan, Simbal. "The New Obama Administration and Its Policy on Pakistan." *Reflections* 1 (2009).

particularly evident in terms of costly military operations. At the actor level of the Obama administration, there seem to be astounding numbers of staff members for the Bush administration. In addition to personnel policy, some of the Bush administration's tools has continue to be used in the fight against terrorism, such as drone missions and special operations on Pakistani territory. Likewise, the dealings with detained Taliban fighters and extremists do not seem to change fundamentally in the short term. There was only a shift in focus from Guantanamo to Baghram Air Field (BAF) in Afghanistan.

- **The Level Of Strategic Partnership With Pakistan**

In the US, concerns about further destabilizing Pakistan's domestic relations have not diminished. Despite the planned expansion of development assistance, the military in Pakistan remained the recipient of the highest donations. Here an old trend continues. The decision by the Pakistani Supreme Court to ban the Sharif brothers' political activity and President Zardari's unclear role in making that decision not have diminished concern in the US about further destabilizing Pakistan's domestic relations, similarly, it seemingly slow but difficult to stop Talibanization of the country.

The civilian governments in Pakistan was seemed in the US a very weak construction and proved fatal in the long term, because the supreme primacy of US foreign policy remains the security of nuclear weapons and the prevention of proliferation. Equally important are the fight against terrorism and the stabilization of Afghanistan. An unpredictable event of the day, such as oversized anti-Western terrorist attacks on 11th September, has led to short-term strategy changes.

A sustainability of partnership can therefore not be attested to the American-Pakistani relations from a historical point of view. The Obama ammonization seems the descendant generation of high-ranking Pakistani army officers as more critical stance on Washington, and in part as much more religious, it remains to be seen what action the US would take in the long term if its current strategy towards Pakistan fails.

- **The US National Strategy for counterterrorism under Obama administration**

The National Counterterrorism Strategy is part of the Obama Administration's larger National Security Strategy. It aims to provide a comprehensive view of the US' approach to defeating terrorism. Despite the progress that was made during the previous administration, it does not represent a wholesale overhaul of the policies and strategies. The main focus of the US' counterterrorism strategy was on al-Qaeda and its supporters, and the administration made it clear that it was prepared to use all its resources to defeat the terrorist organization. As part of its efforts, the administration unveiled a set of goals that it said would defeat al-Qaeda.

The goal of the National Counterterrorism Strategy is to: Protect the American people and build a stronger counterterrorism partnership with other countries. It also aims to: Degrade al Qaeda's links with its supporters and other terrorist organizations, and prevent the group from acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction. It also focuses on the use of terrorist financing and communications.<sup>48</sup>

- **The Pakistan's Challenge for Obama Administration**

During the time that Barack Obama was elected as the president of the United States, Pakistan was going through a period of change. There was a new civilian government that was trying to establish itself after years of military rule. Unfortunately, the country's economy was struggling due to the financial crisis.

In 2009, militant groups such as the Taliban and al-Qaeda were still active in Pakistan. The Haqqani Network and al-Qaeda's leadership were also based in the country. Obama attributed this to the previous administration's failure to address the issue. Despite Pakistan's efforts to fight terrorism, its efforts were still considered inconsistent by the Obama administration. Although Pakistan had been carrying out operations against militants, but in the eye of Obama administration it failed to target groups that were considered as strategic assets for India. This led to the Obama Administration's realization that the war against terrorism is not only in Afghanistan but also in Pakistan.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Fact Sheet: *National Strategy for Counterterrorism.* June 2011, 8-10.

<sup>49</sup> Armitage, R.L., Berger, S.R. & Markey, D.S. (2010). 'U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan, 11

- **Obama strategies towards Pakistan**

As part of its efforts in counterterrorism, the US was expected to place a greater focus on Pakistan. At the time, the US viewed both Afghanistan and Pakistan as the central front of the war, and therefore considered them as crucial partners in defeating terrorism. The administration also knew that it would not be able to achieve its goals in either country without addressing the issues that are affecting them.

**The new strategy known as "AfPak"** was to treat Afghanistan and Pakistan on equal footing and prevent Al Qaeda from using its territory to launch attacks against the US. Its goal is to disrupt the terrorist organization's activities and prevent them from returning to Afghanistan to carry out attacks.

A report released by an agency tasked with analyzing the US' policy toward Pakistan and Afghanistan stated that the country's goals should be realistic. Two of these objectives were identified as addressing the issues that are affecting Pakistan.

One of these objectives is to disrupt terrorist groups in Pakistan and Afghanistan in order to prevent them from planning and carrying out attacks against the US. The other goal is to improve the country's economy and create a stable government. These goals were established to ensure that the country's people have an opportunity to participate in the political process.<sup>50</sup>

The goal of the Obama Administration was to strengthen the relationship between the US and Pakistan through various means. These included military, diplomatic, and development assistance. The United States' first objective in Pakistan was to establish a strong and effective counterterrorist force. It was also focused on providing security assistance to Pakistan to help it fight against terrorist groups. The second objective was to strengthen Pakistan's democracy and development. Despite the Obama administration's desire to have a cooperative relationship with Pakistan, it was clear that if the US had to act on its own, it would do so. During his campaign,

---

<sup>50</sup> Mazhar, M.S. & Goraya, N.S. (2009). 'Changing Trends in American Policy Towards Pakistan and Afghanistan.' p.26-27.



Barack Obama stated that if Pakistan did not want to help in the fight against al-Qaeda and OBL, then the US would take action on its own.<sup>51</sup>

- **Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act (EPPA)**

The US had been rethinking how it would provide assistance to Pakistan. One of the first steps that the US took was to increase its non-military aid to the country. This included the establishment of the EPPA, which doubled the amount of non-military aid that the US would give to Pakistan. The other part of the aid package was the conditional aid that the US would give to the government of Pakistan. The EPPA has approved a five-year program for non-military aid to Pakistan that will provide \$1.5 billion annually. This includes projects such as education, infrastructure, and health care.

The EPPA aid package for Pakistan included a provision that allowed the country to request additional security assistance. The goal of the legislation was to help strengthen democracy in Pakistan and prevent terrorist camps from being established there. It also aimed to help the country create stability. The legislation also required the US Secretary of State to certify that Pakistan is working with the US in fighting against terrorists. This condition would only be granted if the country's elected government is free and transparent.<sup>52</sup> Some sections of Pakistan, such as the military and the Pakistan Muslim League, were against the establishment of the EPPA. They felt that it would affect the country's foreign and national security policies. President Asif Ali Zardari dismissed the criticisms about the US's support for Pakistan as being misinformed and misconstrued. He stated that the US' assistance to Pakistan is not charity but rather, it is in the country's long-term strategic interest. Zardari also supported the EPPA because he believed that it would help Pakistan's democracy succeed.<sup>53</sup>

- **The US aid to Pakistan under Obama administration (first term)**

---

<sup>51</sup> *The New York Times*. (September 26, 2008). 'The Second Presidential Debate: Transcript.'

<sup>52</sup> Zaidi, S. Akbar. "Who benefits from US aid to Pakistan?." *Economic and Political Weekly* (2011): 103-109.

<sup>53</sup> Zardari, A.A. (2009). 'Partnering with Pakistan.'

The US President Barack Obama's administration established a program that provides financial and other assistance to Pakistan as part of its efforts to improve its relationship with the country. Aside from military assistance, Pakistan has also been receiving various types of financial and other assistance from the US. In 2010, Pakistan was regarded as the second-largest recipient of US aid, with a total of \$4.2 billion. In 2012, it received over \$2 billion in aid. These include non-military assistance, economic development, and security.<sup>54</sup>

In 2009, former Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf revealed that the aid given to his country was used to prepare for a potential conflict with India instead of using for the war on terror. This revelation caused the US to question the amount of assistance that the country was receiving. It also became clear that some militant groups in Pakistan were receiving support from the country. As a result, the US government started to suspect that there was a need for change in the country's relationship with the US.<sup>55</sup>

- **US military/defence aid to Pakistan**

Although the US government has emphasized the importance of civilian assistance, military aid has also been an integral part of the country's foreign policy. It ranks among the top recipients of military aid. During the military operation in South Waziristan in 2009, the U.S. provided Pakistan with various equipment and services, such as surveillance videos. In 2010, the U.S. gave Pakistan 1,000 gravity bombs and quarter-ton bombs. In October 2010, the US also presented Pakistan with a \$2 billion military aid package. This amount was designed to reassure the country about the US' long-term commitment to its security.

In 2009, two new funds were established by the US government to support Pakistan's counterinsurgency efforts. These funds, which are known as the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund and the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, are aimed at channelling the aid and security assistance that the US provides to Pakistan. The main objective of these funds is to build and strengthen the country's counterinsurgency capabilities.

- **Obama and the promotion of democracy in Pakistan**

---

<sup>54</sup> Kronstadt, K.A. & Epstein, S.B. (2012). 'Pakistan: U.S. Foreign Assistance.' p.7.

<sup>55</sup> 'Musharraf Admits U.S. Aid Diverted.', BBC News. (14 September 2009)

In his address to the nation, US President Barack Obama noted that the situation in Pakistan was becoming increasingly dangerous. He called for more political action in the country to address its internal and external terrorism issues. The US administration believed that the removal of military rule in Pakistan would help the country's political situation. However, it noted that the government still failed to fulfill its responsibilities. As a result, the country's political problems still persisted.

In 2009, Obama stated that the US would support Pakistan's democracy through economic and non-military assistance. These types of assistance would only be granted to a free and elected government. Despite its support for civilian rule, the US still considered the military to be the main force in Pakistan. This was because the government could not effectively control the country's intelligence agency and army. As a result, the US developed a close working relationship with the country's army chief. Despite the US' increased aid to Pakistan, it was still criticized for not having a clear plan on how the country's resources would be used to support its political and economic reforms. This issue is considered a weakness in the US' policy in the region.<sup>56</sup>

- **Pakistan-Afghanistan border as Safe Haven**

President Obama stated that the border region between Pakistan and Afghanistan has become the most dangerous area in the world. As part of the strategy for the region, the US would focus on improving intelligence sharing and conducting special operations in the area.<sup>57</sup>

- **Increased Drone Strikes in Pakistan**

The US carried out more drone attacks in Pakistan as part of its strategy in the region. These attacks were carried out against terrorist groups such as the Taliban and al-Qaeda, and they were carried out whenever Pakistan was unwilling or unable to do so itself. It is believed that the growing number of these attacks was due to various factors, such as the US' decision to close the CIA's facilities and the implementation of harsh interrogation methods.

---

<sup>56</sup> Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan." *speech, US Military Academy at West Point, December 1 (2009)*.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

Due to the lack of resources to capture or relocate militants, drones became more effective. Another factor that contributed to the drone attacks' success was the increasing number of intelligence-gathering activities in the region. In February 2013, the number of drone attacks carried out by the US increased to 310.336. These attacks were able to kill various militant leaders, such as Pakistani Taliban leader Baituallah Mehsud and Haqqani Network founder Siraj Haqqani. Despite these tactical victories, the drone attacks in Pakistan have caused significant damage. Many civilians in Pakistan have been killed due to the drone attacks. The attacks have also been regarded as unlawful by the country's parliament. It passed a resolution that called for an end to the drone operations. The US was also accused of violating Pakistan's sovereignty by carrying out the attacks without its permission.

In 2010, leaked diplomatic cables revealed that Pakistan secretly allowed the US to operate in the country. The cables also revealed that Special Operations units of the US were operating in Pakistan.<sup>58</sup>

- **Obama and the nuclear issues of Pakistan**

Due to Pakistan's nuclear capabilities, the US has been concerned about its security. However, through its partnership with Pakistan's Strategic Plans Division, the US has been able to assist the country in improving its nuclear security. President Obama stated that he was confident that Pakistan's nuclear weapons would remain secure. Prior to becoming a declared nuclear weapons state, Pakistan was very skeptical about the US' intentions regarding its nuclear program. They feared that the U.S. might take away their weapons if they felt that they were at risk. To address this concern, the US accepted Pakistan's status.

After the US President Barack Obama took office, intelligence agencies detected that Pakistan was expanding its nuclear capabilities. According to estimates, its nuclear weapons had ranged from 60 to 90. This was considered a significant development that threatened the administration's efforts to reduce the world's nuclear stockpiles. Despite the officials' assurances

---

<sup>58</sup> The Bureau of Investigative Journalism. (January 3, 2013). 'Obama 2013 Pakistan Drone Strikes.'

that the country's nuclear weapons were secure, some were worried that the materials could be stolen. These materials are stored in different areas and facilities.

As part of his efforts to reduce the world's nuclear stockpiles, Obama was negotiating the Fissile Material Cut off Treaty. However, Pakistan was not in favor of the treaty such policy of Obama administration, as the US has already signed a nuclear agreement with India and refused to signed the same type nuclear agreement with Pakistan. This angered the country, which also didn't support the US' efforts to negotiate a similar treaty.<sup>59</sup>

- **Obama and the Pakistan-India relations**

The U.S. expected Pakistan to improve its relations with India as part of its strategy for the region known as the AfPak. It was aware that the Pakistan policy of maintaining an Indo-centric security framework was an obstacle to regional stability. By addressing the Kashmir issue, the U.S. could help shape Pakistan's international image and limit its military power. During his campaign, Barack Obama stated that he would like to work with India and Pakistan to resolve their issues related to Kashmir. Despite this, India still persists in its insistence that the US should not intervene in the conflict. It believes that foreign interference would promote Pakistani interests. When Obama became the new US president, India made it clear that it would not allow the US to play a role in the ongoing conflict between the two countries. This led to the deterioration of relations between the U.S. and Pakistan.<sup>60</sup>

- **US unilateral action in Pakistan and the killing of Osama bin Laden**

In 2011, the US President Barack Obama promised to take action against al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden if the American intelligence community had information about them. In May 2011, a team of US Navy SEALs carried out a secret operation against OBL in Abbottabad, Pakistan. The operation was carried out in an area that was occupied by a Pakistani military base and an academy. Due to the presence of Osama bin Laden in Pakistan, the US became suspicious of the country's government. This suspicion led to the creation of a rift between the two governments. The Pakistani military and intelligence agencies were accused of protecting the

---

<sup>59</sup> Schmitt, E. & Sanger, D.E. (2011). 'Pakistani Nuclear Arms Pose Challenge to U.S. Policy.'

<sup>60</sup> Schaffer, H.B. (2012). 'The Kashmir Issue: What is America's Role?'

terrorist leader due to their failure to capture him in their own country. However, the government of Pakistan denies that it was aware of the terrorist leader's hide-out.

Following the raid on the compound in Abbottabad, the U.S. officials started to question the country's military aid program. They also wanted to know if there were individuals or institutions in Pakistan that were capable of capturing or killing OBL. Despite this, the administration decided not to cut or reduce the aid to Pakistan as it was important to maintain a positive relationship with the country and to prevent its counterterrorism network from being disrupted.<sup>61</sup>

The relationship between the US and Pakistan deteriorated after the raid on Bin Laden in Pakistan. The country regarded it as an act of unauthorized conduct and the violation of its sovereignty by the US forces. It also led to anti-American sentiment in the region.

- **US Admiral, Michael Mullen accusations on Pakistan**

During his testimony before the Senate in September 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, accused Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency of supporting the Haqqani network, which was responsible for the attack on the US embassy in Kabul. He also stated that the Haqqanis were an extension of Pakistan's intelligence agency. This was regarded as the most serious allegation made against Pakistan by an official from the Obama Administration. Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated that Pakistan's support for militant groups operating in Afghanistan extended to high-profile attacks such as those carried out against the US. These included the truck bombing that killed five individuals and wounded 77 soldiers in Kabul.

It's widely believed that the accusations about Pakistan's involvement in the Haqqani network were made as part of the US' efforts to put more pressure on the country. The US suspected that Pakistan's intelligence agency was supporting the group in order to help extend its influence in Afghanistan.

---

<sup>61</sup> Myers, S.L. & Perlez, J. (2011). 'Tensions Rise as U.S. Officials Press Pakistan for Answers.'

Pakistan rejected the US' claims that it was not doing enough to control militant groups such as the Haqqani network. It also stated that it would not allow American forces to operate in North Waziristan. The government stated that it was already cooperating with the US, but it should respect its sovereignty.<sup>62</sup>

- **US/NATO Strikes on Salala base**

Tensions between Pakistan and the US grew following the November 2011 NATO airstrike that killed 24 Pakistani soldiers. Following this incident, Pakistan closed its communication lines with Afghanistan, which prevented NATO from accessing the country. The US was also asked to leave an airbase in Shamsi. The Pakistani government then boycotted an international conference held in Bonn regarding Afghanistan.<sup>63</sup>

- **Conclusion**

One of the main issues that the Pakistani military had with the new policy was the reduction in the financial support that the US gave them. The army's chief, General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, and his staff protested against the government's performance and actions since 2009. The public lost trust in the government due to its alleged corruption and its failure to build a positive image of Pakistan. The Kerry-Lugar Act was largely debated in Pakistan a compromise on Pakistan's sovereignty. The Obama policy of concentrating on the civilian government and more money for the economic development of Pakistan resulted in the increase of terrorists' attacks on US troops in Afghanistan, while its relations with Pakistan security forces also drop over the time.

The deteriorating relationship between the US and Pakistan caused many Americans to ask the Obama administration to rethink its role in the country's security. As a result, the president Obama was compelled by the circumstances to efforts to restore the relationship with the military factions in Pakistan as the civilian governments in the Pakistan were considered of

---

<sup>62</sup> Bumiller, E. & Perlez, J. (2011). 'Pakistan's Spy Agency Is Tied To Attack On U.S. Embassy.'

<sup>63</sup> Brulliard, K. & Partlow, J. (2011). 'NATO Airstrike Strains U.S.-Pakistan Relations.'

losing their credibility. Despite the US' commitment to reduce its budget for military projects in Pakistan, the amount of money allocated to these programs still increased. This is in contrast to the civilian projects that the US funds.

The US' financial aid to Pakistan's military forces has increased significantly over the past couple of years. From 2008 to 2011, the total amount of money given to the country's armed forces by the US has gone up from \$517 million to \$1,277 million. In 2008 it was \$517 million which increased to \$989 in 2009, \$1236 in 2010 and \$1277 million in 2011. Some of the major contracts that were signed during the previous administration were also recognized.

The security and political relationship between the US and Pakistan was regarded as the main concerns of both governments during the time of the war on terrorism. However, the conflict between the two countries worsened due to the actions of the US military operation of Abbottabad, Ramind Davis case, and Salala strikes. The killing of Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in Pakistan in 2011 triggered a crisis in the relationship between the US and Pakistan. The presence of the terrorist leader in the country raised doubts in Obama Administration about the capabilities of the Pakistani intelligence agency in the war on terror.

The rise of terrorists attacks on US troops in Afghanistan and Pakistan inability to control the Haqqani network created doubts in the US on the role of Pakistan in the war on terror. Thus in December 2011, the US Congress approved a defense authorization bill that provided for continued aid to Pakistan. However, it also included conditions that would make it harder for the US to provide financial assistance to the country.

The killing of Osama Bin Laden by the US on Pakistani soil has caused a great amount of anger in Pakistan. The government of Pakistan immediately demanded the departure of 50 US officials in the country. It also imposed restrictions on the travel of American personnel in the country. Five Pakistanis were also apprehended for allegedly helping the Americans carry out the mission.

On April 12, 2012, the Pakistani Parliament adopted a roadmap that called for the review of the US's activities in Pakistan. It also demanded an end to drone attacks inside Pakistan. The roadmap noted that the US should stop its drone attacks on Pakistani territory. Pakistan has been



asked to stop its infiltration into Afghanistan on various pretexts and refrain from using its air space for the transportation of weapons and ammunition. After the Guideline was passed, the negotiations between the US and Pakistan resumed. US President Barack Obama appointed Marc Grossman as the DCC's representative in Pakistan. The two parties worked to resolve the most critical issue in their relationship. In July 2012, the US apologized to Pakistan for the incident that led to the deaths of 24 Pakistani soldiers at Salala. In exchange, Pakistan agreed to allow the US and NATO to use its territory to reach Afghanistan.

The crisis between the US and Pakistan ended in 2012, but the conflicts and instability between the two countries persisted. Despite the close cooperation between the two countries, tensions and retaliatory actions continued to emerge. Despite these, both the US and Pakistan still consider each other as important partners in the fight against terrorism.

Despite the various factors that contribute to the development of the relationship between Pakistan and the US, there are still divisive issues that remain. For instance, the US considers Pakistan as a safe haven for terrorists. This is the main reason why the country's government did not address the issues raised by the people of Pakistan. The various factors that have shaped the relationship between the US and Pakistan have made it difficult for both countries to reach a consensus on their future cooperation.

## CHAPTER 4

### PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONS: TRUST-DEFICIT AND ISSUES OF IRRITANTS

The relationship between the US and Pakistan has remained cordial and cooperative over the years. However, it has also been marked by various turns and controversies. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1980 led to the re-establishment of friendly relations between Pakistan and the US. These relations were further strengthened following the sanctions implemented by the US in the 1990s. During their partnership, Pakistan and the US have often had compelling interests. However, their various patterns of overlapping interests and their divergence on matters of national interest led to growing mistrust.<sup>64</sup> Despite the success of the war on terror, relations between Pakistan and the US remain strained due to the various issues that they have to face. These issues can only be resolved through targeted actions and not through prolonged and complex interactions.

As the sole global power, the US is not only responsible for its own interests, but also acts independently. This makes it very challenging for the US to deal with Pakistan. The country is also very important to the US in the war on terror, and it has an uncertain strategic environment. The US is also concerned about Pakistan's strategic position and its activities in the region. Its crucial role in the global politics and its relations with other countries are also issues of concern for the country. Also, the ongoing war in Afghanistan and the activities in its tribal regions have created a rift between the US and Pakistan.

Since the September 11 attacks, the US has been asking Pakistan to allow its officials to coordinate with the US forces in the FATA region to carry out operations against terrorist

---

<sup>64</sup> Qadar Bakhsh Baloch, "Engagement and Estrangement in U.S.-Pakistan Relations", *The Dialogue* Vol. I, No. 4 (Autumn 2006): 28-30.

groups. However, this request has been rejected. US officials have been critical of Pakistan's refusal to allow its forces to carry out these operations.<sup>65</sup>

Pakistani politicians and intelligence agencies are very cautious about the US' intentions in the region, especially after the September 11 attacks. They also believe that the US is a fickle friend that cannot be relied on. The public is also concerned about the country's counter-terror alliances with the US. Despite the success of the war on terror, the relationship between Pakistan and the US still has a long way to go before it can be considered a strong strategic partnership. The recent attacks by the US on Salala check post and the killing of Osama bin Laden by US forces in Abbottabad are some of the issues that have raised concerns in Pakistan.

The researcher discussed the various factors that contributed to the distrust between the US and Pakistan following the September 11 attacks and specifically during the Obama administration 2009-2017.

#### **4.1 Trust-Deficit in Pak-US**

The trust deficit between the US and Pakistan is growing due to various factors. These include the deteriorating relationship between the two countries and the increasing number of issues between them.

##### **4.1.1 Pakistanis' Doubts of American role in the war against terrorism**

From the Pakistan's point of view; the trust deficit between the US and Pakistan is growing due to various factors. These include the deteriorating relationship between the two countries and the increasing number of issues between them.

- Pakistan was worried that the US might withdraw from Afghanistan and creates a state of chaos.

---

<sup>65</sup> Hasan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan's Strategic Culture", in *South Asia in 2020: Future Strategic Balances and Alliances*, Michael R Chmbers, ed. (Carlisle Baracks PA: The Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2002), 314-318..

- The US officials have criticized the performance of Pakistani soldiers and intelligence agency in the war on terror.
- The various conditions that the US places on aid are also causing Pakistanis to distrust the US.
- Pakistan was also worried that the country would get betrayed again as was in the 1990's.

#### **i. Pakistan's fear of US withdrawal from Afghanistan**

The US' actions following the September 11 attacks have played an important role in shaping the country's foreign policy toward South Asia. As a result, its engagement with the region has changed from its previous policy. The country's long-term commitment is also different from its previous approach, which led to a series of chaotic policies.

After the Geneva Accords was signed, the US decided to withdraw from the region. This was a mistake that allowed extremist groups to use Afghanistan as a launching pad for attacks against the country and other international targets. It also threatened the country's vital interests. Since 9/11, the US' foreign policy has been focused on South Asia. Under Secretary of State Nicholas Burns noted that the region is now a central part of the country's foreign policy. He also noted that it would be the US' top foreign officer in the next few decades. For the first time in its history, the US viewed South Asia as a vital region for its foreign policy interests. Through its improved strategic relations with the region, the US has a stronger chance of achieving its goals.

However, recent developments in Afghanistan, such as the withdrawal of NATO forces and President Barack Obama's decision to reduce the number of troops in the country, have raised doubts about the US' commitment in the region. This uncertainty has led to the concerns of top Pakistani officials. They believe that the US would leave Afghanistan in disarray and that Pakistan would become a vulnerable state.<sup>66</sup>

#### **ii. Pakistan role in the war on terror and US accusations**

---

<sup>66</sup> David O. Smith, "Facing up to the Trust-Deficit: The Key to an U.S.-Pakistan Defence Relationship", *Strategic Insights* VI, issue 4 (June 2007): 9.

The US officials' accusations and criticism regarding Pakistan's performance in the war on terror has increased the distrust between the two countries. Top US officials such as Army Chiefs and State Department officials have criticized the country's soldiers for not performing well in the fight against terrorism. The US stated that terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda and the Taliban have been staying in the FATA region and are operating from there. Jones also confirmed during a senate hearing that Taliban leaders have been staying in the city of Quetta. Pakistani policymakers were shocked by the statements made by US officials. They believed that the accusations were baseless and aimed at undermining the country's foreign policy.<sup>67</sup>

The growing accusations against Pakistan by the Afghan leadership and the top military officials of the coalition forces have become a major issue in the relations between the two countries. Also, the US' allegation that Pakistan is providing safe havens to terrorists has added to the tensions in the relationship.

The Obama Administration has been repeatedly demanding that Pakistan carry out military operations against the Haqqani network and other militant groups in the country's tribal regions. This has created a misunderstanding at the bilateral level. For Pakistan, building its credibility and legitimacy in the region is a huge task that requires a lot of patience and effort.

The situation in the FATA region, which is considered to be the most neglected area of Pakistan, required a comprehensive strategy to get the support of the local population to eliminate the presence of Taliban and al-Qaeda. The US strategy in this region was focused on short-term objectives. The main objective of the operations in this region was to prevent the infiltration of militants and terrorists into Afghanistan.

Despite the success of Pakistan's military operations in the region, the country's short-term strategy often alienates the local population and increases the support for militant groups such as al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The US, on the other hand, has a strategy that focuses on

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid. 9-10.

carrying out military hot-pursuit operations to achieve quick victory and withdraw from Afghanistan.<sup>68</sup>

Due to the different approaches taken by both the US and Pakistan while dealing with the militancy along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border, the two countries' relations have become strained. However, despite the negative statements, the two countries maintained their relations. They continued to work together to overcome the issues of mistrust. Aside from regular military and economic activities, the two countries also regularly conducted exchanges programs and visits.

### **iii. Indo-US strategic Partnership and Pakistan security concern**

The relationship between India and Pakistan has always been a source of tension for the US. Following the September 11 attacks, the deteriorating relations between the two countries became a major concern for Washington. Tensions grew even worse after the Indian and Pakistani armies deployed their forces across their border. The US was also surprised by the situation. The US' proactive mediation helped defuse the conflict between India and Pakistan. It also encouraged the building of trust between the two nations.<sup>69</sup>

The nuclear deal between India and the US has been regarded as an irritant in the relations between Pakistan and the US. It has also created doubts about the US' role in the region. As an ally of the US in the war on terror, Pakistan is eager to have a civil nuclear agreement with the US. However, the progress on this front has not been seen in the past couple of years. The US' decision to sign the nuclear agreement with India has negative effects on the relationship between the two countries. Aside from criticizing the deal, Pakistan also expressed its concerns

---

<sup>68</sup> Rizwan Akhtar, *US-Pakistan Trust Deficit and the War on Terror*, A Report of the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College (PA. Carlisle Baracks, 2008), 9-10.

<sup>69</sup> Fazal Rabbi, "Pakistan's Security Concerns over Indo-US Post 9/11 Strategic Engagements." *Pakistan Journal of History & Culture* 38, no. 2 (2017), 155-186. See also Stephen J. Blank, *Natural Allies? Regional Security in Asia and Prospects for Indo-American Strategic Cooperation* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2005).

over the increasing nuclear capabilities of India. It said that the agreement would have a negative effect on the South Asian region's balance of power.<sup>70</sup>

According to Pakistan, the deal would encourage other countries, such as North Korea and Iran, to pursue their nuclear programs. It also claimed that it would undermine the non-proliferation efforts. It also expressed its distrust of the US' continued strategic engagement with India. The country's military leaders believe that the deal would strengthen India's power and increase its hostility toward Pakistan. They also believe that the US is helping India expand its military capabilities. It also claimed that India was using Afghanistan as a base for its covert activities. It also believed that the country was helping Baloch insurgents in the region. As a result of the nuclear deal, distrust between Pakistan and the US has increased.<sup>71</sup>

#### **iv. US conditional aid to Pakistan**

The Obama administration conditional aid (both economic and security) and do more policy has created a sense of frustration amongst Pakistan.

There were various bills introduced in the US Senate and House of Representatives that raised doubts about the relationship between Pakistan and the US. One of these was the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. This bill would allow the president of the US to sign a certificate stating that Pakistan is preventing Al Qaeda and Taliban groups from operating in its territory. Naeem Salik, a former Pakistani brigadier, said that the proposed legislation was a serious development that would affect the relationship between the two countries.

The US has now become explicit about its intention towards Pakistan, which is a hostile design the country is being presented in the context of its ongoing war against terror. This is a direct threat to Pakistan and its frontline ally. The Section 1442 of the Pakistan Act of 1974 gives the US President the power to make Pakistan's government stop the Taliban from operating in

---

<sup>70</sup> Nicholas Burns, "American's Strategic Opportunity with India: The New US-India Partnership", *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 2007): 131-146.

<sup>71</sup> Syed Shahid Hussian Bukhari, "India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implication for Pakistan", *Berkeley Journal of Social Science* 1, no. 1 (January 2011): 1-28.

areas under its control. These include the areas of Balochistan, FATA, and Chaman. As a result, it is important that the public accepts the US' intention towards Pakistan, which is a threat that it should not allow to be tolerated. It is also common for some fifth columnists to provide the US with fabricated information.

Sherin Mazari noted: “The US intent towards Pakistan has now become completely unambiguous and it is a threatening and hostile design the US is unfurling in the context of its frontline ally in the war on terror ... Now the US has effectively moved to threaten Pakistan directly. The section on Pakistan (1442) effectively takes Pakistan-US relations back to the Pressler days ... Amongst the conditionalities, the President would have to certify that the Government of Pakistan was preventing the Taliban from operating in "areas under its sovereign control" including specifically Chaman, Quetta, FATA and the NWFP. One can see how some fifth columnists among us having been feeding the US often concocted information that they feel the US wants to hear ... The point is that by now we should accept that the US intent towards us is threatening and overall negative.”<sup>72</sup>

#### **v. The Bad Bargain: The US support of military-political elites in Pakistan and public reservation**

The support given by the Obama administration to political and military elites in Pakistan has been regarded as a bad bargain. In every instance of close engagement between the US and Pakistan, there has been a military-controlled government. The policies of the US have been set by the White House, the Pentagon, and the CIA.

Pakistan's foreign policies were made keeping in mind the country's vital national interests and the global issues that it was involved in. The last phase of the Cold War was also played out in Afghanistan. The US has supported the military and political elites of Pakistan at the expense of the country's civilian institutions. This has allowed the military and the powerful elites to maintain their hold on power and prevent the public from participating in the political process.

The people of Pakistan have expressed their dissatisfaction with the country's relationship with the US. They feel that the US has benefited the military regimes in Pakistan at the expense of the

---

<sup>72</sup> Shireen M. Mazari, “US threats to Pakistan”, *The News*, February 4, 2007.



civilian governments. According to Tauqir Hussian, the bad bargain between the US and Pakistan has led to the rise of anti-American sentiment in the country. This sentiment stems from the people's resentment towards the governing elite and the US.<sup>73</sup>

#### **4.1.2 American doubts of Pakistan role in the war against terrorism**

After the September 11 attacks, the US carried out successful operations in Afghanistan. The government of the Taliban was eventually replaced by the elected government of Hamid Karzai. However, under the Obama administration the security situation in the Afghanistan worsened. Due to the growing number of attacks by the Taliban and their ability to regroup, the US officials became shocked by the developments in Afghanistan. They attributed the growing number of attacks to various factors.

- Safe Haven in FATA and Pakistan support of Haqqani militant group
- Pakistan's support of Kashmiri Jihadi groups
- Nuclear transparency and A.Q.Khan Network
- The Narcotics issues and its trafficking

##### **i. Safe Haven in FATA and Pakistan support of Haqqani militant group**

The US had doubts about the role of the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) in supporting the Taliban. During the 1980s, the agency was involved in providing financial and technical support to the militant groups in Afghanistan, which eventually became the Taliban. After the Soviets left Afghanistan, the group became a pro-Taliban organization. Pakistan also provided material and diplomatic support to the Taliban during the pre-9/11 period. Following the September 11 attacks, the US pressured Pakistan to end its support for the Taliban. Aside from this, the country also helped the US and allied forces in Afghanistan by providing them with logistical and intelligence support. Through these activities, the US was able to oust the Taliban government from power.

---

<sup>73</sup> Touqir Hussain, "US-Pakistan Relations: What Trust Deficit?", *Policy Brief* no. 31 (Washington D: The Middle East Institute, November 2010), 4.

The majority of the Taliban members were killed or captured by Pakistani forces. Many of them escaped into Pakistan and Afghanistan. Also, through its support, Pakistan was able to kill many al-Qaeda members. Hundreds of these individuals were handed over to the US. Despite the positive effects of Pakistan's assistance in fighting terrorism in Afghanistan, the US still regarded the country as a strategic ally. However, after the Taliban was able to gain strength and attacks against the US and NATO forces, Washington started to doubt its ally. The US doubts about Pakistan's intentions in Afghanistan can be attributed to its close relationship with elements within the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai. These individuals have previously been hostile to Pakistan.<sup>74</sup>

Despite its claims that Pakistan has the capability to capture and kill al-Qaeda members, the US still doubts that the country is doing enough to prevent the Taliban and other militant groups from taking over its territory. It was also not satisfied with Musharraf's statement that identifying these groups in Pakistan is very difficult due to the country's cultural and linguistic similarities. In September 2006, the US criticized the agreement that was signed with the local tribal leaders in Pakistan's North Waziristan region. The pact was regarded as a mistake that would lead to a reduction in the country's military capabilities and an increase in cross-border attacks against US and allied forces in Afghanistan. Aside from this, the US also doubts that Pakistan is supporting the insurgents in Afghanistan, which could prove very costly for the country as it would also lead to the deaths of American and coalition soldiers. Bruce Riedel, a former CIA officer, noted that many of the groups operating in Pakistan have long-standing ties with the country's intelligence agency.

In September 2011, insurgents armed with heavy weapons attacked the US Embassy and NATO's headquarters in Kabul. The attack, which resulted in the deaths of seven civilians and two soldiers, served as a frightening reminder of the presence of foreign forces in Afghanistan. The attack on the Kabul police headquarters highlighted the concerns that the country's security forces might not be able to prevent the Taliban and other militant groups from taking over the country after the US and its allies withdraw from Afghanistan in 2014. It also reinforced the

---

<sup>74</sup> David O. Smith, "Facing up to the Trust-Deficit: The Key to an U.S.-Pakistan Defence Relationship", *Strategic Insights* VI, issue 4 (June 2007): 11.

doubts about the capabilities of the Afghan forces. Despite the attacks, President Hamid stated that the country's transition from military to civilian control would not be affected by the incidents. He noted that the attacks would only strengthen the resolve of the people to take the necessary steps to ensure their own security.<sup>75</sup>

The US and Afghanistan have accused Pakistan of supporting the Haqqani Network, which carried out the attacks against American forces. According to the NATO commander General John Allen, the group is an important ally of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. The group has also been instrumental in providing intelligence for Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies.

From the beginning of the US-led campaign in Afghanistan and the beginning of the war on terror, the Bush administration had suspected that the Taliban were planning attacks against the US. However, they had found the suspicions to be unsubstantiated. In 2008, it was clear that the war was losing and that Washington was considering pulling out of the country. Before the US carried out the attack on September 11, Pakistan had mostly bet on the American success in Afghanistan. However, it started to look for other ways to support the Taliban.<sup>76</sup>

Although North Waziristan was still a target of US drone attacks, the Haqqani Network was not completely dismantled. The US pressured Pakistan to launch a military operation against the group. Despite this, the relations between the two countries remained strained following the killing of al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in Pakistan. Leon Panetta, the US Defense Secretary, warned that the country would retaliate against those who are based in Pakistan. Ambassador Cameron Munter of the US stated that the attack that happened in Kabul was carried out by the Haqqani network, which was allegedly supported by the Pakistan government. Munter's statements were immediately condemned by Pakistan's foreign office. It noted that the US ambassador's statements about militancy and terrorism were not helpful in addressing the issue.

<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Alissa J. Rubin, Ray Rivera, and Jack Healy, U.S. Embassy and NATO Headquarter Attacked in Kabul, *The New York Times*, September 13, 2011.

<sup>76</sup> Touqir Hussain, 3.

<sup>77</sup> "Kabul siege: 'Attackers linked to Pakistan govt'", *The Express Tribune*, September 18, 2011.

Admiral Michael Mullen, the chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, accused Pakistan of supporting the Haqqani Network during his testimony before a senate committee on September 22, 2011.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that the Haqqani Network and the Balochistan Shura, which are groups of terrorists that are supported by the government of Pakistan, are operating from the country with impunity. He also accused them of carrying out attacks against American troops and civilians. The Haqqani Network is a strategic asset of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency. It is believed that the group was behind the September 13 attacks against the US Embassy in Kabul. Mullen noted that there is enough evidence linking the Haqqanis to the June 28 attack on the Inter-Continental hotel in Kabul and the September 10 attack on the US Embassy in Afghanistan. The June 28 attack injured over 80 people and killed five Afghans.<sup>78</sup>

The leadership of Pakistan, including Prime Minister Yousuf Gilani, Interior Minister Rehman Malik, and the head of the country's intelligence agency, Shuja Pasha, rejected the US allegations and asked the Obama administration to refrain from hurting the country's sentiments. According to the minister, the CIA did not create the Haqqani network and was not responsible for the attacks in Afghanistan. Relations between the US and Pakistan deteriorated following the statements made by US Admiral Michael Mullen. His statements resulted in various counter-statements and statements that negatively affected the relationship between the two countries.<sup>79</sup>

## **ii. US doubts of Pakistan's support of Kashmiri Jihadi groups**

The Bush administration pressured the Pakistani government to change its policy regarding Kashmir. In response, the government of Pervez Musharraf targeted religious schools

---

<sup>78</sup> Statement of Admiral Michael Mullen, U.S. Navy Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Afghanistan and Iraq September 22, 2011, [Online] available: <http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2011/09%20September/Mullen%2009-22-11.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> *Dawn*, September 25, 2011.

that were allegedly promoting the culture of militancy in the region. The schools were also required to introduce secular subjects in their curriculum.

In response to the growing extremist activities in the country, President Pervez Musharraf launched a comprehensive campaign against sectarian violence and banned organizations and groups that were involved in militant activities. He also targeted the military's top brass. Some of these groups and organizations had links with individuals who were involved in the Kashmir jihad. Their funds were frozen and their accounts were controlled.<sup>80</sup>

Despite the government's efforts, the US still believed that Pakistan still had not fully dismantled the groups that were involved in the Kashmir jihad. Bruce Riedel, a former CIA officer, accused the intelligence agency of having close ties with these groups. Despite the government's actions, the US still doubted the sincerity of the Pakistani government's efforts in curbing militancy in the region. It believed that the groups and individuals involved in the Kashmir jihad were merely ordered to stop their activities. The US also believed that some of these groups and organizations were still operating in Pakistan. They were able to reopen their operations and carry out attacks.<sup>81</sup>

### **iii. Nuclear transparency and A.Q.Khan Network**

Due to the activities of AQ Khan, which involved the proliferation of nuclear technology, Pakistan and the US had become strained. The government of General Pervez Musharraf launched a campaign against him and his network. However, due to his national hero status, he was pardoned by the Pakistani president. The US has repeatedly asked Pakistan to allow American personnel to investigate A. Q. Khan, the mastermind of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the US. This issue has affected the relations between the two countries for a couple of

---

<sup>80</sup> John F. Burns, "Pakistan Is Said to Order an End to Support for Militant Groups", *New York Times*, January 2, 2002.

<sup>81</sup> David O. Smith, 11.

years. Due to the increasing number of nuclear programs in Iran and North Korea, the US doubts about Pakistan's past assistance to these countries.<sup>82</sup>

Critics in the US also questioned Pakistan's refusal to allow American officials to investigate Khan. They believe that the country has something more to hide regarding the proliferation of nuclear technology. The issue is not yet resolved, but it could become a major issue once the US troops leave Afghanistan.<sup>83</sup>

#### **iv. The Narcotics issues and its trafficking**

The geographical location of Pakistan and its border with Afghanistan also pose challenges for drug trafficking to the country. For years, the border had been used to transport drugs from Afghanistan to Europe and the US. The fight against drugs in Pakistan was partly linked to the US' war on terror. Due to the increasing concern about the trafficking of drugs, especially those originating from Pakistan, the US became more concerned about its eradication. As a result, Pakistan supported the US' efforts to control the cultivation of narcotics.

Despite the presence of thousands of troops in Afghanistan, the country's narcotics still reach western countries. The US accused Pakistan of supporting terrorism through the drug trade. In 2010, the Obama administration placed conditions on the aid it provides to the country. One of these conditions prohibited the use of funds for the establishment of border coordination centers. The US Congress enacted the Act to provide aid to Pakistan in the national interest. However, it noted that the country had made significant efforts in fighting against drugs. This act

---

<sup>82</sup> For detail see Paul Kerr and Mary Beth Nikitin, *Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, March 19, 2013) and David E. Sanger, "The Khan Network", paper presented at the *Conference on South Asia and the Nuclear Future*, held June 4-5 2004 at Stanford University. [Online] available: [http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/3889/Khan\\_network-paper.pdf](http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/3889/Khan_network-paper.pdf)

<sup>83</sup> David O. Smith, 11.

also recommended that the US should continue providing aid to Pakistan. Despite this, the issue of drug control remained a major issue between the two countries.<sup>84</sup>

#### **4.2 Issues of Irritants in Pak-US relations**

Tensions and distrust grew between the United States and Pakistan after the September 11 attacks. The two countries had various issues and problems before their relationship started to deteriorate. Tensions between the US and Pakistan grew following the killing of Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and the release of Raymond Davis, a CIA operative who was captured and later released in Pakistan. There have also been drone attacks and the suspension of the NATO supply route in the country.

##### **i. Raymond Davis case**

On January 27, 2011, Raymond Davis, a CIA contractor, shot and killed two men in the city of Lahore. According to a newspaper report, he was apprehended on December 9, 2009, in Pakistan after he and his companions were stopped by law enforcers while they were trying to enter a Cantonment area. The incident was then resolved through the intervention of the US consulate.

The US Embassy in Pakistan then demanded the release of Davis. He was identified as a US diplomat and was supposed to have a Pakistani visa and a diplomatic passport. The embassy noted that Davis was authorized to carry out his duties as a US diplomat.

Although the US identified Davis as a technical and administrative staff member of the embassy, the country later revealed that he was a CIA contractor who was involved in the covert activities of the agency in Pakistan. Rana Bakhtiar, a prosecutor in Punjab, noted that even though Davis was an embassy employee, he did not have special privileges because he was on a business visa while in Pakistan.

---

<sup>84</sup> Susan B. Epstein and K. Alan Kronstadt, *Pakistan: U.S. Foreign Aid Conditions, Restrictions and Reporting Requirements*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, June 1, 2012), 6-7.

In Pakistan, the public demanded not to release of Davis. The government of President Asif Ali Zardari was also under pressure after a delegation from the US visited him.<sup>85</sup>

Regarding Davis Obama issues statement: “With respect to Mr. Davis, our diplomat in Pakistan, we've got a very simple principle here that every country in the world that is party to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations ... if our diplomats are in another country, then they are not subject to that country's local prosecution ... We respect it with respect to diplomats who are here. We expect Pakistan, that's a signatory and recognize Mr. Davis as a diplomat, to abide by the same convention.”<sup>86</sup>

In her address to the US Congress, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton noted that there are still many challenges that the two countries need to overcome in order to improve their relationship. She also said that they need to work together to prevent misunderstandings from undermining the progress that has been made in the past two years.

On February 23, 2011, the chief of Pakistan army General Kiyani and the chairman of US Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen held a meeting to discuss the issue of Raymond Davis, an American who was apprehended in Pakistan. Within a few hours, almost 50 members of Tehreek-e-Taliban, who were in contact with Davis, were arrested. Around 30 to 45 Americans who were residing in different areas outside the US embassy in Pakistan also left for the US.

The case of Davis revealed that many CIA operatives came to Pakistan during the regime of Pervez Musharraf.

Brigadier (r) Shaukat noted ““These were CIA, Black ops, or associated personnel from security agencies like Xe ... Musharaf opened all doors permitting CIA and its contract agents unlimited access to Pakistan, Pakistan’s GHQ/ISI could not have struck a better deal! This was a priceless opportunity to get rid of the CIA; it

---

<sup>85</sup> *Dawn*, February 1, 2011.

<sup>86</sup> The President’s New Conference, February 15, 2011, [Online] available: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/>. See also “Obama Calls for Release of U.S. Prisoner in Pakistan,” *Reuters*, February 15, 2011; Charlie Savage, “Pakistan Case Tests Laws on Diplomatic Immunity”, *New York Times*, February 22, 2011.



was also a success that could hardly have pleased Langley, on which subject, more below.”<sup>87</sup>

After a few weeks, the US agreed to release Raymond Davis on March 16, 2011. Due to this, the relations between Pakistan and the US were severely affected. Various religious groups held protests against the release of Davis.

## **ii. Drone Strikes in Pakistan**

Many people in Pakistan have protested against drone attacks, which have been killing civilians in the country. The US started its drone war against Pakistan in 2004, with the objective of killing terrorist groups and their allies in the country. Since then, more than 400 attacks have been carried out.

The killing of civilians in drone attacks has created distrust in the relationship between the US and Pakistan. This was also reflected in the country's leadership, which regarded these strikes as counterproductive. The attacks deeply affected the majority of Pakistanis.

The people of Pakistan were angered by the drone attacks, which they considered as violations of the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity. They also considered the attacks as a threat to their country.

Following the release of Raymond Davis, a US drone targeted a Jirga in North Waziristan and killed 41 civilians, which included women and children. The attack was carried out on March 17, 2001. Although the US claimed that the people who died were militants, Pakistan's government condemned the drone attacks.

---

<sup>87</sup> Shaukat Qadir, “Admiral Mullen’s Secret Deal: How the Pentagon supervised Raymond Davis’ release and how the CIA took its revenge”, *Counterpunch*, March 22, 2011. [Online] available: <http://www.counterpunch.org/2011/03/22/how-the-pentagon-supervised-raymond-davis-release-and-how-the-cia-took-its-revenge/>

Ambassador of Pakistan to the US, Hussain Haqqani, delivered a strong protest to the US. He was also summoned to the Foreign Office to discuss the incident. The US official was told that Pakistan would have to rethink its relations with the US due to the incident.

According to Shaukat Qadir, a political analyst, the drone attack on March 17 was carried out by the CIA in response to the incident involving the release of Davis. He also claimed that the agency was furious because of the deal that was made between the Pakistani and US militaries.

Army Chief Kiyani states: “It is highly regrettable that a jirga of peaceful citizens including elders of the area was carelessly and callously targeted with complete disregard to human life. In complete violation of human rights, such acts of violence take us away from our objective of elimination of terrorism. It is imperative to understand that this critical objective cannot be sacrificed for temporary tactical gains. Security of people of Pakistan, in any case, stands above all”.<sup>88</sup>

In response to the US' continued drone attacks and the killing of its citizens, Pakistan lodged a protest with the US. The country stated that these actions were unjustified and were not in accordance with the principles of international law. The increasing number of attacks and the killing of its citizens have also raised concerns about the trust deficit between the two countries.

### **iii. American unilateral raids and killing of bin Laden**

The killing of Osama bin Laden by the US forces in Abbottabad on May 1, 2011 was regarded as the most significant event in the relationship between the two countries. It deeply affected the relations between the US and Pakistan. The location where bin Laden was staying, which was close to the Pakistan Military Academy, raised suspicions that the country's intelligence agencies had been protecting him for a long time.

The relationship between Pakistan and the US deteriorated during the past years. Due to various factors, including the US' anti-terrorism campaign, the country's relations with the US were negatively affected. Some think tanks and US officials launched a campaign against Pakistan, accusing it of allowing Osama bin Laden to live in a country without being noticed.

---

<sup>88</sup> Inter Services Public Relations, *ISPR Press Release* No PR65/2011-ISPR, March 17, 2011.

For many observers, the hunt for bin Laden provided only two plausible conclusions. One of these is that Pakistani officials were either incompetent or complicit in hiding the terrorist leader. The other is that the country's intelligence and military services were not able to find key terrorist leaders in the country. This has severely affected Pakistan's credibility. For years, various Pakistani officials had claimed that the country's extremist groups were not finding safe haven in the country.<sup>89</sup>

Pakistan's ambassador to the US, Haqqani, said that NATO's claim that al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden was living in a house in Pakistan was not true. He noted that if bin Laden knew that he was living in a house in Pakistan, then the US would act on it.

“Over the years, I've repeatedly made clear that we would take action within Pakistan if we knew where bin Laden was. That is what we've done. But it's important to note that our counterterrorism cooperation with Pakistan helped lead us to bin Laden and the compound where he was hiding. Indeed, bin Laden had declared war against Pakistan as well and ordered attacks against the Pakistani people. Tonight I called President Zardari, and my team has also spoken with their Pakistani counterparts. They agree that this is a good and historic day for both of our nations. And going forward, it is essential that Pakistan continue to join us in the fight against Al Qaida and its affiliates.”<sup>90</sup>

Even as President Asif Ali Zardari and Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani hailed the victory of the army in the elections, the military leadership remained silent. They were reacting to the US media's criticism.

On May 5, 2011, General Kiyani, the corps commander, held a meeting to discuss the situation regarding the killing of Osama Bin Laden. It was revealed that the CIA did not share intelligence

---

<sup>89</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, “Pakistan-U.S. Relations: A summary”, *CRS Report for Congress* (Washington DC: May 16, 2011), 3-4.

<sup>90</sup> Barack Obama: “Remarks on the Death of Al Qaida Terrorist Organization Leader Usama bin Laden,” May 1, 2011. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=90315>

with the ISI, which contradicts the practice between the two services. The meeting concluded that the actions taken by the US in violation of Pakistan's sovereignty would warrant a review of the level of cooperation between the two intelligence agencies.

The US' first concern was the safety of its citizens in Pakistan. There were various reasons why it felt that Pakistan was incapable of doing enough to fight against terrorism. One of these was the country's failure to prevent the US from launching attacks on its soil. The US also acted unilaterally when it killed al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in Pakistan.<sup>91</sup>

#### **iv. Salala incident and suspension of NATO supply**

Aside from the fog and friction that can result from military operations, other factors such as political tensions can also affect the outcome. In February 2007, a US aircraft attacked a Pakistani post on the Afghan border, which resulted in the deaths of several Pakistani soldiers. This incident had a negative effect on the Pakistani soldiers deployed on the border.

Due to various incidents, including the US drone attack on a Pakistani post, misunderstandings and misconceptions emerged between the two countries. On November 26, 2011, NATO aircraft carried out air strikes against two check posts in Salala, which were located on top of an area with a difficult terrain.

Tensions between the two countries flared up following the incident. It occurred a day after a meeting between General Kiyani and US General John Allen, who was leading the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan.

The incident resulted in the deaths of 24 individuals and injured 13 others. Following the incident, the Pakistani government held an emergency meeting. Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani chaired the meeting, which also included a discussion about the NATO supply routes. After the meeting, the country's military leaders decided to close the supply routes to the US.

---

<sup>91</sup> Inter Service Public Relations (ISPR), *Press Release*, May 5, 2011. [Online] available: [http://www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main.asp?o=t-press\\_release&date=2011/5/5](http://www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main.asp?o=t-press_release&date=2011/5/5)

In response to the incident, Hina Rabbi, a Foreign Office spokesperson, stated that the attack was not an incident and that an apology was not enough. She also noted that the coalition forces repeatedly crossed the red line. According to her, Pakistan has been acknowledged for its efforts in helping resolve the conflict in Afghanistan.

According to a statement released by the Pakistani government, it was impossible for the country to see its soldiers getting killed by allied forces. It also accused the NATO forces of not informing Pakistan about the activities of their soldiers prior to the incident.

The incident involving the attack on the Salala check post was considered as one of the most serious issues that affected the relationship between Pakistan and the US. On September 30, 2010, Pakistan closed its supply routes to NATO forces after the latter conducted an airstrike inside the country. The following day, Pakistan protested against the violations of its border and demanded the UN to resolve the issue.

Following the recent NATO raids in Pakistan, the supply route for the US and allied forces in the region was stopped. The trucks and fuel tankers were stopped near the Jamrud road in the country's FATA region.<sup>92</sup>

#### **v. The F-16 Issue**

In the ongoing war on terror, Pakistan has played a vital role in supporting the US and NATO forces in Afghanistan. Through its intelligence and logistic support, the country has been able to successfully carry out numerous military operations against terrorist groups in the region.

The US officially recognized Pakistan as a non-NATO ally and provided it with various economic and military assistance. Aside from weapons, the US also provides Pakistan with various military equipment such as helicopters and the F-16 fighter jet. Although these are very helpful in enhancing the country's defense capabilities, some people in Pakistan still feel that the F-16s were not delivered. They noted that the US had already ordered and paid for the aircraft before they were delivered. Daniel S. Markey, a US analyst, noted that Pakistan's military is very

---

<sup>92</sup> "Pakistan stops Nato supplies after raid kills 28 troops", *Dawn*, November 26, 2011.

jealous of the weapons and spare parts it receives from the US. He said that the country's F-16 fighter jets are among the best in the region.<sup>93</sup>

#### **vi. Democracy related issues**

The US and Pakistan have been at odds over various issues, including democracy and the rule of law in the country. In 2007, the US expressed its concerns over the situation in Pakistan following the assassination of Benazir Bhutto. It also viewed the country's flourishing democracy as a potential threat to extremist groups.

During the US Congress' discussion about the situation in Pakistan, the members of both houses condemned the state of emergency and urged the US to suspend aid to the country. The US State Department also stated that it is working with Pakistani officials and other international organizations to ensure that the elections are conducted in an environment that is free, fair, and credible.

The 2008 and 2013 general elections in Pakistan were regarded as the culmination of the country's desire to rid itself of what it sees as a militant version of Islam. The subsequent criticism and allegations about the rigging in the elections by the opposition parties, which led to the formation of the Nawaz government, affected the country's democratic system.<sup>94</sup>

#### **vii. US support for Northern Alliances and Indian growing influence in Afghanistan**

Despite being an ally of the US in the war on terror, Pakistan has reservations about the policies of the US in the region. Its army and ISI believe that the US' policy of war on terror has created a critical situation in Afghanistan, which is detrimental to its interests. It has also raised concerns about the growing Indian influence in the region.

---

<sup>93</sup> Daniel S. Markey, 6.

<sup>94</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, *Pakistan Political Crises*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, January 3, 2008), 3.

The presence of US forces in Afghanistan allowed India to make an entry into the country and try to deny Pakistan's influence. It also provided an opportunity for the latter to maintain its strategic interests in the region.

The presence of Indian engineers in Afghanistan for the protection of their personnel close to Pakistan's border has also raised concerns about India's growing involvement in the region. It has also been reported that India's intelligence agency, known as Research and Analysis Wing, has been providing support to insurgent groups in Pakistan. Despite Pakistan's protests, the US has continued to encourage investment and trade in the region.

Despite being an ally of the US, Pakistan has reservations about the policies of the US in the region. Its army and ISI believe that the US' policy of war on terror has created a critical situation in Afghanistan, which is detrimental to its interests. India's increasing involvement in the country has also raised doubts about the US' objective in the region.<sup>95</sup>

#### **viii. US Media/think tank and their doubts regarding Pakistan's role in the war on terror**

Bilateral agreements and engagements are usually understood from the statements made by the political and national leaders. However, the way they are reported by the western media can create various misconceptions about the relationship between Pakistan and the US. For instance, the US media often states that Pakistan's forces are stationed along its eastern border.

In the ongoing war on terror, Pakistan has been deploying massive troops along its western border with Afghanistan. This was not desirable from a military and political standpoint. However, it was necessary to maintain its security along the border due to the Indo-Pak paradigm. Even if the majority of its troops are on the Indian border, it would still be necessary to maintain a security situation along the border due to the Indo-Pak paradigm.

There is no evidence indicating that Pakistan was reluctant to fight against the Haqqani groups in North Waziristan. However, the US viewed that Pakistan did not want to take action against the

---

<sup>95</sup> Afifa Kiran, "Indian Quest for Strategic ingress in Afghanistan and its implications for Pakistan", *ISSRA Papers* 1 (2009): 12-20.

militant organization. As a result, the Pakistani army entered the region and launched the ongoing operation Zarb-e-Azab.

Despite the billions of dollars that the US has given to Pakistan, the country is not doing enough to eliminate terrorist groups in the Pak-Af border region. Various reports published by the New York Times and Washington Quarterly criticize the government of Pakistan for failing to take effective action against these groups.

During a hearing regarding the US' aid to Pakistan, Gary Ackerman, a Republican, stated that the country was regarded as a black hole for the American taxpayer. He said that the country has received over \$24 billion in foreign assistance. He also noted that nothing positive has come out of the aid that the US has given Pakistan.



## CHAPTER-5

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, SUGGESTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- **FINDINGS**

- The Obama administration policy on the war on terror was to some extent the continuity of Bush policy but also was change to some extent when dealing its relations with Pakistan.
- The Obama administration considered Pakistan as equal threat to America as Afghanistan and thus he focused on Pakistan by designing its Af-Pak strategy, to counter terrorism in the border region, where militant/terrorist enjoyed safe haven.
- As part of this strategy, it also appointed a Special Envoy to Afghanistan and Pakistan, showing the importance it was giving to the region.
- Pakistanis were not too keen on the AfPak strategy of Obama. They especially resented the term since it put them on the same level with Afghanistan. They disagreed with this since according to them Afghanistan is a smaller country with a destabilized government, unlike itself.
- Under the Obama administration the campaign of drone strikes against terrorists in the tribal areas of Pakistan was greatly increased and intensified. Drone strikes inside Pakistan during Obama was more (total 373) as compare to Bush administrations of only 51.
- Obama administration emphasized the use of aid and assistance to Pakistan as a part of its foreign policy strived to have a stable Pakistan in order to be able to cooperate in the war. He continued to provide military and defense aid to Pakistan but at the same time also focus on non-military aid which was to support democracy and commit to stability in Pakistan. The total economic aid to Pakistan in Obama administration was \$7.6 billion (security aid as \$13.5 billion) which was more as compare to Bush administration, as Bush aid was only security centered.
- Instead of choosing military factions as the preferred dialogue partners, US President Barack Obama opted for a more consultative approach with the elected governments of Pakistan. He pushed for the passage of the Kerry-Lugar Act, which would have increased

the funding for non-security sectors in the country. Aid to Pakistan under Obama also differed from his predecessor since it included conditionality. This meant giving more importance to accountability and in order to avoid such aid and assistance from being misused as was previously done. The reduction of military aid in the Karr-Lugar bill and conditionality related to aid was largely debated in Pakistan a compromise on its country sovereignty.

- Like Bush, the Obama administration also considered Pakistan a major ally in the war on terror, and cooperation with Pakistan was considered vital to US national security interests. However he was willing to act alone if necessary i.e. the unilateral action against Osama in Abbottabad etc.
- Not only did his administration increase the use of drones in the country, but it has been argued that adding conditionality to aid meant interfering in Pakistani affairs and that it breached the country's sovereignty by raiding Osama compound on Pakistani soil without its consent.
- Obama preferred comprehensive engagement with Pakistan in all important fields including cooperation in the war on terror, financial and economic assistance to Pakistan, the safety and security of Pakistan nuclear weapons, and the democratic process in Pakistan.
- The Obama Administration was unwilling to support military rule in Pakistan. The administration emphasized the importance of improving the political situation in Pakistan in order for it to be more successful in dealing with terrorism. His administration preference to provide more civilian aid as compare to military aid was failed, as the military setup did not allow him to do so. The Obama policy of concentrating on the civilian government and more money for the economic development of Pakistan resulted in the increase of terrorists' attacks on US troops in Afghanistan, while its relations with Pakistan security forces also drop over the time.
- Obama was not only focusing on single agenda of the war on terror with Pakistan, but he also tried to promote democratic couture in Pakistan.
- There was no shift in the Obama policy towards Pakistan and Indian dispute. Obama has given great focus on the resolution of the conflict between India and Pakistan and normalizing their relations. This was in order to ensure peace and security in the region

and to eliminate the global threats of terrorism and nuclear arms which both countries possessed. With regards to Pakistan, it was important for Obama administration that there would be resolution in order for the country to be an effective partner to the U.S. in Afghanistan since Pakistan clashes with India was considered a distraction.

- The trust deficit between the US and Pakistan is growing due to various factors. These include the deteriorating relationship between the two countries and the increasing number of issues between them. These include the deteriorating relationship between the two countries and the increasing number of issues between them.
- a) Pakistan was worried that the US might withdraw from Afghanistan and creates a state of chaos.
- b) The US officials have criticized the performance of Pakistani soldiers and intelligence agency in the war on terror.
- c) The various conditions that the US places on aid are also causing Pakistanis to distrust the US.
- d) Pakistan was also worried that the country would get betrayed again as was in the 1990's
  - American doubts of Pakistan role in the war against terrorism were:
    - a) Safe Haven in FATA and Pakistan support of Haqqani militant group
    - b) Pakistan's support of Kashmiri Jihadi groups
    - c) Nuclear transparency and A.Q.Khan Network
    - d) The Narcotics issues and its trafficking
- Tensions and distrust grew between the United States and Pakistan because of various issues of irritant in the bilateral ties includes the Raymond Davis case, Drone Strikes in Pakistan, unilateral raids and killing of bin Laden, American Salala incident and suspension of NATO supply, US support for Northern Alliances and Indian growing influence in Afghanistan, and the US Media/think tank and their doubts/accusations regarding Pakistan's role in the war on terror.
- However, it has been evident that Pakistan's bilateral relationship with the U.S. has shifted from being a strong ally under Bush to the deterioration of relations under Obama.

- **CONCLUSION**

The relationship between the United States and Pakistan during the Obama Administration has been analyzed in this thesis with the aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors that influenced the relationship between the two countries. Although the US-Pakistan relationship is the longest and most intense in the region, it has become unstable due to the various factors that affect it and has undergone various changes during the Obama Administration.

Following the turmoil performance of the previous administration of Bush, which led to a decline in the US' relationship with Pakistan, Barack Obama's team adopted a new approach toward the Islamabad. As a result, "AfPak" strategy was coined by the US President to refer to the close relationship between Pakistan and the Washington. The US President Obama also focused on the country's efforts to resolve the issues related to the war in Afghanistan. His administration focus on the military set-up of Pakistan was decreased and with the civilian government interaction was increased.

Instead of choosing military factions as the preferred dialogue partners, US President Barack Obama opted for a more consultative approach with the elected governments of Pakistan. He pushed for the passage of the Kerry-Lugar Act, which would have increased the funding for non-security sectors in the country. The Obama administration's new approach toward Pakistan helped break the stalemate in the relationship between the two countries. It also promoted the US' position in South Asia. Despite the various difficulties that the US encountered in its relations with Pakistan, the Obama administration managed to make progress in its relations with the country.

The Obama concentrated on strong relationship with Pakistan that helps the US in achieving its various goals, such as strengthening its presence in South Asia and helping the US in its fight against terrorism in Afghanistan. It also facilitates the country's influence in the region. While Pakistan has three goals in its relationship with the US: 1) strengthening its military capabilities in response to India's growing assertiveness; 2) securing substantial financial

support from the US to improve the country's infrastructure and 3) establishing a more prominent political position in the region.

The relationship between the US and Pakistan has been plagued by various crises and tensions during the Obama administration including US unilateral drone strikes in Pakistan, the Salala incident, killing of Osama in Abbottabad, and Remind Davis case. The lack of strategic trust continues to be a major issue in the US-Pakistan relationship. This is mainly due to the country's inconsistent approach toward the US. It also has a short-term goal of achieving its goals while maintaining a more pragmatic mindset in the war on terrorism. This has prevented the two countries from establishing a solid foundation for their future.

The Obama Administration vowed to use all its power to defeat al Qaeda and its allies. It also knew that Pakistan was a vital part of the US' strategy against terrorism. As a result, it became a main focus of the country's counterterror efforts. As part of the strategy known as the AfPak, Pakistan was regarded as important as Afghanistan, to counter terrorism in the region.

The US President Barack Obama's goal in Pakistan was to establish a more stable and prosperous state by disrupting terrorist groups in the country. Doing so would prevent them from planning another attack and enhance the country's civil control. In order to achieve this, the US used various diplomatic and military tools. However, if Pakistan failed to cooperate, the US would act unilaterally.

Despite the positive effects of the Obama Administration's policies, relations between the US and Pakistan deteriorated during his first term. There were various arguments raised against the US. One of these was the Pakistan's claim that the US was violating its sovereignty. After winning his re-election, the US' foreign policy under the Obama administration continued the same as it was during his first term. However his administration second term in office brought comprehensive changes in its policies towards Pakistan.

Despite the positive effects of the Obama Administration's policies, relations between the US and Pakistan deteriorated during his first term, however positive changes can be seen in the bilateral ties of both countries during the second term of Obama administration. Due to the country's unstable democracy and its continued possession of nuclear weapons, the US has

continued to focus on Pakistan. This region is also a vital part of the US' strategy against terrorism.

The rise of new emerging powers has also affected the relationship between the US and Pakistan. One of these is India, which has been playing a significant role in the recent developments in the US-Pakistan relationship. Its rise has put immense pressure on Pakistan to improve its strategic relationship with the US. Another emerging power that has a significant influence over the relationship is China. The US should consider the growing influence of China in South Asia when it comes to its relations with Pakistan. If the US abandons the country, it could lead to a change in the strategic relationship between the two nations.

The relationship between the US and Pakistan has a strong impact on the region and on each country. The two countries have been instrumental in the fight against terrorism, and their cooperation has also helped the U.S. in maintaining its security. However, their continued cooperation has also raised various doubts and contradictions.

The relationship between the US and Pakistan has helped strengthen the country's military and political security. However, it has also caused various security and economic crises in the country. The continued collaboration with the US has also led to social and political unrest. Despite the positive effects of the relationship between the two countries, the recognition of American privileges has also raised concerns among Pakistani political parties. The support provided by Pakistan to the US in the fight against terrorism has worsened the situation in the region. The presence of American troops in the Afghanistan and the region during the Obama Administration has also led to multiple armed conflicts, which have caused instability and even led to the formation of new political and military forces.

The fluctuations in the US-Pakistan relationship have also affected other countries in the region. For instance, the relationship between India and the US has strengthened following the recent difficulties in the US-Pakistan relationship.

The history of the US-Pakistan relationship could provide valuable insight into the future of the relationship. As the United States continues to focus on terrorism in Pakistan, it will continue to need Pakistan's help in maintaining security in South Asia. Despite the various crises

that have occurred between the two countries, Pakistan will still remain the U.S.'s primary security concern.

Despite the various terrorist activities that have been identified and eliminated in Pakistan, the US still considered Pakistan a safe haven for terrorist. As it seeks to diversify its foreign relations, Pakistan is working toward forging stronger ties with Russia and China. Despite the various crises and conflicts that have affected the relationship between the US and Pakistan, the two countries still have to maintain their close ties. However, after realizing that they cannot expect much from each other, the two countries will have to accept each other for the peace and security of the region and world at large.

- **SUGGESTIONS**

The current situation in Pakistan-US relations is very critical and it is important that both the sides take note of each other's interests and recognize the need for each other. Both the countries should review their transactional relationship and establish a more conducive environment for their cooperation.

A long-term relationship between the United States and Pakistan is very important for the security and stability of both countries. It is also very important for the development of South Asia and for the global economy. Both governments need to prioritize the development of their relations. The US dependency only on military leadership in Pakistan needs to be replaced, with a more proactive role and engagement with the democratic institutions in Pakistan.

The regular meetings between the high-level officials of Pakistan and the US are necessary to maintain a long-term relationship. It is also important that both the sides understand the various needs of the people of Pakistan.

The relations between the two countries should also expand to cover various issues of common concern. These include the fight against terrorism, the establishment of a more balanced and democratic political system, the promotion of trade and investment, and the development of a more conducive environment for their cooperation.

There is a need for mutual understanding and trust between Pakistan and the US to overcome their mistrust and frustrations. Tensions and distrust are often linked to the growing distrust between Pakistan and the US. This is because of the various factors that affect their relationship, such as miscommunication, political issues, and the common threads of frustration and controversy. These problems are likely to affect the long-term relationship between the two countries.

The recent controversy over US drone strikes has negatively affected the relations between Pakistan and the US. The US' policies of keeping the details of drone attacks secret and Pakistan's insistence on keeping them ambiguous have created anti-American sentiments in the country. Despite the various legal arguments raised against the drone strikes, the minimum death of a civilian in these attacks is still considered a crime in an area where there is an active war. This could prove to be a significant issue for the US as it could affect its strategic interests.

The governments of Pakistan and the US need to play their part in the development of the region to end the menace of terrorism and extremism. One way to do this is by regularly engaging with the vulnerable population, teaching them basic skills such as human rights. This could help prevent them from getting into extremist groups.

The US also need to treat Pakistan and India on equal footing and shall maintain the balance of power in the region. It needs to contribute to CPEC objectives of regional development and integration

The western media should stop portraying Pakistan as a safe haven for terrorists and focus on the country's achievements in the war on terror. It should also take active measures to counter the various conspiracy theories and propaganda against the country.

The Pakistani government should also ban the publication of books that promote anti-Americanism in the country. Both the US and Pakistan have to encourage their media to play a role in bringing about a better understanding between the two nations.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## PRIMARY SOURCES

Barack Obama: "Remarks on the Death of Al Qaida Terrorist Organization Leader Usama bin Laden," May 1, 2011. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=90315>

*Combating Terrorism: U.S. Efforts to Address the Terrorist Threat in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas Require a Comprehensive Plan and Continued Oversight* (20-MAY-08, GAO-08-820T). <https://www.govinfo.gov/>

Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Years books*.

Inter Service Public Relations (ISPR), *Press Release*, May 5, 2011. [Online] available: [http://www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main.asp?o=t-press\\_release&date=2011/5/5](http://www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main.asp?o=t-press_release&date=2011/5/5)

Inter Services Public Relations, *ISPR Press Release* No PR65/2011-ISPR, March 17, 2011.

Kronstadt, K. A. (2003). Pakistan-U.S. anti-terrorism cooperation. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://file.wikileaks.org/file/crs/RL31624.pdf>

Kronstadt, K. A. (2004). Terrorism in South Asia. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://file.wikileaks.org/file/crs/RL32259.pdf>

Kronstadt, K. A. (2008). *Pakistan Political Crises*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service).

Kronstadt, K. A. (2011). "Pakistan-U.S. Relations: A summary", *CRS Report for Congress* (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service).

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, *The 9/11 Commission Report* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. 2004).

Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan." *speech, US Military Academy at West Point, December 1* (2009).

The President's New Conference, February 15, 2011, [Online] available: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/>.

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, Remarks by the President on a New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, March 27, 2009. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-a-new-strategy-afghanistan-and-pakistan>

U.S. Government, ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP WITH PAKISTAN ACT OF 2009, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-111publ73/html/PLAW-111publ73.htm>

## SECONDARY SOURCES

“Kabul siege: ‘Attackers linked to Pakistan govt’”, *The Express Tribune*, September 18, 2011.

“Obama Calls for Release of U.S. Prisoner in Pakistan,” *Reuters*, February 15, 2011; Charlie Savage, “Pakistan Case Tests Laws on Diplomatic Immunity”, *New York Times*, February 22, 2011.

“Pakistan stops Nato supplies after raid kills 28 troops”, *Dawn*, November 26, 2011

Afifa Kiran, “Indian Quest for Strategic ingress in Afghanistan and its implications for Pakistan”, *ISSRA Papers* 1 (2009): 12-20.

Ali, Babar. "Pak-US Military Relationship in 1980s." *Economic and Political Weekly* (1987): 588-590.

Ali, T. (2008). *The duel: Pakistan on the flight path of American power*. Londres: Pocket Books.

Alissa J. Rubin, Ray Rivera, and Jack Healy, U.S. Embassy and NATO Headquarter Attacked in Kabul, *The New York Times*, September 13, 2011.

Amin, Afzaal, Hina Malik, Muhammad Hayat Khan, Manzoor Ahmad, Muzamil Shah, Faraz Ali, and Sumayya Feroz. "Zia-Musharraf Era And Pak-Us Relationship, A Tale Of Ups And Down." *Elementary Education Online* 19, no. 3 (2021): 3639-3639.

Armitage, R.L., Berger, S.R. & Markey, D.S. (2010). ‘U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan, 11

Aslam, M. W. "Understanding the ‘Pak’ in ‘AfPak’: the Obama administration's security policy for Pakistan at the mid-term." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 7, no. 1 (2012): 2-21.

Aslam, M. W. "Understanding the ‘Pak’ in ‘AfPak’: the Obama administration's security policy for Pakistan at the mid-term." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 7, no. 1 (2012): 2-21.

Beasley, Francis V., and Charles B. Kelly, eds. *Pakistan & US Relations*. Nova Science, 2009.

Brulliard, K. & Partlow, J. (2011). ‘NATO Airstrike Strains U.S.-Pakistan Relations.’

Bumiller, E. & Perlez, J. (2011). ‘Pakistan’s Spy Agency Is Tied To Attack On U.S. Embassy.’

Butt, Usama, and Julian Schofield, eds. *Pakistan: The US, geopolitics and grand strategies*. Pluto Press, 2012.

Cohen, S. P., & Dasgupta, S. (2001). *US–South Asia: Relations under bush*. Brooking. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/us-south-asia-relations-under-bush>

- David O. Smith, "Facing up to the Trust-Deficit: The Key to an U.S.-Pakistan Defence Relationship", *Strategic Insights* VI, issue 4 (June 2007): 9.
- David O. Smith, "Facing up to the Trust-Deficit: The Key to an U.S.-Pakistan Defence Relationship", *Strategic Insights* VI, issue 4 (June 2007).
- Dawn*, February 1, 2011.
- Dawn*, September 25, 2011.
- Fact Sheet: *National Strategy for Counterterrorism.* June 2011, 8-10.
- Farooq, N. T. (2013). Explaining Pakistan's strategic choices in the 1990s: The role of the United States. Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The University of Leicester, England.
- Glenn, J. (1992, June 26). On proliferation law, a disgraceful failure. *Herald Tribune*.
- Harsh, V. P. (2012). The Pakistan thorn in China-India-U.S. Relations. *The Washington Quarterly*, 35(1), 83-95.
- Hasan Askari Rizvi, "Pakistan's Strategic Culture", in *South Asia in 2020: Future Strategic Balances and Alliances*, Michael R Chambers, ed. (Carlisle Baracks PA: The Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2002), 314-318.
- Hussain, Munawar. "Pak-US relations: An historical overview." *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 37, no. 2 (2016): 61-76.
- Hussain, Munawar. "Pak-US relations: An historical overview." *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture* 37, no. 2 (2016): 61-76.
- Hussain, Zahid. *No-win War: The Paradox of US-Pakistan Relations in Afghanistan's Shadow*. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Ijaz Khan, *Pakistan's Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Making: A Study of Pakistan's Post 9/11 Afghan Policy Change* (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2007).
- John F. Burns, "Pakistan Is Said to Order an End to Support for Militant Groups", *New York Times*, January 2, 2002.
- Kfir, Isaac. "Us Policy toward Pakistan and Afghanistan under the Obama Administration." *MERIA Journal* 13, no. 4 (2009).
- Khan, Aateeb. "For One Tooth, the Entire Jaw: Cross-Border Extremism, Coercive Diplomacy, and the India-Pakistan Security Dyad." (2018).
- Khan, Hafeez Ullah. "China, the emerging economic power: options and repercussions for Pak-US relations." *International Politics* (2020): 1-26.

- Khan, Rais Ahmad. "Fifty Years of Pak-US Relations." *Pakistan Journal of American Studies* 16, no. 1 (1998).
- Khan, Simbal. "The New Obama Administration and Its Policy on Pakistan." *Reflections* 1 (2009).
- Kux, Dennis. *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2001.
- Lokanathan, Venkat. "US Strategy towards Pakistan and implications for India in the 21st century." *Volume VII Issue No. 1-2 March-August September-February* (2012): 21.
- Markey, Daniel S. *No exit from Pakistan: America's tortured relationship with Islamabad*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Markey, Daniel S. *Reorienting US Pakistan strategy: From af-pak to Asia*. No. 68. Council on Foreign Relations, 2014.
- Mazhar, M.S. & Goraya, N.S. (2009). 'Changing Trends in American Policy Towards Pakistan and Afghanistan.' p.26-27.
- McMahon, Robert J. "United States Cold War Strategy in South Asia: Making a Military Commitment to Pakistan, 1947-1954." *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 3 (1988): 812-840.
- Musharraf Admits U.S. Aid Diverted.', *BBC News*. (14 September 2009)
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In the line of fire*. A memoir. Londres: Simon & Schuster.
- Myers, S.L. & Perlez, J. (2011). 'Tensions Rise as U.S. Officials Press Pakistan for Answers.'
- Nawaz, Shuja. *The battle for Pakistan: The bitter US friendship and a tough neighbourhood*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2020.
- Nicholas Burns, "American's Strategic Opportunity with India: The New US-India Partnership", *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 2007): 131-146.
- Ottaway, D. B. (1989, June 7). Bhutto denies Pakistan plans nuclear bomb. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1989/06/07/bhutto-denies-pakistan-plans-nuclear-bomb/88d0c401-f38e-4909-830c-30297950bc04/?utm\\_term=.69b09e548d14](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1989/06/07/bhutto-denies-pakistan-plans-nuclear-bomb/88d0c401-f38e-4909-830c-30297950bc04/?utm_term=.69b09e548d14)
- Paul Kerr and Mary Beth Nikitin, *Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, March 19, 2013) and David E. Sanger, "The Khan Network", paper presented at the *Conference on South Asia and the Nuclear Future*, held June 4-5 2004 at Stanford

- University. [Online] available: [http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/3889/Khan\\_network-paper.pdf](http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/3889/Khan_network-paper.pdf)
- Qadar Bakhsh Baloch, “Engagement and Estrangement in U.S.-Pakistan Relations”, *The Dialogue* Vol. I, No. 4 (Autumn 2006): 28-30.
- Rabbi, F., 2018. The War Against Terrorism and George W. Bush's Policy On Kashmir. *Pakistan Journal of American Studies*, 36(2), pp.84-105.
- Rabbi, F. (2012). War against Terrorism and its Repercussions for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 33(2), 71-90.
- Rabbi, Fazal. "Pakistan's Security Concerns over Indo-US Post 9/11 Strategic Engagements." *Pakistan Journal of History & Culture* 38, no. 2 (2017), 155-186.
- Rabbi, Fazal. Pakistan-United States Relations during the Nawaz Sharif Period (2013-2016), *Journal of Historical Studies* Vol. IV, No.1 (January-June, 2018) PP. 19-40.
- Stephen J. Blank, *Natural Allies? Regional Security in Asia and Prospects for Indo-American Strategic Cooperation* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2005).
- Rizwan Akhtar, *US-Pakistan Trust Deficit and the War on Terror*, A Report of the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College (PA. Carlisle Baracks, 2008), 9-10.
- Sajjad, Mohammad Waqas. "Pakistan, the United States, and the war in Afghanistan." *Strategic Studies* 31, no. 3 (2011): 181-189.
- Sattar, A. (2010). *Pakistan's foreign policy: A concise history, 1947–2009*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Schaffer, H.B. (2012). ‘The Kashmir Issue: What is America’s Role?’
- Schmitt, E. & Sanger, D.E. (2011). ‘Pakistani Nuclear Arms Pose Challenge to U.S. Policy.’
- Shaukat Qadir, “Admiral Mullen’s Secret Deal: How the Pentagon supervised Raymond Davis’ release and how the CIA took its revenge”, *Counterpunch*, March 22, 2011. [Online] available: <http://www.counterpunch.org/2011/03/22/how-the-pentagon-supervised-raymond-davis-release-and-how-the-cia-took-its-revenge/>
- Shireen M. Mazari, “US threats to Pakistan”, *The News*, February 4, 2007.
- Siddiqui , Niloufer, and Joshua T. White, “Pakistan-US trust deficit”, *Dawn* June 18, 2011.
- Statement of Admiral Michael Mullen, U.S. Navy Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Afghanistan and Iraq September 22, 2011, [Online] available: <http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2011/09%20September/Mullen%2009-22-11.pdf>

Susan B. Epstein and K. Alan Kronstadt, *Pakistan: U.S. Foreign Aid Conditions, Restrictions and Reporting Requirements*, CRS Report (Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, June 1, 2012), 6-7.

Syed Shahid Hussian Bukhari, "India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implication for Pakistan", *Berkeley Journal of Social Science* 1, no. 1 (January 2011): 1-28.

The Bureau of Investigative Journalism. (January 3, 2013). 'Obama 2013 Pakistan Drone Strikes.

*The New York Times*. (September 26, 2008). 'The Second Presidential Debate: Transcript.'

Touqir Hussain, "US-Pakistan Relations: What Trust Deficit?", *Policy Brief* no. 31 (Washington D: The Middle East Institute, November 2010), 4.

Yousafzai, Zafar Iqbal. *The Troubled Triangle: US-Pakistan Relations Under the Taliban's Shadow*. Routledge India, 2021.

Zaidi, S. Akbar. "Who benefits from US aid to Pakistan?." *Economic and Political Weekly* (2011): 103-109.

Zain, Omer Farooq. "Zulfi Bhutto's Foreign Policy: Vocalization for Self-reliance and Vivification of Integrity." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)* 32, no. 2 (2012): 427-435.