

**PAKISTAN-US MISTRUST AND REGIONAL
SECURITY CHALLENGES IN SOUTH ASIA:
A PROLONGED INDECISIVE,
FUTILE WAR SEEKS END**

Dr. Musarat Amin and Dr. Rizwan Naseer

Abstract

United States stumbled in Afghanistan because of Pakistan-US mistrust. Expansion of American war in Pakistani areas (drone strikes, covert operations) has caused serious turbulence in Pakistan. If Pakistan goes unstable, then there is a fear of domino effect in the whole region. Pakistan's stability ensures regional stability. Pakistan and United States have divergent foreign policies and national interests even when their mutual interests substantially overlapped. If this mutual mistrust persists then chances to win the war on terror seem bleak and there is a fear of Taliban and Al-Qaida's resurgence. To deal with this complex situation a fundamentally new approach is required that would value Pakistan as a partner rather than surrogate.

Introduction

Joseph S. Nye Jr. dropped few lines about anti-Americanism that this phenomenon has increased in recent years. Consequently, United States' ability to attract other nations by the legitimacy of its policies and values has sharply dwindled down. A Euro-barometer poll has found that even Europeans are not satisfied with the efforts of the U.S to address global challenges. Europeans believe that United States has created hindrance in the way of fighting global poverty, protection of environment and maintenance of peace. Nye further elaborated that without the cooperation of other countries, it is hard for the US to fight against terrorism. There is no doubt that the other nations would cooperate with America by protecting their interest as well but the level of cooperation depends on the attractiveness on United States.¹

American war against terrorism which American started in 2001 against Afghanistan turned out to be uncontrolled, counterproductive and costly in terms of finance and human toll. Expansion of that war to Iraq, then Pakistani areas, US-backed interventions in other Islamic states like Libya, Egypt, Syria and Mali is giving clear reflection that only Islamic states have become target of US and its Western allies. Widespread violence and political chaos in those countries not only endangers the states but their adjoining areas as well. At least before US invasion or intervention in these countries, conditions for human security and state governance were better than now. Unfortunately, United States chose the wrong strategy to address the problems of extremism and terrorism. Extremism and terrorism are not the things that can be managed with arms or force. Peaceful solution to these problems in any society would generate better and long lasting solution. If United States and its allies are serious to hammer out some peaceful solutions to this complex problem in above mentioned Muslim countries, then violence or use of force must be abandoned and some diplomatic solution must be pursued. Techniques of conflict resolution and diplomacy have evolved to the level where almost every conflict at international level can be resolved through peaceful measures.

Connie Peck in her book titled "*Sustainable Peace, the Role of UN and regional Organizations in Preventing Conflict*" talks about a holistic understanding of the conflict and she puts forward two practicable conceptions in the field of conflict resolution. The first is the notion of 'Human Security' which works as a base for addressing basic human needs and ultimately increases state security by empowering government. State sovereignty and populace are crucial for government to achieve human security for all of the citizens. The second concept that has gained more prominence is articulation of relationship between democracy, human rights and development by Boutros Boutros-Ghali in an *Agenda for democratization (1996)*, and *agenda for development (1994)*, and *building peace and democracy (1994)*. In-short human needs can best be fulfilled by practicing good governance and respecting human rights. Good governance in turn, fosters

peace and development.² If Afghanistan and Iraq were issues of governance and democracy then why US invaded and exacerbated the situation. There is no doubt about the efficacy of democracy but forcing some undemocratic country to embrace this notion even causes more commotion and chaos. Transition to democracy is not an easy task especially when the culture of democracy is fragile and almost non-existent. If the transition is not managed effectively, it would bring more serious consequences.³ United States' bellicose behavior might be unacceptable for other countries because of US obsessive war policies even Americans do not support US unilateralism that is the temptation for war with other inimical states. According to Kathleen based on poll-survey United States public opinion found that they prefer *multipolarity* over *unipolarity* and *bipolarity* (desiring balance of power). They want United States to play an active role in world politics in collaboration with other international organizations through multilateral means.⁴

Christopher Perble writes in *National Interest* about Secretary Panetta's statement about America's withdrawal of troops that indicates America may not engage in nation-building in Afghanistan. Secretary Panetta said that combat mission in Afghanistan would come to an end in mid-2013 which sounded positive step but this had been stated intermittently and leaves left many question unaddressed. Washington should end this combat operation and withdraw all troops by 2014 to reach some conclusion successfully. Further narrowing down of objective would make this war winnable for Washington. But the small segment critiques are pressing for nation-building missions in Afghanistan. Staying in Afghanistan furthermore and hunt down those remaining would-be terrorist coupled with a massive operation of nation-building in Afghanistan does not promote American interest.⁵ Now this job is not possible irrespective of whatever energy and efforts America put but a complete support of regional actors especially Pakistan is required to take this issue seriously and jointly; contribute for the peace and development of Afghanistan. Unstable Afghanistan may spread its effects to whole region but until now Pakistan has

been the most affected state by Afghanistan instability. Anti-Americanism in Pakistan is so intense that America's war against terrorism could not seek legitimacy. Without support of locals, no breakthrough is possible. Washington needs to exercise soft power rather than hard power. Winning hearts and minds could bring sustainable peace in the region.

Challenges for Regional Actors

One undesirable event in the region may engulf whole regional actors. Like one incident of 9/11 affected the whole world. If we take stock of events historically, we find that revolution in Iran, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq war (1988) affected the whole South-West Asia. All of these incidents were not limited to those countries but also affected Pakistan. Pakistan's security came under direct threat by war in Afghanistan. Because of these troubles Pakistan never enjoyed amicable relationship with Afghanistan.⁶ But Pakistan is still playing its possible role to bring Afghanistan to normalcy. McClatchy Jonathan Landay writes; that Afghanistan government is seeking a peace agreement with Taliban in which Pakistan would play a key role to arrange direct talks for setting up a coalition government in Kabul. According to that peace initiative Afghanistan would cede control of east and south Afghanistan to Taliban coupled with positions in the government. Power dynamics are quite apparent in this 'Peace Process Roadmap to 2015'. But there are other various factors that may impede this progress towards peace. Washington misjudged that it may control conflict in Afghanistan without any help from Pakistan but now situation has changed. Pakistan's military and intelligence machinery did not control Taliban insurgency so vigorously because they view it as not in favor of their strategic interest. Another factor in achieving peaceful end in the Afghanistan has been because policy makers in Washington lack the ability to address regions' most serious geopolitical challenges. Malou Innocent suggests that for establishing a national government in Afghanistan help should be gotten from Islamabad. Afghanistan is culturally and politically tied to its neighbors and it is pretty hard to cobble a government in

Kabul which enjoys support of all neighbors.⁷ But the imitative that includes participation of Pakistan for development of peace talks between all stake holders in Afghanistan can bring internal strife of Afghanistan to an end.

South Asia is the most volatile region where India and Pakistan are two nuclear rivals. Afghanistan is in state of war with America and that war has encroached some areas of Pakistan. Sri Lanka has seriously dealt with Tamil Tigers' problem, Bangladesh is in state of internal crisis, and Nepal is not a stable state either. American and NATO troops are still operating in Afghanistan. There are chances that after American withdrawal, situation may go worse. Ahmad Rashid a renowned journalist on Afghanistan-Pakistan writes that NATO troops cannot withdraw from Afghanistan safely until the civil war in Afghanistan is going on. Pentagon's anticipation about withdrawal of US and allied troops from Afghanistan after handing over command and control to Afghanistan Armed Forces which Pentagon called as 'smooth and doable transition' is fraught with huge problem that may arise or even may pose serious threat to whole region. Now what measures United States should take in Afghanistan that they must engage Taliban into dialogue and bring that combat to a halt by inking ceasefire with Taliban. A structure of power sharing in which Taliban can be included may bring that civil war to an end. Unfortunately, the role of international community is not up to the mark. All these serious challenges are not under consideration by international community. Some international troops would be withdrawing before others for example, it has been reported that Australian and French troops would be leaving the region earlier than other troops. There is an obligation for international community that they must continue their support for Afghanistan financially at least for 10 years even after the troops withdraw. But unfortunately, chances are bleak that they would continue support later on. There has to be much more commitment from heads of the states for reconstruction and rehabilitation of that Afghan inhabitants. But there are no such plans underway.⁸

America wants 10,000 to 20,000 troops to stay in Afghanistan in post-withdrawal period. But there are some other factors that can obstruct their work in Afghanistan. Six neighbors of Afghanistan are against prolonged presence of American troops in Afghanistan and they would definitely not allow smooth functioning of those remaining troops. Not only this, anti-Americanism has mounted in the whole region because of brutal practices of American soldiers. Afghan President Hamid Karzai called for greater care and circumspection by US military but operational philosophy of US forces is overwhelmingly full of force.⁹ Similarly America planned to station 20,000 troops in Iraq but Iraqi people did not tolerate that and demanded immediate expulsion of US troops and they had to leave under those circumstances. President Obama, to allay these challenges came up with a regional strategy which includes all six neighbors of Afghanistan including India, Russia and Saudi Arabia with some kind of understanding that there shall not be any interference in Afghanistan. The main reason of Afghanistan's instability has been the external interference. Current situation is more complex than in 2008 but there was a hope when Richard Holbrook was appointed as US special envoy to both Afghanistan and Pakistan. Dialogue between neighbors started but broke down because of mistrust and incompatibility of preferences. Other regional actors like China and Russia are also against prolonged presence of US troops in Afghanistan. But there is only one country that favors American troops to stay for long time that is India. But Pakistan has serious reservations about India. Pakistan does not want Indian involvement in Afghanistan affairs while Indians strongly advocate US presence and Indian joint efforts in Afghanistan's reconstruction.¹⁰ There is incompatibility between Pakistan and United States over President Obama's new strategy on how to fight militants. Scholars point out that the main reason of these differences is drone strikes in Pakistan and India's role in Afghanistan. American scholars also believe that Indian role in Afghanistan and Baluchistan is causing serious troubles for Pakistan.¹¹ Pakistan's interests in Afghanistan are because of Pakistan's India-centric foreign policy. Pakistan's fears are that if India and Afghanistan

collaborate then India may seek *strategic depth* in Pakistan. That policy of strategic depth is bit successful because of the reason that the territory on the other side of Afghan border is still unknown to the whole world.¹²

A Comprehensive Af-Pak Strategy

Engagement is a pillar and guiding principle of president Obama's Foreign policy. When Obama assumed office, America was undergoing huge anti-American feelings because of the unpopular war in Iraq and controversial war against terrorism even divided US allies and stigmatized its image abroad. Barack Obama pledged to fix the relationship with outside world and vowed to work with other nations based on shared global challenges.¹³ But when it comes to Pakistan-United States relationship all the stated goals and principles of American policy seem bleak. Pakistan is different from Afghanistan in terms of power and capability. International community has failed to reform civilian sector Pakistan has all elements of power (manpower and infrastructure) to survive but this is only possible if international community supports Pakistan. A strong, stable and prospering Pakistan is in the best interest of international community.

Pakistan's rapid downward trajectory does not augur well for regional actors as well. Some of the experts really think that Pakistan is on the brink of failure.¹⁴ An important development that took place for the first time in the history of regional ties was China, Pakistan and Afghanistan trilateral dialogue (held on 28-29 February, 2012) for chalking out a regional response to American withdrawal and Indian increased interference in Afghanistan. Chinese foreign minister Yang Jiechi appreciated success of this trilateral dialogue. This event has opened up new platform for enhancement of regional cooperation, security and unity. This is termed as success because of the historic *Kabul Declaration (2002)*. The purpose of that mutual understanding was the good neighborly relations with other regional states on the bases of mutual respects, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs of other states. All three

countries expressed their support for the role of international organization (United Nations) and Regional organizations (Shanghai Cooperation Organization) to promote cooperation. Afghan National Security Advisor to President Karzai RanginDadfar invoked China's mediation in addressing misunderstandings between Afghanistan and Pakistan and urged China to invest more and more in Afghanistan. China and Pakistan are long-standing friends and China may invest in Afghanistan reconstruction. The stability of neighboring countries is good not only for China but for all regional states.¹⁵ Now Iran in collaboration with Pakistan has also stepped up to ensure regional stability. In a trilateral Summit held in Islamabad on February 17, 2012 the three Presidents Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (Iran), Hamid Karzai (Afghanistan) and Asif Ali Zardari (Pakistan) pledged to enhance cooperation among these countries realizing shared aspiration of their people for peace, security, stability and economic prosperity of the region. Three sides reached consensus on many issues but most important of them were as follows:-

- Ensure respect for Sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity as enshrined in UN charter.
- To proceed further on the basis of shared interests, mutual respects, on interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states.
- Not to allow any threat emanating from their respective territories against each other.
- Contribute to the development and reconstruction process in Afghanistan.
- The three countries agreed to cooperate for the safe, voluntary and early return of Afghan refugees to their homeland with honor and dignity.
- Trilateral summit also mandated the security secretaries to devise a trilateral framework for cooperation in areas of counterterrorism, counternarcotics and border management within the time of six months. Pakistan and Iran pledged to extend full support to any initiative that can bring peace to Afghanistan including peace process and reconciliation.¹⁶ Regional actors are big stake holder of

the region that is why they share more responsibility to bring peace and order in the region.

Fear of Domino Effect

Pakistan's current position is very alarming regarding economic and political stability. War against terror in collaboration with American has left Pakistan with nothing but mere aggravated instability. There are multiple reasons of this plight but the main reason is US unmanaged, uncontrolled, indecisive and unsuccessful war against terror and its deep impact on Pakistan's all walks of life. Infiltration of terrorists in Pakistani areas has increased extremism and violence in Pakistan. Admiral Mike Mullen Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of the Staff told independent media observers and acknowledged that Al-Qaida has penetrated in Pakistan which has caused increase in violence and bombings in Pakistan. American intelligence reports say that for past eight years all the terrorist attacks have been planned by Al-Qaida operatives based in Pakistan. According to a declassified document Obama has plan to send more CIA spies in Pakistan to expand their operations for hunting down Al-Qaida and its associates. There are fears in Pakistan that American network of espionage has dramatically increased in Pakistan and American drones are killing many innocent citizens on suspicion of terrorists. American cover operation in Pakistan has not only challenged Pakistan's sovereignty but also poses a threat to Pakistan's strategic assets. Pakistan's border areas have been declared epicenter of militants. There are other reports that American and European powers are spreading instability in Pakistan. European Embassies have taken permission from Pakistani government to install anti-gunship in their embassy and some vehicles of Embassies have been intercepted with illegal firearms which show that these embassies are involved in destabilizing Pakistan.¹⁷ There are concerns among Pakistani people that if America continues these clandestine activities to destabilize Pakistan then other countries would also be affected by Pakistan's instability. US State Department reported in 2000 that South Asia had replaced Middle east as locus of terrorism.¹⁸ But if we compare

the current situation with that time we find that now the situation is much worse than that era. If this situation persists or increases this would surely leave a domino effect on the stability of other adjoining countries.

America and NATO should support Afghanistan and Pakistan to cope with this hydra. If America leaves the region in 2014 then should not abandon support to establish democratic government and financial support for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Some advocates of domino theory say that losing in Afghanistan would result in further failures in adjoining areas of South and central Asian region. Another perspective of “Domino effects” is that if Taliban revive and gain support from Pakistan then their victory in Pakistan would encourage them to gain victory in other Islamic states of Central Asia. The prevailing fear is that governments of Central Asian Republics and Pakistan are too weak to defy Taliban. Therefore, such a situation leads to the similar circumstances of forty years ago that only United States can defend the region against extremism. In such a situation loss of faith in America would be net gain for pan-Islamist movements in zero-sum global competition for power. Here falling dominos as a metaphor for predicted consequences of American military pull out reflects profound inability to re-envision America’s place in contemporary global political structure. Another serious concern is that Taliban may revive their support from Pakistan. Another major fear is that they may try to seize the control of Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal. Beyond Pakistan advocates of domino theory point to the Taliban's links to the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan and the Islamic Jihad Union and make a prediction that Taliban’s triumph in Afghanistan would boost the other similar radical Islamist movements in neighboring Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.¹⁹

To overcome the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan president Karzai said “Islamabad has an important role to play in Kabul’s proposed reconciliation talks with Afghan insurgent groups. He admitted that without Pakistan’s cooperation Afghanistan cannot be stable and Peaceful.” One thing that

Afghan president told the media that Afghanistan does not want to become a battle ground between major, regional and world powers. Afghan President seemed serious to end this devastating situation in Afghanistan while he stated. Afghanistan does not want any proxy wars on its territory. It does not want to initiate a proxy war between India and Pakistan over Afghanistan. Neither, it wants a proxy war between Iran and United States on Afghanistan. It does not want any other country to engage into conflict against another country in Afghanistan.²⁰

‘Biting the Bullet’ of Pakistan-US Mistrust

Diego Gambetta defines trust in the following words, “when we say we trust someone or that someone is trustworthy, we implicitly mean that the probability that he will perform an action that is beneficial of at least not detrimental to us is high enough for us to consider engaging in cooperation with other.”²¹ Touqir Hussein (a former diplomat) identifies Pakistan-US trust deficit as symptomatic of deeper problem rather than problem itself. Pakistan and United States have divergent foreign policies and national interests even when their mutual interests substantially overlapped. Both the countries maneuvered to achieve their short term objectives at the expense of broader strategic goals.²²

Over the last 60 years, there has nothing been permanent in Pakistan-US relations but the mistrust and because of that mistrust there came serious hiccups between Pakistan and United States. Both countries have been working together and would continue to do so but in such circumstances cooperation becomes counterproductive especially in the fight against extremism and security challenges. Majority of Pakistanis view United States as untrustworthy because of no support of America during Pakistan-India conflicts and opposition to Pakistan’s nuclear assets by cancelling all sorts of aid to Pakistan. The sharp drop-off in US engagement with Pakistan following Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, United States’ lack of support to those elements who support democracy and human rights in Pakistan, United

States' empowerment of military establishment of Pakistan and violating human rights, violation of Pakistan's Sovereignty and the conviction of many religious elements that United States policies are anti-Islam, are the main causes of mistrusting America and these causes further inflame abhorrence for America.²³ Even still Pakistan's majority of people think that United States is trying to destabilize Pakistan. If Pakistan is destabilized then the biggest concern for America and international community would be Pakistan's Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) and the security of those weapons to keep them safe. This way America may establish a plea to intervene in Pakistan with the active help of international community. Pakistan's nuclear weapons are not acceptable for Israel and America in the eyes of Pakistan's populace. United States is not trustworthy in the eyes of other countries as well. After Iraq war a survey conducted by Pew research centre for the people and press asked respondents, As a consequence of war do you have more confidence or less confidence that United States is trustworthy. An overwhelming majority expressed their less confidence that United States is trustworthy. See the following table.

Is US More or Less Trustworthy after War?²⁴

	More	Less	Same	Don't Know
US	58%	29%	6%	7%
UK	24%	58%	12%	6%
France	14%	78%	6%	2%
Germany	10%	82%	5%	3%
Russia	8%	63%	21%	8%
Turkey	8%	74%	11%	7%
Pakistan	5%	64%	7%	24%
Jordon	4%	50%	38%	8%
Morocco	12%	72%	7%	9%

This table helps to understand that Pakistan is the country that expresses lowest percentage of confidence in America. American mistrust on Pakistan is based on the American suspicion that Pakistan army and ISI provide covert support

to Taliban and other militant organization to fight against America. Another survey helps to understand sharp opposition to US actions in the name of war against terrorism.

U.S.-led Efforts to Fight Terrorism

% Who favor U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2009	2010	2011
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
U.S.	89	--	81	76	73	70	81	78	80
Britain	69	63	63	51	49	38	64	58	59
France	75	60	50	51	42	43	74	67	71
Germany	70	60	55	50	47	42	68	59	67
Spain	--	63	--	26	19	21	59	56	58
Lithuania	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	61
Poland	81	--	--	61	--	52	66	70	60
Russia	73	51	73	55	52	50	54	70	53
Ukraine	86	--	--	--	--	51	--	--	55
Turkey	30	22	37	17	14	9	24	19	14
Egypt	--	--	--	--	10	26	19	18	21
Jordan	13	2	12	13	16	18	11	12	9
Lebanon	38	30	--	31	--	34	31	30	35
Israel	--	85	--	--	--	78	80	--	72
China	--	--	--	--	19	26	50	41	23
India	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	52
Indonesia	30	23	--	50	39	32	59	67	55
Japan	61	--	--	--	26	40	42	42	42
Pakistan	20	16	16	22	30	13	24	19	16
Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	62	57
Mexico	52	--	--	--	--	31	56	43	47
Kenya	85	--	--	--	--	73	80	75	77

Due to an administrative error, results for the Palestinian territories are not shown.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q52.

The above presented data has been obtained from Pew Research Global Attitude Project and can be accessed at (<http://www.pewglobal.org/2011/07/13/chapter-2-views-of-the-u-s-and-american-foreign-policy/>)

Not only in Pakistan even other Muslim states and with Muslim majority express strong unfavourableness to US actions in Afghanistan and Iraq. From 2002 to 2011 Pakistan favour for US-led efforts to fight terrorism has decreased and is now at its lowest ebb. Turkey despite being NATO ally experiences unfavorable opinion (in 2002, 30% to 2011, 14%) about US-led efforts to fight terrorism. Majority of the Muslim states are undergoing similar change in their favorable

opinion towards America after 2001 US-led war against terrorism.

Mutual mistrust between Pakistan and America had widened over the years despite their cooperation in war against terrorism. Mistrust is evidenced by allegations and counter-allegations between the so-called allies. Nobody takes the responsibility of failure in controlling attacks of militants. American strikes against militants in Pakistani areas without prior information to Pakistan security forces show that America does not trust Pakistan and *vice versa*. On the other side Pakistan's current concerns are America would leave the region after winding up war on terror campaign and Pakistan would be placed in the list of states responsible for sponsoring terrorism. Moreover, America would leave the region without clearing their mess as a consequence Pakistan would face political, economic and social problems once again.²⁵ Pakistan's current challenges have implications for the United States simultaneously. Because of those challenges Pakistan's relationship with America is gone more complex and awry. Pakistanis an ally against extremism and at the same time target of extremism. To deal with this complex situation a fundamentally new approach is required that would value Pakistan as a partner rather than surrogate. To improve this highly crucial partnership United States must understand the point that Pakistan has its own respective national interest. Now the time has gone when United States could deal Pakistan as a client state. Now the case is different, people of Pakistan are more nationalists and defenders of their national interests than before. Ultimately there has to be a grand bargain which can only be materialized with the support of United States. An invigorated Pakistan with renewed passion against militancy, with normal relations with India and moderate society is less likely to go anti-American. That is the kind of mutual relationship which both sides are trying to evolve.²⁶

Operation Neptune Spear

There is less doubt about that the role of military force changed dramatically with the end of cold war. There has happened a shift in the balance between military and non-military instruments of power. Use of force is actually an instrument among many for achieving strategic goals. One more thing changed in post-cold war era and that is 'unilateral use of force' which became exception rather than rule. But it has been used by United States most of the times. United States is the only country that can afford practicing unilateralism politically and militarily outside its homeland. US unilateralism may invoke unilateral action by other states as well.²⁷ American action deep inside Pakistani areas to hunt down Bin Laden put both the estranged partners at a course of confrontation.

Pakistan is aiding America since 2001 to combat militancy, extremism and terrorism, additionally Pakistan's secret service has helped capturing high value targets in and border areas to Pakistan. Pakistan's efforts are undoubtedly appreciable. But United States could not evolve trust despite intensive efforts by Pakistan and its forces. The Operation, code-named '*Operation Neptune Spear*' was launched by US Army Special Operation Command's 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment with support of CIA personnel. This operation was designed to hunt down Osama Bin Laden in Pakistan's city of Abbottabad. America had already gathered credible information about Bin Laden's presence in Pakistan's city of Abbottabad but did not share with Pakistan. She conducted operation without Pakistan's consent deep inside Pakistan not much away from Islamabad. American unilateral action to hunt down Bin Laden left Pakistan into deep agony as people of Pakistan including military junta were raising uproar that United States violated Pakistan's Sovereignty. Secondly Pakistan's military was much embarrassed in the eyes of its own nation. Pakistan's Chief of Army staff Gen. Ashfaq Pervez Kayanimade it clear that any repetition of violating our sovereignty would not be tolerated and Pakistan may break up with America if it happens again.²⁸ This act of

United States left Pakistan in a state of dilemma where every nation doubted Pakistan for providing safe haven to Osama Bin Laden. If US could have taken Pakistan into confidence before the raid, Pakistan's image in international community could reach as positive and success of Osama's hunting could be shared with Pakistan but America did not do that. International community and most of the countries around the world cheered Bin Laden's death. Especially United States, NATO members, European Union and many other countries but at the same time Bin Laden's killing in Pakistan was condemned by Fidel Castro of Cuba, Hamas leadership and Pakistan's Taliban outfit Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan. These hardcore supporters of Bin Laden's ideology vowed to avenge Bin Laden's death by launching more and more attacks on American soldiers and military outposts. Intensive diplomatic pressure on Pakistan could be witnessed when international community was suspecting Pakistan of sheltering Osama Bin Laden. Pakistan government in its defense denied all charges of sheltering Bin Laden and gave a clarification that Pakistan had already shared information with CIA and other intelligence agencies about the suspected compound. 'Wikileaks' further deformed image of Pakistan by disclosing American diplomats' standpoint against Pakistan that Pakistan always provided information to bin Laden until CIA hunted him down. Another serious allegation surfaced that Pakistan exported Al-Qaida's associates to Afghanistan in to trouble NATO troops. After operation Neptune Spear anti-Americanism rose to the highest level in Pakistan not only among masses even parliamentarians and military-men. The entire nation stood against America and diplomatic relations touched their lowest ebb. Pakistan army chief's warning that repetition of such an attack inside Pakistan's territorial jurisdiction would not be tolerated again and punitive action would be necessary to stop American blatant breach of Pakistan's sovereignty.

Anti-American Wave and Fear of Resurgence

Pakistan's current situation is very alarming because of blowback from its war against terrorism in collaboration with

United States. Pakistan's stability and security is under serious threat from armed men of various groups including American secret agents and Indian secret agencies operating in Pakistan. Bruce Riedel declares Pakistan as the most dangerous country in the world on the basis of following reasons. Nuclear state with record of nuclear proliferation, drug trafficking inside and outside country, continual military dictatorships and intermittent democratic governments and most importantly international terrorism. Riedel says Pakistan is major victim and sponsor of terrorism simultaneously.²⁹ But the point to understand is Pakistan before the initiation of Afghan-Soviet War (1979) was neither a victim nor a sponsor of terrorist acts. Afghan-Soviet war created a huge unmanageable mess especially after the cold war was over. United States left the region without any reconstruction of the region and addressing major socio-economic problems of the region. Afghanistan's Jihadists penetrated into some parts of Pakistan and spread religious extremism and violence. Some of those elements felt betrayed that US had used them as pawns and after accomplishing their objective of defeating Soviet Union they did not address country's problems. They turned against America and started plotting attacks against America.

The Next phase starts with September 11, 2001 attacks on American soil when America came to destroy Al-Qaida network and even included Taliban in the war. America dragged Pakistan into war which caused a serious damage to Pakistan economically and politically. After more than decade long war when America failed to achieve its objectives in the region then devised a plan to withdraw forces in a dignified manner. All the things have already been planned for American troops to leave Afghanistan. But there is a major concern in Pakistan and Afghanistan that if America leaves the region and even withdraws support to fix the problem that war on terror has incurred then there are chances that those deprived groups who were main target of US and allied forces' and lost the lives of their fellowmen, kinsmen and even beloved ones may reunite to take revenge from America and even Pakistan army. They may regroup themselves and strike

again against Pakistan and America and other regional countries. There is a careful strategy required to deal with this problem which may not be chalked out without the joint effort of all regional and global actors.

Jonathan Fox pens about the increased prominence of religious doctrine in contemporary political and social phenomena. International relations tended to deal with the factors that did not include religious doctrines. Paradigms like realism, liberalism and globalism focused their emphasis on military and economic factors as well as rational calculations, all of which left a little room for religion. But if seen through the prism of religion there is a considerable convergence between Huntington's concept of civilizations and religion. Theory development at the beginning of 21st century posits that religion is a crucial factor in modern era. There are contending theories that rebuff religion's role and put forward theories of religious demise. But series of incidents have strongly refuted theories of religion's demise which include Osama bin Laden's Al-Qaida network, terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Iranian Islamic revolution, the worldwide rise of religious fundamentalism, religious movements throughout the Islamic world not limited to Egypt, Algeria and Afghanistan, religio-political movements in Latin America and ethno-religious conflicts like those in Chechnya, East Timor, Tibet, Sudan, and Sri Lanka highlight the role of religion in contemporary politics. The crux of the theory stipulates that religion occupies a significant position in modern political and social phenomena.³⁰

Alvin Z. Rubinstein and Donald E. Smith mention various four types of Anti-Americanism which helps to understand the several strands of Anti-Americanism in third world countries and especially in Islamic world. '*Issue-Oriented Anti-Americanism*' which includes the intense opposition to United States' policies and actions with which third world countries disagree. Second sort of Anti-Americanism is based on "*ideology*" in this category the countries perceive America as source of all troubles, roots of this can easily be traced in nationalism, Marxism and Islamic fundamentalism. Third

kind of Anti-Americanism is called “*instrumental anti-Americanism*” in which governments blame other states or search for a scapegoat to justify their failure, the purpose of this strategy is amass public support. Lastly, “*Revolutionary anti-Americanism*” seeks to overthrow pro-US regimes and establishes a new system or government based on ideology.³¹ Based on the culture and religion Anti-Americanism is abundantly found in Islamic states and especially in Pakistan. All of the above mentioned types of Anti-Americanism can be combined in case of Pakistan. Ideological anti-Americanism is stronger force in Pakistan than others (revolutionary Anti-Americanism and Instrumental Anti-Americanism), People perceive America as source of all troubles.

Ideological Clash intensifies when Europe or America see Islam as a threat to their system and values. Matthew A. Gentzkow and Jess M. Shapiro write that “America has an image problem. Only 1 percent of people surveyed in June 2003 in Jordan or Palestinian Authority expressed favorable opinion of the United States. Favorability ratings elsewhere in the Middle East were almost all below 30 percent. Osama Bin Laden was among the top three leaders most often trusted to “do the right things” by survey respondents in Indonesia, Jordan, Morocco, Pakistan and Palestinian Authority(Pew research centre 2003).Response to similar question by Americans reveal that the feeling is mutual, in recent poll only 24 percent Americans expressed favorable views of Muslim countries overall.”³² Differences between Islamic countries and united States have grow more deeper and dangerous after one decade of American war against Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan and American intervention in Libya and Syria. American sanctions against Iran and most importantly maligning Islam as a terrorist religion, has brought these antagonistic actors to the brink of clash. Gentzkow and Shapiro quote Walter Lippman (1922), “When full allowance has been made for deliberate fraud, political science has still to account for such facts as two nations attacking one another, each convinced that it is in self defenseThey live, we are likely to say, in different worlds. More accurately, they live in the same world but they think and feel in the different ones.”³³

Giacommo Chiozza states that “hatred, envy or prejudice are, in that view the driving forces behind Anti-American sentiments in the writings of such authors Charles Krauthammer (2003), Jean-Francois Revel (2003), and Dinesh D’Souza (2002), opposition to America is the disposition of people who embrace anti-democratic, anti-market, and anti-modern ideologies; it is the psychological refuge of societies who eschew any responsibilities for their shortcomings, or their failures; it is an all-encompassing cultural trait embodying values and beliefs inconsistent with the “American way of life.” Such sentiments of opposition and rejection are allegedly rife, more than ever, in Islamic countries: “More than anything else,”³⁴

Confrontational posture of American policies towards Islamic countries has generated fear of clash that Huntington has hypothesized. If America continues its bellicose policies to deal with Islamic world then there are huge chances of clash. Giacomo Chiozza writes about Huntington’s idea and quotes his hypothesis that “Huntington depicts a history of bloody confrontations and fleeting truces that cannot be accounted for exclusively in terms of power and interests. It is a value, normative, conflict that shapes the interactions between the countries of Muslim religion and the countries of the West. In clear words, Huntington (1996, 217) writes: “The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power.” Thus, from Huntington’s Clash of Civilizations logic, we derive the prediction that Muslim publics would be wary of the Western norms of individualism, pluralism, and relativism, and would be opposed to all America is and does, as America is the most pristine incarnation of the ideals of freedom, democracy, and opportunity.”³⁵

Conclusion

Washington has realized that without Pakistan’s partnership this indecisive and futile war cannot be won. But

Pakistan-US mistrust is a great impediment to achieve this goal. US should responsibly deal with Pakistan and stop maligning Pakistan's image as promoter of terrorism especially after operation *Neptune Spear*. Secondly, Washington should learn from past bungle that leaving region without addressing serious issues of governance, reconstruction and rehabilitation withdrawal of American troops would allow Taliban and Al-Qaida operatives to regroup and plot again America and its allies. A comprehensive Af-pak strategy is needed to deal with future challenges. All these plans to bring peace and stability in the region require Pakistan-US mutual trust and maneuverability. Without Pakistan's active involvement in Afghanistan affairs, it's impossible to bring peace in there.

Authors

- *Dr. Musarat Amin is Assistant professor at peace and Conflict Studies, National Defence University Islamabad.*
- *Dr. Rizwan Naseer is Assistant Professor at Center for International Peace and Stability (CIPS) at NUST Islamabad.*

Notes

¹ Nye S. Joseph Jr., The Decline of America's Soft Power: Why Washington Should Worry, *Foreign Affairs*(May-June,2004)Vol.83,No.3,:16-17

² Connie Peck, *Sustainable Peace the Role of UN and Regional organization in Preventing Conflict*,. New York, Carnegie Corporation,1998:204-205

³ *Ibdi*.205

⁴ Kathleen Malley-Morrison, *State Violence and the Right to peace*, California, ABC CLIO,2009:156

⁵ Christopher A.Preble, Unanswered Questions on Afghanistan, The National Interest(February2,2012)<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/afghanistan-panetta-leavs-questions-unanswered-6447>

⁶ Pervez IqbalCheema, The Afghanistan Crisis and Pakistan's Security Dilemma, *Asian Survey*,Vol23,No.3(March,1983):227

⁷Malou Innocent, Can Pakistan Lead Afghan Peace? The National Interest (December 13, 2012) <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/can-pakistan-lead-afghan-peace-7841>

⁸ Ahmad Rashid, *Pakistan Afghanistan and US Withdrawal*, (Speech) Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, Chatham House, 2012: 2-3

⁹ Sukumar Muralidharan, Pakistan and Afghanistan After Peace Jirga, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 42, No. 33 (August 18-24, 2007): 3372

¹⁰ Ahmad Rashid, Pakistan Afghanistan and US Withdrawal, (Speech) Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, Chatham House, 2012: 3-4

¹¹ Anwar Iqbal, Dawn, Islamabad (April 8, 2009), <http://archives.dawn.com/archives/37201>

¹² Aasim Sajjad Akhtar, The New Great Game in Afghanistan and Pakistan, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 44, No. 1 (January 3-9, 2009): 37

¹³ Kristin M. Lord, Marc Lynch, *America's Extended Hand, Assessing Obama Administrations' Global Engagement Strategy*. Centre for New American Security, Washington D.C. (June 2010): 3

¹⁴ *Needed a Comprehensive US Policy Towards Pakistan* [R], A Report by Atlantic Council, Honorary Chairs Senator Chuck Hagel, Senator John Kerry, February, 2009

¹⁵ Muhammad Munir, Muhammad Nawaz, Building Regional Ties, Pakistan Observer, Islamabad (March 24, 2012) <http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=146564>

¹⁶ Document Two, Joint Statement of trilateral Summit, Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Islamic Republic of Iran and Islamic Republic of Pakistan on Enhancing Trilateral Cooperation, (February 17, 2012) *IPRI Journal* XII, No. 2 (Summer, 2012): 168

¹⁷ Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, Naheed S. Goraya, America's New Afghan or Pakistan Policy, *South Asian Studies*, Vol, 25, No. 1 (January, 2010): 46-48

¹⁸ Jessica Stern, Pakistan's Jihad Culture, *Foreign Affairs* Vol 79, No. 6 (Nov-Dec, 2000): 115

¹⁹ Jerry Mark Silverman, Sturdy Dominos, *The National Interest* (November 19, 2009) <http://nationalinterest.org/article/sturdy-dominos-3310>

-
- ²⁰ Karzai Stressed Pakistan's Role In Afghan Reconciliation http://www.rferl.org/content/karzai_Says_Afghanistan_Does_Not_Want_Proxy_Wars/1980674.html
- ²¹ Andrew H. Kydd, *Trust and Mistrust in International Relations*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2005:11
- ²² Touqir Hussain, US-Pakistan Relations What Trust Deficit? *The Middle East Institute Policy Brief*, No.31 (November, 2010)
- ²³ Annual Report of 2010 the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, May 2010, Washington D.C :97
- ²⁴ Andrew H. Kydd, *Trust and Mistrust in International Relations*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2005:254
- ²⁵ Naeem Ahmad, US-Pakistan Relations after 9/11: Threats and Responses. SALEEM KIDWAI, *US policy Towards the Muslim World; Focus on the 9/11 Period* [Edited] Maryland, University Press of America. 2010:231
- ²⁶ Touqir Hussain, US-Pakistan Relations What Trust Deficit? *The Middle East Institute Policy Brief*, No.31 (November, 2010)
- ²⁷ Ekaterina Stepanova, The Unilateral and Multilateral Use of Force by the United States, David M. Malone, Yuen Foong Khong, *Unilateralism and US Foreign Policy, International Perspectives*. [Edited] Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003:183
- ²⁸ Jane Perlez, Pakistan Army Chief Warns US on Another Raid, The New York Times (May 5, 2011) http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/06/world/asia/06react.html?_r=0
- ²⁹ Bruce Riedel, Pakistan and Terror: The Eye of The Storm, *Annals of the American Academy of political and Social Sciences*, Vol 618, What the Next President Will Face (June 2008):31
- ³⁰ Fox Jonathan, The Rise of Religious Nationalism and Conflict; Ethnic Conflicts and Revolutionary Wars 1945-2001, *Journal of Peace Research* (November, 2004), Vol.41(6):716-717
- ³¹ Rubinstein Z. Alvin, Smith E. Donald, Anti-Americanism in The Third World, *Annals of American Academy of political and Social Science* (May, 1988), Vol.497:35

³²Gentzkow A. matthew, Shapiro M. Jesse, Media, Education and Anti-Americanism in the Muslim World, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, (Summer, 2004), Vol.18(3):117

³³ Ibid.118

³⁴ChiozzaGiacomo ,Love and Hate, Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World(november7,2004):5
see:http://politics.as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/4737/chiozza_fo4.pdf

³⁵ Ibid.6