



UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS AFGHANISTAN AFTER 9/11 AND ITS IMPACTS ON PAKISTAN-UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP

Abdul Razzaq

*Political Science Department
University of Baluchistan
Quetta - Pakistan
razzaqdehwar@gmail.com*

Dr. Naheed Chisti

*Political Science Department
University of Baluchistan
Quetta - Pakistan*

Dr. Abdul Rahim

*Political Science Department
University of Baluchistan
Quetta - Pakistan
raheem_qta@hotmail.com (Corresponding Authority)*

Abstract:

9/11 attacks on United States were a political change in the world as United States decided to find out the fundamental root causes to eliminate the terrorist groups of the world. It was an essential for United States to work on her probe therein Osama Bin Laden admitted about this act so that United States turned to have counter terrorism for the elimination of Al-Quida. It was a time to strengthen the bilateral relations with United States through strong working process and procedure against terrorism on the soil of Afghanistan, was the deep state of Pakistan. It was a period of General Parwaiz Musharraf who responded positively; thereafter, it was shifted and pledged with continues support for the formation of peace and development of the region.

The bilateral relationship of Pakistan and United States had meaningful approach against terrorism and admitted as a strong front line ally of United States against the will of her nation. It was the main strategic partnership of Pakistan and United States. The foreign policy of United States towards Afghanistan was the most important to keep relation with Pakistan because it reflected on Pakistan directly, that's why United States promised to ease the sanctions along with military aid to Pakistan.



Key Words: Bilateral, Foreign Policy, Terrorism & Extremism.

Introduction

The focussing point “Terrorism” needs to be redefined that means to know the meaning of terror, violate the discipline and illegal act to harm event that reflects on the individual and masses. Establishing the treat and fear to create for the negative atmosphere and brings up with curiosity for unrest sight or region. The terrorist could be one or more than one who follow the negative approaches to dismantle the peace. It may be one unit, group and organization which work against the law and order situation so as to enact the self-made law.

There are two divisions of opinion to articulate the exact definition of terrorism either to accept the meaning as per religious values or in discipline of peace destruction of the world globally. Central Investigation Agency of United States believes that The group of political and social who are motivated to violate the peace against un-combatants with national or international agenda (Khan, 2006:370); however, it differs on the basis of religious approaches as a Jihad and separatists who are being called freedom fighter. The liberation armies have another meaning to go against the evil for the constructive values in the peaceful region.

Instance Turn

The planning of spreading terror was organized by terrorist group as it was to hit and dismantle the peace of United States through the plane to turn peace in to violence. The ordinary day was for the United States to work for the livings at 8:45 am when first attack was done on World Trade Centre (WTC) north tower. The certain hijacked plan (Boeing 767) flight no 175 rushed towards World Trade Centre which was renowned as an economic giant of United States and central point of business for the international community.

Thousands died in buildings and killed in streets by rushing out from their places; similarly, third target was Pentagon which was hit by another plan 77. It was a shocking news for all as Pentagon is prominent in the world due to its military strategic empowerment. It was devastating for the super power to face this terrorist attack and could not have defensive approach to stop any one of them. The next target was Pennsylvania State, had 44 people died in the plan and went for the crash. It was devised to hit the White House through plan crash but got failure to hit and went for the Pennsylvania. It was confirmed that Plans were hijacked to hit target for spreading terrorism in United States.

The US Response Over 9/11 Attacks

Historically, the American Nation has never faced this type of event that destroyed their social, economic, and political disorder in terms of affected state by terrorism. It was Pearl Harbour in 2nd World War then reoccurred in 2001 by killing more than 3000. It was a time to establish narrative against terrorism and move to follow the footsteps of ideological wars. The narrative was



to counter terrorism and devised to attack on Afghanistan. United States was clear about Al-Qaida which has already been expected to attack on the embassy of United States in Kenya and Tanzania. Moreover, Al-Qaida was blamed for attacking on United States and decided to go against of Al-Qaida in terms of counter terrorism. It was called War against Terror (WAT) against the terrorist in the world and it could not be possible to implement without the help of international community.

That was the period of George W Bush to decide about the response of this attack. The historical statement of President of George W Bush was addressed on September 15, 2001. It was said that United States would take revenge against the terrorist who tried to wreck up New York and their abrupt attacks would be answered on their soil as well as give them a lesson that United States would face this challenge and accept as a war dynamically. United States foreign policy initiated to have integral part to United the world against the Terrorists and have strategically multilateral status against Al-Qaida.

The U.N & World Community Response

Firstly, it was shared with United Nation to get resolution from the Security Council to condemn the terrorist attacks on United States. Three of the following resolutions were passed through the acceptance of terrorist attacks on United States/ the certain points were discussed under the shelter of United Nation Security Council. It was well established and endorsed by international community against the war against terrorism academically. 1368 resolution was proposed and passed on 12 September, 2001, secondly 173 was also determined and passed on September 28, 2001 and thirdly on September 28, 2001 therein article 177 qualified for the implementation.

United States passed resolution and asked an international community to play integral role for the eradication of Terrorism. The terror financing was another subject to be endorsed for the implementation plan that was dictated by national Security Council against the terrorist organizations. It was an important phase that national narrative was formulated new dimension against terrorism through the support of international community. The national war was changed into international was with device foreign policy of United States. The concept was established that Taliban government went for the support of Terrorism and the soil of Afghanistan was used against the west. The International community specially England, France, Germany. Australia and Japan promised with United States to be in supporting mode against the terrorism/ the consideration of Article 5 evoked by North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO) therein a member of it is attacked, would be considered as an attack on NATO. Historically.

It was a first time that NATO evoked its article against terrorism and United States has strong successful foreign policy. Australia, New Zealand, and United States (ANZUS) had treaty for the common enemy through integrity for the purposeful image of trilateral relationship. It was an effort of United States to counter the terrorism with the coalition partners of United States. It was planned to establish counter terrorism strategy for the formation of War Against terror.



Pakistan's Role in "Mission Enduring Freedom"

The message of President George Bush was the threat to all the nations, in particular Pakistan was subjected strategically. The statement was to be with United States or giving shelter to terrorists. That period was very difficult for Pakistan to take any decision as Pakistan had strong foreign relations with Afghanistan and favoured Taliban's regime but unfortunately Pakistan has strong foreign relations with United States since her independence. Secondly it was difficult for Pakistan to go against of super power to confront as terrorism took strong footsteps against United States and international community.

That was difficult to deny the fact that Al-Qaida was not involved and Taliban government was not housing them in Afghanistan. The admittance of terror attack by Al- Qaida leadership was problematic for Pakistan.

The geo-strategic position of Pakistan has been very important for the international community as Pakistan was an important for any type of existence in this region. Pakistan was already a foot soldier of United States against Russia, as the proxy war of United States was well managed to confront the Russian against the will of regional powers and helped United States from distance. Thirdly Pakistan was previously engaged in instability of political and financial threats which had been devaluating the Pakistan's economy, social, cultural aspects. Pakistan was in problematic situation of international policies therein foreign policy of Pakistan found threats to manage the super power of the world.

The image of being with United States could ease the replication of Islamic extremism which was the pin objective of India to blame Pakistan as a terrorist country and started lobbying against Pakistan to put them in isolation through entitling as a Terrorist state so as to shelter her black policy in Kashmir.

It was difficult to have systematic settlement with the foreign relation of United States and Afghanistan. The President of United States George W Bush acclaimed Taliban to handover Al-Qaida leadership for getting them on trial for the terrorist attacked in United States. Secondly, Taliban had to close all types of camps which were used for the terrorist acts and spreads animosity in the world against the west. Thirdly, United States soldiers had to be given access to the terrorist camp to dismantle their leaderships and help them for the elimination of nurseries of antagonist approaches. Taliban were to build the trust of foreigners and provide them security.

These above points were to negotiate on diplomatic level with Afghanistan but fortunately the demands of United States were rejected by Taliban. Mulla Mohammad Umar rejected to hand over the Osama Bin Laden as he was considered guest in Afghanistan which could have been against their culture to send back a man who seeks shelter.

It was a time to anticipate as a mediator between Taliban and United States. United States



was forcing Pakistan to deal with Taliban and Pakistan went for negotiation, moreover, Pakistan tried a lot to manage this trilateral relation. Once side United State was trying to occupy the foreign policy of Pakistan so as to tilt towards United States, secondly it was time to deprive form the statement of deep state. Furthermore, the political and diplomatic dialogue went in vain and United States was ready for the response within period due to her public pressure.

Reactionary, Pakistan was subjected by United States as Pakistan had to cut off the logistic support of Al-Qaida and had deep observation on the physical movements of the members of Al-Qaida. Pakistan had to be alignment with United States on the basis of intelligence sharing and required strategic locations for the air operations through the naval source of United States. Pakistan was to stop the diplomatic support to the Taliban and Pakistan had to be fixing the diplomatic co-operation against the War on terror. The event of 9/11 provoked new fear in the world in particular international establishment empowered its signals and indicators to impact on the regional establishments.

The President of Pakistan General Pervez Musharraf assembled the public opinion for the formation of foreign policy of Pakistan. The pressure of international political system could not have been resistible for Pakistan as it was already said either to be with terrorism or favour international community to counter the terrorism which would be against Taliban and Pakistan, was the only country to give possible access to the United States into Afghanistan.

The irrational division of political system of Pakistan brought new drift between the rightist and left groups of government. The religious parties were not willing to surrender in front of United States and help Afghan government against United States, similarly, government had to be in favour so as to extract the national interest of states. It was well analysed by the establishment of Pakistan and agreed with United States to accept the demand of international community. (Jabeen; Mzahar; Goraya, 2010).

The decision was taken in favour of United States to support against the extremism and terrorism, moreover, it was deliberate sense of difficulty to be adopted willingly by Pakistan. The upmost question was for to save the national interest of Pakistan as Indian lobbying commenced a great third world war fare against Pakistan internationally. Being Muslim it was difficult for General Musharraf to keep operational judgements against Afghanistan but it was the matter of geo- political to geo- economic warfare in this region. It resulted FATA and Religious movement against of Pakistan government which started militarily resistance against operation in Afghanistan and shifted this war from Afghanistan to Pakistan.

General Musharraf in his speech of 19 September 2001 declared.

"Some scholars and religious leaders are inclined towards making emotional decision. They are poised to create dissensions and damage the country. There



is no reason why this minority should be allowed to hold the majority as a hostage" (Jones, 2002:1).

Pakistan's Weakness in Negotiations

The dealing with United States was criticised by the intellectual. It was important for Pakistan for the better option of gaining the credibility of United State. Pakistan decided with the pressure of international community in particular United States. The foreign Policy of Pakistan was already confronting the nuclear issue and Kashmir freedom war to get right to vote for the Free State. Pakistan could have dealt better but government took decision with the help of short target policy while negotiation could have brought better result orientation of Kashmir and nuclear defines policy. It was an important to understand the strategic position of Pakistan which has been very important for United States to get hold of this area and confront the terrorism and extremism. Pakistan was the gateway for the West to penetrate into the sight and execution of her foreign policy (Faruqi, 2008).

Critically, realism took place in bilateral relation of Pakistan and United States. Pakistan had her own national interest, similarly, United States was in opinion to get revenge from the terrorists and extremists. The global agenda was divided into different opinions for the formation of individual policy to confront the international terrorism with their own definitions and it was the point to distract the international agenda with the division of opinions. Pakistan had strong relationship with Taliban government as the closest neighbour and traditionally friend state , therein Pakistan wanted United States to have formal but lenient diplomatic relations with Afghanistan and avoid any force to distract the relationship of Pakistan and Afghanistan, in addition to know about the status of Kashmir which was not prominent for United States because Kashmir had direct link with India that has defence packed with United States so that Pakistan and United States had parting of opinion but together in war against terror (Faruqi, 2008).

US Pressure to "Do More" & Afghan blame game over Pakistan

The language barrier took place between Pakistan and United States in particular war against terror as well as strong diction brought trust deficits in bilateral relations. The foreign office was failed to deliver soft and diplomatic language for the trust building to deal with common agenda. "Do more" was a narrative from United States against Pakistan to get empowered in Afghanistan. It was strange that war of United States and Afghanistan was shifted in Pakistan and Pakistan was blamed to do more critically.

It was successful diplomatic move of United States along with her allies. Pakistan faced diplomatic challenges and deactivated the supply line which was used by United States. It was shaped after the period of 2011 as Raymond Davis, Salala Check posts, Osama Bin Laden, F/16 Issue, Memo gate, Dr. Abdul Qadeer and Dr. Afia Siddique case. These cases had brought diplomatic contradiction between Pakistan and United States. The period of war was terrible against terror for Pakistan blamed for housing the terrorists and shelters the sleeping cells to devise



the terrorist activities against the world. Similarly it was a paradigm shift to a new history of Pakistan which was occupied by Terrorist organizations, moreover, Pakistan was forced to work on boarder management and commence fencing between Pakistan and Afghanistan (Rana, Gunaratna, 2007).

Pakistan was always blamed for keeping relation with Afghanistan to house the terrorism and extremism by India. United States also determined to blame Pakistan for supporting the irrelevant groups or Pakistan is failed to stop terrorism and extremism and Pakistan always tried to defend herself though suffered more than 80,000 causalities and infrastructural damages of the state. International community was not willing to trust Pakistan and Pakistan got failure in diplomatic move. Pakistan could not clarify her position and get maximum advantage either from Afghanistan and United States. Pakistan scarified a lot even though suffered more than once in the region. It was crystal clear that Pakistan scarified her social, political, economic and religious fabrics after 9/11 (Haq, 2007:26). It was shocking for an international community that Pakistan and Afghanistan was in pool therein Al-Qaida operated well and Pakistan left to groom due to the wrong information which was denied by Pakistani officials. Pakistani government was criticized and went for the worst effects orientation. It was believed to stress out Pakistan by foreign policy and left in defence diplomatically.

Obama's New Strategy and Pak – US Relations

The important issue was about the Afghan government after Taliban. President Hamid Karzai was fail to administrate and failed to conduct the writ of the government in complete Afghanistan. It was symbolically called Kabul government and remaining 95% area was not in the control of Afghan government. The refugees from Afghanistan came to Pakistan without any verified data and Pakistan did not have any strong boarder management that was another problem for increasing the terrorism and extremism.

The closing area of boarder from both side had housings of terrorism and government did not have resources to stop the terrorist attacks either in Pakistan and Afghanistan. Obama Administration played role in a way of stressful dimension against Pakistan diplomatically and Pakistan was compelled to administrate and defend her territory so as to stop the terrorist attacks in the region (Katzaman, 2009). The joint Chief of Staff of United States Admiral Mike Mullen gave statement about the scepticism and ambiguities. He declared curiosity about the winning position of War and could not defend the victory of United States from Afghanistan.

March, 27, 2009 announcement of Strategic Review was declared in NATO submit which was held on April, 04, 2009 with the following objectives:

1. Establishing Policy to distract the international financing network to reduce the power of terrorist attacks and dismantle their execution to launch any terrorist attack on West.



2. There had been question on Afghan government which was not strong enough to administrate so that establishing new administrative structure to have governing body.
3. The counter strategic training would be given to the Afghan military so as to support United States' operational team.
4. The integrity of International community is required to help war against terror for the global peace.
5. 17000 fresh militaries would be sent to play their combat role in War against Terror.
6. Commencement of Peaceful dialogue with Taliban groups who admits the constitution of Afghanistan.
7. United States pledged to provide 1.5 billion per year for the next five years to distract the linkages of terrorist networks in Pakistan, similarly, started economic zone among Pakistan, Afghanistan and United States in particular reconstruction of Afghanistan after war.
8. Contact group was to establish for the security risk factors which included Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Russia, India, China and NATO allies (Katzman, 2009; Khan 2009).

There was difference between George W. Bush and Obama Administration regarding Afghanistan. The period of Bush persuaded Afghan government to eliminate Taliban as they were fully considered Terrorist and extremists, on the contrary, Obama administration was in favour of reconciliation therein diplomatic level administration was expected to deal with Taliban. Bush administration did not anticipate in restructuring Afghanistan but Obama played vital role to increase the fund for the improvement of infrastructure of Afghanistan.

The foreign policy of United States was flexible in the period of Obama as special fund was recommended to find and demolish the terrorist networks from Pakistan and United States that established a developing status of Pakistan and Afghanistan through the economic zone. The bilateral relationship of Pakistan and United States was very important for both nations and went to eradicate the trust deficits form both nations.

Drone Attacks

Historically, Unmanned airborne vessels (UAV) was introduced for the surveillance in Kosovo and Bosnia but later on it worked perfectly in Iraq, Afghanistan and northern and Tribal areas of Pakistan to identify and devastate the subject (khan, 2011).

This technology went successful in wars and Pakistan allowed this to be used against the terrorists, but fortunately it started destroying the infrastructure and killed innocent people of tribal areas. In replication, the citizens remained enemy of Pakistan government for allowing and supporting United States for this killing machine Drone. Secondly public opinion of Pakistanis went against of United States for using the territory of Pakistan which was a challenging position for the government of Pakistan, thirdly, the certain areas of populated places were targeted without the consent of Pakistan which was a clear challenge to the writ of government. It was a violation



of territorial status of Pakistan (khan, 2011).

On the contrary, United States admired the usage of Drone which helped them to defeat the Al-Qaida. The Drone strategic war brought fruitful results without devastating structure of military on boot (Pape; Eldman, 2010:23). Terrorists and extremists from the region. The big guns of Al-Qaida and Taliban's were targeted by Drone, had melted the enigmatic temperature against the west. Pakistan was a scarifying object that suffered more than anyone.

United States decided to attack on FATA as housing of terrorists were entertained in this region, moreover, strategically it was difficult to have direct attacks without the help of Pakistan's administration so United States kept using the Drone against the targeted place. It was threat to the sovereignty of Pakistan to intervene through Drone without the permission of Pakistan. The instability of political system of Pakistan took place and extremism increased to counter Drone and operations.

The pressure was developed by increasing the number of casualties which crossed 80000 and Pakistan took breathe to review its policies in war against terror. Continues efforts of Indian government to isolate Pakistan with the title of Terrorist state of the region and Pakistan had to manage the interest of United States in Afghanistan. The drone attacks integrated the militants to operate strategically which was problematic to suffer by Suicides and other terms of terrorists. Historically, Obama followed the drone attacks policy which was initiated by Bush Administration (Oakley; Hammes, 2010).

The results of Drones were successful as 2006-2009 kept 60 targets to hit the 14 Al-Qaida members and 687 innocents were hit during the operations (Synnott, 2009). After drone attacks just 2% of Pakistan went in favour of bilateral relations with United States (Oakley; Hammes, 2010).

Without permission and consultation of Pakistan Drone attacks were spreading scepticism about the writ of the government which created instability in political system of Pakistan. Pakistan protested against Drones, in concerning the public opinion that reflected bilateral relationship of Pakistan and United States in hard and increased the tension diplomatically.

Exit Strategy

In an interview Obama said that "There needs to be an "Exit strategy" for Afghanistan so that US policy does not appear to be perpetual drift" (Katzman, 2009: 30). The exit period would be commenced from 2011 to 2014, was determined by Obama (James; James, 2011). It was an important to discuss the diverse opinion of different stake holders as west was in contradictory view to pull forces out of Afghanistan. The Congress demanded from all to co-operate for the resettlement of war to formulate policy for the Exit but some were in a favour to reconstruct the infrastructure and provide a political stability in Afghanistan.



It was determined to settle the military of Afghanistan with effective training to counter the insurgency. Secondly, the stable political system of Afghanistan was an important to govern and stop exploitation of soil of Afghanistan and counter Talibanization was the third to stop their movement in Afghanistan (Morells, 2009). The Exit of United States was favoured and welcomed by Pakistan and China. On the contrary, India was not in favour to pull military out of this game as existence of India was problematic for Pakistan and Indian existence was an important for their foreign policy in south Asia, which was problematic for Pakistan for the deterrence policy.

United States & Taliban's Peace Talks.

Peace agreement between Taliban and Afghanistan was very essential for exiting from Afghanistan. Pakistan played vital role as a mediator and got successful results in Qatar. The agreement was expected peace and toleration from both side and they were consciously rising towards settlement. The upmost important thing was to make an atmosphere because of other forces who could dismantle the efforts of Pakistan.

Conclusion

The bilateral relation of Pak- United States was critically analysed to sum up with findings that Pakistan was the key player for mediating between United States and Afghanistan. Pakistan always suffered due to the War in Afghanistan and it declined the political, economic, social and culture system of the state. The refugees were having direct impact on the infrastructure and financial values of Pakistan. It was difficult to manage, however, Pakistan tried to eradicate the terrorism and fought internal operations.

The diplomatic period of Musharraf regime was difficult to counter the quest of United States and defend the image of Muslims in the world. The boarder management was another difficult problematic event to counter the Indian narrative which had been due to Kashmir freedom fight. Finally, Pakistan decided to have multilateral relationship and became closer to China, Russia and Afghanistan for the regional development; moreover, Pakistan tries to have strong relationship with United States to counter the insurgency from this region.



References

- Faruqui, A. (2008). *Musharraf's Pakistan, Bush's America & the Middle East*. Vanguard Books.
- Gunaratna, R., & Rana, M. A. (2008). *Al Qaeda Fights back inside Pakistani Tribal Areas*. Pakistan Institute of Peace Studies.
- Haq, N. U., & Qazi, A. H. (2007). *Pak-Afghan Relations 2005-2007*. IPRI: Fact File.
- Jabeen, M., Mazhar, P. D. M. S., & Goraya, N. S. (2020). Trends and challenges in Pak-US relations: Post September 11. *South Asian Studies*, 25(2). Relations: Post September 11. *South Asian Studies*, 25(2).
- Jones, O. B. (2003). *Pakistan*. Yale University Press.
- Katzman, K., & Thomas, C. (2010). *Afghanistan: Post-Taliban governance, security, and US policy* (pp. 7-5700). Congressional Research Service.
- Khan, A. N. (2010). The US 'policy of targeted killings by drones in Pakistan. *Washington Post* (Washington), 25.
- Morelli, V. (2009). *NATO in Afghanistan: a test of the transatlantic alliance*. DIANE Publishing.
- Oakley, R. B., & Hammes, T. X. (2010). *Prioritizing strategic interests in South Asia* (No. 256). DIANE Publishing.
- Pape, R. A., & Feldman, J. K. (2010). *Cutting the fuse: The explosion of global suicide terrorism and how to stop it*. University of Chicago Press.
- Shinn, J., & Dobbins, J. (2011). *Afghan peace talks: a primer*. Rand Corporation.
- Synnott, H. (2009). *Transforming Pakistan: Ways out of instability* (Vol. 406). Routledge.