

## Re-defining US-Pakistan Relations

Naeem Ahmed\*

### Abstract

*The paper examines the current impasse in the Pakistan-US relations, which have remained fraught with acrimony, and hostage to the Washington's insistence on Islamabad 'to do more' to eradicate the terrorist network of militant groups, Taliban and Al-Qaeda, operating from Pakistan's tribal areas and perpetrating terrorism within and outside Pakistan. It is argued that from the outset the two allies in the Global War on Terror (GWOT) have divergent strategic interests in the region. For the US, the GWOT was meant to curb the Al-Qaeda-led global terrorism and punish the perpetrators of the September 11, 2001, attack on the American soil. On the other hand, Pakistan, which reluctantly joined the US-led GWOT, wanted to secure its interests, domestic and regional, by avoiding the American wrath. It is argued that both the US and Pakistan need to re-define the existing level of their relations and work together for attaining higher goals, set in the GWOT. Failing to do so, may jeopardize the counter-terrorism military operations in Pakistan-Afghanistan border areas. Consequently, the region as well as the world at large will continue to face the menace of terrorism.*

**Keywords:** Pak-US relations, India, Afghanistan, Global War on Terror, Terrorism, Al-Qaeda, Haqqani Network

### Introduction

The current stalemate in the US-Pakistan bilateral relations has jeopardized the efficacy of the cooperation between the two major allies in the Global War on Terror (GWOT). It is argued that the pretext of the alliance between the US and Pakistan since the launching of the GWOT immediately after the September 11, 2001, incident has remained weak and challenging. The two countries had diverse strategic interests from the very beginning of the GWOT. While, on the one hand, the US wanted to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure of the Al-Qaeda, allegedly

---

\* Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, University of Karachi; Editor, Pakistan Journal of International Relations (PJIR)  
Email: naeem@uok.edu.pk

involved in the 9/11 carnage, by toppling up the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, Pakistan, on the other hand, did not want to lose the support of a friendly government in Afghanistan.<sup>1</sup>

Pakistan, which reluctantly joined the GWOT amid intense US pressure, was forced to sever its ties with the Taliban regime by withdrawing its diplomatic recognition, to help the US launch military strikes inside Afghanistan against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda infrastructure by providing military/naval bases and authentic intelligence information, and also to start crackdown on the home-grown militant groups, which had links with the Taliban and Al-Qaeda and were also involved in militancy within and outside Pakistan. The main objective of the US was to ensure Pakistan's cooperation in order to punish the presumed perpetrators of the 9/11 incident, and to bring a secular regime in Afghanistan by toppling up the Taliban regime from power.

Complying with the American demands, Pakistan withdrew its diplomatic recognition to the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and launched military operation against the Al-Qaeda hideouts in the tribal areas, along with clamping down against the militant groups. In return, Pakistan was offered major gains, which included, ending diplomatic isolation; funneling economic and military aid as well as writing off debts; and providing help avert the crisis between Islamabad and New Delhi, particularly after an assault on the Indian Parliament on December 13, 2001.<sup>2</sup>

Despite such cooperation and reciprocal gains, the relations between the two allies in the GWOT have not remained free from frictions. Arguably, the US-Pakistan relations, since the launching of the GWOT, have remained fraught with acrimony, and hostage to the Washington's insistence on Islamabad 'to do more' to eradicate the terrorist network of militant groups, Taliban and Al-Qaeda, presumably operating from Pakistan's tribal areas and perpetrating terrorism across the borders. Moreover, the US' frequent use of drone strikes in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Washington's pressure on Islamabad to take action against Qadeer Khan Network for its involvement in nuclear proliferation, and Indo-US nuclear deal are the major underlying causes of the confrontation between the two strategic allies.

The May 2, 2011, covert military operation of the US Navy Seals inside Pakistan to target Osama bin Laden was more than enough to mark "a new era of intensive U.S. government scrutiny of a now tense and even adversarial relationship."<sup>3</sup> The relations between the two major allies got further deteriorated when in an air assault by NATO forces 24

Pakistani soldiers were killed in November 2011. As a reaction, Pakistan closed its border crossings to the NATO supplies in Afghanistan, although conditioned to open them if the US tendered an apology. Although Pakistan has re-opened the supply routes, the differences on major policies issues are deep-rooted and very difficult to be resolved as they are related to Pakistan's security concerns in the regional settings, particularly after the withdrawal of US' combat forces from Afghanistan by 2014.

It is argued that in the presence of lingering differences on major issues between the US and Pakistan, the desired goals of the GWOT would be very difficult to achieve. Thus, the failure of the GWOT would have dire consequences not only for the US and Pakistan, but also for the whole world. To prevent the occurrence of such a disaster, it is pertinent for both the US and Pakistan to re-define their relations by focusing more on the areas of convergence, and work together for the larger goal – to eradicate the terrorist network of Al-Qaeda and associated groups, which are involved in perpetrating terrorism within and outside Pakistan.

In this respect, the paper analyzes the US-Pakistan relations by arguing that despite their cooperation in the GWOT, the very foundations of the US-Pakistan alliance are very weak and fragile. It is also argued that the next few years will unravel whether Pakistan remains an American ally and the cooperation in the GWOT continues or it is again pushed out of the US' circle of friends. The paper is divided into four parts. The first part critically examines the US-Pakistan relations immediately after the 9/11 incident, where both the countries established a strategic alliance against the international terrorism without any long-term commitment of Washington vis-à-vis Islamabad. Second part deals with the issues of discord between the US and Pakistan by analyzing the underlying causes of confrontation between the two major strategic allies in the GWOT. Following this, an attempt has been made in the third part to analyze the consequences of strained relations and as a result lack of cooperation in the GWOT between the US and Pakistan. Finally, the last part emphasizes upon re-defining relations between the US and Pakistan for the eradication of the terrorist infrastructure of Al-Qaeda and related groups in order to achieve the set goals of the GWOT.

### **US-Pakistan Relations in the Post-9/11 Scenario**

The September 11, 2001, incident brought in a third-time US-Pakistan strategic alliance.<sup>4</sup> Immediately after the incident, the US launched the GWOT to eradicate the Al-Qaeda's terrorist infrastructure, which was based in the Taliban controlled Afghanistan. In order to launch military operations against the Al-Qaeda militants and the Taliban regime, the

Bush Administration sought the assistance of Pakistan, a proximate neighbor of Afghanistan. Moreover, Pakistan's influence and role, particularly after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979, in Afghan politics qualified it to become the major US' ally in the GWOT.

In order to seek Islamabad's help in the GWOT, the US adopted a very strict policy. In an interview broadcast on CBS television in September 2006, then Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf, revealed that after the 9/11 attacks, in his conversation with Lt. General Mahmud Ahmed, then head of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), Richard Armitage, the then US Deputy Secretary of State, threatened to bomb Pakistan back to the stone age, if it did not immediately turn against its Afghan ally, Taliban, and allow the US to use military bases in Pakistan to invade Afghanistan.<sup>5</sup>

In his address to a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001, President Bush warned that: "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make: Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime."<sup>6</sup> This was a clear message for a country like Pakistan, which was an active actor of Afghanistan's internal politics.

For Islamabad, it was an extremely hard decision to sever ties with the Taliban, which were created and nurtured by Pakistan in order to secure its strategic interests in Afghanistan.<sup>7</sup> Following the intense American pressure, Pakistan had no other option, but to bandwagon with the US. As a result, Pakistan joined the US-led GWOT and accepted the American demands of withdrawing its recognition to the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and launching a crackdown on the militant groups and Al-Qaeda militants. While justifying Pakistan's decision, Pervez Musharraf in his address to the nation on September 19, 2001, clearly said:

*In such a situation a wrong decision can lead to unaffordable losses; what are our critical concerns and important priorities? These are: First of all is the security of the country from external threat. Second is our economy and our efforts for its survival. Third priority is our strategic, nuclear and missile assets. And finally, the Kashmir cause.<sup>8</sup>*

According to Lawrence Ziring,

*To defy the United States in the aftermath of the horrific events of September 11 would be to place Pakistan in*

*direct association with the actions of Al-Qaeda. Moreover, at this juncture there was no separating Al-Qaeda from the Taliban, and Islamabad was forced to choose between being identified as a co-conspirator with the named band of terrorists, or joining the American call for the severing of ties to the regime of Mullah Omar. Musharraf was also forced to ponder the decision to neutralize the most militants of the Islamist organizations operating in Pakistan.*<sup>9</sup>

The Pakistan's cooperation in the GWOT had required Islamabad to provide Washington "with blanket overflight and landing rights to conduct all necessary military and intelligence operations, including the use of Pakistan's naval posts, air bases, and strategic locations on borders; end diplomatic relations with the Taliban government; and assist the United States to destroy Al-Qaeda network."<sup>10</sup> In this regard, Pakistan provided "four airports to the U.S. forces for logistic support including Pasni, Dalbadin, Shamsi (Kharan) and Jaccobabad."<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Pakistan also helped the US engage in espionage operations, including the use of spy planes, in South and North Waziristan, Chitral, the Hindu Kush mountain chain, Zhob, and the mountainous belt between Kandahar in Afghanistan and Pakistani Baluchistan. Tracking devices were also installed in a number of places to monitor movements in the border areas.<sup>12</sup>

Another responsibility of Pakistan in the GWOT was to help the US eliminate the terrorist network of Al-Qaeda. In this respect, Pakistan not only arrested several Al-Qaeda leaders and cadre, and handed them over to the US, but also played an active role in foiling several terror plots. In August 2006, with the help of Pakistan's active intelligence information, a terror plot, targeting aircrafts travelling between UK and the US, was foiled. According to Ms. Tasnim Aslam, then Foreign Office spokesperson, Pakistan made some arrests in coordination with arrests made in Britain to foil the plot. She said, "The arrests in the United Kingdom have followed active intelligence cooperation between Pakistan, the UK and the U.S."<sup>13</sup>

It must be noted that the September 11 incident also provided an opportunity to Pakistan to reap the benefits of its cooperation with the US in the GWOT. However, it is argued that these gains have not shown any long-term US commitment to build strong and viable relations with Pakistan. These benefits were in the form of political support to the military regime, the funneling of American economic and military aid; and the US active support in normalizing relations with India.

*Political support to military regime*

At the time of the September 11, 2001, incident, Pakistan was in the grip of military's rule. Musharraf's military regime, which had been facing an international isolation because of the overthrowing of the civilian democratic government of Mr. Nawaz Sharif in October 1999, was in dire need of an international legitimacy. The regime was also under international pressure to restore democracy in Pakistan.

However, the situation completely changed after Pakistan's joining of the US-led GWOT. Musharraf rose to the status of world's popular leader as many dignitaries visited Pakistan and assured their support to the Musharraf regime. These included, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair, the German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, the U.S. Secretary of State, Colin Powell, the U.S. Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld, and the foreign ministers of France and Turkey.

Ironically, the Washington-Islamabad cooperation in the GWOT was at the expense of democracy in Pakistan. Anxious to legitimize his position as Pakistan's President, and to safeguard the corporate interests of the Pakistani military that could have been threatened in a US campaign against global terrorism, Musharraf acquiesced rapidly to all the demands that the US placed before him. In so doing, he sent a very important signal to the U.S.: 'you help me and I will help you'. In the short term, this strategy worked. Almost instantaneously, he was transformed from being the usurper of Pakistani democracy and the villain of Kargil who was hell-bent on wresting Kashmir from India, into a strong ally of the free world who was a key partner in the fight against global terrorism.<sup>14</sup>

The Bush Administration, reciprocally, refrained from criticizing Musharraf to restore democracy in Pakistan. Moreover, during Musharraf's visit to the US in December 2004, the Bush Administration even declined to raise the question of shedding of his uniform. Instead, President Bush expressed his support and lauded the Pakistani President for 'very strong' cooperation with the United States and 'focused efforts' to combat terrorism.<sup>15</sup>

By providing full support, the Bush Administration had clearly said that it was not looking at a Pakistan without General Pervez Musharraf as president. In an interview to *The New York Post*, then Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, clearly said, "Musharraf dramatically changed the orientation of the country after 9/11 and is determined to root out extremism. We've got in Pakistan, in this particular leader, someone who has tried to root out some of the extremism that came into Pakistan essentially after the Soviet Union was defeated in Afghanistan...who is a good ally in the war on terror."<sup>16</sup>

Although the political situation in Pakistan changed after the February 2008 elections in which the Pakistan Peoples' Party (PPP) emerged as the winning party and formed the government, the military still controls the major areas of foreign policy, including Pakistan's relations with the US, India, Afghanistan; Kashmir; and nuclear program.

*Funneling of American economic and military aid*

It is true that the fragile economic condition of Pakistan was also one of the reasons to cooperate with the US in the GWOT. Pakistan, which had been facing the economic and military sanctions, imposed by the US and other donor countries for conducting nuclear tests in May 1998 and military's derailing of democratic process in October 1999, had badly needed assistance to smoothly run the state affairs. With the extension of Islamabad's cooperation in the GWOT, the American Congress not only lifted those sanctions, but also poured a considerable economic and military aid to Pakistan. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report of May 2012, "By the end of 2011, Congress had appropriated about \$15.3 billion in overt assistance over ten years, including more than \$8.3 billion in development and humanitarian aid, and nearly \$7 billion for security-related programs."<sup>17</sup> Similarly, acknowledging Pakistan's contributions in the GWOT, the US government in 2004 designated Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally, a status under which a country is exempted from the suspension of the US military assistance and qualifies to receive surplus defence material from US stockpiles.<sup>18</sup>

However, there is no long-term commitment of the continuation of the aid to Pakistan once the GWOT is over. The American arrogance vis-à-vis Pakistan could be seen during the recent standoff between the two countries. The US not only suspended the reimbursement of Pakistan's dues under the Coalition Support Fund (CSF), but also withheld \$33 million of appropriated Foreign Military Financing (FMF) funds as a reaction to the awarding of 33 years imprisonment by a Pakistani court to Dr. Shakil Afridi for his alleged role in tracing bin Laden through a fake vaccination campaign.

*US role in normalizing India-Pakistan relations*

The 9/11 incident and as a result the launching of American-led military operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan has made the US a regional actor in the South Asian affairs. For the success of the GWOT, the US is very keen to see cordial, friendly and tension-free relations between the two neighboring states of South Asia. It is interesting to note that the US was a driving force behind the beginning of the Composite Dialogue between

India and Pakistan in January 2004.<sup>19</sup> In order to bring India and Pakistan on the negotiating table and to pave the way for normalizing their relations after the attack on the Indian Parliament in December 2001, the US Deputy Secretary, Richard Armitage, visited South Asia in May 2003. Mr. Armitage's major focus was on Pakistan's efforts for stopping cross-border terrorism in Kashmir in order to satisfy India, which accused Pakistan-based militant groups of their involvement in the December 13, 2001, carnage.<sup>20</sup>

It is a fact that the US would not remain unconcerned if any dangerous situation, which may sabotage its military operations in Afghanistan, arises between India and Pakistan. Although the US firmly believes that the success of war against international terrorism depends upon the friendly relations between India and Pakistan, it has so far failed to devise any effective mechanism to address and resolve the outstanding disputes, including the Kashmir issue, which is the primary cause of tension between Islamabad and New Delhi. The American efforts have been related only to easing tension and conflict management rather than conflict resolution between the two neighboring states of South Asia, with the history of tensions, crises and wars.

Despite such cooperation and reciprocal gains, the relations between the US and Pakistan "started deteriorating in the latter half of the 2000s"<sup>21</sup> because of major differences on how to deal with the menace of terrorism, emanating from Pakistan's tribal areas. The US' displeasure with Pakistan's policy of softly dealing with the Haqqani network is the main cause of deterioration of relations between the two countries. Besides this, the two countries have also different and opposite views on US' frequent use of drone strikes in Pakistan's tribal areas; the role of Qadeer Khan Network in nuclear proliferation and the Indo-US nuclear deal.

### **Issues of Discord between the US and Pakistan**

Although Pakistan and the US have succeeded in resolving the current impasse, the major underlying causes of confrontation have yet to be settled. Following are four main issues on which there is a severe clash between the US and Pakistan.

#### *Targeting the Haqqani Network*

The major issue of discord between the US and Pakistan is the former's pressure to launch military operation against the Haqqani Network in the latter's tribal areas, particularly in North Waziristan. The US believes that Pakistan is not seriously committed to eliminate the terrorist infrastructure from the FATA region, and continues to provide safe



havens to the Taliban and Al-Qaeda terrorists. Pakistan's reluctance to do so is one of the reasons of deteriorating relations between Islamabad and Washington.

The US civilian and military leadership speak openly of Pakistan's collusion with the Haqqani network. In a joint press conference held with Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Hina Rabbani Khar, in Islamabad on October 20, 2011, the US Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, "urged the Pakistani government to show greater cooperation with the US to corner militants."<sup>22</sup> She further said, "You can't keep snakes in your back yard and expect them to only bite your neighbors,"<sup>23</sup> clearly identifying Pakistan's links with the Haqqani network. Similarly, while addressing the audience at the think-tank Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, then US' Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, criticized Pakistan's ISI on its links with the Haqqani network. He said that the ISI had to make decision to strategically disengage with the Haqqani network.<sup>24</sup> In the same tone, the US Defence Secretary, Leon Panetta, threatened Pakistan of dire consequences and warned to stop supporting the Haqqani network. During his visit to Afghanistan in June 2012, Mr. Panetta said, "We are reaching the limits of our patience for that reason. It is extremely important for Pakistan to take action to prevent (giving) the Haqqanis safe havens, and for terrorists to use their country as a safety net to conduct attacks on our forces."<sup>25</sup> The US believes that Pakistan's FATA region is the epicenter of terrorism. According to the Congressional Research Service Report 2012, "Declassified U.S. government documents indicate that the Taliban's resurgence in the mid-2000s could not have been possible in the absence of FATA sanctuaries."<sup>26</sup>

On the other hand, Pakistan has a different viewpoint on the Haqqani network and launching a military action against it in North Waziristan. Pakistan perceives the Haqqani network as its strategic asset and has adopted a careful approach to extend military operations against it in North Waziristan. According to Ayesha Siddiqi, "The military is not inclined to cater to US' concerns about Taliban groups in North Waziristan, who have formal and informal agreements with the Pakistani army not to attack the state if the army does not attack them. Islamabad does not want to start a battle on all fronts and is willing to talk to militant forces that do not attack Pakistan."<sup>27</sup> The links between Pakistan's military and the Haqqani network revealed in a statement issued in February 2012 by the Chief Operational Commander of the Haqqani network, Sirajuddin Haqqani, who for the first time conceded the existence of a peace deal between Pakistan's security establishment and Shura-e-Murakeba (Observation Council).<sup>28</sup> Under the deal, the

militant groups would not attack Pakistani troops, and instead would focus on NATO/ISAF forces in Afghanistan.<sup>29</sup> The statement says, "...all the Mujahideen (militants), i.e., Ansaar (those being provided shelter) and Mohajireen (the refugees) are informed that we had signed a peace agreement with Pakistan in North Waziristan and its compulsory for everyone of us to follow that truce. Nobody would be allowed to violate the accord, and if someone is found violating it, he will be treated as a culprit and stern action would be taken against him."<sup>30</sup> Quoted by Ayesha Siddiq, the former ISI Chief Lt. General Shuja Pasha "once declared Taliban leaders such as Fazlullah and Baitullah Mehsud as patriots and nationalists."<sup>31</sup> Moreover, Pakistan fears that once the GWOT ends, the US would once again leave it unattended, and would place it on the list of nations sponsoring terrorism. Therefore, Pakistan rejects any US dictation which would affect its strategic interests in the region.

In actual, Pakistan fears that the growing Indian influence in Afghanistan may threaten its "long-term obsession with the quest for 'strategic depth' against India."<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the Indian presence in Afghanistan would also jeopardize Pakistan's strategic and economic interests not only in Afghanistan, but also in Central Asia. Pakistan's fears are not baseless. The signing of 'Strategic Partnership Pact' between India and Afghanistan in October 2011 has actually enhanced Pakistan's vulnerabilities.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, Pakistan does not want to put itself in a situation which would endanger its strategic interests, particularly related to the future political set up of Afghanistan in the post-US withdrawal scenario. In this regard, Pakistan's geo-strategic interests require not to cut off its links with the Taliban and other "friendly" militant groups.

#### *Drone Strikes*

Another issue on which Washington and Islamabad strongly differ is the frequent US drone strikes in Pakistan's FATA region, which the Americans claim is the hiding ground for the militant groups and Al-Qaeda/Taliban militants, who carry out terrorist attacks across the border. The US officials implicitly support the use of drone strikes against the militants and call it legal and according to the international law. Addressing the Global Counter-terrorism Forum in Istanbul, Turkey, in June 2012, Ms. Clinton said, "We will always maintain our right to use force against groups such as Al Qaeda that have attacked us and still threaten us attack. We will always maintain our right to use force against groups such as Al Qaeda that have with imminent attack."<sup>34</sup> Similarly, speaking at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for

Scholars in Washington, USA, in April 2012, President Barack Obama's counter-terrorism adviser, John Brennan, justified the legality of the drone attacks. He said, "As a matter of international law, the United States is in an armed conflict with Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces, in response to the 9/11 attacks, and we may also use force consistent with our inherent right of national self-defence."<sup>35</sup> Moreover, *The Washington Post* in its editorial on September 14, 2008, supported the US military strikes at Taliban and Al-Qaeda targets inside Pakistan and called them necessary. The newspaper also claimed that "it is clear that Pakistani army and security forces lack the capacity to defeat the extremists – and may even support some of the Taliban commanders. Pakistan army has arranged truces with some of the extremists that don't preclude them from fighting in Afghanistan."<sup>36</sup>

On the other hand, Pakistan severely opposes the drone strikes. Although there are several claims that Pakistani authorities tacitly support the US drone strikes in the FATA region<sup>37</sup>, the public statements of the civilian and military leadership show that Pakistan strongly opposes such attacks, and call it a violation of the sovereignty and integrity of the country. Pakistan's Parliament, in April 2012, also demanded the US of "an immediate cessation of drone attacks inside the country, cessation of infiltration into Pakistani territory on any pretext, including hot pursuit."<sup>38</sup> Talking to journalists in September 2008, the former Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani said that any action against militants "inside our territory is the sole right of Pakistan ... we don't want anyone to interfere in our sovereignty."<sup>39</sup> Similarly, in a statement, Chief of the Army Staff, General Ashfaq Pervez Kayani said, "The rules of engagements with the coalition forces are well defined and within that the right to conduct operations against the militants inside own [our] territory is solely the responsibility of the respective armed forces."<sup>40</sup>

It is a fact that in more than two hundred drone strikes, since 2005, over two thousand people have been killed.<sup>41</sup> Statistics show that the number of high value targets killed in Pakistan by the drone attacks is only 3 per cent of all reported casualties.<sup>42</sup> It means that majority of the victims are innocent people, including women and children. The UN also criticizes the drone attacks and terms the drone strikes illegal and a clear violation of human rights. Addressing a press conference in Islamabad, Pakistan's capital, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay, said, "I see indiscriminate killing and injuring of innocent people as a clear violation of human rights. Drone attacks do raise serious questions about compliance with international law."<sup>43</sup> However, the US does not pay heed to these concerns and considers the drones as one of the chief weapons against the Al-Qaeda and associated terrorist groups.

The US' inflexibility has caused unrelenting tension between Islamabad and Washington.

*Action against the Qadeer Khan Network*

The US and Pakistan are also at odds on the issue of the alleged involvement of Dr. Qadeer Khan, pioneer of Pakistan's nuclear bomb, in the proliferation of nuclear technology. In 2004, Dr. Khan publicly confessed his involvement in illegally transferring nuclear technology. While taking the full responsibility, Dr. Khan, on February 4, 2004, in a public statement on Pakistan's national television, said, "It pains me to realize this, that my entire lifetime of providing foolproof national security to my nation could have been placed in serious jeopardy on account of my activities, which were based in good faith, but on errors of judgment related to unauthorized proliferation activities... I take full responsibility for my actions and seek your pardon."<sup>44</sup> Musharraf immediately pardoned him. Speaking a press conference at the Army House, Rawalpindi, on February 5, Musharraf announced the decision and, at the same time, vowed to continue the country's nuclear programme "come what may."<sup>45</sup>

The American authorities have been pressing Pakistan, since long, to interrogate Dr. Khan about the help which he had allegedly provided to Iran's nuclear program.<sup>46</sup> In a testimony before the Congress, in May 2006, David Albright, President of the Institute of Science and International Security (ISIS), argued that specific questions involving Iran include the extent of centrifuge assistance, the logistics of that assistance and the possible supply of nuclear weapons design supplied to Iran by the Khan network.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, the Kerry-Lugar Bill (2009) also put a condition on Pakistan to give access to individuals associated with nuclear network.<sup>48</sup>

On the other hand, Pakistan outrightly rejects the American claim to further interrogate Dr. Khan. Rather, it claims that the case against Dr. Khan has now closed and there is no need of direct access to question Dr. Khan. In a news briefing on May 2, 2006, then Foreign Office Spokeswoman, Ms. Tasnim Aslam, said that the government's investigations into the activities of disgraced nuclear scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan were over and that "this chapter is closed." She said that the information from the investigation had been shared with the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency and the USA. Pakistan had not allowed external investigators to interview Khan.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, on May 19, 2006, then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Khurshid Kasuri, told the Senate that "Yes, we are under a lot of pressure on the issue of Dr. A.Q. Khan, but we will not surrender. We are an ally of the U.S. in the global

war on terror, but we will not take dictation from anybody on our national interests.”<sup>50</sup>

To-date this issue has not been resolved between the US and Pakistan. According to CRS report on “Pakistan-US relations”, the US’ concern is that “Pakistan’s nuclear know-how or technologies remain prone to leakage.”<sup>51</sup> Moreover, the Report also says, “recent reports indicate that Pakistan is rapidly growing its nuclear weapons arsenal, perhaps in response to recent U.S. moves to engage civil nuclear cooperation with India, which the Obama Administration wants to see join major international nonproliferation regimes.”<sup>52</sup>

#### *Indo-US Nuclear Deal*

Another issue which has exacerbated tension and trust-deficit between Washington and Islamabad is the transfer of civil nuclear technology by the US to India. Both the US and Pakistan have different stances over the civil nuclear cooperation between Washington and New Delhi.<sup>53</sup> While signing the bill into law on October 8, 2008, Bush called the US and India ‘natural partners’ as both nations emerged from a colonial past to establish vibrant democracies.<sup>54</sup> He further said that both nations had stood against the dangers posed by extremists who had carried out attacks in both the countries.<sup>55</sup> The US denies such a facility to Pakistan, because of the latter’s suspicious history of involvement in the nuclear proliferation.

On the other hand, the growing India-US nexus is a major concern for Pakistan. Islamabad views that the Indo-US nuclear deal would greatly impact the security paradigm of Pakistan, and demands Washington to offer a similar cooperation to enhance its nuclear capability. In a conversation with Richard N. Haass, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, at a meeting jointly organized with the Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C, on July 30, 2008, Mr. Gilani said, “There should be no discrimination. If they want to give such nuclear status to India, we expect the same for Pakistan.”<sup>56</sup> Pakistan fears that the transfer of civilian nuclear technology to India only would have long-term implications for the region, which might face a likely nuclear arms race, involving Pakistan, India and China. However, the US is not ready to entertain Pakistan’s concerns and rejected its request on the pretext that the deal was India specific and could not be replicated for others.<sup>57</sup>

The different and opposite stances on major policy issues between the US and Pakistan may have dire consequences for the strategic interests of both the countries. Following segment will discuss and analyze these consequences.

### **Consequences of Strained Relations between Pakistan and the US**

This segment looks at the consequences of the failure by both the US and Pakistan to tackle the deep-rooted differences on major policy issues, as discussed above. It is argued that failing to do so, may have serious consequences, as discussed below, for both the allies in the GWOT. First, the relations between the two major allies in the GWOT would further deteriorate. In such a scenario, the on-going military operations in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border areas would seriously be impacted.

Second, the lack of coordination between the US-led coalition forces and Pakistan to handle the militants on their respective areas would also contribute to further strengthening of the militants to freely carry out terrorist activities within and outside Pakistan. The recent surge in terrorist activities of the militant groups in Pakistan's tribal areas as well as in Afghanistan could be seen in that context, for that it has boosted the confidence of the militants, operating on both sides of the border. The deadly attack on a hotel in Kabul in June 2012 speaks itself of the strength and planning of the militants. The US blamed on the FATA-based militants.<sup>58</sup> Similarly, in June 2012, the Taliban took full control of Tirah Valley after defeating the local Kukikhel tribe.<sup>59</sup> The rise in the cross-border movement of the militants could further disturb Pakistan's relations with Afghanistan. Moreover, the attacks on the Pakistani check posts, located in the FATA region, have also been under the attack of militants from the other side of the border. A similar kind of attack took place on June 24, 2012, in which six Pakistani soldiers were killed in combat and another seven beheaded.<sup>60</sup>

Third, the US-Pakistan deteriorating relations have also given a space to the extremist forces, in Pakistan. They are against Pakistan's joining of the US-led GWOT, and time and again urge the government to disassociate Pakistan with the war on terror. In a big public meeting at the Minar-e-Pakistan, Lahore, in December 2011, organized by the *Difaa-i-Pakistan Council* (Defence of Pakistan Council -- DPC), an alliance of 40 right-wing parties, the participating leaders strongly protested on the NATO's raid of the Salala checkpost inside Pakistan. They publicly vowed to wage Jihad against the West and India.<sup>61</sup> Speaking on the occasion, the DPC head and the Chief of Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam – Sami Group (JUI-S), Maulana Sami-ul-Haq, said that the DPC was not a temporary alliance. It was a movement of Jihad against the conspirators of Pakistan.<sup>62</sup> Hafiz Mohammad Saeed, the Chief of Jamaat-ud-Dawa (JuD), warned the US to avoid creating troubles for Pakistan. He said,

*Today, I send out a message to Americans. We will give you due respect as guests in line with our religion. But if*

*you come here to deprive Pakistan of its nuclear assets, to martyr our soldiers in Mohmand Agency-like incidents, kill innocent people as Raymond Davis had done and use our country's air bases for spying, we will defend our country with full force.*<sup>63</sup>

Moreover, it is argued that because of the Islamists exploiting the issues of discord between the US and Pakistan, the latter's society is more prone to anti-Americanism. Available surveys show that Pakistan is the most anti-American society in the world. A Pew Survey of 2011 discloses that the image of the US among the Pakistanis is extremely negative. According to the Survey, only 12 per cent Pakistanis hold a positive view about the US.<sup>64</sup> The Survey further says that around 70 per cent of the Pakistanis see the US as an enemy, consider it a potential military threat, and oppose American-led anti-terrorism operations.<sup>65</sup> Fourth, as a consequence of the tense relations between Pakistan and the US, the latter has heavily relied on the use of drone strikes in former's tribal areas. Although the US' authorities still consider the drones as a chief weapon in fighting against the militants, statistics reveal that they have proved ineffective and counter-productive. They have killed more innocents than the militants.

Fifth, the deteriorating Pakistan-US relations has also proved for the former more disastrous as the latter is eager to give a major role to India in Afghanistan. In June 2012, the US and India signed an agreement to bring political stability in Afghanistan. The fact of the matter is that the US "wants India to fill up the post-withdrawal vacuum in Afghanistan."<sup>66</sup> Such a scenario may jeopardize Pakistan's long-term geo-strategic interests in the region. Moreover, Pakistan's increasing regional insecurities, particularly vis-à-vis India, may compel it to rely more on its nuclear capabilities, and thus, the South Asian region would face a nuclear arms race between Pakistan and India. Moreover, if Pakistan comes out of the US orbit, it would freely pursue its strategic interests in the region, particularly in Afghanistan and India, by using militant groups, which are still considered as strategic assets by Islamabad.

Lastly, the troubled relations between the US and Pakistan, and as a result, the failure of the counter-terrorism military operations against the militants in the FATA region, has seriously damaged the image of the US as a lone super power, particularly in the wake of the withdrawal of American combat forces from Afghanistan by 2014 without achieving the set goals of the GWOT. Similarly, Pakistan's non-cooperation in the GWOT may bring an international wrath as well as a reason to be

identified a country sponsoring terrorism, and at the same time violating the UN Resolutions, which clearly called on states “to work together urgently to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these terrorist attacks and *stresses* that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harboring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable.”<sup>67</sup> Failing to comply with the resolutions may lead to isolation for Pakistan at the international level.

### **Re-defining US-Pakistan Relations**

Presently, the US-Pakistan relations have been passing through very difficult times. Being the partners in the GWOT, both the US and Pakistan can ill-afford to part their ways. The sanity requires mending fences and building normal relations, based on understanding each other’s needs and compulsions.

Since both the US and Pakistan need each other, though for different reasons, important question is how to persuade Islamabad to fulfill Washington’s demands. According to Daniel Markey, former State Department official during the Bush Administration, “issuing threats employing sticks, and leaning on Pakistan is precisely the wrong approach. These tactics will tap into distrust about American intentions, aggravate Pakistani insecurities about US abandonment, and increase Pakistani incentives to hedge.”<sup>68</sup>

Similarly, for Pakistan it would be an unaffordable loss if the US-led coalition of forces fails in Afghanistan. As a consequence, Pakistan may face regional and international isolation. In order to achieve the desired objectives of the GWOT, it is pertinent to re-define the existing relations between the two important allies in order to successfully conclude the war on terror. For this, both the countries need to take following measures:

#### *Alleviate the element of mistrust*

It is generally believed that the mounting trust deficit between the US and Pakistan in recent years has sabotaged the desired goals of the GWOT. The lack of trust is prevailing on both sides. For the US, Pakistan is not serious in uprooting the terrorist infrastructure of militant groups, particularly the North Waziristan-based Haqqani network, which have links with the Taliban and Al-Qaeda.

On the other hand, a widespread perception in Pakistan is that the US is not a reliable partner, for that the latter has always used the former for serving its interests in the region and never helped Pakistan during crucial times. This exactly happened during the first alliance between Pakistan and the US against Communism during 1950s and



1960s. Despite Pakistan's protests, the US of provided military assistance to India during the Sino-Indian war of 1962. Similarly, during the 1965 war between India and Pakistan, the US imposed military sanctions, which severely impacted Pakistan as it was the major recipient of American weapons. On the other hand, India continued to receive weapons' supply from the former Soviet Union.

Similarly, being the frontline ally of the US during the Afghan War in 1980s, Pakistan was left unattended by the US once the Soviet troops withdrew from Afghanistan in 1988. Despite Pakistan's contributions in the War, sanctions related to nuclear proliferation under the Pressler Amendment<sup>69</sup> were imposed on it. Being internationally isolated, Pakistan had no other option but to deal with the post-Soviet withdrawal Afghanistan on its own way without any international pressure. The creation and nurturing of Taliban in mid-1990s illustrates Pakistan's regional insecurities, which even did not end after Islamabad's becoming of the US frontline ally in the GWOT after the 9/11 incident. Pakistan fears that after the end of the GWOT, the US would not only leave Pakistan unattended, but also handover the responsibility of the Afghan security to India, Pakistan's arch enemy. The signing of India-Afghanistan security pact in 2011 is a case in point. Moreover, the recent signing of an agreement between Washington and New Delhi on holding regular trilateral talks with Kabul has further strengthened Pakistan's doubts.

Keeping in view the past experience of its relations vis-à-vis each other, both the US and Pakistan are reluctant to trust each other. Consequently, the desired objectives of the GWOT have largely been affected. Therefore, it is pertinent for both the countries to mitigate trust-deficit vis-à-vis each other and pursue the common goals in the GWOT.

#### *Dealing with the security concerns of Pakistan*

Pakistan's regional security concerns, particularly vis-à-vis India, are the major impediment in effectively clamping down against the militant groups, which Pakistan considers as strategic assets to serve its strategic interests in Afghanistan and the Indian-held Kashmir. If left alone, as it was after the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan in 1988, Pakistan would further strengthen its ties with those militant groups, in whom it has been greatly investing since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Pakistan's major complaint vis-à-vis the US is that the latter has never paid heed to the former's long-term security concerns in the region. Islamabad argues that despite its alliance with Washington, both during the Cold War and the post-9/11 partnership, the US has always

dealt with Pakistan discriminately. Although it was India which was responsible for the nuclearization of South Asia, as it tested nuclear weapons in 1974, the Americans have been scared of Pakistan's nuclear program. Moreover, the US is reluctant to play a role of a mediator between India and Pakistan to resolve the Kashmir conflict, which has become a nuclear flashpoint in South Asia as well as a root-cause for terrorism in the region as it provides a justification to the militant organizations for waging Jihad against the Indian atrocities on the Kashmiris. Therefore, the US needs to take advantage of its leverage over India and pressurise it to resolve the Kashmir issue, and lessen Pakistan's security concerns in the region in order to successfully conclude the GWOT.

#### *Strengthening democracy in Pakistan*

The US needs to understand that its giving of priority to the military over the civilian democratic forces in Pakistan has proved disastrous for both the countries. As a consequence, the democratic forces in Pakistan are too weak to assert their authority and independently formulate the foreign and domestic policy of the country. It is argued that only a democratic Pakistan will ensure domestic, regional and international peace. Therefore, it is pertinent for the US to heavily invest in the civil democratic institutions. The weakening of liberal democratic forces may pave the way for Islamists' takeover of nuclear Pakistan. If this happens, it would be a nightmare for the Americans.

#### **Conclusion**

Presently, Pakistan's relations with the United States are passing through a defining phase. It is true that the two countries had established the alliance after the 9/11 incident from two different positions: Washington needed Islamabad to launch attacks against Afghanistan, ruled by the Taliban who were sheltering Al-Qaeda, allegedly involved in terrorist attacks against the US on September 11, 2001; on the other hand, for Pakistan, the purpose of the alliance was to save itself from the wrath of the US, and reap economic and military benefits from it and other western powers.<sup>70</sup> It is because of this that the cooperation in the GWOT between the US and Pakistan has remained shaky and hostage to their respective strategic interests in the region. Consequently, the desired goals of the GWOT have not been achieved, and the relations between the two allies have reached to the lowest ebb ever since the launching of the GWOT.

It is argued that the deterioration in relations between the US and Pakistan would have serious consequences for the GWOT, which aims to

eradicate the terrorist infrastructure of Al-Qaeda, Taliban and the militant groups operating in Pakistan's tribal areas. This is a high time for both the US and Pakistan to pragmatically analyze their failures and successes in the GWOT, identify areas of convergence and work together for securing the world from the menace of terrorism.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, it needs to discard its dual role of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. Islamabad needs to revisit its foreign policy, particularly vis-à-vis India and Afghanistan – two major regional states around which Pakistan's foreign policy has hitherto revolved. In this regard, to do away with the notion of 'Indian obsession' must be the important priority of Pakistan. Such a policy, consequently, would not only lessen Pakistan's doubts about the Indian role in Afghanistan, but also compel Islamabad to seriously launch crackdown on the militant groups, including the Haqqani network, as per demanded by the US for the success of the GWOT.

Being the lone Super power, the US needs to respect the sovereignty and independence of the weaker states, such as Pakistan, which also happen to be the major ally in the GWOT. In this regard, the US needs to be sensitive to Pakistan's complaints and sincerely address its fears of isolating it in the region. Abandoning nuclear Pakistan will be a great mistake on the part of the US. The increasing insecurities may compel Pakistan to rely more on its nuclear capabilities, and thus, the South Asian region would face a nuclear arms race between Pakistan and India. Moreover, if Pakistan comes out of the US orbit, it would freely pursue its strategic interests in the region, particularly in Afghanistan and India, by using militant groups, which are still considered as strategic assets by Islamabad. To avoid such a situation, where Pakistan may embark upon its traditional policies vis-à-vis India and Afghanistan in the wake of its insecurities, the US need to play an active and committed role in two major areas: one, to devise a mechanism for resolving bilateral disputes between India and Pakistan, including Kashmir; and two, to help strengthen the nascent democratic institutions in Pakistan, because a strong democracy will be an affective tool to fight the menace of terrorism in the region.

## Notes and References

<sup>1</sup> In Pakistan's view, a friendly government in Afghanistan will not only remain silent on the Durand Line issue, but also provide an easy, short and safe access to the Central Asia, a region rich of oil and gas reserves. Pakistan was also one of the three countries, along with Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates (UAE), which recognized the Taliban regime.

<sup>2</sup> India blamed that Pakistan-based militant outfits were involved in the incident. As a result, India massed around 700,000 troops on the borders with Pakistan, and threatened an invasion across the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir or cross the international borders. In reaction, Pakistan also moved its troops to the Indian borders. Under intense American pressure and back channel diplomacy, the two nuclear neighboring countries removed their troops and initiated the dialogue process, known as the Composite Dialogue, in January 2004.

<sup>3</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations", Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress (May 24, 2012), 1.

<sup>4</sup> The first alliance between the United States and Pakistan was established during 1950s when Pakistan joined US-sponsored military pacts – SEATO and Cento; while the second one in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in Eric S. Margolis, "Pervez Musharraf had little choice", *Daily Times*, October 2, 2006

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in "11 September 2001: The Response", House of Commons Library (London), Research Paper 01/72, (October 3, 2001), 13

<sup>7</sup> In the wake of Pakistan's strained relations with Afghanistan particularly on latter's claim over the former's North-West territories and supporting the issue of Pukhtoonistan by rejecting the Durand Line, a friendly government in Kabul was a blessing for Islamabad. The Taliban regime never raised these issues.

<sup>8</sup> See the text of President Musharraf's address to the nation on September 19, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan at the Crosscurrent of History* (Lahore: Vanguard, 2004), 305

<sup>10</sup> Pervez Musharraf, *In the Line of Fire* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 205

<sup>11</sup> "3 airports on standby for US: Secretary", *Daily Times*, July 19, 2006

<sup>12</sup> Syed Saleem Shahzad, "Stage Set for Final Showdown", *Asia Times Online*, July 21, 2004

<sup>13</sup> "Pakistan helped foil UK terror plot", *Daily Times*, August 11, 2006

<sup>14</sup> Ahmad Faruqi, Ahmad Faruqi, *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan: The price of strategic myopia* (Hampshire: ASHGATE, 2003), xxi-xxii

<sup>15</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan's Domestic Political Developments", Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, (February 14, 2005):

2

<sup>16</sup> "U.S. not looking at post-Musharraf phase in Pakistan", *Daily Times*, September 28, 2006

<sup>17</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations", (May 24, 2012): 54

<sup>18</sup> "Status of non-Nato ally formalized", *Dawn*, June 17, 2004

<sup>19</sup> The Composite Dialogue consisted of eight baskets, which included: Kashmir, Peace and Security, Siachen, Wullar barrage, Sir Creek, Terrorism and Drug Trafficking, Economic Cooperation, and Promotion of friendly Exchanges.

<sup>20</sup> Under intense American and Indian pressure, Musharraf in his address to the nation on January 12, 2002, vowed to take severe action against the Islamic extremist organizations. He not only condemned the terrorist act, but also vowed to take stern action against any Pakistani group found involved in terrorism in the name of Kashmir. He also announced a ban on five militant and sectarian organizations. These included: Jaish-e-Mohammad (JeM), Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP), Tehrik-e-Ja'afria Pakistan (TJP), and Tehrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Mohammadi (TNSM). Moreover, on November 20, 2003, the government also banned three more groups – Hizb-ul-Tehrir (HuB), Jama'at-ul-Furqan and Jamiat-ul-Ansar

<sup>21</sup> Arif Jamal, "Contradictions in Pakistan's Counterterrorism Strategy Leading to Security Collapse" *Terrorism Monitor*, Vol. 9, Issue 24, (2011)

<sup>22</sup> "Work Hard to squeeze Haqqanis, Clinton tells Pakistan", *The Express Tribune*, accessed on June 15, 2012, available at:

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/278815/us-wants-pakistan-to-take-strong-steps-on-afghan-militants/>

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> "Strategic assets: ISI must disengage from proxies: Mullen", *The Express Tribune*, September 21, 2011

<sup>25</sup> "US losing patience with Pakistan, says Panetta", *Reuters*, accessed on June 13, 2012, available at: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/us-usa-afghanistan-panetta-idUSBRE85605V20120607>

<sup>26</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations", CRS Report (May, 2012): 27

<sup>27</sup> Ayesha Siddiq, "Pakistan's Counterterrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from Enemies", *The Washington Quarterly*, 34 (Winter 2011): 151

<sup>28</sup> Established on January 2, 2012, the Observation Council is an alliance of five Pakistani and Afghan militant organizations – the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan, led by Hakeemullah Mehsud; Afghan Taliban, led by Mullah Omar; the Haqqani Network, led by Sirajuddin Haqqani; and the militant outfits of Hafiz Gul Bahadur and Mullah Nazir. According to Amir Mir, "The militant circles in Pakistan say the moving spirit behind the formation of the Observation Council was Mullah Mohammad Omar, the Ameer of Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan (the shadow Taliban government) with a view to resolve differences among various factions of the Pakistani and Afghan Taliban and garner support for the ongoing battle against the US-led forces in Afghanistan." [Amir Mir, "Siraj Haqqani exposes military-militants peace deal", *The News International*, February 14, 2012].

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ayesha Siddiq, "Pakistan's Counter-terrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from Enemies", op.cit.,156

- <sup>32</sup> Sumit Ganguly and Nicholas Howenstein, "India-Pakistan Rivalry in Afghanistan", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (2009): 34
- <sup>33</sup> The pact, which is Afghanistan's first with any country, outlines areas of common concern including trade, economic expansion, education, security and politics. Moreover, under the Pact, India will also train the Afghan National Force. ["Afghan foreign minister in India", *Dawn*, May 2, 2012]
- <sup>34</sup> "Clinton backs drone attacks", *Dawn*, June 8, 2012.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> "US Strikes necessary: Washington Post", *Dawn*, September 15, 2008.
- <sup>37</sup> Suzanna Koster, "Drone Wars: Pakistan tacitly allows drones to strike", *The Global Post*, accessed on: June 11, 2012, available at: <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/asia-pacific/pakistan/111007/drone-wars-pakistan-cia>
- <sup>38</sup> "Parliament redefines relations with the US", *Daily Times*, April 13, 2012.
- <sup>39</sup> "Only Pakistan can act in FATA: PM", *Dawn*, September 13, 2008.
- <sup>40</sup> "Kayani warns U.S. to keep its troops out", *Dawn*, September 11, 2008.
- <sup>41</sup> For details see: "Drone attack in Pakistan: 2005-2012", accessed on: June 11, 2012, available at: <http://www.satp.org/satporqtp/countries/pakistan/database/Droneattack.htm>
- <sup>42</sup> A.S.M. Ali Ashraf, "U.S. Drone Strikes in Pakistan: Increasing Trends, Questionable Legitimacy, and the Issue of Tacit Cooperation", *Pakistan Journal of International Relations* Vol. 1, No. 2 (2010): 26
- <sup>43</sup> "Drone raids violate human rights", *Dawn*, June 8, 2012.
- <sup>44</sup> "Dr. Khan seeks pardon; cabinet decision today: •Meets Musharraf •Admits error of judgment", *Dawn*, February 5, 2004.
- <sup>45</sup> "Dr. A.Q. Khan pardoned: Other scientists' fate hangs in the balance •Beg, Karamat cleared: Musharraf", *Dawn*, February 6, 2004.
- <sup>46</sup> "Pakistan: Musharraf's unhappy year", *The Economist*, January 21-27, 2006, p. 30.
- <sup>47</sup> "Case against AQ Khan far from closed: US experts", *Daily Times* May 27, 2006.
- <sup>48</sup> See the Text of Kerry-Lugar Bill, accessed on: June 10, 2012, available at: <http://ipripak.org/factfiles/ff114.pdf>
- <sup>49</sup> "Closure of investigation into Nuclear Scientist" *Keesing's Record of World Events*, Vol. 52, No. 5, (2006): 47264.
- <sup>50</sup> Quoted in Ahmed Rashid, "A Taliban Comeback?", *Daily Times*, May 25, 2006.
- <sup>51</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations", CRS Report (May 2012): 46.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>53</sup> The US House of Representatives approved the deal on September 28, 2008. 298 congressmen voted in favor of the deal, while 117 voted against it. The US Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the Bill by 19 to 2 votes.
- <sup>54</sup> "Bush sings India N-deal law", *Dawn*, October 9, 2008.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> “Pakistan expects nuke deal similar to India’s, says Gilani”, *Daily Times*, July 31, 2008.

<sup>57</sup> “US House approves nuclear deal with India”, *Dawn*, September 29, 2008.

<sup>58</sup> Anwar Iqbal, “US, Pakistan heading towards collision”, *Dawn*, June 23, 2012.

<sup>59</sup> Containing Significant strategic importance, Tirah Valley, on the one hand, shares borders with Afghanistan, while on the other hand, it is linked with Bara area, which connects Khyber Agency to Peshawar.

<sup>60</sup> “Cross-border attacks”, *Dawn* (Editorial), June 27, 2012.

<sup>61</sup> “defenders vow Jihad against West, India”, *Dawn*, December 19, 2011

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> The Pew Survey on “Support for Campaign against Extremists Wanes: U.S. Image in Pakistan Falls No Further Following bin Laden Killing”, accessed on June 22, 2012, available at: <http://www.pewglobal.org/files/2011/06/Pew-Global-Attitudes-Pakistan-Report-FINAL-June-21-2011.pdf>

<sup>65</sup> The Pew Survey on “Support for Campaign against Extremists Wanes: U.S. Image in Pakistan Falls No Further Following bin Laden Killing”.

<sup>66</sup> Anwar Iqbal, “US, India sign pact on Afghanistan”, *Dawn*, June 15, 2012.

<sup>67</sup> See the text of UN Security Council Resolutions No. 1368 and 1373 adopted by the Security Council on September 12, 2001 and September 28, 2001 respectively.

<sup>68</sup> Quoted in Robert M. Hathaway, “Leverage and Largesse: Pakistan’s post-9/11 partnership with America”, *Contemporary South Asia*, Vo. 16, No. 1 (2008): 20-21.

<sup>69</sup> The Amendment required the American president to issue a certificate on annual basis that “Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device, is not developing a nuclear device, and is not acquiring goods to make such a device”, before funds are released. Since 1989, no US president has issued such a certification, accessed on: July 8, 2012, available at: <http://www.fas.org/news/pakistan/1992/920731.htm>

<sup>70</sup> Naeem Ahmed, “Pakistan-US Relations: Threats and Responses”, in Saleem Kidwai (ed), *US Policy Towards the Muslim World: Focus on the post-9/11 Period* (Maryland: University Press of America, 2010), 230.