
Pakistan-United States Strategic Relations: Understanding the Formation of Alliance with US in Pakistan Perspective after 9/11

Dr. Imran Khan

Email: imranzada1987@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v4i1.2585>

Abstracts

The incident of 9/11 has changed the dynamics of the global world. Once US demands started when President Bush and his cabinet reached to the conclusion that Al-Qaeda has been involved in brutal attacks on World Trade Centre and Pentagon located at New York and Virginia respectively. After the conclusion they announced their strategic level strategy in combating terrorism publicly. In this particular strategy they have announced that all countries across the globe that are harboring and sponsoring terrorism are enemies to USA. For this purpose, Afghanistan and Iraq became the major target for Bush Administration. Pakistan became feasible option for USA to reach out to Afghanistan in this regard because Pakistan advantages in many aspects over other regional countries. US made alliance with Pakistan purely based on securing her national interests, there were many factors involved which pushed them to make alliance with Pakistan. Similarly, Pakistan has its desired goals and objectives through which she has achieved it through US. She has not alternative options in hands, she cannot join Chinese nor Russian bloc because of US hegemony. The Bush administration has clearly mentioned that either you are with us or the terrorists so Pakistan immediately joined US sponsored war against terrorism. The economic condition of the country was very weak the democratic government of Nawaz Sharif was overthrown and replaced by dictatorial reign of President Musharraf. Pakistan wanted to boost the economic conditions and military assistance through USA to balance out the power in the region. On the other hand Pakistan wanted peaceful resolution of Kashmir for this purpose she needed powerful country to support her stance at both regional and global levels. The other important aspect of Pakistan's going in alliance was that President Musharraf wanted to legitimize his government through the help of USA.

Keywords: Pakistan, USA, Alliance, Foreign Policy

Introduction:

After deep understanding of the different elements which led Bush administration to seek assistance of Pakistan. It is very imperative to dig out the striking aspects, insights and causes which pushed President Musharraf to extend his support and cooperation towards America after the incident of 9/11. Here some important questions will be answered for example Why Pakistan went against the self-installed government of Taliban after the withdrawal of USSR? This cooperation and support with America was imposed or President Musharraf willingly sided with America? Was this decision difficult for Pakistan in its true spirits? What were the main and concerns which forced President Musharraf to fight American imposed war on terrorism?

Once US demands started when President Bush and his cabinet reached to the conclusion that Al-Qaeda has been involved in brutal attacks on World Trade Centre and Pentagon located at New York and Pentagon respectively. After the conclusion they announced their strategic level strategy

in combating terrorism publicly. In this particular strategy they have announced that all countries across the globe that are harboring and sponsoring terrorism are enemies to USA. For this purpose, Afghanistan and Iraq became the major target for Bush Administration. Pakistan became feasible option for USA to reach out to Afghanistan in this regard because Pakistan advantages in many aspects over other regional countries (Woodward, 2002). These aspects were the geographic and ethnic links of Pakistan with Afghanistan, real time information due to Pakistan military and political support in Afghanistan with Taliban and other Jihadi networks. Bush Administration logically put Pakistan on top of her most important ally in war against terrorism. They immediately demanded President Musharraf to stop transmission and all activities of Al-Qaeda within Pakistan as well as in Afghanistan as well, discontinue diplomatic ties with Taliban regime, freeing of all assets of Taliban, stoppage of fuel supplies from Pakistan to Afghanistan, provide the information to US intelligence agency about each and every activity of Al-Qaeda and Taliban, to allow US to conduct air strikes on Al-Qaeda and Taliban while using Pakistan air bases, to provide safe bases to US troops within Pakistan territory, strong condemnation was demanded from Pakistan for 9/11 incidence, to stop support to all those who are against the US interests and to provide positive response to the US offer in war against terrorism (Rauf, 2012). President Musharraf on September 19, 2001 addressed the nation. During his address to the nation he clarified each and everything to the people of Pakistan regarding US demands. He stated “there are three important things in which America is asking for our help. First is the intelligence and information exchange second is the support in the use of airspace and the third is that they are asking for the logistic support from us” (Blake, 2009)

However, it was very difficult for Pakistan to take decisive decision against the US demands. It has involved many factors which provided tough time for President Musharraf. First and the most important one was Pashtuns, they share border with Afghanistan with same language and ethnicity. On the other side another province of Pakistan named Balochistan has soft corners in their hearts for Afghanistan and for the people of Afghanistan (Ahmer, 2003). The decision of going into alliance was provoking public sentiments against the government of Musharraf. Second, Pakistan being firm representative and most important country in the Muslim world has the responsibility on her shoulders to protect another Muslim country from brutal attacks. Third one was Pakistan choosing US side was like going against their self-established and pro Pakistani government in Afghanistan. Fourth, Pakistan was going through economic turmoil and she could not afford another war in its neighborhood which can impact their destabilized economy to the worst extent. Fifth majority of public sentiments were totally anti American and they were supporting Taliban regime on the basis of religion and ethnicity. Sixth, due to past bad and unreliable experiences of Pakistan with US people from all phase of life were not in favor of Pakistan’s alliance with USA (Cheema, 2005).

Due to immense pressure from US side Pakistan immediately condemned the terrorist attacks conducted on World Trade Center and Pentagon, and stated that it as “most brutal and horrible attack” (Musharraf, 2001). Musharraf decided to side with America calling it was in the interest of Pakistan to join US Sponsored war on terror. After Musharraf statement of siding with Afghanistan, when Secretary of the State Collin Powell briefed President Bush that President Musharraf has accepted all demands he was surprised and stated “It looks like you got it all” (Woodard, 2002). President Bush knew that some of the demands which were put on the table for Pakistan were bargaining chips, for example the constant demand of “condemn the September 11 attacks and curb all domestic expressions of support for terrorism against the US” and partner countries. He knew that these kinds of demands would be difficult to practice (Woodward, 2002). President Musharraf later on justified the decision of cooperating with US in dismantling terrorist and terrorist organizations he told that this decision has been taken on the basis of beliefs of Islam, justice principles purely based on wisdom. He said that, “Where national interests are at stake, the

decision should be taken with wisdom and sagacity and it is not the question of cowardice or bravery". He further elaborated "Pakistan comes first and everything else is secondary". To calm down the sentiments of the public he stated that his initial response to this entire episode was aggressive than he thought about it with cool mind. He justified "Bravery without an element of wisdom is foolishness" He was referring to a Quranic verse which explains, "Wisdom is the best of all bounties of God" (Lutz and Lutz, 2013)

Reasons behind Pakistan's Cooperation with US

Many Political Scientists and renowned philosophers has classified the causes of Pak-US cooperation in broader categories in war against terrorism, but when it comes to Pakistan's cooperation with US some of them lacks in providing empirical evidence to deal with the causes in proper manner. Many writers have described Pakistan's isolationism as main stimulus factors behind the alliance with US in war against terrorism (Chambers, 2002). According to many researchers point of view it is not a single independent variable but infect it is the part of another variable for example "non- availability of alternative options". If we take this argument a little further as consider whether this was the cause of cooperation, then before the incident of 9/11, why Pakistan did not Pakistan diverted its foreign policy towards Afghanistan (Taliban and Militants) in order to save themselves from Isolation. President Clinton, despite his pressure put on Pakistan to change its foreign policy towards Afghanistan as he has offered handsome economic aid and prolonged political partnership, Pakistan refusal played critical part in his offer. President Bush, later on during his early days of presidency request Pakistan to reconsider its foreign policy; Pakistan reply was Big No to his request (Kux, 2000). Hence isolationism or any other single independent variable has played its critical role in President Musharraf's decision to side with in war against terrorism. In reality it was combination of different factors which forced Pakistan to cooperate with US in dismantling terrorism. Coming to the main theme of the causes of cooperation it involved many entities like kinds and nature of choice, economic and military assistance, safeguarding of national strategic assets whether its nuclear or missile program, Kashmir dispute, Indian factor and Musharraf own government which was acquired under the coup. These were the hardcore points which surrendered President Musharraf in front of American demands. President Musharraf during his speech to the nation on September 19, 2002 identified some of these points:

"We in Pakistan are facing a critical situation perhaps as critical as the events in 1971. If we make the wrong decisions our vital interests will be harmed. Our critical concerns are our sovereignty, second our economy, third our strategic assets (nuclear and missile), and forth Kashmir cause. All four will be harmed if we make the wrong decision" (Musharraf, 2001)

Here we will be discussing Pakistan's causes to cooperate with US in war against terrorism in detail.

Lack of Alternative options

Throughout the history nations has changed their strategies according to the situation due to happenings of unique events in International arena. Pakistan after the 9/11 incident was going through tough economic situations and politico-strategic compulsions, which left no option for her and it had to comply with US demands of support. The answers of this question have to be answered whether this decision was imposed on Pakistan or Pakistan willingly joined the war against terrorism. It was forced decision which was imposed on Pakistan which can be justified through the following:

Firstly, President Bush, in his famous speech to the nation on September 20, 2001, made it clear and conveyed the message to the whole world by stating that "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make: Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorist" (Bruijn, 2006). Pakistan's exemption through this statement was not possible. So President Musharraf had to make

critical decision to go as Ally state or to become enemy of the US in war against terrorism. During the United Nations Security Council meeting Collin Powell former Secretary of State told that US has made it clear to Pakistan that “the time to act was now” (Agathangelou and Ling, 2005). Therefore, President Musharraf extended his help and cooperation towards US in war against terrorism. According to many researchers if Pakistan had not provided the due support to US it would face huge troubles and disastrous situation, may be similar to Afghanistan. During the Principle Committee meeting which was headed by Condoleezza Rice, she stated that, “If Pakistan decided not to help the United States; it too would be at risk” (Palit, 2004). Secondly, all the powerful countries of the Muslim world including Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Turkey and Syria plus the big players in international politics like China, Russia and European Union immediately extended their support in favor of America. Beside their support USA passed resolution in UN General Assembly and UN Security Council to punish all terrorist organizations and their leaders who were involved in 9/11 brutal attacks (Booth and Dunne, 2002). On September 19, 2002 General Pervez Musharraf to the nation said:

“But we do know that whatever the United States intentions might be, they have the support of the UN Security Council and the General Assembly in the form of a resolution. This is a resolution for war against terrorism and this is the resolution for punishing those who support terrorism. Islamic countries have supported this resolution. This situation has been prevalent in the outside world” (Musharraf, 2001).

Thirdly, the main cause of Pakistan’s isolation in the international environment in pre 9/11 era was the negative image. Which assured President Musharraf to play vital role as coalition partner in war against terrorism, otherwise deadly clouds of being declared “rogue state” were lurking on Pakistan. It clearly suggested that Pakistan through this policy has successfully avoided the US strategy of preemptive strikes over other nations. Pakistan was facing severe problems after conducting successful nuclear attacks in 1998 which equaled the “Balance of Power” in this region. Others problems included Pakistan support to Taliban government after USSR withdrawal, corruption issues, weak economic conditions, support to freedom fighters in Kashmir, Kargil crisis and implementing dictatorship after overthrowing democratic government of Nawaz Sharif in 1999 (Shah, 2002). Fourthly, the attitude of Taliban’s towards the international environment tilted the foreign policy directions of Pakistan, despite the fact that Taliban’s were brainchild of Pakistan’s military establishment it changed the total policy towards Afghanistan in days (Fraser, 2019). The GHQ and Inter Service Intelligence (ISI) were penetrating the scheme of things that they were constantly directing Prime Minister Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif regarding their foreign policy towards Afghanistan (Akhtar, 2008). Fifthly, the decision of siding with Afghanistan or USA was relatively difficult for President Musharraf. In real sense Pakistan did not had any viable choices after the devastation which was witnessed at World Trade Center and Pentagon. On the other hand, there was definite anger in the public, international media was showing no mercy towards Taliban and Al-Qaeda and the mounting pressure of US administration was causing major problems too (Yamin, 2015).

All these entities put Pakistan in a strangle situation and it has left with no options rather than siding with US in war against terrorism. Pakistan immediately abandoned Taliban in immense pressure cooker situation. Everyone knew that if Pakistan did not play front line role in war against terrorism, it will face severe consequences including possible attacks. Therefore, Pakistan avoided the policy of the Taliban and it showed flexibility in her policy. It did not repeat the blunders as Taliban has committed. Moreover, President Pervez Musharraf has highlighted the same issues in his address to the nation, “I am worried about Pakistan only. I am the Supreme Commander of Pakistan and I give top priority to the defense of Pakistan. Defense of any other country comes later” (Musharaff, 2001).

Economic Assistance

It is one of the most important features on modern day politics where economically weak nations are heavily dependent of other nations of the world. This structure has created neo-imperialism in contemporary politics in which the economic dependency is playing the role of military, political and cultural imperialism. The countries having stable and strong economy propagated this dependency through different sort of international agencies to achieve their objectives. This forces other nations to fluctuate their policies according to the wishes of the donor country (Galtung, 1971). The same narrative can be applied on Pakistan's economic situation throughout its history. The basic transformation of the infrastructure of Pakistan's economy since its independence has been haunted by average growth rate. Different international donor funding agencies like IMF, ADB, WB, DFID (Now FCDO) and UN has played vital role in stabilizing the infrastructure. Pakistan has received 53 billion USD from these donor agencies from 1960 till 2000. Furthermore, Lawrence Zring in his research work further elaborates the dependency of Pakistan's economic situation on "the funds made available by the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the United States, which has offered to compensate Pakistan for much of its cost in the war on terrorism" (Zring, 2003).

These donor agencies have close relations with the US and Pakistan has always been adjusting its policies according to the dictations of these donor partners. We can conclude hypothesis on the above statement that if Pakistan does not extend its support and assistance towards America in war against terrorism? Definitely US being the main financier would pull major multimillion reform projects in Infrastructure, Energy, Education and Institutional Capacity building from Pakistan. It will be a great setback for the stability of Pakistan.

For example, if we critically analyze the decade of 1990s, the focus of these major donors were drastically shifted. They totally ignored the role of economic development of Pakistan resulted the increase proportion of borrowing money which was mainly used in non-development budgets. The outlays of defense expenditure grew up which directly impacted the adjustment in the development budgets. The outlays share in the development budget fell drastically to 13% in 2000 which was 13% in 1980s. It caused severe constraints in debt related issues which caused severe problems in the implementation of development projects. The drastic decline in infrastructure related expenditure impacted the private sector to a heavy extent (Zring, 2003 p 336). It all happened because of the non-availability of funds from US and other donor agencies. In simple words the absence of US funded donor agencies deteriorated the economic conditions along with infrastructure of Pakistan. The government of Pakistan during 1999 faced serious issues which caused some deteriorating features which includes hostile looming defaults, constant falling down of revenues, issue of submitting external payments, debt burden, poverty issues, failing to comply with international indicators and poor governance (Hussain, 2012).

In addition to the above mentioned problems, US imposed heavy sanctions on Pakistan during the era of 1990s. It automatically reduced the strategic level communication between the both countries to boost up the economic related conditions of Pakistan. It was during the cold war when US focused its policies on South Asia to contain communism Pakistan became the most trusted ally for them. After the disintegration of USSR in early 1990s after the completion of US objectives in this region Pakistan became suddenly the most sanctioned ally out of nowhere (Wizarat, 2001). It was because of the imposed sanctions of US on Pakistan the cooperation between both countries was almost frozen on the economic fields. Mr. Wolfowitz, published report from Washington has pointed out that the US assistance before the start of war on terror was below 4 Million USD per year as compared to President Bush Administration who released 700 million USD to Pakistan on yearly basis (Ahmer, 2011).

Moreover, the above mentioned challenges for Pakistan while dealing with its economic related situation and its high dependency over foreign funding and Aid especially from USA. Pakistan has

no choice but to side with USA in war against terrorism. The cooperation with US on becoming front line ally in war against terrorism was imperative for the survival and the stability of Pakistan. Therefore, Moonis Ahmer in his research work writes “The U-turn taken by Pakistan on its Afghan policy resulted in domestic opposition but the government decided to continue with the policy to support Washington in order to save itself from predictable American action and to promise secure economic benefits” (Ahmar, 2001).

Military Assistance

Military problem has been a key issue with Pakistan since its independence. It was considered as huge weakness for the existence of Pakistan due to historical rivalry and aggressive attitude of Indian government towards Pakistan. After the partition majority of the defense related possessions were occupied by India. The military hardware with Pakistan to protect its border was not enough. In order to protect its border from Indian aggression Pakistan military had to take fresh start from the scratch to match Indian Army (Alavi, 1998). These potential threats have haunted Pakistan on several occasions, therefore the leader from military and political wing have been in constant search to modernize and equip its army (Alavi, 1998 p 1551). This assistance in military aid has created several implications on Pakistan such as a) The officials of US military maintained close ties with the military establishment of Pakistan b) During the late 1990s it has provided every possible opportunity for the military establishment to play its role in every aspect in context to Pakistan especially politics and economy c) The utmost dependency of Pakistan’s military over US aid has pushed President Musharraf to be front line state in war against terrorism (Ganguly, 2001). According to Pakistan’s perspective, the event of 9/11 has provided a golden opportunity to improve its military related environment. It was in dire need of replacing the out dated weaponry with modernized weapon systems. One the part of military regime and its willingness to update its military related weapons has attributed a lot in going within alliance with US. The main purpose of this alliance was to boost its military equipment. The issue of Pakistan’s military out dated weaponry has been discussed by former Chief of the Army Staff General Rtd, Karamat with US delegation when they visited Pakistan in 1998. During his meeting with the American officials he explained the sanction of US administration over spare parts on Pakistan Air Force; he stated that due to this problem we have lost 16 PAF pilots. These sanctions have also dented the capacity building of young Pakistani army officers; they could not visit US to receive modern trainings anymore. General Karamat also explained that he was the last army officer who received proper capacity building from “US Army’s Command and General Staff College at Fort Leaven Worth” who then became Chief of the Army staff (Tallbot, 2010). The main cause of this pathetic situation was the US refusal to sell military related spare parts, modern equipment and limited number of jet fighter in shape of F-16 in which Pakistan has made advance payments of 476 million USD (Grimmett, 2008).

Thus, the only way Pakistan could overcome its defense related issues is to build strong linkages with US. For the same purpose, even before the incident of 9/11 it has extended its due cooperation towards US by sending hundreds of troops in different UN peace keeping missions in different parts of the world. Pakistan has deployed 5000 army personnel to Kingdom Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates during the Gulf war in 1990. When US troops were targeted in Somalia from 1992-1994, Pakistan sent military troops to Somalia in order to protect US marines from attacks. It has deployed 5000 military troops in Sierra Leone, Congo and Kosovo from November 2001 to participate in the peace building process. It shows the dedication of Pakistan that even during the era of unstable Pak-US diplomatic relations, Pakistan extended its cooperation in order to overcome over the problems it has been facing in weaponry and defense related side (Kronstadt, 2004). Another basic interest of Pakistan behind this close alliance was to rescue those military officers who were fighting along with Taliban during the civil war in Afghanistan. They got trapped after the US invasion of Afghanistan. President Musharraf was in difficult position because

American troops were constantly pounding on Kunduz area of Afghanistan where Pakistani military personals were trapped in (Kukreja, 2003). It was the prime responsibility of President Musharraf being COAS to protect army officers and soldiers. We can conclude that the deterioration occurred in weaponry in Pakistan army, dependency of Pakistan over US military aid, non-availability of Spare parts with PAF and rescue of the army officers which were trapped in Kunduz forced President Musharraf to extend its cooperation towards US in combating war against terrorism in Afghanistan.

Kashmir Cause Struggle

Since British transferred its powers in 1947 through which Pakistan received its independence after great deal of struggle. Soon after the independence a chronic in form of Kashmir rose to the scenes as military flash point between Pakistan and India. It is quite clear that Pakistan is integral part of the Kashmir dispute. It has also believed in the liberation of Kashmir according to the wishes of Kashmiri people. Pakistan has fought 1948 and 1965 war over this dispute. Beside Kashmir Pakistan and India has shared hostile situation in shape of Kargil crisis during May to July 1999 (Joeck, 2008). It is believed that the failure of mediation and deterrence during Kargil war could lead to a full fledged nuclear war between both Pakistan and India. USA played pivotal role in bringing both countries to negotiate over Kashmir issue (Limaye, 2002).

The importance of Kashmir issue can be elevated from certain facts that Pakistan kept on allotting its main and precious resources towards defense expenditures. The national interest in Pakistan foreign policy, Kashmir holds integral part and its foreign policy mainly “revolves around the primary issue of Kashmir” (Akram, 2002). Such determination to the liberation of Kashmir cause has three major factors: First, Pakistan considers Kashmir a vital territory for its security, railway system and two main roads located at West area of Pakistan are parallel to Kashmir. So Kashmir in Indian occupation is direct threat to Pakistan’s security. Second, Pakistan being agricultural country is banking on three major rivers which is originating from the areas of Kashmir. Manga Dam which is imperative for Pakistan’s energy sectors is also situated in Kashmir. It gives Pakistan immense pressure in economic terms to resolve the issue of Kashmir. Therefore, Sir Zafarullah Khan foreign minister of Pakistan presented the case of Kashmir in the following manner:

“The possession of Kashmir can add nothing to the economy of India. On the other hand, it is vital for Pakistan. If Kashmir should accede to India, Pakistan might as well, from both the economic and strategic point of views, become a feudatory of India or cease to exist as an independent sovereign state” (Akram, 2002 p.30).

Third and most important is that both Kashmiri’s and Pakistani’s share the same religion and cultural values. They have brotherly relations with the people of occupied Kashmir. Therefore, they people of Pakistan from all phase of life throughout the history from occupation has soft corner for the people of Kashmir against the brutal occupation of India (Haqqani, 2003).

It is because of the mentioned reasons Kashmir has gained strategic importance that even no political or military figure cannot afford to ignore Kashmir cause on regional and international arena. For the same purpose President Musharraf while addressing to the nation stated that Kashmir will remain main point of concern in his policies. He was emphasizing on to continue his policies in support of Kashmiri struggle for their freedom (Musharraf, 2001). Furthermore, President Musharraf once again raised the issue of Kashmir on international forum in a meeting with then US Secretary of State, Colin Powell. During Musharraf meeting with Colin Powell he stated about the future relations of Pakistan and India “would require that the Kashmir dispute is resolved in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people” (Hussain, 2008). President Musharraf also raised the issue of Kashmir during his address to the 56th session of UN General Assembly on November 10, 2001 in New York. He identified Kashmir dispute as the causing factor of terrorism and point of contention in South Asia region. He further stated:

“We need to ask ourselves what really causes extreme acts around the world. To my mind these are the unresolved political disputes the world over, disputes in Bosnia, Kosovo, Palestine, Kashmir and other places. Unfortunately, all these disputes involve Muslims, and more sadly the Muslims happened to be victims at all, which tends to give a religious tinge to these otherwise political disputes. The lack of progress in resolution of these disputes has created in them a sense of deprivation, hopelessness and powerlessness. The frustration gets even worse when such disputes like Kashmir and Palestine remain unsettled, for decades, despite the United Nation’s Security Council’s resolutions” (Mahmood et al. 2003).

If Pakistan did not extend its support and cooperation as front line state in war against terrorism, President Musharraf would not have been able to highlight the terrifying issue of Kashmir in front of American Officials as well as on the floor of UN being international Organization. It can be easily assumed that the extension on Pakistan’s cooperation towards US was clear indication to draw US and International community attention towards the issue of Kashmir. It was a great opportunity for Pakistan to regain the lost trust of Western countries which was hampered during Kargil crisis. During the Kargil crisis they declared Pakistan as offenders on the basis of International Border laws. Another important point which is worthy to mention that if Pakistan did not extend its cooperation in war against terrorism, US policies would automatically have tilted towards Indian side which had the potential to give Pakistan tough times.

Securing Strategic Level Assets

Since the inception of Pakistan, security has remained top most priority whether it is at domestic or international level politics. For securing its core interests, Pakistan has always thrived to acquire and then safeguard its nuclear and missile capabilities. Pakistan made rapid strides in securing these strategic assets after the 1971 India and Pakistan war which distributed Pakistan into two pieces (Matinuddin, 1998). The acquiring and securing of Nuclear and strategic level assets has been close to Pakistan heart that all the successive governments after Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in 1970s has offered open hand to the leading scientist Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan to develop and then play his role in securing nuclear and missile systems of Pakistan. Though American sanctions were lurking on their heads if Pakistan develop nuclear program, US will declare them “rogue” or “failed state” (Matinuddin, 1998 p.17).

However, US throughout its relations with Pakistan showed it extreme concerns and hesitation towards Pakistan on becoming nuclear power due to: First, the nuclear states existing in South Asian region Pakistan and India which has been showing hostility towards each other can damage US interests in this region for example the containment of China would become difficult for them including India as their biggest goods market and US strategic interests in Central Asia and Afghanistan territories. Therefore, when Pakistan tested its nuclear blasts in controlled environment on May, 1998 and followed by the issue of Kargil made US anxious over this issue. It was President Clinton who came forward and demanded peaceful solution of this conflict in order to protect US interests in this region. This shows the strategic importance of Pakistan nuclear assets which caused panic in US including international environment as a result President Clinton imposed sanction on Pakistan after conducting successful nuclear test in 1998 (Rennack, 2003). The second reason behind US concerns was regarding Pakistan transfer of nuclear technologies to those countries which has been showing hostilities towards US “Rogue States”. The US government also accused Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan on offering nuclear technology to those states that they declared as “axis of evil” states. According to the 9/11 commission document which has identified the basic problems in Pakistan and US relations has highlighted the issue of Proliferation and it says: “On proliferation, Musharraf has repeatedly said that Pakistan does not barter with its nuclear technology. But proliferation concerns have been long-standing and very serious. Most recently, the Pakistani government has claimed not to have known that one of its nuclear weapon

developers, a national figure, was leading the most dangerous nuclear smuggling ring ever disclosed” (Falkenarth, 2004).

Moreover, President Bush, way before the incident of 9/11 showed his intent towards tackling nuclear proliferation issue alarmed Pakistan’s government authorities. It was obvious that the best measure to deal with this issue are taking unilateral military means in which dangerous countries would be targeted rather applying this formula on friendly states like India. President Bush on November 1998 during his presidential election campaign stated that, “our nation must diminish the evil attraction of nuclear weapons for rogue states by rendering them useless with missile defense. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty does nothing to gain these goals. It does not stop proliferation, especially to renegade regimes”(Talbot, 2010 pp 209-210).

The concerns and criticism of US and International community over Pakistan’s nuclear and missile program before the incident of 9/11 made Pakistan strategic decision makers to shift its nuclear assets from designated laboratories and plants to more secure and protected places. Which made President Musharraf inclined to support and help US in war against terrorism. If this decision was not taken in favor of US then there were severe threats of US targeting Pakistan nuclear assets with the help of India. It was also speculated that US has developed back up plans to dismantle Pakistan’s nuclear assets through American marines (Mehar, 2004). President Musharraf assumption regarding this issue was clearly expressed in his speech to the whole nation on September 19, 2001, during his speech he declared Pakistan’s strategic assets both nuclear and missile technology as matter of critical concerns. Pakistan clearly wanted to protect its nuclear weapons and missile systems, but the cooperation with US on war against terrorism covered the negative image of Pakistan as a nuclear power as they were supporting the issue of nuclear proliferation across the world.

Indian Factor

Security concerns when a neighbor country shows hostile intents become very important for independent states. Analyzing the geo political situation of Pakistan, security has become top priority in Indian context. The Indian hegemonic designs in the region have made security on top of the list in Pakistan’s foreign policy. The security and economic concerns during the early 1950s pushed Pakistan to join SEATO and CENTO. Through this alliance Pakistan fought war in 1980s and supported US to contain Soviet Union in Afghanistan. The support of Taliban during 1990s as a neighboring country minimized security concerns despite other consequences. It shows that Pakistan after getting independence has never compromised on its security in Indian context (Jabeen and Mazhar, 2011). The astonishing and stressful event of 9/11 made Pakistan attentive towards the Indian approach because it was constantly maligning Pakistan on terrorism card. President Musharraf has expressed his thoughts on Indian designs towards Pakistan during his address to the nation. He informed the public of Pakistan that India is itching to go into alliance with Bush Administration in war against terrorism. He stated that they wanted to declare Pakistan “Terrorist state” by taking US in confidence. He further explained that they want to sabotage the struggle of Kashmiri’s and destruction of Pakistan’s strategic assets on their hit list. While exposing the dangerous propaganda of India against Pakistan he told “If you watch their television, you will find them dishing out propaganda against Pakistan, day in and day out” (Musharraf, 2001). Therefore, the delay on Pakistan side to join hands with US in war against terrorism would have adverse effects. There was every possibility that US might declare Pakistan as “terrorist state” and the same will happen with Pakistan as did with Afghanistan. Delay in going into alliance with US would definitely jeopardize the security situation in this region. Therefore, Hassan Askari says: “Regional security imperatives also made it necessary for Pakistan not to stay aloof from the global consensus for combating terrorism. Pakistan’s failure to respond to the changed international situation would have provided its regional adversary, India, with an opportunity to pursue its agenda of affixing the label of a terrorist state on Pakistan. Some of Indian leaders and

the media revived the campaign for designating Pakistan as a terrorist state soon after US administration talked of the involvement of Osama Bin Laden in the terrorist attacks” (Rizvi, 2002). Some leading American philosophers and personals of the media knew that Indian media has been constantly twisting its narrative against Pakistan in context to the situation in Afghanistan post 9/11 crisis. They were linking this crisis with the situation in Kashmir to extract more advantage on their side. Therefore, Strobe Talbott in his research work writes; “the Indians saw what happened on September 11 as further evidence of what they had been telling the United States for years: Pakistan should be dealt with as a rogue state since it was the main principal sponsor and protector of the Taliban (Talbott, 2010 p. 213). Moreover, the strategic cooperation between the USA and India to provide check and balance over Chinese strategic designs on becoming the sole super power in next 15-20 years was considered threat to Pakistan. This situation motivated president Musharraf to support US in war against terrorism to mitigate the dangerous designs of India (Wizarat, 2001 p. 26). Thus, Pakistan could only mitigate the Indian narrative and its global propaganda against Pakistan by giving positive response in fight against terrorism which was made by US and under the umbrella of UN. If Pakistan did not respond to the call of international actors in war against terrorism, there was every possibility that India would attack Pakistan on the basis of pre-emptive strikes. The US government would be definitely in silence because they had geo strategic and economic interests closely linked with India.

Legitimacy Musharraf Regime

Since 1999, after Nawaz Sharif was overthrown from Prime Minister Office Pakistan has been ruled under the military leadership. They faced heavy backlash in regard to their legitimacy from the international community. According to military leadership this critical issue can only be resolved with the help of US, which was the sole super power in the international environment in that era. They would provide due leverage to Pakistan in their domestic and as well as in international politics as well. The unconstitutional dictatorship which continued in Pakistan after the US attack on Afghanistan needed severe legitimacy both in domestic and international politics. This desperation in legitimizing Musharraf regime can be assessed when Musharraf took charge of the government. He was not welcomed in majority of the European countries including America. President Musharraf visited fewer countries during initial five years of his reign. During the UN General Assembly meeting in autumn 2000, President Musharraf failed miserably in engaging other countries in fruitful discussions. President Musharraf during his visit also cancelled his meeting with Bangladeshi Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina Wajid which was already scheduled. The reason behind cancellation of this meeting was because Hasina Wajid was pressing the question of returning dictatorship in Pakistan. Public apology was also included in Bangladesh agenda due to the civil war killings happened in 1971. Due to this situation Musharraf “left New York as quietly as he had arrived” (Zring, 2003 p. 178) After the military takeover on October 12, 1999, US immediately imposed sanctions on Pakistan which deteriorated the relations of Pakistan and USA. Under the US law of Section 508 Public Law 108 and 108 prohibits providing any kind of direct assistance to those countries whose head of the states came into power under undemocratic means (Fani, 2004). Secondly during March 2000, When President Clinton spent few hours in Pakistan as compared to India where he spent almost a week; it was clear indication of President Clinton dissatisfaction with President Musharraf. The joint and photograph session was also avoided by President Clinton with Musharraf. In South Asian perspective, South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation meeting which was scheduled in Kathmandu was postponed on severe pressure of India. Commonwealth suspension of Pakistan membership also dented Pakistan. The European Union strongly condemned the interference of Pakistan military establishment in Pakistan’s politics. President Musharraf frustration increases when commonwealth refused to readmit “to the fold” was direct question on President Musharraf

legitimacy. The cooperation of President Musharraf on war against terror with US could legitimize his undemocratic government (Zring, 2003 p. 271).

Conclusion

To summarize the whole discussion, it can be said regarding the nature of Pakistan's choices whether it a) economic aid b) military aid c) securing strategic assets d) Kashmir conflict e) legitimacy of President Musharraf regime are the main causes which turn out to be the deciding factor of Pakistan joining the war against terrorism. Saying "YES" to Bush Administration was an imposed step rather than willing step on behalf of Pakistan. The "Realist School" of thought thoroughly explains the attitude of smaller countries reacting in such situation. It can also be applied on Pakistan keeping in mind the basics of this school of thought. In International system "Defensive Realism" explains three major characteristics which are a) Anarchy is basically the ordering principle derived from the system b) Units existing in the system has the character to pursue its security regardless of consequences c) The distribution of capabilities in terms of units differ while discussing the shape of International system. This theory explains the structure and function of the International system which dictates other states to act in particular way. In Pakistan's context this theory is fully applicable that how the structure of the system compelled Pakistan to form alliance with the global power for its ultimate survival. This section has already offered a brief understanding of critical concerns in context to Pakistan's domestic and foreign policy at the global level.

References

- Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. (2005). Power and play through poesies: Reconstructing self and other in the 9/11 commission report. *Millennium*, 33(3), 827-853.
- Ahmer, M. (2011). The Impact of the War Against Terror on Pakistan. *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, 35(1), 63-79.
- Ahmer, M. (January 1, 2003). *The World After September 11: Challenges And Opportunities*. Karachi: BCC&T.
- Akhtar, N. (2008). Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Taliban. *International Journal on World Peace*, 49-73.
- Akram, Z. (2002). Pakistani-U.S. Relations after 9/11: A Pakistani Perspective. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 115-123.
- Alavi, H. (1998). Pakistan-US military alliance. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1551-1557.
- Booth, K., & Dunne, T. (2002). Worlds in collision: terror and the future of global order.
- Bruijn, H. D. (2006). One fight, one team: the 9/11 commission report on intelligence, fragmentation and information. *Public Administration*, 84(2), 267-287.
- Chambers, M. R. (Ed.). (2002). *South Asia in 2020: Future strategic balances and alliances*. Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College.
- Cheema, P. I. (2005) The Challenge of Terrorism after September 11: A Pakistani Perspective. In a workshop *The World After September* (Vol. 1).
- Falkenrath, R. A. (2004). The 9/11 Commission Report
- Fani, D. M. I. (2004). US-Pakistan Relations after 9/11: Options and Compulsions. *op. cit*, 68.
- Fraser, A. H. (2019). Pakistan and the Taliban. *American Intelligence Journal*, 36(2), 99-107.
- Galtung, J. (1971). A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of peace research*, 8(2), 81-117.
- Ganguly, S. (2001). Putting South Asia back together again.
- Grimmett, R. F. (2008, January). US arms sales to Pakistan. Library Of Congress Washington Dc Congressional Research Service.
- Haqqani, H. (2003). Pakistan's endgame in Kashmir. *India Review*, 2(3), 34-54.

- Hussain, Z. (2008). *Frontline Pakistan: the struggle with militant Islam*. Columbia University Press.
- Hussain, Z. (2012). *No-Win War: The Paradox of U.S.-Pakistan Relations in Afghanistan's Shadow*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jabeen, M., & Mazhar, M. S. (2011). Security game: SEATO and CENTO as instrument of economic and military assistance to encircle Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 109-132.
- Joeck, N. (2008). The Kargil War and nuclear deterrence. In *Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia* (pp. 129-155). Routledge.
- Kronstadt, K. A. (2004). Pakistan-US Relations: *Congressional Research Service (CRS) Reports and Issue Briefs*.
- Kukreja, V. (2003). *Contemporary Pakistan: Political processes, conflicts and crises*. Sage.
- Kux, D. (2001). *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Limaye, S. P. (2002). Mediating Kashmir: A bridge too far. *Washington Quarterly*, 26(1), 157-167.
- Lutz, J., & Lutz, B. (2013). *Global terrorism*. Routledge.
- Mahmood, T., Wasi, N., Gul, N., & Saifuddin, M. (2002). Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Quarterly Survey: October 2001-March 2002. *Pakistan Horizon*, 55(1/2), 1-30.
- Matinuddin, K. (1998). Nuclearisation of South Asia Implications and Prospects. *REGIONAL STUDIES-ISLAMABAD*-, 16, 3-75.
- Meher, J. (2004). *America's Afghanistan war: the success that failed*. Gyan Books.
- Musharraf, P. (2001). Address by General Pervez Musharraf, president of Pakistan delivered as a broadcast on radio and television from Islamabad on September 19, 2001. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 67(24), 754.
- Palit, P. S. (2004). The 9/11 report: Reaffirming Pakistan-terrorism nexus.
- Rauf, T. (2012). US Seeks Pakistan's Assistance'. *Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, Monterey Institute for International Studies*, <http://cns.miis.edu/research/wtc01/pak>
- Rennack, D. E., & Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division. (2003, February). India and Pakistan: US Economic Sanctions. Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.
- Rizvi, H. A. (2002). Pakistan's strategic culture. *South Asia in 2020: future strategic balances and alliances*, 11, 305.
- Robert O. Blake, J. (2009, September 9). The Obama Administration's Policy on South Asia. Washington, DC, Washington, DC, USA.
- Shah, A. (2002). South Asia faces the future: Democracy on hold in Pakistan. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(1), 67-75.
- Talbott, S. (2010). *Engaging India: Diplomacy, democracy, and the bomb*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Wizarat, T. A. (2001). Pakistan-US Relations After The Cold War. *Pakistan Journal of American Studies*, 19(1-2), 21.
- Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at war*. Simon and Schuster.
- Yamin, T. (2015). Examining Pakistan's strategic decision to support the US War on Terror. *Strategic Studies*, 35(2), 113-135.
- Ziring, L. (2003). *Pakistan: At the crosscurrent of history*. Oneworld.