

Comparison of George W. Bush & Barrack Obama Regimes Regarding Pakistan-US Strategic Relations (2001-2017)

Imran Khan¹, Dr Nazim Rahim²

¹ Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Political Science & International Relations, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology Peshawar, Email: imranzada1987@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Chitral, Chitral, Email: mnazimrahim@gmail.com

Abstract

The main theme of this study is to dig out different aspects for prolonged peace and stability with different administrations of USA towards Pakistan. Since the inception of Pakistan; she has been facing many challenges in shape of India, a hostile neighbor of Pakistan. She has to balance out her capabilities in military, strategic and economic grounds to survive at global and regional arena. Pakistan in dire need to find a global partner who can rescue her in difficult situation but America has betrayed her ambitions on multiple occasions. She has cut down economic and military aid in different eras; they have opposed Pakistan's nuclear experiments on number of occasions which resulted in imposing Pressler amendment. Pakistan and US relations has seen many ups and downs since 1947. The brutal attack on America by Al-Qaeda brought both countries to make alliance to fight global war against terrorism. President Bush during his administration clearly mentioned that "are you with us or terrorists". President Musharraf without hesitation joined American war against terrorism. She has supported Bush administration in every aspect to dismantle Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan. President Bush was strong believer to use hard power to attain his foreign policy goals and objectives. The sovereignty of Pakistan was badly affected during his administration. When President Barrack Obama became the President of USA he altered the foreign policy of US by applying smart power to achieve his foreign policy goals and objective. During his administration he provided aid both economic and military. The drone attacks were doubled as compared to President Bush administration. He conducted "Operation Neptune Spear" to kill Osama Bin Laden in Abbottabad, city of Pakistan. The National Security Strategies of both presidents were different while tackling Pakistan. In reply Pakistan faced many challenges in shape of a) economic b) military c) civilian d) infrastructure where she lost 80,000 precious human lives. Terrorism spread to all parts of Pakistan during both Bush and Obama administrations. Realist School of thought has been applied to the theme of the study while data has been evaluated through qualitative paradigm. Hypothesis has been proved along with key finding and recommendations.

Keywords: USA, Foreign Policy, President Bush, President Obama, Terrorism, National Security Strategy, Pakistan

Introduction

Throughout the history every nation at international environment wants to enhance their relations with other countries, protect their national interests and achieve their national interest & goals by devising formidable strategic policy for the external world. Regarding USA it has been following specific foreign policy to achieve her strategic objectives and interact with global players through set values and collaboration (Kissinger and Wellings, 1977). There are many strategic goals of USA foreign policy but promotion of peace, eradication of terrorism,

democracy and flourishing of America and the American people are the highlighted and marked objectives in their international politics. Other important strategic objectives of US foreign policy which can never be ignored includes controlling of deadly weapons, upholding the economic interests of USA, trade related international agreements, promotion of education across the globe, protection of the US nationals globally and firm steps to make strong economic ties with the global world (Zakaria, 2008). In the framework of foreign policy, individual personalities have deep impacts in the strategic decision making of the particular country. The role of a person in devising and implementation of foreign policy involves intellectual procedures, back ground of the personality, personal features, motives behind his foreign policy and his basic beliefs. So the foreign policy mechanism is the product of individuals which is known as “human agency” (Jensen, 1982). The foreign policy of both President Bush and Obama were different towards Pakistan in many aspects but their goal remained the same to protect American dreams globally and regionally. Here we will be evaluating the convergence and divergence in their foreign policies along with its impacts on Pakistan. Brief history and trends in the relations of both countries will be covered to show striking aspects of the relations.

While examining the foreign policy of US towards Pakistan, different theories of International Relations have to be studied and examined. Hence, the focus of the particular research study is foreign policy and foreign policy analysis of the Bush and Obama administrations. While examining the administrations and style of the foreign policies of both presidents the theory of “Realism” is one of the formidable theories which can explain the personal behavior in all dynamics of the leader and it simplifies and examines the strategic policy of a country towards the specific country along with global community as well. Through policy the political actions in global environment are carried out through a well-directed and well-coordinated strategic policy. The adoption of foreign policy is done to safeguard and protect the national interests of the state. The basic reason is that individuals and states formulate the foreign policy which has the blend of being state-centric and perceive the paradigm of the realist school of thought (Hill, 2003). The nature and scope of this research is qualitative in nature, analytical and descriptive method of qualitative research will be applied during this research in order to answer the research questions.

Literature review

Bonnie Frazier has evaluated foreign policy in different aspect according to him it's not just a term rather it's the strategic policy of a country through which they achieve its national goals. Further, he argues that different techniques and patterns are implemented to achieve the desired national interests (Frazier, 2019). According to *Stephen Walt*, realism is closely associated human nature. The foreign policy devising is set according to the nature of the humans. Human beings traits and personality sets the tone of a nation to deal its external environment (Waltz, 1975). *M. S. Venkatarmani*, in his book “*The American Role in Pakistan*” has covered different aspects of the formation of alliance between Pakistan and United States of America from 1947 to 1958. In this book he has mentioned that after independence Pakistan's main threat perception was India centric which was considered close to former USSR. *Zahid Hussain* in his book “*No-win War: The Paradox of US-Pakistan Relations in Afghanistan's Shadow 2021*” Has explained and explored the relations of Pakistan and the United States of America after Pakistan went into alliance with US in 2001. The book has explained the points of divergence between the government of Pakistan and USA on certain issues. *Hussain Haqqani* writes in the book “*Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, the USA and an Epic History of Misunderstanding*” has wrote the concise history of Pakistan and US relations. This book has covered many aspects of Pakistan and US relation like a) events b) reasons of alliance c) achievements and success during both countries strategic relations. The author has explained the main ups and downs in the relationship of both countries throughout the history.

Terry Deibel in his book *“Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”* he has explained the effective utilization of a country resources in directive to attain external policy objective in a broader context. In this book the author has written extensive literature on the functions of Democrat and Republican parties in US politics. Zubair Ahmed Firdousi in his book *“Eagle Over Pakistan”* has covered every aspect of Pakistan and USA relations from 1947 till 1979. He has beautifully explained the formulation of alliance between both countries. Zamir Akram in his research work *“Pakistani-U.S.Relations after 9/11: A Pakistani Perspective”* argues that 9/11 incident has totally transformed the relationship of Pakistan and USA. After Pakistan joining the war against terrorism it has provided new dimensions in the relations of the both countries.

Background of the Study

It is quite imperative to understand and learn the present state of affairs of Pakistan and United States of America to study the history of their past relations. Pakistan and United States of America are two different states having different culture, creed, religion, language and region, but both countries share strong diplomatic ties in crunch situations. Since the inception of Pakistan when she was in dire need of someone who can provide them with firm sustainability to counter the aggression of India. Pakistan found an ally in shape of United States of America who can provide them with all sort of help which a newly established country needs. Pakistan joined US bloc during 1950's, which means Pakistan started receiving economic and military aid to strengthen her economic conditions and to assist them in establishing proper infrastructure for its citizens. During this alliance not only Pakistan benefited from US but rather US has also benefited from this alliance during whole cold war era to contain communism in the region. Despite the efforts of Pakistan during the cold war era, US have played double game in terms of diplomacy with Pakistan. She has imposed cut down on her aid, imposed sanctions in shape of Pressler, Glenin and Symington amendments. Pakistan was left alone by United States of America after the disintegration of USSR during 1990's. Pakistan has provided every kind of support to the US during Afghan jihad to stop the spreading of communism. Despite the efforts of Pakistan she was been abandoned by US.

The incidence of 9/11 brought both countries together to fight the global war against terrorism after Al-Qaeda targeted and blew Twin Towers with planes. The Bush administration conveyed message to the world including Pakistan that “either you are with us or the terrorists”. Pakistan under the leadership of President Musharaf responded and joined the global war against terrorism. During the US sponsored war against terrorism, Pakistan has provided every sort of support to dismantle Al-Qaeda and terrorists from the map of the world. The administrations of Bush and Obama had different foreign policies for Pakistan while combating the war against terrorism. President Bush believed on the implementation of hard power while President Obama believed on smart power to achieve his foreign policy goals and objectives.

Hypothesis

President Obama's administration was more authoritative as compared to president bush in US sponsored war against terrorism in Afghanistan and Pakistan

Foreign Policy

According to Joseph Frankel, foreign policy is a balanced blend of actions and decisions in which substantial amount of relations are involved between one state to another state in the world (Frankel, 1968). On the other hand, Huger Gibson defines it as foreign policy is conducting business of one government with rest of the world based on knowledge, comprehensive plan and experiences (Gibson, 1944). According to Laura Neack foreign policy is the systematic activities adopted by states to change the behavior of other global states (Neack, 2008). Security is considered as the most important pillar which held the nations tightly with each other in

diplomatic fronts. History suggests that both Pakistan and US came closer to each other purely on the basis of their security. Pakistan faced threats from Indian side while communism from former USSR posed vital threats for the future of American nation. Pakistan secured her national interest by joining hands with USA, who provided them with every sort of support in economy, diplomatic fronts and military to secure its fronts. On the other hand US has successfully contained the expansionist ideas of communism through Pakistan in Afghanistan and other parts of the region. After the incidence of 9/11 Pakistan gained more importance in US sponsored war against terrorism to dismantle Al-Qaeda. Pakistan had feasible geo strategic location and experience to deal with Taliban. The concept of collective security was established for the stronger and weaker states to assist each other in tough times.

Collective Security

After the bloody WWII the concept of Collective Security emerged to handle the global political affairs. This was the era when leading political scientists and leaders of the world paid attention to collective security in order to bring peace and stability in the world. The global stage is anarchic in nature, where there is no central authority to provide check and balance on the affairs of the world. So we can assume that the country that possesses more power will penetrate the global politics. According to Charles Marshall; every state will take strict action against those who pose threats or attack the other country resulting in destroying the sovereignty of the particular country. According to him the nature of collective security is descriptive, amalgamated and murky one. According to George Schwarzenegger, "It is a mechanism for collective actions in order to avert and counter an attack against a well structured global order". We find slight difference in collective security and collective actions. In collective security each and every nation of the world combines to play its due role in combating the problem. While in collective actions few states play their visible part at the ground level. Pakistan played its due role in collective security as well as collective actions in US sponsored war against terrorism. In both the administration of President Obama and President Bush, we can find both the elements in Pakistan's perspective. Yet the foreign policies of both Presidents were different from each other in handling Pakistan (Corera, 2006)

US Foreign Policy

Throughout the history every nation at international environment desire to enhance their relations with other countries, protect their national interests and to achieve their national interest & goals by devising formidable strategic policy for the external world. Regarding the USA it has been chasing specific foreign policy to achieve her strategic objectives and interact with global players through set values and collaboration (Kissinger and Wellings, 1977). There are many strategic goals of US foreign policy but promotion of peace, eradication of terrorism, democracy and flourishing of America and the American people are the highlighted and marked objectives in their international politics. Other important strategic objectives of US foreign policy which can never be ignored includes controlling of deadly weapons, upholding the economic interests of USA, trade related international agreements, promotion of education across the globe, protection of the US nationals globally and firm steps to make strong economic ties with the global world (Zakaria, 2008). After the deadly and exhausted World War I, USA emerged one of the major super powers in the world due to her effective strategic policies to penetrate the world politics. Then USA has transformed and shaped itself a super power at the end of World War II along with USSR. The disintegration of USSR in early 90's made US a sole super power in the world as it was dominating the global and regional politics through its effective foreign policy. From 1991 till 2011, the USA was dominating and penetrating the international politics through its strong economy and military might which helped USA to spread its power globally and regionally. After 2011, internationally and regionally the importance and influence of USA remained unmatched but in terms of economic might it was challenged by EU, Republic of

China, Russia Federation, India and Brazil. These have faced severe challenges while tackling the issues of nuclear proliferation, climate and environmental issues and global terrorism. The above mentioned six entities have the same peace and anti-terrorism policies as compared with USA which may lead these states to have peaceful coexistence and strong economic ties in the future with each other's. The global balance of power has been transforming with the passage of time and these rising and emerging states have the potential to challenge American authority across the globe (Buzan and Lawson, 2013).

Pakistan US Relation 1947-2001

The relations of Pakistan and US till 2001 can be understood from the table below.

Table 1Source: Pakistan in a changing strategic context by Matthew Joseph written on page 78

Era	Level of Tension in Cold War Perspective	Pakistan Importance in US Perspective	Comments
1950s	Extremely High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very High - Military Alliances - Huge Military Assistance in shape of Aid 	Developments in Europe and Penetration in South Asia to Curb Communism
1960s	Détente	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance of Pakistan Reduces - Becomes low after 1965 Sanctions 	Chinese and Pakistan Ties started building up. China wanted to decrease the US influence on Pakistan. It was the starting point of Pak-China Strategic relations
1970s	Normal till 1978 (In 1979 USSR attacked Afghanistan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance and relations were on low due to 1971 incidents - Pakistan was pressurized and threatened due to her Nuclear program 	Chinese kept on supporting Nuclear Program despite US immense pressure Burning of US Embassy
1980	Extremely High due to War in Afghanistan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very High - Pakistan became front line ally with US to fight Communism - US started to ignore Pakistan Nuclear Program due to Afghan Jihad 	Supply of Chinese Ballistic Missiles
1990	Normal/ Tensed The End of Cold War Disintegration of USSR Taliban Backfire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very low - Sanctions 	Isolation US left Pakistan after achieving her Strategic Goals i.e Disintegration of USSR
2000s	High (Due to Pakistan Role in War on Terror)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High - Acted as Front line state in Global WOT - Taliban and Al-Qaeda presence in Pakistan - Radical Islamism concerns of US and Rest of the world in Pakistan - Increase in US Economic and Military Aid 	The role of Pakistan in creation of Taliban and other militant organizations operating within Pakistan was ignored The Relations of Pakistan with China started to prosper and it touched the top levels ever recorded in history of both countries strategic relations

The foreign policy of US after 9/11

The neoconservatives suggested an emphatic foreign policy for the Bush government. Charles Krauthammer, in early 2000 noted that that “the next management has four strategic duties: (1) to discourage and disarm rogue’s states that acquired weapons of mass destruction; (2) containment of china; (3) guarding against revanchist Russia; (4) maintaining order as the ultimate guarantor of world steadiness.” According to the neoconservative assumptions the US is

the final option to balance this imbalance world (Herspring, 2008). The Geo-strategic affairs were more important for the neoconservative than the economic affairs. According to them the administration of president Bill Clinton which was following the ideology of “wishful liberalism” could not solve the issues of mass destructions and scoundrel states who can potentially disturb the peace of the world. In their views President Bill Clinton give too much importance to Geo-Commercial issues than focusing on geo political interests of the American government in the international environment (Lind and Wohlforth, 2019). It was the matter of fact that President Bill Clinton has focused on Economic globalization to sought out the security related challenges of the world. They criticized and raised objections against the administration of Bill Clinton that due to lack of interest and attention on Clinton behalf the national interests of the US have been challenged especially with the weapon of mass destruction and potential threat posed by smaller and weaker countries of the world (Kupchan and Trubowitz, 2007). Furthermore, they were of the fact that the global environment must be off limit for the great powers in the ongoing millennium as Monroe Doctrine has declared: “the Western Hemisphere was off-limit for the European powers in 19th century.” This was kind of Neo-Monroe doctrine for them in the century. The neoconservatives were scanning the development and rising of China in global affairs through Realist School of thought. They assumed that “the US and China are destined to be adversaries” and “the intensions and capabilities of the states are hidden”. It is a very difficult task for the experts of foreign policy in order to shape these capabilities to quantify in precise manner. Based on the mentioned argument the proposal of the neoconservatives was to contain the rising of China before they can challenge the supremacy of US in the world. They were of the fact that the effective strategy should be immediate solution to the problem before it gets worst (Mearsheimer, 2010).

The intentions of the neoconservatives were to develop the foreign policy of the US which can totally protect them from the threats of revanchist Russian Federation. They considered the fact that they should be more careful about the role of Russia in regional and international affairs. They were fearful about the role of Russia which she can play in the future in Euro-Asia. Neoconservatives were anticipating that Russia might extent its interventionist ideology and role in the former colonial empire of US (Dorrien, 2013). The neoconservatives suggested a clear order which can guarantee the stability and peace of the global world under the leadership of US. They considered that US has become “indispensable power in the world.” The important duty of the US in the global affairs is to maintain the stability of the world through its “benevolent global hegemony” (Krauthammer, 2000). Moreover, during the first initial six weeks of President Bush presidency, Charles Krauthammer declared “the existence of Bush Doctrine”. Therefore, the decade was started with “a return to the unabashed unilateralism of the 80s and the Reignite spirit: we build to suit ourselves”. The neoconservatives had strong believed in President Bush that his administration has immense power that it can automatically create reality (Dorrien, 2013 pp 35-37). Condoleezza Rice, during the campaign of President Bush wrote a comprehensive article which was published in Foreign Affairs she cleared the tasks of the Bush Administration which are;

“If deterrence fails then America can wage war, use power and it can fight anywhere for its defense and survival. America will extend free trade and stabilize monetary systems to promote economic growth including the territories of western hemisphere. This area has been ignored in the US strategic policy for a long time and it holds important position for the US national interests. It will reshape its close ties with the allied countries that support the US value system and culture in promoting peace, freedom and prosperity. US will spend its energies in context to relationships with the big power like Russia and China to mold the political system of the world. These countries along with US will deal the rogue regimes decisively who is posing threats for the international community with terrorist activities and weapons of mass destructions” (Rice, 2000). These tasks were reflected in the President Bush continuity and certain variations he

brought in the US foreign policy. The nature of foreign policy advocated by Rice for the upcoming president of the US has highlighted moderate tone. The main cause of being moderate was that she has not explained the ways and means to tackle with the rising threats for the US supremacy. She has tried to describe the criteria, but she has not described the actors and states that can be potential threat for the US. This article has been considered as a skeleton of President Bush foreign policy before his victory in the election. After fabulous victory in the presidential elections the Bush Administration entered into the office with ABC slogans "Anything but Clinton" as far the US foreign policy has concerned (Rhodes, 2008). For the first eight months his humble foreign policy was the reflection which was advocated by Rice in her article, "Bush's lack of enthusiasm to take on major new foreign policy initiative during his first few months in office was apparent on the issues besides defense expenditure and missile defense system" (Ziring, 2003). President Bush withdrew from the US existing treaties before 9/11 attacks. During the first eight months of Bush presidency the US "withdrew from Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, rejection of Biological weapons and Kyoto Protocol Weapons Convention (BWC), abolished Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Landmine Treaty and criticized the International Criminal Court. President Bush unilateral tendencies were matching the goals of neoconservatives but his policies were not fully based on conservatism as whole. He was carrying "Partial" continuation of President Clinton policies as well (Dorrien, 2013 p. 95). The neoconservatives proposed President Bush on many initiatives regarding pursuing the foreign policy of US, on rogue states, emergence of new states who can challenge US in international politics and weapons of mass destruction. It was evident that President Bush was not fully ready to take such decisions. He distant his administration from certain global issues likes Israel-Palestine dispute and peace making process, the desire of North Korean nuclear capability and conflict which was taking place in Northern Ireland. The neoconservatives showed their disappointment towards President Bush that he is lacking the strategic vision in the international politics to represent the power of US in the new millennium (Colucci, 2009).

Comparative Analysis of President Bush and President Obama Administrations

Bush regime lacked in devising strategic policy for Pakistan due to the distraction caused by focusing on war against terrorism only, the lack of strategic policy allowed Taliban and Al-Qaeda to build their safe heavens in the tribal belt of Pakistan. On the other hand, Obama was focused on Pakistan; he realized the importance of effective strategy to dismantle the elements which were perceived to pose immense threats to the US interests thus devised AF-PAK strategy to focus on Pakistan. Therefore, he appointed special envoy to keep close eye on Pakistan and Afghanistan. (Kandel, 2021). Bush regime in 2004 started drone strike to destroy the terrorist sanctuaries in the tribal belt of Pakistan from 2004 till 2009 total 52 drone strikes were made to dismantle terrorists. While drone strikes made in Obama regime were six times higher than Bush regime (Ahmer, 2011). The violation of Pakistan sovereignty continued in both regimes but Obama took one step ahead by violating the sovereignty of Pakistan by conducting Operation Neptune Spear in Pakistan to eradicate Bin Laden in Pakistan, he openly stated in speech in Cairo that US will defend itself by violating sovereignty of nations and rule of law (Obama, 2009). The aid provided to Pakistan during Bush regime was focused on military assistance and approximately US\$ 10 Billion were transferred to Pakistan during 2001 to 2009. Obama emphasized on non-military aid (Kerry-Lugar Bill US\$ 10 Billion) to support Pakistan in democracy, institutional building, health, education and judiciary (Obama, 2009). During the presidency of George W. Bush, he supported the illegitimate government of General Pervez Musharraf as he thought that military regime is keeping Pakistan stable which will directly support him in war against terrorism. In an interview he stated that "I have been strong supporter of General Musharraf", he stated. I personally believed that he understands how to deal with terrorist organizations, his nerves are strong and he knows how to fight terrorism. That's why they tried to assassinate him". Unlike Bush, Obama did not support military regime in Pakistan,

he wanted to improve the political situation in Pakistan through democratic government. According to Obama democratic government can be more helpful in dismantling terrorism. (Blake, 2009).

Comparative analysis of President Bush and President Obama National Security Strategy

President	Bush National Security Strategy	Obama National Security Strategy
Total Pages	33	39
Total Chapters	-	6
Purpose	Promotion of global institutions, implementation of rule of law, democracy and free trade market to protect the interests of USA	Obama NSS was focused on safeguarding US interests through strong and punctual leadership
Strategic Approach	Bush too preemptive measures before potential threats and attacks	Obama focused on four thematic areas to protect the national interests of US
Foreign Policy	Collective cooperation, Containment Doctrine and Alliances	Abstain approach having multi dimensional foreign policy
National Interests	American supremacy, assertive Realism, Lead alliances, internationalism	Security and prosperity of US, Morals, Global order, Leader of global world
Pillars	To defeat terrorists, Preservance of peace, Extension of peace	Obama NSS had no pillars apart from four sections
Threats	Al-Qaeda and Weapons of Mass destruction	Iran, North Korea,
Allies	UN agencies and NATO	UN agencies and NATO

(Onder, 2020) (Cantalapiedra, 2003)

The Drone Strikes Policy of Bush and Obama Administrations

President Bush on June 19, 2004 undertook the first ever drone strike in Pakistan to target Al-Qaeda and Taliban. It was the start of fearful war which took hundreds of precious lives in the tribal belt of Pakistan. It was believed that it has disturbed the sovereignty of Pakistan on several occasions, but it was the policy of President Bush to hit and strike the terrorist who are threading their security so he conducted Drone attacks as pre-emptive strikes. After the first attack in which Taliban leader named Naik Muhammad was killed in Tribal belt of South Waziristan, these attacks remained mysterious during Bush Administration there were no statements regarding these attacks or collateral damages (Guterson, 2019). Moreover, Bush administration staged secret negotiations with President Musharraf and intelligence agencies of Pakistan. They reached out to the conclusion and bargain was set on the drone strikes. The intelligence agencies of Pakistan during that meeting demanded that prior approval will be required before each drone attack from them. This demand was to gain control of the targets US drones were intended to target. They ensured that drones attack would be conducted in specific parts of the tribal belt to avoid maximum collateral damage. Purpose behind these demands from Musharraf government was to limit the Bush administration from attacking those areas which Pakistan did not want them to target; they were safeguarding strategic assets and the camps which were established for the Kashmir freedom fighters. The ISI and CIA after constant deliberations agreed on the point that all drones attack will be carried out under the supervision of “CIA covert action authority” which means the Bush administration would not take the responsibility of the Drone attacks and Pakistan would have the right to take the credit if any prominent leader of the A-Qaeda or Taliban gets killed or Pakistan would remain silent on the issues (Mazzetti, 2013). During December 2005, Al-Qaeda leader Abu Hamza a very important target was killed in drone strike in the tribal belt of Pakistan. There were two other members named Suleman al Moghrabians

Amer Azizi who were linked in the Madrid bomb blasts were also killed in the particular drone strike. Amer Azizi wife Raquel Burgos Gracia was also amongst the victim list. It shows the Bush administration to resolve to strike and hit hard the terrorist areas and their houses to dismantle the chains and sources of Al-Qaeda even from the territory of Pakistan. President Musharraf in an interview stated regarding the killing of Rabia:

“Yes indeed, 200 percent confirmed.’ He was killed in North Waziristan, Musharraf continued. ‘It is a place called Mirali, or little north of this town, that’s the place... I think he was killed the day before yesterday [December 2 2004], if I am not wrong”

Furthermore, the interior minister of Pakistan and Chairman of Qaumi Watan Party stated:

“[Rabia] was a very important al Qaeda commander,’ adding: ‘Five people were killed in the explosion and we have identified that one of them was Hamza Rabia. There were two other foreigners but we do not know their identities”

The President Bush policy on drone towards Pakistan has caused a lot of damage to the human lives and infrastructure. The pre-emptive strikes policy of his administration to target the terrorists and their hide out at any corner of the world paid great dividends. In the tribal territory of Pakistan Bush administration has successfully killed and injured many prominent leaders of Al-Qaeda and Taliban during the span of four years from 2004-2009. Some of them are:

Ayman al-Zawahiri, Abu Khabab al Masri, Abd Rahman al Masri al Maghribi, Abu Ubeidah al Masri, Marwan al Suri, Khalid Habib, Abdul Hadi al Iraqi, Mohsin Musa, MatawalliAtwah, MaulviLiaqat, Awaz (or Hawas) Khan, ShaykhIssa al Masri, Abu Laith al-Libi, Abu Obeida Tawari al-Obeidi, Abu Adel al-Kuwaiti, Qari Hussain Mehsud, Abu Sulayman al-Jazairi, BaitullahMehsud, Abu Wafa al Saudi, Abu Haris Saudis, Abdullah, Zain Ul Abu Qasim, MaulviNazir and Abu Jihad al Masri.(The Bureau of Investigative Journalism, 2011).

The most accurate publically available information regarding Bush Administration and his drone strike on Pakistan are: total number of 52 drone strikes were conducted in the tribal belt of Pakistan from 2004 to 2009 in which 416 to 599 people were killed along with 292 civil casualties amongst these 123 children lost their precious lives during the course of this time (Bowden, 2012). The drone strikes on Pakistan have been increased 10 times during the administration of President Barrack Obama as compared to the administration of President Bush. The Obama administration during his first year made 563 drone strikes targeting Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen. As compared to the administration of President Bush total 57 drone strikes were carried out. The policy of increasing drone strikes during the Obama administration was to continue the war against Al-Qaeda and the main purpose of these severe attacks were to protect the US and NATO troops from direct combat wars. During the drone strikes in Pakistan many innocent civilians has lost their precious lives in the Tribal Belt of Pakistan and President Obama kept on insisting that the drone strikes launched against the terrorists and terrorist organizations are “exceptionally surgical and precise”. Despite such statements the people of tribal belt kept on losing the lives of their loved ones besides losing the precious lives it has impacted the socio-economic lives of the people of the tribal belt. The White House has released the data of the people killed in the drone strikes from 2009 to 2015 on severe pressure of the Bureau to announce the number of persons killed in the drone strikes carried out during the administration of President Barrack Obama. The White House, after releasing the data has stated that from 64-116 people has been killed during the drone strike which was contrary to the data released by the Bureau which stated that from 380-801 people has been killed in US drone strikes which is six times higher than the data released by the white house. The White House released long-awaited

figures last July on the number of people killed in drone strikes between January 2009 and the end of 2015, an announcement which insiders said was a direct response to pressure from the Bureau and other organizations that collect data. However, the US's estimate of the number of civilians killed – between 64 and 116 – contrasted strongly with the number recorded by the Bureau, which at 380 to 801 was six times higher (Purkiss and Serle, 2017).

Impacts on Pakistan

After joining the war against terrorism, it has produced both positive and negative impacts on Pakistan. The alliance helped Pakistan to minimize the sanctions imposed on her. Pakistan has gained economic and military assistance and ended international isolation successfully. Pakistan achieved the status of non-NATO ally, restored its membership in Common Wealth. On the other side Pakistan has paid heavy price in socio-economic and political fields. It has suffered irrecoverable human loss (70,000 people) in global war on terror. It has faced enormous troubles with Afghanistan and found great difficulties in global diplomacy while addressing the freedom struggle for Kashmir. Pakistan launched different operations like operation Zarb-e-Azb and operation Radd ul Fasad to eradicate terrorism in different parts resulting backlash which lead to institutional instability and social problems. Pakistan economy has been badly affected due to war against terrorism (Rabbi, 2012). The Foreign Policy of Pakistan towards Middle East has been badly affected; the economic assistance from Gulf Council Countries i.e. United Arab Emirates, Kuwait and Qatar has been reduced to greater extent. Pakistan has been made dependent on World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF). The commitment of US with India to make her regional power is disturbing the equilibrium of influence in the area especially in US-Indo nuclear arrangement which was signed in 2005 and the increasing role of India in Afghanistan's internal affairs and infrastructure is dangerous for regional peace and stability (Bukhari, 2011).

Snapshot of Pakistan Economic Losses 2001-2015

Year	Economic losses in USD Billion
2001-2002	2.67 billion US Dollars
2002-2003	2.75 billion US Dollars
2003-2004	2.93 billion US Dollars
2004-2005	3.41 billion US Dollars
2005-2006	3.99 billion US Dollars
2006-2007	4.67 billion US Dollars
2007-2008	6.94 billion US Dollars
2008-2009	9.18 billion US Dollars
2009-2010	13.56 billion US Dollars
2010-2011	23.77 billion US Dollars
2011-2012	11.98 billion US Dollars
2012-2013	9.97 billion US Dollars
2013-2014	6.63 billion US Dollars
2014-2015	106.98 billion US Dollars

(Akhtar, 2015)

Conclusion

Pakistan and United States of America are not connected in terms of geography nor do they share some common border with each other. They are connected through their strategic policies towards each other. Pakistan throughout the history has desired to establish friendly and cooperative relations with United States of America due to her needs at global and regional arena. Pakistan is the only country in the world that has supported the US sponsored war against terrorism whole heartedly in both administrations of President Obama and President Bush. Both

administrations had different foreign policies for Pakistan. President Bush who was the main architect to launch global war against terrorism has supported Pakistan in different ways i.e militarily and economically. Yet his strategic policies have proved to be destructive for Pakistan. He has violated the sovereignty of Pakistan as well as supported the dictatorship of President Musharraf. He was firm believer of implementing hard power in his policies. While Barrack Obama believed on smart power rather opting for hard power. He gave Aid and assistance to Pakistan in every possible manner but during his presidency “Operation Neptune Spear” took place which was clear cut violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty. During the both administration 70,000 people lost their lives, infrastructure has been badly disturbed and terrorism has spread across the country.

Hypothesis Results

President Obama applied more power than President Bush

- a) Obama launched massive drone strikes
- b) Killed Osama Bin Laden in “Operation Neptune Spear
- c) Offered more aid than President Bush

Findings

- d) The diplomatic relations of Pakistan and United States of America were never based on equality
- e) US exercised her powers in every aspects to keep Pakistan on back foot due to her hegemonic power
- f) Both Presidents used coercive means towards Pakistan and WoT
- g) Due to the US war against terrorism Pakistan is suffering from economic and political related challenges and issues.

Recommendations

- a) Pakistan should address her national interests whenever establishing her foreign relations at global level
- b) Pakistan’s focus should be on establishing relations with US purely on the basis of equality
- c) It is the need of the hour that Pakistan should overcome its challenges on political and economic fronts.

Reference

- Ahmer, M. (2011). The Impact of the War Against Terror on Pakistan. *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, 35(1), 63-79.
- Akhtar, I. (2015, June 5). Pakistan Suffered \$107b loss due to Terror War. *The Nation*
- Akram, Z. (2002). Pakistani-U.S. Relations after 9/11: A Pakistani Perspective. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 115-123.
- Bowden, M. (2012). *The finish: The killing of Osama bin Laden*. Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Bukhari, S. (2011). India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan. *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, 5-11.
- Buzan, B., & Lawson, G. (2013). The global transformation: The nineteenth century and the making of modern international relations. *International studies quarterly*, 57(3), 620-634.
- Cantalapiedra, G. (2003). Engagement or Compellence: *US Policy Choices in North Korea Crises*. UNISCI Discussion Paper
- Colucci, L. (2009). Grand Strategy Transformed: 9/11 and the Birth of Crusading Realism. In *The Impact of 9/11 on Politics and War* (pp. 167-176). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Corera, G. (2006). *Shopping for bombs: Nuclear proliferation, global insecurity, and the rise and fall of the AQ Khan network*. Oxford University Press.

- Deibel, T. (2007). *Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorrien, G. (2013). *Imperial designs: Neoconservatism and the new pax Americana*. Routledge.
- Firdousi, Z. A. (1988). *Eagle Over Pakistan*. Lahore: Book Traders.
- Frankel, J. (1968). *The Making of Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Decision-Making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frazier, B. (2019). *What is Foreign Policy? Definitions and Examples*. (Dot Dash) <https://www.ThoughtCO.Com.foreign-policy-definations-examples-4178057>
- Gibson, H. (1944). *The road to foreign policy*. Philadelphia: Doubleday, Doran, and Co. Inc.
- Gusterson, H. (2019). Drone warfare in Waziristan and the new military humanism. *Current Anthropology*, 60(S19), S77-S86.
- Haqqani, H. (2013). *Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, The United States, and an*. New York: BBS Public Affairs.
- Herspring, D. R. (2008). *Rumsfeld's wars: The arrogance of power* (p. 71108). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Herspring, D. R. (2008). *Rumsfeld's wars: The arrogance of power* (p. 71108). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Hill, C. (2003). *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hussain, Z. (2012). *No-Win War: The Paradox of U.S.-Pakistan Relations in Afghanistan's Shadow*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, L. (1982) *Explaining Foreign Policy*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Kandel, M. (2021, September 10). 2001 - 2021: How September 11 Changed the United States. *Institut Montaigne*. Retrieved February 8, 2022, from <https://www.institutmontaigne.org/en/blog/2001-2021-how-september-11-changed-united-states>
- Kissinger, H., & Wellings, V. (1977). *American foreign policy* (p. 122). Royal Victorian Institute for the Blind Tertiary Resource Service.
- Krauthammer, C. (2000). American power-For what? A symposium. *Commentary*, 109(1), 34-35.
- Kupchan, C. A., & Trubowitz, P. L. (2007). Dead center: The demise of liberal internationalism in the United States. *International Security*, 32(2), 7-44.
- Lind, J., & Wohlforth, W. C. (2019). The future of the liberal order is conservative: A strategy to save the system. *Foreign Aff.*, 98, 70.
- Mazzetti, M. (2013, April 6). A Secret Deal on Drones, Sealed in Blood. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 23, 2022, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/07/world/asia/origins-of-cias-not-so-secret-drone-war-in-pakistan.html>
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2010). The gathering storm: China's challenge to US power in Asia. *The Chinese journal of international politics*, 3(4), 381-396.
- Neack, L. (2008). *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Obama, B. (2009, December 1). Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan. *The White House*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-address-nation-way-forward-afghanistan-and-pakistan>
- Obama, B. (2009, January 1). Remarks by the President in the address to the nation on the way forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan. New York, New York, USA.
- ONDER, M. A. (2020, May 05). The Comparison of United States National Security Strategy Documents, Released in 2015 in Obama-Period and Released in 2017 in Trump-Period. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Review*, 1 (5) 40-50.

- Purkiss, J., & Serle, J. (2017, January 17). Obama's Covert Drone War in Numbers: Ten Times More Strikes Than Bush. *The Bureau of Investigative Journalism*. Retrieved March 12, 2022, from <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2017-01-17/obamas-covert-drone-war-in-numbers-ten-times-more-strikes-than-bush>
- Rabbi, F. (2012). War against Terrorism and its Repercussions for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 71-90.
- Rice, C. (2000). Promoting the national interest. *Foreign Aff.*, 79, 45.
- Robert O. Blake, J. (2009, September 9). The Obama Administration's Policy on South Asia. Washington, DC, Washington, DC, USA.
- The Bureau of Investigative Journalism. (2011). *The Bush Years: Pakistan Strikes 2004- 2009*. [online.] Available from: <http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2011/08/10/thebush-years-2004-2009/> [Accessed 5 May 2022]
- Venkataramani, M.S. (1984). *The American Role in Pakistan*. Lahore: Allied Press
- Waltz Kenneth, N. (1975). Theory of International Relations. *Handbook of Political Science*, 8, 1-85.
- Zakaria, F. (2008). *The Post-American World*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ziring, L. (2003). *Pakistan: At the crosscurrent of history*. Oneworld.