

***Existence of External Forces in Afghanistan: Pakistan's
Security Dilemma since 9/11***

Syed Sujha Uddin
Research Scholar
Departement of Intenational Relation
University of Karachi

Abstract

Pakistan and Afghanistan suffered a proxy war in the region on the behalf of the foreign interventions since 1979, especially after 9/11. Pakistan faced direct impact of Afghanistan's internal and external conditions. India, Russia, USA and others countries' interventions, fragile Pakistan's survival and breaches its security. Pakistan Geo Strategic interests demands to counter it security threat with the cooperation of common-border countries so that external forces would leave the region. Since great powers' strategic interests in Afghanistan to pitch against the potential threat of religious extremism, terrorism, drug trafficking and nuclear proliferation which substantiates the assertion that existing great powers in the region have potential to generate effects on Pakistan's security dilemma. Instability of Afghanistan, fighting proxy war in the region and on the lame of extremism, would make Pakistan instable and weak, it could bring into disintegration. Pakistan's geo-strategic interests need the re-establishment of peaceful, stable and friendly Afghanistan whose territory not use for external forces and no other country make its land for their on strategic depth.

*Key Terms: Geostrategic, Offensive-Defensive Realism,
Security Dilemma*

I. Introduction

Pakistan became a frontline state in war on terror after 9/11 (Woodward, 2002). It has an important *Geo-strategic* location as it provides a gate way to the world for energy-rich Central Asian countries (Paul, 2004). Pakistan has long relations with US and its Western alliance for supporting international liberal agenda. In Asia, it was considered first as a frontline state of US in the Cold War period as Pakistan joined US led pacts SEATO and CENTO in 1950s to check expansion communism (Ayub, 1967), and December 1979, became second time, a frontline ally, when soviet entered in Afghanistan (Jayaram & Deshpande, 2008).

During this decade of Cold War, it became a key battleground for the two superpowers (USSR and USA) to entangle each other which cost the USSR to collapse and disintegrate into fifteen sovereign states by 1990s and at the same time, Afghanistan suffered a protracted violence and civil war which Pakistan had to bear its cost on its soil (Grare, 2007). To understand the complex US-Pakistan relations, undermine Pakistan's internal and external security challenges.

II. Theoretical Framework of Nuclear Deterrence for Survival

India's nuclear tests named "*Smiling Buddha*" in 1974 threatened regional security and Pakistan was forced to resort non-conventional means of weapon to counter new balance of power in the region. Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1973-77) initiated Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, and this led subcontinent to get sensitive uranium enrichment technology and experts. India's ambitions of nuclear weapons were an effort to dominant power beyond its borders; Pakistan's was an existential and *defensive imperative* to counter India's hegemony (Feroz, 2012). This scenario can be seen in the Robert Jervis theory of *Defensive Realism* where one state increases its security which decreases the security of other states, states do not rely upon other states due to distrustful. This leads states to maximize their own security. For that way of countering, result in the situation of the security dilemma (Baylis & Smith, 2005). *Realist* views of *structural realism* break *Defensive realism* arguments with their strong evidence as maximizing relative power is necessary for the state because in anarchic situation any state can become more power than anyone. So,

offensive Realism can make state dominance on other states (Baylis and Smith, 2005). *Offensive Realism* can be understood by US after 9/11 when Al-Qaeda launch a terrorist attack in US (Woodward, 2011); as a *revisionist state*, Afghanistan has been punished with the excuses of Al-Qaeda leadership existing in the country (Jervis, 2003). This environment made fragile the whole regional situation because regional countries could settle their reservation without external forces. South Asia faced wrath of external forces since fighting their proxy war and existing physical appearance in Afghanistan that had been experiences in the Cold War, USSR invasion of Afghanistan. After 9/11, the world's power and its thoughts changed into new ideology of revisionist *World Order* implication (Snyder, 2002).

III. Power Politics Revision Method over Pakistan's Security

Pakistan was instigated with a security threat from two ways; first, Soviet to the Pakistan's west, who wanted entrance to the Hot Seas, in Indian Ocean, and second Indians to the east, where Pakistan already lost its huge long territory of Siachen 1984, Kargil hills 1971 and long area of Ran of Kuch in 1965. Hence, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Pakistan looked another opportunity to join coalition with the United States to fight against Soviet Union (Hollen, 1980). By design, it was called jihad, which was very much attracted to mujahideen from all over the Islamic world (Marshall, 1998). Pakistan with the help of US and Western alliance trained and armed them and forced them into Afghanistan for fighting against communist soviet. Pakistan was not alone in accusing of assistance mujahideen, US, the West, UAE, Saudi Arabia and number of anti-soviet countries are equally responsible for nurturing the militancy that defeated the Soviet Union in 1988, expelled its military out from the soil of Afghanistan in 1989 and these matured and like-minded religious groups integrated and seeks safe-haven for flourishing their religious agenda in Pakistan's territory (Evans, 2002).

Having left Kabul by Soviet Union and the Americans abandoned Islamabad for solving chaotic state. This put Pakistan on fundamentalist, extremist and dogmatic situation where Washington rewarded its Cold War ally by invoking the Pressler Amendment in 1989 and imposing military sanctions, and strengthening its strategic relationship with India. These sanctions did alone not make Pakistan's

economy worst but nearly four million Afghans refugees streamed into former front-line ally of US and it became the world's largest refugee population (Evans, 2002). Here, Pakistani society had to face drug smuggling, Kalashnikov culture, and bomb explosions as the world super power took their work and left filth in the country. Pakistanis felt treachery and used in the fighting of US-Soviet war, in which US won with the cooperation of West (Munazza, 2013). For Pakistan, the worst of decade's disaster had begun. US-West put Pakistan into sanctions and they did not effort to reassess its program, reconstruct a destructed country, and change mujahideen's mind to settlement and adjust in the country or redevelop and build back war-ravaged Afghanistan. In the failure of restructuring, this deliberate shortsightedness led to ethnic fighting, warlordism and Afghanistan's went into bleak.

The mujahideen gathered into two directions: one who came from outside of Afghanistan and Pakistan, preferred to join Al Qaeda and second those who were living in Afghanistan and Pakistan's boarder area for centuries, preferably joined Taliban as a shelter. The Taliban, who emerged as a powerful force in 1996, eventually occupied 90 percent of the country, Taliban was said to be a roughly force through their obscurantist medievalism. This year of 1989 was also important as India-administered Kashmir freedom struggle reignited. This movement Indian government failed to repression of Kashmiries where purely indigenous and peaceful uprising started against Indian atrocities. From this point, all over the world Muslims and Islamic states are accusing India and presenting their sympathies with Kashmiries. Indian occupied Kashmiri youth voluntarily joined in indigenous mujaheedin groups and are fighting as guerilla war against Indian army which called them radicalized and indiscriminately crackdown locals (Venkatraman, 2012).

After the disintegration of Soviet Union, new international political era has emerged in 1991. World was facing *New World Order* where US practicing political realism in the world. In 1990s a powerful countries showed its extreme power as conducted nuclear tests. The Soviet Union's last nuclear test took place on 24 October 1990; the United Kingdom's on 26 November 1991 and the United States on 23 September 1992. Two others great powers France and China, did not let to show its hegemony, conducted their last tests in January and July 1996 respectively. These hegemonic *realism* impacts on south Asia as India, which have ambitions to be fourth largest military power in the world, tested its bomb again in May 1998 at Pokhran after its first test

in 1974. This was the turning point for Pakistan to contest India for putting barrier on regional hegemony, Pakistan went at Chaghai and tested bomb in the same month, May, and year of 1998 (Basrur and Cohen, 2002). These tests became a symbol of pride for the people of Pakistan which presents it as survival from external threat and especially in the South Asia where India disturb its region's balance of power with non conventional arms and missiles. Nuclear arms are also considered for the territorial security and strengthening Pakistan's survival. This expensive arsenals were thought to be alone Deterrence in the *realism* as the world facing *Anarchical World System* which weak world's territorial boundaries until country self-preservation or self- help (Waltz, 1981). So, Pakistanis considered it as resolution and innovation in the face of adversity, and a source of protection which come from external force.

Pakistan became a first Muslim nuclear power state. Much of the world, especially US-West allies, Russia, India and Israel are anxious about the security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons as it has been the premier supplier of nuclear technology to as what US allies said *rogue states* as North Korea and Iran. It has also said to terrorist organizations obtaining a nuclear weapon, who considered US and West as occupier of Muslim's territories and their resources such as Palestine, Kashmir, Iraq, Libya, and others. Pakistan thinks nuclear power as its national interest and balance of power in the region (Goldberg and Ambinder, 2011). Pakistan has also concerned with US assistance to Indian civil nuclear program, *123 Agreement* of July 18, 2005, which US views differently from it. Pakistan who have been bearing shortage of electricity, pursuit of nuclear power for civilian purposes; this was viewed negatively by Pakistan's nuclear opponent. Interestingly, US assisting India with legitimately as giving civil nuclear technology help (An Agreement between India and US for *civil nuclear technology*, Named, *123 Agreement*). USA has partially been assistance Pakistan which was deemed defames by Pakistanis who are front line ally with US in the War on Terror.

There are also believed that US wants to seize Pakistan's nuclear weapons either by force or any way of economically dismantle it as creating a situation of Dilemma. Because it fears the weapons could come into the hands of the Taliban, Al Qaeda, or any of the myriad militant organizations who have faced any situation of chaos in Pakistan. Pakistan is very much satisfied claiming that its nuclear weapons are in safe hand and secure (Hoodbhoy, 2012).

The Attacks of 9/11 infuriated US to spread its policies in this region where strategic location insisting to stay long for keeping view on Russia, Iran and China. US has long experienced to inspect its enemy as it stayed their forces in Germany, South Korea, Vietnam and other region of Arab countries. Invasion of Afghanistan made Taliban and Al-Qaeda compelled to fled on mountain, especially moved outward to across Pakistan.

These fundamentalist outfits local and international organization's activists joined global coalitions with Al-Qaeda and Taliban. They got nexus with Kashmir freedom fighters, Arab-jihadists, and opponent of US policies from all over the world. This gun battle started in Pakistan where the nation victimized by extremists.

IV. Outlaw Organizations and Their Existential Causes

In 2001, when US and allied forces attacked in Afghanistan with the help of Pakistan's government who were heading former President and Army Chief General Perve Musharaf. Invasion of Afghanistan was very much criticized by religious-minded political organizations that heart fully cooperating and making environment for fighting jihad against Non-Islamic and occupier forces in Afghanistan, former President also came in the wrath of these organizations.

Many people went for paying an Islamic necessary obligation (jihad). Taliban has divided into many parts, Sawat chapter Taliban leader Mulana Fadlullah, who is son in law of Sufi Muhammad, took more than ten thousand people from Pakistan to Afghanistan for paying jihad, in which many of Jihadists killed by US attacked or in the hand of Afghan Taliban who were not accepting them or doubting them for US spying (Lubna and Naveed, 2009).

But this was also fact that many Pakistani believed in jihad or they had sympathies on those religious-minded political organizations who proclaim Jihad. There is no doubt that Pakistani society are very much touch with the Islam and its principles which mostly presented by religious-minded organizations. On the same trajectory, Mujahideen groups, who are working in Indian-administered Kashmir, seem to have public's political, social and economic support in Pakistan. Many religious parties came together under the umbrella of the Pak-Afghan Defense Council or 'Defa-e-Pakistan' and got political identity with name of MMA in 2002 and became a second largest party in 2002 General Election. In 2008-09 MMA broke and scattered in their

original religious political organizations such as Jamyat Ullma e Islam (f), Jamat e Islami, many of them contested democratic election in 2008 and showed some reformist type of face. These religious-minded organizations have been launching a nationwide campaign to their vested interest since 9/11. Strikes and street demonstrations occurred throughout the country, American flags were burned, several people were killed in protest and many properties have been damaged. Thousands of extremists also traveled to Afghanistan to fight with the Taliban against the US led anti-terrorism coalition. However, none of these actions managed to incite the Pakistani population against the government or persuaded both governments of Pakistan and Afghanistan either to backtrack on his policies or to step down.

After thirteen years long experiences (11 September, 2014), Pakistan's army and some ruling political parties have accepted its assistance on War on Terror with US and allied, for their own war but religious-minded organization and other opposition ruling parties such as -e- Tehrik Insaf and its leadership do not oath its own war as they want to come out from front line ally on War on Terror ("Tehrik Insaf," 2014). There has once consensus that drone's attacks in Pakistan's tribal areas are extremely not acceptable for the country and Pakistan has been paying its wrath in War on Terror. An estimated, Pakistan lost of more than 75 billion dollar of damaging buildings, schools and infrastructure. And in others, Pakistanis have lost more than 35000 precious lives in suicidal attacks and in other revenge. This was also just one side of shed (Hidayat, 2013).

Pakistan has been sacrifices as falling in US court in 2001, Pakistan provided full support with basing and over-flight permission for all US and coalition forces, who hit Pakistan's sovereignty as they entered in Abttabad's Usama bin Ladin house without letting permission where US accepting Pakistan's role in finding Bin Ladin (Haq, 2011). So, they did not trust in its front line ally and betrayed it with just made an agreement of five billion dollar assistance as giving in five years. Pakistan had to deploy more than 70 thousand troops along the Afghanistan border in support of international community and provided intelligence support to the international anti-terrorism coalition (Haqqani, 2002). If see on the other part of views, where Pakistan has already been deploying its more than one lac troops from its eastern border where India installing its surveillance and keeping it view with intelligence support and well coming with mortal bomb or standing troops. In Pakistan, those who are effecting since 2001, asking

to the government and US that what Pakistanis are earning from giving complete assisting in War on Terror as daily losses their worthy brothers and sisters lives.

V. What US Achieving from Afghanistan: An Analytical Way of Direct Impact on Pakistan

US and allied forces especially West, have their vested interest to join hand in attacking of Afghanistan. They wanted to ensure that Al-Qaeda's terrorists training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime were trouble for US and West. Because they are spreading Antagonistic-ism against them and preaching jihad against the world powers which installing a pallor type of Balances as used tactics in Realism. US and allied wanted to eradicate a warrior from Afghanistan. After thirteen years of US invasion of Afghanistan September 11, 2014, the Taliban's control over the many part of Afghanistan, has increased, suicide bombing and attacking on US installations and important Afghan assists has been targeting, US and allied have come up on negotiations, and Al-Qaeda still alive with strength in the absence of Osama Bin Ladin. Notwithstanding, both sides extremists ideological outlaws have threatened US and West for being existence in the region from its safe-haven along the Pakistani border, and this led deteriorating the situation in both countries where Pakistan's infrastructure, and precious lives and property have been damaging and Afghanistan's institutions building, strengthening democratic system and hope of peace despair due to making it as a "Strategic Depth". US President Obama has announced its strategic policy for Afghanistan and Pakistan twice after taking oath of his Presidency in 2009 and 2013. In the first attempted, he announced that additional US troops would be sent to reinforce US and allied forces and in the second, he has reiterated a date for leaving US forces from Afghanistan. (USA Presidential Address, 2009).

Strategies of US have been weakening Afghanistan and Pakistan condition. Pakistan's cities especially FATA's area where Taliban rule regularly settled and Al-Qaeda's member felt secure in the tribal agencies. Albeit, US Drones strikes on both outlaws organizations who are plotting and launching attacks against in both countries fragile Pakistan's unity and National Assembly of Pakistan also passed resolution against these Drones attack. Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, a Pakistani province, has been suffered a lot due to scourge of radicalism

and militarism by serial planned attacks and suicidal explosions such as Peshawar School attacked on 16 Dec. 2014 where more than 141 students and staff were killed by Taliban militant ("Peshawar School Attack," 2014).

On the other side, after long experiences, US started its negotiations with the " moderate" elements in the Taliban as they categorized them in reformist or " moderate" Taliban who are agree in negotiations with US and other category is extremist who wants to attack an occupied forces and expel them from this region (Waldman, 2014). This showed a weakness position from foreign occupier.

When US preparing to quit the region, Afghanistan and Pakistan's security situation have gradually been fallen down and the Taliban insurgent groups steadily rose with new strategies. The US has long been stayed in the region where it have supported with West and allied forces in the shadow of world's trained defense organization NATO, who working under the US order. These one of the best trained and skillful militaries, did not overcome Taliban insurgent groups, and was not able to eliminate Al-Qaeda and Taliban even in absence of Al-Qaeda Leader Osama Bin Laden and numbers of the Taliban leader who are hiding in Pakistan's agencies or FATA area. Pakistan's responsibility to eradicate Taliban and Al-Qaeda from its areas, instead of it, US Dorn which reparations has to bear people of Pakistan.

Afghan Taliban insurgent groups, after long struggle, became stronger and have shown their influences in the Northern part of Afghanistan than previously only showing active participation in the Southern part along with Pakistan's territory, Southeastern along with Iranian sides, and Southwestern parts along with Turkmenistan board (Safdar, 2009).

As studied about self-interested theory of International Relations that says every country pursues her interest to the best of her ability (Gauthier, 1986). Pakistan has become the epicenter of diplomatic, economic and strategic problems. Pakistan's economic condition could not give her strength to stand against US and West to return its policy from War on Terror so that they could save its territorial integrity or ideological boundary. Pakistan wants to restore its sovereignty in term of stop Drone attacks and wants to normalize relations with world as it learnt the lesson from Iran, Libya and Venezuela that are facing extremely sanction from all over the world in the past. This hanging position is making Pakistan worse than Afghanistan.

US is wanted to secure its citizens and eliminate the threat of terrorism which it feel from Afghanistan and their hideouts. USA's think-tank has been making environment especially about the threat of Islamic extremists or fundamentalist after emerging the scholarly debate of The End of the World and Clash of Civilizations (Baran, 2004). US have been expending billions of dollar for eliminating the threat of terrorism for securing its nation and West. Theses situation showed two conditions that one is US goal, which defined its engagement with Pakistan for eliminating terrorists on any cost. Second, it is a part of its foreign policy to tackle this region with the name of terrorism; drug production and trafficking as well as ethnic strife within the region were likely to reinforce challenges to regional security and stability (Sohail, 2013). In the region, US wants to make a ground especially in Iran, Pakistan, China, and Central Asian countries. US economically and militarily are supporting India in this region much more than any other country. These facts show to achieve its long-term objectives in this region. India got multi-faceted characteristics after US convinced to engage her for defining relations in civil nuclear strategies. US gave a big role for India as it expended one billion dollar in Afghanistan and a hegemonic mission in the region to be a regional superpower in South Asia.(Scholar Views on seminar, 2012).

Pakistan has concerned over India's conventional non-conventional superiority. It keeps maintaining its *balance of power* in the region. It's always making *deterrence* policy against India as it testing nuclear missiles or any other long rang arsenals. Pakistan has also anxiety about US-India strategic partnership. This relationships serves to support threats, especially when US reached an agreement of Civil Nuclear technology with India as it free to assemble it non civilian militarily technology and easy accesses to the nuclear buyer communities (Bukhari, 2012). The keystone of Pakistan's strategic policy has been to counter India's threat whether it could come from politics, economics, socials or military. Pakistan deems about India's relations with Israel and Russia who give it surveillance instruments and military purpose arsenals which India could use against it. Pakistan has an important position in this region, it is beneficial for her to have normal ties with India and friendly relations with Afghanistan so that it could facilitate Central Asian countries from it Gate Way. India and Pakistan, Both have been feeling threatening from each other's policies and where survival and security has weaken each other's trust. Pakistan

does not want to be a sandwich between India and Afghanistan's hostility. Therefore, being a chronic neighboring state, Pakistan wants to play a greater role in Afghanistan for restructuring and rehabilitating. Pakistan has also ambitions to work with India so that region could be normalized for all stakeholders. Pakistan was ensured while taking its 'U turn' policy against Afghanistan by US (and also in Bone Conference) that Pakistan's role would be widen in this region and its concerned must be away from Indian intrusion in the region (Abbasi, 2014) Pakistan's fourteen years long support to US and its Western ally have been eroded by Indian interferences. Pakistan has also been evidence that India with the help of Afghan Northern Alliance supporting anti-Pakistan segments whether Taliban or Baluch separatist or any movement who disturb the image of Pakistan (Sajjad, 2011). This has increased suspicions and doubt between both as Afghanistan and Pakistan much affected with terrorism, suicidal attacks and anti sentiment elements.

Central Asian countries are rich in their resources. Therefore, super powers have been putting its influence on this region for about a century. Afghanistan is one which not only provides a gate to reach this region but also its soil has not been opened for natural resources. That's why; regional and international players keep their eye on particular terrain. At this time, Afghanistan is best choice for US as strategically sit in this country to check the regional players especially Iran and China. Whereas, a nuclear Pakistan with their "assets" Mujahideen could be controlled and sizing Russia from other side as it started disturbance Eastern Europe of Ukraine. US is concerned of a new "Fall of Saigon", (North Vietnamese captured South Vietnam, 1975) in Afghanistan as it becoming Al-Qaeda and Taliban sanctuaries once again.

Iran has been very concerned about US and allied staying in Afghanistan. Because any anti-Iran, Afghan ruler put it into trouble. In this revisionist state, Iran must need good relation with any new Afghan ruler so that region could be free from external occupier. Iran has now been engaged in Middle East especially in Yemen, Syria and Iraq nexus in the region.

As like Iran, Central Asian countries have very strong stakes in Afghanistan as they exchanging economic, cultural and security issues for normalization their regional issues where as Russia kept her eyes on them. Russia feels "surrounded" by NATO and the US forces. Iran and Russia also very concerned about the possibility of Taliban or ISIS

type of Islamic government emerging in Kabul that be dangerous for shia-Islamic government in Iran and Central Asian states whom would be motivated and inspired by extremist Islamic agenda by Taliban or ISIS. Both Iran and Russia, do not want to see US and Western allies to exploit Central Asian resources and not to bear them to stay in the region.

China has separate stakes and interests in Afghanistan. It has grown weary of the US presence in Afghanistan for longer term. After the defeat of the Taliban, the establishment of military bases in Nooristan province close to the China also looking Afghanistan and Central Asian natural resources as it has rampant consumption for its economy. China also increasing its Pak-China corridor-transit route from Central Asian via Afghanistan which are full of mineral resources and potential market for its product.

The whole region are disturbed as external forces staying in the region, apart from external player, Pakistan and India are actively participate in the Afghanistan to thwart each other's influences and strategic plan in Kabul. India, has historically close to Kabul at political and diplomatic levels, and wants to use its ties for formation of political and cultural ground so that it could be workable against Pakistan. This could be advancing Indian aim in the region. India is very much ambitious to install a pro-Indian government that may counterbalance Pakistan in the region.

Strategically, Pakistan has long been relations and stakes in Afghanistan and it also wants to make a strategic setup in Afghanistan. Islamabad does not want to see Indian security agenda or any armed force in the Afghan soil. Because, it could lead to Durand Line and Pakhtunistan type of issues in the future as pro-Indian government launched in Afghanistan. Concerning of Arab world and their stakes under the leadership of Saudi Arabia are muddling at best. After 9/11, they are officially supporting the US and allied in Afghanistan due to international obligations.

Arab countries consider Al-Qaeda and ISIS as a future threat for the survival of Kingship and do not want Taliban or ISIS reinstall their government in Kabul which may provide sanctuaries to terrorist organization especially Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan.

Conclusion

Peace and stability are very necessary in Afghanistan which could not possible without the will and cooperation of regional players

and neighboring stakeholders like Pakistan, India and Iran. US and its allies are also very important for reinstate and restructuring the country but external forces must leave their existence from the region. Other than the way, Russia and China are to containing countering surrounding policy against the revisionist power.

In this backdrop, Pak-Afghan efforts for restoration of peace and stability in the region and both countries would not be difficult. This protected aim will be able to work, if all actors gather to play a constructive role for making a bridge to an end the war. A durable peace can be flourished, if all the concerned address from all stakeholders. Interests are very important among all stakeholders which should be adjust their positions to a level that everyone gets benefits and of the player harm by other.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, Iqbal, Azhar. (2014). Afghanistan-Pre and Post 2014; Implications for Pakistan, *OPINION* (Vol.1 No.1, June 2013, p. 84). Also available at, Dr. Umbreen Javaid and Dr. Razia Musarrat. (Eds.). Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Challenges and Options. *Al-Siyasa Journal of Politics, Society and Culture*, (Issue VIII, April 2005). p.59-60.

Ali, Abid, Lubna and Khan, Iqbal, Naveed, (2009). The Rise of Tehreek – e– Nifaz – e – Shariat – e - Mohammadi in Malakand Division, NWFP: A Case Study of the Process of “State Inversion”. *Pakistan Vision*, (Vol. 11, No. 1, 2009). p. 89-95.

Amin, Sohail. (2013). (Ed.). SCO's Role in Regional Stability: Prospects of its Expansion, Islamabad Policy Research Institute, p.4. ISBN: 978-969-8721-43-5

Azam, Amjad, Munazza. (2013). Facing the Monster Head-On. *International Relations Department, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad*.
https://groups.google.com/forum/#!msg/people-of-pakistan/WdkOmFe0V0/TsP_zBbrnJXgJ

Baran, Zeyno, (2004). *HIZB UT-TAHRIR Islam's Political Insurgency*. The Nixon Center, The Nixon Center 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 1250 Washington, DC20036, December 2004, also available in, Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn. (Eds.). Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond,
<http://111.68.99.107/libmax/Administrator/Library/DigitalResources/Digital/Books/Global%20Responses%20to%20Terrorism.pdf>

Basrur, M. Rajesh and Cohen, Philip, Stephen. (2002). Bombs *In Search Of A Mission: India's Unclear Future*, p. 128. Retrieved from
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/files/PUB108.pdf>

Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (2005). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, 2005, p.95-110.

Bukhari, Hussain, Shahid, S. (2011). India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan. *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, (Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 2011, p. 1-2).

Evans, Martin. (2002). *Afghanistan: A Short History of Its People and Politics*. (New York: HarperCollins, 2002). p. 12. & 113-131.

Gauthier, David, (1986). *Morals by Agreement*. Oxford University Press. p.20-35.

Goldberg, Jeffrey and Ambinder, Marc. (2011). The Pentagon's Secret Plans to Secure Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal. *National Journal*, (Nov. 9, 2011).
<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/the-pentagons-secret-plans-to-secure-pakistans-nuclear-arsenal/>

Grare, Frédéric. (2007). Rethinking Western Strategies Toward Pakistan an action agenda for the united states and Europe. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington, DC 20036, July 10, 2007, p.5.
http://carnegieendowment.org/files/grare_pakistan_final.pdf
Haq, Riaz. (2011). Seeing Osama Bin Laden's Death in Broader Perspective.
<http://www.riazhaq.com/2011/05/seeing-osama-bin-ladens-death-in.html>

Haqqani, Hussain. (2002). America's New Alliance with Pakistan: Avoiding the Traps of the Past. Policy Brief No. 19, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, October, 2002, p. 7-8.

Hollen, Van, Christopher. (1980). the Tilt Policy Revisited: Nixon-Kissinger Geopolitics and South Asia. *Asian Survey*, (Vol. 20, No. 4, April, 1980, pp.339-361).

Hoodbhoy, Pervez. (2012). The Flight To Nowhere: Pakistan's Nuclear Trajectory. Publication series on Promoting Democracy under Conditions of State Fragility: Pakistan-Reality, Denial and the Complexity of its state, *Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung Publication*, (Nov 09, 2012, p.9).
http://pk.boell.org/sites/default/files/downloads/The_Flight_To_Nowhere_by_Pervez_Hoodbhoy_GE_%282%29.Pdf

Jayaram, N., & R. S. Deshpande. (Eds.). (2008). *Footprints of Development and Change: Essays in Memory of Professor V.K.R.V. Rao Commemorating His Birth Centenary*. Academic Foundation Publisher, 01-Jan-2008, p. 237. ISBN 10:8171887040. (India view....that Pakistan, as a US ally). Also available in, P.Musharaf.(2010). *Don't Mess With Pakistan*,
<http://www.pakistanileaders.com.pk/articlesinds.php?id=1154>

Jervis, Robert, (2003). Understanding the Bush Doctrine. *Political Science Quarterly*, 118:3, 2003, pp.365-388. Also available in, Michael Haas. (2009). *George W. Bush*,

War Criminal? The Bush Administration's Liability for 269 War Crimes. ABC-CLIO, USA: WASHINGTON, 2009, p.22. ISBN:978-0-313-36499-0.

Khan, Ayub, M. (1967). *Friends Not Masters: A Political Biography*. Oxford University Press. pp. 130. Also available in, Devin T. Hagerty. (Ed.). *South Asia in World Politics*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 01-Jan-2005, p.169.

Khan, H. Feroz. (2012). *Eating Grass: The Making of the Pakistan Bomb*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2012, p.14-30. ISBN 978-0-8047-8480-1. (e-book), Hossein Amirsadeghi. (2012). the Security of the Persian Gulf (RLE Iran A). CRC Press, 23-Apr-2012. Routledge Library Edition: Iran, Chapter fifth, *Persian Gulf Nuclearisation: Prospects and Implications*. Also available in, P. Musharaf. (2010). <http://www.pakistanileaders.com.pk/tarticlesinds.php?id=1154>

Khan, Hidayat. (2013). Pakistan's Contribution to Global War on Terror After 9/11, *Pakistan Defense*, (issue no 8727). <http://defence.pk/threads/contribution-to-global-war-on-terror-after-9-11.255643/>

Marshall, Andrew. (1998). *Terror 'Blowback' Burns CIA.* (November 1, 1998). Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/terror-blowback-burns-cia-1182087.html>

Paul, T.V. (2004). *The Warrior State: Pakistan in the Contemporary World*, Publisher: Oxford University Press, USA. p.30; (Pakistan has been at the center of major geopolitical struggles). Also available in, Qazi Shakil Ahmad. (2004). Pakistan-India Relations: Some Geostrategic Considerations. *JSTORE*, (Vol. 57, No.3, July 2004). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/41394054>

Paul, T.V. (2010). *South Asia's Weak States: Understanding the Regional Insecurity Predicament*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, ISBN 978-0-8047-6220-5, p.12-13.

Scholar discussion (2012): a Joint Seminar of NDU Islamabad with Party School of the Central Committee of CPC & PLA National Defence University, "Strategic Environment & its Fallout on Regional Security & Economic Development", National Defence University Islamabad, 03-04 April 2012, p. 5.

Sial, Safdar. (2009). Taliban on the March: Threat Assessment and Security Implications for the Region. *Pakistan Institute for Peace Studies*, Islamabad, Jul-Sep, 2009, p. 2-8

Snyder, G.H. (2002). Mearsheimer's World-Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security: A Review Essay. *International Security*, 2002, pp.149-161.

Taliban. (Pakistan), "Peshawar school attack leaves 141 dead". (2014, December 16). *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-30491435>

Tehrik Insaf and its leadership do not oath its own war. (2014, [February 24](#)). *Globally True*. Retrieved from <https://globallytrue.wordpress.com/tag/pakistan-tehreek-e-insaf/>. Also available in, Imran Khan's PTI joins banned terrorist groups in pro-army rally in Lahore. (2011, December 18). <https://lubpak.com/archives/66829>

The Fall of Saigon is a capture of South Vietnam capital, 'Siagon' by National Liberation Front on 30 April, 1975.

The 123 Agreement is the terms of engagement which works the treaty agreement between India and US on transfer of civil nuclear technology. The next step is to enter into agreement with the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) for safeguards of the civil nuclear reactors to be set up under the 123 agreement and to enter into an agreement with the NSG (nuclear suppliers group) for supply of nuclear fuel i.e. uranium for the civil nuclear reactors; Retrieved from <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/resources/fact-sheets/critical-issues/5451-us-india-nuclear-deal>

USA Presidential Address. (2009). On the eve of his national address at West Point, President Obama [issued an order](#) to the Pentagon to send additional U.S. troops to Afghanistan, 30 Nov, 2009, Washington Monthly. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/archives/monthly/2009_11.php. And also available on, President Obama, Address, February 12 2013, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/12/remarks-president-state-union-address>

Venkatraman, Amritha. (2012). *Kashmir: Islam and Terror* (Doctoral Dissertation). Submitted to the Newark Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, p. ii. Retrieved from <http://dga.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Islam-and-Terror.pdf>

Waldman, Matt, Dangerous Liaisons with the Afghan Taliban. *United States Institutes of Peace*. 1200 17th Street NW . Washington, DC 20036. 202.457.1700, p.7-8. <http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/SR%20256%20-%20Dangerous%20Liaisons%20with%20the%20Afghan%20Taliban.pdf>

Waltz, Kenneth. (1981). The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better. *Adelphi Papers, Number 171*. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies. <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm>

Woodward, B. (2002). *BUSH AT WAR*. Simon & Schuster, New York, NY 10020. p.61-68. ISBN , 9780743215381.

Woodward, Bob, (2011). *Obama's War*. New York: Simon and Schuster, New York, NY, 2011, p. 63. Also available in, Carlos L. Yorddn. (2006). America's Quest for Global Hegemony Offensive Realism, the Bush Doctrine, and the 2003 Iraq War. *Theoria*, August 2006. p 125. <http://users.drew.edu/cyordan/Yordan-THEORIA-AUG-06.pdf>