

US-PAKISTAN RELATIONS: AN APPRAISAL OF THE AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STRATEGY TO COUNTER TERRORISM

BY

BRIGADIER MALIK ZAFAR IQBAL
Pakistan Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2010

Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 12-03-2010			2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE US-Pakistan Relations: An Appraisal of the Afghanistan-Pakistan Strategy to Counter Terrorism					5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
					5b. GRANT NUMBER	
					5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Brigadier Malik Zafar Iqbal					5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
					5e. TASK NUMBER	
					5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Professor Edward J. Filiberti Department of Command, Leadership, and Management					8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013					10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
					11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.						
14. ABSTRACT The history of US - Pakistan (US-Pak) relations has alternated between cooperation and dissonance. For the last decade terrorism has brought the countries together despite other divergent interests. Combating terrorism has become a vital national interest for both countries and the proximity of combat operations requires close cooperation and coordination. The US Afghanistan-Pakistan (AFPAK) Strategy announced by the US President, however, caused consternation by some key stakeholders. This paper examines the history of US-Pak relations and their cooperation in the fight against terrorism. It focuses on the proposed AFPAK strategy, analyzes that strategy, and advances several recommendations for both improving the strategy and enhancing US-Pak cooperation.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Global War on Terrorism, FATA, AFPAK, US – Pakistan Cooperation						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			UNLIMITED	36

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**US-PAKISTAN RELATIONS:
AN APPRAISAL OF THE AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN
STRATEGY TO COUNTER TERRORISM**

by

Brigadier Malik Zafar Iqbal
Pakistan Army

Professor Edward J. Filiberti
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Only a work of the United States Government is not subject to copyright. Based upon the nature of a particular student-author's employment, a paper may not be a work of the United States Government and may, in fact, be protected by copyright.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Brigadier Malik Zafar Iqbal

TITLE: US-Pakistan Relations: An Appraisal of the Afghanistan-Pakistan Strategy to Counter Terrorism

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 March 2010 **WORD COUNT:** 6,479 **PAGES:** 36

KEY TERMS: Global War on Terrorism, FATA, AFPAK, US – Pakistan Cooperation

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The history of US - Pakistan (US-Pak) relations has alternated between cooperation and dissonance. For the last decade terrorism has brought the countries together despite other divergent interests. Combating terrorism has become a vital national interest for both countries and the proximity of combat operations requires close cooperation and coordination. The US Afghanistan-Pakistan (AFPAK) Strategy announced by the US President, however, caused consternation by some key stakeholders. This paper examines the history of US-Pak relations and their cooperation in the fight against terrorism. It focuses on the proposed AFPAK strategy, analyzes that strategy, and advances several recommendations for improving the strategy while enhancing US-Pak cooperation.

US-PAKISTAN RELATIONS: AN APPRAISAL OF THE AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STRATEGY TO COUNTER TERRORISM

In the eight years since 9/11, the US is still muddling towards a viable strategy to combat terrorism. Regarding the US efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Washington appears “on the verge of proving Churchill’s quip that the United States always does the right thing after first trying everything else.”¹ Correspondingly, current relations between Pakistan and the United States are a paradox. Never before has security depended so much on mutual cooperation and support yet been so plagued by mutual mistrust and misgivings.² If Pakistan is to emerge from this conflict as a stable, prosperous, culturally diverse, peaceful, and stabilizing influence within the region, the US and Pakistan must dispel their suspicions and reconcile their differences. Moreover, because of the globalized nature of the ominous terrorist threat, the success of Pakistan is critical to U.S. security, the region and indeed the entire international community.³ However, trust and suspicion, cooperation and dissension, agreement and disagreement, accusations and atonement continue to pervade the US-Pak relationship. In the recent past, this rutted path has been treaded chaotically by both countries.

Strategic events have forced the US and Pakistan into close cooperation on three separate occasions: during the Cold War (50s and 60s); during fight against the Russians (1980s); and currently in global war against terrorism.⁴ Despite differences in many other areas, the relationship between the two countries has been inexorably drawn together by re-emerging coincident

interests. The current war on terrorism is the most recent and provides considerable impetus for further cooperation. Likewise, the recently announced AFPAK Strategy adopted by the current US Administration provides a starting point for furthering cooperation between the US and Pakistan in the war on terrorism - yet many issues remain to be addressed.

This paper briefly examines the history of US- Pak relations to gain insights on the previous oscillations in the relationship, assesses the current US-Pakistani cooperation in the war against terrorism within the context of the recently announced AF-PAK Strategy, and recommends ways to enhance the relationship and improve cooperation between both countries to help prevail in the fight against terrorism.

Background

The birth of India and Pakistan coincided with the early years of the Cold War. Significantly, the partitioning of India and Pakistan led to the different alignment of the two countries with the different superpowers. India joined the USSR camp while Pakistan's chose to align with the west.⁵ This initial alignment logically evolved into further US-Pakistani military cooperation and support. As a consequence Pakistan received much needed military support both in terms of training and military hardware. This was a period of close cooperation and, according to President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Pakistan became "America's most allied ally in Asia."⁶ However, the US suspension of aid during 1965 Indo-Pak war, and the repeat of the same action six years later during the 1971 Indo-Pak war, fractured Pakistani trust in the fidelity of the US-Pak relationship. For example, when India attacked East Pakistan in 1971 with military support from

USSR, Pakistan approached the US for support and the request was denied. Shortly thereafter, East Pakistan became an independent country - Bangladesh. This was followed by India's development of a nuclear weapons program (dramatically tested in 1974) that essentially drove Pakistan into developing a similar program.

Pakistan's pursuit of a nuclear program cast a dark shroud over US-Pak relations and has undermined cooperative efforts ever since. Most notably, President Jimmy Carter and Congress suspended all US aid to Pakistan in April 1979 because of the nuclear program. Just nine months later, however, and as a response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the US offered Pakistan a \$400 million aid package (much larger than the previously proffered package). Notwithstanding the size of the package, Pakistan eventually rejected the offer. Not until June 1981 did Pakistan agree to an annual 500 million dollar aid package; but it came with strings attached: a limited 6-year *waiver* of the previously imposed nuclear non-proliferation sanctions.⁷ Shortly thereafter, Pakistan became the springboard for a US sponsored proxy war waged by the Mujahedeen against the Soviet Union within Afghanistan. The seeds of militancy planted with the intent of defeating the Soviets⁸ continued to spread and afflict Afghanistan and Pakistan long after the Soviet withdrawal. The jihadist culture which took roots at that time continues to haunt the world in the shape of Al-Qaeda and extremist elements of the Taliban. In retrospect, the US played an essential role in creating the conditions which spawned Al Qaeda and the Taliban and the US, Pakistan and the region have suffered the consequences ever since.

⁹ The sharp rise in the number of madrassas and a large influx of Afghan refugees that brought with them a gun and heroin culture undermined the social fabric of Pakistani society and created favorable conditions for the growth of militant extremists. Correspondingly, there was no follow-up strategy or resources committed for reconstruction and stabilization and the conditions in Afghanistan deteriorated. The abrupt disengagement by the US intensified anti-US feeling in Pakistan as Pakistan was left alone to face the Afghan imbroglio.

With the Soviet withdrawal, the vital need for Pakistani cooperation was removed and just a scant 18 months later the US re-imposed the Pressler Amendment non-proliferation related sanctions and all US economic and military aid was terminated. Since little had changed in respect to the Pakistan nuclear posture, it appeared that the US support and alliance was one of convenience: to be easily cast aside at the whim of the US whenever Pakistan had served their 'transactional' purpose. As the 1990s rolled on, the economic sanctions took its toll. Pakistan's nascent and fragile democracy struggled and wavered under the increased weight and societal influence of Afghan refugees and the sanctions.¹⁰ As a consequence, the 90s became the decade of non-engagement.¹¹

US-Pak Cooperation in Countering Terrorism

General Pervaiz Musharraf, the then Chief of Army Staff, assumed the role of Chief Executive after a bloodless coup in October 1999. Pakistan was faced with intense diplomatic pressure and security challenges due to: the military coup; economic difficulties due to Pressler Amendment; a continuous threat of a hostile and nuclear-capable India in the east; and a destabilized Afghanistan under increasing Taliban control in the west. With the potential

emergence of a second security threat from Afghanistan, Pakistan chose to build amiable relations with the Taliban as both countries sought peace. However, despite its recognition of the Taliban, “Pakistan had identified the growing threat of extremism and had taken aggressive actions to curb extremism and combat terrorism”¹² within its borders. Nevertheless, Pakistan’s efforts to combat terrorism were intensified following 9/11 as the interests of both countries again coincided.

The tragic events of 9/11 dramatically changed the South Asia, Central Asia and Middle East landscapes. The resultant Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) aimed at defeating Al-Qaeda and the Taliban once again thrust Pakistan into the forefront of US strategy. “September 11 marked an irrevocable turn from the past into an unknown future. The World would never be the same.”¹³ Interest of both countries converged. Despite strong public opposition, Pakistan again aligned itself with the US. Similarly, the US responded by assisting Pakistan in reducing its foreign debt burden, provided economic and military assistance, eliminated sanctions related to its nuclear program and military coup, and recognized Pakistan as a major ally.¹⁴

The Global War on Terrorism began with the relatively broad support of the World and within three months the limited numbers of Allied ground forces supported by lethal air assets together with the significant forces of the Northern Alliance ousted Afghanistan’s Taliban government. However, following the removal of the Taliban, the conflict shifted to an insurgency.

As the Taliban transitioned into a full-fledged insurgency and began rebuilding its strength, the US and many of its allies invaded Iraq. Not only did this invasion distract efforts to consolidate the gains in Afghanistan and stabilize the country, it also alienated many of those who supported the invasion of Afghanistan and increased those sympathetic to the displaced Taliban in Pakistan.¹⁵ The diversion gave breathing room to Al Qaeda and the Taliban who expanded their influence in areas beyond Afghanistan and sought refuge and support in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) in Pakistan. There in the FATA, a confluence of Pashtun nationalism and the Taliban brand of Islam helped spread militancy within the tribes in South and North Waziristan that would present a difficult challenge to both the Allied forces in Afghanistan and security forces in Pakistan.¹⁶

Since the GWOT inception, both Pakistan and the United States have pursued operations consistent with their own unique political constraints and public support. Pakistan faced some difficult challenges ranging from public support for Al-Qaeda, the Taliban and Osama bin Laden; to the public's unfavorable view of the US-led war on terror; and to their dissatisfaction with their own Country's leadership.¹⁷ Initially the Government of Pakistan took a measured and deliberate approach in combating terrorism with an acute sensitivity to the fragility of public support for US-Pak cooperation in the war on terrorism. The distrust caused by historic US betrayals permeates public perceptions: "fully 64% of the public regards the U.S. as an enemy."¹⁸ This is especially significant in the FATA where the culture, social norms, historical

administration, law enforcement, and political and tribal influences are dramatically different than those of the rest of the country and causes even Pakistani regular military forces to be considered outsiders.¹⁹

Winning the hearts and minds of the FATA populace and their cooperation is not just a goal, it is an imperative. Effective operations simply can not be accomplished without the support of the populace and definitely not if they actively oppose those operations. Thus, the Pakistan government and the military had to take a nuanced and long-term approach to operations against the increasing number of Taliban and Al-Qaeda. By exercising patience and allowing the Taliban enough „rope to hang themselves’ the prospects for long term success increased substantially. In general, the extremist Taliban and Al Qaeda cannot help themselves: they impose an abusive and brutal dogma and become their own worst enemies. Correspondingly, the Taliban and Al Qaeda have alienated major portions of the populace and Pakistan has secured the needed local support for the government’s military intervention. This is a phenomenon similar to what occurred with the „Anbar Awakening’ that helped the 2008 US surge to be successful in Iraq.²⁰ The key point is that for the viability of the Government of Pakistan and the strategic success of the counter-terrorism campaign, operations have to be undertaken with a long-term view of the regional and public context and NOT solely based upon the near-term concerns of Afghanistan or the United States...despite their strong desire for immediate military responses to stop cross-border terrorist excursions. Premature military operations are ineffective, costly and push the tribal elders towards increased

support of the extremist Taliban/Al Qaeda. The success of the Swat and South Waziristan Operations, besides the sacrifices of the brave soldiers of the Pakistan Army, is the outcome of the cohesion achieved between the local public, government and the military.

Pakistan deserves credit for conducting a series of difficult and costly operations in the region throughout the post 9/11 GWOT period and providing critical support to the US and its allies in Afghanistan. The operations conducted by Pakistan have led to the capture of some 500 Al-Qaeda militants. Additionally, Pakistan pledged and has provided major support for the US led anti-terrorism coalition.²¹ According to the US Departments of State and Defense, Pakistan has provided the United States with unprecedented levels of cooperation by allowing the US military to use bases within the country, helping to identify and detain extremists, tightening the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and blocking terrorist financing.²² Not only has Pakistan lost more personnel in this conflict than any other US ally,²³ large quantities of critical military supplies moves through Pakistan into Afghanistan. Without this logistical support, both the US Operation Enduring Freedom and NATO operations in Afghanistan would be severely constrained if not impossible. “Over the last seven months Pakistani military had launched 209 major and 510 minor operations in 10 regions...and 2,273 Pakistani army officers and soldiers [have] been killed in the fighting so far.”²⁴

The AFPAC Strategy

As with most US strategies, the AF-PAK Strategy has been iteratively developed. The strategy was first articulated by President Obama in March 2009,

and then updated based upon feedback from his military leadership and subsequently redefined in a December '09 speech at West Point. The strategy was further expanded in the Department of State's 'Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy' subsequently published in January 2010 and summarized in the recently issued 'Quadrennial Defense Review' (QDR).²⁵ The AFPAK strategy is highly amenable to an 'ends, ways and means' analysis.

Ends. The strategy succinctly outlines the overall goal: "to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future..."²⁶ Significantly, the "prevention of return" portion of the 'goal' implies a long-term and comprehensive approach to supporting operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Ways. As suggested by the title, the strategy considers both Afghanistan and Pakistan within its preview. Importantly, it goes beyond just military cooperation and looks at increasing economic and social support to Pakistan. In outlining the strategy, President Obama recognized the mistrust that remains between the two countries due to a mottled historical relationship. He promises to overcome that past by building a long and enduring relationship: "In the past, we too often defined our relationship with Pakistan narrowly. Those days are over." Moreover, the President commits to building a foundation of "mutual interest, mutual respect, and mutual trust...going forward, the Pakistan people must know America will remain a strong supporter of Pakistan's security and prosperity long after the guns have fallen silent, so that the great potential of its people can be unleashed."²⁷

The most detailed description of the *ways* of the strategic concept is outlined in the supporting State Department Stabilization Strategy. The strategy promises a broad „whole of government’ approach with the US “leading the international community in helping Pakistan overcome the political, economic, and security challenges that threaten its stability, and in turn undermines regional stability.”²⁸ The Pakistan strategy proposes multifaceted *ways* addressing a comprehensive assistance program as well as security assistance, communications, strengthening people-to-people ties and enhanced bilateral engagement measures. Additionally, the US security assistance efforts will continue the current counterinsurgency support and provide other requested assistance to Pakistan’s military and police intended to better prepare them to fight against the insurgents while simultaneously helping to support the populace negatively affected by the militants.²⁹

Means. The *means* are defined by the committed resources (funds and personnel) as well as supporting activities designed to accomplish the major objectives outlined in the strategic concept. The Kerry-Lugar-Berman legislation proposes \$7.5 billion in U.S. civilian assistance over a five year period. This commitment of funds is aimed at assistance measures designed to improve the social and economic conditions in the country and, in so doing, will provide an environment that decreases the appeal of the extremists’ dogma. From the military perspective, the US President has decided to commit an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan. These troops will deploy to reinforce the 68,000 Americans and 39,000 non-U.S. ISAF troops already there. These troops

will enable the allies to target the insurgency, break its momentum, better secure Afghanistan's population centers, and strengthen the Afghan security forces and Afghan government to a point where they can take the lead across all these areas.³⁰ Conversely, Pakistan views the huge surge negatively as it will likely have a destabilizing influence on the border region and indeed the entire country.³¹

Within Pakistan, there is a broad range of planned initiatives addressing energy, agriculture, water, health and education, assistance to displaced Pakistanis, and assistance to build the capacity of Pakistan's democratic institutions at the national, provincial, and local levels. Possibly the most promising of the assistance programs are the efforts to address Pakistan's most challenging social and economic issues. All these efforts are designed to empower Pakistan to sustain long term growth across all social, political, economic and military domains and directly or indirectly aid in the campaign against extremists both in Pakistan and the region.³²

Clearly, these planning efforts are significant and, if executed, will significantly aid in the war against the Taliban extremists and Al Qaeda. The strategy, however, could be improved in several critical areas.

Appraisal of AFPAC Strategy

The AFPAC strategy is an important step for the US to expand its heretofore rather myopic Iraq/Afghanistan-centric perspective. In some respects it provides a degree of optimism by attempting to address the exigent issues with regard to more than a single actor. It does make many provisions that will undoubtedly have a positive impact on both Afghanistan and Pakistan. These

include: significant increases for Afghanistan and Pakistan in essential economic aid; proffered assistance to help improve the security capabilities of both countries; the recognition of the difference between the Taliban and Al Qaeda and a willingness to negotiate with the former; and directly addressing the pervasive narcotics trafficking.³³ Unfortunately, the strategy also raises numerous issues and concerns that may derail its implementation. These include: the announcement of a timetable for a US withdrawal that harkens back to the US precipitous exodus from the region following the Soviet's withdrawal from Afghanistan; the inappropriate and dubious linkage of the US's overall strategy for Afghanistan with the overall strategy for Pakistan; the superficial treatment of the India-Pakistan relationship challenges and the incredible lack of appreciation for the perceived threat India's activities in Afghanistan poses for Pakistan's security; the proposed limitations/conditions (strings) on proffered assistance; the limited focus and relatively modest amount of the proposed economic and aid package; and no specifics on improved US-Pak military cooperation such as suspending US covert operations within Pakistan, sharing intelligence and providing drones and other capabilities to Pakistan to better enable Pakistan's own campaign against the extremists. These issues are key ingredients to crafting a more comprehensive strategy.

Announcement of a Timetable

The most unsettling aspect of the announced AFPAK strategy centers on the timeline for the withdrawal of US forces.³⁴ To grasp the insidious magnitude of this element of the strategy one must first recognize the profound impact on the public psyche of past instances of US abandonment and policy reversals that

had appalling strategic consequences for Pakistan and the region. While establishing a timeline may help to energize Afghanistan toward taking responsibility for security and governance reforms and plays well with a US public growing weary with the war, it significantly undermines Pakistan's public confidence in US resolve. While President Obama alluded to „conditions-based' withdrawal criteria, his emphasis on a timed 18-month withdrawal was unmistakable. It implied and was understood to mean that the US was leaving according to the timeline despite „conditions.' To mitigate this perception, it is imperative that future public pronouncements deliberately address the „conditions' that will dictate the degree of US presence and emphasize the US's long term commitment to regional stability and prosperity.

Inappropriate Linkage of Pakistan and Afghanistan Strategies

Developing a capstone strategy applicable to the diverse and unique strategic environments of both Afghanistan and Pakistan at best reduces the applicability to each and at worst can undermine efforts in both countries. Strategic activities in one country often work at cross-purposes to those of the other. Pakistan is not Afghanistan and vice versa. While the intention may have been to better unify counter-terrorism efforts and simplify the strategy, it may have had the opposite effect.³⁵ Islamabad harbors deep reservations about approaching the Afghanistan-Pakistan border areas as a single area of operations. There are substantial differences in the strategic consequences of US operations depending upon which side of the border they are conducted and it is reckless and short sighted to treat them as being the same. The unintended consequence of treating both the same is to provide greater rationale for militants

on both sides of the border to form an alliance to oppose a common external threat posed by US troop increases.³⁶ Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari has criticized the US administration's linkage of Pakistan and Afghanistan under a single strategy and "in an interview with the *Financial Times* pointed out that Afghanistan and Pakistan are distinctly different countries, and cannot be lumped together for any reason."³⁷ The differences are significant: Pakistan is an established democracy, possesses a large professional military that is nuclear capable, has a growing middle class and comparatively stable economy, well established and widespread news and communications networks, and is a country of 170 million people with a colonial history of exercising local, provincial and state governance. Conversely Afghanistan is a near-failed state with a nascent democracy, insurgency prone and with a history of spotty, corrupt and ineffective governance. The context and associated strategic consequences of counter-terrorist operations can vary dramatically between the two countries. Very bluntly, within Pakistan, public opinion counts. For instance, President Obama's implication that the US will take action against targets in Pakistan only serves to further inflame Pakistani public opinion and undermine the strategic aims of both countries.³⁸ These differences make a single AFPAK strategic approach for both countries extremely difficult if not utterly impracticable.

Importance of the India-Pakistan Rapprochement

It is difficult to overstate the central role that the threat of India plays in Pakistani security concerns.³⁹ Over the course of its brief 63 year history there have been: three shooting wars and four near-wars; the juxtaposition of significant armed forces from both countries on their common border; an on-

going bitter dispute over Kashmir; a nuclear arms race; and increased animosity over the terrorist attack in Mumbai in 2008.⁴⁰ President Obama has at least acknowledged this issue both in his 27 March '09 speech and while he was on the campaign trail in 2008,⁴¹ but his strategy falls far short of addressing solutions to the underlying Pakistan-India disputes and, due to Indian opposition, he has dropped any references in his public presentations to resolving the Kashmir issue.⁴² Nevertheless, strategies must conform and adapt to the exigencies of the strategic environment and not *vice versa*. "The success of Obama's strategy will be contingent on how calm relations are between Delhi and Islamabad."⁴³ Thus, if the US hopes to be successful in its campaign against terrorists in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, it must assuage the tension between India and Pakistan and actively pursue the resolution of the Kashmir issue, reduce Indian and Pakistani security forces along their common border, and pursue a bilateral agreement seeking the maintenance of some degree of balance between their nuclear and conventional forces. Only then can Pakistan act decisively against the militants in the border area⁴⁴...and only then will the AFPAK strategy have an improved likelihood of success.

Related to the perceived threat posed by India to Pakistan is the increase in Indian activity and influence within Afghanistan that further complicates and diverts Pakistani focus against extremists in the border region. Addressing the India-Pakistan relationship necessarily requires the US to exercise substantial influence in curbing India's provocative activities on Pakistan's western border. There is evidence that India is conducting operations from their consulates in

Afghanistan (Jalalabad and Qandahar) on the border of Pakistan, are infusing money into Baluchistan, engaging in provocative actions such as utilizing the Border Roads Organization to construct particularly controversial portions of the Ring Road, and erecting schools in contentious areas such as in Kunar that is next to Bajaur.⁴⁵ This activity combined with India's previous provocative actions in establishing a base in Farkhor, Tajikistan⁴⁶ and new evidence of India supplying weapons to militants in the Swat and FATA⁴⁷ portend dire consequences for the AFPAC strategy.

While Pakistani concerns about India's increasing influence in Afghanistan has been largely downplayed by the US, it has in fact significantly grown to the point where Pakistan no longer views its flanks as secure. Correspondingly, General McChrystal reported on the sensitivity of Indian activities in Afghanistan in his initial assessment in August 2009. He warned that the increasing Indian influence in Afghanistan would probably aggravate the regional tensions and cause Pakistan to directly counter India's subterfuge in Afghanistan. The consequence of moving the India-Pakistan conflict into Afghanistan and escalating the activities of both countries could in and of itself derail the existing AFPAC strategy and, with two nuclear-armed states jockeying for an advantage in new and volatile areas, lead to catastrophic consequences.⁴⁸ General Kayani, Pakistan's Chief of Army Staff, has aptly and candidly described the threat dynamics to Pakistan when he said,

While the Pakistan Army is alert to and fighting the threat posed by militancy, it remains an "India-centric" institution and that reality will not change in any significant way until the Kashmir issue and water disputes are resolved.⁴⁹

The success of the AFPAK strategy will depend upon the US recognizing and applying its diplomatic clout to address and diffuse the India-Pakistan dispute by resolving Kashmir and water issues.

Conditions-based and Sufficiency of Economic Support Efforts

As previously noted, the prevailing strategy calls for an expanded support effort addressing a wide range of civilian support activities in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. This includes pursuing the Kerry-Lugar-Berman legislation authorizing \$1.5 billion a year to support Pakistani civil support activities for a five year period; a request for Congress to pursue a bipartisan bill creating Reconstruction Opportunity Zones in Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan; and soliciting international support for a new Contact Group for Afghanistan and Pakistan to bring together all Nations that have a stake in establishing security and prosperity in the region.⁵⁰

While significant, these efforts will likely be insufficient given the scope and severity of the challenges facing Pakistan and the region. To stem the growing groups of militants, Pakistan must provide a viable economic and social alternative especially to the significant pool of disaffected young men who are particularly susceptible recruitment by the extremists. Moreover, the \$7.5 billion over a 5 year period hardly reflects the ascribed central role that Pakistan plays within the US strategy nor will it likely resolve the immediate solvency crisis Pakistan faces. Current estimates are that Pakistan will require at least \$20 billion of international support within the next few years if it is to be financially stabilized. This level of International support is not unreasonable given that Pakistan has spent an estimated \$35 billion in the war on terrorism since 9/11.⁵¹

The imposition of ‚conditions‘ for the provision of aid, which pervades US strategy and rhetoric, undermines Pakistani public and governmental support for the United States. For instance, President Obama not so subtly intimated an ultimatum in his 27 March speech when he threatened that: “Pakistan must demonstrate its commitment to rooting out Al Qaeda and the violent extremists within its borders. And we will insist that action be taken -- one way or another -- when we have intelligence about high-level terrorist targets.”⁵² Correspondingly, Bruce Riedel, a retired CIA expert on South Asia who chaired the special interagency committee to develop the AFPAK strategy, warned against the Kerry-Lugar-Berman legislation being loaded with conditions. He strongly opposes conditions because they represent a transitory “conditions-based relationship.”⁵³ This sentiment is shared by Islamabad. Umbrage is taken where imposed conditions or benchmarking of support efforts are used to gauge performance in the war on terrorism. Striking a particularly sensitive nerve was Obama’s insistence that the US would not provide a “blank check” implying that Pakistan was little more than hired help rather than a valuable ally. Also in an interview, Senator Kerry reinforced this perspective by offering a possible conditions-based metric that would measure whether Pakistan was moving its security forces away from India and towards the Afghanistan border region. “Any effort to impose conditions that aim to change Pakistan’s national security calculus would be misguided and doomed to fail. No country’s national security priorities or structures can be reconfigured from outside.”⁵⁴ If Pakistan is to continue to be a critical ally in the war against terrorism it needs both the full

support and assistance of the US and the international community and to be treated with the respect a trusted ally deserves.

Military-to-Military Cooperation and Support

While Pakistan and Afghanistan have dramatically different operational and strategic environments, there are some potential benefits for improved coordination between allied efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan operations in the border region. In establishing the guiding principles to improve the cohesiveness of the AFPAK strategy it is important to place it within the context of effective counter-insurgency doctrine. The following principles should guide counter-terrorist operations for both nations.

- The battle for the hearts and minds of the population will likely decide the success of the campaign and the strategy. The campaign must first separate the Taliban from Al Qaeda, then reconcile with the moderate Taliban and then use that support to help locate, defeat and destroy the isolated extremists.
- Success will depend upon a nuanced approach to operations on both sides of the border. For instance, a large surge or major escalation of operations in Afghanistan would likely create long-term negative consequences in the border region. There will undoubtedly be a large influx of fleeing militants/Al Qaeda and other refugees to Pakistan. Unfocused „sweep operations’ generating large numbers of civilian displacements and collateral damage in the border areas will likely generate reprisal terrorist attacks in Pakistan for the government’s perceived role in supporting the US aggression.⁵⁵ All these likely effects serve to

dilute and derail Pakistan's own efforts to execute their counterinsurgency campaign in their portion of the border region.

- Select conventional operations should be conducted only with the support of local tribal members to help locate and destroy the extremists. Because of the extreme sensitivity of the indigenous tribal members to foreign intervention, as the campaign progresses, operations in Afghanistan should be increasingly conducted by Afghan forces and only sparingly by US or Allied units.

- With an emphasis on precision and select engagements, operations on each side of the border should also be thoroughly coordinated but not integrated. Collateral or parallel operations should be conducted so as to limit the ping-pong effect of terrorists moving back and forth across the border and avoiding the efforts by either the US/Allies or the Pakistanis. This, however, requires a relative high level of local support on both sides of the border. Albeit, as the pool of tribal terrorist sympathizers dries up, there will be fewer safe havens for which the extremists can seek shelter and support and, consequently, they will become more vulnerable. Thus, operations against suspected extremist locations should be increasingly „conditions-based' rather than necessarily time/opportunity driven.

- All combat capability should be employed and operations be limited within the confines of the respective national borders. The sovereignty of both nations should be observed and respected. This requires that all covert operations conducted by the US within Pakistan territory must cease⁵⁶ including US drone attacks against known or suspected terrorist locations in Pakistan.

Despite President Obama's assurances, the frequency of drone attacks within Pakistan's border region has increased substantially since his election.⁵⁷ The „tactical' benefits of these attacks are usually far outweighed by the strategic liability caused by the loss of Pakistani public support for the US and even for Pakistan's own efforts against the terrorists.⁵⁸ A more strategically viable approach would be to share actionable intelligence between the US and Pakistan and provide Pakistan with the technological capability (drones and supporting control system-of-systems) to conduct the operations within their own territory. The "United States should show strategic patience as well as respect for a sovereign country's red lines in deeds, and not just words."⁵⁹

- Pakistan should gradually assume the role in training and assisting the Afghan security forces. This would help relieve the burden on the overstressed coalition forces and posture Afghanistan for continued long-term cooperation with its neighbor. It would also exploit the common cultural, language, religious and social affiliations of Pakistani and Afghani security personnel.

In summary, the military component of the AFPAC strategy must reflect the dramatically different contexts within each country yet be sufficiently compatible so as to achieve complementary effects and not derail the military campaigns in either country. The negotiated de-escalation of military operations together with the corresponding progressive reduction of indigenous support for the Al Qaeda and irreconcilable extremist Taliban promises to collapse the insurgency to an extent where focused and aggressive operations can then eliminate those extremists. Meanwhile, the fragile public sentiment within

Pakistan will shift to support government military operations against the radical factions who choose to continue their extremist ideology.

Recommendations

The necessary improvements to the AFPAK strategy cut across diplomatic, informational, military, and economic domains and address important areas. The recommended modifications to the strategy that would enhance both US and Pakistan activities are summarized below.

US Focus

- The AFPAK strategy must expand its aperture to encompass all the regional actors while simultaneously focusing its lens to capture the unique strategic and operational environments of each. Limiting the strategy to Afghanistan and Pakistan excludes many key regional nations that play a critical role in the existing insurgencies. Likewise, focusing on seemingly apparent commonalities ignores unique and unseen disparate causes of many of the same symptoms.
- The US must actively and with sincerity pursue a deliberate diplomatic strategy to achieve Pakistan-India rapprochement and resolve lingering disputes between the two countries. This should include addressing in priority: the Kashmir issue, conventional and nuclear arms limitations, suspension of provocative activities in the border areas by both countries, water issues and diffusing numerous other friction points.
- The United States needs to continue to expand its strategic perspective to include all the whole-of-government domains. The best means to prevent the surge of militancy in Pakistan is to resolve economic and social

dissatisfaction and improve the conditions and hope of the populace. An immediate and substantial infusion of approximately \$20 billion should be made by the international community. This would „stop-the-bleeding’ associated with the current financial crisis while more deliberate measures are instituted.

Similarly, the comprehensive whole-of-government programs announced in the US State Department’s supporting strategy is a welcomed and needed long term approach to addressing many social and economic challenges; but more is needed. Specific measures to enhance Pakistan’s textile trade exports to the US and to other western nations would help spur the economy. The rapid implementation and establishment of Reconstruction Opportunity Zones (ROZs) as stated in the AFPAK strategy would also help alleviate some of the difficult economic conditions existing in the FATA and provide a real alternative to those young males who are vulnerable to Al Qaeda and extremist Taliban recruiting efforts. Finally, dropping all strings or conditions to the proffered aid would also help in rebuilding the trust between the two countries.

- The US-PAK trust deficit must be transformed into a fully cooperative transparent relationship. The US must gain and sustain confidence in Pakistan’s judgments regarding their military measures and efforts to combat terrorism within their own borders. Open dialog between the militaries and diplomats must dispel underlying mistrust and clarify the rationale and intent for differences in strategic and operational approaches. All parties should avoid accusations, finger-pointing, threats and public condemnations that only serve to undermine the strategy, foment public outrage and weaken the mutual trust and respect

needed for effective collateral operations. With improved trust should come improved cooperation, increased shared intelligence and the provision of US high-technology drones to Pakistan for Pakistan's employment of those assets in the campaign against terrorism.

- Both the US and Pakistan must take immediate and continued actions to improve military-to-military cooperation, as discussed above, to rapidly bridge the current „coordination gap' in their dual efforts to combat terrorism.

Pakistan Focus

- Pakistan must visibly tackle the challenges of providing good governance, improving security and economic viability if it is to restore the confidence in its future by the international community.⁶⁰

- Recent successes in military operations in Swat and South Waziristan have helped to build international confidence and provided hope to many of the residents in these areas who have suffered under the abusive rule of the Taliban and endured the associated social and economic hardships. Following these successful operations, Pakistan must continue to establish favorable conditions within the remaining disputed areas through increased interaction and negotiations with the local populace. As conditions dictate, Pakistan should then conduct deliberate follow-on and focused operations to destroy the residual extremists and maintain the current strategic momentum.

- Once security is established or re-established in the contested areas of the FATA, Pakistan must adopt a comprehensive plan to institute and stabilize the local governance of the tribal agencies. The plan should outline a set of

related political processes designed to establish a centralized civilian authority to implement and sustain institutional, economic and political reforms.⁶¹ These reforms include integrating the tribal areas into the federal constitutional framework; establishing political diversity and encouraging competition; improving employment opportunities; and providing constitutional rights and privileges as well as the civil protection of the court system to the residents of the FATA.⁶²

- Continue to effect and expedite madrassas reform to ensure these educational institutions are brought within the framework of the mainstream educational system.

Conclusion

The AFPAK strategy is an important first step towards an integrated and comprehensive approach to a viable regional strategy. Although it breaks new ground in developing a whole-of-government approach for Afghanistan and Pakistan, it fails to recognize and adjust to the unique strategic and operational environments of each. This paper examined a broad range of strategic requirements of the AF-PAK strategy, focusing primarily on Pakistan, and identified several areas in need of improvement. Major proposed areas of improvement included: recant the premature announcement of the duration of the campaign; abandon the single unified strategic approach to the disparate insurgencies in the two diverse countries; recognize and accommodate other regional influences that profoundly affect the strategy; discard the unnecessary and provocative imposition of „conditions’ on the proffered aid and support; cease military operations that violate Pakistan sovereignty; and curtail coarse and

sweeping military operations that displace and cause the deaths of innocent civilians and inflame and alienate public support. The reconciliation of policies and military operational approaches in critical areas of mutual concern is essential given the urgency of the issues at hand. In the process of enhancing mutual confidence, each side must show a greater understanding for the other's security concerns. Washington must demonstrate in practice and not just in words that it will no longer pursue an "America only" approach.⁶³ Pakistan on its part, must reform the political process in the FATA so as to integrate it with rest of the country, while aggressively pursuing the militants and undertaking major development activities in the FATA. In doing so, both countries can steady their oscillating relationship and move toward a cooperative long-term alliance that improves the security of both nations, the region and the world.

Endnotes

¹ Steve Coll, Testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 1 October, 2009, available <http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/SNAA-WF7DC?OpenDocument> (accessed on 30 Nov 2009).

² Maleeha Lodhi, The Future of Pakistan-US Relations: Opportunities and Challenges, INSS Special Report, April 2009, available [http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docUploaded/SR_Lodhi_web%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docUploaded/SR_Lodhi_web%20(2).pdf) (accessed 14 December 09).

³ Ibid.

⁴ Rizwan Akhtar, Brigadier, *US Pakistan Trust Deficit and the War on Terror*, Strategy Research Project (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 15, 2008), 2.

⁵ Gilani Tariq, Brigadier, *US Pakistan Relations*, Strategy Research Project (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 10, 2006), 1-2. Gilani indicates that "Liaquat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, turned down Stalin's invitation to visit Moscow and went instead to Washington in 1950."

⁶ Kronstadt Alan, "Pakistan – US – Relations," Congressional Research Service, February 6, 2009, 32, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33498.pdf> (accessed on March 4, 2010).

⁷ Cecile Shea, "PAKISTAN: The Problem of Pakistan," *Hoover Digest*, no. 2, (2008): 1. <http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/17849379.html> (accessed January 23, 2010).

⁸ Gilani, "US Pakistan Relations," 3. "The immediate effect of the proxy war was a sharp rise in religious madrassas (religious seminaries) in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) in Pakistan. These madrassas were meant to indoctrinate the young Muslim students...to fight the Soviet forces."

⁹ John A. Nagl, "A better war in Afghanistan," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, 56, (1st quarter 2010): 39. Nagle indicates that the US helped create Al Qaeda and Taliban in that they "grew and thrived amidst the chaos that followed the Soviet withdrawal and subsequent international neglect..... Afghanistan became the viper's nest in which Al Qaeda grew."

¹⁰ Shea, "PAKISTAN: The Problem of Pakistan," 2. "US sanctions severely limited or barred engagement that might have encouraged economic transformation, law enforcement training, and political party and civil society development."

¹¹ Lodhi, "The Future of Pakistan-US Relations," 1. Lodhi summarized the complex and fluctuating relationship between Pakistan and the US during this period succinctly: "The mutually negative perceptions of both countries can be ascribed in part to the burden of history. This, after all, has been a rollercoaster relationship, characterized by an erratic stop-go pattern in which Pakistan has swung between being America's most "allied ally" and "most sanctioned friend" to a "disenchanted partner."

¹² Rizwan Akhtar, Brigadier, *US Pakistan Trust Deficit and the War on Terror*, 3.

¹³ Pervez Musharraf, *In the line of fire*, (New York: Simon and Schuster 2006), 22.

¹⁴ Kronstadt. Alan, "Pakistan US Relations," 49. The US "designated Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally of the United States under Section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961."

¹⁵ Becker S. Gary, "PAKISTAN: Developing a Taste for Stability," *Hoover Digest*, no. 2, 2008, 1. <http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/17852414.html> (accessed 23 January 2010). "An August 2007 survey by Terror Free Tomorrow, a nonpartisan policy group in Washington, offered a window into Pakistanis' views about Al- Qaeda and terrorism... More than a third held favorable views of Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Osama bin Laden; at the same time, President Musharraf was cited as the least popular political leader in Pakistan. Respondents also had a decidedly unfavorable view of the U.S.-led war on terror, expressing the belief that its real purpose is to kill Muslims, undermine Muslim countries, and achieve other related goals."

¹⁶ Lodhi, "The Future of Pakistan-US Relations." Lodhi highlights the confluence of factors associated with the invasion of Iraq that drove the local tribes toward militancy and radicalism: "Lack of clarity about the goals pursued by coalition forces in the past 7

years and the inability to distinguish between al Qaeda and Taliban began to result in the growing confusion about the aims of the war effort. It also led to the growing fusion between Pashtun nationalism and Muslim radicalism, which in turn strengthened the insurgency. The fatal distraction of the Iraq War and the consequential diversion of resources and attention compounded all these problems. The downward trajectory in Afghanistan caused devastating fallout on Pakistan, especially in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) where it spread militancy and radicalized some of the tribes in South and North Waziristan. This in turn accentuated the threat of the Talibanization of Pakistan. Much like the war in Vietnam was pushed into Cambodia, the escalation of the military campaign and failure to contain and subdue the Taliban in Afghanistan pushed the conflict into Pakistan's tribal belt."

¹⁷ Baker, "PAKISTAN: Developing a Taste for Stability," 1.

¹⁸ The PEW Global Attitudes Project, "Pakistani Public Opinion: Growing Concerns about Extremism, Continuing Discontent with U.S.," Washington DC, Pew Research Center Project, 13 Aug, 2009, 1, <http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/265.pdf> (accessed 5 February 2010). The report indicates that "Opinions of America and its people remain extremely negative. Barack Obama's global popularity is not evident in Pakistan, and America's image remains as tarnished in that country as it was in the Bush years. Only 22% of Pakistanis think the U.S. takes their interests into account when making foreign policy decisions, essentially unchanged from 21% since 2007. Fully 64% of the public regards the U.S. as an enemy, while only 9% describe it as a partner."

¹⁹ Balazs Gardi, "The Truth about Talibanistan," *Time* in partnership with CNN, March 22, 2007, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1601850,00.html> (accessed 23 Jan 2010). Gardi highlights some aspects of tribal areas. The FATA is in a remote and sparsely populated area of northwest Pakistan occupied by fiercely independent and warlike Pashtun tribes who have never really submitted to the authority of any country and are only partially influenced by the Pakistani government. Additionally, the FATA is a very inhospitable environment that is mostly mountainous and densely forested.

²⁰ Hasan-Askari Rizvi, "Analysis: The Turning Point," *Daily Times*, 27 Sep 2009, http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2009%5C09%5C27%5Cstory_27-9-2009_pg3_2 (accessed 4 March 2010). Rizvi describes the major events that swayed public opinion: "There were several developments in Swat and elsewhere during February-April 2009 that caused a high degree of insecurity in the society, including destruction of schools; killing of people who defied the Taliban; the video of a girl being flogged in public; the Taliban's refusal to abide by the agreement with the NWFP government; statements questioning the legitimacy of Pakistan's constitution and democracy; attempts to control Buner; and vigilantism by pro-Taliban hard-line Islamic activists in some of the major cities, including Lahore, Karachi and Rawalpindi. The threat of their march from Swat-Buner to Islamabad haunted the government and people."

²¹ Shah Saeed, "Despite US pressure, Pakistan continues to follow its own road," <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/world/AP/story/1346431.html>, (accessed November 23, 2009). "Whatever the disagreements of the moment might be - the long term

partnership is essential. After all Pakistani contributions to counter terrorism since 9/11 have been decisive, and the government recognizes it.”

²² Ibid.

²³ Brigadier Zahid Latif, “Pakistan’s Security Perspective and its Role in Fight against Terrorism,” presentation at CENTCOM, 16 Feb 2010. Brigadier Zahid is the National Senior Representative of Pakistan at CENTCOM. He briefed the International Fellows of USAWC and presented the details of human losses in Pakistan due to terrorism and the fight against it since 2001. These included: Civilian: Killed 5099 and wounded 9348; and for the Military: Killed 2273 and wounded 6444. No other single nation has sacrificed more than Pakistan.

²⁴ Husain Zahid, “Kayani spells out terms for regional stability,” Dawn.com, 2 Feb 2010, <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/kayani-spells-out-terms-for-regional-stability-220> (assessed 3 March 2010).

²⁵ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, February 2010, 60. http://www.defense.gov/qdr/images/QDR_as_of_12Feb10_1000.pdf (assessed 10 March 2010). The report mentions that the “United States has committed to a long-term strategic partnership with Pakistan that is built on a foundation of mutual interests and joint efforts. We will work with Pakistan to strengthen its capacity to combat extremism, and we will provide substantial resources to support Pakistan’s democracy and development.”

²⁶ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President on a New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan,” The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 27 Mar 2009, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-on-a-New-Strategy-for-Afghanistan-and-Pakistan (accessed on 5 Feb 2010).

²⁷ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan,” The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 1 Dec 2009, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-address-nation-way-forward-afghanistan-and-pakistan> (accessed on 5 Feb 2010).

²⁸ Department of State, “Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy,” Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, January 2010, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/135728.pdf> (accessed 5 Feb 2010).

²⁹ Ibid., iv.

³⁰ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-address-nation-way-forward-afghanistan-and-pakistan> (accessed on 13 December 2009).

³¹ Maleeah Lodhi, “The Impact of Afghanistan on Pakistan,” Executive Summary of Testimony to Senate Foreign Relations Committee, October 2009, <http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/LodhiTestimony091001a.pdf> (accessed 3 March 2010). Lodhi indicates that escalation would push the Taliban even closer to Al Qaeda and even the enhanced troops level will be insufficient to implement a “clear, hold

and build” strategy. Economic costs will also escalate and the war will intensify regional rivalries and will lead to more western casualties. The impact on Pakistan will be the further influx of refugees and Al Qaeda fighters into Pakistan, the increase in the vulnerability of US-NATO ground supply routes, stretching Pakistan Forces to protect supply lines, produce a spike in violent reappraisals on mainland Pakistan, lead to the influx of more Afghan refugees with further destabilizing effects in NWFP and Baluchistan, and it could erode the present fragile political climate in Pakistan to fight militancy.

³² Department of State, “Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy,” Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, January 2010, iii, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/135728.pdf> (accessed 5 Feb 2010).

³³ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 3.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Burki, Shahid Javed, “AfPak policy a mistake,” Tuesday, 17 Nov, 2009, <http://cspasif.blogspot.com/2009/11/afpak-policy-mistake-by-shahid-javed.html> (accessed 17 December 2009).

³⁶ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 3-4.

³⁷ Lamont, James and Bokhari, Farhan, “Zardari Rejects Obamas Afpak Strategy,” *Financial Times*, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/93986082-9d46-11de-9f4a-00144feabdc0.html?catid=5&SID=google> (assessed 30 Nov 2009).

³⁸ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 3.

³⁹ Gwertzman Bernard, “Pakistan’s ‘Existential Threat’ Comes From Within,” http://www.cfr.org/publication/19321/pakistanies_existential_comes_from_within.html (accessed November 11, 2009). Bruce O. Riddell commented that “there’s clearly a recognition that if you want to change Pakistan’s overall behavior, India will have to be a part of that equation. The Indians have made it very clear that they don’t want to be put in the same grouping. But at the same time, we should understand that you can’t change Pakistan’s behavior without understanding it’s obsession with the Indian equation.”

⁴⁰ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 4.

⁴¹ Raja Mohan, “Barrack Obama’s Kashmir thesis,” <http://www.indianexpress.com/news/barack-obamas-kashmir-thesis/380615/> (accessed 31 Oct 09). Obama stated in his speech that “To lessen tensions between two nuclear-armed nations that too often teeter on the edge of escalation and confrontation, we must pursue constructive diplomacy with both India and Pakistan.” See also Rachael Maddow, “Transcript: Barrack Obama talks to Rachael Maddow 5 days before election,” 30 Oct 2008, linked from tvmsnbc.com at “Rachael Maddow Show,” <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/27464980/> (accessed 12 March 2010). Obama was quoted as saying: “The most important thing we’re going to have to do with respect to Afghanistan, is actually deal with Pakistan. And we’ve got work with the newly elected government there in a coherent way that says terrorism is now a threat to you. Extremism is a threat to you. We

should probably try to facilitate a better understanding between Pakistan and India and try to resolve the Kashmir crisis so that they can stay focused not on India, but on the situation with those militants.”

⁴² Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 4.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 4-5.

⁴⁵ Fair, C. Cristine, “What is the problem with Pakistan,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/discussions/roundtables/whats-the-problem-with-pakistan> (assessed 13 December 09).

⁴⁶ Indian military base in Tajikistan, Indian News on line, <http://news.indiamart.com/news-analysis/indian-military-base-3326.html> (assessed 13 December 2009).

⁴⁷ Indian Weapons In Swat & FATA, Pakalert Press, 16 June 2009, <http://pakalert.wordpress.com/2009/06/16/indian-weapons-in-swat-fata/> (accessed 13 December 2009). “The Pakistani military through its own channels has shared evidence with the US military about Indian support for terrorism in Pakistan’s tribal belt and Swat. The evidence was embarrassing for the Americans because they have been defending Indian presence in Afghanistan and have also been defending the opening up of Indian consulates in areas close to the Pakistani border.... This is one explanation for why U.S. Undersecretary of State William Burns raised for the first time in New Delhi last week the need to “trim” the Indian consulates working in Afghanistan, among other things.”

⁴⁸ Bearden Milton A, “The War in Afghanistan-The Regional Effects,” Statement to the Senates Foreign Relations Committee, October 1, 2009, <http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/BeardenTestimony091001a.pdf> (accessed 30 November 2009).

⁴⁹ Cyril Almeida, “Kayani spells out threat posed by Indian doctrine,” <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/front-page/12-kayani-spells-out-threat-posed-by-indian-doctrine-420--bi-08> (assessed 28 February 2010).

⁵⁰ Obama, “Remarks by the President on a New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan,” 27 March 2009.

⁵¹ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 5.

⁵² Obama, “Remarks by the President on a New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan,” 27 March 2009.

⁵³ Bernard, “Pakistan’s ‘Existential Threat’ Comes From Within.”

⁵⁴ Lodhi, “The Future of Pakistan-US Relations,” 4.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 3-4.

⁵⁶ Constable, Pamela. "Pakistan Army shows off captured Taliban posts," <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/17/AR2009111701647.html> (accessed 23 November 2009). These operations are suspected to be more than just drone attacks and this perception is frequently distorted by the Pakistani press that also inflames public sentiment: "Public resentment against the United States has grown with persistent reports in the Pakistani media that Xe Services, the U.S. contractor formally known as Blackwater, is operating in Pakistan. The Pakistani Taliban blamed Xe on Monday for a series of bombings against civilians, including a car bombing that killed more than 100 civilians in a Peshawar market late last month. In an English-language statement posted on its Web site, the Taliban said that Pakistani and U.S. government charges that insurgents were responsible for the blast were part of a plot "to create hatred among the common people" against the Taliban." See also Alex Rodriguez, Pakistanis Look on U.S. Embassy Plans With Suspicion, *Los Angeles Times*, 25 Sep 2009, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/sep/25/world/fg-pakistan-anger25?pg=3> (accessed 21 Feb 09).

⁵⁷ Barbara Starr, CNN Pentagon Correspondent, The Situation Room (CNN), "Push Button War," American Morning Transcripts, aired 19 Nov 2009, <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/091119/sitroom.02.html> (accessed 23 November 2009). "Since Obama took office the number of attacks has jumped - 45 this year so far, compared to 34 for all of 2008,...hundreds of civilians may also have been killed...over the life of the program, up to 1,000 people have been killed and up to a third were civilians." For a summary of the history of the number of drone attacks and corresponding terrorist and civilian casualties see also Jason H. Campbell and Michael O'Hanlon, "Pakistan Index Tracking Variables of Reconstruction & Security," *Brookings*, 5 October 2009, 6-7, <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/Programs/FP/pakistan%20index/index20091005.pdf> (accessed 20 December 2009).

⁵⁸ Lodhi, "The Future of Pakistan-US Relations," 3.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Lodhi, "The Future of Pakistan-US Relations," 5.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Pakistan: Countering Militancy in FATA, Asia Report N°178, 21 October 2009, International Crisis Group, <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=6356> (accessed 16 December 2009).

⁶³ Maleeha Lodhi, "The Impact of Afghanistan on Pakistan", Executive Summary of Dr. Maleeha Lodhi's Testimony to Senate Foreign Relations Committee," October 2009 <http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/LodhiTestimony091001a.pdf> (accessed 3 March 2010).